

TABLE B - STRATEGY

Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Question 3 Do you agree that the preferred approach provides a good basis for applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development? If not, what changes do you suggest? Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any changes required?	Name	Business or organisation name;
Yes	Noted		Lisa Marron	Resident
Yes	Noted		Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
Yes	Noted		Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
<p>Caveat (B) presupposes conflicting policies are robust and up to date. Applications supported by objective up to date evidence should be afforded discretion. Where new evidence supersedes old; officers should be afforded discretion to recommend applications in spite of their perceived conflict. Caveat B is prejudicial.</p> <p>For instance; Broom Leys Farm, extant application 14/00808/OUTM for 250 units near to the centre of Coalville currently conflicts with saved Green Wedge policy. The council's own urban fringe and green wedge review papers (2012) identify the site as not fulfilling either the function of green wedge or area of separation. Yet, this draft Local plan part 1 proposes to re-designate the entire green wedge as an area of separation.</p> <p>At present NWLDC has overlooked the facts outlined within its own evidence base and two independently commissioned landscape and visual impact studies. Applying an untested policy to omit a sustainable development site in Coalville that is critical to the delivery of key highway improvements required to relieve congestion along an identified key route to the M1 outlined in highway policies;</p> <p>Caveat B is too prescriptive, officer should be afforded discretion to measure applications against the most up to date evidence available.</p>	<p>The Settlement Fringe Assessment 2010 acknowledges that the area between Coalville and Whitwick doesn't meet all of the criteria to be defined as a Green Wedge however it does recognise the importance of protecting this area to avoid the coalescence of settlements. The area is not classed as particularly attractive countryside but meets the criteria as being defined as an Area of Separation.</p> <p>Application 14/00808/OUTM does not currently have planning permission and is still pending consideration. The inclusion of the policy is based on guidance issued by the Planning Inspectorate. It is proposed to amend caveat B to refer to the National Planning Policy Framework for clarity</p>	<p>Amend caveat B of the policy to state "Specific Policies in the National Planning Policy Framework indicate that development should be restricted".</p>	George Breed	Persimmon Homes NMID

<p>The term "sustainable" is the key, and must be defined such that the objectives in 4.4 are met. For example, priority of brownfield sites over greenfield, and proper studies conducted on capacity of local services and infrastructure (ignoring lightweight and biased surveys done by development companies themselves).</p>	<p>Noted. The District Council has conducted settlement surveys to assess the services and facilities of each of the settlements within the district to identify a settlement hierarchy. The District Council is also in the process of preparing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will highlight any infrastructure concerns.</p>		<p>Stephen Saxby</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>		<p>Alison Wright</p>	<p>Heather Parish Council</p>
<p>Page 23, para 5.3 and page 117, para 11.16. The draft local plan says that development should be restricted in "locations at risk of flooding". if the ground level of the site on which the Castle Donington Willow Farm industrial estate was built, had not been raised, the industrial estate would have flooded at least once in recent years. the Barrett housing estate on station road, Castle Donington, is built on the flood plain. If the sewage drainage system were to fail when there is flooding or the water table rises, life would become very unpleasant for residents. These are two examples where there have been major developments in "locations at risk of flooding". The local plan should place greater emphasis on restricting developments in these locations.</p>	<p>Noted. The draft Local Plan includes policy Cc3: Flood Risk, which looks to reduce the risk and impact of flooding.</p>		<p>Gerald Dalby</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>I think it is difficult to balance the presumption in favour of sustainable development with Policy S4, Countryside. It is possible to make a case that a development is in a sustainable area even when it is outside the limits to development (as has happened recently in Coleorton and is likely to happen again). If sustainability is the main approach, it will be quite easy to lose countryside. Possibly one solution is to have wider limits to development around some villages to allow some organic growth where it can be shown to be in a sustainable area, but then rigidly maintain the Countryside.</p>	<p>Noted. The current Limits to Development in the 2002 adopted Local Plan are out dated this is one of a number of reasons why the Limits to Development have been revised as the existing Limits to Development have been breached. Once the new Local Plan is adopted these policies will be up to date and will therefore be much more defensible when determining planning applications.</p>		<p>Sue McGlynn - Clerk to Coleorton Parish Council</p>	<p>Coleorton Parish Council</p>

<p>Strategy.</p> <p>Presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>This may be a good policy, which is supposed to be in force at present. But the council are not either driven by this or conform to this statement. The drivers seem to be local politics and nimbyism. Review of the results of district wide planning applications shows that in some areas applications are much more likely to be approved than in other areas.</p> <p>Would this policy in the plan result in developments which don't meet the councils criteria will not be approved? It hasn't in the past.</p> <p>Page 23 - Item 5.3</p> <p>Should include high class agricultural land. Ref NPPF page 26 item 111</p> <p>Item 5.5 and 5.6</p> <p>Identify the amount jobs and houses needed. You can only approve acceptable applications; if applications are not acceptable then this cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Plus once approval is given you have little to no control over getting these houses built. The council cannot affect the quantity of new jobs. You can allocate as much land as you like for industry, but we already have land set aside for jobs already. Sitting on your thumbs obviously doesn't work. The plan should be proactive on both housing build and encouraging industry. See NPPF page 7 item 22.</p>	<p>Each application has to assessed on its own merits, and will be assessed using both national policy and the local plan once it is adopted. The inclusion of the policy is based on guidance issued by the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan positively promotes housing growth by allocating over and above the required number of houses as set out in the Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (SHMA) in order to accommodate higher economic growth for example the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange to the north of the District.</p> <p>The Local Plan is planning for economic growth by allocating further employment sites to the land north of Ashby and protecting existing employment sites from alternative uses unless where it can be demonstrated that the property has been vacant for at least 6 months and has been subject of genuine marketing for commercial (B class) uses for at least that period of time, at reasonable market values , and which is proved unsuccessful. The site is no longer capable of meeting the needs of modern businesses; continuation in employment use would be inappropriate in terms of adjoining uses or the amenity of the wider area.</p> <p>It is agreed that para 5.3 should be amended to refer to Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land.</p>	<p>Amend para 5.3 to include Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land.</p>	<p>Steve Palmer</p>	<p>NA</p>
--	--	---	---------------------	-----------

<p>Notwithstanding this we do not support large commercial areas being created involving employees having to travel considerable distances. If any major housing conurbation is to be considered then it should be as close to the existing employment opportunities as possible. Where it is not you, should ensure off road access is available both by way of footpaths and cycle ways.</p> <p>We are not in a position to comment on the amount of housing and employment needed or practical as that is outside our remit. We take it that so called affordable (social and housing association) housing should not be concentrated in largish areas but should be spread throughout the area including any extensions to rural communities. Low cost starter homes are a must whether for purchase or rental, private or social especially where first time buyer properties at affordable prices are rare and force younger people out of their communities. This does then bring in sustainable travel considerations which we would wish to promote; in locating additional housing the means of travel must be a major consideration. Quite apart from the provision of off road routes, public transport must be available, which does suggest that the existing bus corridors should be considered first. Routes like the Coalville – E M Airport link could support some growth of the small villages along the route and if such routes were better promoted, they could attract visitors into the wider rural area boosting those local economies.</p>	<p>The settlement hierarchy which directs development is tested as part of the sustainability appraisal. As part of the local plan to ensure that development is located in the most sustainable settlements within the district. As part of new proposals it is encouraged that they are linked to existing services and facilities to create a sustainable pattern of development as set out in the NPPF.</p>		Terry Kirby	Chairman local access forum
<p>There is scope within national planning policy to restrict development in areas of designated heritage assets. See attached plan and document which refer to the draft limits to development for Packington.</p> <p>We wish to express our concern that the draft new Local Plan for Packington village will destroy the character and appearance of the Packington Conservation Area. The current draft, if adopted, will lead to substantial harm and total loss of significance of designated heritage assets contrary to para 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework. We propose that the Limits to Development be extended to the east of the village of Packington; rather than to the west, as contained within the current draft document.</p>	<p>We are required to include policy S1 in accordance with guidance from PINS. The Limits to Development are a separate planning tool to conservation areas. The Limits to Development are a commonly used tool in Local Plans that provide clear, defensible boundaries around settlements within which development will normally be confined. They have been used as a planning policy tool in North West Leicestershire for a considerable time.</p> <p>Limits to Development distinguish between areas of development and development potential and areas of restraint, such as countryside.</p> <p>The draft Limits to Development for Packington have been drawn to take account of existing Planning Permissions and will need to be amended to include land at Spring Lane.</p> <p>The impact on the conservation area will be considered as</p>		Keith and Sandra Goodwin	NA

<p>The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that Conservation Areas are kept under review (Section 69(2)) and that local planning authorities in exercising their planning powers, pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Areas (section 72). As supplementary planning guidance the Conservation Area Appraisal /Study document whilst not having the same status as an adopted plan policy may be taken into account as material consideration in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 statutorily requires that when determining planning applications special regard should be had to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building and preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. These requirements are similar to those set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the framework). To promote sustainable development, among other things, the Framework seeks to ensure that heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.</p> <p>Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, special regard should be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting. Para 132 of the NPPF states that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the assets conservation. Paragraph 133 of the NPPF states that where a development will lead to substantial harm or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset , local planning authorities should refuse planning permission.</p> <p>The draft Limits to Development in the new Local Plan for Packington village have mainly been extended to the west of Mill Street. These new limits include the Conservation Area surrounding the Grade 2* listed Church of the Holy Road, a Grade 2 listed Tomb at the church, the Grade 2 manor House and Grade 2 bridge opposite the Manor House in Mill Street. Conservation Areas are</p>	<p>part of any new development.</p>			
---	-------------------------------------	--	--	--

defined as "areas of special architectural or historic interest, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990). The Conservation Area surrounding the heritage assets above was formerly designated an Area of Special Housing Character and protected under the lapsed Policy H9.

The draft Limits to Development have also been extended to the north-west of Mill Street. The Conservation Area for this part of the village of Packington include the Grade 2 listed Packington Mill and Grade 2 listed bridge opposite the mill. Any development in this part of the Conservation Area would additionally affect the setting of two grade 2 listed cottages at Numbers 9 and 11 Mill Street. Both Mill Croft and Croft Cottage are situated in an elevated location on the south-west side of Mill Street and their setting would be affected contrary to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Visual evidence also survives of the former mill pond to Packington Mill in the field area to the north of the seventeenth/ eighteenth century Mill building. The Domesday Survey of 1086/7 records that there was a mill in the village and it is common for such sites to be occupied by a series of structures, There appears, therefore, to be some archaeological potential in respect of this area.

We strongly urge the District Council to retain and protect the historic environment and the setting of buildings which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Packington Conservation Area. We urge the District Council to from a new Limits to Development to the east of Packington village in the Spring Lane/ Normanton Road/Redburrow Lane areas. These areas do not form part of the Conservation Area of the village and buildings are almost entirely composed of Twentieth Century housing stock. The setting of the Grade 2 listed Packington House on Spring Lane is already affected by the location of a modern house immediately adjacent both the north and the south.

Planning permission for residential development has recently been granted on two sites to the east of the village. In addition planning permission has previously been granted for residential development for 42 houses to the south-east of

--	--	--	--	--

Spring Lane. Permission was granted on this site on the recommendation by officers that the site was sustainable and lent itself to development being situated in a natural hollow thereby lessening the visual impact of the site.

Limits to Development in the Spring Lane/ Normanton Road/Redburrow Lane area should be extended as shown on the enclosed illustrative plan outlined in red. Planning permission granted recently by the District Council for the construction of 30 houses to the south-west of Normanton road outside the village boundary has already created new Limits to Development in this area. It would seem logical that these new Limits to Development be extended up to Redburrow Lane which is a natural rather than an arbitrary boundary. Proposed Limits to Development to the north of Normanton Road/Spring Lane would be limited to an easterly projection of the existing building line to minimize any effect on the setting of the Grade 2 listed Packington House.

In our opinion the draft proposal to extend the Limits to Development for Packington village to the west and north-west of Mill Street to include the Conservation area is not 'sound'. It cannot be justified that the setting of listed building and preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area is compromised in this manner. It is not consistent with the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and para 132 and 133 of the NPPF.

We believe that emphasis instead should be given to considering new Limits to Development in Spring Lane/ Normanton Road/Redburrow lane area as shown on the attached plan. Development to the east of the village, rather to the west as currently proposed, would also satisfy the draft policy S5:Design of New Development. This policy seeks to support development where intended occupants of the proposed development would not be negatively affected (or harmed) by neighbouring uses existing or proposed). Any development to the west and north -west of Mill Street will result in bringing intended occupants within affecting distance of the proposed route of HS2. We urge the Council therefore to adopt our proposal.

--	--	--	--	--

The Parish Council feels that sustainable development should not be built on an area of flood plain. The plan should also consider the effects of surface water run-off downstream and ways to mitigate this, such as Balancing Ponds.	The draft Local Plan does consider flooding and is covered by Policy Cc3, allocated development sites have also been assessed against the SRFA 2015, which assess flood risk across the district. The draft Local Plan also sets the need for assessing the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to mimic the natural drainage process whilst removing pollutants from urban runoff at the source before entering a watercourse.		Samantha Lockwood	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council
Yes	noted		Mr Robert Harlow	Harlow Bros Ltd
Yes	noted		F J ALLGOOD	Land Owner
No	noted		None	none
Strategy implies clear sky thinking and your plan is just tinkering and putting more houses near the biggest towns! Cheap and very poor strategic analysis.	The distribution of housing development has been tested as part of the sustainability appraisal process used to prepare the local plan. It is important to direct development to the most sustainable locations.		David Harris	Pyrotect Ltd
The areas Housing needs cannot be discussed in isolation of the areas recreational space. The designation of Local Green Space in the local plan is essential. Ashby is being identified for a large number of new properties - the provision and protection of the existing green spaces are essential.	The protection of open spaces is currently covered by draft Local Plan IF3. The need to provide open space as part of new development is based upon national standards. However we need to have regard to a range of other factors as it is not the case of 'one size fits all'. For example, the size and type of many properties being provided will influence the type and amount of open space which may be needed; family homes are more likely to require more open space than one where the development is aimed at more elderly people. Similarly there may already be sufficient provision in the locality such that further provision is not required or is limited.		Colin Eaton	Colin Eaton
What does this sentence mean - should be written so normal people can even understand it	Draft Policy S1 is included within the draft Local Plan in order to conform to national policy.		Simon Litchfield	Resident
The inclusion of a reference to planning applications according with policies with in Neighbourhood Plans is welcomed.	Noted.		Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
Yes	Noted.		Angela Cornell	Fisher German
I believe that you need to look at how other towns similar to Ashby have been developed to ensure that the historic nature of the town is not lost. A railway link would help to reduce congestion and must be seen as a critical enhancement to Leicester / Burton.	Noted. The historic nature of the town is considered when planning for the future development of the town. The route of the Leicester to Burton Line is safeguarded by draft Local Plan Policy IF5.		Andrew Stone	NA

<p>Sustainable development includes the concept of considering the location of employment and building houses nearby to reduce commuting distances and to enable the use of public transport. Development needs to be served by public transport and developers should, as part of planning permission, be required to provide funds for public transport out of their profits. In particular, the Railway line to Burton and Leicester needs to be re-opened before any further housing is built in this area; the developers should be required to contribute.</p> <p>Without such considerations the concept of real sustainability cannot be achieved.</p>	<p>The need to make contribution towards public transport, is assessed on a site by site basis. A contribution towards public transport can only be requested if this passes a number tests to make the development acceptable. Policies in the local plan seek to ensure that new development contributes to the relevant forms of infrastructure.</p>		Mary Lorimer	Not applicable
Yes	Noted		Trevor Davis	None
The Parish Council appreciate presumption has to apply however don't necessarily agree with the National Policy on this.	Noted.		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
Yes	Noted		Edward Hines	N/A
<p>The criteria used by planning for determining that a village is considered 'sustainable' is too low. Appleby Magna has very limited village resources. There is no doctors surgery, even though developers have continued to state the village still has this facility for a significant time. The basic public transport has now been reduced further. It does not now travel to the nearest town (Ashby) at all, and does not support any typical daily commuter requirements. There is a small store in the village, but the vast majority of residents shop out of the village.</p>	<p>To help define the settlement hierarchy we need to distinguish the roles and functions of different settlements and to guide the location of future development, although it should be appreciated that the scale and location of most new development that is needed is already committed.</p> <p>In considering the sustainability of different settlements this means looking at the range of services and facilities available including accessibility by public transport and non-card modes.</p> <p>Appleby Magna is considered sustainable as it has the following services and facilities :</p> <p>Primary School</p> <p>Post Office</p> <p>General Store</p> <p>Public House</p> <p>Community Hall</p> <p>Recreation Ground</p> <p>Employment</p> <p>Place of Worship</p> <p>High Speed Broadband</p>		Mr Richard Hine	Resident of Appleby Magna

	Public Transport			
<p>There is no GP surgery or pharmacy in the village, the nearest GP is Woodville in South Derbys. If they continue to treat N.W Leics patients due to the speed and size of development in Woodville, 400 new homes to be built and cannot to be taken as certain health care provision for the village over the plans life. The alternative near GP surgeries are Ashby, Measham or Swadlincote. Near Pharmacies are Woodville, Ashby or Swadlincote. This does not equate with</p> <p>Objectives 1,4,7 and14</p> <p>@3.2.1 ageing population</p> <p>3.5 transport and access</p> <p>13.2 health and wellbeing</p> <p>Education</p> <p>The village school is over subscribed now and into the foreseeable future with no room for expansion, the nearby Moira primary school is also oversubscribed as is Woodville School in South Derbys preventing it taking NW leic children. nearest possible schools are Albert Village, Ashby Cof E and Ashby Hilltop all access via Main Street, Heath Lane onto the A511 or Driftside, Blackfrodby Lane and Ashby Road. Both routes are via unclassified roads with narrow or no footpaths and busy roads with fast moving traffic, not safe for children to cycle or walk, no school buses and not acceptable distance to travel. Necessitates use of cars. This does not equate with</p> <p>Objective 1,4,7 and 14</p> <p>@3.2.1 number of young children, access to schools</p> <p>3.3.1 access to services</p> <p>3.4.1 access to primary and secondary education</p> <p>3.5 not disadvantaged by not driving need to reduce high car dependency, improve safe and direct routes, limited local services in village.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plans objectives are strategic to cover the whole district. The settlement hierarchy has been developed to locate new development in the most sustainable settlement within the district. It is acknowledged that not every sustainable settlement has access to all services and facilities. e.g. not every sustainable settlement will have a GP surgery within the village.</p> <p>It should be noted that as part of preparing the draft Local Plan the key service and infrastructure providers i.e. the heath and education authorities are consulted. These providers are also consulted as part of the planning application stage. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan, this study will also indicate any shortfalls of capacity within the district.</p> <p>It should be noted that development is required in the sustainable settlements in order to sustain services and facilities, without settlements receiving small amounts of growth there is the danger of losing services and facilities.</p> <p>Affordable Housing Needs Surveys are carried out to provide evidence to support Rural Exception sites if they come forward and to use provide evidence that future market housing sites need to provide an affordable housing contribution.</p>		Mr W H Chesterton	NA

<p>Employment</p> <p>There is no prospects of employment within the village. Residents must commute our for viable jobs and income, little possibility bus times coincide with start and finish job times or suitable destination dictating the use of a car. This does not equate with</p> <p>Objectives 2,4,5 and 14</p> <p>@3.3.1 sustianble access to jobs</p> <p>3.4.1 skills and job mismatch</p> <p>3.5 disadvantage people by not driving, need to reduce high car dependency, some villages limited with local services reduce the need to drive</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>During recent past applications for small infill building projects in the village have been refused on the grounds of access, traffic and sewage. An affordable housing survey in 2012 in the village indicated the need for four affordable homes all of which is acceptable to the village, As yet no site or funding has come forth for affordable homes. This does equate with</p> <p>Objectives 2 and 12</p> <p>@ 3.3.1 need for affordable housing</p> <p>Shopping</p> <p>The nearest Post Office are Woodville and Moira, nearest general stores Woodville and Norris Hill, nearest Supermarkets Ashby or Swadlincote. Human instinct dictates the use of a car rather than waiting around for an hourly bus and carrying shopping any distance . This does not equate with the aims of</p> <p>Objectives 4 and 14</p> <p>@3.2.1 populations in rural areas</p> <p>3.3.1 Sustainable access to services</p> <p>3.5 disadvantage people by not driving need to</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>reduce high car dependency some villages have limited local services</p> <p>13.2 health and well being</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>The village has a one hourly bus service to Ashby, Swadlincote and Burton on Trent taking business out of the NW Leics economy into South Derbys and South Staffs. Rural bus services cannot be taken as permanent service over the life of the plan. In 2015 service No 9a ceased to run leaving Ashby Woulds without public transport. Service No 16 route changes left Thringstone without access to public transport and no 7 Appleby Magna to Ashby now terminates at Measham. Bus services are decided by operators commercial decisions not district councils. A one hourly bus service does not coincide with appointment times, opening times such as entertainment or reasonable distance from required destinations. Unless a bus pass holder, annual cost of bus fares are higher than using the more convenient motor car. This does not equate with</p> <p>Objective 1,2,5 and 8</p> <p>@3.3.1 housing where it can deliver greatest benefits</p> <p>3.4.1 access to education</p> <p>3.5 disadvantages people by not driving need to reduce high car dependency improved services will help to reduce need to drive high carbon emissions.</p> <p>Flooding and water quality</p> <p>Blackfordby is low lying with high ground to the N.E. towards the A511 and to the S.W towards Woodville along Butt Lane. In heavy rain storms surface water runoff from the high ground overtops the urban drainage system flooding Butt Lane, the lower part of Strawberry lane and Main Street entering the combined stormwater and sewage system overwhelming it mixing sewage and surface water. Houses, gardens and the brook and ultimately the River Mease becomes contaminated with sewage. The inadequate urban drainage</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

system has not been maintained or upgraded to cater for climate change instant run –off from development in the village or factory site in living memory (SUDS) no data is available on sewage pipe uajs, connections, direction of flows or flow or flow rates or quantity for housing developments. During the 1960’s 70’s 80’s or 90’s in or around the village or its transportation requirement to Packington treatment works. Without this data no finite calculations can be made as to the systems capability to cope with any further developments. This does not equate with

Objectives 1,7,8,9 and 14

@3.7 parts of the district at risk of flooding

3.11 protect the River Mease capacity o sewage treatment effective use of urban drainage systems

13.2.2 Meet the need of an increasing population

13.2 health and well being

Safety

The road network through Blackfordby, Heath Lane, Main Street, Driftside and Butt Lane are all unclassified roads with narrow or no footpaths, one small area of traffic calming and no pedestrian crossings. The village roads are used by speeding traffic to by-pass the A511 congestion at the traffic light with Hepworth Road and Clock Grange Island in Woodville. At peak traffic times (rat run) the village is not a safe place to walk or cycle around especially for the elderly and young children and of concern to residents for a long time. Significant development within the village would exasperate the situation. This does not equate with

Objectives

3.3.1 Housing growth where it can deliver greatest benefits and access

3.5 safe and direct routes

13.2 health and wellbeing

<p>I would like to make representations on behalf of my clients, Mr & Mrs Canty, in relation to the above consultation. Please accept my apologies for any inconvenience caused by my not using the online consultation system to submit representations, however my response could not easily be made using the system.</p> <p>I wish to raise an issue concerning a small area of the Proposals Map, at 24 Clements Gate, Diseworth, as shown outlined by a blue dashed line on the extracts from the adopted and proposed draft Proposals Maps below.</p> <p>There is a difference in the 'Limits to Development' between the adopted and draft Proposals Map that removes some of my client's land from the area within Limits to Development, as highlighted yellow on the draft Proposals Map below.</p> <p>The area highlighted contains an old brick kiln. The kiln is one of the three original kilns built in the village towards the middle of the 18th Century and is now the only surviving example in Diseworth.</p> <p>The kiln is a type of 'Scotch' kiln which was introduced in this area in the 17th Century.</p> <p>The kiln is noted in the Diseworth Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) as an 'unlisted building of architectural or historic interest which makes a positive contribution to the streetscape of the area' (although the wrong building is identified on Map 2 to the CAA). Paragraph 3.4 of the CAA notes that 'a brick making industry flourished around the village during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.</p> <p>Brick making had all but ceased by the start of the twentieth century, although a derelict kiln remains as evidence to the industry at the rear of 'Kiln House' at No. 24 Clements Gate'.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan would propose to remove this small area of land and the kiln building from the area within Limits to Development. My client is concerned that the removal of the brick kiln from the Limits to Development could hamper the potential for conversion and restoration of the building. My client intends that the kiln could be converted to residential use as part of proposals for a new dwelling. Without these proposals, the</p>	<p>This is covered by policy S3.</p>		<p>Caroline Chave</p>	<p>Chave Planning</p>
--	--------------------------------------	--	-----------------------	-----------------------

restoration of the kiln building is not viable and its condition will continue to deteriorate. Eventually the building will be lost and this loss would be of detriment to the historic interest of the Diseworth Conservation Area.

The draft Local Plan does not explain why this change in the Proposals Map is proposed. It seems wrong that an existing building, part of the historic fabric of the village, should be excluded from the Limits to Development. It is therefore respectfully requested that the current Limits to Development are maintained at 24 Clements Gate, such that the brick kiln continues to lie within the Limits to Development.

<p>My concern is that whatever is planned should have every likelihood of delivering not only sufficient new homes to accommodate the anticipated population of the District, but also the requisite services for a changing demography.</p> <p>The Government has introduced constraints which make it more difficult for local authorities to secure funding for these services through development. The extent to which developers have benefitted has been evidenced in quarterly returns posted by national house builders such as Persimmon and Taylor Wimpey.</p> <p>I have already made representations to NWLDC in connection with its handling of viability studies for development schemes. It is my belief that developers can all too easily argue their way out of proper and commensurate social infrastructure contributions. They must not be allowed to do this in the future. One of the best safeguards is to ensure that only land is allocated which has every prospect of delivering the appropriate number of new homes, whilst providing the necessary support for schooling, healthcare and social housing. The ability of the Coalville Urban Area to fulfil these requirements is questionable, and Background Paper 4 recognises that only 54% of the 3500 units planned there will actually be built during the period to 2031. Para. 5.7 says: " Land values in Coalville are lower than in most parts of the district and viability has been an issue on some sites. In addition, demand is weaker than other parts of the district." To compensate, the Council has identified additional allocations in Ashby where the market is perceived as being stronger. This begs the question: why was such a significant allocation made for development in and around Southeast Coalville?</p> <p>Background Paper 1 refers to the PACEC study of the FEMA (which I gather "accords" to the HMA) covering all of Leicester and the Leicestershire Housing Market. On the basis of this evidence, the draft local plan seeks to make provision for 10,700 new homes during the 2011 - 2031 plan period. This is between 53% and 87% more than the OAN for NWL. I found the narrative of Background Paper 1 confusing, although I understand that the 65,600 jobs referred to at para. 4.11 are those which PACEC says will be in NWL. If this is so, it is difficult</p>	<p>As part of the planning process developers are required to sign a S106 agreement which sets out the level of contribution they will make for infrastructure.</p> <p>it is acknowledged that it is unlikely that South East Coalville will be delivered over the plan period due to it being large scale development. It is therefore proposed to allocate the shortfall in the housing requirement to the North of Ashby. Although South East Coalville is allocated within the draft Local Plan, the site already has an outline planning permission and a Full Application for 800 dwellings. All sites with planning permission have been taken into account in order to reach the districts housing requirement to 2031.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that not everybody who is employed by the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange will live within the district and this is reflected within the housing numbers.</p> <p>The reserved sites within the draft Local Plan are included in order to meet the districts housing needs if HS2 gets built out, these sites will not be allocated for housing unless the sites with planning permission are lost for the development of HS2.</p> <p>The majority of sites that have been allocated within the draft Local Plan have already gained planning permission or a resolution to permit. The only sites that does not currently have planning permission or a resolution to permit is land to the north of Ashby. The Local Plan has considered the viability of development sites through the preparation of a viability study which indicates the importance of not allocating too many sites within one settlement within the district in order to not over saturate the market.</p> <p>The delivery of affordable housing has been considered by the supporting viability assessment and has therefore set different thresholds to which different settlements should expect to achieve affordable housing.</p>		Chris Waltho	NA
---	--	--	--------------	----

for anyone to argue with the logic, except for the assumptions that have been made about the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange. It seems that NWLDC is assuming that all people who will work at the SRFI will live in NWL. Bearing in mind the development's proximity to the M1, I should think that this is highly unlikely.

Together with the contingency allocations at Ashby (mentioned above) and Measham (in case HS2 scuppers allocations on the west side of the High Street) a total of 10,999 new homes are proposed. This represents some 93% more than the lower estimate of the OAN as demonstrated by the SHMA.

The problem with allocating too much land is that this will almost certainly depress development land values in the District to levels below what might be considered a reasonable return to the land owners, as envisaged by the NPPF. Much of this land has been owned for generations by the same (often farming) families. They have derived their livelihoods from the land, and are aware of the high prices that have been paid for development land in the past. They will be reluctant to sell at what they may consider to be unrealistic discounts. The problem is exacerbated by the fall in the number of developers. The Country's inability to build 250,000 new homes each year has been attributed to the fact that there are just too few developers on account of mergers and acquisitions. The allocation of too much land could well stifle the District in meeting its own targets - an informed balance needs to be struck.

All of this brings me back to scheme viability, and in particular the supply of affordable housing. The Council must be aware of which areas are likely to sustain affordable housing percentages of 30% and which are not. This is because it will be expecting to demonstrate, to the Planning Inspector, that it has procured evidence in this connection regarding the respective settlements. It is obvious that sites in Ashby will be able to sustain more affordable housing than those in Coalville. If developers contend that they are having to pay over the odds for development land in order to persuade landowners to part with their property, this will strengthen their viability arguments to the detriment of the supply of affordable housing.

We agree that the preferred approach provides a good basis for applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development.	Noted.		Geoff Platts	Environment Agency
We agree that the preferred approach provides a good basis for applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development.	Noted.		Geoff Platt	Environment Agency
Yes	Noted.		Nick Wilkins	NW
Blackfordby is down as a sustainable village, which is deemed to be able to provide for people if further developed. Blackfordby does not have enough amenities to be classed as a sustainable village and any developer would need to demonstrate spare capacity within the amenities of neighbouring areas before a development could be seen as credible. Woodville does not have any spare capacity as I have already spoke to Derbyshire County Council at a local meeting and Woodvile Parish Council also.	Blackfordby is classed as sustainable village due to the number of services and facilities it contains. A supporting infrastructure delivery plan is currently being prepared to highlight any capacity issues. The relevant authorities including the education authority get consulted as part of any planning applications.		Mrs Melanie Warren	Mrs Melanie Warren
The text of the final paragraph does not completely reflect the guidance provided in paragraph 14 of the Framework. The text should be reworded to say 'the Council will, except where material considerations indicate otherwise, grant permission unless:.....'.	The paragraph states that planning applications will be approved without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise, therefore no amendment is required.		Lance Wiggins	Landmark Planning
Yes	Noted		Yvonne Willars	retired
Yes	Noted		Ruth Hamm	teacher
The NPPF document has 13 sections and NWLDC appears to be giving inadequate consideration to section 8 Promoting Healthy Communities, (paras 73, 74 and 77) Section 11, Conserving and Enhancing the natural environment (paras 109, 111, 112, 114, 118 and 123 and Section 12, Conserving and Enhancing the historic environment (paras 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134 and 13) The proposed Local Development Plan as regards Appleby Magna does not adhere to the guidelines laid down in the NPPF otherwise protected for key areas within the village, and the village as a whole would be enhanced, not reduced.	The Local Plan needs to be reflective of national policy, but it is also important that the Local Plan doesn't repeat the NPPF. Health and Wellbeing is one of the local plans objectives and a number of policies within the local plan work towards improving the health and wellbeing of the districts population i.e. protection and delivery of open spaces, provision of affordable housing etc. The Natural Environment and historic environment sections of the NPPF are covered by draft Local Plan environment and heritage chapters. Appleby Magna is subject to the same local plan policies as the rest of the district.		Chris and Sue Nicholls	TMBS
This section does not explain how the plan policies will distinguish 'sustainable development' from other forms of development!	In determining planning applications regard will be had to a wide range of factors and a balanced view will need to be arrived at.		Clare Marsh	Appleby resident
Yes	Noted		Mr. j Lewis	1950

The release of ever more fields is by definition not sustainable. The current policy of the UK Government presuming in favour of sustainable development is likely to change as it appears to be a developers charter which takes greenfield sites over brownfield ones. A 'greenfield' tax or levy should be paid to assist the development of more costly brownfield sites.	Noted. This issue is beyond the scope of the Local Plan.		Steve Johnson	YYYY
The approach should make it clear that when provision has been made for an adequate additional number of housing units to be built as proposed by this Local Plan then the presumption of sustainable development will not apply, at least where an application relates to land which is outside the limits for development as shown on the plans In addition it should be made clearer how the District Council will work with local communities to shape development proposals - it sound like PR at the moment with no flesh on it.	Although the District Council has met its housing requirement this does not mean that the Council can automatiacally refuse applications as all planning applications have to be considered on their own merits. Developers are required to engage local communities before they submit a planning application, a consultation statement is required as part of the planning process.		Lesley Birtwistle	not applicable
I feel the preferred approach is not taking fully into account the limited services especially in Appleby Magna. The requirement for each home to have a car to enable them to get to the shopping etc.	The settlement hierarchy is prepared by distinguishing between the roles and functions of different settlements. In considering the sustainability of different settlements this means looking at the range of services and facilities available including accessibility by public transport and non- car modes.		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
The NPPF statement quoted at 5.2 suggests that economic development should be the primary driver of planning policy, and does not reference other considerations for example environmental and social. Although Policy S1 sees that local communities will be involved in shaping development proposals I am also concerned by the statement that 'Planning applications that accord with the policies in the Local Plan...will be approved without delay' as this suggests that this will be done without consulting local communities.	The quote set out in para 5.2 of the draft Local Plan is based on the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), however both the NPPF and the local plan need to be read as whole which takes out of environmental and social issues. The planning application process will still need to be carried out in the same way including the consultation with local communities. This sentence is stating that proposals that accord with the Local Plan will be approved without delay, as it is assuming that there are no obstacles to overcome in the planning process that would lead to timely delays.		Hugh James	n/a
Yes	Noted		Paul Varty	Resident of Appleby
Yes	Noted		John Edwards	XMOS Semiconductors Ltd
Yes	Noted		Tim Abbott	Householder
There must be an acknowledgement that over provision of housing/industrial space is also unsustainable. At the moment, legal planning decisions appear to be removing the ability for Councils to refuse on the grounds that they have a 5 year supply/provision in place. This is not acceptable. We should not presume in favour but have a clear	Local Planning Authorities have to work within the national planning guidelines paragraph 49 of the NPPF states " Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five -year supply of deliverable housing sites". The draft Local Plan identifies land to the north of Ashby de		Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying

strategy with identified sites for future development - as per the Plan. It only works for windfall small scale sites or brownfield locations being brought back into use. Presumption in favour undermines the theory of having a Plan and identifying sites already!! Please address.	la Zouch to meet the housing shortfall			
Yes	Noted		Heather Parish Council	Heather Parish Council
No	Noted		JON WALTERS	LPT
Policy S1 provides a good basis for applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development, reflecting the requirements of the NPPF.	Agree.		Andrew Johnson	Erewash Borough Council
Yes	Noted		Mrs Penny Bicknell	Les Stephan Planning Ltd
Yes	Noted		Lesley Colley	None
It would be beneficial to see the key attributes of sustainable development laid out in the local plan as an exemplar standard for developments to meet.	The Local Plan read as a whole is what North West Leicestershire District Council considers constitutes sustainable development, where a proposal does not meet all the policies within the local plan a balance needs to be made with other issues taken into consideration.		Alison Saxby	N/A
The preferred approach relies heavily on people travelling into the North of the area to take up employment, with additional housing in the area anticipating that the Roxhill development will be approved by the Secretary of State in January 2016.	The Local Plan has to take into consideration the proposed Roxhill development to the north of the district, however a further employment site is proposed for the North of Ashby and existing good quality employment sites are protected as part of the draft Plan.		Vicky Roe	Kegworth Parish Council
This section does not explain how the plan policies will distinguish 'sustainable development' from other forms of development. The section does not relate the concept of sustainable development to the characteristics, issues and objectives for North West Leicestershire. For example how is the insight that NW Leicestershire has particularly high carbon emissions due to transport in comparison with other LA s built into an assessment of what sustainable development means in NWL.	The Local Plan read as a whole is what North West Leicestershire District Council considers constitutes sustainable development, where a proposal does not meet all the policies within the local plan a balance needs to be made with other issues taken into consideration. The policies within the Local Plan have been designed to meet the draft Local Plan objectives and to address the key issues. As part of the final plan a monitoring framework will be included to show how each of the policies relates to the objectives within the local plan.		Lindsay Gene	Appleby Magna Parish Council
This section does not explain how the plan policies will distinguish 'sustainable development' from other forms of development. It needs a more thorough definition of sustainability drawing on key policy sources such as DEFRA's 'Securing the Future' which remains the most definitive approach accepted by successive governments. (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/securing-the-future-delivering-uk-sustainable-development-strategy) A useful overview is also provided by the Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology (POST) in 'Seeking Sustainability' PostNote No.408, March 2012 (http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchB	The Local Plan read as a whole is what North West Leicestershire District Council considers constitutes sustainable development, where a proposal does not meet all the policies within the local plan a balance needs to be made with other issues taken into consideration.		Sonia Liff	Chair Appleby Environment

riefing/Summary/POST-PN-408#fullreport)_				
<p>English Local Government politicians will always be required to consider Whitehall instructions through or associated with the NPPF. The draft Policy S1 speaks about 'being proactive with developers' first and only secondly to 'involve local communities in shaping 'development proposals'. This is quite simply the wrong way round. The Council needs to be 'proactive', putting communities and their needs first and influencing developers so that they meet those requirements.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>(a) The forthcoming Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plan will test this Council's resolve to consider proposals put forward by that community instead of developers.</p> <p>(b) Erroneous and unclarified use of the word 'sustainable'. Many of the proposed development sites are clearly 'un-sustainable' due to the lack of identification of (all) infrastructure needs and costs.</p> <p>(c) Lack of proper involvement to encourage communities to look at their development needs over the Plan Period.</p>	<p>Draft Local Plan has been prepared to be in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>The Ashby Neighbourhood Plan is required to accord to the currently adopted Local Plan on all strategic policies.</p> <p>To support the preparation of the Local Plan an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to identify any infrastructure requirements to support new development.</p> <p>As part of the preparation of the Local Plan there has been the opportunity for local communities to get involved through consultation events held as part of the consultation process.</p>		Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader
<p>The Council's commitment to taking a positive approach to development proposals and working proactively with applicants to find solutions as set out in the policy is welcomed. However, it does not seem that the policy adds any specific or relevant local context to the guidance on the presumption of sustainable development as set out in the Framework.</p>	Noted.		Guy Longley,	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.
<p>Local residents and Parish Councils should be involved at the start of decision making in deciding location and distribution of development not just officers and developers.</p>	<p>All of the sites within the draft Local Plan apart from the land allocated to the north of Ashby have already achieved planning permission or a resolution to permit. Therefore the decision on where to locate development has been made outside of the plan preparation process. Parish Councils have been invited to make representations as part of the two Regulation 18 consultations that have been held in Summer 2014 and Summer 2015.</p>		C Tandy	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society

<p>Arla Foods own the dairy site at Smisby Road, Ashby de la Zouche and will be submitting an outline application for the redevelopment of the site for housing in the very near future.</p> <p>We have read the Draft Consultation Local Plan and would make the following comments;</p> <p>1. Policy S1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development. We support this policy as the redevelopment of the Dairy site is a sustainable development located as it is within the urban area of Ashby, a Key Service Centre.</p>	Noted.		Andrew Thomson	Thomson Planning Partnership
<p>We do not have any specific comments to make in response to these question.</p>	Noted.		Tim Evans	Bilfinger GVA
<p>The approach and presumption in favour of sustainable development is supported.</p>	Noted.		Jon Bottomley	East Midlands Airport
<p>William Davis are generally supportive of the overall scale of new housing which the Council are proposing. The overall 'target' figure for a minimum of 10,700 dwellings up to 2031 is acceptable as generally is the 96Ha figure for land for employment purposes. William Davis have certain concerns that the scale of development at Hugglescote (even allowing for the reduced delivery of dwellings that the sire set out in the Councils Housing Paper) would actually come forward within the 2031 period, Thus a larger 'safety net' for additional allocations over and above the 10,700 minimum figure would be advisable. William Davis consider that the delivery of 1,200 dwellings at Hugglescote in the Plan period is a more realistic figure to rely on in the housing calculations.</p>	Noted.		Simon Chadwick	Signet Planning on behalf of William Davis

<p>This section does not explain how the plan policies will distinguish 'sustainable development' from other forms of development. It needs a more thorough definition of sustainability drawing on key policy sources such as DEFRA's 'Securing the Future' which remains the most definitive approach accepted by successive governments. (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/securing-the-future-delivering-uk-sustainable-development-strategy). A useful overview is also provided by the Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology (POST) in 'Seeking Sustainability' PostNote No.408, March 2012 (http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/POST-PN-408#fullreport)_</p> <p>The section does not relate the concept of sustainable development to the characteristics, issues and objectives for North West Leicestershire. For example, how is the insight that NW Leicestershire has particularly high carbon emissions due to transport in comparison with other LA s built into an assessment of what sustainable development means in NWL?</p>	<p>The Local Plan read as a whole is what North West Leicestershire District Council considers constitutes sustainable development, where a proposal does not meet all the policies within the local plan a balance needs to be made with other issues taken into consideration.</p> <p>The policies within the Local Plan have been designed to meet the draft Local Plan objectives and to address the key issues. As part of the final plan a monitoring framework will be included to show how each of the policies relates to the objectives within the local plan The final local plan will include a table setting out how each of the policies meet the local plan objectives. The draft local plan objectives are based on addressing the key issues within the district.</p>		Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment	Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation
No comment	Noted.		Pegasus Group on behalf of Stuart Andrews	Pegasus Group
Yes. It would be beneficial to see the key attributes of sustainable development laid out in the local plan as an exemplar standard for developments to meet.	Noted. The attributes of sustainable development is the plan read as a whole to include all of the policies.		Mrs. A Saxby	n/a
<p>Reference to involving local communities should be deleted.</p> <p>Policy S1 on the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development is supported in the most part however , the sentence relating to working with the community on shaping development proposals should be deleted from the Policy. This is covered adequately by para 66 of the Framework and should not be repeated.</p> <p>Gladman do not consider that the level of housing development promoted through the Plan represents the Full Objectively Assessed Need for Housing within North West Leicestershire. As set out in detail in Section 5 above and in Barton Willmore's OAN it is considered that the housing requirement for North West Leicestershire should be between 534 and 739 dwellings per annum with the mid-point 637 dwellings per annum being suggested as the most appropriate OAN for the</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is required to consult on all planning applications, developers are also required to consult local communities on large schemes coming forward before they submit a planning application. It is acknowledged that draft Local Plan policy S1 is very similar to the NPPF, however it is an expectation that this policy is included within local plans, as set out within the Planning Advisory Service Soundness Self Assessment checklist.</p> <p>The local plan provides housing within the rural areas through extant planning permissions, however the local plan does allow for limits amounts of growth to be provided within the sustainable and small villages. Background paper 3 assesses the sustainability of settlements.</p> <p>Both the Sustainability Appraisal and Viability Assessment have assessed the distribution of housing sites across the district in order to ensure that housing market in any particular part of the district is saturated.</p>		Phil Bamford	Gladman on behalf of Wilton Balmore.

<p>district.</p> <p>Gladman support the identification of Coalville as the Principal Town given the settlements population and extensive range of services and facilities. It is appropriate that a significant level of new development is directed towards Coalville as the Principal Town.</p> <p>Whilst it is supported that Coalville continues to play a key role in the accommodation of future housing development within the district, this should not be at the expense of ensuring that the housing and employment needs of other settlements are met. para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. it is essential to meet the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and meaningful growth apportioned to them to ensure their on-going vitality and viability.</p> <p>The level of growth aimed at rural settlements should therefore be sufficient to ensure that the housing needs of the rural population of the district can be addressed.</p> <p>It is important to consider existing services and facilities in a settlement when assessing their suitability for accommodating new growth.</p> <p>Therefore option B provides the best spatial strategy for the distribution of new housing and employment growth within the district.</p> <p>In distributing growth the council should be mindful that to maximise housing supply the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location, are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products.</p>				
<p>Amendment to Policy S1 paragraph 2 “development proposals when they are forthcoming and ensure that the agreed shape of the development is maintained throughout all the stages of the development.”</p>	<p>The additional paragraph is not appropriate to be included within the policy, as the up keep of the development is out of the control of planning and the Local Plan.</p>		<p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p>	<p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p>

Policy S2: Future economic development needs

Question 5 Do you agree with the amount of employment development we propose to make provision for? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any changes required?	Name	Business or organisation name;
Yes	Noted		Lisa Marron	Resident
I strongly question the evidence on the employment figures...	The employment forecasts are based on the PACEC report 2013.		Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
Yes	Noted		Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
Yes	Noted		Stephen Saxby	None
Yes	Noted		Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council
Page 24 - Item 5.8 As mentioned there is huge potential for new employment in the Castle Donington area. The Councils plan should needs to ensure these jobs go to NWL residents by building suitable sustainable homes as close to the employment opportunities as possible. Ref NPPF	Noted. As above the Local Plan allocates 895 new dwellings due to this site already gaining planning permission. However the planning system cannot dictate who gets jobs or where they live, it can only provide for development so that people have opportunities.		Steve Palmer	NA
The Parish Council doesn't agree with the location suggested. The SRFI doesn't follow the sustainable development plan. The Parish Council would also like to know if NWLDC has a plan should the SRFI NOT go ahead.	Noted. Permission has now been granted.		Samantha Lockwood	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council
I do agree but there should be encouragement for business in rural locations to expand without unnecessary and unhelpful neighbours objections. I acknowledge they should be considered but sometimes they can just take so long to sort out as can conditions imposed that simple applications can take much longer to determine. Having said that we have our business in a rural location and have just had an application passed without problem. It is hard enough to get labour to travel to rural locations and in a lot of villages the local children do not stay because they cannot afford to live in these villages.	Noted. Draft Local Plan policy S4: Countryside makes an allowance for business expansion within the countryside, however this is subject to strict criteria.		Mr Robert Harlow	Harlow Bros Ltd
Yes	Noted		David Harris	Pyrotect Ltd
Yes	Noted		Simon Litchfield	Resident

<p>1) As there is already sufficient allocated land to meet the basic employment need in DLPlan para 5.6 we propose that the allocation in policy Ec2 on greenfield land at Money Hill Ashby be withdrawn.</p> <p>2) The need for an extra employment allocation depends solely on the validity of the loss of 45 hectares of industrial land to housing DLPlan para 7.16. If this guestimate is reduced by just one-third, or an offsetting allowance made for smaller and unidentified brownfield sites coming forward over the plan period, no new allocation would be required under policy Ec2.</p> <p>3) If credible the employment land lost to housing should also be included in the housing calculations.</p> <p>4) If the employment at the proposed Strategic Rail freight Interchange, DLPlan para 7.22, is certain enough to justify increasing the housing land allocation at Money Hill an offsetting reduction should also be made in the overall need for additional employment land.</p>	<p>There is currently a shortfall of just over 13 hectares of employment land, land to the north of Ashby Money Hill has been assessed as the most sustainable location to accommodate this growth.</p> <p>The loss of brownfield employment land is based upon the land that has been lost historically to other uses mainly housing. The Lounge Site (25ha) could be potentially lost with the construction of HS2.</p> <p>Only sites that have been granted planning permission or have been built out since 2011 can be included within the housing calculations for the draft Local Plan. The issue of windfall sites are considered as part of the housing chapter.</p> <p>Employment requirements are those from the PACEC study which did not include the SFRI.</p>		Robert Yates	Cliftonthorpe Residents Management Company
There is a lack of clarity in the document about how much of the 96 hectares for employment use will be taken up by the Strategic Rail Interchange.	The requirement of 96 hectare does not include land for the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange.		Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
You need more factories to balance the housing in the local area.	As part of allocating employment land within the new Local Plan, an assessment has been carried out in order to identify the most suitable sites for additional employment sites. The evidence shows that there will be more need for housing to ensure a balance between the number of people of working age and the number of jobs in the district.		Andrew Stone	NA
Leave alone	There is a requirement to meet the employment land requirements for the district to 2031.		Trevor Davis	None
Yes agree providing that transportation is improved to reach these areas.	Noted.		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
Yes	Noted.		Edward Hines	N/A

<p>1) As there is already sufficient allocated land to meet the basic employment need in DLPlan para 5.6 we propose that the allocation in policy Ec2 on greenfield land at Money Hill Ashby be withdrawn.</p> <p>2) The need for an extra employment allocation depends solely on the validity of the loss of 45 hectares of industrial land to housing DLPlan para 7.16. If this guestimate is reduced by just one-third, or an offsetting allowance made for smaller and unidentified brownfield sites coming forward over the plan period, no new allocation would be required under policy Ec2.</p> <p>3) If credible the employment land lost to housing should also be included in the housing calculations.</p> <p>4) If the employment at the proposed Strategic Rail freight Interchange, DLPlan para 7.22, is certain enough to justify increasing the housing land allocation at Money Hill an offsetting reduction should also be made in the overall need for additional employment land.</p>	<p>There is currently a shortfall of just over 13 hectares of employment land, land to the north of Ashby Money Hill has been assessed as the most sustainable location to accommodate this growth.</p> <p>The loss of brownfield employment land is based upon the land that has been lost historically to other uses mainly housing. The Lounge Site (25ha) could be potentially lost with the construction of HS2.</p> <p>Only sites that have been granted planning permission or have been built out since 2011 can be included within the housing calculations for the draft Local Plan. Windfall sites are cosidered as part of the housing questions in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Employment requirements are those from the the PACEC study which did not include the SFRI.</p>		Sue and Gerry Perks	NA
<p>I do not disagree with the stated requirement for 96 hectares of employment land. However, as stated, there is already more than sufficient employment land with planning permission (+32 hectares), so there is no need to allocate any more. I object to the allocation of an additional 16 hectares at Ashby Money Hill solely on the basis that there may be a loss of 45 hectares to other uses, especially when none of this loss is included when calculating the availability of housing land.</p> <p>Also, if the employment at the proposed Strategic Rail freight Interchange, DLPlan para 7.22, is certain enough to justify increasing the housing land allocation at Money Hill an offsetting reduction should also be made in the overall employment land requirement.</p>	<p>The requirement for 96 hectares of employment land is based on the PACEC report 2013, which is most current and update evidence. Although the majority of this is need already has the benefit of planning permission set out within draft Local Policy Ec1. There is still a shortfall of just over 13 hectares of employment land.</p> <p>The loss of employment land to housing is not calculated into the housing requirement as this is market led. Sites which have been lost to housing during the plan period have been taken into account as part of meeting the districts housing requirement. However it is important to ensure that we plan for the loss of employment land to ensure that we can continue to meet the districts employment needs.</p> <p>The SFRI cannot be off set against the districts employment need as the SFRI is a National Infrastructure project and will therefore provide jobs regionally and not just for the district.</p>		David Bigby	Private individual
<p>The new warehouses being built between Ellistown and Bardon may provide work during construction, but how many jobs they will generate after that depends on what they are used for.. the proposed Amazon warehouse off Beverage Lane will only employ a few hundred people it they install the same driverless forklifts and other computer controlled equipment they have used in their other new warehouses .</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		Yvonne Willars	retired

Yes	Noted.		Ruth Hamm	teacher
The existing employment sites in Ashby have had very slow take up in the past 20 years and still offer more than adequate development potential for the plan period.	The Local Plan needs to allocate enough employment land to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to balance the market and in conformity to the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby. Planning cannot control the market, but it is important to make land available for such a time that it is needed.		Tim Gregory	Ashby Control Engineering Ltd.
No	Noted		Mr. j Lewis	1950
The assumption about future employment may be drastically wrong as many commentators are now predicting that large amounts of blue collar and even some white collar jobs will be automated in the next twenty years. More people will work from home. This is not a robust projection as technology advances into our lives at an ever greater pace.	The employment land provision is based on the PACEC report 2013 which is the most up to date available evidence. A Housing Employment Development Assessment has just been commissioned to update the PACEC report using the latest projections.		Steve Johnson	YYYY
Yes	Noted		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
I struggle to accept that the forecasted job growth, mainly referenced to the possibility of the new East Midlands Gateway development, would result in so many new people deciding to live in the Coalville, North West Leicestershire district area. Should the East Midlands Gateway even be approved, which is far from confirmed, then to assume that so many new people would decide to live in North West Leicestershire, and then travel approximately twenty miles to this new proposed location of work, is highly unlikely in my opinion.	The East Midlands Gateway development is a national infrastructure project which will create approximately 7,000 additional jobs. It is acknowledged that not all the people working at this site will live within North West Leicestershire. The proposal is expected to attract people regionally, however the Local Plan still needs to take account of the proposal.		J Ball	N/A
Yes	Noted.		Paul Varty	Resident of Appleby
Yes	Noted.		John Edwards	XMOS Semiconductors Ltd
No comments	Noted.		Tim Abbott	Householder
It assumes we will continue to grow when, in fact, most companies are scaling down their logistics and number of depots. Also, reliance on technology is increasing and the number of jobs decreasing wee Amazon as an example of this and they are apparently moving into our District.	The employment land forecasts are not solely based on job forecasts. The employment land forecasts are included within both the PACEC study 2013 and the SHMA 2013. The local plan is required to support Government policy on encouraging the growth of the national economy and therefore has to make provision over the plan period to accommodate this growth.		Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying
Yes	Noted		Heather Parish Council	Heather Parish Council
No	Noted		JON WALTERS	LPT

<p>Is the amount of employment land based on hectares of the total site area or floorspace of the built development?</p> <p>Why have the more recent Local Growth Plan figures from 2013 (instead of the earlier PACEC) not been used to calculate the employment land requirement? These indicate an aspirational requirement for a potential additional 2000 jobs.</p> <p>The emerging policy approach to employment land is not as flexible as it could or should be, and is not as flexible as the previous Local Plan policy approach which recognised the potential role and value of proposals on unallocated sites or expansions to existing sites which deliver economic benefits, and gave a clear signal that such proposals would be positively considered, within the framework of the other policies in the Plan. It is not clear at present how an existing employer (or inward investor) who needed additional land or a new site to grow, would be supported.</p> <p>Part of the context for the need for this flexibility is the LEP and local initiatives of the 'Coalville Growth Corridor' and also the 'East Midlands Enterprise Gateway' – both could see significant new employment creation over the plan period beyond the jobs and land forecasts of the PACEC study which pre-dates them. If those initiatives are successful they may well need to be able to respond positively through supporting delivery of additional employment sites.</p> <p>We support employment land requirements being explicitly expressed as a minimum.</p> <p>The emerging plan identifies a need for 96 ha of employment land, but there are also references to jobs numbers in the plan period too. It should therefore be clearer whether both land and jobs are to be monitored for consistency. Measuring floorspace can be more meaningful and is easier than monitoring job growth/delivery.</p>	<p>Employment land is measured in both hectares and floor space.</p> <p>The figures used within the Local Growth Plan are aspirational rather than evidence based used in the PACEC Study 2013. The Local Plan is required to be based on sound evidence and therefore has to use the figures within the PACEC report 2013, as this is currently the most up to date piece of evidence. However it should be noted that the Local Growth Plan jobs figures is higher than that suggested by the PACEC study because it post -dates the effect of the recent recession and takes account of the potential job creation associated with the East Midlands Gateway.</p> <p>Importance of East Midlands Gateway and the LLEP growth corridors are acknowledged within the supporting text of chapter 7. The District Council has also published the Local Growth Plan to complement the LLEP's Strategic Economic Plan. This identifies a range of actions to address the Council's growth and investment priorities to 2018.</p> <p>The number of jobs created and the amount of new employment floorspace will be monitored and will be set out in the monitoring framework that will support the delivery of the Local Plan.</p>		Steve Harley	Oxalis Planning on behalf of Cordovan Holdings Ltd
--	---	--	--------------	--

<p>Is the amount of employment land based on hectares of the total site area or floorspace of the built development?</p> <p>Why have the more recent Local Growth Plan figures (instead of the earlier PACEC) not been used to calculate the employment land requirement? This indicates an aspirational requirement for a potential additional 2000 jobs.</p> <p>The emerging policy approach to employment land is not as flexible as it could or should be, and is not as flexible as the previous Local Plan policy approach which recognised the potential role and value of proposals on unallocated sites or expansions to existing sites which deliver economic benefits, and gave a clear signal that such proposals would be positively considered, within the framework of the other policies in the Plan. It is not clear at present how an existing employer or inward investor who needed additional land or a new site to grow to secure investment and job creation in the District, would be supported.</p> <p>Part of the context for the need for this flexibility is the LEP and local initiatives of the 'Coalville Growth Corridor' and also the 'East Midlands Enterprise Gateway' – both could see significant new employment creation over the plan period beyond the jobs and land forecasts of the PACEC study which pre-dates them. If those initiatives are successful they may well need to be able to respond positively through supporting delivery of additional employment sites.</p> <p>We support employment land requirements being explicitly expressed as a minimum.</p> <p>The emerging plan identifies a need for 96 ha of employment land, but there are also references to jobs numbers in the plan period too. It should therefore be clearer whether both land and jobs are to be monitored for consistency. Measuring floorspace can be more meaningful and is easier than monitoring job growth/delivery.</p>	<p>Employment land is measured in both hectares and floor space.</p> <p>The figures used within the Local Growth Plan are aspirational rather than evidence based used in the PACEC Study 2013. The Local Plan is required to be based on sound evidence and therefore has to use the figures within the PACEC report 2013, as this is currently the most up to date piece of evidence. However it should be noted that the Local Growth Plan jobs figures is higher than that suggested by the PACEC study because it post -dates the effect of the recent recession and takes account of the potential job creation associated with the East Midlands Gateway.</p> <p>Importance of East Midlands Gateway and the LLEP growth corridors are acknowledged within the supporting text of chapter 7. The District Council has also published the Local Growth Plan to complement the LLEP's Strategic Economic Plan. This identifies a range of actions to address the Council's growth and investment priorities to 2018.</p> <p>The number of jobs created and the amount of new employment floorspace will be monitored and will be set out in the monitoring framework that will support the delivery of the Local Plan.</p>		Steve Harley	Oxalis Planning on behalf of the Trustees of Curzon Coaker Settlement
Yes	Noted		Mrs Penny Bicknell	Les Stephan Planning Ltd
Yes	Noted		Lesley Colley	None

<p>As there is already sufficient allocated land to meet the basic employment need in DLPlan para 5.6 we propose that the allocation in policy Ec2 on greenfield land at Money Hill Ashby be withdrawn.</p> <p>The need for an extra employment allocation depends solely on the vailidity of the loss of 45 hectares of industrial land to housing DLPlan para 7.16. If this guestimate is reduced by just one-third, or an offsetting allowance made for smaller and unidentified brownfield site coming forward over the plan period no new allocation would be required under policy Ec2.</p> <p>If credible the employment land lost to housing should also be included in the housing calculations.</p> <p>If the employment at the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange, DLPlan para 7.22, is certain enough to justify increasing the housing land allocation at Money Hill an offsetting reduction should also be made in the overall need for additional employment land.</p>	<p>There is currently a shortfall of just over 13 hectares of employment land, land to the north of Ashby Money Hill has been assessed as the most sustainable location to accommodate this growth.</p> <p>The loss of brownfield employment land is based upon the land that has been lost historically to other uses mainly housing. The Lounge Site (25ha) could be potentially lost with the construction of HS2.</p> <p>Only sites that have been granted planning permission or have been built out since 2011 can be included within the housing calculations for the draft Local Plan. Windfall sites are considered as part of the housing questions in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Employment requirements are those from the PACEC study which did not include the SFRI.</p>		Dominic and Christine Fellow	NA
<p>It is not possible to question the level of provision without understanding the approaches undertaken by the Public and Corporate Economic Consultants (PACEC). Did their methodology account for the likelihood of increased employment above 'usual rates' due to significantly higher levels of transport and logistics employment, which may grow faster than traditional sectors?</p> <p>KPC considers that alternative sources of employment should be provided in the area in addition to the airport / Roxhill SRFI [if approved].</p>	<p>The PACEC study methodology used employment land projections and job forecasts plus sites that are already in the pipeline to assess the amount of employment land required over the plan period. The PACEC report however did not accommodate the SFRI in the overall employment land requirements.</p> <p>The Local Plan cannot control the types of employment available within the north of the district, as it can only provide the relevant policies in which future planning applications will be determined against and allocate employment land to meet the districts needs.</p>		Vicky Roe	Kegworth Parish Council

<p>'The Market' has applied for a considerable number of Planning Permissions within NWL for employment use. Many have not been 'delivered' and some remain grossly underutilised. Many of these sites lie abandoned and blight our communities.</p> <p>NWLDC continues to allow speculative employment permissions in the Northern Parishes rather than pro-actively directing employment development to sites already approved.</p> <p>The Labour Group remains unconvinced that employment land will be delivered and provided to existing communities in the south of the District. Legislation exists that enables Local Authorities to direct developers, for example designating development zones. This plan does not choose to use the available legislation.</p>	<p>The Local Plan has to ensure that there is choice within the market to ensure that sites are available for a number of different employment uses.</p> <p>The District Council can only determine the application put before them and cannot control the location in which these planning applications are submitted.</p> <p>The Local Plan acknowledges the LLEPs Strategic Economic Growth Plan which identifies two growth corridors within North West Leicestershire including the East Midlands Enterprise Gateway and the Coalville Growth Corridor. The District Council has also prepared the Local Growth Plan to complement the Strategic Economic Growth Plan, this identifies a range of actions to address the Councils growth and investment priorities to 2018.</p> <p>The Local Plan is required to accord to the Governments aim, as expressed in the NPPF, is that the planning system should facilitate economic growth and Councils must plan positively to secure it.</p>		Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader
No comment.	Noted.		Guy Longley,	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.
<p>There is already a shortage of employment buildings. 96 hectares is insufficient</p> <p>Bigger allocation to maintain supply considering demand, lack of progress with proposed sites and brownfield sites being converted to housing.</p>	The Local Plan states that a minimum of 96 hectares of land for employment purposes during the plan period.		C Tandy	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society
I struggle to accept that the forecasted job growth, mainly referenced to the possibility of the new East Midlands Gateway development, would result in so many new people deciding to live in the Coalville, North West Leicestershire district area. Should the East Midlands Gateway even be approved, which is far from confirmed, then to assume that so many new people would decide to live in North West Leicestershire, and then travel approximately twenty miles to this new proposed location of work, is highly unlikely in my opinion.	The East Midlands Gateway development is a national infrastructure project which will create approximately 7,000 additional jobs. It is acknowledged that not all the people working at this site will live within North West Leicestershire. The proposal is expected to attract people regionally; however the Local Plan still needs to take account of the proposal.		Johnathan Bell	

<p>1) As there is already sufficient allocated land to meet the basic employment need in DLPlan para 5.6 we propose that the allocation in policy Ec2 on greenfield land at Money Hill Ashby be withdrawn.</p> <p>2) The need for an extra employment allocation depends solely on the validity of the loss of 45 hectares of industrial land to housing DLPlan para 7.16. If this guestimate is reduced by just one-third, or an offsetting allowance made for smaller and unidentified brownfield sites coming forward over the plan period, no new allocation would be required under policy Ec2.</p> <p>3) If credible the employment land lost to housing should also be included in the housing calculations.</p> <p>4) If the employment at the proposed Strategic Rail freight Interchange, DLPlan para 7.22, is certain enough to justify increasing the housing land allocation at Money Hill an offsetting reduction should also be made in the overall need for additional employment land.</p>	<p>There is currently a shortfall of just over 13 hectares of employment land, land to the north of Ashby Money Hill has been assessed as the most sustainable location to accommodate this growth.</p> <p>The loss of brownfield employment land is based upon the land that has been lost historically to other uses mainly housing. The Lounge Site (25ha) could be potentially lost with the construction of HS2.</p> <p>Only sites that have been granted planning permission or have been built out since 2011 can be included within the housing calculations for the draft Local Plan. Windfall sites are considered as part of the housing questions in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Employment requirements are those from the PACEC study which did not include the SFRI.</p>		David Owen	Cliftonthorpe Management Company
No response.	Noted.		Mrs. A Saxby	n/a
A meaningful level of development should be directed towards the smaller sustainable settlements in the rural area to deliver their housing needs and support local services and facilities.	Noted. Sustainable settlements are expected to receive a small amount of growth in order for them to continue to be sustainable.		Phil Bamford	Gladman on behalf of Wilton Balmore.
I struggle to accept that the forecasted job growth, mainly referenced to the possibility of the new East Midlands Gateway development, would result in so many new people deciding to live in the Coalville, North West Leicestershire district area. Should the East Midlands Gateway even be approved, which is far from confirmed, then to assume that so many new people would decide to live in North West Leicestershire, and then travel approximately twenty miles to this new proposed location of work, is highly unlikely in my opinion.	The proposal for East Midlands Gateway development is due to be determined early 2016. It is acknowledged that not everybody within the district will travel to work to the north of the district. The proposal is a National Infrastructure Project and this will provide jobs across the region.		Jonathan Ball	n/a
Question 5 - The amount of employment development proposed is inadequate to meet projections that indicate that the local labour force will grow by 247 – 435 jobs per annum (Experion). This is a range of 4,940 – 8,700 jobs over the Plan period requiring 85 – 150 hectares of land for employment. Again, the selection of 96 ha is within the range but is towards the bottom end. The Plan should aim towards a figure at the higher end to ensure that land supply is not a constraint	The Local Plan states that provision needs to be made for a minimum of 96 hectares of land for employment use. The representation does not clearly state where the evidence to support the employment figures is from.		Sigma Plan	Sigma Plan on behalf of Hallam Land Management

<p>on job growth – particularly where the main employment uses are in the storage and distribution category where greater areas of land are required.</p>				
<p>5600 jobs plus 7200 gives a total of 12800 jobs based on this local plan. Any growth beyond 12800 jobs detailed in this plan would be unsustainable therefore is not envisaged that any significant employment development outside of the plan would be approved.</p>	<p>The local plan is planning for minimum amounts of growth and must work within the Government aims as expressed in the NPPF, is that the planning system should facilitate economic growth and Councils must plan positively to secure it.</p>		<p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p>	<p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p>
<p>1) As there is already sufficient allocated land to meet the basic employment need in DLPlan para 5.6 we propose that the allocation in policy Ec2 on greenfield land at Money Hill Ashby be withdrawn.</p> <p>2) The need for an extra employment allocation depends solely on the validity of the loss of 45 hectares of industrial land to housing DLPlan para 7.16. If this guestimate is reduced by just one-third, or an offsetting allowance made for smaller and unidentified brownfield sites coming forward over the plan period, no new allocation would be required under policy Ec2.</p> <p>3) If credible the employment land lost to housing should also be included in the housing calculations.</p> <p>4) If the employment at the proposed Strategic Rail freight Interchange, DLPlan para 7.22, is certain enough to justify increasing the housing land allocation at Money Hill an offsetting reduction should also be made in the overall need for additional employment land.</p>	<p>There is currently a shortfall of just over 13 hectares of employment land, land to the north of Ashby Money Hill has been assessed as the most sustainable location to accommodate this growth.</p> <p>The loss of brownfield employment land is based upon the land that has been lost historically to other uses mainly housing. The Lounge Site (25ha) could be potentially lost with the construction of HS2.</p> <p>Only sites that have been granted planning permission or have been built out since 2011 can be included within the housing calculations for the draft Local Plan. Windfall sites are considered as part of the housing questions in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Employment requirements are those from the the PACEC study which did not include the SFRI.</p>		<p>Cliftonthorpe Residents c/o Robert Yates</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Policy S2:Retail requirements

Question 6 Do you agree with the amount of retail development we propose to make provision for? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any changes required?	Name	Business or organisation name;
<p>Given that a lot of the new housing will be in Ashby there should be more retail development planned for here rather than planning for it all to go to Coalville, particularly as the travel options between Ashby and Coalville are restricted to car and limited bus.</p>	<p>Noted. New retail development is proposed for Coalville as the principal town to accommodate future housing growth and to aid the regeneration of the town. A retail capacity study has been carried out which supports this policy and more information on the development of the policy can be viewed within background paper 10. Although Coalville is the preferred location for new retail uses, policy does support retail development in our other centres where it is appropriate to the role and function of that centre, and does not undermine the retail hierarchy.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>Lisa Marron</p>	<p>Resident</p>
<p>Again the retail development required needs to be questioned... There are lots of shops empty in Coalville and increasingly Ashby.. We don't need more out of town retail space that kills the high streets even further....</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan looks to concentrate retail uses to the district town and local centres. The need for additional retail floorspace is based on the district's retail capacity study, which estimates the amount of additional floorspace that is required, based on the district's most up to date population and household forecasts. The sequential approach would be applied to any development for new retail provision.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>Mr S Whitehouse</p>	<p>Personal</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Support welcomed</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>Nigel Garnham</p>	<p>Packington Nook Residents Association</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Support welcomed</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>Stephen Saxby</p>	
<p>The primary settlement in the district which provides an extensive range of services and facilities including employment, leisure and shopping and which is accessible by public transport from surrounding areas and to other large settlements outside the district. The largest amount of new development will be directed here, including retail development, to support the regeneration of Coalville Town Centre.</p> <p>This is a joke.</p> <p>Coalville needs a COMPLETE overhaul, not just scratching the surface. You may be bringing people and jobs into the area, but the money won't be spent in Coalville in its present state. It's time we looked into the mirror, be honest, and find out what local people really need in a shopping area.</p> <p>Look at Loughborough for a real market and pedestrianisation</p>	<p>The Coalville urban area has the largest population within the district as well as the most services and facilities. By directing the majority of new development to the Coalville Urban Area this allows local developments to potentially contribute to the regeneration of the town centre. By having more people living within the town this will increase the amount of money that is available to be spent within the area, helping to support shops, and services.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>Alison Wright</p>	<p>Heather Parish Council</p>

Item 5.10, 5.11 and 5.12 Retail capacity study, Create a need and business will create their solution. It will fix itself if the conditions dictate.	Noted. The Local Plan needs to provide the right environment to protect the viability and vitality of the retail sector and to encourage further investment in the town.	No change	Steve Palmer	
No comment	Noted.	No change	Samantha Lockwood	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council
Yes	Support welcomed	No change	F J Allgood	Land Owner
No need for new build supermarkets, this damages local trade in Ashby town centre. None of you listen because you are too busy listening to the demands of short term big businesses.	The draft Local Plan does not allocate any further sites for convenience (food) floor space, the retail capacity study update 2015 states that there is not a requirement for any further supermarkets.	No change		
No	Noted	No change	Olive kearins	
Planning constraints need to take account of the type of retail outlets currently in the various locations. No point in providing more retail space in Ashby for yet more Charity shops. Has anyone thought of how to limit this pervading development. Do Charity shops pay rates? if not place a limit on them.	The planning system, including the local plan, cannot control the number of charity shops within the high street as in planning terms all shops are considered the same, irrespective of who the occupier is or the goods they sell. .	No change	David Harris	Pyrotect Ltd
Yes	Support welcomed	No change	Simon Litchfield	Resident
This section also needs to encourage small scale retail development within sustainable villages where there are currently no shops, e.g. in Blackfordby.	This policy only identifies the overall need for additional retail floor space, and other policies of the plan deal with location issues. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.	No change	Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
Yes	Support welcomed	No change	Andrew Stone	
Coalville town centre needs major work, with reduced rents in the precinct and schemes to attract both major chains, but even more importantly, small independent retailers who can offer a range of interesting and attractive products to increase the number of people who are wanting to use Coalville to shop. Two ways of doing this would be reduced rents for small retailers, and removing the car parking charges so that people see Coalville as good place to shop. Grandiose schemes are unlikely to work; small, but targeted schemes are better.	Noted. The matter of rents of outside the control of the planning system. The precinct is privately owned and the matter of rents is for the owner of the precinct. In planning terms all shops are considered the same, irrespective of who the occupier is or the goods they sell. Car parking charges are also out of the remit of the local plan. A separate project has been set up to help regenerate Coalville. The project is based around what the council can do itself, and what each organisation and businesses in the town can do themselves to contribute to the town.	No change	Mary Lorimer	
Yes	Support welcomed	No change	Trevor Davis	
Agree as long as the mix of retail is appropriate.	Noted.	No change	Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council

Concentrate in the centre of towns not on the outskirts.	Agreed. The draft Local Plan requires that proposals for main town centre uses that are not in the centre should be assessed having regard to their impact on centres. The NPPF requires such an assessment particularly for development over 2,500 sqm gross but does not allow us to set a local threshold for the scale of development which should be subject to an impact assessment.	No change	Edward Hines	
Yes	Support welcomed	No change	David Bigby	Private individual
Yes	Support welcomed	No change	Lance Wiggins	Landmark Planning
The councillors on the planning committee should have listened to the people they are supposed to represent, instead of turning down Asda's application for permission to build their new store on the former T.Grieve site. That store could have been open now with a large car park off Market Street, this may have encouraged people to shop in this side of the town.	Noted. The local plan looks forward, and guides new development proposals. Decisions about planning applications are made on the basis of the local plan, as well as other relevant issues.	No change	Yvonne Willars	retired
Yes	Support welcomed	No change	Mr J Lewis	1950
There are already more shops than customers in Coalville, shoppers are deserting Coalville and Ashby because it's easier/cheaper to park elsewhere (eg NB Swadlincote) , the trend towards home shopping via the internet still has a long way to go - to build more retail space will simply undermine the existing businesses , and our town centres will end up as ghost towns .	The retail capacity study (2014) identifies the need for future retail floorspace requirements. When calculating these requirements, the study had regard to the likely impact of non-traditional forms of shopping such as the growth and potential growth of internet shopping. With respect to car parking charges, this is outside of the remit of the Local Plan.	No change	Michael Ball	Individual
Traditional retail shopping is contracting. Tesco, to name just one of the big names are selling off parts of their land bank and are putting big stores on hold. Out of town shopping centres are starting to look old fashioned. The quaint shopping areas with cafes restaurants and entertainment will live on, but internet shopping will decimate many high streets and shut many large supermarkets as time goes by. It is admittedly, difficult to restrict the large corporations dominating the high street even in wealthy and touristy areas but where possible it should be limited, because if all high streets are the same the internet will win far quicker.	The Local Plan cannot control individual retailers that take up vacant units, the local plan policies look to support the viability and vitality of the town centres.	No change	Steve Johnson	
I do think this needs to be monitored as time goes by since people are shopping more and more on line. Coalville in particular consistently has empty shop units which gives a "run-down" air - vibrant town centres would be great but just providing extra space for retail development will not solve the problem.	Internet shopping impacts on every centre, not just Coalville, so the success of the local plan strategy to meet identified needs is unlikely to turn on the continued expansion of internet shopping. A monitoring framework will be prepared to support the monitoring of the Local Plan, in order to assess if the retail policies are being effectively implemented.	No change	Lesley Birtwistle	
Yes	Support welcomed	No change	Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
Yes	Support welcomed	No change	Paul Varty	Resident of Appleby

Yes	Support welcomed	No change	John Edwards	XMOS Semiconductors Ltd
No comments	Support welcomed	No change	Tim Abbott	Householder
<p>It's ok.</p> <p>I do think retail must be focussed in the town centre and pressure applied to the owners of Belvoir shopping centre.</p> <p>I would like to see the old factory at Mantle Lane (recently set fire to) brought back into use and would make a fantastic new location for a Science Park. Relocate Snibston to that wonderful heritage building and expand the Science offering to include, natural history and more textiles etc. on the different floors.</p> <p>Have some long term ambition NWLDC and stop being short sighted and selling off our best assets because its "too difficult" to fix!</p>	Decisions regarding the future of Snibston Discovery park are beyond the remit of the Local Plan. The county council, not the district council, is the owner of the Snibston estate	No change	Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying
Yes	Support welcomed	No change		Heather Parish Council
No	Noted	No change	Jon Walters	LPT
A little less retail development, as the rise of online shopping may make some such developments obsolete before long.	The Retail Capacity Study 2015 based on the most up to date household and population projections suggests the need for more comparison floor space with the biggest need being focused in Coalville. When calculating these requirements, the study had regard to the likely impact of non-traditional forms of shopping such as the growth and potential growth of internet shopping. It is important that the Local Plan can meet the districts retail need for the plan period, just because there isn't the demand at present, this may change during the plan period.	No change	Lesley Colley	
There is an increasing move away from shopping at large superstores to use of local convenience stores, as demonstrated by a number of new, large store plans being shelved/more small stores opening. KPC considers that Kegworth's retail centre needs more shops, restaurants, and parking to allow for ad hoc shopping as this is popular in Kegworth, including sandwich shops and convenience shopping, particularly given another 448 houses (Slack & Parr, Ashby Road, Coker) will be built and the likely SRFI.	Noted.	No change	Vicky Roe	Kegworth Parish Council

<p>(a) No clear plan. We feel that there is a lack of recognition that there is rapid evolution of retail within Europe due to internet sales and home delivery.</p> <p>(b) The public are demanding more leisure day and night-time facilities from our town centres and (much) less retail. The draft Local Plan does not specifically detail these demographic moves.</p> <p>(c) Lack of retail in northern villages – and communities such as Albert Village, Moira, Norris Hill, Ashby Heights (etc) need measures in place to provide retail growth and a sustainable future.</p>	<p>The Retail Capacity Study identifies a need for further retail floor space for comparison goods, therefore the Local Plan needs to ensure that this need is met for the plan period.</p> <p>a) When calculating these requirements, the study had regard to the likely impact of non-traditional forms of shopping such as the growth and potential growth of internet shopping.</p> <p>b) Other policies in the Local Plan seek to ensure the vitality and viability of the town centre by encouraging a wide range of town centre uses, not just shopping uses.</p> <p>c) Retail provision within the rural areas is monitored and any new proposals will be assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	No change	Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader
No comment.	Noted.	No change	Guy Longley	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.
<p>We write on behalf of our client, New River Retail Ltd (NRR) to provide representations to the above. NRR purchased the Whitwick Retail Park in Coalville during July 2015 and are committed to invest in the park to ensure its longevity as a viable retail facility for local residents.</p> <p>Policy S2 – Future housing and economic development needs and paragraph 5.12 which supports the policy say that there is a requirement for 7,300sqm of comparison floorspace but no additional need for convenience retail floorspace.</p> <p>We note that the figures do not include the Belvoir Centre redevelopment coming forward within the plan period. Due to the uncertain nature of that development which first gained planning consent in 2010 we welcome that approach.</p> <p>With regard to the need for convenience goods floorspace, we feel that it would be prudent to have a degree of flexibility within the plan to allow for delivery of convenience goods floorspace should the current commitments allowed for not come forward. We have seen significant changes in the convenience retail market in the past 18mths and there is nothing to prevent further changes happening as quickly.</p> <p>At present a significant amount of capacity for additional convenience goods floorspace is taken up by two proposals, Hotel Street and Station Road, Castle Donington. Neither of these</p>	<p>Noted. With respect to existing planning commitments, the permission for development on Hotel Street that included convenience retail floorspace has since expired, and therefore not 'carried over' in the Retail Capacity Update Study. A more recent approval for development on this site does not indicate an element of convenience shopping. The Update Study however does include figures for a new commitment for a foodstore and a number of small retail units at Station Road, Castle Donington.</p>	No change	Nicole Roe	NJL Consulting

commitments have food retailers signed up to operate the proposed stores, which automatically brings their delivery into question. If both of these commitments were to not come forward then the stated oversupply in the 2015 Retail Study Update (which forms the evidence base for the Local Plan) would automatically reduce by 3,913sqm.				
No, there is no need for further space to be allocated for retail, especially in Coalville. Space is already available in empty premises. Internet shopping will stifle future demand. Local towns taking large increases in housing will require increased convenience shopping for sustainability.	The Retail Capacity Study 2015 based on the most up to date household and population projections suggests the need for more comparison floor space with the biggest need being focused in Coalville. When calculating these requirements, the study had regard to the likely impact of non-traditional forms of shopping such as the growth and potential growth of internet shopping.	No change	C Tandy	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society
Yes	Support welcomed	No change	Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council	Castle Donington Parish Council

Policy S3 – Settlement Hierarchy

Question 7 Do you agree with our suggested settlement hierarchy? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any changes required?	Name	Business or organisation name;
Yes			Lisa Marron	Resident
Yes			Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
<p>The limits to development should be redrawn to only include where permission for housing has already been given</p> <p>The local plan should say that development in such villages should be limited and that the term physical extension of the settlement should be dropped.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period, no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state “Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extensions to these settlements is supported in principle”.</p>	Lisa Holloway	N/a
Option B is preferable and recognises better the role of all settlements in supporting development.	Noted		Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
I would suggest that Coleorton, specifically Lowermoor Road, is not as sustainable as suggested and any proposed development numbers for this settlement should be reviewed	The draft Local plan does not identify a housing allocation for Coleorton over the plan period, the background for how the sustainability of settlements has been assessed can be viewed within Background Topic Paper S3.		Mark Hutchinson	Mark Hutchinson
Regarding physical extension to settlement in supposedly "sustainable villages" this policy should be dropped as it risks creeping and uncontrollable development. Regard should be taken to the particular field and its proximity to heritage sites, schools and resultant highway problems, i.e. the field in Top Street, Appleby Magna behind Didcott Way/Wren Close, without a simple blanket policy.	The Limits to Development have been drafted to account for future housing needs for sustainable settlements. The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period, no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore required. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.	Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state “Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle”.	Mr J Madge	None
Coalville is the principal centre of the District, the majority of development within the district should be focused at Coalville to help deliver private capital and job growth to assist with regenerating the town centre.	Noted. A large proportion of new development is focused within the Coalville Urban Area.		George Breed	Persimmon Homes NMID
On the whole I believe this to be a sound concept, however the plan does not explain how the hierarchy would be implemented in reality. The main difficulty I see in implementing this method is that it is not possible to get a full holistic view of all planning applications in a given period, and therefore be able to allocate the developments appropriately. Instead one must deal with each application as it comes, without knowledge of any	Noted. Further explanation needs to be provided as part of the Local Plan or supporting background papers on the justification of settlements within the settlement hierarchy. Although the approach suggested would be too prescriptive as each individual site needs to be assessed on its own merit, as the impact of the development would depend upon the scale of the development and the settlement.	Statement included within the local plan on how settlements are assessed as being sustainable.	Stephen Saxby	None

<p>future applications, thus complicating the decision-making process.</p> <p>I believe this method could be enhanced by providing further guidance as to the allowable development size and rate per classification, for example a small village may have a maximum of 25 houses in any one application, in any given 5 year period. This could be augmented with a clause to allow further development under exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The effects of this method would be to ensure that the appropriate level of growth is applied for each settlement, with an allowance for exceptional circumstances. It also removes further subjectiveness from the decision-making process, which provide much welcomed clarity for all process stake-holders.</p> <p>The way in which the settlements have been classified within the sustainable villages and small villages categories is inconsistent and confusing.</p> <p>Referring to North West Leicestershire Draft Local Plan Background Paper 2 – S3 Settlement Hierarchy, each settlement is summarised by its available services and facilities. However there is no clear link between the classification given, and which or how many services are available in that settlement. For example, Breedon-On-The-Hill is classified as a sustainable village, with a multitude of services available. Whereas Diseworth is given the same rating, but with much less services available.</p> <p>Furthermore, some settlements have been allocated the small village category yet offer more services than some in the sustainable village category, such as Newton Burgoland.</p> <p>These are just a few examples, yet this inconsistent approach can be seen across many other settlements.</p>				
Yes	Noted		Mark Chadbourn	Emerald Eye Ltd
Coalville has less to offer than Ibstock or Measham. Can't comment on Kegworth as I don't know that area.	Coalville has a greater number and range of services and facilities compared to Ibstock and Measham and also has the largest population.		Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council

Is it to be assumed that unsustainable villages will be allowed to wither and die?	Within small villages and hamlets the policy will allow for the conversion of existing buildings and the redevelopment of previously developed land or rural exception sites for affordable housing. It would be unsustainable to allow further development in such locations, where new development cannot be supported by services and facilities.		Gerald Dalby	NA
Yes, but some of the limits to development may be too tight as it is possible to make a case for sustainability outside the line, for example Peggs Green or the area around The Moor/Ashby Road in Coleorton. If no development is allowed, it will be difficult for an area to become sustainable eg by having sufficient people to use a bus service, a shop or a school.	Noted. The local plan does not prohibit all development a small amount of development is supported within the limits to development. A Neighbourhood Plan could plan for a greater amount of housing if it was felt it was needed locally to support local services and facilities.		Sue McGlynn - Clerk to Coleorton Parish Council	Coleorton Parish Council
<p>Page 25 - Item 5.12</p> <p>Plan incorrectly defines the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>As Coalville loses employment opportunities it becomes more of a commuter town with considerable numbers leaving the district to work. The majority of development for the Coalville area is NOT sustainable and only increases the need for the use of the motor car. This policy is hugely flawed. Housing is sustainable when it reduces the carbon footprint. Building commuter homes does not do this.</p> <p>The Policy S3 which is on pages 25 through 27 does not conform to the NPPF page 9 item 3 supporting a rural economy.</p> <p>Pages 28 and 29</p> <p>Ignores the fact that the fact that during the day Castle Donington has the largest population of the district.</p> <p>Page 30</p>	<p>The Coalville Urban Area remains to have the largest population and the greatest range of services and facilities, including the greatest concentration of employment. A number of different options in relation to the settlement hierarchy have been tested as part of the local plan sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>The population figures set out within the Local Plan are based on the number residents within the district and not the number of people that commute in for work or other reasons on a daily basis.</p> <p>In relation to Policy S3 the need to support the rural economy this is covered by draft local plan policy S4. It is suggested that policy S4 is amended to reflect the wording within the NPPF.</p>	Amend policy S4 part 2 (i) to state "Extensions to all types existing businesses, both through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings".	Steve Palmer	NA
Does Diseworth class as a sustainable village?	Diseworth is classed as a sustainable village.		Samantha Lockwood	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council
Yes			Mr Robert Harlow	Harlow Bros Ltd

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The limits to development should ONLY include land at H1a where houses have permission. • The limits to development should NOT include houses on Botts Lane, Appleby which are not part of the core village. • Physical extensions to settlements should NOT be allowed in sustainable villages. Required housing land is already allocated. 	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state “Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle”.</p>	<p>Paul Hemmerdinger</p>	<p>Parish Council</p>
<p>Although classed within the Coalville Urban area Thringstone is a distinct village community. Its development needs should be assessed as such.</p>	<p>Noted. It is recognised that Thringstone is a community in its own right, however due to the location of the settlement it functions as part of the wider Coalville Urban Area.</p>		<p>F J ALLGOOD</p>	<p>Land Owner</p>
<p>I disagree with the classification of Appleby Magna as a sustainable village. People have to use private vehicles to access services or facilities. A bus every two hours to Measham with an immediate turn round and no connection to Ashby does not constitute public transport provision. No wonder the bus is always empty. The through routes of Mawby's Lane and Black Horse Hill have no footways and are already dangerous. The former has a blind right angled bend . There should be no physical extension to the village especially in the light of the planning consents already granted.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna is classed as a sustainable village as there are a number of services to meet day to day needs for example a primary school, general store and access to employment.</p>		<p>Michael Foote</p>	<p>Appleby Environment</p>
<p>The limits to development should ONLY include land at H1a where houses have permission.</p> <p>The limits to development should NOT include houses on Botts Lane, Appleby which are not part of the core village.</p> <p>Physical extensions to settlements should NOT be allowed in sustainable villages. Required housing land is already allocated</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state “Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle”.</p>	<p>Paul Cooper</p>	<p>Resident</p>

<p>Regarding strategy concerning Appleby Magna (issues 1, 3 & 4 on the map):</p> <p>1. The limits to development should ONLY include land at H1a where houses have permission.</p> <p>2. The limits to development should NOT include houses on Botts Lane, Appleby which are not part of the core village.</p> <p>3. Physical extensions to settlements should NOT be allowed in sustainable villages. Required housing land is already allocated</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development .It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state “Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle”.</p>	<p>Alison Draper</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>Noted</p>		<p>Olive kearins</p>	<p>Na</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>		<p>David Harris</p>	<p>Pyrotect Ltd</p>
<p>Muller Property Group object to policy S3.</p> <p>Background Paper 2 has been provided in support of policy S3. At Appendix 1 this includes an assessment of the facilities provided in each settlement. We consider the classification of Ibstock as a Local Service Centre to be inconsistent with this evidence.</p> <p>The facilities of Ibstock closely mirror those of Castle Donnington which has been included as a Key Service Centre whilst Ibstock has been considered a Local Service Centre. Kegworth and Measham are classified with Ibstock, yet neither for instance has a secondary school. Ibstock Community College provides a public leisure centre including a swimming pool (alongside Coalville and Ashby). It also has a wide range of other facilities including a doctors surgery, dentist, pharmacy, post office, large community venue, country park, allotments, and skate park.</p> <p>We therefore disagree with the suggestion that as a Local Service Centre Ibstock provides “some services and facilities primarily of a local nature meeting day-to-day needs and where a reasonable amount of new development will take place”.</p> <p>We feel Ibstock should be recognised as playing a more important role in providing services and facilities to the surrounding area. It has the critical mass needed and as such it is a sustainable location for growth. Indeed a restrictive approach to further</p>	<p>In order to determine the sustainability of different settlements we have looked at the range of services and facilities available. Consideration has also been given to the role of specific settlements. For example, some settlements will have services and facilities which only serve the immediate population, for example Ibstock will has a limited retail role. Whilst in other settlements there is a greater range of services and facilities which serve an area wider than the settlement itself.</p>		<p>MATT WEDDERBURN</p>	<p>Muller Strategic Projects Limited</p>

<p>development here will not assist in maintaining and supporting these facilities.</p> <p>We therefore object to policy S3 and request the reclassification of Ibstock as a Key Service Centre.</p>				
<p>The definition of Ashby de la Zouch as a key service centre/ main town and Blackfordby as a sustainable village is supported, however there are reservations about how sustainable a village can be when there is no shop.</p> <p>It is of concern that this settlement hierarchy appears to be ignored later in the document when housing and employment land is allocated.</p>	<p>Noted. As part of assessing the sustainability of settlements these are assessed against a wide range of services and facilities and no specific facility is given more weight than another. The sustainability of a settlement cannot there be assessed on the availability (or otherwise) of one facility i.e. a shop. The land allocated within the local plan within the sustainable settlements has already been granted planning permission, outside of the local plan process.</p>		<p>Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk</p>	<p>Ashby de la Zouch Town Council</p>
<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development</p> <p>The Limits to Development should not include houses at Botts Lane which are not part of the Core Village.</p> <p>Required housing land is already allocated and physical extensions to settlements should not be allowed.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>Nicky and David Keer</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>I am concerned that the line along the east side of Black Horse Hill has been moved to enable land behind the houses to be built on.</p> <p>The Limits to Development should only include land at H1a where the development already has permission. Houses on Botts Lane should not be included and remain outside the Core Village strategy physical extensions to our village should not be allocated especially where required housing land has already been allocated.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>Duncan Saunders</p>	<p>NA</p>

<p>For Appleby Magna</p> <p>The limits to development should ONLY include land at H1a where houses have permission.</p> <p>The limits to development should NOT include houses on Botts Lane, Appleby which are not part of the core village.</p> <p>Physical extensions to settlements should NOT be allowed in sustainable villages. Required housing land is already allocated.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this. The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state “Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle”.</p>	<p>Peter Selby</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Do you agree with our suggested settlement hierarchy? If not what changes do you suggest?</p> <p>According to the 2011 Census the largest population was in Coalville (36,801 people) followed by Ashby-de-la-Zouch (12,385), Castle Donington (6,350), Ibstock (5,961), Measham (5,200) and Kegworth (3,541).</p> <p>As such identifying the Coalville Urban Area as the Principal Town is supported and identifying the Ashby de la Zouch as the Key Service Centre is supported.</p> <p>In terms of population, Ashby de la Zouch is approximately double the size of Castle Donington which is more akin to the settlement sizes of Ibstock, Measham and Kegworth. Ashby also has a much greater range of services and facilities including a full range of education, GP services/pharmacies, countless public houses, restaurants and night clubs, as well as very important leisure facilities such as the Hood Park leisure centre with its various activities, the Venture theatre for cultural activities and numerous hotel accommodation. Many of these important facilities were omitted from the Settlement Proforma included in Background Paper 2. Table 1 below is a hybrid of the Ashby and Castle Donington services and facilities which has been updated (in red) to add several comments and additional facilities.</p> <p>Table 1 Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington Services & Facilities</p>	<p>The settlement hierarchy is based on a number of factors which looks at the number of services and facilities a settlement provides, population, amount of employment and the number of other settlements that a settlement supports. Therefore due to Castle Doningtons population and the amount of employment opportunities it provides, along with the number of settlements it supports it classified as a Key Service Centre.</p>		<p>Angela Cornell</p>	<p>Fisher German</p>

Service/Facility				
Ashby				
Castle Donington				
Education				
Ashby CE Primary School				
Woodcote Primary School				
Ashby Hill Top Primary School				
Ashby Willesley Community Primary				
Ivanhoe College				
Ashby School				
Orchard Primary School				
St Edwards C of E Primary School				
Castle Donington College				
Post Office				
Within the Town Centre				
Post Office, Borough Street				
General Store				
Ashby Town Centre and out of town (Tesco, Aldi)				
Castle Donington Town Centre,				
Co-Op supermarket on Trent Lane				
GP Surgery				
Ashby Health Centre, North Street				
Burton Road Health Centre opening				
3rd December 2015				
Castle Donington Surgery, Borough Street				

Pharmacy Ashby Pharmacy, The Green Dean and Smedley Ltd, Market Street Boots, Market Street Tesco Burton Road Health Centre opening 3rd December 2015 Manor Pharmacy, Borough Street Public House + restaurants/night clubs Various within and around the Town Over 10 restaurants Manhattans Nightclub Ciros Nightclub Various within and around the Town Less than 10 restaurants Community Hall Holy Trinity Church Hall, Kilwardly Street Castle Donington Village Hall, Moira Dale Recreation Ground Various Various Employment Ashby Business Park Ivanhoe Business Park Nottingham Road Industrial Estates				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Willow Farm Industrial Estate</p> <p>East Midlands Distribution Centre</p> <p>Trent Lane industrial estate</p> <p>Place of Worship</p> <p>Various, mainly located within or close to the Town Centre.</p> <p>(7 in number)</p> <p>Various</p> <p>(4 in number)</p> <p>High Speed Broadband</p> <p>Existing commercial coverage. In parts of the area there is expected coverage by Spring 2016 as part of the Superfast Leicestershire project.</p> <p>Existing commercial coverage. Most parts of Castle Donington are expected to have high speed broadband by Spring 2016 as part of the Superfast Leicestershire Project.</p> <p>Public Transport</p> <p>Various services to Coalville, Leicester, Burton and Swadlincote</p> <p>Skylink services to Derby, Loughborough, Nottingham and Leicester. Hourly services day, evening and night</p> <p>Roberts Coaches 155</p> <p>Mon-Fri – 07:54 – 18 :54</p> <p>Sat – 07:54 – 18 :54</p> <p>Frequency – hourly</p> <p>Coalville</p> <p>Leisure</p> <p>Hood Park Leisure Centre (comprising indoor pool,</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

outdoor pool, fitness suite, fitness classes,
 badminton courts, squash courts, short tennis,
 AstroTurf pitches, function rooms for hire

Bowls Club, Bath Grounds

Culture & Arts

Venture Theatre, North Street

Accommodation

Premier Inn

The Royal Hotel

The Queens Head Hotel

The Bulls Head

The Fallen Knight Hotel

Various guest houses/B&B's

Tudor Hotel

Church View Hotel

Donington Manor Hotel

Various guest houses/B&B's

The table demonstrates that the services and
 facilities located in Ashby are more plentiful and
 wide ranging than in Castle Donington. Ashby has a
 strong town centre with a hinterland that covers a
 large part of the south-west of the district. Whilst
 Castle Donington has employment provision, the
 services and facilities do not match that of Ashby.
 This aligned with the population data suggests that
 Castle Donington should fall in a lower settlement
 category than Ashby.

It is therefore considered that Castle Donington
 should fall within the Local Service Centre category,
 or Ashby be moved to the Principle Town category
 to distinguish between the very different
 settlements.

This is supported further within the Retail
 Hierarchy (Policy Ec9) which identifies Coalville and

Ashby as Town Centres in view of their both of their scale and function serving a more than local area. Castle Donington is classified alongside Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham as Local Centres.				
No	Noted.		Andrew Stone	NA
There is a disproportionate amount of development to the South East of Coalville. This will have major adverse effects on the people of Hugglescote and this side of Coalville. It would be much better to spread the development into smaller, more manageable developments located throughout the district, and nearer to the areas where there are employment opportunities.	The development to the south east of Coalville has been granted planning permission or is subject to a resolution to grant planning permission..		Mary Lorimer	Not applicable
Prefer option A however feel that Ashby should be considered as the principle town for North West Leicestershire due to the lack of investment and direction afforded to Coalville.	Both Options A and B have been tested a part of the sustainability appraisal. There is very little to choose between the two options, however Option B recognises that Ashby and Castle Donington are different to the other larger settlements in terms of the number and range of services and facilities. Whilst Coalville remains that largest settlement in terms of population and has the greatest range of services and facilities.		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
<p>The plan at h1a land off Measham rd seems to have been directly lifted from the shlaa plan and the plans submitted for a large scale development in this field only half of which has had planning permission granted. This whole area is outside the limits to development and should be considered as countryside. The limits to development should be redrawn so as to only include that area of the field where permission has already been granted.</p> <p>The houses on Botts lane have also been included in the limits to development. This area is not part of the central core of the village and as such should not be included in the limits to development.</p> <p>Appleby is defined as a sustainable village , the term physical extension to the settlement should not be allowed to be used in the context of a sustainable village, housing land has already been allocated.</p>	The Limits to Development have been drawn in accordance with the methodology, to follow the boundary of the application site. However It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.	Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.	Mr T J Marsh	Appleby Resident
In principle.	Noted.		Edward Hines	N/A

<p>The limits to development in Appleby Magna should ONLY include land at H1a where houses have permission.</p> <p>The limits to development should NOT include houses on BOTTTS LANE, Appleby Magna which are not part of the core village.</p> <p>Physical extensions to settlements should NOT be allowed in sustainable villages. Required housing land is already allocated.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>Rachel Darby</p>	<p>resident of the village</p>
<p>The limits to development should ONLY include land at H1a</p> <p>where houses have permission.</p> <p>The limits to development should NOT include houses on Botts Lane, Appleby which are not part of the core village.</p> <p>Physical extensions to settlements should NOT be allowed in sustainable villages. Required housing land is already allocated.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this. The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore required. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>Mr Richard Hine</p>	<p>Resident of Appleby Magna</p>
<p>the limits to the development should include only land at H1a where houses have permission.</p> <p>This should not include houses on Botts lane which are not part of the core village.</p> <p>Physical extensions to settlements should not be allowed in sustainable villages ,required housing land has already been allocated.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>Sharon Chapman</p>	<p>home owner</p>

<p>Option A is preferable as it will ensure a more equitable distribution of investment, housing and new infrastructure across the District's Main Towns and Rural centres. Option B has been chosen as this can be used to justify allocating almost all housing allocations to Ashby which would have the effect of increasing the size of Ashby by an unacceptable 61%.</p> <p>Blackfordby cannot be designated as a sustainable village when it has no shop. it should be designated a small village until a shop and post office are established.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In defining the settlement hierarchy we have assessed the different settlements within the district in terms of the range of services and facilities available, including accessibility by public transport and non-car modes. The frequency of public transport to and from settlements and also the range of destinations of services have also been taken into account.</p> <p>Option B recognises the important role played by Coalville, but also recognises that Ashby and Castle Donington are different to the other larger settlements outside of Coalville in terms of population size and the range of services and facilities available.</p> <p>Blackfordby has been defined as a sustainable village due to the number of services available, although Blackfordby doesn't have a local shop there is an hourly bus service to Ashby, Swadlincote and Burton in order to access these facilities without the use of a car, therefore on balance it is considered to represent a sustainable village.</p>		David Bigby	Private individual
<p>only include development which has granted permissions now as Appleby Magna is already over developed</p> <p>Do not include houses Botts Lane and Measham Road as they are not the core of the village.</p> <p>Extensions to settlements should not be allowed in sustainable villages as required housing/development land is already allocated</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this. Physical extensions will be allowed on the edge of sustainable settlements to allow some degree of flexibility to meet local housing needs. Future development will need to be of the scale and character appropriate to the existing settlements and existing services and facilities will need to be able to accommodate any additional growth. The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	Janet Christine Denson	non

<p>NPPF paragraph 160 requires authorities to have a clear understanding of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area by working with neighbouring authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships, in this instance the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP).</p> <p>Paragraphs 5.6 onwards of the draft Plan demonstrates that the authority has worked with the LLEP to determine the development requirements for the District, having regard to evidence contained within the Public and Corporate Economic Consultants Study (PACEC) that was commissioned by the LLEP.</p> <p>In Paragraph 5.8 the future employment creation is identified using the PACEC which refers to a proposal for a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) near to East Midlands Airport which could create 7,400 jobs. As a result the housing requirement has been increased to provide for this and maintain a balance between jobs and homes in the area.</p> <p>However, the draft plan does not make reference to the wider Strategic Economic Plan of the LLEP which provides the framework for achieving the vision for the area. The Strategic Economic Plan states;</p> <p>‘We will prioritise infrastructure investment in five priority Growth Areas and accelerate delivery of four Transformational Priorities that are of national significance.’</p> <p>The East Midlands Enterprise Gateway (EMEG) is an identified growth area located around East Midlands Airport and the East Midlands Gateway Strategic Rail Freight Interchange is identified as ‘a Transformational Priority’.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy aims to distinguish between the roles and functions of different settlements and to guide the location of future development to comply with NPPF core principle which is:</p> <p>‘to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.’</p>	<p>The settlement hierarchy sets out the hierarchy to guide future development, the Local Plan as part of the employment chapter recognises the Strategic Growth Plan and the District Councils Local Growth Plan and the importance of the East Midlands Enterprise Gateway and the SFRI.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy is prepared by considering the sustainability of different settlements by assessing the different settlements within the district in terms of the range of services and facilities available, including accessibility by public transport and non-car modes.</p> <p>Consideration has also been given to the role of specific settlements. Those settlements with fewer facilities and services are less self sufficient in their ability to meet the daily requirements of residents. Therefore they rely on nearby towns or larger villages to access some services and facilities. For example Castle Donington is proposed as a Key Service Centre and Kegworth as a Local Service Centre. It should be noted that East Midlands Enterprise Gateway is not included within the settlement hierarchy as it is not a proposed settlement.</p>		Jeremy Williams	ID Planning
--	--	--	-----------------	-------------

<p>The overall settlement hierarchy set out in Policy S3 has been informed by the evidence base to consider the housing needs based on the potential jobs created, in particular with regard to the SRFI. However, we do not feel that the hierarchy fully reflects the evidence base or demonstrates an understanding of the business needs of the markets as required by NPPF paragraph 14.</p> <p>As proposed, the settlement hierarchy is not effective as it conflicts with the key part of the LEP and Local Plan economic growth strategy, namely the East Midlands Enterprise Gateway.</p> <p>The East Midlands Enterprise Gateway including East Midlands Airport is identified as a Growth Area and should therefore be considered a sustainable location. The scale of growth planned and the importance of the East Midlands Airport area to the delivery of the LLEP and Local Plan economic strategy should be reflected in the Local Plan hierarchy in Policy S3, particularly with reference to where employment needs are to be met.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy should be amended to include the East Midlands Enterprise Gateway or East Midlands Airport area as a suitable location for major new 'employment development' to ensure that the policy is sound and fully complies with NPPF. This could be achieved by identifying the area as a major growth area at the end of Policy S3 with links to Policy Ec5.</p>				
<p>The limit to development should only include land at Site H1a - Off Measham Road, Appleby Magna where houses have permission. It should not include houses on Botts Lane. rented housing land is already allocated.</p> <p>The village is well maintained, an attractive place, roads are too narrow for more cars, with traffic and access problems. electricity, telephone and sewer services are inadequate. Poor bus service and does not provide access to a large shopping area. Doctors surgery has closed.</p> <p>Development will spoil the village and its facilities are not adequate.</p> <p>Object to Limits to Development being extended to the back of the large gardens on Black Horse Hill as</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this. The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>Mollie Starr</p>	<p>n/a</p>

<p>this will lead to developing on agricultural land and spoiling the character of the village.</p>				
<p>Whilst we agree Swannington is a sustainable settlement and can accommodate moderate growth over the plan period, subject to it being well related to the existing settlement, we also feel that given the location of Swannington and its close proximity to Coalville, the settlement could be considered as part of the Coalville Urban Area rather than just a sustainable settlement in its own right.</p> <p>Indeed the draft proposals map refers to Swannington as part of the Coalville Urban Area where in growth terms the draft policy states the bulk of the growth should go.</p>	<p>The settlement of Swannington is separated by open countryside and is physically separated from the Coalville Urban Area.</p>		<p>Nick Wilkins</p>	<p>NW</p>
<p>The limits to development should only include at H1a where houses have permission and the limits should NOT include houses on Botts Lane Appleby which are not part of the core village.</p> <p>We believe physical extensions should NOT be allowed. Required housing land is already allocated</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this. The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>Mr Clive Jayne and Mrs Patricia Jayne</p>	<p>Retired</p>
<p>The categorisation of Castle Donington as a Key Service Centre is supported as is the expansion of the draft Limits of Development and the consequent removal of the Sensitive Areas policy (E1 of the old Local Plan).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Lance Wiggins</p>	<p>Landmark Planning</p>

<p>I wish to point out that Blackfordby does not have enough amenities to be classed as a sustainable village: no Post Office, no village shop, nearby schools full to capacity, poor road system through the village (list not exhaustive).</p> <p>I would therefore prefer Blackfordby to be classed as a 'small village' where development will be restricted to conversions of existing buildings or the redevelopment of previously developed land.</p>	<p>Noted. In order to assess if a settlement is sustainable it is assessed against the following services and facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Post Office • General Store • GP surgery • Pharmacy • Public House • Community Hall • Recreation Ground • Employment • Place of Worship • High Speed broadband • Public Transport <p>No one specific service or facility carries more weight than another. A settlement cannot be defined as unsustainable because it doesn't have a specific service or facility. On balance Blackfordby is considered sustainable due to the range of service and facilities available to residents.</p>		Martin Horridge	n/a - personal comment
<p>This Representation is made on behalf of JF & BM Gray with regards to land off Talbot Place, Donisthorpe.</p> <p>Support the inclusion of Donisthorpe as a "sustainable village", support the identification of such "sustainable villages" as suitable centres to accommodate limited new growth through infilling and physical extension of these identified settlements.</p>	Noted.		Philippa Kreuser	CT Planning
<p>Post offices, shops, Public Houses are closing or have already closed in villages all over the country. people living in these places commute to towns for employment. the only feasible way to do this is by motor vehicle. public transport is only an option if there is a bus stop near your home and near your destination, and you work Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm, for the majority of people who start or finish work in the early hours, or work weekends (such as shift workers) their car is the preferred mode of transport especially when its cold or wet.. the Authorities should wake up to the fact that most people prefer the comfort and convenience of their car to commute or shop, I have held a bus pass for 6 years and have never used it, nor intend to. So it is my opinion that new houses should be built in or on the edge of towns rather than villages.</p>	The sustainability of settlements are regularly monitored, the settlement hierarchy directs the vast majority of new development to the larger more sustainable settlements.		Yvonne Willars	retired

<p>Bloor Homes Limited (BHL) does not agree with the suggested settlement hierarchy in respect of its approach to 'Sustainable Villages'. This tier of the hierarchy includes a large number of sustainable villages of various sizes, with very different levels of services and facilities, from a minimum of 3 key facilities such as at Albert Village, to a maximum of 8 key facilities such as at Appleby Magna. Some of these sustainable villages will therefore be more suitable and able to accommodate development than others, and BHL would request the Council consider sub-dividing this tier of the hierarchy to recognise those settlements which are clearly more sustainable and suited to development than others.</p> <p>The Council will be aware that some of the larger sustainable villages have key facilities which are vulnerable to becoming unviable and closing during the lifetime of this plan, such as primary schools and village shops. This can often be a consequence of changing age profiles of the population within those settlements, e.g. fewer young families and a reduction in primary school age pupils.</p> <p>An issue and objective within the Draft Local Plan Consultation is to reduce the need to travel and maintain access to services and facilities, including jobs, shops, and education. In order to achieve this objective, it will be vitally important that key village services therefore remain viable. However, BHL note from the Housing Trajectory at Appendix Two that no new housing is proposed to be developed in the Sustainable villages for ten years between 2020/21 and 2030/2031 (save for infill plots). This approach to housing distribution is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the viability of those key services and facilities within the Sustainable villages, will undermine the achievement of the Council's objective, and will not contribute towards the social dimension of sustainable development as set out in the Framework.</p> <p>By way of example, Appleby Magna has 8 of the key facilities and is of a scale which can accommodate modest growth. There is also land available and suitable for residential development adjoining the village as set out in the SHLAA (2014), which includes Ap6 (Rear of Didcott Way) which is under the control of BHL.</p> <p>As well as local employment and community</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan does not suggest that no further development should take place within the sustainable settlements. The draft Limits to Development allow for some small scale development to take place within the sustainable villages.</p> <p>In the case of Appleby Magna the settlement has permission on four different sites for a total of 76 dwellings to be built out during the plan period. Therefore this does offer the opportunity for local services to be supported.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal looked at dispersing the remaining housing requirement over the district, however this scores less than allocating a sustainable urban extension to the North of Ashby due to the fact that services and facilities are harder to access and the concentration of development within one place is more likely to deliver supporting services.</p>		Jennifer Towers	Bloor Homes Limited
--	--	--	-----------------	---------------------

owned uses, the village facilities include a local primary school, post office, and shop. However, the Council will be aware that the village has an ageing population profile (see paragraph 3.1 of the consultation paper), and that such a profile will not maintain levels of young families and primary age children to support the viability of the primary school and local shop in the future.

The imposition therefore of a moratorium on new development after 2020 can only serve to increase the risk of the primary school and shop becoming unviable during the lifetime of the Plan, and thereby result in the Plan failing to achieve its objectives in relation to maintaining access to services in Appleby Magna.

In relation to the Sustainability Appraisal prepared to support the draft Local Plan, its findings in respect of assessing the 'dispersal option' fail to recognise that such development within the Sustainable villages can reduce the need to travel by maintaining access to jobs and services, and is therefore a positive rather than a negative impact. It is also not accepted that limited development around some of the villages would automatically have a greater negative impact on the landscape and built environment, than similar developments around urban areas. That is a judgement that can only be made when comparing specific sites. The findings of the Sustainability Appraisal in respect of the 'dispersal option' should therefore be reviewed.

BHL also therefore request the Council reconsider its approach to the distribution of new housing, and assess the level of new housing that is needed to sustain the existing level of services within the larger Sustainable villages that have a school and shop/post office, in particular at Appleby Magna.

--	--	--	--	--

<p>The Limits to development should only include land at H1a where houses already have permission</p> <p>The limits of development should NOT include houses on Botts Lane or places Appleby which are not part of the core village</p> <p>Movement of the existing Limits to development, including physical extensions to existing settlements, should not be allowed within sustainable villages.</p> <p>Adequate required housing land is already allocated within the existing limits to development.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore required. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>Mr Stuart Morris</p>	<p>Private</p>
<p>The Limits to development should only include land at H1a where houses already have permission</p> <p>The limits of development should NOT include houses on Botts Lane or places Appleby which are not part of the core village</p> <p>Movement of the existing Limits to development, including physical extensions to existing settlements, should not be allowed within sustainable villages.</p> <p>Adequate required housing land is already allocated within the existing limits to development.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore required. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>Hayley Morris</p>	<p>none</p>
<p>The Limits to development should only include land at H1a where houses already have permission</p> <p>The limits of development should NOT include houses on Botts Lane or places Appleby which are not part of the core village</p> <p>Movement of the existing Limits to development, including physical extensions to existing settlements, should not be allowed within sustainable villages.</p> <p>Adequate required housing land is already allocated within the existing limits to development.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>Brenda Wedgbrow</p>	<p>none</p>

<p>The Limits to development should only include land at H1a where houses already have permission</p> <p>The limits of development should NOT include houses on Botts Lane or places Appleby which are not part of the core village</p> <p>Movement of the existing Limits to development, including physical extensions to existing settlements, should not be allowed within sustainable villages.</p> <p>Adequate required housing land is already allocated within the existing limits to development.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state “Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle”.</p>	<p>Mr William Morris</p>	<p>private</p>
<p>Blackfordby has recently had two planning applications declined by NWL District Council (15/00083/OUTM & 15/00306/OUTM) due to the proposals not being sustainable. This is evidence that Blackfordby should not be classed as a sustainable village. The only option I can see is for it to be classed as a small village.</p>	<p>Noted. In order to assess if a settlement is sustainable it is assessed against the following services and facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Post Office • General Store • GP surgery • Pharmacy • Public House • Community Hall • Recreation Ground • Employment • Place of Worship • High Speed broadband • Public Transport <p>No one specific service or facility carries more weight than another. A settlement cannot be defined as unsustainable because it doesn't have a specific service or facility. On balance Blackfordby is considered sustainable due to the range of service and facilities available to residents.</p>		<p>Kim Horridge</p>	<p>n/a</p>

<p>As regards Appleby Magna, I feel that NWLDC is undermining the democratic aspect of the planning process. In April many people from the village went - and spoke at the planning committee to oppose a number of developments which collectively, if not individually, would destroy the character of the village and turn it into yet another characterless commuter hub. The Measham Road application (13/00797/FULM) was revised and reduced from some 73 dwellings to 39 and this was approved, yet now it is proposed to extend the limits of development to include the area identified by the original application. This means that the developer will simply submit an application to extend the development which will be in the limits of development and presumably have permission granted. What is the point of going through a very time consuming process where people come back from work and then spend their evenings and free time to draw up and put forward objections if they can be reversed by sleight of hand? I also note that your proposals suggest removing Church Hall Field's designation as a 'Sensitive Area' which seems quite perverse unless it is re-designated as a Local Green Space. In April this year, proposed development on that site (Application reference 13/00799/FULM) was rejected by the planning committee and one of the main reasons was a powerful submission by English Heritage who stressed the irreparable damage any development would have on both the site in particular and the village as a whole yet the council's response is to remove the sensitive site designation and yet offer no alternative protection. A similar situation exists on the green area bordering Top Street and Bott's Lane which where it is also proposed to remove its sensitive site designation and offer no further protection. If NWLDC was listening and responsive, it would be aware of deep concerns, already expressed by the local community which it appears to be ignoring. I really hope that this consultation is something which makes a difference to policy rather than being a tick box paper exercise where any awkward views can be dispensed with and tick put against 'Local people consulted'</p>	<p>The Limits to Development are correct of June 2014 using the most up to date information available at the time. Any changes to the site area of further applications will need to be taken into account when revising the Limits to Development before the Submission of the Local Plan for examination, to ensure that the Limits to Development are up to date.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan policy S4:Countryside, looks to protect the countryside and its character, when determining future applications regard will be had to the National Character Areas prepared by Natural England. Potential sites have greater protection covered by the countryside policy than they would being covered by an Area of Separation. It is not appropriate to include a number of Areas of Separation as this reduces the flexibility of the plan when separation issues maybe a legitimate issue, but are not covered by the Area of Separation policy.</p>		Chris and Sue Nicholls	TMBS
--	--	--	------------------------	------

<p>The redrawing of the limits to development in 3 places within the village of Appleby makes it likely that further development will be approved in the village. The limits to development should be redrawn and ONLY include land on which there is planning permission already granted. In Appleby magna, (i.e. Measham Road) the limits in some cases seem to have been expanded to include areas which could be developed as an extension to planning permissions granted.</p> <p>The limits to development should NOT include houses on Botts Lane, Appleby which are not part of the core village.</p> <p>Physical extensions to settlements should NOT be allowed in sustainable villages. Required housing land is already allocated.</p> <p>The term 'sustainable village' also seems misleading and the goal posts constantly move in the criteria needing to be met. I believe the current definition is a village where 'services and facilities which are largely to meet the day to day needs of the immediate locality'. Appleby Magna has been described as a 'sustainable' village when, in truth, there is no regular, usable bus service that can be used for commuting, most villager use cars to get their shopping, commute to work etc and we no longer have a doctors surgery in the village. Our services and facilities consist of the pub, post office and butcher - which is not in a central position. How can this be classified as 'sustainable'. This ridiculous term is totally useless and should be dropped!</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this. Physical extensions will not be allowed as the housing requirement has been met within the draft Limits to Development. Appleby Magna has been defined as a sustainable village as it has the following services and facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Primary School - Post Office - Public House x 2 - Community Hall - Recreation Ground - Place of Worship - High Speed Broadband - Public Transport - 2 Hourly Bus Service 	<p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>Clare Marsh</p>	<p>Appleby resident</p>
<p>limit development to land at H1a where permission already granted</p> <p>limits to development should not include houses on botts lane as separated from village by large field</p> <p>physical extensions to villages should not be allowed where adequate housing land has already been allocated</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this. The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>Mr. j Lewis</p>	<p>1950</p>

Yes	Noted.		Michael Ball	Individual
There is far too much emphasis on Coalville. Unless the proper infrastructure and transport links such as a passenger rail station are included, then the amount of housing proposed is unsustainable. It appears to be more about protecting votes in rural areas.	The direction of growth has been tested as part of the Sustainability Appraisal which supports the draft Local Plan, which would result in a sustainable pattern of development consistent with the NPPF. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is also currently being prepared to assess the impact of growth on existing infrastructure.		Steve Johnson	YYYY
Appleby Magna has limited service facilities and also due to the fact that people living in the village have to travel for employment this has caused a vast increase in car usage and parking issues. Therefore any further development in the village will be detrimental to the environment and the lost of a village in its own right.	Appleby Magna has been identified as a sustainable village, due to residents having access to a number of services and facilities. Jubilee Business Park also provides employment opportunities.		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
As a resident of Appleby Magna, I would suggest that the potential for further growth of the settlement is extremely limited and that it could arguably fall into the small village rather than sustainable village category. The limits to development should ONLY include land at H1a where houses have permission, and should NOT include houses on Botts Lane, Appleby which are not part of the core village. Physical extensions to settlements should NOT be allowed in sustainable villages. Required housing land is already allocated. There are several green spaces within Appleby magna which are regularly used and regarded by residents as public spaces which should also not be considered for development as this would adversely affect the both the character and quality of life in the village.	The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development . It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this. The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.	Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".	Hugh James	n/a
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The limits to development should ONLY include land at H1a where houses have permission. • The limits to development should NOT include houses on Botts Lane, Appleby which are not part of the core village. Future development should not be allowed outside the 'limits of development' of the village plan. • Physical extensions to settlements should NOT be allowed in sustainable villages. Required housing land is already allocated. 	The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development . It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this. The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.	Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".	Paul Varty	Resident of Appleby

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The limits to development should ONLY include land at H1a where houses have permission. • The limits to development should NOT include houses on Botts Lane, Appleby which are not part of the core village. • Physical extensions to settlements should NOT be allowed in sustainable villages. Required housing land is already allocated. 	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this. The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>Maria Lewis</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>John Edwards</p>	<p>XMOS Semiconductors Ltd</p>
<p>Option B is acceptable.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Tim Abbott</p>	<p>Householder</p>
<p>I think you should be careful not to put all development on the key towns.</p>	<p>The Local Plan does not allocate all new development to the main towns. Sustainable Villages are expected to receive a limited amount of growth of the plan period.</p>		<p>Jane Tebbatt</p>	<p>Quarrying</p>
<p>Although Heather does have some services, we would be hesitant about it being in the sustainable areas due to the lack of public transport</p>	<p>Heather has been identified as a sustainable village due to being supported by a number of services and facilities within the settlement including a primary school, shop and employment.</p>		<p>Heather Parish Council</p>	<p>Heather Parish Council</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The limits to development should ONLY include land at H1a where houses have permission. • The limits to development should NOT include houses on Botts Lane, Appleby which are not part of the core village. • Physical extensions to settlements should NOT be allowed in sustainable villages. Required housing land is already allocated. 	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this. The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	<p>JON WALTERS</p>	<p>LPT</p>

<p>The settlement hierarchy is agreeable, but the distribution of growth therein is not.</p> <p>Settlement hierarchy – With regard to sustainable villages, the statement ‘Limited amount of growth’ is not sufficiently detailed, transparent or positive. The statement it is too vague and open to negative interpretation that does not reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.17 – The lack of aspiration to improve the sustainability of the lower order settlements is disappointing. The Government is promoting rural economic growth and launched its Rural Productivity Plan in August 2015. This is government policy and provides a 10-point plan to improve the fortunes of rural areas that have seen decades of decline, closing businesses, services cut and curtailment of organic growth of villages. Increased regulation, control of village growth for the sake of the Countryside has suffocated villages and made them unaffordable and unable to meet their own needs in terms of housing growth, services and employment.</p> <p>The 10-point plan includes increasing the availability of housing in rural areas and the government wants to ensure that any village in England has the freedom to expand in an incremental way, subject to local agreement.</p> <p>It is measured, regular incremental growth that will make villages vital and viable sustainable settlements again, they should not be satellite suburbs for elderly and affluent commuters.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan allows for growth within the plan period through the implementation of planning permissions. The draft Limits to Development allow for small scale in fill development, to allow for sustainable development within settlements. Future development within small villages and hamlets is not ruled out as the policy allows for conversions of buildings and development on brownfield sites. It is considered inappropriate to include the amount of growth that will be supported within each settlement as this would be too prescriptive and would not provide the flexibility required. The Local Plan does not have to conform to the Rural Productivity Plan but to the National Planning Policy Framework. The amount of development that would be required to deliver new services and facilities would likely need to be significant which could result in a change in character and appearance of settlements.</p>		<p>Tim Farley</p>	<p>Copesticks Ltd.</p>
<p>In light of recent permission in the area including 02/01416/OUT, Woodville Pipeworks off Moria Road, Woodville and 13/00355/FULM, Hepworth Road and the associated link road which serves them, the area of Woodville should be considered as part of the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Whilst right on the edge of the NWLDC district boundary, consideration should be given to these recent permissions and the location when associated with Woodville and Swadlincote. The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to have regard to cross-boundary issues (para 178-181 of the NPPF refers).</p>	<p>In determining access to services and facilities, neighbouring settlements are taken into consideration, however the North West Leicestershire Local Plan cannot identify Woodville within its settlement hierarchy as this settlement falls in to the district of South Derbyshire and will therefore be covered by the South Derbyshire Local Plan.</p>		<p>Mrs Penny Bicknell</p>	<p>Les Stephan Planning Ltd</p>

It does not allow for how close together some villages are. Even limited development on the edge of some risks joining them up so that each town and village becomes a suburb of another and the rural nature of the area is destroyed. There is a particular risk of this in the Ashby,, Moira, Donisthorpe area.	The protection of each settlements identity is covered by draft Local Plan Policy S4 part 3 (b).		Lesley Colley	None
Agree with Option B.	Noted.		George F Stapley	NA
We support option B which allows for growth to be more distributed rather than concentrated in Coalville.	Noted.		Roland Wilson	Loughborough Gospel Halls Trust
Blackfordby is identified as a sustainable village but I do not perceive this to be the case. A sustainable village is defined as having a limited range of services and facilities. Blackfordby do not have a range of services. It has no post office, no convenience shops for bread and milk etc, no doctors, no dentists, for food outlets, no library and no retail outlets. The definition of the small village of 'very limited services' if most applicable to Blackfordby. In terms of services it only has a very small primary school. This school has no room for expansion, being within the village conservation area. If the village was to receive money to ensure the 'services' could be maintained without detrimental effect as a result of any housing development I cannot see how money could help if there is physically no room for expansion of the school. All other services used by current residents are not in Blackfordby. The closest amenities are in the county of South Derbyshire. So I cannot see how Blackfordby can be classed as a sustainable village. Especially as it is reliant on services from other counties, which could be cut or reach capacity as a result of the actions of the South Derbyshire council not the North West Leicestershire council, which we have no say over. Blackfordby should be classed as a small village.	Noted. In order to assess if a settlement is sustainable it is assessed against the following services and facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Post Office • General Store • GP surgery • Pharmacy • Public House • Community Hall • Recreation Ground • Employment • Place of Worship • High Speed broadband • Public Transport Not one specific service or facility carries more weight than another. A settlement cannot be defined as unsustainable because it doesn't have a specific service or facility. On balance Blackfordby is considered sustainable due to the range of service and facilities available to residents.		Alison Saxby	N/A
Yes. Kegworth Parish Council accepts option B with Coalville as the Principal town and Kegworth as a Rural Centre. From Kegworth the main retail destination is Loughborough or Long Eaton. Coalville is too far, with no direct transport links. For smaller shops, residents in Kegworth would go to Castle Donington or Melbourne. Transport links between Kegworth and Coalville unnecessary and not required.	Noted.		Vicky Roe	Kegworth Parish Council

<p>We object to the settlement hierarchy as defined in the plan on the basis that it fails to take into account the relationship of land adjacent to Swadlincote and Woodville. Clearly land adjacent to Swadlincote and Woodville is in a sustainable location in close proximity to those centres where there are a full range of social and employment facilities. The proposal of South Derbyshire to locate new employment immediately north of the District Boundary supports this view, and which does not follow through into this draft local plan. The designation of Albert Village as a fourth tier settlement belies its position in close proximity to the urban area of Swadlincote and Woodville to which it is functionally related. To treat this area as a free standing village settlement does not deal with the reality of the situation in geographical terms. On this basis the settlement hierarchy needs to be amended to reflect the position of the land adjacent to Albert Village and the sustainability of the location. The text to the Policy makes no mention of the existence of Swadlincote and Woodville and the presence of this large urban area on the western extremity of the district. On this basis the sustainability of various locations has been artificially skewed by the presence of a boundary line which belies the geography of the area.</p> <p>It is noted that variations A and B consider alternative variations but none of these alternatives pay due attention to the presence of Swadlincote and Woodville,</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the residents of Albert Village will use the services and facilities within neighbouring settlements. However the settlement hierarchy is prepared looking at the services and facilities within individual settlements to meet day to day needs, as Albert village is physically separated from Swadlincote.</p>		Tom Beavin	jvh planning
---	--	--	------------	--------------

<p>We agree with the basic concept of the settlement hierarchy as stated in Background paper 2 which is “to promote as sustainable a pattern of development as possible by encouraging close links between homes, jobs and services and to provide a framework for reducing the need to travel, consistent with the NPPF” (3.3). However we do not agree that the way it has been implemented in the past couple of years (part of the plan period) achieves this goal, nor that policy S3 in this draft local plan will achieve it in the future.</p> <p>At the conceptual level we feel the concept of a ‘sustainable village’ is misguided and should be dropped. A sustainable village is supposed to have “services and facilities which are largely to meet the day-to-day needs of the immediate locality” (Background paper 2). The villages identified as ‘sustainable’ can only be considered to meet this requirement if one assumes that day to day needs are minimal – or are fully anticipated by their residents’ regular car journeys to urban centres. In practice all residents are dependent on purchases made outside these villages for their day to day living and socialising. For those without cars – particularly the old and young – they are reliant on others and / or socially isolated. It would be more honest to just say that the definition of a sustainable village is only met by the places defined as Local Service Centres.</p> <p>In practice the council has not been applying this settlement hierarchy to recent planning decisions (since 2011 which this plan’s housing locations is intended to cover). Decisions in Appleby have been based on granting permissions for houses at the same level of proportional increase as for every other settlement in the District. As we have argued consistently this is not in line with either the concept of sustainable villages or with sustainable development as defined in the NPPF.</p> <p>The new Draft Local Plan has compounded these trends by decisions in two areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first is included in the definition of ‘sustainable villages’ (part of policy S3) the clause ‘suitable for a limited amount of growth, including infilling and / or physical extension of the settlement.’ To take the term ‘physical extension of the settlement’ first, this can never be the basis of 	<p>Settlements are defined as sustainable depending on the number of services and facilities available to residents. A number of the settlements that are defined as sustainable have a public transport service.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy will have not been used since 2011 for determining applications, as the policy has not yet been adopted.</p> <p>Infill development is only expected within the draft Limits to Development, it is not expected that infill development would result in the adjoining of the limits to development. When determining planning applications the local plan has to be read as a whole, if a site was submitted outside of the limits to development the countryside policy would apply. Future development will need to be of the scale and character appropriate to the existing settlements and existing services and facilities will need to be able to accommodate any additional growth.</p> <p>The Measham Road site Appleby Magna is included within the Limits to Development as the site is yet to be built out and the layout of the site could potentially change with a revised layout.</p> <p>The Houses on Botts Lane have been included within the draft Limits to Development to distinguish between the built framework and the open countryside in accordance with the methodology used to prepare the revised Limits to Development.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been drawn following the gardens of Black Horse Lane as this is in accordance with the methodology.</p> <p>It is not the role of the Local Plan to designate heritage assets as they are designated under separate legislation. It is therefore not appropriate for these to be plotted on the policies map.</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development will be amended to exclude the open space within site H1a from the Limits to Development</p>	<p>Lindsay Gene</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Parish Council</p>
--	---	---	---------------------	-------------------------------------

<p>a 'limited amount of growth' since it is infinitely extendible. We have already experienced this along Measham Rd in Appleby where granting permission on one site just led to an application on the next field along. It also contradicts the underlying plan approach that says that housing needs have been properly identified and sites allocated. The clause 'physical extension of the settlement' should be removed.</p> <p>The term infilling is also problematic since it does not define what it includes. It should say explicitly that infilling refers to building within the limits to development which are compatible with the existing settlement patterns and policy He1 (historic assets). Otherwise it can be used to link areas of built development whose separation are part of the characteristics of the settlement pattern. For example in Appleby developers have argued that 'squaring off' the limits to development is a way of completing the village.</p> <p>2. The second refers specifically to Appleby and involves the redrawing of the limits to development in 3 places, all of which make it likely that further development will be approved in a village which has already had more development post 2011 than is warranted under the policies of this draft local plan:</p> <p>i. Measham Rd. The boundary of the site H1a refers to the original application site not to the area where planning permission has been granted under H1a. Since this is a detailed application there can be no doubt as to which area will be built on. Leaving the boundary as shown on the current inset map is only encouraging an extension of the site. The boundary should be re-drawn to follow the boundary of site for which planning permission has been granted.</p> <p>ii. Botts Lane. The houses on one side of Botts Lane have for the first time been included in the limits to development. The houses are separated from the core village by a field which is part of the ancient settlement pattern of fields coming into the heart of the old village and fronts the Conservation Area. This characteristic is recognised in the conservation appraisal and in the Appleby Magna Village Design Statement. Given permissions that have been granted on Snarestone</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>Lane since the map cut off date this is in danger of making this field appear to be potential ‘infill’. This is exacerbated by absence of any policy equivalent to the ‘sensitive site’ policy (E1) in the existing local plan. The houses on Botts Lane should be removed from the limits to development.</p> <p>iii. Black Horse Hill. The limits to development have been extended in the properties on the East side. This can only have the results of encouraging development on this edge of the village. These are not normally sized gardens where it could be argued that policy now requires limits of development to follow property boundaries. Instead they are extensive land which extends into what is currently countryside. The limits to development on Black Horse Hill should be reinstated.</p> <p>iv. We further feel that the ancient monument site in the heart of the village should be shown on the inset map.</p>				
<p>At the conceptual level the concept of a ‘sustainable village’ is misguided and should be dropped. A sustainable village is supposed to have “services and facilities which are largely to meet the day-to-day needs of the immediate locality”. The villages identified as ‘sustainable’ can only be considered to meet this requirement if one assumes that day to day needs are minimal – or are fully anticipated by their regular car journeys to urban centres. In practice all residents are dependent on purchases made outside these villages for their day to day living and socialising. For those without cars – particularly the old and young – they are reliant on others and / or socially isolated. It would be more honest to just say that the definition of a sustainable village is only met by the places defined as Local Service Centres.</p> <p>In practice the council has not been applying this settlement hierarchy to recent planning decisions (since 2011 which this plan’s housing locations is intended to cover). Decisions in Appleby have been based on granting permissions for houses at the same level of proportional increase as for every other settlement in the District. this is not in line with either the concept of sustainable villages or</p>	<p>Settlements are defined as sustainable depending on the number of services and facilities available to residents. A number of the settlements that are defined as sustainable have a public transport service. The settlement hierarchy will have not been used since 2011 for determining applications, as the policy has not yet been adopted.</p> <p>Infill development is only expected within the draft Limits to Development, it is not expected that infill development would result in the adjoining of the limits to development. When determining planning applications the local plan has to be read as a whole, if a site was submitted outside of the limits to development the countryside policy would apply. The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Measham Road site Appleby Magna is included within the Limits to Development as the site it proposed to amend the Limits to Development as the permission includes a large area of open space to the north of the site.</p> <p>The Houses on Botts Lane have been included within the draft Limits to Development to distinguish between the built framework and the open countryside in accordance with the methodology used to prepare the revised Limits to</p>		Sonia Liff	Chair Appleby Environment

<p>with sustainable development as defined in the NPPF.</p> <p>The new Draft Local Plan has compounded these trends by decisions in two areas:</p> <p>1. The first is including in the definition of 'sustainable villages' (part of policy S3) the clause 'suitable for a limited amount of growth, including infilling and / or physical extension of the settlement.' To take the term 'physical extension of the settlement' first, this can never be the basis of a 'limited amount of growth' since it is infinitely extendible. We have already experienced this along Measham Rd in Appleby where granting permission on one site just led to an application on the next field along. It also contradicts the underlying plan approach that says that housing needs have been properly identified and sites allocated. The clause 'physical extension of the settlement' should be removed.</p> <p>The term infilling is also problematic since it does not define what it includes. It should say explicitly that infilling refers to building within the limits to development which are compatible with the existing settlement patterns and do not have adverse effects on its character and heritage. Otherwise it can be used to link areas of built development whose separation are part of the characteristics of the settlement pattern. For example in Appleby it should prevent developers pursuing detrimental 'squaring off' proposals.</p> <p>The heritage assets of the village should be properly indicated in order for the sensitivity of their setting to be made apparent. The ancient monument site in the heart of the village should continue to be shown on the inset map and the Conservation area and listed buildings should also be clearly identified. Otherwise the map, quite wrongly, implies similar status to all sites within the limits to development.</p>	<p>Development.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been drawn following the gardens of Black Horse Lane as this is in accordance with the methodology.</p> <p>It is not the role of the Local Plan to designate heritage assets as they are designated under separate legislation. It is therefore not appropriate for these to be plotted on the policies map. Heritage Assets will still need to be considered when determining planning applications, however it is not appropriate to include them on the policies map as they are covered by separate legislation.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

<p>(a) Settlement hierarchy can be subjective and changes can be rapid due to circumstances outside the Council's control.</p> <p>(b) The Labour Group will support Option B as the preferred option</p> <p>(c) Blackfordby cannot be designated as a sustainable village when it has no shop. It should be designated a small village until a shop and post office are established. NWLDC should not consider sustainability by relying on South Derbyshire to provide whatever is needed to satisfy developer thirst for more development on the boundary.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the sustainability of villages will potentially change during the plan period, the sustainability of settlements will therefore have to be closely monitored. The most up to date evidence will be used when determining planning applications.</p> <p>Blackfordby has a number of services and has access to nearby services and has therefore been classed as sustainable. When assessing accessibility to services it is important to look at where people travel to to access services and facilities, which must recognise that such decisions are not confined by local authority boundaries.</p>		Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader
<p>My clients consider that the suggested settlement hierarchy and its evidence base is flawed and fails to take full account of particular local circumstances.</p> <p>Blackfordby is classified as a "Sustainable Village". Policy S3 classifies such settlements as "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities and so are suitable for a limited amount of growth, including infilling and / or physical extension of the settlement"</p> <p>My clients welcome the classification of Blackfordby as "Sustainable" and that such settlements are suitable for "physical extension". This means that the Council expressly acknowledge that building beyond pre-existing boundaries is appropriate to accommodate an "amount of growth". In these circumstances (including the issues highlighted above with housing land supply) the amount of growth should be commensurate with housing need (including affordable housing need) and the ability to supply enough housing to meet minimum requirements for the District.</p> <p>It is submitted that "Background Paper 2" which underpins the approach of Policy S3 fails to adequately consider sustainability characteristics and particularly those associated with Blackfordby. As such, this has in my opinion influenced the policy to the extent that no specific housing site has been identified to meet future needs within Blackfordby as it has been concluded to have, or provide access to "a limited range of services and facilities".</p>	<p>No further sites for residential have been allocated within the local plan within sustainable settlements, the only allocation that is required to meet the districts housing need is proposed to be allocated at land to the north of Ashby (Money Hill).</p> <p>The Forest Works Site will be included within Background paper 2, to acknowledge that Blackfordby offers employment opportunities. It is also acknowledged that the policy needs to be amended to cover Woodville as this is a unique settlement within the district as it cross the administrative borders.</p> <p>The availability of services and facilities within neighbouring authorities as it is acknowledged that these services can be nearer to residents than services within North West Leicestershire, as part of the Local Plan South Derbyshire District Council and the other neighbouring authorities have been consulted.</p> <p>As part of the preparation of the Local Plan the Limits to Development have been fully reviewed using the following methodology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Existing commitments by virtue of an extant planning permission for residential or employment development on the fringes of settlement; (they may not be reflective of recent planning applications) ii. The Limits to Development follow clearly defined physical features such as wall, fences, hedgerows and roads. iii. The inclusion of schools, halls, large houses and other buildings which stand in extensive grounds would depend on their relationship to the overall fabric of the settlement. In some cases, their relative isolation caused by their spacious 	Amend background paper to include the Forest Works site as a form of employment within Blackfordby.	Christopher Lindley	Development Planning and Design Services

<p>For example, within Background Paper 2, the assessment pro-forma for Blackfordby states that there is no employment facility. This is incorrect and it must be recognised that there is an employment facility (The Forest Works) immediately adjacent to my client's land which adjoins the western edge of Blackfordby.</p> <p>The Forest Works site is operated by Wavin UK, who are understood to be (based on their website) a world leader in plastic pipe systems for residential, non-residential and civil engineering projects. As stated within draft Local Plan paragraph 7.34 this site (together with</p> <p>other Brickworks and Pipeworks) "provide a source of employment that is important to local communities and to the wider economy". Clearly, an omission of a source of employment that is "important to local communities and to the wider economy" is notable, particularly given the role it will undoubtedly play in the overall sustainability of the village.</p> <p>It is also notable that whilst Background Paper 2 classifies settlements within the District's administrative area and recognises the different role they play within that defined area, there would appear to be a complete lack of consideration for services offered by settlements in adjoining authority areas. This is also confirmed by the SHLAA proforma for the site which confirms that measurements from the site to services "have been taken to facilities in Ashby</p> <p>however there may be closer facilities located in South Derbyshire District".</p> <p>This is true in the case of Blackfordby which is a settlement is located in the western part of the district located within convenient walking distance from the village of Woodville, which is situated within the South Derbyshire District.</p> <p>Within their Core Strategy Topic Paper (July 2014) South Derbyshire District set out the Settlement Hierarchy for the district. The Settlement Hierarchy in South Derbyshire consists of five categories of which the 'Urban Areas' category has a wide range of higher order facilities and services and a large population.</p>	<p>setting would justify total exclusion, whereas in other cases, the building itself could be included within the Limits to Development but the curtilage excluded.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore required. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

<p>Table 4 (p12) of the Topic Paper shows that the town of Swandlicote including the village of Woodville is classified as an “Urban Area” and a focus for significant housing growth.</p> <p>It is suggested that consideration must be had within the local plan for where physical extensions to Sustainable Villages such as Blackfordby can be recognised as sustainable development given the links to services and facilities immediately outside of the existing settlement boundary (such as the employment facility) and services and facilities within convenient walking and cycling distance to sustainable “Urban Areas” in neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>To further clarify the links to services and facilities within convenient distance of my clients land enclosed is “Sustainability Technical Note” prepared by Bancroft Consulting and a “Local Facility Proximity Plan” prepared by DPDS. To summarise, these documents (both of which are enclosed with these representations as “Enclosure 3” and “Enclosure 4” demonstrate that the</p> <p>site provides convenient access to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Public Transport;· Education;· Retail;· Leisure (including Public Open Space);· Healthcare;· Employment; and,· Community Uses. <p>This matter has been considered previously through the consideration of planning applications for residential development. In particular, planning officers concluded that “a strong case has been made concerning the sustainability of the site”. Furthermore, as part of ongoing work relating to the planning appeal by my clients, the highways consultant has in close co-operation with the Leicestershire County Council (as highway</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

authority) been able to conclude that:

“it has been established that the proposed development would comply with standard requirements for access to local bus services, ensuring that local destinations are accessible by a reasonable choice of modes.”

And:

“It is agreed that the proposals represent sustainable development that could be provided in accordance with current planning policy set out within the National Planning Policy Framework document”.

And with regard to the Sustainability Technical Note (see Enclosure 1):

“It is agreed that the findings of the Sustainability Technical Note are robust and reflect established industry good practice and prevailing planning policy”

On this basis therefore, it is considered that Blackfordby and my client’s land represents a sustainable location for residential development.

It is also telling in this case that the Council does not appear to have fully considered reviewing the Settlement Boundaries associated with Blackfordby in the context of its proposed housing requirement. A report titled ‘Limits to Development’ was put before the Local Plan Advisory Committee on 9th September 2014.

This report acknowledged that “although Limits to Development are defined in the 2002 adopted Local Plan, their preparation dates back to the 1990s, so they have not been fully reviewed for over 20 years. At the time they allowed for some new development. As these opportunities have been realised so the remaining opportunities for new development have become more constrained.” (DPDS emphasis – source: Paragraph 2.1)

It is therefore submitted that the boundary of Blackfordby should be further considered in light of the failure to identify sufficient housing land for the next five years, along with the acknowledged

sustainability credentials of the site.

Notwithstanding this it is also important to consider past growth associated with Blackfordby and the implications of failing to ensure it grows in the future. In December 2014, NWLDC planning officers considered (through a report presented to planning committee) the scale of growth proposed by the development of my clients land "as to understand its potential impact upon the scale and character of the village".

It noted the how the findings of "the GL Hearn Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Requirements Study which was used to inform the housing requirement in the now withdrawn Core Strategy includes information regarding future natural change across the district. This Study projected that a 23.4% increase in housing was required across the District from 2006-2031, which was reflected in the now withdrawn Core Strategy."

Following this officers estimated that:

"there are 399 properties in the village of Blackfordby within its main built up area. This proposal for 81 dwellings would represent a 20.3% increase in the number of dwellings within the village. The 81 proposed dwellings alongside the 1 new dwelling built since 2006 and the outstanding commitments for 1 dwelling would equate to a 20.8% growth in the village since 2006. Therefore, the proposed development would represent a lower level of growth than that for North West Leicestershire as a whole. As such it is considered that the

proposal would not result in a significant increase in housing development within the village."

My clients continue to support this conclusion and assert that allocating their land for residential development would not result in a significant increase in housing development within the village.

The consistency of allocating the land for residential development with the NPPF, and particularly paragraphs 151 and 152 of the NPPF is considered below under the heading "Conclusions and the Planning Balance".

<p>Whilst supporting the general approach to identifying a hierarchy of settlements, nonetheless, Policy S3 (and it's preamble at paragraph 5.16) should acknowledge that Sustainable Villages could play a greater role in accommodating the development needs of the District. As well as infilling (which should be defined so as to encompass developments that are more than just the infilling of small/narrow gaps in otherwise substantially built-up frontages) and physical extensions to Sustainable Villages, the Council should also support the redevelopment of previously developed land and buildings outside identified Limits to Development boundaries but on the edges of, or well-related to, Sustainable Villages. Each case will need to be treated on its individual merits having regard to other policies in the Plan and all other material considerations. As presently worded, such development would fall to be considered against the requirements of Policy S4(1) (as would physical extensions unless within identified Limits to Development).</p> <p>The rural parts of the District also contain many small groups of dwellings considered as "hamlets" (below the Small Village category) but even within these settlements there is often a strong sense of community that has developed over many years. Whilst accepting that it might not be appropriate to positively allocate development to such settlements, nonetheless, it is also inappropriate to treat all such settlements as falling within open countryside. Within some of the larger hamlets, there may well be opportunities for limited infill between existing buildings where development would reflect the pattern and character of development (as recognised in Policy S4) and might help to accommodate housing for local need (e.g. elderly) to enable people to stay within the local community and thereby release existing housing to help maintain the vitality of the rural community. Policy S3 should be reworded to permit limited infilling in such settlements.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drawn to accommodate future growth over the plan period. The revised Limits to Development include all extant planning permissions. The Limits to Development have been drafted to accommodate any previously developed land that relates well to the existing settlement.</p> <p>Development within the open countryside and small settlements such as hamlets will be assessed at application stage against the criteria set out within draft Local Plan policy S4.</p>		Andrew Thomas	Thomas Taylor Planning
--	--	--	---------------	------------------------

<p>The settlement hierachy is seriously flawed in that it seems to pick communities haphazardly as "sustainable" without any proper or accurate assesement of their location, resources or infrastructure. There is no appraisal or assessment of available infrastructure nor any plan for its delivery. This demonstrates a clear and obvious lack of knowledge and effective intelligence gathering on the part of those drafting the Plan. There is also the issue that the subsuming of individual communities into the larger conurbations removes areas of separation of those communities and with it their community identity.</p> <p>The plan completely disregards the impact of further development, particularly in rural communities, on an already overburdened local road system which it makes no effort to address. The road situation will be made even worse by the fact that the level of commuting will be significantly increased. Reference to "travel plans" walking cycling and public transport are unrealistic in that for the foreseeable future there is no doubt whatsoever that the majority will continue to use private transport as their principal means of travel.</p> <p>Also, the plan fails completely to address the enormous impact faced by the local transport system, especially the A42 and the major east/west routes during the construction of the proposed high-speed rail route.</p> <p>Finally in relation to Blackfordby village:-</p> <p>The plan shows a total ignorance of this rural community by declaring it to be "sustainable" Clearly the draftspersons either do not know where Blackfordby is, do not understand what is meant by "sustainable" or define it as anything that suits their purpose or all three.</p> <p>The village is apparently defined as "sustainable" as it has a church, chapel and two public houses - absolutely ludicrous! Even on this basis the two religious houses appear to have a very limited future and two public houses are currently quite clearly "unsustainable" The fact is that there is absolutely no effective infrastructure to support any significant development and anyone living in the village is effectively reliant entirely on public transport or everyday travel.</p>	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to support the preparation of the local plan. The infrastructure delivery plan will highlight any capacity issues associated with supporting infrastructure. As part of preparing the Local Plan infrastructure and service providers have been consulted, they are also consulted as part of the planning application stage.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan can only encourage sustainable patterns of development and not enforce individual behaviours to use private transport and not public transport. Blackfordby has been assessed against a wide range of services and facilities and on balance it is considered to be a sustainable village. No one single service or facility carries more weight than another.</p>		robert nettleton	NA
--	---	--	------------------	----

<p>There is no post office or shop (an attempt a few years ago to re-open a post office at one of the public houses was obstructed by planners on grounds of access and traffic), no GP surgery or pharmacy, no library (mobile library visits have recently been severely curtailed) and no recreational or entertainment facilities. All of these facilities require the use of a private motor car to conveniently access outside of the village as waling or cycling is quite unrealistic. The village is served by a perceived inadequate and dangerous unclassified road system with narrow or non-existent footpaths with no effective traffic calming used by volumes of traffic, most speeding, at peak times to avoid congestion on local main routes, particularly the A511.</p> <p>The village is served by an old combined sewage system installed for a village a fraction of its' present size is overwhelmed by storm water. The lower part of the village floods with raw sewage deposited on properties and flowing back into dwellings as the sewer and drainage capacity is overwhelmed by storm water. There is no information available from either NWLDC or the current operating Agencies as to the connections, capacities or condition of the drains and a lack of any co-ordinated approach to a solution. In fact the apparent response from all authorities is to ignore it and pretend it doesn't happen so as to avoid responsibility.</p> <p>The village school, St Margaret's C of E Primary School is full to capacity and is having to turn away local children despite a recent extension to its buildings. There is no space whatsoever to permit any further extension of the village school even if funding was to be available. Other local schools are full to capacity and, again, parents of any children who cannot be accommodated will have to transport their children further afield out of the village adding further to traffic. Routes out of the village are unsafe for children walking or cycling.</p> <p>There are no employment opportunities in the village and residents must commute to work. Not only do limited public transport times not match working start and stop times but routes and journey times are not practical.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>There is an hourly bus service to Ashby, Swadlincote and Burton but only by very indirect and time-consuming routes and rural services cannot be assumed at all to remain during the life of the draft Plan. Recent reductions in local services have left some communities with reduced or non-existent public transport and it must be appreciated that current bus services are dictated by operators commercial decisions rather than public service.</p> <p>Whilst the plan identifies Blackfordby as "sustainable" apparently for the convenience of property speculators rather than the benefit of the public several small infill projects which would have met the need for affordable housing for local people have been refused on the grounds of access, traffic and sewage.</p> <p>To conclude, I would also point out that the settlement referred to as "Boundary" in the draft plan which is in fact an area of Blackfordby with the same circumstances is included separately as being "unsustainable", again evidence of the lack of any reasonable local knowledge on the part of the plan drawers</p>				
<p>The proposed settlement hierarchy is broadly supported. This appropriately reflects the role of the wider Coalville Urban Area as the primary settlement within the district. The Council should however review the definition of the Coalville Urban Area. Proposed Policy S3 refers to the area as comprising Coalville, Donington-le-Heath, Greenhill, Hugglescote, Snibston, Thringstone and Whitwick as well as the Bardon employment area. It is noted that the Affordable Housing SPD refers to a Greater Coalville Urban Area extending to include Ellistown and Battleflat.</p> <p>The Council should consider the inclusion of Ravenstone as part of the wider Coalville Urban area for policy purposes. The settlement is as well related in functional terms to Coalville and the main facilities available in the town centre as Thringstone, Whitwick and Ellistown. Recent consents for development in the settlement recognise the location's sustainability credentials. Inclusion of Ravenstone within the Coalville Urban Area would be a better reflection of the proximity of the settlement to Coalville and the clear</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan once adopted will take precedence over the Affordable Housing SPD, the Affordable Housing SPD is currently being updated to ensure that it conforms to the draft Local Plan and current National Policy.</p> <p>Ravenstone village should be seen as a settlement in its own right due to its physical separation from the Coalville Urban Area.</p> <p>It is agreed that Ibstock is a sustainable settlement as defined in the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan has allocated land to the North of Ashby to account for any delays in the delivery of South East Coalville to ensure that the districts housing requirement can be met over the plan period.</p>		<p>Guy Longley,</p>	<p>Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.</p>

<p>functional relationships.</p> <p>The definition of Ibstock as a Local Service Centre is supported. The settlement is a highly sustainable location that has accommodated growth in recent years successfully. There is scope to accommodate some further growth that could assist in the delivery of new transport infrastructure for the settlement.</p> <p>Davidsons has interests in land at Hugglescote that could provide for a suitable extension to approved development proposals in the area. In addition, land interests at Ravenstone, Ibstock and Packington provide sustainable opportunities for additional housing and should be considered for allocation. Plans of the potential sites for allocation are attached at Appendix 1.</p> <p>Provision for additional allocations would provide a degree of flexibility and a mix of sites to ensure that the housing requirements over the plan period are delivered should there be delays in the delivery of the larger strategic housing sites.</p>				
<p>The Draft Local Plan has identified the village of Whitwick (part of the Coalville Urban Area) as being sustainable and in accordance with directives and policies embodied within the NPPF (2012 & PPG's) and the Draft Local Plan (September 2015). The Land (adjacent 191 Loughborough Road, Whitwick) is considered to be both sustainable and deliverable for housing supplt within the following 18 month period (subject to the timing of any future planning consent etc.).</p>	<p>Noted. The site being promoted is covered by policy S4.</p>		<p>Martin Ladd</p>	<p>Housemartin Design</p>

<p>The settlements as advised within the settlement hierarchy are considered to be acceptable, and the hierarchy appropriate with the key direction of growth being to the Coalville Urban Area.</p> <p>Concerns are however raised with regards to Ellistown being defined as a sustainable village. The proposed housing resolutions H2g and H2f, albeit separated by the employment area EC3, and employment provision EC1d, are considered to bring Ellistown fully into the Coalville Urban Area. Noting that all these areas, including the settlement of Ellistown are included within the proposed Limits to Development (Policy S4), it is not considered appropriate for Ellistown to be considered as a separate settlement.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that Ellistown should be included within the description of the Coalville Urban Area.</p>	<p>Ellistown is physically separated from the Coalville Urban Area and has its own services and facilities.</p>		<p>Alan Hardwick</p>	<p>rg+p</p>
<p>The Draft Local Plan has identified the villages of Moira and Donisthorpe as being sustainable and in accordance with the directives and policies embodied within the NPPF (2012 and PPG's) and the Draft Local Plan (September 2015). The Land (rear of Bambro Farmhouse, Ashby Road, Donisthorpe) is considered to be both sustainable and deliverable for housing supply within the following 18 month period (subject to the timing of any future planning consent etc).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Martin Ladd</p>	<p>Housemartin Design</p>
<p>The proposed settlement hierarch is supported. The inclusion of Whitwick as part of the Coalville Urban Area is supported. Ravenstone and Donisthorpe are identified as Sustainable Villages and there are opportunities for further sustainable growth in these settlements. Given the close relationship of Ravenstone to Coalville, consideration should be given to extending the definition of the Coalville Urban Area to include Ravenstone.</p> <p>Western Range Limits has interests in land at Whitwick, Donisthorpe and south of Ravenstone which offer opportunities for sustainable development to provide for a wider mix of housing sites to help deliver the Councils housing requirements. Plans of the sites where Western Range has an interest are attached.</p> <p>Provision for additional allocations would provide a degree of flexibility and a mix of sites to ensure</p>	<p>Noted. The Local Plan housing requirement has already been increased to allow for the non delivery and slow delivery of sites over the plan period. The Local Planning Authority work closely with the development industry to overcome any obstacles that may lead to the delay in the delivery of sites. It would be inappropriate to include Ravenstone village within the Coalville Urban Area as the settlement is physically separated.</p>		<p>Helen Prangley</p>	<p>Western Range</p>

that the housing requirement over the plan period are delivered should there be delays in the delivery of the larger strategic housing sites.				
<p>Appleby Magna Limits to Development should only include land at H1a where housing already has permission.</p> <p>Limits to Development should not include houses on Botts Lane.</p> <p>Physical extensions to settlements should not be allowed in sustainable villages. Required housing is already allocated.</p> <p>Present Limits to Developments on Black Horse Hill to be retained. This is not a core part of the village and exceptionally large curtilages can lead to speculative development with a foot in the door to the open countryside.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been drafted to include all extant planning permissions up until June 2014. The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state "Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle".</p>	D.E.A Shaw	NA
<p>We agree that Option B is the best approach for the settlement hierarchy because it recognises that Ashby and Castle Donnington serve a different function to the rural centres of Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham.</p>	Noted.		Nicole Roe	NJL Consulting
<p>We support option A and this is the reality of you look at how housing is distributed.</p> <p>Coalville as the main town is not how housing and employment is distributed.</p> <p>It is of concern that this settlement hierarchy appears to be ignored later in the document when housing and employment land is allocated.</p>	<p>Option B is the preferred option and this is how both employment and housing development has been distributed over the plan period. To date Coalville and Castle Donnington have received the most amount of growth, due to the facilities and services that Ashby offers and its population size it is classed as a main town within the settlement hierarchy and is therefore being allocated more growth.</p>		C Tandy	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society
<p>2. Policy S3 Settlement Hierarchy. We support the proposed settlement hierarchy and the identification of Ashby as a Key Service Centre which can accommodate new development.</p>	Noted.		Andrew Thomson	Thomson Planning Partnership
<p>I'm of the opinion that adequate policies should be in place to create protection zones for existing communities / hamlets, such as Abbott's Oak, from inappropriate development and urban sprawl.</p>	Noted. Small villages and hamlets are covered by the countryside policy.		Johnathan Bell	n

<p>Though there are several aspects of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan, I will confine my comments to just two areas, Sustainability and the Sewage system of the village of Blackfordby, which includes surface water, as it is a combined system and the flooding issues related to it. These issues have been voiced many times, in some cases, over the past thirty years, but with little or no response to the documented and photographic evidence presented. This has included input from the Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water Ltd.</p> <p>Sustainability</p> <p>Blackfordby is situated at the edge of North West Leicestershire, close to the borders of South Derbyshire. The main road artery passing within a mile of the village is the A511 which takes an East /West route. Westward to Swadlincote (Derbyshire) and on to Burton on Trent (Staffordshire). Eastward to Ashby-de la-Zouch, Coalville and Leicester, (obviously all in Leicestershire). There is an hourly bus service in the village Eastward and Westward. A one mile walk, uphill out of the village, at the A511, there is a further hourly bus service on the East /West route. As experience has shown, all bus services are dependant on the individual companies financial circumstances, which does not give assurance to people who's lifestyle may be geared to the ability to travel to and from the village to work, school or medical appointments. There is no medical practice in the village, nor pharmacy. No shop in the village nor Post Office. The village school is full to capacity and will be so for several years to come and with no room to expand further.</p> <p>There is a situation on the village roads, which are narrow, with a narrow, often single footpath and sometimes no footpath at all. These roads are used by non-village traffic as a means of by-passing the congestion created by peak time traffic at the traffic lights at the Hepworth Road junction and the Woodville island bottle-neck. This traffic is often travelling at speeds well above the limit as frustrated drivers try to get to work or to get home after work. Outside my house, Butt Lane forms a double 's' bend like a chicane, with 60% of vehicles straddling the white line or actually on the wrong side of the road. Contrary to statistics, there have</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan includes policy Cc3 Flood risk, which covers the issues of flood risk in relation to new development. Leicestershire County Council as the lead flood authority, the Environment Agency and Severn Trent water are all consulted as part of the preparation of the Local Plan and planning applications. The SFRA has highlighted that there is an issue of Surface Water Flooding within Blackfordby. The sustainability of Blackfordby has been assessed as part of preparing the settlement hierarchy. Blackfordby has a number of services and facilities and on balance it is therefore considered that Blackfordby is sustainable.</p>		<p>M A McCrea</p>	<p>NA</p>
--	--	--	-------------------	-----------

been numerous accidents here, but no fatalities. As yet!.

Blackfordby lies in a shallow basin, with the high ground extending radially from the South of West, through North, to the South of East. The natural drainage is therefore into the centre and follows the natural course of the brook, which is nominally from the North to the South. Butt Lane follows the edge of the brook from just below the ridge at the North.

The sewer, which was laid down in the late 1940's also follows this route within Butt Lane it's self. Blackfordby was a small village even at that time and the sewer was made as a combined system to take the road surface water, the foul sewage and the domestic top water.

The field runoff, however remained as it had by nature formed, accommodated by the brook/ditch system. When the lane evolved into the metalled surface it became a barrier to the west side flow of water to the natural brook, and a ditch system was created on the west side of the lane till it reached Boothorpe Lane, at some point here it crossed Butt Lane to join the east side flow before it reached Strawberry Lane. The then combined flow, then crossed Strawberry Lane and flowed across the field, joining the flow from the spring brook at 90 deg., before crossing Main Street at the 'Forty bridge' and away across the fields to Shellbrook in a southerly direction, ending up flowing into the river Mease!.

Over the years the size of Blackfordby increased and more properties were added to the original sewer coming down Butt Lane. The Butt Lane sewer is actually one branch of a two line system, the other branch coming down from the top of Heath Lane at 'Boundary' (the junction with the A511). The 1965 to 1980 period saw a large increase in the amount of property connected to this Butt Lane branch with properties built in Fenton Avenue, Parkers Close, Butt Lane and Strawberry Lane. No records of sewer connections for these properties are on the drawings held by Severn Trent Water Ltd., nor by NWLDC planning department. It is this department who would have overseen the planning for these properties and surely some one must have been responsible for

<p>updating the sewer plans. At that time sewers were the responsibility of NWLDC. The planning department has all these plans within it's archives and should update the sewer plans and pass on the information to Severn Trent Water Ltd., This company is asked to comment on planning proposals with incomplete information to hand, a situation which does not inspire confidence in the ability to calculate the amount of material entering the sewage system. We experience flooding now. In times of heavy rainfall the system is overpowered, not sustainable,</p> <p>During this period of development, we started to experience flooding, which I mentioned earlier. This was by sewage and top water, the sewer being pressurised by surface water and it took the next twenty years to get non-return valves fitted to our sewer connections. However the flooding still occurs, not so much entering the house now, it heads mainly for the brook and the river Mease!. The sewer is at the top end of it's capacity during heavy rainfall and is pressurised by the overland flow. Global warming and increased rainfall may in deed be a factor, but the condition of the ditch and brook system is a definite factor which will increase in severity with the effect of global warming. The culverting of parts of the east side of the brook in Butt Lane, which has removed storage capacity and the dire condition of the west side ditching is a definite factor in the severity of such flooding. This is the direct responsibility of Leicestershire County Council, who at the moment do not respond to my concerns in an adequate way.</p> <p>Spending money, I know every department is trying to avoid, but it is of the utmost importance that the present state of affairs is recorded and taken notice of, in this 'Sustainability appraisal of NW Leicestershire Local Plan.</p>				
Yes	Noted.		Tim Evans	Bilfinger GVA
<p>Further to the open consultation on the North West Leicestershire Local Plan Draft 2015, please find below our responses on behalf of our client Swan Strategic Limited.</p> <p>As per the consultation document, the comments relate to specific sections only, identified in accordance with the Policy and Question reference as per the Consultation Document.</p>	<p>As part of assessing the sustainability of settlements consideration is had to the services that are provided within neighbouring districts, this needs to be made clearer within the text of the draft Local Plan.</p>		Alan Hardwick	rg+p

<p>Policy S3: Settlement Hierarchy</p> <p>Question 7</p> <p>In principle, the settlements as advised within the settlement hierarchy are considered to be acceptable, and the hierarchy appropriate. However, neither the proposed hierarchy nor the information within background paper 2 give any consideration to the potential for 'cross-boundary' development with South Derbyshire District Council (SDDC). It is considered that specific regard should be given to the relationship with the Swadlincote/Woodville settlements which are designated by SDDC as a 'Principal Town/Urban Area', the highest of that District's settlement type, and the most sustainable and to where growth is to be directed.</p> <p>A number of locations which are deemed to be within open countryside within NWLDC are, in terms of a cross-boundary site, actually situated to the edge of a Principal Town/Urban Area, and it is considered that the proposed settlement hierarchy should make note of such cross-boundary allocations. This should include a statement on the potential suitability of surrounding land to provide for sustainable development to this Principal Town, albeit that of a key area situated within an adjacent Council area. It is considered that, according with the principles of the NPPF on the duty to co-operate, that this is a valid matter for consideration with regards to the interpretation and assessment of proposed policy S3</p> <p>with the District of South Derbyshire, and not just other Leicestershire authorities on which the considerations of housing have been made.</p> <p>As such appropriate commentary to the Settlement Hierarchy should be included to take account of the opportunities for further cross-boundary development with SDDC.</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>This Parish is deemed to be part of the Coalville Urban area. If Swannington and Ellistown are deemed sustainable villages then members feel this should also apply to Hugglescote and Donington Le Heath (H&DLH).</p> <p>H&DLH are rural village communities together offering a range of services some which other Sustainable Villages (Ellistown) do not have i.e. Doctors Surgery. Members feel that the parish should be separate from the Coalville Urban area to retain and protect its own identity. There is very little area separation with Ellistown and earmarked developments are infilling any green wedge that currently exists.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Hugglescote is a community in its own right, however due to the location of the settlement it functions as part of the wider Coalville Urban Area. . Ellistown is physically separated from the Coalville Urban Area, it is acknowledged that once South East Coalville is implemented that there will be very little separation between Ellistown and Coalville and this will need to be assessed at a later date.</p>		Simon Weaver	Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish Council
<p>The table on page 26 includes a list of ‘Sustainable Villages’. In terms of transport provision our highway authority advice has identified Appleby Magna as not being sustainable, due to its remoteness, lack of an hourly bus service and lack of employment.</p> <p>Small village: it would be useful to have clarity on how permitted development will be dealt with.</p> <p>In relation to settlement hierarchy the consultation document acknowledges the existing distribution of services and facilities between the settlements. It recognises the sustainability of a settlement when guiding the distribution of development and the selection of allocations, making the availability of deliverable and developable land around a settlement of greater significance to the settlement hierarchy.</p>	<p>Noted. In order to assess if a settlement is sustainable it is assessed against the following services and facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Post Office • General Store • GP surgery • Pharmacy • Public House • Community Hall • Recreation Ground • Employment • Place of Worship • High Speed broadband • Public Transport <p>Not one specific service or facility carries more weight than another. A settlement cannot be defined as unsustainable because it doesn’t have a specific service or facility. On balance Appleby Magna is considered sustainable due to the range of service and facilities available to residents.</p>		Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council

<p>William Davis agree that the settlement hierarchy should continue to emphasise Coalville as the principle town in the district. Its population in excess of 36,000 out of the overall district figure of some 73,500 indicates that approximately 40% of all residents of the district live in the town.</p> <p>The Councils background paper on housing comes to the conclusion that the combination of committed housing and land and proposed allocations (assuming a reduced amount of dwellings comes forward on the Hugglescote site by 2031) would mean the same proportion of existing and new housing would come forward in Coalville up to 2031 at 40%. This is not considered by William Davis to be the correct approach and will not be achieved in any event given the reliance on Hugglescote. Given the continued focus on Coalville both for employment growth and to boost the town centre, the 40% figure should not be seen as a threshold not to be exceeded. This is particularly the case where the figures for the proposed housing at Ashby show that some 24% of the new housing would be generated in that area whereas the proportion of the district population in Ashby is only 13%.</p> <p>It is considered the housing allocation strategy the Council has adopted is more concerned with identifying sites that are perceived to be suitable for housing rather than adopting a strategy that seeks to boost the role of Coalville . William Davis object to the strategy with particular regard to how the new housing allocations have been arrived at; their location and because Coalville needed to be concentrated upon more in the strategy moving forward.</p>	<p>The Local Plan allocates housing development in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, land to the north of Ashby has been allocated in order to balance the level of growth between the two local service centres as Castle Donington has already seen a high level of growth. The majority of new housing growth is concentrated in Coalville, the viability assessment has suggested that by allocating any further housing sites within the Coalville Urban Area that this would saturate the market making the sites less deliverable.</p>		Simon Chadwick	Signet Planning on behalf of William Davis
--	---	--	----------------	--

<p>Please provide further comments;</p> <p>We agree with the basic concept of the settlement hierarchy as stated in Background paper 2 which is “to promote as sustainable a pattern of development as possible by encouraging close links between homes, jobs and services and to provide a framework for reducing the need to travel, consistent with the NPPF” (3.3). However we do not agree that the way it has been implemented in the past couple of years (part of the plan period) achieves this goal, nor that policy S3 in this draft local plan will achieve it in the future.</p> <p>At the conceptual level we feel the concept of a ‘sustainable village’ is misguided and should be dropped. A sustainable village is supposed to have “services and facilities which are largely to meet the day-to-day needs of the immediate locality” (Background paper 2). The villages identified as ‘sustainable’ can only be considered to meet this requirement if one assumes that day to day needs are minimal – or are fully anticipated by their residents’ regular car journeys to urban centres. In practice all residents are dependent on purchases made outside these villages for their day to day living and socialising. For those without cars – particularly the old and young – they are reliant on others and / or socially isolated. It would be more honest to just say that the definition of a sustainable village is only met by the places defined as Local Service Centres.</p> <p>In practice the council has not been applying this settlement hierarchy to recent planning decisions (since 2011 which this plan’s housing locations is intended to cover). Decisions in Appleby have been based on granting permissions for houses at the same level of proportional increase as for every other settlement in the District. As we have argued consistently this is not in line with either the concept of sustainable villages or with sustainable development as defined in the NPPF.</p> <p>The new Draft Local Plan has compounded these trends by decisions in three areas:</p> <p>1. The first is included in the definition of ‘sustainable villages’ (part of policy S3) the clause ‘suitable for a limited amount of growth, including infilling and / or physical extension of the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Settlements are defined as sustainable depending on the number of services and facilities available to residents. A number of the settlements that are defined as sustainable have a public transport service.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy will have not been used since 2011 for determining applications, as the policy has not yet been adopted.</p> <p>Infill development is only expected within the draft Limits to Development, when determining planning applications the local plan has to be read as a whole, if a site was submitted outside of the limits to development the countryside policy would apply.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the future growth required over the plan period; no further extensions to the Limits to Development are therefore proposed. The wording in the local plan will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Houses on Botts Lane have been included within the draft Limits to Development to distinguish between the built framework and the open countryside in accordance with the methodology used to prepare the revised Limits to Development.</p> <p>The methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development. It is considered within this instance as the site has full planning permission and the layout has been approved, there is a substantial area of open space to the north of the site, it is therefore proposed that the draft Limits to Development will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been drawn following the gardens of Black Horse Lane as this is in accordance with the methodology.</p> <p>It is not the role of the Local Plan to designate heritage assets as they are designated under separate legislation. It is therefore not appropriate for these to be plotted on the policies map.</p>	<p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state “Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extension to these settlements is supported in principle”.</p>	<p>Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment</p>	<p>Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation</p>
--	---	---	--	--

settlement.’ To take the term ‘physical extension of the settlement’ first, this can never be the basis of a ‘limited amount of growth’ since it is infinitely extendible. We have already experienced this along Measham Rd in Appleby where granting permission on one site just led to an application on the next field along. It also contradicts the underlying plan approach that says that housing needs have been properly identified and sites allocated. The clause ‘physical extension of the settlement’ should be removed. The term infilling is also problematic since it does not define what it includes. It should say explicitly that infilling refers to building within the limits to development which are compatible with the existing settlement patterns and do not have adverse effects on its character and heritage. Otherwise it can be used to link areas of built development whose separation are part of the characteristics of the settlement pattern. For example in Appleby it should prevent developers pursuing detrimental ‘squaring off’ proposals.

2. The second refers specifically to Appleby and involves the redrawing of the limits to development in 3 places, all of which make it likely that further development will be approved in a village which has already had more development post 2011 than is warranted under the policies of this draft local plan:

i. Measham Rd. The boundary of the site H1a refers to the original application site not to the area where planning permission has been granted under H1a. Since this is a detailed application there can be no doubt as to which area will be built on. Leaving the boundary as shown on the current inset map is only encouraging an extension of the site. The boundary should be re-drawn to follow the boundary of site for which planning permission has been granted.

ii. Botts Lane. The houses on one side of Botts Lane have for the first time been included in the limits to development. The houses are separated from the core village by a field which is part of the ancient settlement pattern of fields coming into the heart of the old village and fronts the Conservation Area. This characteristic is recognised in the conservation appraisal and in the Appleby Magna Village Design Statement. Given permissions that have been granted on Snarestone Lane since the map cut off

date this is in danger of making this field appear to be potential 'infill'. This is exacerbated by absence of any policy equivalent to the 'sensitive site' policy (E1) in the existing local plan. The houses on Botts Lane should be removed from the limits to development.

iii. Black Horse Hill. The limits to development have been extended in the properties on the East side. This can only have the results of encouraging development on this edge of the village. These are not normally sized gardens where it could be argued that policy now requires limits of development to follow property boundaries. Instead they are extensive land which extends into what is currently countryside. The limits to development on Black Horse Hill should be reinstated.

3. The third relates to the failure to identify heritage assets on the inset map for Appleby (and perhaps for other settlements). We argue that the heritage assets of the village should be properly indicated in order for the sensitivity of their setting to be made apparent. The ancient monument site in the heart of the village should continue to be shown on the inset map and the Conservation area and listed buildings should also be clearly identified. Otherwise the map, quite wrongly, implies similar status to all sites within the limits to development.

--

--

--

--

<p>S3 Settlement Hierarchy</p> <p>On the whole I believe this to be a sound concept, however the plan does not explain how the hierarchy would be implemented in reality. The main difficulty I see in implementing this method is that it is not possible to get a full holistic view of all planning applications in a given period, and therefore be able to allocate the developments appropriately. Instead one must deal with each application as it comes, without knowledge of any future applications, thus complicating the decision-making process.</p> <p>I believe this method could be enhanced by providing further guidance as to the allowable development size and rate per classification, for example a small village may have a maximum of 25 houses in any one application, in any given 5 year period. This could be augmented with a clause to allow further development under exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The effects of this method would be to ensure that the appropriate level of growth is applied for each settlement, with an allowance for exceptional circumstances. It also removes further subjectiveness from the decision-making process, which provide much welcomed clarity for all process stake-holders.</p> <p>Settlement Classification</p> <p>The way in which the settlements have been classified within the sustainable villages and small villages categories is inconsistent and confusing.</p> <p>Referring to North West Leicestershire Draft Local Plan Background Paper 2 – S3 Settlement Hierarchy, each settlement is summarised by its available services and facilities. However there is no clear link between the classification given, and which or how many services are available in that settlement. For example, Breedon-On-The-Hill is classified as a sustainable village, with a multitude of services available, see Figure 1. Whereas Diseworth is given the same rating, but with much less services available, see Figure 2.</p> <p>Furthermore, some settlements have been allocated the small village category yet offer more</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been revised to include future growth to 2031 the end of the plan period. In order to assess if a settlement is sustainable it is assessed against the following services and facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Post Office • General Store • GP surgery • Pharmacy • Public House • Community Hall • Recreation Ground • Employment • Place of Worship • High Speed broadband • Public Transport <p>Not one specific service or facility carries more weight than another. A settlement cannot be defined as unsustainable because it doesn't have a specific service or facility.</p>		<p>Stephen Saxby</p>	<p>N/a</p>
---	--	--	----------------------	------------

services than some in the sustainable village category, such as Newton Burgoland, see Figure 3.

These are just a few examples, yet this inconsistent approach can be seen across many other settlements [copies of the Breedon on the Hill, Diseworth and Newton Burgoland settlement hierarchy proformas are included in the response]

A more consistent approach would be to assign certain facilities a higher importance, and require that a minimum number of important services be available before higher settlement categories are given. For example, I would argue that the key services that are required by an independently sustainable settlement are;

- Education
- Post Office
- General Store
- GP Surgery
- Pharmacy
- Employment
- Public Transport

Without the services above additional journeys would be required by the residents to other areas. All other services are luxuries.

Within Background Paper 2 – S3, a sustainable village is defined as;

Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities

A small village is defined as;

Settlements with very limited services

Thus, a sustainable village would be one which includes enough of the necessary services listed above, for example 3 or more.

Taking the approach suggested above, the categories would be re-arranged as table X, with

<p>changes to existing in blue.</p> <p>Small Village</p> <p>Albert Village, Battram,</p> <p>Blackfordby, Coleorton (excluding lower Moor Road Area),</p> <p>Diseworth, Griffydam, Hemington, Lockington, Lount, Newbold, Osgathorpe, Peggs Green, Sinope, Snarestone, Spring Cottage,</p> <p>Swannington, Sweystone, Tonge, Wilson.</p> <p>Sustainable Village</p> <p>Appleby Magna, Belton, Breedon-On-The-Hill, Coleorton (lower Moor Road Area), Donisthorpe, Ellistown, Heather, Long Whatton, Moira,</p> <p>Newton Burgoland, Oakthorpe, Packington, Ravenstone, Worthington.</p> <p>Worthy of note are the villages of Blackfordby and Albert Village, which is right on the border with South Derbyshire. The ability to use the services of neighbouring settlements should not be grounds to consider the settlements as self-sustainable, since it requires the use of services from a completely different county. Furthermore, the importance of “areas of separation” is paramount in order to maintain physical independence between settlements that have been built up right to the edge of the border in South Derbyshire. Development must be restricted here to prevent coalescence with Woodville, Swadlincote and Church Gresley.</p>				
<p>Policy S3 provides a settlement hierarchy to be used when assessing the suitability of a settlement for new development. This sets out the overarching direction of development, and seeks to direct growth to those settlements which are most sustainable. Packington is identified as a Sustainable Village; suitable for a limited amount of growth, including infilling and/or physical extension of the settlement. This approach is supported given the wide range of facilities and services available in Packington.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Pegasus Group on behalf of Stuart Andrews</p>	<p>Pegasus Group</p>

<p>Policy S3 provides a settlement hierarchy in order to focus significant development to locations which are most sustainable. Ashby de la Zouch, along with Castle Donington, is identified as a Key Service Centre. This approach is supported. Ashby de la Zouch is a highly sustainable settlement with an extensive range of services and facilities.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Pegasus Group on behalf of Miller Homes</p>	<p>Pegasus Group</p>
<p>No. Blackfordby is identified as a sustainable village but I do not perceive this to be the case. A sustainable village is defined as having a limited range of services and facilities. Blackfordby do not have a range of services. It has no post office, no convenience shops for bread and milk etc, no doctors, no dentists, for food outlets, no library and no retail outlets. The definition of the small village of 'very limited services' if most applicable to Blackfordby. In terms of services it only has a very small primary school. This school has no room for expansion, being within the village conservation area. If the village was to receive money to ensure the 'services' could be maintained without detrimental effect as a result of any housing development I cannot see how money could help if there is physically no room for expansion of the school. All other services used by current residents are not in Blackfordby. The closest amenities are in the county of South Derbyshire. So I cannot see how Blackfordby can be classed as a sustainable village. Especially as it is reliant on services from other counties, which could be cut or reach capacity as a result of the actions of the South Derbyshire council not the North West Leicestershire council, which we have no say over. Blackfordby should be classed as a small village.</p>	<p>Noted. In order to assess if a settlement is sustainable it is assessed against the following services and facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Post Office • General Store • GP surgery • Pharmacy • Public House • Community Hall • Recreation Ground • Employment • Place of Worship • High Speed broadband • Public Transport <p>Not one specific service or facility carries more weight than another. A settlement cannot be defined as unsustainable because it doesn't have a specific service or facility. On balance Blackfordby is considered sustainable due to the range of service and facilities available to residents.</p>		<p>Mrs. A Saxby</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>The policy arbitrarily restricts development in sustainable urban and rural settlements.</p>	<p>The draft Limits to Development allow for small amounts of infill development and have been revised to accommodate all sites that currently have planning permission or a resolution to permit.</p>		<p>Phil Bamford</p>	<p>Gladman on behalf of Wilton Balmore.</p>

<p>I accept that NWLDC can demonstrate a 5 year supply plus 20% buffer of land already permitted for housing, representing approximately 7.8 years for this local authority. Supported within the last thirteen months by two appeal decisions, perhaps the most relevant being the Lower Packington Lane, Packington Nook Appeal Decision, where the Planning Inspector upheld NWLDC's position reference 5 year housing land supply.</p> <p>NWLDC have already identified preferred sites for housing development, as per the NPPF, including brownfield sites, and town centre sites, and I share the view that these sites should be prioritised over edge of town greenfield sites.</p> <p>As quoted on the BBC website (21st September 2015), it was referenced that North West Leicestershire was identified as one of the top performing local authorities (along with Liverpool, Lincoln, North East Lincolnshire and Blackburn with Darwen), with reference to approving planning applications, with the referenced source being the National Housing Federation http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-34209027 In my opinion, NWLDC should not be required to approve development, at any site considered as being a greenfield location.</p>	<p>The District Council can only determine the application it has put before them and has assess each application on its own merits. The NPPF states "Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay". Para 49 and 50 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to maintain a five year housing land supply. It should also be noted that there is not enough suitable and viable brownfield land to meet the districts housing needs.</p>		Jonathan Ball	n/a
<p>Question 7 - Ashby-de-la-Zouch should be elevated to the status of a Principal Town. It has a significantly greater population than any of the other settlements apart from Coalville and has a range of services of similar scale and of a better quality than Coalville. As a result it is a more attractive location for people to live and is better suited than Coalville to meet the demand for market housing in accordance with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF. It should therefore have equal status with Coalville in the Settlement Hierarchy as it did under the former Local Plan and the Leicestershire Structure Plan.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy is influenced by existing commitments, and reflects the settlement hierarchy, which is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coalville (Principal Town); • Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington (Key Service Centres); • Measham, Ibstock, Kegworth (Local Service Centres); • Sustainable Villages and smaller settlements <p>If Ashby were to be defined as a principal town this would mean that Ashby would have to accommodate all additional growth, this would then not balance the amount of growth and the benefits that are associated with growth across the district in particularly Coalville. Coalville is also larger than Ashby in terms of population and the number of services and facilities.</p>		Sigma Plan	Sigma Plan on behalf of Hallam Land Management

Yes - option B	Noted.		Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council	Castle Donington Parish Council
Best of a difficult job, but see question 41 for an important omission.	Noted.		Mr and Mrs Wrightman	NA
<p>The Development Strategy</p> <p>The aim of the settlement hierarchy is to direct and apportion housing development to those settlements most able to accommodate it, measured against the functions that each settlement fulfils (based on the level of existing services and facilities and their physical accessibility). This approach is appropriate and is supported by Rosconn Group.</p> <p>However, whilst it is appropriate to assess the capacity of all settlements within the District in order to identify the Settlement Hierarchy as proposed under Policy S3, it is critical that the hierarchy is then appropriately reflected in the Local Plan's development strategy, and particularly the identification of housing sites through to meet identified needs through the plan period. In doing so account also needs to be taken of the delivery issues in the District (highlighted in the response to Question 4) and the particular needs of specific settlements.</p> <p>Here there is a clear mismatch between the proposed settlement hierarchy in Policy S3 and the actual delivery that will result from the sites identified in Policies H1, H2 and H3, which arises from the level of existing commitments rather than a planned strategy of delivery. Specifically the concentration of recent past delivery and proposed delivery of housing through the plan period at Coalville in particular, and also the Key Service Centres, at the expense of the Sustainable Villages, such as Heather, which have sufficient facilities to support further housing development, but no future provision is proposed, is a key cause for concern.</p> <p>Table 2 in Background Paper 4 highlights that approximately 50% of completions and existing commitments in the District are focussed on the Coalville Urban Area. The proposed additional allocations (Policy H3) further exacerbate this issue by again focussing on the Coalville Urban Area and Key Service Centres. Table 3 in the Background Paper examines the position in relation to future</p>	<p>The housing requirement for the local plan has already been met through sites that already have planning permission or a resolution to permit, the settlement hierarchy allows small amounts of development within the sustainable settlements to meet local needs. Draft Local Plan policy H5 supports rural exception sites to meet affordable housing needs within the rural areas. This policy allows for a small amount of market housing to support the delivery of rural exception sites.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal has assessed the settlement hierarchy and the other realistic options to accommodate growth, the distribution of growth has to be looked at strategically and by allocating the development all on one site reduces the need to travel to services and facilities and there is more opportunity to provide supporting infrastructure for the delivery of new housing.</p> <p>Where local parishes have evidence that there is demand for further housing within sustainable settlements there is the opportunity for these parishes to allocate sites as part of Neighbourhood Plans.</p>		Kirstie Clifton	Rosconn Group Ltd

growth and the total supply represents 44% of the total growth in Coalville, with a further 34% in the Key Service Centres.

Therefore, a relatively small proportion of the future development proposed in the District will be directed to other sustainable locations, such as the Sustainable Villages. That is despite the recognition in the draft Local Plan that the Suitable Villages are “suitable for a limited amount of growth, including infilling and/or physical extension of the settlement”. Moreover, paragraph 54 of the NPPF states: “In rural areas, exercising the duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities, local planning authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing, including through rural exception sites where appropriate. Local planning authorities should in particular consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs”. Furthermore, paragraph 55 continues: “To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities”.

The draft Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) considers the spatial strategy for delivering housing within the District, taking into account existing commitments and setting out the spatial alternatives for further allocations. The strategy options considered take an ‘all or nothing’ approach to include a focus on Coalville Urban Area, on Ashby de la Zouch, main towns (including the main urban area and Key Service Centres), or dispersal across Local Service Centres and the Sustainable Villages.

The SA inappropriately dismisses the latter dispersal option on the basis that it would have an adverse effect on the landscape and the built environment, and proposes it would result in an increased reliance on car travel to access jobs and services. Whilst such locations are less accessible than the main Urban Area and Key Service Centres, it is essential that some further housing is provided to support existing services and facilities within these locations, potentially triggering additional functions and economic activities. Indeed, there

--	--	--	--	--

are suitable locations for additional development that lie outside of the Mease Catchment that are considered sustainable and could potentially have less environmental impact where there is already pressure from committed development.

Rosconn Group agrees that it is an unreasonable alternative (as defined in the SA) to direct “all” growth to Sustainable Villages. However, the current spatial strategy approach will have a significant negative impact on the role and function of a number of the Sustainable Villages in the District, including Heather.

Moreover, the imbalance in the provision that is proposed in the Sustainable Villages needs to be taken into account. The Housing Trajectory and Policies H1 & H2 highlight that the growth directed to the Sustainable Villages is very much focussed on Ravenstone (322 dwellings) and to a lesser degree Appleby Magna (68 dwellings) and Moira (42 dwellings). In comparison, whilst Heather is similar in scale, nature and function to those settlements, it has accommodated very little development recently and absolutely no development is now planned in the rest of the plan period to 2031.

As it stands, therefore, the Local Plan does not reflect the requirement of the NPPF to address rural housing needs (para 54) or to promote sustainable development where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities (para 55). This is a serious failing of the draft Local Plan that will need to be addressed in order for it to be considered sound. Clearly the suitability and capacity of the Sustainable Villages identified in the settlement hierarchy in Policy S3 for development should be underpinned by planned growth as a means of supporting and maintaining rural economies and of meeting local housing need in these areas.

SHLAA Site Ref. H3

As noted above, Heather is identified as a Sustainable Village and an appropriate location for some development or limited expansion, yet the village has not benefitted from any housing development since 2011 and the Housing Trajectory indicates that no further housing is

--	--	--	--	--

planned for the entire plan period.

However, Rosconn Group control land to the west of the village adjacent to Sparkenhoe Estate (SHLAA Site Ref. H3) that would provide a suitable location for some future housing development. The suitability and capacity of this site has been assessed and is illustrated in the attached Facilities & Movement Plan (Ref. 205_002) and Masterplan (Ref. 205_001).

The site is an entirely suitable development site in an accessible and unconstrained location. It is not subject to any landscape or ecological designations and can be readily accessed via Swepstone Road, or via an extension of Blackett Drive. The nature of the site means that its delivery can be phased to meet needs as they arise, which is considered to be an appropriate strategy to reflect the likely demand in this location and the scale of facilities available or that might be extended to support such. The total site capacity is in the order of 140 dwellings, but smaller developments of 35 dwellings upwards could be provided (refer to Phasing Plan ref. 205_003 A) with associated public open spaces. The phasing plan provided demonstrates that each phase of development can be readily integrated with the existing built form, maintaining key links to the village and the existing services and facilities.

Notably the site is very much contained by the existing woodland planting to the west, and the landscape and visual impact of development on the site will be relatively limited as key landscape features will be retained, the visual envelope is very contained, and the proposed public open space and strategic landscaping can positively respond to the landscape character and visual amenity.

The development would therefore, result in environmental benefits through the provision of a high quality scheme that optimises the use of an unconstrained site in a sustainable location, and which is integrated with the built form of Heather and respects the relationship with the countryside.

The development of the site would result in a number of significant socio-economic benefits including the provision of new housing that would

--	--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--	--

make a significant contribution to meeting local needs and sustaining local services and facilities, as well as addressing wider housing requirements in the District and providing much needed affordable housing. The proposed development would also result in a number of clear economic benefits through new job creation, local spend in the area and the new homes bonus. These benefits of development are recognised by the NPPF (para 54 & 55) that seeks to “promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship” (para 28 bullet 4). Moreover, whilst there is some existing bus infrastructure within Heather village, with bus stops already in place, there is not currently a regular service. A regular service to the village could be potentially be secured in association with future development.

The development of the site would, therefore, positively contribute to the economic, social and environmental objectives of sustainable development advocated by the NPPF.

Conclusion

In summary:

- The Local Plan should identify and address housing needs across the District including (sustainable) rural settlements;
- The role of settlements identified in the Settlement Hierarchy, notably sustainable Villages, should be appropriately reflected in the actual development strategy, notably in the planning delivery of housing.
- Additional development allocations should be identified in Sustainable Villages, including Heather in order to meet local needs, support local services and facilities, and ensure the sustainability of those settlements in the long term;
- With that objective in mind all or part of SHLAA Site Ref H3 should be allocated for residential development.

These matters need to be addressed in the

--	--	--	--	--

preparation of the Local Plan in order for it to comply with the NPPF, and be considered sound.				
The City Council have no specific comments to make on the spatial distribution of development within the district.	Noted.		Grant Butterworth	Leicester City Council

Policy S4- Countryside

Question 8 Do you agree with our suggested approach to development in the countryside? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any changes required?	Name	Business or organisation name;
Yes	Noted.		Lisa Marron	Resident
Yes	Noted.		Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
Yes	Noted.		Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
<p>Land adjacent to 40 Whitehill Road, Ellistown.</p> <p>I refer you to the previous correspondence which has taken place during the recent past few years concerning this land. Mr A. Adenuga, who holds the title, has asked me to convey his full support for the inclusion of this land within the area for which development will be considered by the Council.</p> <p>Should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Will you please acknowledge receipt of this letter.</p>	Noted.		Michael Troughton	Michael Troughton
<p>Sensitive land (policy E1) makes reference to land being Sensitive Areas and development will not be permitted that would adversely affect or diminish the present open character of such areas. On the original Local Plan -East, the land behind my house between Stoney Lane, The Woolrooms and Aquaduct Lane was hatched with a diagonal line and classified as Sensitive Areas (policy E1).I am concerned that the new local plan has removed the policy E1 from this land and therefore this extra layer of protection to this land has also been removed. One of Coleorton’s key characteristics is the open countryside and separation you have between existing cottages, houses & farm buildings. Removing the Policy E1 will give greater encouragement to developers, builders & land owners etc to infill this land with houses between these existing building. Thus ruining the open character of this rural settlement.</p>	<p>The currently adopted Local Plan 2002 policy E1 is covered by the new Local Plan policy S4: Countryside</p> <p>"(3) Development in the Countryside will only be approved where:.....</p> <p>(b) it does not undermine, either individually or cumulatively with existing or proposed development, the physical and perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements through contiguous extensions to existing settlements or through development on isolated sited on land divorced from settlement boundaries....".</p>		Mark Hutchinson	Mark Hutchinson

<p>Page 30, policy S4. We agree with (2)(k), (n) and (o) and with 2(d) provided this allows for the conversion of vernacular farm buildings to residential where they are in farmsteads and not isolated farm buildings away from roads. By referring to policy S3 I'm not clear if this policy (S4) allows for such development or not.</p> <p>Page 31, paragraph 5.24. How will the council have regard to national character areas when considering proposals in a countryside location? If it is in an advisory way, e.g. landscaping should include these features because it's in national character area such and such, then that's fine. But if it is in a restrictive way, such as barn conversions are not allowed in character area x because of y, then we would oppose that interpretation.</p>	<p>National Character Areas will be used to assess the impact of proposals on the landscape character of the area. It is proposed that the policy is amended to include reference to the National Character Areas, The Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Historic Landscape Characterisation project 2010.</p>		<p>Paul Tame</p>	<p>NFU</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Stephen Saxby</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Traveller sites are not appropriate for the countryside. They should be set up near to major transport hubs, e.g. the M1/A50/A453 interchange as - even when fixed sites - they generate a lot of traffic.</p>	<p>National Planning Policy allows for the allocation of Gypsy and Traveller sites within the open countryside. As part of assessing the sustainability of sites access is considered.</p>		<p>Mark Chadbourn</p>	<p>Emerald Eye Ltd</p>
<p>In our village, Heather, we have two large brown field sites, one of which is for sale and the other I believe is possibly for sale, yet you persist in digging up our beautiful countryside.</p> <p>Why have these not been considered for building</p>	<p>Noted. There is currently not sufficient evidence to suggest that these two brownfield sites are available and deliverable. Sites can be promoted by landowners and agents through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and Employment Land Availability Assessment. This piece of evidence is then used to inform the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>		<p>Alison Wright</p>	<p>Heather Parish Council</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>		<p>Phil Ellis</p>	<p>Whitwick Parish Council</p>
<p>The district is covered by 5 National character Areas - A plan showing these areas would be helpful</p>	<p>A map of the National Character Areas is included within the supporting Background Paper 3 Policy S4.</p>		<p>Gerald Dalby</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>But it may be difficult to maintain the Countryside against sustainability arguments. The current policy E1 Sensitive Areas seems to give more protection to certain areas of Countryside and I would like to see this maintained as it would give greater strength to ensuring there is no development in areas that separate existing villages. It would not have to necessarily always go right up to the current limits of development, but would give extra protection to those areas that are clearly the buffer areas between existing settlements.</p>	<p>Local Plan policy E1 is incorporated in the draft Local Plan policy S4 part 3 section b which states :</p> <p>Development in the Countryside will only be approved where.....</p> <p>(B) it does not undermine, either individually or cumulatively with existing or proposed development, the physical and perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements either through contiguous extensions to existing settlements or through development on isolated sites on land divorced from settlement boundaries....</p>		<p>Sue McGlynn - Clerk to Coleorton Parish Council</p>	<p>Coleorton Parish Council</p>

<p>Policy S4,</p> <p>Item 1</p> <p>Many of the approved developments have been outside of the limits to developments for years. Consequently this policy should either be enforced or removed. Currently it's meaningless.</p> <p>Item 3</p> <p>Development in the Countryside.</p> <p>This policy section is unfortunate. The land identified in the plan for development meets all these criteria.</p> <p>Developments are constantly being allowed where ancient settlement separation is being significantly reduced. Something local residents are passionately against.</p> <p>Page 31</p> <p>Item 5.20</p> <p>Almost all of the open areas being targeted for development is valuable agricultural land. The areas are targeted by developers in the developer lead land policy.</p> <p>Question 8</p> <p>The policy is just appalling; the actual state is that great damage is being done to the countryside. There are areas which could be developed which would be less devastating.</p>	<p>Item 1 - the main reason for the Limits to Development being reviewed is because they are currently out of date and have been breached on a number of occasions. Once the new Local Plan has been adopted these new Limits to Development will become much more defensible when determining planning applications. For more information on the revised Limits to Development please see the District Councils website where the background information is presented.</p> <p>Item 3- In order to prevent the coalescence of settlements draft Local Plan Policy S4 part 3 b sets out criteria that new development should not undermine, either individually or cumulatively with existing or proposed development, the physical and perceived separation and on undeveloped character between nearby settlements.</p>		Steve Palmer	NA
<p>Yes, particularly 3(b) because Ravenstone and Ellistown need to remain as distinct as possible from the Coalville Urban Area.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		Phil Larter	None
<p>Agree. The Parish Council agrees that building should not be permitted on green field land and land outside the current boundaries.</p>	<p>Noted. Local Plan policy S4 doesn't rule out all development within the countryside but it will be limited to those uses set out within the policy.</p>		Samantha Lockwood	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		Mr Robert Harlow	Harlow Bros Ltd
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		Frank Bedford, MBE	Willesley Environment Protection Association

<p>North West Leicestershire District bounds the county of Nottinghamshire along the line of the River Soar running approximately 1 mile north of Hathern to the confluence with the River Trent near Trent Lock. However, the influence of development within the district potentially extends beyond this political boundary and may impact upon the landscape of Nottinghamshire, notably the south west area of Rushcliffe Borough.</p> <p>The National Character Area Profile 69 – Trent Valley Washlands (as defined by Natural England’s National Character Areas 2014), spans the boundary between North West Leicestershire and Rushcliffe, and underlines the landscape character that is shared by the two districts.</p> <p>A methodology for undertaking landscape character assessment was developed by Nottinghamshire County Council’s Landscape and Reclamation Team, based upon Natural England’s Landscape Character Guidance (2002). This methodology was produced to update Nottinghamshire Landscape Guidelines 1998 and to respond to changes in Government legislation (PPS7) which required the greater emphasis on the use of landscape character assessments in informing policy within Local Development Frameworks. The landscape character assessment fits national characterisations (as designated by Natural England’s ‘Character of England Landscape, Wildlife and Cultural Features Map’ produced in 2005) and regional characterisations.</p> <p>In the Greater Nottingham Area, including Rushcliffe, the landscape character assessment has been executed by TEP consultants in a slightly modified fashion to produce similar results. The process allows the landscape to be divided into Regional Character Areas, which are then subdivided into Landscape Description Units (LDU). Each Policy Zone (DPZ) is subsequently allocated a Conservation and Enhancement policy which defines the required approach to future development.</p> <p>The North West Leicestershire Local Plan should make allowance for the possible visual or landscape impact of any development extending beyond its boundary. Where this influence extends in to the adjacent Rushcliffe Borough, the</p>	<p>Noted. The plan should be amended to make reference to the Leicestershire Historic Landscape Characterisation Assessment.</p>	<p>Amend text to make reference to the Leicester, Leicestershire Historic Landscape Characterisation Assessment.</p>	<p>Eilidh McCallum</p>	<p>Nottinghamshire County Council</p>
--	--	--	------------------------	---------------------------------------

proposals should be considered in relation to the Greater Nottingham Landscape Assessment and the landscape policy and actions associated with the relevant DPZ.

There does not appear to be any cross referencing to the Leicestershire Landscape Character Assessment in Section 9 of the Draft Plan. The glossary contains a mention of the National Landscape Character Area defined by Natural England, but there is no mention of the County Level Landscape Character Assessment which has been carried out, as would normally be expected in a Local Plan.

Conclusion

The County Council does not raise any objection on strategic planning policy grounds. Attention is raised to the Greater Nottingham Landscape Assessment in terms of cross-boundary landscape issues.

<p>Discrimination against me I have copies of the Core Strategy plan I have a building plot that is inside the Limits to Development adjacent to 18 Masefield Close you now propose to move this line the other side of the plot alienating building land your proposal now follows the line of existing estate you have alienated potential building land that runs from Masefield Close to Burns Close Flood Zone 1 you now have altered the line on property number 12 Burns Close the line now includes flood zones 2 and 3 your council have previously passed plans for this property of which you allowed hard standing to be built in flood zone 2 and 3 restricting flow of water you have plans of this also the hard standing slopes towards the River Mease so the run off goes on the SSSI site previously on this plot there was a restriction that no hard standing should be erected as not to restrict the flood plain a gravel board with close boarded fence on top so hard standing is a foot above original level plus garden has been lifted to push flood water elsewhere.</p> <p>This is an objection to the new line of Development adjacent to 18 Burns Close and the inclusion of new line on number 12 Burns Close allowing Limits to Development line to include Flood Zones 2 and 3 yet taking out flood zone 2 and 3 on our property. Could you please explain</p> <p>We are happy to meet you on site to discuss this logically we are happy to arrange a site visit with ourselves and solicitor.</p>	<p>The site proposed a part of this consultation is not deemed appropriate to be included within the Limits to Development as this would include an area of open space that is currently defined as open countryside. By including the site within the Limits to Development would be contrary to the methodology used to define the Limits to Development which is set out below: The draft Limits to Development have been revised using the following methodology:</p> <p>i. Existing commitments by virtue of an extant planning permission for residential or employment development on the fringes of settlement; (they may not be reflective of recent planning applications)</p> <p>ii. The Limits to Development follow clearly defined physical features such as wall, fences, hedgerows and roads.</p> <p>iii. The inclusion of schools, halls, large houses and other buildings which stand in extensive grounds would depend on their relationship to the overall fabric of the settlement. In some cases, their relative isolation caused by their spacious setting would justify total exclusion, whereas in other cases, the building itself could be included within the Limits to Development but the curtilage excluded.</p> <p>The Limits to Development are prepared as a standalone policy and do not consider issues such as flood risk and other environmental or policy constraints. When determining planning applications the Local Plan will be read as a whole and therefore issues such as other flood risk will be considered then by assessing proposals against the relevant policies within the Local Plan.</p>		DM Humphries	NA
<p>Establishing Countryside "land banks" for potential future development would assist in providing homes to meet population growth</p>	<p>Noted. The Local Plan allocates sufficient sites to meet the districts housing requirements to the end of the plan period.</p>		F J ALLGOOD	Land Owner
<p>I would like to ask for inclusion in the Local Plan of the land on Spring Lane, Packington LE65 1WU; as detailed in the planning application ref 15/01064/OUT submitted on the 5th of November by David Granger Design Ltd.</p>	<p>The draft Limits to Development will be revised and amended to take account of any applications that have been approved since they were drafted in July 2014, before the submission of the Local Plan.</p>		Lucy Bates	self employed
<p>No</p>	<p>Noted</p>		Olive kearins	Na
<p>No - should not encroach further into the countryside</p>	<p>Draft Local Plan S4 is designed to allow only appropriate development within the countryside, whilst protecting its intrinsic character and beauty. This policy is in accordance with National Policy.</p>		Simon Litchfield	Resident

<p>Muller Property Group object to the defined Limits to Development as set out for Ibstock on Inset Map 14 to the Proposals Map. Muller Property Group consider the Limits to Development should be extended to cover the site shown at Appendix 1 ('Land to the south of Curzon Street, Ibstock, Leicestershire').</p> <p>The site benefits from strong boundaries comprising hedgerows and trees and is visually well contained. It sits at a lower point in the landscape and will not create a precedent for new development extending more widely into the landscape being well-related to existing residential development. The site abuts one of the largest villages in the area and is sustainably located to access to the services and facilities in Ibstock and further afield by bus. Further development at Ibstock will assist in maintaining and supporting these facilities.</p> <p>The plan at Appendix 1 comprises an indicative layout showing how the site might come forward.</p>	<p>Noted. In terms of the delivery of the large housing sites the Council will work with organisations that will have a key part in the implementation of the Local Plan to ensure the aims and objectives of the Local Plan are delivered. If delivery rates are falling short of what was anticipated the Council will take necessary actions to address any shortfall. Further information on potential actions are detailed in draft Policy IM2. In regards to development in Ibstock there has been a significant amount of new development with more yet to take place.</p>		<p>MATT WEDDERBURN</p>	<p>Muller Strategic Projects Limited</p>
<p>The encouragement of recreation and tourism echoes themes in the draft Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plan and is welcomed. To help protect existing recreation opportunities and to enhance tourism it is essential that the Local Plan protects attractive and accessible open countryside adjoining the existing settlement boundaries.</p> <p>The explicit condition that development in the countryside does not create or exacerbate ribbon development is good, as it should keep small settlements like Shellbrook, New Packington and Boundary from joining with neighbouring towns. However for places like Shellbrook and New Packington the concern is that the growth of the larger town removes their area of separation. This also applies in sustainable villages like Blackfordby. An area of separation between these communities and Ashby de la Zouch needs to be maintained.</p>	<p>Draft Local Plan policy S4 ensures that consideration is given to the cumulative impact of proposals on settlement identity and the potential impact of development in the isolated countryside as well as to the impact of extensions to the built up areas.</p>		<p>Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk</p>	<p>Ashby de la Zouch Town Council</p>
<p>Dont lose the historic nature of the town and its castle</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Andrew Stone</p>	<p>NA</p>

It is essential to preserve good agricultural land. Building should be predominantly on less good land, brownfield sites and redevelopment sites. Any "country parks" should allow access to bicycles and horses as well as pedestrians and should be for the benefit of local residents firstly, who should be consulted not imposed on.	Noted. There is not sufficient deliverable brownfield land to meet the districts housing needs.		Mary Lorimer	Not applicable
<p>There is a difference in the 'Limits to Development' between the adopted and draft Proposals Map that removes some of my client's land from the area within Limits to Development, as highlighted yellow on the draft Proposals Map below.</p> <p>It is not explained in the draft Local Plan why this change has been made. My client would request that the Limits to Development are not changed and that the yellow land remains within the Limits to Development. This is because the change might unduly constrain the satisfactory conversion of a stone barn immediately within the current Limits to Development, as coloured blue on the plan above. A planning application (reference 15/00949/FUL) has already been submitted for this conversion, along with the development of 3 new dwellings on Hall Field Farm. Some of the land highlighted yellow is necessary for extension of the barn to form a dwelling and formation of a residential curtilage, whilst creating a cohesive development with the remaining Hall Field Farm site. Without this land the potential for conversion and enhancement of the stone barn within the Conservation Area would be unduly constrained.</p>	<p>The draft Limits to Development will be amended in the event that the current planning application is approved. It would be inappropriate to include the site within the Limits at this stage as the site stands in isolation to the built up framework. The Limits to Development have been prepared using the following methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Existing commitments by virtue of an extant planning permission for residential or employment development on the fringes of settlement; (they may not be reflective of recent planning applications) ii. The Limits to Development follow clearly defined physical features such as wall, fences, hedgerows and roads. iii. The inclusion of schools, halls, large houses and other buildings which stand in extensive grounds would depend on their relationship to the overall fabric of the settlement. In some cases, their relative isolation caused by their spacious setting would justify total exclusion, whereas in other cases, the building itself could be included within the Limits to Development but the curtilage excluded. 		Caroline Chave	Chave Planning
All should be treated the same	Noted.		Trevor Davis	None
Agree as long as the guidance is strictly enforced and the local knowledge of the Parish Council into taken into consideration when such developments are in early planning stages.	Noted.		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
Yes	Noted		Edward Hines	N/A
No			Mr Richard Hine	Resident of Appleby Magna
Yes	Noted.		David Bigby	Private individual

<p>In respect of the aforementioned Draft Local Plan, it hereby requested that North West Leicestershire District Council duly considers the inclusion within the proposed Local Plan and illustrated within the Proposed Policies map "Limits to Development" the following land</p> <p>Land of Ashby Road 9 adjacent to No 30 Packington, Ashby de la Zouch.</p> <p>The following options 0.35 ha 0.99 ha</p> <p>The land is positioned to the upper northern end of the village along Ashby Road, located to the east adjoining the existing settlement boundary.</p> <p>The land has remained under used for in excess of 15 years, being characteristically flat and formed by the existing settlement boundary to the south, Ashby Road to the west, hedgerow and screeded to the east and fenced to the north.</p> <p>The land in part benefits for a planning consent for the erection of a stable block along the northern boundary (11/00891/FUL) and planning indication for the erection of a dwelling (s) in an LPA pre-application consultation HE/PAA/14/326/A</p> <p>Draft Local Plan :-</p> <p>Strategy 5</p> <p>Para 5.9 states the identified need for the delivery of 10,700 dwellings between 2011 and the end of the plan period in 2031 at a measured rate of 535 dwelling per annum</p> <p>Housing 6</p> <p>Para 6.4 Housing Table 2- "housing provision @ 1.04.2015 "illustrates a total of estimated combined housing – with committed completions= 1706 (A), under construction = 428 (B) planning permissions =4442 (c) and resolutions to grant = 4178 (D)- giving a total estimate of 10759 (A+B+C+D)</p> <p>Para 6.8 identifies an adjusted housing delivery figure of 9200 dwellings and thereby a shortfall of 1600 dwellings required during the lifetime of the plan until 2013.</p>	<p>It is not considered appropriate to extend the limits to development as the extant planning permission is for stable block with hay store, Tack room and Tractor Shed, Laying of Hardstanding, Erection of gates. By extending the Limits to Development to include agricultural buildings would not be in accordance with the methodology set out below. The draft Limits to Development have been prepared using the following methodology:</p> <p>i. Existing commitments by virtue of an extant planning permission for residential or employment development on the fringes of settlement; (they may not be reflective of recent planning applications)</p> <p>ii. The Limits to Development follow clearly defined physical features such as wall, fences, hedgerows and roads.</p> <p>iii. The inclusion of schools, halls, large houses and other buildings which stand in extensive grounds would depend on their relationship to the overall fabric of the settlement. In some cases, their relative isolation caused by their spacious setting would justify total exclusion, whereas in other cases, the building itself could be included within the Limits to Development but the curtilage excluded.</p>		Mr Ladd	HMD
---	---	--	---------	-----

<p>Para 6.9 states that windfall sites have not been considered in the estimate for housing supply but acknowledges the historical record of windfall sites (less than 10) having an important role to play on the assisting the delivery of the forecasted figure within the lifetime of the plan period.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan has identified the village of Packington as being sustainable and in accordance with directives and policies embodied within the NPPF and the draft Local Plan. The land is considered to be both sustainable and deliverable for housing supply within the following 18 month period.</p>				
<p>The East Midlands Enterprise Gateway is identified throughout the plan as a focus for key economic activities. The area is located outside the settlement boundary and therefore identified as countryside through Policy S4.</p> <p>Part 2 of Policy S4 provides exceptions to development in the countryside in accordance with other policies in the Plan. Criteria (p) and (q) refer to Policies Ec5 and Ec8, East Midlands Airport and Donington Park respectively.</p> <p>Reference to the specific policies in Policy S4 does not allow for any flexibility or growth that may occur in these areas. It is considered that criteria (q) of the policy should be deleted and criteria (p) should be amended to read as follows;</p> <p>Economic Development associated with the East Midlands Enterprise Gateway, specifically East Midlands Airport and Donington Park in accordance with other policies of this plan.</p> <p>This proposed wording will enable the policy to respond better to the proposed Economic Strategy for the northern part of the district whilst ensuring that proposed development in areas allocated as countryside comply with the development and economic policies of the plan.</p> <p>In addition, the site East of Finger Farm is currently allocated as open countryside on the Draft Map. The site has the benefit of planning permission which has been partly implemented. The exclusion of the site from the airport boundary conflicts with</p>	<p>Finger Farm is not physically part of East Midlands Airport. It is acknowledged that there needs to be reference to East Midlands Gateway within the local plan.</p>	<p>Include a reference to East Midlands Gateway in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Jeremy Williams</p>	<p>ID Planning</p>

<p>Part c of Policy S4 which seeks to ensure that development in the countryside does not exacerbate ribbon development.</p> <p>The site to the East of Finger Farm, benefits from planning permission and development has been implemented. Discussions are ongoing with the authority over the future development of the site. It is considered that its inclusion within the airport boundary and within the Primary Employment Area is necessary to ensure that the plan reflects the current position and is up to date.</p>				
<p>Not all land outside the LTD identified as Countryside can be deemed intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all.</p> <p>Some areas whilst drawn outside LTD do not necessarily pose these attributes and are outside due to tightly drawn LTD around settlements. Swannington is an example of this whereby the LTD is tightly drawn and in the context of landscape appraisals and character assessments supporting the draft Plan do not consider the area as significant in landscape terms.</p> <p>In these instances particularly in settlements whereby the Council consider are sustainable and can accommodate some growth relative to the its size and more relaxed boundary should be proposed to promote infill development.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development are a tool to provide clear, defensible boundaries around settlements within which development will normally be confined. Swannington is identified as sustainable settlement which allows for a limited amount of growth, including infilling.</p>		Nick Wilkins	NW
Yes	Noted		Lance Wiggins	Landmark Planning

<p>This Representation is made on behalf of JF & BM Gray with regards to land off Talbot Place, Donisthorpe.</p> <p>Part 2 of Policy S4 lists those types of development which may be acceptable in the defined countryside. Criterion d) and e) of Part 2 refer specifically to those types of development set out in Policy S3 (Settlement Hierarchy) which would be acceptable in the countryside namely:-</p> <p>a) The re-use and adaption of buildings for appropriate purposes including house in accordance with the settlement Hierarchy (Policy S3)</p> <p>and</p> <p>b) The re-development of previously developed land for housing in a Small Village in accordance with Settlement Hierarchy (Policy S3).</p> <p>However, Policy S3 also makes reference to “physical extensions” being acceptable in the identified “Sustainable Villages”. In most cases, the physical extensions will result in development beyond the Limits to Developments into Countryside and therefore an additional criteria should be included in paragraph 2 of Policy S4 which allows for development in the countryside where it constitutes the “physical extension to a sustainable village” as set out in Policy S3. This would rectify the omission and ensure there is conformity between Policy S3 and S4.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan needs to be reworded to make the relationship between policies S3 and S4 clearer, the Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate all required growth for the plan period and therefore no physical extensions are required to sustainable villages.</p>	<p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state “Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extensions to these settlements is supported in principle”.</p>	<p>Philippa Kreuser</p>	<p>CT Planning</p>
<p>See above</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Yvonne Willars</p>	<p>retired</p>
<p>The National Forest Company supports the inclusion of development associated with forestry, farm diversification and recreation and tourism as acceptable forms of development within areas designated as countryside. All of these forms of development are likely to be brought forward within The National Forest over the plan period.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Philip Metcalfe</p>	<p>The National Forest Company</p>

<p>Policy S4 seeks to restrict development beyond the confines of established settlement boundaries. It is considered that this policy is not NPPF compliant. The Three Pots appeal decision in Burbage, Hinckley (Appeal Ref: 2202261) concluded that a blanket countryside protection policy is not in conformity with the NPPF and the weight ascribed to it is accordingly reduced. The Council are entitled to protect certain / specific valued landscapes and / or areas of separation, however a catch-all countryside protection policy is not appropriate.</p> <p>The Council will also be aware that this very general policy is a 'counterpart' policy for the supply of housing and in the event that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites this policy will, by virtue of NPPF paragraph 49, be dis-applied (See South Northamptonshire [2014] EWHC 537 and Wenman [2015] EWHC 925 rulings).</p>	<p>The NPPF recognises the need to "take account of the different roles and character of different areas and that planning should recognise " the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside".</p> <p>Draft Local Plan policy looks to balance appropriate development within the countryside and is therefore not putting a blanket approach to all development within the countryside. The policy will be amended to include reference to landscape.</p>	<p>The policy will be amended to incorporate reference to the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Landscape Characterisation Study, National Character Areas and any subsequent pieces of evidence.</p>	Jennifer Towers	Bloor Homes Limited
<p>areas previously designated sensitive sites should now be designated green space status</p>	<p>Noted. Areas previously desingated as sensitive areas are covered by local plan policy S4 Countryside.</p>		Mr. j Lewis	1950
<p>It is essential that areas of separation are maintained between existing communities so that their unique character is kept alive and we don't end up living in one massive homogeneous conurbation .</p>	<p>Noted. The issues raised within the representation are included within policy S4 part 3 (b).</p>		Michael Ball	Individual
<p>I feel that all large scale developments in the countryside should be halted as they are by nature unsustainable. There is a need for housing for local people at affordable prices as the market seems to create a decline in communities by creating an influx of wealthy buyers who don't have the same connections to an area as those born and bred there.</p>	<p>Draft Local Plan Policy S4 is designed to protect the character of the countryside, and development is supported for a number of uses. One of these uses is affordable housing on rural exception sites.</p>		Steve Johnson	YYYY
<p>Potential for more infill and development of settlements on sensitive sites could lead to new applications coming in and nothing would stop these from being agreed. Affordable housing in villages like Appleby Magna was promised on the last development yet we have houses (£300k) bracket. Affordable to who?</p>	<p>The delivery of affordable housing is supported within the Local Plan and any planning application that is determined following the adoption of the draft plan will need to be assessed against the relevant policies. Draft Local Plan Policy S4 is designed to protect the character of the countryside, and development is limited to that which requires a rural location. One of these uses is affordable housing on rural exception sites.</p>		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>		Hugh James	n/a

<p>Although I believe additional significant weighting should be given to the below mentioned:</p> <p>Further protection of areas of particularly attractive countryside should be included, with specific sites identified as such.</p> <p>Included within the final local draft plan should be policies in place to protect specific sites and areas, recognised for their contribution to the ecological network, being both green infrastructure / wildlife corridors providing habitat for species.</p> <p>It is important that policies recognise and afford proper protection for our open spaces and Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside, as well as providing valuable wildlife habitat and enhancing biodiversity through protection of green infrastructure within established ecological networks.</p> <p>I would like included again, that the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, be clearly identified and protected in the local plan, as being an unallocated Greenfield land located outside the limits to development of Coalville, as defined in the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan, confirmed as being an Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside, forming part of the Charnwood and National Forests. Therefore, should be protected against any future development.</p> <p>Subsequently, these policies should continue to be included within the future local plan, and given additional weighting if considered beneficial.</p>	<p>Local Planning Authorities are discouraged from allocating local landscape designations and the impact of development of development on the local landscape needs to be assessed as part of the planning application stage on a site by site basis. In determining the character of the countryside the draft Local Plan refers to the National Character Areas prepared by Natural England.</p> <p>It is proposed that reference to these be incorporated into the policy.</p> <p>Biodiversity sites and ecological networks are protected by draft Local Plan policy En1.</p>	<p>The policy will be amended to incorporate reference to the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Landscape Characterisation Study, National Character Areas and any subsequent pieces of evidence.</p>	<p>J Ball</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>		<p>Paul Varty</p>	<p>Resident of Appleby</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>		<p>John Edwards</p>	<p>XMOS Semiconductors Ltd</p>
<p>There is local awareness of the 'remote and tranquil' quality of attractive countryside to south-west of Ashby on both sides of Willesley Lane. This area would be sensitive to a solar farm development on the scale of schemes already approved elsewhere near to Ashby, Would the scope of 'renewable energy' (o) be constrained by section 3a) and b) of the policy S4?</p>	<p>Any proposals for renewable energy will be assessed on their own merit and the local plan will need to be read as a whole. The proposal will also need to be assessed against other appropriate policies within the Local Plan no just S4.</p>		<p>Tim Abbott</p>	<p>Householder</p>

<p>More protection is required of key assets. More protection should be afforded via Policies to protect natural assets, the importance of communities and residents' well being which will stand up well to legal challenge</p> <p>It seems unless a site is designated, it becomes fair game for legal challenge by developers and landscape is merely in the eye of the beholder and the Planning Inspectors are under ministerial guides/pressures as well. This is wholly unacceptable and circumnavigates the local process for sustainable development decided by those who know the area best.</p> <p>Adequate designations must be put in place by NWLDC via Policy to protect our key sites. I do not believe the current woolly Policy is sufficiently robust. APAC is no longer seen as robust and is under legal challenge from developers in Planning Inquiries.</p> <p>More reference to Charnwood Forest and designation required.</p> <p>Include reference to the importance of ecological networks and green infrastructure and identify sites which should be preserved for their connectivity to other key nature sites or as corridors connecting farmland etc. This will facilitate improvements to biodiversity.</p> <p>The importance of ecological networks and protecting green infrastructure. Many sites (such as Bardon Quarry) that allow for biodiversity improvements do not necessarily provide corridors to allow those species to migrate to other sites/areas of the District. Also, current legislation/PPG protects the habitat/home of certain species but does not afford protection of the surrounding habitat upon which the species relies for food etc. for example badger sets are protected but the adjacent foraging habitat is not. This must be rectified in the new Local Plan with water tight Policies that can be relied upon to protect such important sites.</p> <p>Many sites (such as Bardon Quarry) that allow for biodiversity improvements do not necessarily provide corridors to allow those species to migrate to other sites/areas of the District.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the landscape of the countryside varies in character and appearance across the district. It will be important that these are taken account of when determining proposals within the countryside.</p> <p>Natural England has defined National Character Areas across the whole country, each of these areas has a profile associated with it which describes in detail the key landscape features and identifies any issues and opportunities.</p> <p>It is proposed that reference to National Character Areas be incorporated into the policy.</p> <p>Local Plan policy E22 Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside is not compliant with the NPPF and can therefore not be included within the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Biodiversity is referenced within draft Local Plan En1, the delivery of Green Infrastructure is supported under draft Local Plan policy IF1.</p>	<p>The policy will be amended to incorporate reference to the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Landscape Characterisation Study, National Character Areas and any subsequent pieces of evidence.</p>	<p>Jane Tebbatt</p>	<p>Quarrying</p>
---	--	--	---------------------	------------------

<p>e) The current objectives of the Plan and associated Policies make no reference to archaeology, heritage assets in terms of culture (Bardon being highest point in Leics, its geodiversity and the rich geological history).</p>				
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Heather Parish Council</p>	<p>Heather Parish Council</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>JON WALTERS</p>	<p>LPT</p>
<p>The Local Plan approach to the Countryside is a major obstacle to creating a sustainable pattern of development. Reliance and focus on principle urban areas has not been a successful strategy in meeting identified local housing needs and has led to the decline of important villages that define the District.</p> <p>The focus on principal urban areas is an outdated Regional Plan policy, it may be sustainable for those that live and work in the area already, but it is not sustainable for residents and people with family and employment connections to lower order settlements. It is a pattern that, if maintained, will lead to further decline of rural services, gentrification of villages, pricing locals out of the market and continued unbalanced growth of selected centres.</p> <p>The approach does not fully accord with the NPPF in terms of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and does not reflect the latest policy approach from the Government, as discussed above.</p> <p>It was more liberal organic growth that led to vibrant villages in the early and mid 20th centuries, over-regulation in the late 20th Century has resulted in decline, through seeking to preserve villages and the immediate surrounding countryside, for its own sake.</p> <p>Growth of villages would breathe new life, reinvigorate shops and services, including public transport, which would have clear beneficial impact in terms of sustainability overall. Bus services are being cut back and subsidies are threatened by public sector cuts, creating the demand for rural bus services through increased population, will reverse this trend.</p>	<p>The settlement hierarchy and distribution of development have been tested as part of the sustainability appraisal. Distributing the districts housing requirements over the district doesn't score very well compared allocating sites around the principal town and the key service centres. It is acknowledged that sustainable settlements require limited amounts of growth over the plan period in order for them to remain sustainable and this is reflected within draft Local Plan Policy S4.</p>		<p>Tim Farley</p>	<p>Copesticks Ltd.</p>

Paragraph 5.20 states that the Authority wants to maintain, and where possible enhance the environmental, economic and social value of the countryside. We would contend that by arbitrarily limiting growth of villages, there would be negative social and economic sustainability impacts.				
<p>The first para seeks to restrict development in areas not within a development boundary whereas this goes against the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>"Land outside the Limits to Development is identified as countryside which will be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all"</p> <p>The above para is sweeping statement which seems to suggest that all land not within the development boundary has intrinsic character. This is not factual. Specifically valuable areas need to be highlighted within any allocations plan and evidenced accordingly; otherwise, it has not been objectively assessed. This includes full LVIA's, Heritage and Ecological Assessments.</p>	The Local Plan policy needs to be read as a whole and the second paragraph within the countryside policy sets out what uses are supported within the countryside.		Mrs Penny Bicknell	Les Stephan Planning Ltd
Your definition of countryside should include farmland close to towns and large villages, which is currently in danger of being built on.	All parcels of land outside of the draft Limits to Development is classified as open countryside. Most of the land identified as countryside is in agricultural use whether next to a settlement or a remote farm.	Provide a definition of countryside within the glossary.	Lesley Colley	None
<p>The council should re-examine the wording of its policy to identify and protect areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside (APAC) Reference was made at the recent appeal by Gladman to a hierarchy of factors contributing to what can be defined as an APAC. This should be reviewed and the councils policy updated and applied to all those areas of which the council seeks to protect.</p> <p>As an overall policy, brownfield sites should be developed before greenfield sites (where this is an option) and priority given to sites close to town or village centres, to minimise the impact of car transport.</p>	<p>It is not seen as appropriate to include Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside as part of the new local plan as these were designated as part of the Leicestershire Structure Plan 1991-2006 and this policy was not carried forward as part of the next structure plan which has since been revoked.</p> <p>An overall policy on the use of brownfield land before greenfield land would not be appropriate as this is covered by the National Planning Policy Framework and local plans should not repeat national policy.</p>		Malcom Allsop	NA
The Whitwick Action Group would like to support the Countryside Policy S4	Noted.		Whitwick Action Group	Whitwick Action Group

<p>We would like to see your entry (I), policy S4 Countryside amended to read;</p> <p>Community services and facilities, including Places of Worship, meeting a proven local need</p>	<p>Noted, policy S4 to be amended to include places of worship</p>	<p>Noted, policy S4 to be amended to include places of worship</p>	<p>Roland Wilson</p>	<p>Loughborough Gospel Halls Trust</p>
<p>I agree with the overall approach. I do however notice that the map shows pretty much any area not yet built upon to be classified as countryside.</p> <p>This indirectly means that any new larger development will likely be within this 'countryside'. It may be worthwhile classifying the suitability of 'countryside areas' for development, as some areas will be much more suitable than others, rather than everything being identified as countryside.</p> <p>It is very useful however to see what areas are identified as outside existing development. I would add that areas of physical and perceived separation could be highlighted on the map, such as areas of separation between built up areas and areas of separation between counties.</p>	<p>The areas within the limits to development have been revised to accommodate future large scale development within the plan period. Development outside of the Limits to Development will be subject to the criteria set out within Policy S4 part B, which covers the coalescence and perceived coalescence of settlements.</p>		<p>Alison Saxby</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>No. KPC considers that if the Roxhill Development is not approved then this area of land and other agricultural land around the Village should be protected in the local plan</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Vicky Roe</p>	<p>Kegworth Parish Council</p>

<p>The area designated as countryside on the proposal map is objected to, with specific reference to the land north of Occupation Lane. This land as shown on the attached plans has been worked for minerals including coal and clay and is currently underused land.</p> <p>Given the close relationship between this land and the proposed employment development in South Derbyshire, this land should be excluded from the open countryside and a more logical edge to the urban area be made along Occupation Lane itself.</p> <p>There is no requirement for this land to be included within open countryside designation when it can play a valuable part in the delivery of regeneration in this locality providing both an employment and housing opportunity. Much of this land it already developed with existing employment uses and it would be logical therefore that this should be included within a development boundary and not remain part of open countryside.</p> <p>Draft Inset Maps</p> <p>We object to Inset Plan 1 for Albert Village, the Village development boundary should be extended to the east to include the land identified north of Occupation Lane for a mix of housing and employment purposes as defined on the accompanying masterplan.</p> <p>Proposals Map</p> <p>We object to the district proposals map as this shows my clients land as part of the open countryside designation which is inappropriate</p>	<p>It is not proposed to amend the Limits to Development to accommodate the proposed site as the local plan has already met the housing and employment land requirements for the plan period in accordance with the settlement hierarchy.</p>		<p>Tom Beavin</p>	<p>jvh planning</p>
---	---	--	-------------------	---------------------

<p>S4(1) should additionally include: its contribution to the characteristics of settlements</p> <p>S4(1) has far too many options for justifying development in the countryside. In particular the following should be removed:</p> <p>(g) Affordable Housing – The plan makes generous provision for housing and within this for affordable housing. Including this clause only encourages developers to underprovide affordable housing within permitted sites and then apply for development in the countryside. See further comments in relation H5 (Q14).</p> <p>(i) Extensions to existing businesses – if businesses are expanding then they should move to sites allocated for economic activity under the plan.</p>	<p>There is not a blanket acceptance for affordable housing within the open countryside in order to secure the provision of affordable housing in the rural areas to meet the needs of local communities. A genuine need to live in the village must be established before sites are considered and a planning application is submitted. Such a need could be someone who lives or is employed in the village or needs to give or receive support from a close family member who lives in the village.</p> <p>Noted extensions to businesses within the countryside are potentially allowed otherwise this would be contrary to the aims of the NPPF to build a strong, competitive economy.</p>		Lindsay Gene	Appleby Magna Parish Council
<p>We support the policy in that it recognises that sites for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople usually need to be located within the countryside.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		A. R. Yarwood	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
<p>It should recognise the sensitivity of some countryside locations adjacent to settlements and resist development in such locations</p>	<p>Part 3 of Draft Local Plan policy S4 Development within the countryside, recognises the sensitivity of locating new development within the countryside.</p>		Sonia Liff	Chair Appleby Environment
<p>(a) Taking into account positions taken in the past in relation to ‘Limit of Development’ we have little or no trust in the current administration to sustain Policy S4</p> <p>(b) Policy S4 must be legally enforceable during the Plan Period with the definition of ‘countryside’ clearly understood by both communities and developers.</p> <p>(c) We want to see better recognition of the importance of National Forest and control on development in the Charnwood Forest</p> <p>(d) Identify as ‘countryside’ larger areas of communal space such as the Bath Grounds in Ashby, Snibston Grange in Coalville, Lount Woodland etc.</p> <p>(e) Identify and protect the most productive agricultural land</p>	<p>a) The current Limits to Development in the 2002 adopted Local Plan are difficult to enforce as the plan is out of date and therefore, there are occasions where the Limits to Development have been breached. This is why it has been important to revise the Limits to Development to accommodate future growth to 2031.</p> <p>b) The definition of countryside is in conformity to national policy and there is a clear criteria to the use and scale of development that will be acceptable in the countryside.</p> <p>c) The Charnwood and National Forest are covered by individual policies within the draft plan.</p> <p>d) The issue of communal spaces is covered elsewhere within the local plan.</p> <p>e) Agree, text will be inserted into the draft Local Plan to be in conformity to the NPPF.</p>	<p>Statement on agricultural land will be inserted in the supporting text to be in accordance with the NPPF.</p>	Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader
<p>Policy S4 appears overly-restrictive.</p> <p>Part (2) of Policy S4 is too restrictive and is not</p>	<p>Agree “ development which requires a rural location will be removed from policy S4”.Small villages are covered by the countryside policy and therefore relates to</p>	<p>“ development which requires a rural location will be removed from policy S4” S3 amended to included the</p>	Andrew Thomas	Thomas Taylor Planning

<p>consistent with National Planning Policy Guidance. The prerequisite that only “development which requires a rural location” should be deleted from Policy S4.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy has little relevance to the merits of converting existing buildings that are suitable for re-use but located outside settlements and are within the Countryside. Policy S4 addresses development in the Countryside which, by definition relates to sites outside any of the settlements in the hierarchy so criterion S4(2)(d) should be re-worded accordingly or else deleted.</p> <p>Similarly, S4(2)(e) cross-references with Policy S3 but if redevelopment of previously developed land in a small village is acceptable then it should also merit mention as being acceptable in a Sustainable Village (which is higher up the hierarchy). Also see my comments above regarding Q7 and the need to provide a positive policy framework for the redevelopment of previously developed land well-related to (or on the edge of) Sustainable Villages but outside Limits to Development (which would also fall to be assessed under Policy S4 as being located within Countryside). There is a need for greater consistency between Policy S3 and S4.</p> <p>S4(2)(k) should be re-worded to remove the reference to “small-scale” or else otherwise support new development necessary to serve existing large scale employment providers in the Countryside (eg the only viable option for an existing large-scale employer in the Countryside to expand might be to do so in-situ).</p> <p>S4(2)(l) is more restrictive than suggested by National Planning Policy Guidance and the requirement for such development to demonstrate that it meets a “proven local need” should be deleted.</p> <p>Policy S5(a) appears overly-prescriptive. Whilst fully supportive of the Council’s desire to secure high quality design, the requirement that development should be measured against either the North West Leicestershire Place Making Principles or the Building for Life 12 design quality indicator (or subsequent equivalent standards which may be in place at the time an application is determined) is too prescriptive (and potentially</p>	<p>S4(2)(d).Acknowledged and agreed that the redevelopment of previously developed sites needs to be included within Sustainable Villages. Greater consistency is required between policy S3 and S4 and the local plan will be amended to reflect this. Expansions to existing businesses in the countryside is covered by part (i) of the policy but will be amended to state expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings. Smaller settlements with no or very limited services and facilities are not sustainable locations for development. While there will be no blanket restriction on all housing development in these places, opportunities will be more limited. As a consequence, there will be no need to identify Sustainable Settlement Boundaries for settlements with no or limited services and facilities. The Limits to Development Policy will need to be read in conjunction with the Countryside policy which will allow for some appropriate development, which could include leisure and tourism. Breedon Priory is a garden centre that has diversified into a range of uses including craft shops, cafe etc. The buildings and their surroundings still have an agricultural appearance and retain a relationship with the surrounding open area. The site is quite different in character and use to the adjoining homes and business around The Green and the housing along the east side of Ashby Road. The site has a well landscaped frontage to Ashby Road so that when entering the village from the south, the site appears to be a continuous part of the countryside. Agricultural buildings and nurseries will only be included within the Limits to Development where they relate well to the existing settlement.</p>	<p>redevelopment of brownfield sites within sustainable villages. Part (i) of policy S4 will be amended to state "expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings;"</p>		
--	---	---	--	--

confusing given the “either/or” option). These could be referred to as examples of good practice for assessing development but other yardsticks might also be appropriate and Policy S5 should be re-worded to simply refer to the Council’s expectation that all new development should be of a good standard of design.

The requirement that all new development should include Master Plans to demonstrate how a site will be developed exceeds the national and local requirements for validation and whilst they may be a useful tool for major planning applications, they are seldom essential for smaller scale developments. The Council has powers to require the submission of additional information in the case of outline planning applications and the use of a “blanket” policy requirement such as this is unreasonable and should be deleted from Policy S5.

Limits to Development boundaries should also be identified around smaller settlements (in addition to the listed settlements in the Settlement Hierarchy) and groups of buildings to help clarify their visual and functional relationship with their surroundings and to help to distinguish (with some degree of certainty) where built development ends and the surrounding countryside begins. There remains some potential for accommodating small-scale development within these locations (eg leisure, tourism and employment - as well as housing) and the identification of LtD in these locations (including groups of buildings separated from, but close to, the edges of larger settlements) will provide additional policy guidance to help protect the wider countryside from unrestricted sprawl without fundamentally harming the Council's focus on directing the majority of development to the sustainable settlements identified in the Settlement Hierarchy. The "hierarchy" implied by the current list of "sustainable" settlements need not be affected by this and could be distinguished through appropriately worded planning policies.

The LtD should be extended at the western edge of Breedon to include the land within and surrounding Breedon Priory Nurseries. There is an extensive area of buildings and parking/delivery areas associated with the existing uses there. They

--

--

--

--

<p>form a clearly definable part of the settlement and are both visually and functionally well-related to the settlement being close to the village green and the centre of the village. A small area of land to the rear of the pub car park between the Nurseries and properties on Melbourne Lane should also be included as it is also visually well-related to the nurseries and enclosed by mature hedges. Consideration should be given to identifying this as an "opportunity site" for the redevelopment of existing buildings and facilities supported by residential development and community infrastructure. This would provide an opportunity for some limited planned growth in this Sustainable Village which would help sustain its vitality and role for the wider rural community nearby</p>				
<p>Retention of present units to development to the northeast of Blackhorse hill Appleby magna which could lead to extension of exiting settlement</p>	<p>This issue is covered under S3.</p>		<p>Mr Stephen Turner</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>The proposed policy has a long list of developments/uses requiring a rural location. As framed, the policy appears overly complex and does not clearly set out the nature of development/uses that would require a rural location. It would seem to be appropriate to look to simplify the wording of the policy.</p>	<p>Noted. The policy will be amended to make the wording more positive.</p>	<p>"In areas designated as Countryside on the Policies Map, development for the following uses will be supported:"</p>	<p>Guy Longley,</p>	<p>Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.</p>
<p>It is hereby requested that North West Leicestershire District Council duly considers the inclusion within the Proposed Local Plan and illustrated within the Proposed Policies Inset Maps "Limits to Development" - the following land: Land adjacent to No: 191 Loughborough Road, Whitwick, Leics LE67 5AS. The approx. size of the land is 0.45 Hectares. The land is positioned to the upper eastern end of the village along Loughborough Road - located to the north prior to the road junction with Swannymote Road - adjoining the existing settlement boundary. The land has remained under used for in excess of 10 years, being characteristically flat and framed by the existing settlement boundary and residential properties to the west, by Loughborough Road to the south, by hedgerow and mature tree screen along Swannymote Road to the east and an open small parcel of recreational land with a small stone walled boundary to the north, framing Cademan Wood (Map provided with response). The NWL (interim) Local Plan Sustainable Appraisal Document 4.2.3 (site Appraisal Framework" Table 4.3 supports the Land as being:</p>	<p>It would be inappropriate to include the proposed site within the Limits to Development as this wouldn't be in accordance with the methodology. The methodology can be viewed at: http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/draft_limits_to_development</p>		<p>Martin Ladd</p>	<p>Housemartin Design</p>

<p>a) considered to be available and deliverable in the short term - i.e. less than 18 months</p> <p>b) within a reasonable walking distance - i.e. 1200 metres</p> <p>c) less than 30 min. journey time to a GP/Health Centre by foot and/or public transport</p> <p>d) development unlikely to adversely affect the environment/amenities experienced by would-be occupiers and/or neighbouring areas.</p> <p>e) no loss of employment (through an alternative development)</p> <p>f) within 800 metres to a regular bus service</p> <p>g) within reasonable walking distance to a primary school</p> <p>h) situated entirely within Flood Zone 1</p> <p>i) unlikely to have significant effect on heritage assets of their environment</p> <p>j) able to facilitate a high potential of achieving suitable landscape mitigation or enhancement</p> <p>k) development unlikely to have a significant effect on congestion at key junctions.</p> <p>For the above reasons it is hereby respectfully requested that this application for the inclusion of the land within the Proposed Final Local Plan is considered positively.</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>Notwithstanding the representations with regards to Policy S3 above, and Policy H3 below, it is acknowledged that Policy S4 is intended to be restrictive in accordance with the NPPF to development within the open countryside.</p> <p>Despite the general agreement to the principle of this policy, it is evident from recent years that a number of open countryside sites on the edge of suitable sustainable settlements, are in fact suitable to meet housing and development needs. As such, it is requested that additional consideration is given with</p> <p>regards to housing allocations which can support exceeding the minimum growth target, incorporating additional commentary to provide a level of flexibility to this policy to allow, should the achievement of Policy S2 not be forthcoming, that sites, located to the edge of existing settlements (within or adjacent to the district), which may, subject to a robust assessment of its design and impact, may be suitable for development where they do not have a significant impact on the intrinsic character, beauty and diversity of its landscapes.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy, and its associated designation of the limits to development for the Coalville Urban Area, also removes any defined areas of separation to the eastern extent of Coalville, to this regard, and the comments below related to Policy H3: new housing allocations, it is considered that the area of land to the south of The Green, and north of the former railway, should be excluded from the Countryside designation.</p>	<p>Flexibility has been made to the housing numbers to allow for increased housing growth across the district over the plan period. The Limits to Development have been amended in order to accommodate growth. It is acknowledged that a number of the existing Limits to Development have been breached in recent years, this is due to the Limits to Development now being out of date.</p> <p>The draft Limits to Development have been defined using the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Existing commitments by virtue of an extant planning permission for residential or employment development on the fringes of settlement; (they may not be reflective of recent planning applications) ii. The Limits to Development follow clearly defined physical features such as wall, fences, hedgerows and roads. iii. The inclusion of schools, halls, large houses and other buildings which stand in extensive grounds would depend on their relationship to the overall fabric of the settlement. In some cases, their relative isolation caused by their spacious setting would justify total exclusion, whereas in other cases, the building itself could be included within the Limits to Development but the curtilage excluded. <p>It would therefore be inappropriate to include the site mentioned in your representation.</p>		Alan Hardwick	rg+p
<p>It is hereby requested that North West Leicestershire District council duly considers the inclusion within the Proposed Local Plan and illustrated within the Proposed Policies Inset Maps "Limits to Development" - the following land: land to the rear of Bambro Farmhouse, Ashby Road, Donisthorpe DE12 7QS (map provided). The approximate size of the land is 0.45 hectares. The land is positioned to the rear of Bambro Farmhouse with the existing settlement boundary and residential development to the south (inc. recent planning permission ref No's: 14/00736/FUL and 11/00762/FUL) and established mature hedgerow/tree screen set to the northern, eastern and western boundaries.</p>	<p>The draft Limits to Development have been revised using the following methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Existing commitments by virtue of an extant planning permission for residential or employment development on the fringes of settlement; (they may not be reflective of recent planning applications) ii. The Limits to Development follow clearly defined physical features such as wall, fences, hedgerows and roads. iii. The inclusion of schools, halls, large houses and other buildings which stand in extensive grounds would depend on their relationship to the overall fabric of the settlement. In some cases, their relative isolation caused by their spacious 		Martin Ladd	Housemartin Design

<p>The land has remained under used for in excess of 10 years, being characteristically flat and framed by the aforementioned existing settlement boundary and residential properties to the south, benefiting from an unrestricted direct access (in the same ownership as the said land now subject to this request) to and from Ashby Road.</p> <p>The NWL (interim) Local Plan Sustainable Appraisal Document 4.2.3 "Site Appraisal Framework" Table 4.3 supports the land as being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) considered to be available and deliverable in the short term - less than 18 months b) within a reasonable walking distance of facilities - i.e. 1200 metres c) less than 30 min. journey time to a GP/Health Centre by foot and/or public transport d) development unlikely to adversely affect the environment/amenities experienced by would-be occupiers and or neighbouring areas e) no loss of employment (through an alternative development) f) within 800 metres to a regular bus service g) within reasonable walking distance to a primary school h) situated entirely within Flood Zone 1 i) within the River Mease SAC catchment area j) unlikely to have significant effect on heritage assets or their environment k) able to facilitate high potential of achieving suitable landscape mitigation or enhancement l) developments unlikely to have a significant effect on congestion at key junctions <p>For the above reasons it is hereby respectfully requested that this application for the inclusion of the land within the Proposed Final Local Plan is considered positively.</p>	<p>setting would justify total exclusion, whereas in other cases, the building itself could be included within the Limits to Development but the curtilage excluded.</p> <p>It is therefore appropriate to include this site within the revised Limits to Development.</p>			
---	--	--	--	--

<p>Valuable landscapes and areas of separation should have protection under policy.</p>	<p>The policy is intended to encourage good design as part of new development, landscape and areas of separation is covered by draft Local Plan policy S4. It is proposed to make reference to the Leicester and Leicestershire Historic Landscape Characterisation Study and National Character Areas.</p>	<p>Amend Policy to make reference to the Leicester, Leicestershire Historic Landscape Characterisation Assessment.</p>	<p>C Tandy</p>	<p>Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society</p>
<p>Policy S4 Countryside is generally supported. However, in the absence of a policy to protect and enhance landscapes National Trust considers that this policy either needs to be expanded and strengthened, or supplemented by an additional strategic policy relating to landscape. Refer to comments on Question 53.</p>	<p>It is proposed that reference to the National Character Areas and Historic Landscape Characterisation Assessment are included within the policy.</p>	<p>Amend Policy to make reference to the Leicester, Leicestershire Historic Landscape Characterisation Assessment.</p>	<p>Kim Miller</p>	<p>National Trust</p>
<p>As NWLDC can already demonstrate a five year plus twenty percent housing supply, I request that adequate policies be included, which can be relied upon by NWLDC's Officers to retain areas of countryside, particularly areas of attractive countryside as a natural asset, and for their wildlife and amenity benefits including provision of open space and recreational benefits. Particularly the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, should be protected from any future development, as being an area of particularly attractive countryside.</p> <p>I would like included again, that the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, be clearly identified and protected in the local plan, as being an unallocated Greenfield land located outside the limits to development of Coalville, as defined in the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan, confirmed as being an Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside, forming part of the Charnwood and National Forests. Therefore, should be protected against any future development.</p> <p>Policy S3 of the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan provides a presumption against non-essential residential development in the countryside and Policy E22 of the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan states that development will not be permitted which would adversely affect or diminish the present open character and attractive rural landscape and / or be detrimental to natural habitats and scientific interest. Subsequently, these policies should continue to be included within the future local plan, and given additional weighting if considered</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been revised as part of the draft Local Plan to accommodate the districts housing growth over the plan period. Sites outside the Limits to Development are classed as being in the open countryside and therefore development is limited.</p> <p>The Greenhill Farm site was approved at appeal, although it is now the subject of a legal challenge.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to include policies E1 and E22 as local planning authorities are advised not to designate additional landscape areas. The principles of policy S1 is covered by a number of policies within the draft Local Plan.</p>		<p>Johnathan Bell</p>	<p>n</p>

<p>beneficial.</p> <p>I would like to see the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, protected from any future development, for the below mentioned reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">o This particular area of land is confirmed as an important wildlife corridor linking Bardon Hill SSSI (Site of Special Scientific Interest), Charnwood Lodge NNR (National Nature Reserve), Holly Rock Fields SSSI, and Coalville Meadows SSSI.o This site lies outside of the town's identified Limits to Development, as defined in the North West Leicestershire Local Plan, and is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.o This site is visible from particular points of interest to Coalville, and very much in the landscape between Bardon Hill and Warren Hills. For anybody familiar with Leicestershire, and Bardon Hill (being the highest point in Leicestershire) would confirm that this area and its incredible views of Leicestershire, is very much a jewel in the Crown of North West Leicestershire.o To both Coalville residents and the wider local Leicestershire area, these fields are a valued asset to the community, considered of high community and landscape value. With this particular area being considered as an attractive gateway to Coalville, in what I would consider a tranquil area.				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Just to let you know that our council have asked that the four areas we highlighted,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dawson's Yard • Heather Brickworks • The MTS Site • Station Terrace <p>are included within the red line that gives the potential for development to happen in them. There is already an application outstanding for the MTS Site and we are particularly concerned that Dawson's yard is available as a potential building site if the owner should decide in the future to sell it. The village has had, as you may know, many problems over many years in relation to that site and we would not want it to be used in a similar way in the future if it is possible to prevent it.</p>	<p>All the sites have been assessed and are too far removed from the existing settlement to be included within the draft Limits to Development and would be contrary to the methodology used to define Limits to Development.</p>		<p>Jan Shepherd</p>	<p>Heather Parish Council</p>
<p>Policy S4 seeks to protect the countryside for its own sake and to arbitrarily restrict residential development in any countryside location. Insofar as national policy is concerned, there is only one specific reference within the NPPF to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside (paragraph 17). However, the NPPF merely states that planning should recognise this. It does not go so far as to say that the countryside should be protected for its own sake. Accordingly Policy S4 is not in conformity with the NPPF.</p> <p>Moreover, the boundaries to which the policy relates may not be capable of accommodating the 10,700 dwellings that Policy S2 provides will be delivered over the Plan period. As a consequence, the policy is lacking the flexibility required to deal with changing circumstances (for example the need to increase the Plan's housing requirement so as to meet affordable housing need) and is therefore likely to limit and resist, rather than facilitate, sustainable development. Accordingly the countryside is not defined on the basis of up to date evidence (including evidence why development in the countryside would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits). Policy S4 is therefore at odds with significant parts of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Draft Local Plan Policy S4 sets out the criteria of what type of development will be supported within the countryside, it is therefore allowing development within the countryside but only for suitable uses in accordance with para 114.</p> <p>The draft Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the districts housing requirements up until 2031.</p>		<p>Tim Evans</p>	<p>Bilfinger GVA</p>

<p>Notwithstanding the representations with regards to Policy S3 above, and Policy H3 below, it is acknowledged that Policy S4 is intended to be restrictive in accordance with the NPPF to development within the open countryside.</p> <p>Despite the general agreement to the principle of this policy, it is evident from recent years that a number of open countryside sites on the edge of suitable settlements, are in fact suitable to meet housing and development needs, particularly where a lack of housing supply is identified, or where the (minimum)</p> <p>housing allocation may potentially not be feasible.</p> <p>As such, it is requested that additional consideration is given with regards to housing allocations which can support cross-boundary development, incorporating additional commentary to provide a level of flexibility to this policy to allow, should the development of Policy S2 not be forthcoming, that sites, located to the edge of existing settlements (within of adjacent to the district), which may, subject to a</p> <p>robust assessment of its design and impact, be suitable for development.</p>	<p>Limits to Development distinguish between areas of development and development potential and areas of restraint, such as countryside. The Limits to Development have been amended to accommodate the future growth over the plan period. Any application would have to be assessed on its own merits.</p>		<p>Alan Hardwick</p>	<p>rg+p</p>
<p>Maintaining separation between settlements from South Derbyshire. Villages are at risk of becoming large urban sprawls. Albert Village will disappear at some point!</p>	<p>Noted. The issue of maintaining separation between settlements is covered by local plan policy S4 3 (b)</p>		<p>Andrea Robinson</p>	<p>Ashby Woulds Town Council</p>

<p>As NWLDC can already demonstrate a five year plus twenty percent housing supply, I request that adequate policies be included, which can be relied upon by NWLDC's Officers to retain areas of countryside, particularly areas of attractive countryside as a natural asset, and for their wildlife and amenity benefits including provision of open space and recreational benefits. Particularly the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, should be protected from any future development, as being an area of particularly attractive countryside.</p> <p>I'm of the opinion that adequate policies should be in place to create protection zones for existing communities / hamlets, such as Abbott's Oak, from inappropriate development and urban sprawl.</p> <p>Existing NWLDC policies S3, E1 and E22 of the Local Plan should continue to be referenced, and specific sites protected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NWLDC have already identified preferred sites for housing development, as per the NPPF, including brownfield sites, and town centre sites, and I share the view that these sites should be prioritised over edge of town greenfield sites. 	<p>The Limits to Development have been revised as part of the draft Local Plan to accommodate the districts housing growth over the plan period. Sites outside the Limits to Development are classed as being in the open countryside and therefore development is limited.</p> <p>The Greenhill Farm site was approved at appeal, although it is now the subject of a legal challenge.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to include polices E1 and E22 as these were originally allocated as part of the Leicester and Leicestershire Structure Plan which has since been revoked. The principles of policy S1 is covered by a number of policies within the draft Local Plan.</p>		Mrs Trena Elizabeth Ball	NA
<p>S4 (Countryside) – it is not considered that this policy should cover minerals and waste development. This is a matter that is best addressed in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy S4 It is not considered appropriate for the Local Plan to deal with minerals and waste development within the Countryside (items s & t). Mineral extraction and associated infrastructure should be acceptable in the countryside, but not all waste facilities will be. Indeed, the strategy is for much of the new waste facilities required within the County to be within the built-up areas.</p>	<p>It is agreed that it would appropriate to delete refreence to minerals and waste matters as these are the responsibility of Leicestershire County Council.</p>	Delete S4 (s) and (t)	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council

<p>I have recently been informed that the ‘boundaries for permitted development’ of Appleby Magna are being reviewed? This is of great concern to me, my family and many other residents of Appleby Magna.</p> <p>Much of the proposed changes / extensions to the boundary include local village green spaces and considerable areas of agricultural land. Development on these sites will dramatically change the rural, historical aspect of Appleby, and its nature as a village.</p> <p>Homeowners on the existing village boundary – of which I am one, face the risk of large housing developments taking the place of the open aspect at the rear of their properties. Totally destroying an extremely important part of why these properties were originally purchased, drastically reducing desirability and property value, together with the quality of life currently enjoyed on a daily basis.</p> <p>I also fear that by extending the boundaries for permitted development, this will also give a ‘foot in the door’ for additional in-fill between proposed sites, and allow large numbers of property owners the ability to build / develop within their physical property. Where will this end??</p> <p>Appleby Magna is largely registered as a conservation area. The rural, historical nature of the village is why the majority of residents opt to live here.</p> <p>I believe that the government core strategy for housing considered Appleby as only able to absorb small scale development? And that areas for development have already been allocated with the existing boundaries for development, to fulfil the need for housing in the village? Now it appears that the greed of land owners and property developments is influencing plans, in total disregard to the effects of existing residents, and at the cost of Appleby’s environment.</p>	<p>The Limits to Development have been reviewed using the following methodology set out below. No further development sites are therefore allocated within Appleby Magna other than those that have already been granted planning permission and we are not proposing to make any further amendments to the Limits to development beyond those sites which have since gained planning permission.</p> <p>i. Existing commitments by virtue of an extant planning permission for residential or employment development on the fringes of settlement; (they may not be reflective of recent planning applications)</p> <p>ii. The Limits to Development follow clearly defined physical features such as wall, fences, hedgerows and roads.</p> <p>iii. The inclusion of schools, halls, large houses and other buildings which stand in extensive grounds would depend on their relationship to the overall fabric of the settlement. In some cases, their relative isolation caused by their spacious setting would justify total exclusion, whereas in other cases, the building itself could be included within the Limits to Development but the curtilage excluded.</p> <p>The impact of development in conservation areas is assessed under separate policies and is therefore not relevant when revising the Limits to Development.</p>		Stuart C Morris	N/a
---	--	--	-----------------	-----

<p>Please provide further comments;</p> <p>S4(1) should additionally include: its contribution to the characteristics of settlements</p> <p>S4(1) has far too many options for justifying development in the countryside. In particular the following should be removed:</p> <p>(g) Affordable Housing – The plan makes generous provision for housing and within this for affordable housing. Including this clause only encourages developers to under provide affordable housing within permitted sites and then apply for development in the countryside. See further comments in relation H5 (Q14). (i) Extensions to existing businesses – if businesses are expanding then they should move to sites allocated for economic activity under the plan.</p>	<p>S4 (1) already mentions the existing character of the area, it is proposed to amend the policy to make reference to the National Character Areas and the Leicester and Leicestershire Historic Landscape Characterisation Study.</p> <p>There is no blanket approach to allowing affordable housing within the open countryside. Rural Exception Sites are required to meet the needs of local communities, as identified in the SHMA. This approach enables the delivery of affordable housing to meet local need on land which is identified as countryside that would not normally be released for housing. ' Exceptions' sites are usually managed by a housing association and can provide homes for existing residents or those with a family or employment connection to the local community.</p> <p>A genuine need to live in the village must be established before sites are considered and a planning application submitted.</p> <p>Noted the policy needs to be made clearer in setting out the requirements for extensions to businesses in the countryside.</p>	<p>Amend Policy to make reference to the Leicester, Leicestershire Historic Landscape Characterisation Assessment.</p>	<p>Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment</p>	<p>Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation</p>
<p>Pegasus Group act on behalf of Stuart Andrews, who has land interests at Mill Street, Packington. The site is located to the north of Packington; to the north of Mill Street and west of Ashby Road. A site location plan is at Appendix 1, which shows that the site extends to 1.56ha. The site at Mill Street falls within the Limits to Development as set out by policy S4 of the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy S4 sets out that land outside the Limits to Development is identified as countryside which will be protected “for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all”. This approach is consistent with the Framework and is therefore supported.</p> <p>NWLDC consulted on the revised draft Limits to Development with Town and Parish Councils between 17 November and 9 January 2015. The consultation pages of the NWLDC website confirm that the draft Limits to Development have been defined using the following criteria: i. Existing commitments by virtue of an extant planning permission for residential or employment development on the fringes of settlement; (they may not be reflective of recent planning</p>	<p>Noted. Development that will be supported within the Limits to Development is set out within draft Local Plan S3 - Settlement Hierarchy.</p>		<p>Pegasus Group on behalf of Stuart Andrews</p>	<p>Pegasus Group</p>

<p>applications) ii. The Limits to Development follow clearly defined physical features such as wall, fences, hedgerows and roads. iii. The inclusion of schools, halls, large houses and other buildings which stand in extensive grounds would depend on their relationship to the overall fabric of the settlement. In some cases, their relative isolation caused by their spacious setting would justify total exclusion, whereas in other cases, the building itself could be included within the Limits to Development but the curtilage excluded.</p> <p>Inset Map 19 for Packington shows the draft Limits to Development and the extent of Countryside under policy S4. The site at Mill Street is included within the proposed Limits to Development. This approach is supported given that the proposed limits now follow clearly defined physical features and include buildings which are present on the site.</p> <p>Appendix 1 provides a glossary, and for Limits to Development this sets out that these limits will “provide clear, defensible boundaries around settlements within which development will normally be confined. Limits to development distinguish between areas of development and development potential and areas of restraint, such as countryside”. It would be helpful for policy S4 to set out clearly that the Local Plan will respond positively to small-scale opportunities for development within the defined Limits to Development of Sustainable Villages, such as Packington.</p>				
<p>Yes. I agree with the overall approach. I do however notice that the map shows pretty much any area not yet built upon to be classified as countryside.</p> <p>This indirectly means that any new larger development will likely be within this 'countryside'. It may be worthwhile classifying the suitability of 'countryside areas' for development, as some areas will be much more suitable than others, rather than everything being identified as countryside.</p> <p>It is very useful however to see what areas are identified as outside existing development. I would add that areas of physical and perceived separation could be highlighted on the map, such as areas of separation between built up areas and areas of separation between counties.</p>	<p>The area outside of the Limits to Development of sustainable settlements is defined as countryside as the draft Limits to Development have already been revised to accommodate the housing requirements over the plan period.</p>	<p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state “Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extensions to these settlements is supported in principle”.</p>	<p>Mrs. A Saxby</p>	<p>n/a</p>

<p>The Policy is Unduly onerous and should be substantially reworded.</p> <p>Policy S4 is unsound. it represents a blanket approach to development outside the defined settlement policy boundaries which does not accord with the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the Framework. Any policy for the protection of the environment should be established in light of the national policies contained in the Framework, particularly para 109 to 125.</p> <p>para 109 sets out that the planning system should contribute to and enhance valued landscapes with advice in para 133 stating that Local Planning Authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposal fro any development on or affecting such sites should be judged. in addition, para 113 highlights that distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites so that protection is commensurate with their status.</p> <p>It is important to note that this advice does not suggest a ban on all development in or adjacent to these designated areas and that the weight that can be attached to any conflict with such designations should be aligned with their importance based on the hierarchy detailed above.</p> <p>The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead without delay. The use of settlement limits restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required in the framework.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan policy has been drafted in accordance with the NPPF, the countryside policy does not rule out all development within the countryside and sets out suitable uses that are acceptable within the countryside. The site is then required to be assessed against set criteria. NPPF para 109 states “The Planning System should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by...”.</p> <p>Para 133 is referring to the loss of heritage assets and is covered by a separate policy in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Para 113 of the NPPF is covered by local plan policy En1 which seeks to protect biodiversity and geodiversity sites. It is agreed that landscape needs to be included within policy S4 or as a separate standalone policy.</p>	<p>Amend Policy to make reference to the Leicester, Leicestershire Historic Landscape Characterisation Assessment.</p>	<p>Phil Bamford</p>	<p>Gladman on behalf of Wilton Balmore.</p>
--	--	--	---------------------	---

<p>As NWLDC can already demonstrate a five year plus twenty percent housing supply, I request that adequate policies be included, which can be relied upon by NWLDC's Officers to retain areas of countryside, particularly areas of attractive countryside as a natural asset, and for their wildlife and amenity benefits including provision of open space and recreational benefits. Particularly the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, should be protected from any future development, as being an area of particularly attractive countryside.</p> <p>It is important that policies recognise and afford proper protection for our open spaces and Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside, as well as providing valuable wildlife habitat and enhancing biodiversity through protection of green infrastructure within established ecological networks.</p> <p>I would like included again, that the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, be clearly identified and protected in the local plan, as being an unallocated Greenfield land located outside the limits to development of Coalville, as defined in the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan, confirmed as being an Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside, forming part of the Charnwood and National Forests. Therefore, should be protected against any future development.</p> <p>Policy S3 of the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan provides a presumption against non-essential residential development in the countryside and Policy E22 of the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan states that development will not be permitted which would adversely affect or diminish the present open character and attractive rural landscape and / or be detrimental to natural habitats and scientific interest. Subsequently, these policies should continue to be included within the future local plan, and given additional weighting if considered beneficial.</p> <p>Existing NWLDC policies S3, E1 and E22 of the Local Plan should continue to be referenced, and specific sites protected, such as the land at Greenhill Farm,</p>	<p>The Limits to Development once the Local Plan has been adopted will be up to date and will therefore planning applications will have to be determined against the policies within the Local Plan. The Greenhill Farm site was approved at appeal, although it is now the subject of a legal challenge.</p>		Jonathan Ball	n/a
---	---	--	---------------	-----

<p>south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire.</p> <p>I would like to see the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, protected from any future development, for the below mentioned reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This particular area of land is confirmed as an important wildlife corridor linking Bardon Hill SSSI (Site of Special Scientific Interest), Charnwood Lodge NNR (National Nature Reserve), Holly Rock Fields SSSI, and Coalville Meadows SSSI. o This site lies outside of the town's identified Limits to Development, as defined in the North West Leicestershire Local Plan, and is considered best and most versatile agricultural land. o This site is visible from particular points of interest to Coalville, and very much in the landscape between Bardon Hill and Warren Hills. For anybody familiar with Leicestershire, and Bardon Hill (being the highest point in Leicestershire) would confirm that this area and its incredible views of Leicestershire, is very much a jewel in the Crown of North West Leicestershire. o To both Coalville residents and the wider local Leicestershire area, these fields are a valued asset to the community, considered of high community and landscape value. With this particular area being considered as an attractive gateway to Coalville, in what I would consider a tranquil area. 				
<p>Yes – however, CDPC feels that additional wording could be included along the lines of policy He1, point 2 in that, “There will be a presumption against development outside of the limits of development that will be harmful to the significance and importance of the open countryside. Any development proposal that would cause harm to the open countryside will be refused permission, unless the works are justified, there are overriding public benefits and mitigation measures are secured”. CDPC to forward its own Open Countryside policy for consideration.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan needs to be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, which doesn't rule out development within the open countryside. The Local Plan needs to be positively prepared and supportive of growth that is appropriate within the countryside. It should be noted that although certain types of uses are appropriate within the open countryside outside the Limits to Development they still needs to be assessed against the impact on the character of the landscape and a number of other factors set out within draft Local Plan policy S4 part 3.</p>		<p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p>	<p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p>

<p>Policy S4 (1) seeks to protect the countryside and prevent development, except in a limited number of circumstances (Policy S4 (2)). Rosconn Group object to this approach as it is not in compliance with the core planning principles of the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF now requires (para 17) Local Plans to “recognise” the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, but it is no longer subject to a blanket protection from development where identified development needs exist. Similarly whilst the NPPF (para 17) “encourages” the use of previously developed land, it does not prioritise it over other suitable and sustainable sites that can equally contribute to meeting identified needs.</p> <p>A countryside protection and brownfield land first approach cannot be adopted in the Local Plan, as the policy imperative must be the delivery of sufficient greenfield and brownfield land to meet identified development needs when they arise. The critical issue to consider is the selection of appropriate and deliverable greenfield and brownfield sites in sustainable locations where the harm can be minimised and effectively mitigated against through the scheme design.</p> <p>The limitation on development in the countryside in parts (1) and (2) of Policy S4 also conflicts with the objectives for the limited expansion of Sustainable Villages, as identified in Policy S3. This is relevant to Heather, where absolutely no development is the plan period is proposed, yet there is clear opportunity to expand the village via a sustainable housing development on the Rosconn Group site adjacent to Sparkenhoe Estate. Development on this site would clearly meet the requirements for Development in the Countryside as set out in part (3) of Policy S4, but would be prevented by parts (1) & (2) without out regard to the contribution it can make to meeting District wide and local development requirements, or the overarching objectives of delivering housing development that can be suitably integrated with the existing built environment and landscape character.</p>	<p>Draft Local Plan policy S4 is not a blanket approach to no development within the countryside, it allows for suitable uses within the open countryside subject to criteria. It is acknowledged that the relationship between policy S3 and S4 needs to be made clearer. The Limits to Development have been revised to accommodate the housing needs of the district over the plan period.</p>	<p>Amend wording in the Local Plan draft policy S4 Sustainable villages to state “Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extensions to these settlements is supported in principle”.</p>	<p>Kirstie Clifton</p>	<p>Rosconn Group Ltd</p>
--	---	--	------------------------	--------------------------

Policy S5 – Design of new development

Question 9 Do you agree with our suggested approach to the design of new development? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any changes required?	Name	Business or organisation name;
Yes	Noted.		Lisa Marron	Resident
Yes	Noted.		Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
Yes	Noted.		Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
<p>All new development from single dwellings to large developments should be encouraged to review the local vernacular and housing elevations/designs should reflect the local character. The days of building standard boxes with soffit and fascia should be stopped.</p>	<p>Noted. Good design is a key priority for the District Council and is encouraged as part of all new developments.</p>		Mark Hutchinson	Mark Hutchinson
<p>Section a) clarification needed on whether Building for Life 12 or NWL Place Making is employed.</p> <p>Section b) need to define what is meant by amenity.</p> <p>Section c) objective has merit however scope to achieve aims is contingent upon land ownerships, contractual obligations so discretion must be employed.</p>	<p>Noted. It is agreed that the design policy it not particularly user friendly and will need revising.</p>		George Breed	Persimmon Homes NMID
<p>Page 33, policy S5. We support this policy which protects new residents from bad neighbour uses and allows existing bad neighbour uses such as livestock buildings and grain driers to be considered when new development is proposed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		Paul Tame	NFU
<p>There is no mention of housing density. This is a key aspect which has direct knock-on effects to the surrounding environment, and should have an absolute maximum, in line with the class of settlement as defined in policy S3.</p>	<p>Noted, the local plan does not set a housing density as this should be judged on a site by site basis as the overall density of the site is dependent on location, topography and character of the local area. For example development within urban areas tends to be of a much higher density than development within more rural settlements.</p>		Stephen Saxby	None
Yes	Noted		Mark Chadbourn	Emerald Eye Ltd
Yes	Noted		Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council

<p>Page 32 - Item 5.25</p> <p>In reality the Council ignore any constraints and just let developers go ahead, even if it is unsuitable due to local infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Item 5.29</p> <p>The fascination with building more and more terraced housing needs to stop. Better homes and an elevation in standards is what's needed. These new terraced type houses which abut or are very close to the pavement are not required. They are not in historically sensitive or conservation areas and are holding the town back.</p> <p>Page 33 - Item 5.30</p> <p>"A greener footprint"</p> <p>All requirements for National Forest planting should be delivered within the development and not on some field miles away. It's accepted that trees improve the quality of life and would mean even less farm land lost.</p> <p>This section also continues to mention cycling and walking opportunities. NWLDC ignore the needs of both walkers and cyclists with each new development, whether housing, retail or industrial there are opportunities missed.</p> <p>The plan should detail what facilities must be provided. Without that specification this cannot be called a plan and no consistent provision will be delivered.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council currently uses design quality indicators to avoid subjective assessments of design quality. Within North West Leicestershire we use two design quality indicators to determine quality applications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - North West Leicestershire Place Making Principles - Building for Life 12 - for residential led developments <p>The council can only determine the application with the house types submitted i.e. terraced style housing that is submitted to the authority. The new local plan does however set policies for the types of houses that should be delivered as part of new developments coming forward for example bungalows.</p> <p>The District Council works to the National Forest Design Charter which states that where planting cannot be accommodated on site then the developers will be expected to make a contribution towards planting. The summary can be viewed at https://www.nationalforest.org/document/information/develop.pdf</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the design policy could be more user-friendly and will therefore be reviewed.</p>		Steve Palmer	NA
Yes	Noted		Phil Larter	None

<p>The District is blessed with large parts within the National Forest and adjoining the Charnwood Forest Regional Park and any new housing should reflect this. Extensions to existing villages should not be of such size as to lose their rural character but should accommodate and give sustainable access to the open countryside on their doorsteps. Something akin to the Garden City concept would improve the quality of life for residents. Any development should afford easy access to such opportunities with the health and wellbeing benefits that affords. Full consideration should also be given to the rights of way network and not just within the confines of the actual development. Possibilities may be there to enhance access by way of the network for other residents by the creation of new links. Further to that footpaths should not be subsumed into estate roads as the therapeutic benefits of walking include the sense of calm etc coming from walking a footpath through green spaces.</p>	<p>Noted. Draft Local Plan supporting text to policy S5 discusses that potential for the design of new developments to reflect that of the National Forest. North West Leicestershire Place Making Principles encourage good design to encourage a healthy lifestyle with access to open spaces and linking new and existing developments through the use of footpaths.</p>		<p>Terry Kirby</p>	<p>Chairman local access forum</p>
<p>No. The extension of the draft Limits to Development to the west and north west of Mill Street in Packington village would be contrary to draft policy S5.</p>	<p>Although Limits to Development are defined in the 2002 adopted Local Plan, their preparation dates back to at least 1993, so they have not been fully reviewed for over 20 years. At the time they allowed for some new development, but over time those opportunities have become more constrained. It is therefore important that the Limits to Development are revised to accommodate the growth required up until 2031.</p>		<p>Keith and Sandra Goodwin</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>The Parish Council feels that sustainable development should not be built on an area of flood plain and consideration should be given to the effects of surface water run-off downstream.</p>	<p>Noted flood risk issues are covered as part of draft Local Plan Policy Cc3, allocated development sites have also been assessed against the SRFA 2015, which assess flood risk across the district.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan also sets the need for assessing the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to mimic the natural drainage process whilst removing pollutants from urban runoff at the source before entering a watercourse.</p>		<p>Samantha Lockwood</p>	<p>Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>		<p>Mr Robert Harlow</p>	<p>Harlow Bros Ltd</p>
<p>National Forest green infrastructure requirements need to include for maintenance arrangements over a much longer period than the current requirement of five years and be supported by a commuted sum. If such areas and associated planting are not adopted by a public body with future maintenance falling to residents, it is likely that such areas and planting will not be adequately maintained and will become a problem and a nuisance rather than an asset.</p>	<p>Noted. The management of the woodland provided on site is set out within the S106 agreement that sets out the need to provide the planting. Management is normally carried out by the National Forest, North West Leicestershire District Council or Parish Councils.</p>		<p>Frank Bedford, MBE</p>	<p>Willesley Environment Protection Association</p>

Yes	Noted		F J ALLGOOD	Land Owner
All new builds are completely ugly and artificial looking. Monotonous!	Noted. The inclusion of draft Local Plan Policy S5 will be used to assess future planning applications to promote the good design of future developments.		None	none
No	Noted		Olive kearins	Na
No	Noted		david harris	Pyrotect Ltd
The design does not include any provision for the long term protection of the existing green spaces in the form of Local Green Space. This omission has to raise questions over the future of Ashby's green space.	The protection of specific areas of green space is covered by other policies within the local plan.		Colin Eaton	Colin Eaton
See comments above	Noted.		Simon Litchfield	Resident
<p>Policy S5 outlines that 'all new development will have no demonstrate how it satisfies the Council's place-making principles and should include the use of Master Plans to demonstrate how a site will be developed.'</p> <p>Criterion (a) of Policy S5 already outlines that design will be measured against the Place-Making Principles and as such this is duplication/repetition of the same objective. The latter should therefore be removed.</p> <p>In addition the Council's objective for 'all new developments' to provide Master Plans is completely onerous and would in any event be covered again in the Place-Making Principles. As such it is considered that this sentence should be omitted from the policy.</p>	Agreed the policy needs to be made clearer, the first part of the policy is intended to set out where development will be supported, whilst the second part of the policy is setting out how we expect the applicant to demonstrate the proposal meets the objectives of the first part of the policy.		Angela Cornell	Fisher German
No			Andrew Stone	NA
See comments on locations and size above.	Noted.		Mary Lorimer	Not appliccable

<p>There is a difference in the 'Limits to Development' between the adopted and draft Proposals Map that removes some of my client's land from the area within Limits to Development, as highlighted yellow on the draft Proposals Map below.</p> <p>It is not explained in the draft Local Plan why this change has been made. My client would request that the Limits to Development are not changed and that the yellow land remains within the Limits to Development. This is because the change might unduly constrain the satisfactory conversion of a stone barn immediately within the current Limits to Development, as coloured blue on the plan above. A planning application (reference 15/00949/FUL) has already been submitted for this conversion, along with the development of 3 new dwellings on Hall Field Farm. Some of the land highlighted yellow is necessary for extension of the barn to form a dwelling and formation of a residential curtilage, whilst creating a cohesive development with the remaining Hall Field Farm site. Without this land the potential for conversion and enhancement of the stone barn within the Conservation Area would be unduly constrained.</p>	<p>The revised Limits to Development have been defined using the following methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Existing commitments by virtue of an extant planning permission for residential or employment development on the fringes of settlement; (they may not be reflective of recent planning applications) ii. The Limits to Development follow clearly defined physical features such as wall, fences, hedgerows and roads. iii. The inclusion of schools, halls, large houses and other buildings which stand in extensive grounds would depend on their relationship to the overall fabric of the settlement. In some cases, their relative isolation caused by their spacious setting would justify total exclusion, whereas in other cases, the building itself could be included within the Limits to Development but the curtilage excluded. <p>The barn does not currently have permission for its conversion and therefore should remain outside of the Limits to Development, it is important that the Limits to Development are prepared consistently for all sustainable settlements across the district.</p>		Caroline Chave	Chave Planning
Partially agree, but mix environment should be on individual site,	Noted.		Trevor Davis	None
Agree in principle, however again Parish Council local knowledge should be taken into consideration at early planning stage	Noted.		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
Yes	Noted.		Edward Hines	N/A
<p>The criteria used by planning for determining that a village is considered 'sustainable' is too low. Appleby Magna has very limited village resources. There is no doctors surgery, even though developers have continued to state the village still has this facility for a significant time. The basic public transport has now been reduced further. It does not now travel to the nearest town (Ashby) at all, and does not support any typical daily commuter requirements. There is a small store in the village, but the vast majority of residents shop out of the village.</p> <p>Developments should favour those with close proximity to, or transport links with centres of employment.</p>	<p>The sustainability of settlements is regularly monitored. The sustainability of settlements is measured to meet residents every day needs for example a settlement has a school, public transport to access services in neighbouring settlements, a local shop, it is not expected that residents would be able to do all of their shopping within the village. This issue is covered by policy S3.</p>		Mr Richard Hine	Resident of Appleby Magna
Policy S4 2 k leaves the door wide open for industrial development in the countryside, particularly the phrase "farm diversification".	It is the role of the Local Plan to support rural economic growth whilst balancing the need to protect the countryside. This approach is consistent with the NPPF.		David Bigby	Private individual

No	noted		Nick Wilkins	NW
Yes	Noted		Lance Wiggins	Landmark Planning
Due to the demise of the coal and manufacturing industries in this area, and the influx of migrants from eastern europe the wages for working people have stagnated or fallen. it is impossible for anyone on minimum wage to afford to buy or rent property.. tower blocks were built after WW2 to provide cheap housing for the working classes, but they turned into ghettos, and are gradually being torn down. whether the council can come up with anything better is unknown.	Draft Local Plan policy S5 will be used when determining applications in order to ensure a good standard of design, in new developments.		Yvonne Willars	retired
While the Policy is generally supported, the National Forest Company considers that the Place Making Principles (set out in Paragraph 5.30) should be included within the Policy to afford them additional weight. The inclusion of a National Forest-inspired identity as a Place Making Principle is welcomed and supported. We would welcome the opportunity to work with the Council on the proposed Design SPD.			Philip Metcalfe	The National Forest Company
Yes	Noted		Mr. j Lewis	1950
Yes	Noted		Steve Johnson	YYYY
Important where safe to preserve existing trees on site and in particular on edge of development to form a screen	Noted.		Lesley Birtwistle	not applicable
Not really sure that this criteria for design of new development takes into account villages with lack of facilities, increasing car usage and destruction of our wildlife.	Draft Policy S5 is used to ensure good sustainable design as part of new developments. It is the role of the design policy to deliver services and protect wildlife sites as these issues are covered by other policies within the draft Local Plan.		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
Yes			Hugh James	n/a
Yes			Paul Varty	Resident of Appleby
Transport needs to be a key driverr. Many people need to travel to work so locating the majority of the building near the main transport routes (M1 and M42) is critical. Location of building at Bardon for the M1 and Ashby for the M42 should be focus. Also transport to town centres - building should be located where there are existing bus routes or where the size of the new build will lead to the creation of new bus routes. Also, due to the number of houses that need to be built, it is key to focus the builds on areas that will meet the requirements using a small number of large developments, rather than ruin the countryside by building a large number of small developments.	The sustainability of new development sites will be assessed against the relevant policies within the Local Plan as part of determining the planning application. Draft Local Plan Policy S5 looks to promote good design.		John Edwards	XMOS Semiconductors Ltd

Yes, welcome 'future growth of settlement not compromised'	Noted.		Tim Abbott	Householder
<p>The sites identified seem logical.</p> <p>Pressure must be placed on Government to understand the situation regarding HS2 so sites currently held in stalemate can be brought on stream as quickly as possible.</p> <p>This also applies to the railway line connection to Coalville and the proposed development at the back of Bardon Road. DO NOT lose our rail link. It may not be feasible at the minute but it will be in a few years to come.</p>	The District Council is awaiting a Government announcement in relation to HS2 expected in Autumn 2016 until a decision can be made in relation to reserve sites. Draft Local Plan policy IF5 protects the Leicester to Burton Line.		Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying
<p>I whole-heartedly agree that we need to focus on environmentally responsible design for future housing and suggest that a recognised standard is adopted, to avoid the opportunity for "greenwash". To re-iterate my earlier comment, an important aspect is not to underestimate the ecosystems services value of green infrastructure, in particular the role of green space in flood attenuation; hence greenfield sites should be protected development.</p>	Noted. Policy S5 is concerned with achieving good design and it is recognised that this includes provision of open space as part of new development?		Elaine Robinson	Not applicable
<p>However, we would make reference to innovative proposals such as self/custom build opportunities.</p>	Noted. Self build and custom build proposals will be assessed in the same way any other proposal is assessed against the design policy and all the other policies contained within the Local Plan.		Mrs Penny Bicknell	Les Stephan Planning Ltd
Yes			Lesley Colley	None

<p>I agree with the overall suggested approach to the design of new development. I would like to add that safety of residents needs to be a key aspect of road planning and access for any new development.</p> <p>Spaces that encourage mixed transport methods all to use one route are not safe.</p> <p>For example, if you have a new development which does not use the typical 'pavement and road' layout but instead has 'blended regions' typically block paved in an effort to encourage less use of vehicles. They may look nice on paper but in reality you are left with unsafe areas. There is not a designated area for pedestrians or for cyclists, so cars, bikes, and pedestrians all end up trying to use the same space. If you add parked cars, delivery lorries and the need to push prams or wheelchairs around you end up with many potential accidents in such areas. Wide pavements are required and dedicated cycle ways. That is the best way to encourage less use of vehicles - not multi-transport 'blended areas'.</p>	<p>Noted. Spaces that are mix transport methods are designed to slow down traffic to make the spaces equally as accessible and safe for pedestrians.</p>		<p>Alison Saxby</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>No. KPC consider that design should be more sustainable/green development as a matter of principle. We would like to see energy consumption levels to be included as a factor, working towards 2019 with a 'near to zero target' [meeting National aspirations].</p> <p>The approach for architectural quality should include the intention to reduce energy consumption whilst guarding against summer overheating, particularly for new developments aimed at the older population. This will be difficult to achieve where building close to the airport / M1/ Roxhill developments will require [closed] double glazing and fenestration design to minimise sound pollution to the useable rooms in a house.</p>	<p>The Government has now revoked the Code for Sustainable Homes and therefore does not allow Local Planning Authorities to include any policies that require sustainable construction over and above what is included within the Building Regulations.</p>		<p>Vicky Roe</p>	<p>Kegworth Parish Council</p>
<p>Policy S5 should give recognition to community initiatives such as Village Design Statements or Neighbourhood plans which provide guidance on appropriate design.</p>	<p>Village Design Statements where they have been adopted by the District Council will support the Local Plan as Supplementary Planning Documents. Where a neighbourhood plan is adopted and contains design policies these policies will get taken into consideration as part of determining a planning application. The supporting text to the Design Policy will be amended to direct the user to Neighbourhood Plans and Village Design Statements.</p>	<p>Amend supporting text to refer the user to Village Design Statements and Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	<p>Lindsay Gene</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Parish Council</p>
<p>No</p>			<p>Sonia Liff</p>	<p>Chair Appleby Environment</p>

<p>We have been supportive of the negotiating skills of the Council's Urban Design Consultant.</p> <p>(a) We remain critical of the terms 'responsive to context' as many of our diverse communities now 'look' the same.</p> <p>(b) Non-motorised 'interconnectivity' has not been sufficiently prioritised. There is no plan to improve connectivity between off-road and Sustrans routes.</p>	Noted.		Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader
<p>The Council's emphasis on the importance of good design in new developments is supported. Davidsons Developments has established a market leading track record in providing high quality new residential development proposals, with sites they have been involved in locally being seen as exemplars of good design principles.</p> <p>Building for Life 12 provides a useful tool to help measure design quality in new developments. The Council needs to ensure that this does not result in unacceptable delays in bringing developments forward.</p>	Noted.		Guy Longley,	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.
<p>Approach should used place making and build for life not either or as stated. Should also follow national policy.</p>	<p>The supporting text states that Building for Life principles will be used for residential development and the Place Making Principles for all other types of development. It is agreed that the policy needs to be reviewed to make the relationship between Place Making and Building for Life clearer.</p>	<p>Design Policy to be reviewed to make it clearer to the user the relationship between the Place Making Principles and Building for Life.</p>	C Tandy	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society
<p>Under Policy S5 – Design of New Development it is not clear how the Council proposes to assess development proposals against Building for Life 12 criteria. The Council's interpretation of the scoring of Building for Life 12 is also incorrect. It is understood that a score of 9 out of 12 greens rather than 12 greens from an independent assessor forum would be sufficient to warrant Building for Life 12 status. This Policy should be modified and re-worded accordingly.</p>	<p>To secure support from the Council, a development proposal must robustly demonstrate that positive performance against BfL is achieved. A positively performing scheme is defined as one where 12 'green indicators' are achieved. Amber indicators against BfL 1 – 3 may be acceptable if these are demonstrated to be outside of the applicant's control or on the basis of viability (BfL4 only); and therefore justified. One of more 'red indicators' would be considered a justification for refusal. The policy will be reviewed to make it clearer how proposals will be assessed against the Building for Life principles.</p>	<p>Design Policy to be reviewed to make it clearer how proposals will be reviewed against the Building For Life Principles.</p>	Susan E Green	HBF
<p>Policy S5: There is no mention of 6Cs Design Guide here, yet it is referred to elsewhere in the document.</p>	<p>Noted. The policy and supporting text will need to be amended to reflect the 6Cs design guidance.</p>		Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council

<p>Please provide further comments;</p> <p>Policy S5 should give recognition to community initiatives such as Village Design Statements or Neighbourhood plans which provide guidance on appropriate design.</p>	<p>Village design statements were adopted by the Council are Supplementary Planning Documents and will therefore supplement the local plan.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans where they have been adopted and include the relevant design policies will be used to determine planning applications for the area in which the neighbourhood plan covers. It is agreed that the supporting text should be amended to refer the use to Village Design Statements and Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	<p>Amend supporting text to refer the user to Village Design Statements and Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	<p>Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment</p>	<p>Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation</p>
<p>S5 (d) Design of new development</p> <p>Future growth of a settlement is not compromised, in particular the ability to connect various developments together over a short or long period of time.</p> <p>My interpretation of this clause leads me to believe that the main aim of development is to be forever expansive with no limits attached where possible, and over the long-term to try to connect all developments to create one giant urban super-settlement.</p> <p>I can't imagine that this was the intended meaning of the clause, and I would suggest its purpose is to prevent a situation whereby organic growth of a settlement (fully supported by local residents) is made difficult due to poor forward planning of a previous development.</p> <p>Therefore I would suggest that this clause is re-written to ensure that it targets its intended message more accurately.</p> <p>Clause 5.26</p> <p>Clause 5.26 references two documents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · North West Leicestershire Place Making Principles · Building for Life 12 (also known as Built for Life) - for residential led developments. <p>And states that these documents serve to remove the subjective-ness from assessments of design quality. Having read the documents, they are no more than a guide with mere suggestions on how designs of developments could be improved, and many of the criteria require a subjective opinion on how to interpret it.</p>	<p>The policy is intended to make new developments accessible to existing developments within settlements to allow the movement and integration between the two communities.</p> <p>Density is not set out within the design policy as this needs to be assessed on a site by site basis depending on the topography of the site and character of the surrounding area etc. It is agreed that the Design Policy will be reviewed to make it more user friendly.</p>	<p>Amend design policy to ensure it is clear to the user what is expected as part of the proposal.</p>	<p>Stephen Saxby</p>	<p>N/a</p>

<p>Furthermore, the clauses 5.25 and 5.27 only “encourage” developers to follow the design principals, suggesting that they may deviate when it doesn’t suit their agenda.</p> <p>In addition, there is no mention of housing density anywhere in the local plan, nor in the design quality indicator documents referenced in S5. This is probably the most important aspect to consider with the design of new developments which deserves a particular mention. The density of developments directly influences every other design factor, including property sizes, traffic and pollution, noise, open space, character, community, drainage and waste. Clearly developers have vast incentives to increase the housing density of their developments as high as possible, therefore I believe this specific aspect must be considered as a stand-alone requirement, with a maximum density defined above which developers cannot go.</p> <p>Thus, this entire section needs to be re-thought, as to its intended function as part of the local plan. It should be more prescriptive, and include specific important requirements to the avoidance of all doubt.</p>				
<p>I also wish you to add to my previous response to Question 9 (further comments), WEPA’s concern regarding the maintenance of green infrastructure on new developments. I attach copies of correspondence that I had had with the National Forest Company and your Planning Officer Ebony Mattley at the time that planning application 14/00520/FULM was being considered. That application being subsequently refused and dismissed on appeal.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Frank Bedford MBE</p>	<p>Willesley Environment Protection Association</p>

<p>Yes. I agree with the overall suggested approach to the design of new development. I would like to add that safety of residents needs to be a key aspect of road planning and access for any new development.</p> <p>Spaces that encourage mixed transport methods all to use one route are not safe.</p> <p>For example, if you have a new development which does not use the typical 'pavement and road' layout but instead has 'blended regions' typically block paved in an effort to encourage less use of vehicles. They may look nice on paper but in reality you are left with unsafe areas. There is not a designated area for pedestrians or for cyclists, so cars, bikes, and pedestrians all end up trying to use the same space. If you add parked cars, delivery lorries and the need to push prams or wheelchairs around you end up with many potential accidents in such areas. Wide pavements are required and dedicated cycle ways. That is the best way to encourage less use of vehicles - not multi-transport 'blended areas'</p>	<p>The idea of using mixed use transport methods is to encourage cars to slow down within residential areas.</p>		<p>Mrs. A Saxby</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Policy S5 on Design of New development is unsound as drafted. It is unduly onerous to expect all development to satisfy the Councils Place making Principles and include Master Plans to demonstrate how a site will be developed. These issues should be considered on a site by site basis dependent upon the type and location of the development. This sentence should therefore be deleted from Policy S5.</p>	<p>The place making principles can be reflected in site layout plans draft policy S5 will be amended to reflect this.</p>		<p>Phil Bamford</p>	<p>Gladman on behalf of Wilton Balmore.</p>
<p>Yes in the main however it is not practical and unrealistic to plan out lower use of vehicles due to the British people's love affair with their cars!</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p>	<p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p>

<p>Below are additional comments for the suggested approach to the design of new development:</p> <p>'A greener footprint' –</p> <p>To create infrastructure (such as electric charging points) to help facilitate the uptake of low emission vehicles that would reduce NO2 emissions.</p> <p>'Connected Places' –</p> <p>Where opportunities exist, the Council could seek new public transport infrastructure and improvements to public transport by working with partners.</p> <p>Para 7.5 – page 54</p> <p>Is the development of a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange still a proposal? It reads as if the development has planning permission.</p>	<p>Noted. Infrastructure to be delivered as part of new developments is covered elsewhere within the local plan. The SFRI since the publication of the draft Local Plan has since gained planning permission.</p>		<p>Grant Butterworth</p>	<p>Leicester City Council</p>
---	---	--	--------------------------	-------------------------------