

TABLE C - HOUSING

Policy H1 – Housing provision: planning permissions

Question 10 Do you agree with our suggested approach in respect of housing sites with planning permission? 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
<p>You have stated that the sites with current planning permission may not build all the houses, and therefore recommending other sites for planning to compensate. I really do think this is a poor approach. You should look at innovative ways of ensuring developers meet the agreed quotas.</p>	<p>We have to ensure that the Local Plan can deliver the required housing needed over the plan period. A large number of sites do already have planning permission, however due to the scale of the sites such as South East Coalville, they cannot be fully built out during the plan period.</p> <p>There are no mechanisms available to the council to require developments to be implemented.</p>		Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
Yes	Noted		Sue Colledge	colledge's florists
Yes	Noted.		Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
<p>Background Paper 4 – Housing paragraph 5.6 bullet point 3 precludes land from being allocated that falls within a proposed Area of Separation.</p> <p>The proposed Area of Separation has not been tested. NWLDC cannot preclude sites from allocation based on untested designations. This approach is both unsound and prejudicial.</p> <p>Policy H3 – Ashby</p> <p>The justification for this allocation stems from a need to meet an anticipated shortfall arising from under delivery at Coalville Bardon Grange and Hugglescote SUE.</p> <p>NWLDC must anticipate what shortfall the proposed Ashby SUE allocation will suffer and in-turn identify more sites to account for this.</p>	<p>Sites that would fall within the proposed Area of Separation were considered however, to allocate such sites would be contrary to the Councils stated desire to maintain separation between Coalville and Whitwick. The District Council will continue to work closely with developers and landowners in the delivery of sites, which will be closely monitored over the plan period. South East Coalville is the only site which has been allocated within the draft Local Plan where evidence suggests that it will not be fully developed during the plan period.</p>		George Breed	Persimmon Homes NMID
Yes	Noted		Stephen Saxby	None
<p>You seem to have met the criteria needed already, and yet an empty brickyard which is for sale is still not on the list</p>	<p>Noted, the sites listed are those sites that currently have planning permission. The brickworks referred to does not have planning permission.</p>		Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council

<p>Page 35</p> <p>Item 6.4</p> <p>From these numbers we do not need any more approvals before 2031? How many of these are much needed affordable homes? The plan should be specific and define the actual numbers.</p> <p>Page 36</p> <p>The plan is up to 2013. The authority should only be allowing developments at this time that will provide completions before the end of 2031. Approval banking should not be permitted beyond ten years out. This ties up land which may or may not be developed or developed for years.</p> <p>The effect of this is that someone may come along with positive plans to do something with the land in question. But banked approvals, which may or may not come to fruition will prevent this. A rolling ten years would be sufficient with costs awarded if developments are not completed.</p> <p>Item 6.12 and question 10</p> <p>This allows land and approval banking which should not be acceptable as this prevents other housing provision on blocked land.</p>	<p>Whilst the number of permissions accords with the overall housing requirements up to 2031, it does not mean that we cannot determine any future planning applications for housing development.</p> <p>The amount of affordable housing required within the district is set out within para. 6.24. The SHMA assessed the affordable housing need over the plan period to be 212 dwellings per annum. A significant amount of affordable housing has already been built since 2011 or is already committed. In the period April 2011 to April 2014 some 258 affordable dwellings were built out of an overall total of 1,028 which equates to 25% of all new builds.</p> <p>The sites within the Local Plan are expected to be delivered by 2031 apart from the sites collectively known as South East Coalville. In this instance land isn't being banked by developers it is the case that due to the size of the site and build rates the site isn't expected to be delivered by 2031. There is no mechanism available to the council to prevent landbanking, even if there was evidence to show that it was happening.</p> <p>Para 6.12 is in relation to sites which have already been granted planning permission and therefore are helping to meet the districts housing requirement up until 2031. Due to these site already having planning permission the Council cannot reverse these decisions. If the permissions were to lapse the Council would have to have robust reasons for not renewing permission as the principle for development on these sites has already been established.</p>		Steve Palmer	NA
NO COMMENT	Noted.		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		Olive kearins	Na
see previous answers and don't just put houses where most houses exist.	The distribution of housing development has been tested as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process. It is important to create a sustainable pattern of development as required by the NPPF.		David Harris	Pyroprotect Ltd
No	Noted		Simon Litchfield	Resident
Yes	Noted		Peter Selby	None

<p>Policy H1 sets out sites which have planning permissions (10 dwellings or more). Site H1n, Land north of Grange Road, Hucclecote identifies 800 dwellings. The site was allocated as part of the adopted Local Plan and was initially identified in the mid-1990's. Despite an outline planning permission for 800 dwellings, with a reserved matters application for 205 dwellings (Phase 1a) following from this, no development has taken place to date, primarily due to viability related issues. It is therefore considered that this should not fully contribute to the housing supply. Of the 800 dwellings permitted, only 205 dwellings can be considered to be deliverable within the plan period.</p> <p>Site H2a - South of Burton Road, Ashby and Site H2I - Loughborough Road, Thringstone both have planning permission and should be included in Policy H1.</p>	<p>In regards to land north of Grange Road, this forms part of the south-east Coalville development site, paragraph 6.7 of the Local Plan details that 1,900 of the total 3,500 dwellings are expected to be built on the site during the plan period.</p> <p>The Local Plan lists sites that were granted permission on or before 1st April 2015. It has been agreed that sites will no longer be identified as part of the Policy.</p>	Delete list of sites from policy	Angela Cornell	Fisher German
<p>The housing strategy is fatally flawed as it is based on the existing road structure. Have to visited the Tesco junction on a Sat afternoon on a good day it can take 15 mins to get through the junction,</p>	<p>The Council, as part of the planning application process consult with the highway authorities to establish the impact of the proposed development on the highway network. The Highways Authorities have been consulted in preparing the Local Plan and are content that the impacts of development on the road network can be satisfactorily accommodated. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p>		Andrew Stone	NA
<p>Planning permission is inconsistent: permission is granted to large developers to build huge quantities of housing on open countryside, but single houses are not allowed.</p>	<p>The sites listed in Policy H1 are sites of 10 or more dwellings. Planning applications are determined against the same criteria, irrespective of the number of dwellings proposed. Each planning application has to be considered on its own individual merits. Table 2 in the Local Plan (pg 35) identifies that there were 4,442 dwellings with planning permission at 1st April 2015. This is more than those sites listed in H1 and includes all sites of less than 10 dwellings.</p>		Mary Lorimer	Not applicable
<p>too much development for ashby should be spread, cannot support this growth all health and welfare facilities will be damaged. Poor public transport.</p>	<p>The direction of growth considered within the draft Local Plan is based on the settlement hierarchy that has been assessed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal. Local Plan Policy IF7 (Development and Infrastructure) requires that development is supported by and makes contributions (as appropriate) to the provision of new infrastructure such as health facilities and public transport.</p>		Trevor Davis	None
Yes	Noted		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
See previous statements	Noted.		Edward Hines	N/A

<p>We agree with the suggested approach and encourage and support the development of sites that already having planning permission to move forward. Additional allocation to be considered as and when applications come in the area's where development is needed to help save time.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Helen Stockdale</p>	<p>Lovell Partnerships</p>
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings are needed in the district (including 1,750 on Money Hill)</p> <p>On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 should be allocated (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site)</p>	<p>Noted. Additional sites have been allocated to ensure that the housing requirements can be met over the plan period.</p>		<p>lynn bradbury</p>	<p>Retailmap Ltd</p>
<p>Levers need to be identified and enforced to ensure that these sites are actually developed. For instance, can a council tax tariff be imposed on undeveloped sites with planning permission? Otherwise a 5 year housing supply deficit will develop and we shall have a developer free for all once again.</p>	<p>The Council can only determine planning applications. Planning permission usually requires development to commence within a certain time period (usually 3 years). There are no other mechanisms available to the council to require developments to be implemented.</p>		<p>David Bigby</p>	<p>Private individual</p>
<p>the limits for development for Moira are correct.</p> <p>There needs to be better transport and health infrastructure in the district, along with schools, leisure facilities etc</p> <p>This should be provided from the outset.</p>	<p>Draft Local Plan Policy IF1 requires new development to be supported by and make contributions (as appropriate) to the provision of infrastructure such as health and other public services, and transport infrastructure, including public transport in order to mitigate the impacts of the development on the environment and local communities.</p>		<p>Paul McCaffrey</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>We agree that the preferred approach provides a good basis for applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Geoff Platts</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>
<p>The North West Leicestershire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2015 Update should be used to determine which sites are at the greatest risk of flooding and support the application of the sequential test as part of any option assessments. In line with national planning policy we would wish to see any new development directed away from those areas at highest flood risk from all sources of flooding.</p>	<p>Noted. The sites listed in Policy H1 already have the benefit of planning permission. In determining these applications consideration will have been given to issues relating to flooding.</p>		<p>Geoff Platt</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>

<p>As efficiently as possible is not measurable and positively prepared. Given the changes in circumstances and reassessment of these proposals the Council refer to, this is open ended and does not therefore contribute to a deliverable housing trajectory over the plan period.</p> <p>Given the above, it does not take into account potential JR Challenges and unforced delays.</p> <p>Also given the plan start date of 2011 renders the last 4-5 years for these sites as irrelevant, thus distorting the trajectory.</p>	<p>The sites listed in Policy H1 have been granted planning permission, these sites would only be reassessed if planning permission lapsed. Policy H1 supports renewals. As the principle of development has been agreed on these sites there would need to be a material change in circumstances for a renewal application to be refused, therefore there is a significant degree of certainty that the sites identified in Policy H1 will be delivered.</p> <p>Applications for a JR must be made within six weeks of the date of a decision. All of the sites listed in Policy H1 have had permission for longer than 6 weeks. Account has been taken of the likely deliverability of these (and other sites) and it is for this reason that additional housing provision is proposed.</p>		Nick Wilkins	NW
<p>When planning permission is refused to any developers they should not be able to appeal. It's a waste of the councils time and the taxpayers money!</p>	<p>Noted. Legally an applicant is entitled to appeal against a refusal of planning permission.</p>		Mrs Melanie Warren	Mrs Melanie Warren
<p>The text refers to permission lapsing. Such permissions could not technically be renewed, however, i agree that applications that are made on sites where permission has recently lapsed would be assessed against the criteria set out in the adopted Local Plan and other material considerations.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		Lance Wiggins	Landmark Planning
<p>Policy H1 suggests that a planning permission will effectively remain in perpetuity on sites identified by this policy, even if the permission lapses. This effectively predetermines the location of development for those settlements listed as part of this policy which could stifle other development opportunities within these settlements from coming forward.</p>	<p>Policy H1 supports renewals of lapsed planning permissions provided that proposals accord with policies in the Local Plan and any other material considerations. The principle of development on the sites listed in Policy H1 has already been agreed however, this would not prevent applications being submitted for other sites which would be assessed on their own merits.</p>		Jennifer Towers	Bloor Homes Limited
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>		Mr. & Mrs Loveless	Retired
<p>No time frame is shown here, The Housing Provision: Resolutions does not say when these developments for 4581 dwellings have been approved, I know that there are several developments which have been approved in Appleby Magna, but none are mentioned here so unless context is provided it appears difficult or impossible to understand your suggested approach.</p>	<p>The sites listed in Policy H1 are those that were granted permission on or before 1st April 2015. Two sites in Appleby Magna are referred to in Policy H1.</p> <p>The site off Measham Road, Appleby Magna was granted permission on 14th November 2014 and the site off Top Street, Appleby Magna was granted permission on 22nd August 2014.</p> <p>All of the sites listed in Policy H2 had a resolution to grant planning permission as at 1st April 2015.</p>		Chris and Sue Nicholls	TMBS
<p>No more additional housing in Ashby other than on the old Arla site.</p>	<p>Noted. Additional housing sites have been identified to ensure the housing requirements are met during the plan period.</p>		Mrs Margaret Murton	In Context

<p>Especially in relation to Ashby and the Ashby area we are concerned that there is too much pressure on housing and roads in the area. There is also pressure on schools. businesses have recently closed in the area, and it is important that businesses are encouraged to return to the Ashby area.</p> <p>it is not a solution to only increase housing in the Ashby area, we are concerned that the schools are full and that there is too much pressure on the town and the town centre. there should be no more housing developments in the Ashby area.</p>	<p>As part of preparing the Local Plan the impact of new development on the supporting infrastructure has been assessed. An infrastructure delivery plan is also being prepared to support the delivery of the Local Plan.</p>		Christopher Bush	NA
Yes	Noted		Mr. j Lewis	1950
<p>It appears, unless I am very much mistaken, that because developers are not, for whatever reason building the houses granted planning permission, then more sites will have to be released. This is exactly what the Council for the Protection of Rural England have said happens with the NPPF. The targets are not met so more land is threatened and so on. The onus should be on developers to use the land or lose it. For instance; the old factory site on Bridge Road Coalville has had outline permission for years now the self set trees are towering above the boundary boards and there seems to be no prospect of action.</p>	<p>The council has to be able to show that it will be able to meet the identified housing needs over the plan period. An assessment has identified that one site (south-east Coalville) will not be built out during the plan period, primarily due to its scale (3,500 dwellings). Policy H1 is not proposing any additional sites but rather recognises that sites have permission and sets out how the council will respond in the event that these permissions lapse. Planning permissions include a condition that requires development to start within three years. There are no other mechanisms available to the council to ensure that developments commence.</p>		Steve Johnson	YYYY
<p>Why is the current housing development north of Atherstone Road Measham not included in this policy, in the same way as the land north of Greenhill Road, Coalville. Does it mean that these dwellings have not been included in the housing supply figures in error?</p>	<p>Policy H1 lists the sites that had been granted planning permission at 1st April 2015. The site to the north of Atherstone Road, Measham was granted permission after this date, on 8th June 2015. The site to the north of Greenhill Road (Ref. H1I) is included in Policy H1.</p>		Stuart Moffat	Resident
<p>A review of all current planning permission in light of previous builds and extensions that have already taken place in villages like Appleby Magna. We have creeping development that is not being taken into account and could continue under the radar.</p>	<p>Noted. The New Local Plan, once adopted, will be be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.</p>		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
<p>The limits to development should ONLY include land at H1a where houses have permission.</p>	<p>The issue of Limits to Development is considered under Policy S4. The capacity of sites listed in Policy H1 reflects the number of dwellings approved on each site.</p>		Hugh James	n/a
Yes	Noted		Tim Abbott	Householder
<p>As before, bring the existing sites held in abeyance on stream as fast as possible to free up the need to build on other sites to bridge the gap.</p> <p>Make more of the fact that NWLDC is contributing significantly to the Governments target to increase the number of homes nationally (currently 21% rising to 27% from a national target of 18%).</p>	<p>The Council will work with developers and applicants to ensure that the legal agreements associated with developments are completed as efficiently as possible so that permission can be issued as quickly as possible.</p>		Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying

Yes	Noted		Heather Parish Council	Heather Parish Council
No	Noted		JON WALTERS	LPT
<p>Identifying housing sites with extant planning permission as part of the overall provision is considered acceptable, subject to there being sufficient impetus in policy to renew such permissions should they lapse. The Council should be aware that, as they form part of the housing land position, the lapsing and non-renewal of extant permissions will have wide and significant implications for the overall housing land position. It must be a priority for the Council therefore to ensure that permissions are started and, where a renewal of permission is required, it focusses on supporting the renewal of that permission. The presence of Policy S1 within the plan, as well as the principle in favour of sustainable development being at the core of the NPPF will likely ease the process of renewing permission and this, alongside the presence of Policy H1 will likely be sufficient in enabling the renewal of permissions should this be required.</p> <p>Policy H1g identifies land with extant planning permission for 895 dwellings south of Park Lane, Castle Donington. Policy H1q identifies land with extant planning permission for 110 dwellings at Ashby Road, Kegworth. Whilst housing development at these locations will likely impact on local infrastructure – including that which may interact with Erewash (in particular the much larger Castle Donington site), by virtue of planning permission having been granted it is assumed that potential impacts have been appropriately identified and mitigated, where required. In the event that planning permission should lapse however, new permissions should be granted on the basis of the most recent evidence available, where feasible and reasonable keeping in mind the principle in favour of sustainable development. The balance between viability and sustainable planning should be met, despite potential added pressure for the Council to renew planning permissions as a result of their tie to the housing provision position. Policy H1 provides for this balance appropriately in our view.</p>	Noted.		Andrew Johnson	Erewash Borough Council
There is already far too much building planned around Ashby and Moira. If nothing can be done about this, then it should be used to justify refusals of future applications.	Noted. There is a need for additional housing provision to ensure the housing requirements for the district can be met over the plan period.		Lesley Colley	None

Lapsed applications should be replaced with entirely new applications not just resubmitted.	The process for re-applying for planning permission should it lapse would require the applicant to submit details as required by the current planning application requirements. An application would be determined on its own merits.		George F Stapley	NA
KPC considers that if permission lapses then any new application should be in line with 'Green' or sustainable initiatives and house design requirements included in the NWLDC local plan or any Neighbourhood plan in place at the time of the new application.	Noted, the new Local Plan (once adopted) will be a material consideration in determining planning applications, along with any Neighbourhood Plans in place.		Vicky Roe	Kegworth Parish Council
We do not consider that para 6.8 of the plan is a robust assessment of what will be delivered from the large sites at Coalville, and that the allocation figure of 1,600 dwellings should be treated with caution.	It is estimated that over the plan period 1,900 dwellings will be built at south-east Coalville, out of a total of 3,500. Provision has been made for an additional 1,600 to ensure the housing requirement is met over the plan period.		Tom Beavin	jvh planning
(a) Subject to any changes to the NPPF or its successor, we do not consider draft Policy H1 as being acceptable. It does not take into context changes over the Plan Period into adjacent land use (ie employment, retail or wildlife areas) (b) Heritage Finds on adjacent land could significantly change the landscape importance of the former permitted site during the Plan Period. (c) Change of Community needs could affect land use on the permitted site.	Whilst Policy H1 supports the renewal of lapsed permissions it does require that renewal applications are subject to the policies of the Local Plan and any other material considerations, which could include any changes in circumstances.		Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader
Chapter 6 of the Local Plan further considers housing and considers the response to meeting the housing requirement (set out in Chapter 5), it clarifies that policy S2 sets out that a minimum of 10,700 new dwellings / 535 per annum will be built 2011-2031. It is vital that the Local Plan identifies sufficient housing sites to meet its requirements across the plan period to ensure that it remains up to date and a sound basis for decision making. In particular to ensure consistency with the NPPF it is vital that at the point of adoption, the draft Local Plan is able to provide a robust 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF, including an appropriate buffer (of 5% or 20% to reflect past performance in housing delivery). Should the Local Plan not be able to demonstrate this, in the context of paragraph 49 of the NPPF, its housing policies will be immediately out of date. The Council has published a housing trajectory as	The Local Plan has been positively prepared; the Local Plan identifies a housing requirement significantly in excess of that identified in the SHMA and also makes additional provision to take account of the likely shortfall in provision from south-east Coalville in order to ensure that the identified requirement will be met. The 5 year housing land supply position will be updated.		Christopher Lindley	Development Planning and Design Services

Appendix 2 to the draft Local Plan and it has also published a spreadsheet on its website which provides the “5 year housing land supply 1st April 2015”.

Both documents have been analysed for the purposes of these representations. It is important to note that no detailed justification has been provided by the Council for assumptions underpinning the inclusion of specific sites within the envisaged housing trajectory, nor has a robust methodology been provided to explain assumptions made upon the deliverability of sites. This is also absent from the 5 year housing land supply evidence and the published spreadsheet. On this basis therefore my clients reserve the right to further clarify this with the Council as part of future consultation, particularly should further evidence be published by the Council.

Notwithstanding this, upon undertaking a simple calculation of 5 year housing land supply, it is apparent that based upon the published evidence, and the housing requirement within the draft local plan, a five year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated. Whilst it is accepted that a housing land supply calculation is a “snapshot” in time, it should be robustly qualified and in the context of a draft plan (as noted above), the optimal position is for a Council to be able to demonstrate an adequate supply.

The Council accepts that in the context of past performance, it has failed to deliver sufficient housing to meet policy requirements. In particular from 2006-2011 it failed year on year to meet the requirements of the East Midlands Regional Plan (RSS) accruing a shortfall of some 1,210 dwellings (and only achieving 53% of the dwellings required over that period). Similarly when considered against the annual targets in this draft plan, the Council has accrued a shortfall of some 434 dwellings from 2011-2015.

This is very concerning and suggests a significant long term problem with housing delivery in North West Leicestershire. Whilst this situation is not unusual (and somewhat symptomatic of a recession which has suppressed the construction industry) it is no excuse for not positively planning for the housing that the District urgently needs. As

such, in the context of paragraph 47 of the NPPF “there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing” and a buffer of 20% added to the requirement over the next five years is justified to “ensure choice and competition in the market for land”. This appears to have been accepted by the Council as part of a calculation presented in the 5 year housing land supply spreadsheet.

However what is clear from further analysis of that spreadsheet is that its calculation is incorrect and in the context of the draft local plan, the Council is unable to demonstrate an adequate housing land supply. This is evidenced through a series of simple calculations (included within the representation) which begin with Scenario 1:

Scenario 1 clearly shows that irrespective of whether the supply is provided from sites with planning permission or including additional sites that have been subject to a resolution to grant planning permission (subject to the completion of a legal agreement), a shortfall of between 436 and 1,113 exists.

The housing trajectory provided within Appendix 2 of the draft Local Plan is analysed within Scenario 2. The precise components of supply within this trajectory are unclear, however the Council has added an additional 270 dwellings to its assumed completions over the next 5 years. Scenario 2 clearly shows that even including unsubstantiated components of housing supply, a shortfall of some 166 dwellings remains.

As mentioned earlier in this letter, Gladman Developments have also considered what should be the appropriate housing land requirement for the District, for the purposes of their evidence, a figure of 637 dwellings per annum was used. Scenario 3 presents a calculation of housing land supply based upon that requirement. This also shows an inadequate housing land supply.

On the basis of these calculations it is apparent that a shortfall in housing land supply exists. In respect of the Council’s own published figures the shortfall is between 166 and 1,113 dwellings over the next five years and based upon a housing requirement that has been suggested in evidence at appeal that shortfall could be as high as between

--	--	--	--	--

<p>1,537 and 2,214 dwellings over the next five years.</p> <p>Unfortunately it has not been possible to further analyse the deliverability of the Council's components of supply as no information or commentary has been provided to explain the assumptions behind including or discounting certain sources. Recent experience of Local Plan examinations elsewhere have suggested that this issue is of some interest to Inspectors.</p> <p>Therefore in anticipation of assisting the inspector and ensuring transparency, my client respectfully requests that this information either be provided by the Council by return in response to this letter or published on its website as soon as possible so that it can be fully examined.</p> <p>Irrespective of this, in light of the calculations above, it is submitted that the approach to housing supply within the draft local plan does not comply with paragraph 47 of the NPPF and therefore it is axiomatic that the policies within (for housing) fail to comply with paragraph 182 of the NPPF. My clients submit that the correct solution is to allocate additional land for housing within the plan to ensure the minimum requirements are met. It is submitted that my clients land is an appropriate location for an allocation for up to 81 dwellings to meet identified needs. The rationale for this and the "planning balance" associated with it is provided in proceeding paragraphs.</p>				
<p>The approach is generally supported. Sites with planning permission provide an important component of the Council's housing land supply and the maintenance of a 5 year supply of housing as required by the Framework. In accordance with Policy S1 and the Framework, where development has not come forward, the Council should work proactively with developers to seek to address any issues, including site viability, to ensure that these consented sites deliver the levels of housing anticipated.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Guy Longley,</p>	<p>Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.</p>

<p>Para 6.4 Housing Table 2 - "housing position @ 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 10,759. (A+B+C+D)</p> <p>Para 6.8 identifies an adjusted housing delivery figure of 9,200 dwellings and thereby a shortfall of 1600 dwellings required during the lifetime of the plan period until 2031.</p> <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 in the assisting the delivery of the forecasted figure within the lifetime of the plan period.</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 6.8 suggests it is likely that 9,100 dwellings will be built over the plan period not 9,200.</p>		<p>Martin Ladd</p>	<p>Housemartin Design</p>
<p>Also take account of national policy.</p>	<p>Noted, the policy includes reference to all material considerations which includes national policies.</p>		<p>C Tandy</p>	<p>Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society</p>
<p>The authority's sites with planning permission contained within H1 form part of the evidence base which underpins and informs the Plan's housing policies. They are the Council's 'commitments' not its 'allocations'. There is therefore, no need for the Plan to contain a policy listing the sites within the District that benefit from planning permission and which provides that planning permission will be renewed for development on these sites in the event that it lapses.</p> <p>In addition, the data contained in the policy will be out of date very quickly.</p> <p>Accordingly, this policy should, in our view, be deleted.</p>	<p>It is agreed that sites should not be included in the policy as the information becomes out of date very quickly. It is considered, however, appropriate to include a policy to set out how the council will deal with situations where permissions lapse so as to provide some certainty.</p>	<p>Delete list of sites from policy</p>	<p>Tim Evans</p>	<p>Bilfinger GVA</p>
<p>Many of the approved developments have been outside of the limits to developments. Consequently this policy should either be enforced or removed. An example is a proposed development off The Green in Donington Le Heath.</p>	<p>Noted. The issue of Limits to Development is referred to in Policy S4.</p>		<p>Simon Weaver</p>	<p>Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish Council</p>

<p>Ashby Woulds Town Council has considered the draft local plan and submits the following representations;</p> <p>The details contained within the local plan for Moira do not consider all of the planning approvals that are now in place, for example the Norburys Farm development on Ashby Road, together with more recent approvals (houses next to Gillivers, houses next to the Railway pub etc)</p> <p>If developments aren't managed within the parish we run the risk of losing our rural status. If we increase housing beyond the threshold leading to loss of grants we may require increase in precept that will add pressure to household budgets</p> <p>The district has mining legacy issues and lessons need to be learnt from the Measham Road development. Not least of which is that in any future developments more detailed surveys need to be undertaken, which address both current and potential risks and the appropriate remedial actions taken. These should include the removal of shallow coal seams and intensive drilling to determine the potential for unrecorded mine shafts.</p>	<p>Policy H1 lists those sites of 10 or more dwellings that had planning permission at 1st April 2015. The site at Sweethill Lodge Farm is yet to be determined.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy En6 (Land and Air Quality) requires that planning applications on sites within the Coal Mining Development Referral Area be accompanied by detailed investigation and assessment of issues, and that appropriate mitigation measures are identified which avoid any adverse impacts upon the site and/or adjacent areas.</p>		Andrea Robinson	Ashby Woulds Town Council
<p>Leicestershire County Council's land main interests in North West Leicestershire District that it would seek to promote through the consultation process are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former Forest Way, Waterworks Way, Coalville • Industrial Portfolio in Coalville • Station Road, Ibstock • Heather Lane, Ravenstone • Ramscliffe Avenue, Donisthorpe • Hill Street, Donisthorpe <p>Policy H1 which relate directly to LCC sites, Former Forest Way, Waterworks Road, Coalville, Station Road, Ibstock and Heather Lane, Ravenstone is supported.</p> <p>Page 36-38: Planning permissions: The approach (to consider permitted, yet undeveloped/lapsed</p>	<p>Noted. The policy requires that regard is had to all material considerations.</p>		Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council

<p>permissions) is acceptable in theory. However, under 'Travel plans, transport assessments and statements in decision-taking' states that "It is important to give appropriate consideration to the cumulative impacts arising from other committed development (i.e. development that is consented or allocated where there is a reasonable degree of certainty will proceed within the next three years). At the decision-taking stage this may require the developer to carry out an assessment of the impact of those adopted Local Plan allocations which have the potential to impact on the same sections of transport network as well as other relevant local sites benefitting from as yet unimplemented planning approval." Therefore, if a site is unlikely to proceed, or if it not allocated within the Local Plan, it may be difficult to require its consideration. However, in our experience, consideration can usually be secured with some guidance from the LPA.</p>				
<p>Question 10 - Planning consents that lapse should not be renewed without careful analysis and assessment of the reasons why they have not been implemented. They should then be judged against the policies of the Development Plan and the NPPF with no pre-ordained outcome. The fact the planning consent was previously granted is a material consideration, but it is important that housing is delivered. Sites that have failed to deliver and where there is no obvious change in their circumstances should not have the benefit of a renewal of their planning consent because this may prevent another site or sites that are deliverable from coming forward.</p>	<p>Whilst Policy H1 supports the renewal of lapsed applications it does require that a renewal application is subject to the policies of the Local Plan and also any other material considerations. Policy H1 also states that evidence regarding the deliverability of the site will also be taken into account when considering renewal applications.</p>		Sigma Plan	Sigma Plan on behalf of Hallam Land Management
<p>Section 38(6) of The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless materials considerations indicate otherwise. Rosconn Group do not, therefore, agree with the assumption that lapsed planning permission on the sites listed in Policy H1 should be automatically renewed, as in many cases the policy context will have significant changed form when the planning permission was granted. Indeed, given the importance of the delivery of housing in the District, the failure to implement the existing planning permission and the overall housing land supply position in the District will be important material considerations to take into account.</p>	<p>Whilst Policy H1 supports the renewal of lapsed applications it does require that renewals are subject to the policies of the Local Plan and any other material considerations, including deliverability of the site.</p> <p>The housing requirements in the Local Plan are above the OAN to ensure the required housing numbers are delivered during the plan period.</p>		Kirstie Clifton	Rosconn Group Ltd

Indeed, it is apparent that the sites included in Policy H1 make up a very substantive part of the housing land supply in the District. In that regard simply seeking to renew planning permissions cannot be the ultimate objective, the delivery of the housing sites is, and that should be the central objective of the policy.

Moreover, it is apparent that the Local Plan has no contingency arrangements embedded within it to address a shortfall in provision that would arise if the planning permission on any one or more of these sites does expire and is not renewed.

Policy H2 – Housing provision: resolutions

Question 11 Do you agree with our suggested approach in respect of housing sites with a resolution to grant planning permission? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any changes required	Name	Business or organisation name;
<p>There are a significant amount of new dwellings planned for Ashby De La Zouch. As Nottingham Road through Ashby is already heavily congested both getting into and out of Ashby there should be very careful consideration given to how cars will access the sites. The pavements on Nottingham Road are very narrow and the increase in traffic will increase pedestrian safety issues. Given the significant increase in dwellings and residents in Ashby there needs to be much greater commitment to improving public transport - bus and rail.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Lisa Marron</p>	<p>Resident</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Mr s whitehouse</p>	<p>Personal</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>sue colledge</p>	<p>colledge's florists</p>
<p>Priority should always be given to brownfield sites and those which are most sustainable i.e. where proximity to services and public transport is genuinely viable.</p> <p>It seems perverse that such a policy is can be adopted in the absence of parallel policies on infrastructure development. Whilst developers make contributions, the overall need for development will sometimes require the local authorities to provide major investment to allow development to proceed. This should surely be recognised in the policies?</p>	<p>Noted, the redevelopment of brownfield sites is the preferred option in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Policy H2 refers to sites where the council has resolved to grant planning permission, subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement. This agreement will normally be required to ensure that the proposed development makes provision for new infrastructure to mitigate the impact of development.</p>		<p>Nigel Garnham</p>	<p>Packington Nook Residents Association</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Stephen Saxby</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Mark Chadbourn</p>	<p>Emerald Eye Ltd</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Alison Wright</p>	<p>Heather Parish Council</p>
<p>NO COMMENT</p>	<p>Noted.</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>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>F J ALLGOOD</p>	<p>Land Owner</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>None</p>	<p>none</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Olive kearins</p>	<p>Na</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>david harris</p>	<p>Pyrotect Ltd</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Simon Litchfield</p>	<p>Resident</p>
<p>6.18 This development should be on hold until HS2 is finalised.</p>	<p>Noted. The Draft Local Plan does identify the issue of HS2 and provides for an alternative site in Measham.</p>		<p>Peter Selby</p>	<p>None</p>

<p>Site H2a - South of Burton Road, Ashby and Site H2I - Loughborough Road, Thringstone both have planning permission and should be included in Policy H1.</p> <p>Site H2g, Land north and south of Grange Road, Hucclecote identifies 2,700 dwellings. This was initially proposed as part of the now withdrawn Core Strategy. The scale of development is such that it is unlikely that it will be all delivered within the plan period. The council acknowledges this and considers that of the combined 3,500 dwellings that 1,900 will be delivered within the plan period.</p> <p>Site H1n (800 dwellings) equates to 23% of the total 3,500 dwellings.</p> <p>Site H2g (2,700 dwellings) equates to 77% of the total 3,500 dwellings.</p> <p>Site H1n is likely to deliver 205 dwellings within the plan period. This equates to 26% of the overall supply.</p> <p>The same formula should be applied to site H2g.</p> <p>26% of the overall supply (2,700 dwellings) equates to 702 dwellings within the plan period.</p> <p>Rather than the Council's considered 1,900 dwelling delivery, it is considered that 907 dwellings will be delivered.</p> <p>In addition, Site H2i is located in the proposed route for HS2 and should be removed from the supply calculations.</p> <p>With the moving of site H2a and H2I from Policy H2 to Policy H1, and the removal of Site H2i from the supply given the HS2 route, reduces the supply to 10,304 dwellings</p> <p>Given the Council identifies the housing requirement figure to be 10,700 dwellings, this shows that the requirements would almost be met. However, there are a number of matters to consider.</p> <p>In relation to Site H1n and H2g (Hugglescote), rather than a 3,500 dwelling delivery, or the Council's adjusted 1,900 dwelling delivery, it is</p>	<p>The comments regarding the possible build out rate at south-east Coalville are noted. However, the figure suggested in the comments does not appear to be based on any evidence. Furthermore, in terms of site H2i provision is made for a reserve site in the event that this site can be developed due to issues related to HS2. It is considered that sufficient provision is made to meet the identified housing requirements.</p>		<p>Angela Cornell</p>	<p>Fisher German</p>
--	---	--	-----------------------	----------------------

considered that 907 dwellings are likely to be delivered within the plan period. This results in a shortfall of 2,593 dwellings (on those two sites alone) resulting in an overall provision of 7,711 dwellings. This would result in an overall shortfall against the Council's 10,700 dwelling target of 2,989 dwellings to be provided for, instead of the Council's 1,600 dwelling shortfall calculation.

When applying the 12,220 dwelling requirement into this calculation as discussed earlier, this would result in a shortfall of 4,509 dwellings (12,220 – 7,711 dwellings) which will need to be provided for as new allocations in Policy H3.

No. The provision made in Policy H3 does not identify enough sites to ensure that the overall provision of housing for the District is met.

Only three housing allocations are made for the entire District when assessing the 2014 SHLAA sites.

- Site H3a - Land north of Ashby comprises the former Arla factory site (SHLAA A5 – 150 dwellings) and Money Hill (SHLAA A22 1,600 dwellings).

- Site H3b – Land off Waterworks Road, Coalville for 95 dwellings is an old Local Plan allocation which has not come forward to date.

- Site H3c – Land west of High Street, Measham for 420 dwellings is a reserve site for when the HS2 route is confirmed, due to the consented site thereby being removed from the supply.

The Coalville and Measham sites appear as reasonable allocations.

The preferred approach of the Council to the strategic distribution of housing was to focus additional growth on Ashby de la Zouch. It is agreed that growth should be directed to Ashby as a Key Service Centre, and one much larger than Castle Donington, with a large number of services and facilities, as discussed earlier,

With the options limited to sites within Ashby de la Zouch, the following site 2014 SHLAA options were appraised in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) to identify how they perform in terms of

sustainability.

The assessment concluded that in terms of the two strategic sites (North East of Ashby and a Southerly extension) the North East option performed better from a sustainability perspective. It also noted that options for redevelopment in the existing urban area performed well although they would result in a loss of employment land.

Table 8.1 and Table 8.2 of the draft Local Plan summarise the SA findings for the site options both individually and collectively as would be required to deliver the identified amount of housing through a strategic extension.

The preferred approach was then taken to allocate land North of Ashby de la Zouch (Money Hill). Both it and the possible southerly extension (Packington Nook) are similar in terms of their potential capacity, but the site at Money Hill is better related to the town centre and employment areas. Furthermore, in landscape terms the Packington Nook area is more sensitive than the Money Hill area whilst it would also be harder to mitigate any impact upon the landscape. There is also a history of proposed developments in Packington Nook not being supported at appeals. As such the Council preferred to allocate the Money Hill due to the limited number of sites available.

However, it is considered that the Ashby allocation of 1,750 dwellings is unrealistic. Firstly the former Arla factory site (SHLAA A22 - 150 dwellings), an employment site, should be included in Policy Ec3 as an Existing Employment Area which is protected for employment purposes.

Secondly the Money Hill aspect of the allocation (SHLAA A5 - 1,600 dwellings) is a substantial site covering 129 hectares and completely out of scale in context to the town. The planning history for the site identifies numerous applications that have been refused, most recently on land adjoining Woodcock Way for 70 dwellings, and land at Money Hill for 605 dwellings including a 60 unit extra care centre (C2), a new primary school (D1), a new health centre (D1), a new nursery school (D1), a new community hall (D1), new neighbourhood retail use (A1), new public open space and vehicular access from the A511 and Nottingham

<p>Road.</p> <p>The infrastructure requirements for the larger Money Hill development (605 dwellings) are substantial, notably the 1,600 metre long access from Nottingham Road to the A511. It is questionable as to whether the site is deliverable, and especially within the plan period.</p> <p>When applying the 12,220 dwelling requirement as discussed earlier, this would result in a shortfall of 4,509 dwellings (12,220 – 7,711 dwellings). The Coalville and Measham sites (95 + 420 dwellings) would provide for 515 dwellings, leaving 3,994 dwellings to be allocated. Deliverability of the Money Hill site remains in question, and the Arla site should remain in employment use, but even if the 1,750 dwellings were delivered this would still leave 2,244 dwellings to allocate.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) sets out that the preferred approach is to focus development at Ashby de la Zouch as it is the second largest settlement within the district with an extensive range of services and facilities and is identified within the settlement hierarchy as a main town. It acknowledges that Ashby de la Zouch has not seen as much growth in recent years as the principal town Coalville and the other main towns within the district. Therefore by directing growth to Ashby de la Zouch this reflects its' position in the settlement hierarchy. Ashby de la Zouch has a buoyant housing market and is attractive to both developers and potential purchasers. The Council has to be sure that what is proposed within the local plan can be delivered in order to meet the districts housing needs. At present it is considered that this is not the case. Additional housing sites need to be allocated within Ashby to ensure the housing need is met, and delivered.</p> <p>In allocating housing sites, the Council reviewed the 2014 SHLAA sites. The Council acknowledged that the sites in the SHLAA were limited and therefore the options available to them were severely restricted. It is understood that the Council are still accepting SHLAA submissions. A further submission is therefore made in respect of land off Moira Road, Ashby. One site exists to the north of Moira Road, adjoining an existing residential development site and area of National</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>Forest planting; with a further site to the south of Moira Road, which could be developed in two phases. The SHLAA submissions are appended in full however these sites could yield approximately 590 dwellings, which would assist in the 2,244 dwelling shortfall as discussed above. The sites are available now, offer a suitable location for development adjacent to existing residential development to the west of Ashby, are achievable and could be viably developed.</p> <p>As such it is considered that the sites west of Ashby should be assessed for inclusion within the residential allocations of the emerging Local Plan.</p>				
<p>Look at where the developments have already taken place Hastings Park for example has added another 150 homes are all the other sites full ?</p>	Noted.		Andrew Stone	NA
<p>Planning permission is inconsistent: permission is granted to large developers to build huge quantities of housing on open countryside, but single houses are not allowed.</p>	Each planning application is determined on its individual merits.		Mary Lorimer	Not applicable
No	Noted		Trevor Davis	None
Yes	Noted		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
Yes	Noted		Edward Hines	N/A
<p>I am surprised at the possibility that the entire area identified as H2m (or M9) may not be used for housing in the event of the proposed route of HS2 being confirmed. From what I can see on the maps produced to date, only a fraction of that land will be required by HS2, mostly on the north-western and northern parts of the site. Allowing for the same separation between the rail lines as currently exists between the proposed rail route and the closest existing housing on the New Street development, well over 50% of that site would still remain suitable for development. This would equate to over 10 hectares, and using the proposed housing density of 22 .2 dwellings per hectare, the site would still have the potential for over 220 dwellings. If the site is not developed for any housing use whatsoever, I can only conclude that the view of NWLDC is that the whole of the site is judged as being too close to the HS2 line. If that is the case, what message does that send to the residents of the New Street development, who would be the closest to the line? If I had to suggest any change, it would be that NWLDC re-examines how the land on the south-eastern section of the site might be used, given its proximity to the village</p>	<p>The supporting text identifies that some of the development on land West of High Street, Measham may still go ahead, depending on the final route of HS2. However, the current proposed route of HS2 impacts on the agreed access to the site. Furthermore, even if some development were physically possible it may not be commercially viable. Therefore, an alternative site has been identified, should the development not be provided west of High Street.</p>		Stephen Jackson	None

centre and existing facilities.				
We agree with the alternative provisions available to ensure the housing target is sufficiently met. We also agree with the suggested approach of planning permission on the housing sites in each area with the forward plan of the council working with developers and applicants to ensure legal agreements are issued before start on site. We believe that planning permission should be granted at an early stage and start communication with all relevant parties as the sites listed in Policy H2 include a large number of dwellings i.e. 2,700 in North and South of Grange Road, Hugglescote.	Noted.		Helen Stockdale	Lovell Partnerships
As above. Levers need to be identified and enforced to ensure that these sites are actually developed. For instance, can a council tax tariff be imposed on undeveloped sites with planning permission? Otherwise a 5 year housing supply deficit will develop and we shall have a developer free for all once again.	The Council can only determine planning applications. Planning permission requires development to commence within a certain time period (usually 3 years). There are no other mechanisms available to the council to require developments to be implemented.		David Bigby	Private individual
H3A there should be no vehicular access to Nottingham road only pedestrian and bikes paths and for busses if a service is provided to serve the whole development. H2G should include the provision for a railway station as it is adjacent to the line.	Policy H3 a(i) details the the principal and secondary vehicular access points for the site to the north of Ashby. Access from Nottingham Road would be primarily for sustainable transport modes such as buses, walking and cycling. The Local Plan supports the reinstatement of the Leicester to Burton rail line, along with the provision of stations.		Paul McCaffrey	NA
We agree that the preferred approach provides a good basis for applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development.	Noted.		Geoff Platts	Environment Agency
The North West Leicestershire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2015 Update should be used to determine which sites are at the greatest risk of flooding and support the application of the sequential test as part of any option assessments. In line with national planning policy we would wish to see any new development directed away from those areas at highest flood risk from all sources of flooding.	Noted.		Geoff Platt	Environment Agency
As per Q10.	See response under question 10		Nick Wilkins	NW
It should only be granted if the planning is on brown sites	Noted, brownfield sites are the preferred option in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. However, there are insufficient brownfield sites available that are deliverable and viable to meet the identified housing requirements.		Mrs Melanie Warren	Mrs Melanie Warren

The Council's five year land supply relies heavily on a three large sites with a resolution to grant planning permission (sites H2g, H2i and H2b). The Council must ensure that these sites remain realistically deliverable in the short term as failure to do so would have implications for housing supply and a consequent need for further sites to be allocated.	The Local Plan acknowledges that all of site H2g (including H1n) will not be delivered during the plan period. In addition the routing of HS2 may affect deliverability of site H2i. As such, housing allocations have been made and reserve sites identified to ensure the housing requirement is met over the plan period.		Lance Wiggins	Landmark Planning
Yes	Noted		Mr. & Mrs Loveless	Retired
The boundaries for permitted development in Appleby Magna should not be extended. Moving the existing boundaries to include agricultural land opens the door for massive development, and further on-going in-fill development, which will drastically increase the size and rural, historic integrity and atmosphere of the village.	The Limits to Development only includes sites with planning permission or a resolution to permit. The draft Limits to Development will need to be amended to take account of any sites granted permission since April 2015.		Mr Stuart Morris	Private
No more additional housing in Ashby other than on the old Arla site.	Noted. Additional housing sites have been identified to ensure the housing requirements are met during the plan period.		Mrs Margaret Murton	In Context
H3a would represent a massive expansion of Ashby whose roads often do not cope with the current traffic flows, it is also in contravention of key issues 4.2 in giving up agricultural land for development. The brownfield Arla site is ideal for development and adequate for the plan period, there is no need to saddle Ashby with the massive speculative, developer lead expansion with further unwanted development on Moneyhill. There is no need within the plan period as previously discussed for providing 10,700 additional dwellings in the district.	The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built 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.		Tim Gregory	Ashby Control Engineering Ltd.
Especially in relation to Ashby and the Ashby area we are concerned that there is too much pressure on housing and roads in the area. There is also pressure on schools. businesses have recently closed in the area, and it is important that businesses are encouraged to return to the Ashby area. it is not a solution to only increase housing in the Ashby area, we are concerned that the schools are full and that there is too much pressure on the town and the town centre. there should be no more housing developments in the Ashby area.	Draft Local Plan Policy IF1 requires new development to be supported by and make contributions (as appropriate) to the provision of infrastructure such as health and other public services and transport infrastructure, including public transport in order to mitigate the impacts of the development on the environment and local communities. The Highways Authorities have been consulted in preparing the Local Plan and are content that the impacts of development on the road network can be satisfactorily accommodated		Christopher Bush	NA
Yes	Noted		Mr. j Lewis	1950
The River Mease is not the only watercourse in North West Leicestershire in need of protection.	Noted, however the River Mease is the only watercourse that is designated as a Special Area of Conservation and therefore protected under the European Union's Habitats Directive.		Steve Johnson	YYYY
Yes	Noted		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield

<p>Although, 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>The land at Greenhill Farm has been granted planning permission at appeal although it is now subject to a legal challenge. Until such time as the results of the legal challenge are known it would not be appropriate to make any change to the Local Plan in respect of this matter.</p>		J Ball	N/A
Yes	Noted		Tim Abbott	Householder
Yes	Noted		Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying
Yes	Noted		Heather Parish Council	Heather Parish Council
No	Noted		JON WALTERS	LPT
<p>Identifying those housing sites which benefit from resolutions from the Council to grant planning permission as part of the overall provision is considered acceptable overall. Clearly, the robustness of this position and the feasibility of the overall provision position in the long term relies on the Council working closely and effectively with those in control of the sites (landowners and developers) to reach legal agreement so that permission can be granted. Policy H2 provides adequate commitment from the Council to achieve this in theory, and Policy S1 as well as the general impetus for the presumption in favour of</p>	<p>Noted, Policy H2 details the Council's commitment to ensuring legal agreements are progressed as efficiently as possible.</p>		Andrew Johnson	Erewash Borough Council

<p>sustainable development underpinning the NPPF will also help to facilitate this.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Council must recognise that a failure to secure legal agreements on sites benefitting from resolutions could lead to a failure in the supply position, unless alternative sites come forward. The supportive standpoint of EBC for the general approach is partly informed on the basis of an assumption that NWLDC have adequately scoped the potential limitations or complexities of sites listed within the policy and as such all issues are able to be surmounted through the legal agreement process (for example, where transport mitigation is required this is known and therefore any Section 106 agreement can positively seek to secure necessary funding for any works). Of course, the need to ensure well-planned development which appropriately mediates potential issues needs to be balanced with the need for development to be viable. Again, our comments in support of this general approach assumes that an appropriate consideration of viability of those sites contained within Policy H2 has been made. Policy H2h identifies a housing site with a resolution to grant planning permission at Slack & Parr, Long Lane on the north edge of Kegworth. Given the geographical proximity to south Erewash and associated infrastructure which interacts with the Borough, this site could have some impact on Erewash albeit limited given its modest size. In recognition of this, we would encourage the Council at this stage to ensure that any legal agreement reached in the future granting of permission at this site specifically is made with adequate consideration for the role transport mitigation measures might play as part of a legal agreement between the Council and developer, with particular consideration given to the provisions of Policy IF1 (Development and Infrastructure) as it currently stands.</p>				
<p>Consider not just if new housing can be fitted in, but by what percentage it increases the size of each settlement. Any sudden increase in size will change the nature of each town and village.</p> <p>Although the use of the Arla site is a good use of brownfield, it does suggest that any commercial premises is worth more if closed down and sold for building and this hardly makes the local economy</p>	<p>Noted. The National Planning Policy Framework advocates the reuse of brownfield sites.</p>		<p>Lesley Colley</p>	<p>None</p>

seem secure.				
<p>(a) We do not agree.</p> <p>(b) Many residents do not regard the Local Plan as priority in their lives and will not have prior knowledge of this issue when they may wish to object to an application.</p> <p>(c) Whitehall however are likely to insist that land indicated in a Local Plan will in principle be granted Planning Permission. NWLDC must be accountable to the electorate during the pre-submission stage and make it clear to the public that land shown for development in the Local Plan will in principle be granted planning permission.</p>	The sites listed in Policy H2 are those with a resolution to grant planning permission subject to a legal agreement being finalised. The sites shown on the draft proposals map are those with planning permission, those with a resolution to grant planning permission and the proposed allocations.		Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader
There should not be an automatic presumption that planning permission will be granted where there is only a resolution to permit and there is any significant delay in the completion of legal agreements. Policy H2 should make it clear that the Council will keep under review all material considerations and will review the planning merits of each proposal prior to issuing a decision notice to approve each of these developments (and any others that might come forward under similar circumstances).	Noted. It is proposed to add additional text to address this matter.	Amend policy to make it clear that where there is a delay in signing a S106 Agreement it may be necessary for the application to be referred back to Planning committee to take account of any material changes in circumstances since the initial resolution to grant permission.	Andrew Thomas	Thomas Taylor Planning
<p>The suggested approach in relation to sites with resolutions to grant consent is also generally supported. The supporting text at paragraph 6.13 indicates that the policy provides a commitment from the Council to ensure that all legal agreements are completed and permissions issued as quickly as possible.</p> <p>This commitment is welcomed and supported. It is however critical that the Council ensures that sufficient staff resources are in place to enable this commitment to be delivered.</p> <p>The identification of land to north and south of Grange Road, Hugglescote within Policy H2 is supported. We have referred to the potential for the further extension of development in this location in our response to Question 7. For completeness a plan showing Davidsons interests on site H2g is attached.</p>	Noted.		Guy Longley,	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.
As above. (Also take account of national policy).	Noted, national planning policy is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.		C Tandy	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society
In our view Policy H2 should also be deleted for the reasons described above.	The list of sites is proposed to be removed and the Policy wording amended to retain the commitment.	Delete list of sites from the policy.	Tim Evans	Bilfinger GVA

No response	Noted.		Mrs. A Saxby	n/a
Yes, as CD already has 8.8% of the population, yet 11.2% of the housing allocation..	Noted.		Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council	Castle Donington Parish Council
Rosconn Group agree with the District Council taking a positive approach to working with developers and applicants on the sites included in Policy H2 to ensure that the relevant legal agreements are completed. However, it is apparent that the sites included in Policy H2 make up a very substantive part of the housing land supply in the District. In that regard simply securing the issue of a planning permission is not the ultimate objective, the delivery of the sites is and that should be the objective of the policy. Moreover, it is apparent that the Local Plan has no contingency arrangements embedded within it to address a shortfall in provision that would arise if the planning permission and delivery of any one or more of these sites cannot be secured. Given the matters highlighted in relation to Site H2g for example, that would be a serious shortcoming of the Local Plan.	The housing requirements in the Local Plan are above the OAN to ensure the required housing numbers are delivered. Policy IM1 details how the council will deal with any shortfall in development.		Kirstie Clifton	Rosconn Group Ltd

Policy H3 – Housing provision: new allocations

Question 12 Do you agree with our proposed housing allocations? If not what change would you suggest? - Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any changes required	Name	Business or organisation name;
Yes	Noted.		Lisa Marron	Resident
Totally disagree with this approach. Ashby town council is currently drafting its neighbourhood plan, which once approved should be considered prior to the NWLDC local plan!!!!	<p>The draft Local Plan on page 119 sets out its relationship with neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Any neighbourhood plan needs to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the Local Plan at Appendix 4. Ashby Town Council who are preparing the Neighbourhood Plan have been consulted on the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan has to ensure that sufficient housing provision is made to meet the needs of the district. The Ashby Neighbourhood Plan is only able to consider housing provision in Ashby itself</p>		Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
Yes	Noted.		Sue Colledge	colledge's florists
Whilst the proposed developments in Ashby have been subject to much consultation, and the proposals are probably sensible, the adoption of this policy should be considered as requiring a major improvement to public transport provision, not just in the local area, but the connections to the major centres of employment in the region and the West Midlands, Leicester, Derby and Nottingham. It is will be insufficient to merely tinker with local bus timetables to make this major development sustainable.	As part of the consultation on the draft Local Plan all infrastructure providers have been invited to make representations. The policy requires the provision of enhanced public transport to ensure that the site is accessible in a sustainable way as possible.		Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
They do not represent the full list of available or sustainable sites given the shortlist omits sites affected by the proposed Area of Separation policy which is as yet untested.	It is not that these sites have not been considered at all, but rather, that having regard to other elements of the Local Plan they are not considered as suitable.		George Breed	Persimmon Homes NMID
Yes	Noted.		Stephen Saxby	None
Remove the Money Hill development. This is an historic and green site that adds to the character of Ashby. The suggested housing provision is already above what is likely to be necessary.	Noted. The Local Plan needs to ensure that the housing requirement is met during the plan period. The Sustainability Appraisal assesses a number of available sites, the Money Hill site is considered the most sustainable site. As part of the assessment both the environment and historic environment are considered.		Mark Chadbourn	Emerald Eye Ltd
Yes	Noted.		Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council

<p>Historic England have advised that “historic environment considerations” should be “properly assessed and addressed in identifying potential site allocations for development”.</p> <p>It is proposed to allocate land at Money Hill, north of Ashby-de-la-Zouch, for up to 1750 dwellings. It is expected that the development would be designed and laid out to minimise its impact upon the setting of the adjoining conservation area; I am pleased that this is the case.</p> <p>The County Historic Environment Record (HER) includes a find spot of “Roman finds from Money Hill” (MLE8032). The HER entry notes that “in 1818, two urns filled with third century coins were ploughed up” and that “a scatter of Roman pottery and Iron Age/Anglo-Saxon pottery was found in adjacent fields in the mid 1990s” (see attached). There are no other HER entries relevant to allocation H3a or the adjoining employment allocations.</p> <p>Development of the land north of Ashby-de-la-Zouch may entail the disturbance of this find spot, which should be considered a heritage asset. The find spot does not seem to indicate archaeological remains of national importance, but I would recommend that you contact the County Archaeologist to confirm that this is the case.</p> <p>The site allocation includes the provision of open space, so for preference the development should be laid out in a manner that would preserve the find spot in situ. Otherwise, the developer should be expected to “record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost ... and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible” (NPPF, paragraph 141). A requirement should be included in policy H3 to this effect.</p>	<p>Noted. The Historic Environment Records Office at the County Council confirm that the find spot at Money Hill should be recognised as a Heritage Asset, as per the NPPF.</p> <p>This and other heritage matters are the subject of ongoing discussions with Historic England.</p>		James White	North West Leicestershire District Council Senior Conservation Officer
<p>Page 39 - Item 6.16</p> <p>Ideal site is close to major infrastructure.</p> <p>All housing policies should specify a percentage of affordable homes; the numbers should be fixed to have any hope of meeting needs. Without definite numbers the Council will never know where they are on affordable provision.</p>	<p>Affordable housing provision for individual settlements is set out in draft Local Plan policy H4.</p>		Steve Palmer	NA

As referred to in Question 4, 1,350 new dwellings have already been approved for Ashby and little or no more should be added, as the existing and proposed infrastructure is inadequate for any more housing development. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan target of 1,434 dwellings is supported. It is agreed that should additional dwellings be provided above this figure or beyond the Plan period, these would best be located on the north side of the town.	A number of sites have been considered to make the provision for the further required housing and it has been concluded that the most appropriate allocation would be north of Ashby de la Zouch. It is the role of the Local Plan to determine the housing requirements for the district and the Ashby Neighbourhood Plan should support the strategic development needs (including housing requirements) set out in the Local Plan.		Frank Bedford, MBE	Willesley Environment Protection Association
I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby. · On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy site) should be allocated.	A number of sites have been considered to make the provision for the further required housing and it has been concluded that the most appropriate allocation would be north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.		Julia Fraser & Henry Sharples	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby. On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy site) should be allocated. 	A number of sites have been considered to make the provision for the further required housing and it has been concluded that the most appropriate allocation would be north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.		Jane Harris	NA
We do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the District. - We do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby. - On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.	Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.		Anne Davis Glynis Gardner	NA
Yes	Noted.		F J ALLGOOD	Land Owner
Build on the remaining brownfield sites in derelict areas in Coalville and Measham first before building in Ashby.	The development of brownfield sites before greenfield sites is the preferred approach in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. There are not currently enough brownfield sites that are deliverable and viable for housing provision, to allow us not to develop on greenfield sites.		None	none
No There is no need for the additional developments outlined for Ashby. The total impact on the town would be significant and this has not been accurately assessed.	A number of sites have been considered to make the provision for the further required housing and it has been concluded that the most appropriate allocation would be north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.		Olive kearins	Na

<p>Allocations on a percentage basis just make the biggest places much bigger still and the smaller places remain still relatively small. Try an approach where numbers of dwellings are detailed specifically.</p>	<p>Noted. The settlement hierarchy directs development to the most sustainable settlements within the district. Draft Policy H3 details the number of dwellings that are allocated on the identified sites. We have not allocated on a percentage basis. Rather most new development is already committed and this policy seeks to allocate sites to meet the identified shortfall.</p>		David Harris	Pyrotect Ltd
<p>Build fewer houses and over a longer period</p> <p>Must protect the green areas in the middle of Ashby - school playing fields and Bath grounds etc</p>	<p>The housing requirements identify the number of homes required in the District up to 2031. The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period.</p> <p>Local Green Space can be designated through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p>		Simon Litchfield	Resident
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not agree 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby de la Zouch. • On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy site) should be allocated. 	<p>We have considered a range of potential locations and sites to make provision and have concluded that the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Paul Riley	NA
<p>I do not agree with the plan, which states that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby.</p> <p>There is simply not enough space of capacity and you are already allowing developments to take place that are making our roads, for example, unsafe.</p> <p>On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby, no more than a further 150(already being built on the brownfield Arla Dairy site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Nick Salt	NA
<p>I do not agree with the plan, which states that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby.</p> <p>There is simply not enough space of capacity and you are already allowing developments to take place that are making our roads, for example, unsafe.</p> <p>On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby, no more than a further 150 (already being built on the brownfield Arla Dairy site)should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Joanne Salt	NA

<p>I object to the Local Plan on the following grounds:-</p> <p>I do not agree that 3100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 1350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		CHRIS AND JILL ARCHER	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the District. The Impact on Nottingham road will result in levels of congestion that will be intolerable. • I do not believe that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby. There is ample capacity in urban centres such as Leicester if more brownfield sites are redeveloped. This would have the added benefit of negating increased commuting from satellite, dormitory towns such as Ashby to the centres of employment such as Leicester. • On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than 150(to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy site) should be allocated 	<p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. The housing requirements are for North West Leicestershire, Leicester City will have their own requirements to meet. The development of brownfield sites is the preferred approach in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. There are not currently enough brownfield sites in the District that are deliverable and viable for housing provision.</p> <p>A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation is considered to be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process. The County Highway Authority have not objected to Money Hill on highway grounds.</p>		Nigel Francis	NA
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the District.</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Thomas Till	NA

<p>I object to the local plan on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An additional allocation of 1,750 new dwellings at Money Hill is massively damaging to the social, environmental and historical nature of Ashby de la Zouch. • Existing approved developments in Ashby fully meet demand for the timespan in question without any further greenfield development. • Ashby's existing infrastructure cannot meet current levels of demand and proposed changes in existing approved developments fail to address this, only adding further pressures. 	<p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. The development of brownfield sites is the preferred approach in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. There are not currently enough brownfield sites that are suitable and viable for housing provision. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation is considered to be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The sustainability appraisal process, assesses a number of available sites, including Money Hill which was assessed as being one of the most sustainable sites. As part of the assessment both the environment and historic environment have been considered. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared, but the impact of development on infrastructure has been discussed with appropriate infrastructure providers in preparing the draft Local Plan.</p>		Richard Brewin	NA
<p>I understand having received information that there are plans for new housing developments within the Ashby de la Zouch area, However reading the article I can see that there is 'quite' a considerable number of houses planned, which for the residents/people who live here is 'excessive' by numbers especially having lived here for 40 or so years with very little 'disturbance' or problems in the town, but now seemingly that could change and not for the better, so maybe you can understand people's concerns about this, after all we all want to live our lives without added problems in our Neighbourhoods, furthermore! there is also the fact that there are other factors to consider about this, and that is the size of the town which for many is 'unique' in as much it is 'small' and many of us like it that way but with the Proposed Plans that will undoubtedly change, because it will never 'retain' its Market Street as we all know it, so I do hope that you will all consider those that already live here,</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		Mrs E Knowles	NA

<p>Formal objection to plan: I am writing to formally object regarding the proposals set out in the local plan, relating to the number of new homes required in Ashby.</p> <p>In making this response; I am reminding you of previous advice NWLDC relied on in a planning appeal; from NWLDC own planning expert; concerning the impact of more homes (above 530) on Ashby and how this would not be sustainable and would have a disastrous impact on Ashby's infrastructure. It is essential that members attention is brought to this previous advice in making a final decision regarding the plan.</p> <p>NWLDC own expert has stated that the impact on Ashby's infrastructure is not sustainable: The facts are that the level of housing development proposed is not sustainable.</p> <p>In evidencing this statement, I would rely on the evidence that NWLDC used at the Holywell Spring Farm Appeal. NWLDC own planning expert, Andrew Murphy in his proof of evidence states making reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Holkywell Spring application for 400 homes, and • At that time the application for Money Hill that had been submitted for just 130 homes (A total of 530 new homes). <p>His findings in the proof of evidence was (8.11), 'the development of both will place a considerable infrastructure burden on Ashby'.</p> <p>The clear case was that an application for 400 homes at Holywell Farm should be rejected as the infrastructure burden on Ashby would be too great. It was subsequently approved.</p> <p>Flawed proposal: The latest proposal is for no just 130 homes on Moneyhill but 1750! This based on NWLDC own expert can therefore only be a flawed proposal. The residents of Ashby will have to live with the consequences of NWLDC decision for generations to come. You cannot afford to get it wrong!</p> <p>In 2013; 400 homes was not supported because of the impact on Ashby's infrastructure, but the</p>	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared, the impact of development on infrastructure has been discussed with appropriate infrastructure providers in preparing the draft Local Plan. The Proof of Evidence of referred to stated that their would be an impact on infrastructure it was not considered an unacceptable impact.</p>		<p>Stephen Clayton</p>	<p>NA</p>
---	---	--	------------------------	-----------

proposal in the plan is 5 times that number! What has changed since 2013? Nothing! You can therefore reasonably take the position, based on evidence from NWLDC own planning expert that any proposal to build close to 2000 more homes in Ashby can at best be described as foolhardy.

Response required: Please ensure that this specific point is responded to in the formal response to the plans consultation. If NWLDC ignore previous advice from your own planning expert and the final plan continues to support such high numbers of new homes; you must refer to the previous advice of your own planning expert and on what grounds that advice is now being ignored (particularly now I have brought this to your attention).

I expect that in any reports to Committee regarding the plan, members attention is brought to this previous advice.

Confirmation required: Can you please confirm this will happen? thereby negating the need for me to contact members individually and bring this to their attention.

<p>Muller Property Group object to the non-inclusion of the site shown on the attached plan at Appendix 1 ('Land to the south of Curzon Street, Ibstock, Leicestershire').</p> <p>We consider that the Council are overly-reliant on large strategic sites. We note that a significant number of the committed dwellings (3,500) are on sites which are collectively referred to as south-east Coalville. Of these 3,500 dwellings 2,700 are on one site and 800 on a second. We note that the Council does not expect their early delivery. It is estimated that during the plan period that only 1,900 of these 3,500 dwellings are likely to be built. Whilst some of these dwellings are in the Council's current committed supply we noted work has not yet started.</p> <p>Strategic sites by their size and nature require a degree of land assembly or require infrastructure to be put in place prior to being capable of being developed and prior to producing significant housing completions. Whilst the vast majority of the Council's supply already has permission, many sites could be constrained by the need to provide infrastructure and viability issues. We note one site is potentially affected by the proposed route of HS2 and unlikely to be attractive to housebuilders with the alternative reserve site not currently deliverable being in current commercial use.</p> <p>Overall we do not consider there is sufficient flexibility in the Council's housing supply. In our view further sites should be identified in order to provide choice and competition in the market.</p> <p>Muller Property Group control the land to the south of Curzon Street, Ibstock and consider this site to be suitable for allocation for housing development. 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 by foot and further afield by bus. Further development at Ibstock will assist in maintaining and supporting these facilities</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. 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. In addition, Ashby (as identified in the settlement hierarchy) is a more sustainable location than Ibstock.</p>		<p>MATT WEDDERBURN</p>	<p>Muller Strategic Projects Limited</p>
--	---	--	------------------------	--

<p>Ibstock is one of the more affordable areas in North West Leicestershire. GL Hearn in the June 2014 SHMA identified 5 broad price zones in Leicestershire and identified Ibstock as sitting along with Coalville as part of the lowest average house price zone of £125,000 - £150,000 (whereas Ashby-De-Le-Zouch sat within a £200,000 - £225,000 average price zone for example).</p> <p>Where the land was allocated for development Muller Property Group will be in a position to deliver a high quality residential scheme. Muller Property Group is a privately owned group of companies involved in housing and commercial property development and land assembly. We are fully confident that all our land promotion sites are deliverable and we have an excellent track record in bringing forward housing development.</p> <p>Land brought forward recently by Muller for residential development is currently under construction in a number of locations including Middlewich, Sandbach, and Alsager in Cheshire East Council area, Tarporley in Cheshire West and at Barlestone in Hinckley and Bosworth. Planning permissions over the last 6 months have included sites at Mynydd Isa in Flintshire and at Whitchurch in Shropshire.</p> <p>Appendix 2 comprises an indicative layout plan showing how the land south of Curzon Street, Ibstock might come forward. It comprises a 5ha site with two potential further land parcels of 2 and 2.7 ha. We would welcome discussion with the Council regarding the potential development of this site for housing.</p>				
<p>ÿ I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district.</p> <p>ÿ I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby.</p> <p>ÿ On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable sites when assessed through the sustainability appraisal..</p>		<p>Judith K Bancroft</p>	<p>NA</p>

<p>We strongly disagree with the proposal to promote Ashby, and Money Hill in particular, as a housing growth zone and the preferred site for almost the entire proposed new allocation of 1750 dwellings, housing 4500 people and giving a growth of over 36% in the town population. The district is a mixture of market towns, where the plan objectives of environmental protection and conservation are paramount and former mining settlements where the key objective of the plan is to continue to promote regeneration. It also benefits from a potential employment growth area on its northern boundary. For the following reasons we think the proposal seriously misaddresses these objectives, needs and opportunities.</p> <p>Development in Ashby</p> <p>1) The need for the high level of district-wide housing development now proposed in policy S2 is highly questionable. In this context to concentrate such major expansion on Ashby is premature and would needlessly pre-empt the opportunity for the careful enhancement and conservation of the town and surroundings. Ashby is currently a relatively prosperous, self-sustaining vibrant Market Town community and stands to derive little if any additional benefit from the over rapid large scale growth suggested for Money Hill. DLPlan para 6.16</p> <p>2) Many local employment sites in the town have recently been sacrificed for new housing development. Accordingly there is no clearly demonstrated need to promote substantial additional housing in Ashby to accommodate local workers. The concentrated major housing growth proposed for the town provides primarily for workers from possible employment growth elsewhere. Thus to promote this in one immediate allocation in Ashby would simply add to the high level of out-commuting, unnecessarily upset the environment and balance of the town services and pre-empt the proper planning of facilities in the developing Neighbourhood Plan. It fails to meet the balanced growth objective 2.</p> <p>3) In contrast Coalville, and adjacent Swadlincote in South Derbyshire, have remaining environmental and infrastructure problems and would derive substantially greater benefit from well planned</p>	<p>The Council's evidence shows that if the districts housing need is to be met, as required by the NPPF, then additional provision is required. Objective 2 is concerned with achieving a balance for the district as a whole. Furthermore, it is proposed that about 16Ha of employment land be developed as part of the Money Hill development. This will help offset some of the employment land that has recently been lost to housing. Significant new growth is already planned for Coalville which will contribute towards the regeneration of the town through attracting in new people. However, it would not be appropriate to allocate additional development there having regard to the evidence relating to deliverability and viability. Ashby de la Zouch is a more sustainable settlement than the smaller mining communities, some of which (such as Ibstock and Measham) are themselves subject of growth proposals. The strategy seeks to achieve a balanced approach by ensuring that most new development is located in the major towns which by their nature are the most sustainable settlements. This approach is consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The suitability of the Money Hill site for housing has been assessed through the sustainability appraisal. The development of the site will incorporate additional recreation provision, including footpath and cycle links, which would be unlikely to be achieved without new development.</p>		Robert Yates	Cliftonthorpe Residents Management Company
---	---	--	--------------	--

<p>future investment. Similarly the smaller former mining communities could benefit substantially from the benefits of scale which further investment would bring. If the overall requirement for new housing allocations is approved it should be carefully split between the districts disparate settlements in accordance with the key objectives and identified needs referred to above. No detailed options for spreading the investment were properly and fully considered.</p> <p>4) Ashby has witnessed a high level of housing investment recently and is known to be a far more attractive and profitable location for housing investment. Accordingly to focus major new housing allocations on Ashby is a flawed strategy. It would put unnecessary pressure on Ashby while further undermining efforts to attract investment to the former mining communities undergoing regeneration. These are currently less attractive to developers and in Coalville the possible deficiency in housing land take-up should be tackled rather than a replacement allocation transferred to Ashby. DLPlan para 6.6-8. It would also exacerbate the current imbalance between housing growth in Ashby and employment growth elsewhere.</p> <p>5) The strategy seems more based on acceding to development pressures in relatively desirable Ashby than one designed to steer investment to meet needs in the major employment and former mining areas which are less attractive for developer housing projects. As such it will only exacerbate the differences in the fortunes of these areas and lead to overheating in Ashby.</p> <p>6) A more positive approach which benefits all communities requires imaginative steps to positively promote investment on outstanding allocations and other brownfield sites in and around Coalville and the other former mining towns.</p> <p>Development on Money Hill</p> <p>1) We object to proposal to promote a major built up growth zone on the prominent Money Hill greenfield landscape and so pre-empt future consideration of its wider leisure potential in the development of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. To do so without a thorough impact analysis on</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>Ashby is an unnecessarily reckless, ill advised and unacceptable scenario.</p> <p>2) To allocate the whole of Money Hill for housing in one step is very risky and blocks the opportunity to develop the wider health benefits which could be achieved by exploiting the unique opportunities for improved and forested footpath, bridleway and cycling links northwards and across the A511 to the Ivanhoe Way and the outstanding countryside areas of the Pistern Hills, Staunton Harold and Calke Abbey. Regrettably neither appraisal of these and other equally appropriate uses- including perhaps senior school and college parking and expansion- of Money Hill nor impact analysis of the effect on Ashby of this major growth proposal have been undertaken.</p> <p>3) Strong arguments and feelings were expressed against such highly visible and prominent development, both badly connected to the town and adding to congestion, when the last plan was considered.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>As previously stated under Question 8 the housing allocation of 10,700 is too high, and approvals have already been given for 10,900 dwellings. With a reduced housing requirement of a maximum of 9,500 dwellings this means there is already contingency of 1,400 dwellings across the District to cover the possible under delivery in SE Coalville. Ashby de la Zouch Town Council does not agree that a further allocation of 1,845 dwellings, including 1,750 on Money Hill, is necessary at this time. However, in addition to the 1,350 new dwellings already approved for Ashby, the Town Council would support the allocation of up to a further 155 new dwellings on the former Arla Dairy brownfield site, but with no other allocations being supported.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy states Coalville Urban Area as the principal town will see the largest amount of new development. Under the proposals within the Local Plan Coalville Urban Area will see 41.13% of new dwellings, whilst the smaller key service centres of Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington when combined will get 43.08% of new dwellings. Thus undermining the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy S3.</p> <p>The proposals in the Draft Local Plan when combined with recent planning approvals, would lead an unacceptable 60% increase in the size of the small market town of Ashby de la Zouch.</p>	<p>The Council's evidence shows that if the districts housing need is to be met, as required by the NPPF, then additional provision is required. The support for the redevelopment of the former Arla dairy site is noted and is included as part of the proposed allocation. In terms of the percentage growth of settlements from April 2011 to 2031 the dwellings already built and permitted and including allocations would result in a percentage growth of 35.51% in Coalville whilst in Ashby the figure is (28.24%). This is consistent with the settlement hierarchy.</p>		<p>Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk</p>	<p>Ashby de la Zouch Town Council</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district • I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby • On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated. 	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		<p>Philip Bastow</p>	<p>NA</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district • I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby • On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated. 	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		<p>Terry Hill</p>	<p>NA</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district • I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby • On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated. 	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		D.Brearley	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district • I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby • On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated. <p>Since I came here in 1966 the town has been destroyed.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Sophia M	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district • I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby • On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated. 	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Mrs S Whitehouse	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district • I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby • On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated. 	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Mrs Lucy Clements	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district • I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby • On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should 	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Mr D Spencer	NA

be allocated.				
Yes	Noted.		Peter Selby	None
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Mr Stuart George Smith	N/a
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		M.S. Bowyer	N/a
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		M.M. Knight	N/a
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Mr David Tweedale	N/a

<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Mrs Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale	N/a
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Sarah Higgins	N/a
<p>I am writing to you to express my concerns and objections regarding the above. Firstly i do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of the town is justified. The infrastructure to support such growth is totally inadequate. This leads onto the 3,100 dwellings to be built in Ashby, which is nothing short of mad. It would seem that the thought of large amounts of money make people do strange things and common sense fails to prevail in such cases. The thought of 10,700 dwellings in the time scale above is simply a joke and certainly unnecessary. Ashby is losing its identity. The reasons people liked Ashby will now be forcing people to leave. Why inflict such plans on a relatively small town. It cannot sustain the projected growth.</p>	<p>The evidence identifies a need for 10,700 dwellings up to 2031. In terms of the percentage growth of settlements from April 2011 to 2031, including the dwellings already built and permitted and including allocations would result in a percentage growth of 35.51% in Coalville whilst the increase for Ashby would be (28.24%). This is consistent with the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate location is considered to be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal process.</p>		Miss C.M. Storer	N/a
<p>Let the town grow along with a proper investment in transport and social structure. ie schools and doctors.</p>	<p>The Local Plan has been prepared in consultation with service and infrastructure providers.</p> <p>The Local Plan will also be supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which will set out the future infrastructure needs of the district and identify any capacity issues.</p>		Andrew Stone	NA

<p>Houses need to be built on brownfield sites near employment opportunities and with proper rail links or public transport available and developers must contribute fully to this provision. They expect to make large profits, why should we pay for them?</p> <p>The suggested allocations put too many houses in SE Coalville. There is already several housing projects underway here. No more are needed. The extra housing should be spread around the district in manageable amounts. It is also sensible to build near the employment opportunities, e.g. Castle Donington.</p>	<p>The development of brownfield land is the preferred approach in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. However, there are not currently enough brownfield sites that are suitable and viable for housing provision.</p> <p>The requirement for a development to make a contribution towards public transport is assessed on a site by site basis. Policy IF1 requires the provision of public transport where it is required. Contributions towards public transport can only be requested if this passes a number of tests to make the development acceptable.</p> <p>The development to the south-east of Coalville has a resolution to grant planning permission.</p> <p>There is already planning permission for development of 895 dwellings in Castle Donington but due to various physical constraints around Castle Donington additional development is not appropriate.</p>		Mary Lorimer	Not applicable
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable sites when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		V Flemwell	N/a
<p>As residents of Ashby de la Zouch we are writing to express concern about the extent of the proposed housing development in the 2011 - 2031 Local Plan.</p> <p>Over the last few years there has already been quite a sizeable increase in the number of houses built within the town and this is already beginning to have an impact. The proposal to build approximately 1800 more in a town with a population of only 12385 would create insurmountable problems for existing and future residents.</p>	<p>Noted. The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation is to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Jean and Graham Morrison	NA

<p>I live in Ashby De La Zouch which was a small town but is getting bigger by the minute, whilst losing industries like Arla, the soap factory, United Biscuits etc.</p> <p>When you plan to do a major area change you should put a specific document through every rate and tax payers letter box. Just because the governments of various persuasions allow thousands of immigrants into the country does not mean we should all suffer because of the lack of work, infrastructure etc etc.</p> <p>I do not agree that an additional allocation 1,845 new dwellings (including 1750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district.</p> <p>I do not agree that 3100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby.</p> <p>On top of the 1350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150(to be built on the brownfield Arla site) should be allocated. In fact the government and local councils should look at regenerating industry on such sites. Government and council should introduce laws that do not allow foreign companies or individuals to buy our industry. Generally the purchaser will close UK factories rather than their own. Such as The soap factory, Arla, Microtherm Insulation, British Steel. In fact British Steel is a strategically vital industry for the future defence of this country.</p>	<p>The Local Plan consultation was done in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation is considered to be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The sustainability appraisal process assessed a number of available sites, including Money Hill which was assessed as being the most sustainable site.</p>		<p>Brian and Barbara Hick</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby.</p> <p>On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby, no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		<p>Pamela Eastaugh</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		<p>J Hackett</p>	<p>N/a</p>

be allocated.				
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable sites when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Mr J Martin	N/a
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable sites when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Dr John Blythe	N/a
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby on top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby. 	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable sites when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Mrs J.S Chapple	NA
<p>We do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby on top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable sites when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Lesley Thom, Iain Thom, Graham Thom	NA
No	Noted.		Trevor Davis	None
<p>We agree with the current allocations however we will not agree to any additional planning applications proposed outside the limits of development and not included in this draft plan.</p>	Noted.		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
Yes	Noted.		Edward Hines	N/A

<p>With regard to the alternative site (H3c or M11, Leicester Road/Grassy Lane), my first observation is the proposed housing density is 30 dwellings per hectare, a 36% increase in density from that proposed for H2m. I ask whether that indicates the housing stock proposed for the H3c site is a different mix from that proposed for H2m - Is it an indicator that multi-storey dwellings would be included on the H3c site, for example? I am also surprised the H3c site is even being considered for housing development, given the amount of subsidence caused by old mine workings in the Leicester Road area. It is a fact that houses on Leicester Road have been demolished in the past - for example, Numbers 72 to 76 Leicester Road now stand on the site of Numbers 1 to 4 Woodfield, which were properties demolished in the 1950s due to the subsidence damage sustained. Earlier this year, a detached property on the opposite side of Leicester Road was demolished due to the whole building having tilted due to subsidence, and that site is now due for redevelopment. Subsidence of the road surface still occurs on Leicester Road on the stretch towards Gallows Lane - part of that road surface had to be repaired a few years ago, and the shape of the surface is still changing. I have lived at Leicester Road since 1994, and I have a direct view of part of the proposed development site beyond my garden at the rear of the property. The surface of that field is very uneven, showing evidence of previous subsidence, and I am certain the shape of the surface is slowly changing due to settlement still taking place.</p> <p>I am concerned about the proposed access to the H3c site - the 2014 plan indicated the access would be from Leicester Road, at a position currently outside the 30mph limit (approximately at the location where the road continues to be subject to subsidence.) There is also a farm track used to access the field, located to the west of 72 Leicester Road - this is currently wide enough for farm vehicles. I would expect the development plan would make use of this as a pedestrian/cycling route, but as it is much closer to the village centre than the proposed main vehicle access, does the plan for the site include widening that access for vehicular access to the proposed housing development? I would hope this is not the case, especially as visibility of oncoming traffic is not good in either direction at that point.</p>	<p>The site at Ashby Road/Leicester Road, Measham includes sites identified as M11 and M12 in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Sites M11 and M12 total some 15.41 hectares, and with a proposed development of 420 dwellings would equate to a density of 27. The site west of High Street, Measham totals some 19.34 hectares, however this site also includes provision for the reinstatement of 1.1Km of the Ashby Canal, if the area given over to the canal is removed it leaves a site area of 17.81 hectares and with the proposed 450 equates to a density of 25. There would be an 8% increase in density between the two sites.</p> <p>The issues raised in regards to land stability requires further investigation in conjunction with the Coal Authority.</p>		Stephen Jackson	None
--	---	--	-----------------	------

<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		<p>Mr & Mrs Varden</p>	<p>N/a</p>
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		<p>D & K Butler</p>	<p>N/a</p>
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		<p>Pat Wilson</p>	<p>N/a</p>
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		<p>C Attenborough and Y Pilkington</p>	<p>N/a</p>

<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		B Mason	N/a
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Mrs Carole Waterfield	Not applicable
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Mr Ralph Waterfield	N/A
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		B M Latimer	n/a

<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		<p>Caroline Brown</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		<p>Mrs Dawn Gardner</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>We agree with the provisions made of the proposed housing allocations and do not suggest any changes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Helen Stockdale</p>	<p>Lovell Partnerships</p>
<p>I do not agree that 10,700 new dwellings are needed in the district over the time frame 2011-2031. the number should be reduced</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby. this means the population will nearly be doubled since 2001 - the infrastructure (roads, schools, medical facilities, water treatment, town centre parking) will not be able to cope</p> <p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings are needed in the district (including 1,750 on Money Hill)</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		<p>lynn bradbury</p>	<p>Retailmap Ltd</p>

<p>Even if the overall housing requirement figure (10700) is accepted then the need for 1600 more houses than provided for by current permissions and allocations can be challenged as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 10754 permissions and approvals have already given – this figure will be considerably greater by the time the plan goes forward for examination. o much more needs to be done to ensure that the homes with existing permissions and resolutions are built during the plan period. The approach outlined in the draft plan encourages developers to claim that they will not be building the houses with existing permissions so that they can leverage additional permissions. o new brown field sites within current limits of development are available now and more will become available - a provision for these needs to be made. I support the inclusion of the Ashby Arla Dairy site which can accommodate 154 houses according to the SHLAA. o the draft plan assumes 45 hectares of current employment land will be lost to other uses (mainly housing). This is sufficient for 900 houses, so the H3 allocation only need to be for another 700 at most. <p>I disagree strongly with the allocation of 1750 more houses to Ashby on top of the 1400 new homes built, permitted or approved for Ashby since April 2011. The effect of policy H3a would be to increase the size of Ashby by 61% over the plan period. This is not acceptable or sustainable within that timescale. Furthermore these homes are very unlikely to be suitable for the Roxhill workers for whom they are being allocated. They are far more likely to merely encourage residence by even more commuters working outside the district.</p> <p>Many local employment sites in Ashby have recently been sacrificed for new housing development. Accordingly, there is no clearly demonstrated need to promote substantial additional housing in Ashby to accommodate local workers. The concentrated major housing growth proposed for the town provides primarily for workers from possible employment growth elsewhere. Thus to promote this in one immediate</p>	<p>At the time of submission the council has to be able to demonstrate that it has sufficient housing provision to meet needs. It cannot be assumed that this will be the case. The available evidence suggests that most of those dwellings with permission (or a resolution) will be built in the plan period. However, the scale of development at south-east Coalville is such that the housing market will not support all of the development by 2031. There are limited brownfield sites which can, as required by the NPPF, be judged as being available and deliverable at this time. Furthermore, the viability study shows that most brownfield sites are not viable. The council needs to be able to show, with evidence that brownfield sites would make a significant contribution towards the housing provision. This evidence is not available at this time. Whilst some of the employment land that may be lost in the future could be redeveloped for housing it is possible that it may also be redeveloped for other uses. The development at Money Hill is not specifically to meet the needs of workers at Roxhill. Instead it is to contribute towards meeting the districts overall housing requirements. It is proposed that about 16Ha of land be developed for employment purposes as part of the Money Hill development. This will help offset some of the employment land that has recently been lost to housing. Significant growth is already planned for Coalville which will contribute towards the regeneration of the town through attracting in new people. However, it would not be appropriate to allocate additional development there having regard to the evidence regarding deliverability and viability. Ashby de la Zouch is a more sustainable settlement than Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham whilst there are clear physical constraints which prohibit further development around Castle Donington.</p>		David Bigby	Private individual
---	--	--	-------------	--------------------

<p>allocation in Ashby would simply add to the high level of out-commuting, unnecessarily upset the environment and balance of the town services and pre-empt the proper planning of facilities in the developing Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (p 101) shows very little strategic difference between the advantages and disadvantages of allocating all new housing to Ashby, all to Coalville or distributing the allocation more evenly around the main towns</p> <p>There is a strong economic and regeneration argument for increasing the allocation to Coalville and reducing the allocation to Ashby. Also a more equitable distribution across the main towns in the District would help sustain the smaller towns. The Settlement Hierarchy (S3) option A would be much better than Option B which has been selected on a very flimsy argument</p> <p>By the time the draft plan goes to examination it is likely that approval will have been given on appeal for 675 houses on Money Hill. This will be more than sufficient to increase the size of Ashby by an unsustainable amount (40% in total). Further housing on Money Hill is not acceptable.</p> <p>The proposed strategy seems more based on acceding to development pressures in relatively desirable Ashby than one designed to steer investment to meet needs in the major employment and former mining areas which are less attractive for developer housing projects. As such it will only exacerbate the differences in the fortunes of these areas and lead to overheating in Ashby.</p>				
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district.</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby.</p> <p>On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		K.V Percival	NA

<p>Having been a resident of Ashby de la Zouch all of my life, with immense fondness of the town, i wish to register my concerns for its future which seems to be in great jeopardy owing to the excessive housing development plans, as outlined above. The plan would create a 60% increase to the size of our town, and this cannot be justified, not can the infrastructure support it. An overwhelming amount of housing developments in Ashby is eroding the character of the town, which is already suffering with unbearable volumes of congestion and traffic. I used to be very proud of Ashby's image as a pleasant and unique market town, but it is losing its identity owing to the scale of housing development which it has has to ensure. I am particularly concerned about the proposals for the Moneyhill site. This is an area of unspoilt green space, providing easily accessible footpaths and countryside in close proximity to the town, and this region deserves to be preserved and protected. I am aware the developers prefer to build in Ashby because of the house price premiums which can be realised, but this should not be influencing unsuitable planning consent. There seems to be a great irony that sites previously providing employment to the town (the Soap Factory, the Biscuit Factory and Arla Dairies) are now turned into housing estates. It begs the question where future residents of this town will be employed; i fear unsustainable commuting is the likely answer.</p>	<p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. The allocation at Money Hill includes 16Ha of land to be developed for employment use. The Sustainability Appraisal assesses a number of available sites to meet the residual housing requirement and Money Hill was assessed as being the most sustainable. As part of the sustainability appraisal both the environment and historic environment were considered. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p>		Mrs Caroline Milward	N/a
<p>As a resident of Ashby de la Zouch for the last 31 years it saddens me the way Ashby is losing its character as a pretty market town. The amount of houses being built in and around Ashby, and the traffic that comes with them. is slowly but surely suffocating the town. Also with the amount being built, just where are the residents going to be working? Certainly not in Ashby, because all the industries seem to be closing down. Arla dairies, the soap factory, the biscuit factory and now Hallmark tractors. Will Ashby just be a commuter town? I understand houses need to be built, but the town seems to be taking for more than its fair share, presumably because Ashby de la Zouch can command a premium in house prices. A 60% increase to the size of this town is unacceptable. the infrastructure cannot cope with this growth. I do not agree that the Money Hill site should be built upon as it is easily accessed for walks in the countryside without getting into the car. I hope that you consider my concerns for Ashby, its roads</p>	<p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation is considered to be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The sustainability appraisal assesses a number of available sites, including Money Hill which was assessed as being the most sustainable site. The allocation at Money Hill includes 16Ha of land fto be developed for employment. As part of the sustainability appraisal both the environment and historic environment were considered. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p>		R Millward	NA

and its countryside.				
We agree that the preferred approach provides a good basis for applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development.	Noted.		Geoff Platts	Environment Agency
<p>Strategic sites</p> <p>All strategic sites must consider the implications for flood risk, contaminated land as well as opportunities to use development to improve and enhance the environment.</p> <p>The North West Leicestershire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2015 Update should be used to determine which sites are at the greatest risk of flooding and support the application of the sequential test as part of any option assessments. In line with national planning policy we would wish to see any new development directed away from those areas at highest flood risk from all sources of flooding.</p>	Noted. The SFRA has been taken into account during the preparation of the Local Plan.		Geoff Platt	Environment Agency
<p>We do not agree that 3100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby de la Zouch; this seems an excessive number for a town of Ashby's size.</p> <p>On top of the 1350 new dwellings already approved for Ashby, no more than an additional 150 should be built, making use of brownfield land.</p> <p>We do not agree that a 60% increase in the size of Ashby is justified, especially as proposed infrastructure improvements to support this growth are totally inadequate.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation is considered to be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p>		Andrew and Anne Heaton	NA
<p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 1350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p> <p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district.</p> <p>If all these houses are built in and around Ashby the area will suffer a loss of character.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation is considered to be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p>		Caroline Ferrier	n/a

<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 3,100 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p> <p>There is nothing wrong with building more houses but this problem is they are being built in the wrong place. They should be built at least 2 miles from Ashby and the building locations must not be swayed by the builders.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation is considered to be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Bernard Noble	n/a
<p>The overall level of housing provision in the plan should be increased. The housing numbers proposed are based upon the Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment 2014, based on available population projections at the time. Latest population estimates indicate that the demand for housing nationally will be greater than previously estimated and with the Government committed to increasing the supply of housing in the short term, it is evident that the level of supply of land for dwellings will soon be inadequate.</p> <p>The plan centralises too much growth in large sites in a small number of urban areas. There is a major risk of these sites not being delivered due to the infrastructure costs. The acceptability of imposing a high level of change upon a few communities is questionable. The spreading of development more evenly across the district is a fairer way of easing the burden of adjustment to an incoming population, to have a lesser impact upon a greater number of people.</p> <p>In the case of Packington, there has been no review of the development boundary carried out as part of the preparation of the plan. This does not reflect the Planning Officer's advice in respect of the proposed increase in the numbers of houses which Packington could accept as a contribution to the overall growth of the district when recent applications were being considered.</p> <p>The approval for only one of the two sites being</p>	<p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) provides evidence of housing need, the housing requirements set out in the Local Plan also take account of economic development and future employment creation in the district.</p> <p>The Local plan does allow for small scale development in the sustainable villages to meet local need. The Local Plan also allows for development in sustainable locations in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. It also allows for development of brownfield land in the small villages. The affordable housing exceptions site policy allows for a limited number of market homes on rural exceptions sites to ensure their viability.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the Local Plan. The Limits to development will be revised as part of the next iteration of the Local Plan to take into account of sites granted planning permission since the 1st April 2015.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council will monitor the implementation of Local Plan policies and 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 Policy IM2.</p>		J Steedman on behalf of Mr and Mrs B Moseley	Steedman Planning

<p>considered results in a new situation, where the development now approved has become a logical extension of the settlement and should be included within the development envelope. The modification of the development boundary in accordance with the plan submitted by post in relation to this submission is therefore suggested as a logical extension to the boundary, utilising the sustainable facilities available in the settlement. The development of this parcel of land would round-off the development boundary in this part of the village without intrusion into open countryside.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements are minimal, so a rapid contribution to the Government's stated objective to increase housing supply would be deliverable, allowing Packington to make a proportionate contribution to the housing needs of the District.</p>				
<p>The overall level of housing provision in the plan should be increased. The housing numbers proposed are based upon the Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment 2014, based on available population projections at the time. Latest population estimates indicate that the demand for housing nationally will be greater than previously estimated and with the Government committed to increasing the supply of housing in the short term, it is evident that the level of supply of land for dwellings will soon be inadequate.</p> <p>The plan centralises too much growth in large sites in a small number of urban areas. There is a major risk of these sites not being delivered due to the infrastructure costs. The acceptability of imposing a high level of change upon a few communities is questionable. The spreading of development more evenly across the district is a fairer way of easing the burden of adjustment to an incoming population to have a lesser impact upon a greater number of people.</p> <p>In the case of Packington, there has been no review of the development boundary carried out as part of the preparation of the plan. This does not reflect the Planning Officer's advice in respect of the proposed increase in the numbers of houses which Packington could accept as a contribution to the overall growth of the district when recent applications were being considered.</p>	<p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) provides evidence of housing need, the housing requirements set out in the Local Plan also take account of economic development and future employment creation in the district.</p> <p>The Local plan allows for small scale development in the sustainable villages to meet local need. The Local Plan also allows for development in other sustainable locations, in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. It also allows for development of brownfield land in the small villages. The affordable housing exceptions site policy allows for a limited number of market homes on rural exceptions sites to ensure their viability.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the Local Plan. The Limits to development will be revised as part of the next iteration of the Local Plan to take into account of sites granted planning permission since 1st April 2015.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council will monitor the implementation of Local Plan policies and 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 Policy IM2</p>		<p>Martin Sansom</p>	<p>Sansom Hamilton</p>

<p>The approval for only one of the two sites being considered results in a new situation, where the further extension of the development now approved becomes a logical extension of the settlement. The modification of the development boundary in accordance with the plan submitted by post in relation to this submission is therefore suggested as a logical extension to the boundary, utilising the sustainable facilities available in the settlement.</p> <p>Infrastructure will be available for its immediate development, therefore a rapid contribution to the Government's stated objective to increase housing supply would be deliverable.</p>				
<p>The overall level of housing provision in the plan should be increased. The housing numbers proposed are based upon the Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment 2014, based on available population projections at the time. Latest population estimates indicate that the demand for housing nationally will be greater than previously estimated and with the Government committed to increasing the supply of housing in the short term, it is evident that the level of supply of land for dwellings will soon be inadequate.</p> <p>The plan centralises too much growth in large sites in a small number of urban areas. There is a major risk of these sites not being delivered due to the infrastructure costs. The acceptability of imposing a high level of change upon a few communities is questionable. The spreading of development more evenly across the district is a fairer way of easing the burden of adjustment to an incoming population to have a lesser impact upon a greater number of people.</p> <p>As a settlement, Ellistown is in danger of being overwhelmed by the continued expansion of industrial development, separating it from the communities of the adjacent areas of Coalville. In close proximity to these major employment opportunities, it represents a sustainable location for employees to live, but it lacks the population base to give it a good range of facilities, whilst possessing a school it has only basic shopping facilities.</p> <p>It is suggested that an increase in the number of</p>	<p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) provides evidence of housing need, the housing requirements set out in the Local Plan also take account of economic development and future employment creation in the district.</p> <p>The Local plan allows for small scale development in the sustainable villages to meet local need. The Local Plan also allows for development in other sustainable locations, in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. It also allows for development of brownfield land in the small villages. The affordable housing exceptions site policy allows for a limited number of market homes on rural exceptions sites to ensure their viability.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the Local Plan. The Limits to development will be revised as part of the next iteration of the Local Plan to take into account of sites granted planning permission since 1st April 2015.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council will monitor the implementation of Local Plan policies and 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 Policy IM2</p>		J T Newbold & Son	Sansom Hamilton

<p>houses in Ellistown would safeguard the future of existing facilities and result in the introduction of a greater range of choice. This would give a greater sense of community and mitigate the impact of the settlement becoming subsumed into the urban area of Coalville.</p> <p>The properties on the west side of Whitehill Road Ellistown are vulnerable to the extension of the clay workings associated with the Ibstock Brick production facility. Windows on the properties face the direction of workings. If a development boundary were to allow development in depth, than new houses could be erected which were designed in such a way that they would be a buffer between the mineral workings and the existing housing. Within the new development, the new homes could be orientated and designed internally to mitigate the impact of the mineral workings.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that the development boundary should be extended in accordance with the plan submitted by post to accompany this submission.</p>				
<p>It is stated that 1600 of the south-east Coalville site will not be built in the plan period. No justification is given for this. An estimate is made, but on what basis? This is a crucial point in the plan and much more detail should be given (and made public) as to why 1600 will not be built. The plan then identifies additional allocations Money Hill (1750) and Measham (420). With the Arla site (154), this makes a total of 2419, 819 more than the 1600 that the plan suggests is required (which I don't accept). Would it not be prudent for the plan to release allocations in a phased way so that if the shortfalls suggested by the plan do not come about, then housing will be in the preferred areas rather than areas (Money Hill) added to existing allocations to meet a forecast shortfall that doesn't materialise.</p>	<p>Given the scale of development proposed at south-east Coalville (3,500 dwellings) is unlikely that all of these dwellings can be built within the Plan Period. A estimate of the number of homes likely to be delivered at south-east Coalville identified a shortfall of 1,600 homes over the plan period. This estimate was based on discussions with the house builders involved in the south-east Coalville site, projected delivery rates and housing market conditions. In order to meet this shortfall Policy H3 identifies allocations at Ashby and Coalville and a reserve site at Measham in the event that the final route of HS2 prohibits the development of the site to the west of High Street, Meahsam (which has a resolution to grant planning permission). The allocations at Ashby and Coalville total 1,845 dwellings, this is slightly higher than the 1,600 shortfall but provides flexibility to ensure that the housing requirements are met over the plan period.</p> <p>Additional information on draft Policies H1, H2 and H3 is provided in Background Paper 4.</p>		Chris Smith	Resident

<p>H3a would represent a massive expansion of Ashby whose roads often do not cope with the current traffic flows, it is also in contravention of key issues 4.2 in giving up agricultural land for development. The brownfield Arla site is ideal for development and adequate for the plan period, there is no need to saddle Ashby with the massive speculative, developer lead expansion with further unwanted development on Moneyhill.</p> <p>There is no need within the plan period as previously discussed for providing 10,700 additional dwellings in the district.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built 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. The table in 4.2 refers to the protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land, the site at Moneyhill is Grades 3 and 4 and is not identified as the best and most versatile land in agricultural terms.</p>		<p>Tim Gregory</p>	<p>Ashby Control Engineering Ltd.</p>
<p>there should be no more housing developments in the Ashby area. develop areas which can cope with the developments (smaller areas)</p>	<p>Noted. The Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy identifies Ashby (along with Castle Donington) as a Key Service Centre due to its range of services and facilities. A significant amount of development will take place in the Key Service Centres, although this development will be less than that identified to take place in the Principal Town (Coalville).</p>		<p>Christopher Bush</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>As already stated in Q4 the proposed housing provision at 10,700 is far higher than needed to support economic growth in the District and should be significantly reduced . It is also ridiculous to make absolutely no allowance for the inevitable small approvals that always have , and always will , make a significant contribution to the District's overall housing supply . The Council's stated strategy is to regenerate Coalville - putting the new retail into Coalville , the new jobs into Castle Donnington and the new houses into Ashby will not achieve that , it'll simply put more and more cars onto the already overloaded road network . There is absolutely no need to allocate 1,750 new homes to Money Hill on top of the 1,350 already approved for Ashby . The brownfield Arla Dairy site should be allocated , and no more .</p>	<p>To provide an allowance for small sites we would need evidence to show they were going to come forward during the plan period. We currently do not have substantial evidence to justify their inclusion.</p>		<p>Michael Ball</p>	<p>Individual</p>
<p>The allocation of more housing is based on the assumption that a better standard of living and quality of life for most people are achieved by population growth. The sites already granted permission or sitting idle should be used before any new ones are released.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built 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.</p>		<p>steve johnson</p>	<p>YYYY</p>

<p>I am not convinced by the argument that although as a result of permissions and resolutions the requirements for housing have already been met, a number of these - and quite a high number - will not be built.(Why?) I assume that if they are built, we shall then end up with a lot more houses than it is estimated that we need.</p> <p>This view leads me to consider that the Plan includes an over provision for new allocations. I also consider that to expect Ashby to provide the location for another 1700 houses is unreasonable. It is - or was - an attractive market town and is fast turning into a sprawling mass of houses. Apart from the visual impact, the footprint of the town centre is too small to service the additional number of residents who will occupy the new houses. Parking is already very difficult and no provision for additional parking seems to be included in the Plan. The town centre is also very congested already and soon the problems which existed before the bypass was constructed will recur. This will deter people from using the town centre and be detrimental to the shops. There will also be huge pressure on facilities such as the Post Office, the Leisure Centre. Indeed, facilities are steadily being taken away from the town e.g. hospital, dedicated post office, police station and yet it is expected to serve more and more people.</p>	<p>Whilst the housing requirement has been met it is identified (in para 6.7) that the total number of dwellings at south-east Coalville will not be delivered over the plan period. The Local Plan needs to ensure housing requirements can be met over the plan period. Therefore, in order to balance the market and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby. Policy H3 requires that development at Moneyhill provides suitable and safe walking and cycling links from the site to Ashby town centre as well as enhanced public transport provision.</p> <p>The infrastructure requirements at Money Hill have been discussed with the various infrastructure providers during the preparation of the Local Plan. In addition, an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p>		Lesley Birtwistle	not applicable
No	Noted.		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
Yes	Noted.		J Ball	N/A

<p>Accept the principle of eventual development on Money Hill but with reservations. The ability to market houses in one combined location at Money Hill and ARLA will be difficult to sustain at the rates implied. Shlaa 2014 states 25 dwellings pa on both sites with a possibility of 75 at Money Hill, when all builders are on-site. Assuming a 2017 start, this will require a rate of about 115 dwellings each year over 14 years to 2031.</p> <p>The dependence on access off the A511 and Smisby Road looks to create problems on this, one of the minor radial roads into town and on A511 a major distributor road with traffic to and from the centre having to be funnelled back onto Nottingham Road, if not Smisby Road. Disruption from construction traffic will be considerable not too mention the undesirable use of a junction shared between industrial and residential traffic.</p> <p>There are a number of issues to be resolved in the vicinity of Ivanhoe College and the edge of the conservation area.</p> <p>The proposed scale of development to 2031 is probably too great. Accept a lesser growth target to 2031 with the prospect of a 'reserve', to complete the development beyond that date.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council has consulted with the County Highways Authority and they are satisfied with the proposed access arrangements. It is anticipated that the Moneyhill site will be delivered within the plan period.</p>		<p>Tim Abbott</p>	<p>Householder</p>
			<p>Jane Tebbatt</p>	<p>Quarrying</p>
<p>No, the former Heather Brickworks is a large brownfield site in a sustainable location in need of regeneration. With the clear support of national planning policy and recent ministerial statements the site has evident potential to deliver in the region of 100 homes. As such this would provide the opportunity to resolve the deficit in the objectively assessment need over the plan period. Furthermore, it would increase the choice and range of site available to give greater flexibility in the Plan. Please see further representations made under Economic question 20.</p>	<p>The site at Heather Brickworks is not considered sustainable given that it is located between two settlements.</p>		<p>Bob Woollard</p>	<p>Planning and Design Group</p>
<p>Whilst I accept that more houses should be built in North-West Leicestershire they need to be in appropriate locations and of appropriate sizes. I suggest that developers should not be given carte blanche planning permission to build estates containing many 4 and 5 bedroom houses in Ashby-de-la-Zouch. I believe they do this as it's easier to sell large houses with an L65 postcode rather than an L67 one.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby. Policy H6 refers to the mix and types of houses that should be provided and identifies that there is a need to focus on the delivery of 2 and 3 bedroom properties.</p>		<p>Douglas Cooper</p>	<p>Member of Friends of Bath Grounds</p>

<p>Too many houses of all types are allocated to Ashby-de-la-Zouch. This will destroy the attractiveness of the town.</p>				
<p>No</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>JON WALTERS</p>	<p>LPT</p>
<p>The inclusion of 'H3c - Land of Ashby Road/Leicester Road, Measham' within 'Policy H3-Housing provision: new allocations' is supported.</p> <p>Notwithstanding support for the principle of allocating site H3c, it is suggested that amendments are made to the policy in respect of the deletion of criterion v).</p> <p>Policy EN2 already places a requirement for the proposed development to accord with the Water Quality Management Plan and Developer Contributions Scheme to safeguard and mitigate against any impacts on the River Mease Special Area of Conservation. In this respect, duplication of the requirements of Policy EN2 are not required as a criterion to site H3c.</p> <p>Proposed Changes to the Policy: - Delete criterion v).</p>	<p>The inclusion of the criteria regarding the River Mease was recommended as part of the Habitats Regulations Assessment.</p>		<p>Miss Marie Stacey</p>	<p>Pegasus Group</p>
<p>We would suggest more balanced growth across the District's sustainable villages and rural centres, taking the settlements as the villages themselves and their rural hinterland.</p> <p>Reliance on urban extensions has been unsuccessful across the region and in many other parts of the Country, repeating the strategy and expecting different results is considered to be an unsafe approach and should be re-thought</p> <p>Distributed growth will enhance the vitality and sustainability of settlements across the District.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal which has assessed the settlement hierarchy and the distribution of development throughout the district. It highlights the most sustainable option is to allocate the majority of development around the principal town and the key service centres. Local Service Centres and Sustainable Settlements will still receive small amounts of growth to support the current services and facilities, a number of these settlements already have extant permissions.</p>		<p>Tim Farley</p>	<p>Copesticks Ltd.</p>

<p>As per the scheme(s) at 'south-east' Coalville, the proposed allocations for land north of Ashby de la Zouch (1,750 dwellings in total) and Land off Ashby Road/Leicester Road in Measham will almost certainly not be delivered over the plan period (up to 2031). Whilst it is recognised that land values are reasonably strongly in Ashby, both schemes require significant infrastructure upgrades which will take time to deliver. Whilst it is accepted that both sites could accommodate development, the Council must consider the quantum of development that can be absorbed by the market in such a concentrated location (with particular reference to Measham where land values are relatively weak). A more effective strategy would be to allocate a series of smaller sites across the District to ensure that the required quantum of housing growth is delivered sooner rather than later and to minimise the risk of the overall strategy being undermined by a single or multiple stalled sites.</p> <p>Land to the west of Hinckley Road/Hawthorne Drive in Ibstock measures approximately 10 acres in size and could accommodate approximately 90 dwellings without the need for significant infrastructure upgrades. The site is within walking distance of various amenities and Ibstock is recognised as a sustainable location for development. Such a scheme could be delivered within 2-3 years and would provide a significant boost to the Council's housing land supply position.</p>	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that the development proposed in Ashby and Measham would not be delivered during the plan period.</p>		<p>Steven Louth</p>	<p>Richborough Estates Ltd</p>
<p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identified that housing need in North West Leicestershire for the period 2011 to 2031 equates to a total of between 5,600 and 7,000 dwellings.</p> <p>However, I understand that the revised proposed total of 10,700 houses for the region to 2031 is already satisfied through existing construction and planning permissions and those where a resolution to grant planning permission has already been given.</p> <p>On this basis, it seems logical that Ashby does not need the additional 1,750 houses on the Money Hill site.</p>	<p>The housing requirement of 10,700 dwellings has been met, however we have to ensure that these dwellings will be delivered during the plan period (to 2031). Given the scale of the proposed development at south-east Coalville it is unlikely that all the dwellings on this site will be built by 2031, therefore additional sites have been allocated to ensure the housing requirements are met during the plan period.</p>		<p>Elaine Robinson</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>

<p>The housing allocations do not appear to make reference to the most recent SHLAA assessments which we understand are to be released next year (2016). It seems premature to make housing allocations until this up-to-date data is available.</p> <p>We act on behalf of landowners whom own the site immediately east of the recently constructed 'Spode Drive', off Hepworth Road, Woodville, Swadlincote.</p> <p>This site was put forward for assessment in the SHLAA and scores positively in terms of sustainability. It is immediately located to existing residential uses, has limited constraints to development, good access to services/facilities (all within 1.5miles but the majority within 1mile). Its overall assessment is as follows:</p> <p>"The site is suitable for residential development, is a sustainable location and would benefit from the existing infrastructure provided in the local area including highway access from Hepworth Road. Use of the site for residential development would be compatible with the local area, in particular the residential development at Davenport Way and Hepworth Road/Moria Road.</p> <p>Most importantly, it concludes that "A new boundary to the development limit would be provided by the existing Hepworth Road" which would prevent urban sprawl to the south.</p> <p>Pre-application advice has also been sought on this proposal.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal which assessed the settlement hierarchy and the distribution of development throughout the district. It highlights the most sustainable option is to allocate the majority of development around the Principal Town and the Key Service Centres. Local Service Centres and Sustainable Settlements will still receive small amounts of growth to support the current services and facilities, a number of these settlements already have extant permissions. The SHLAA will be reviewed before the Local Plan is submitted for independent examination.</p>		Mrs Penny Bicknell	Les Stephan Planning Ltd
<p>Too great an increase in the size of Ashby. House prices are higher in Ashby, hence the high volume builders are keen to build there. Their profits should not be your priority.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby.</p>		Lesley Colley	None
<p>The 1750 concentration is excessive in view that the 1350 already approved would give an early total of 3100.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby.</p>		George F Stapley	NA

<p>Making provision for an additional 10,700 dwellings in the District in the Plan period is excessive. 1350 new dwellings are already approved for Ashby and little or no more should be added, as the existing and proposed infrastructure is inadequate for any further housing development. Such a high level and concentration of development in the Ashby area as proposed in the NWLDC Local Plan would ultimately put under threat high value open countryside at the Heart of the National Forest. We would support the Ashby Neighbourhood Plan target of 1,434 dwellings.</p>	<p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the residual housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and the delivery of infrastructure.</p>		<p>Andrew and Julia Ledger</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the District.</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby.</p> <p>On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairies site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal process.</p>		<p>Ruth Lovett</p>	<p>N/a</p>
<p>1,845 new dwellings sounds a fair number but once again what type of dwellings will be built and what will be the price range.</p> <p>3,100 new dwellings in Ashby alone is far too many.</p> <p>150 new dwellings on the old dairy site is OK but will the site have a shop/general store within the area for that part of town?</p>	<p>Local Plan Policy H6 sets out the types and mix of housing required on new developments. The price range of new dwellings will be determined by the housing market and is therefore not a matter for the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts housing needs over the plan period. In order ensure the housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby. The requirements for development to the north of Ashby include the provision of a range of infrastructure including community facilities.</p>		<p>Alan James Griffin</p>	<p>N/a</p>

<p>We strongly disagree that an additional 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the District. Smisby Road is a hazardous road to drive along now, due to the fact that the houses are terraced and residents have to park their vehicles on the road, thus reducing the road width. We cannot imagine the difficulties would follow if the suggested new dwellings on Moneyhill were to go ahead.</p> <p>We totally disagree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby.</p> <p>We agree that on top of the 1.350 new dwellings already approved for Ashby no more that 150 houses be built on brownfield Arla Dairy site. Especially in view of the Smisby Road problems previously referred to.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built 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. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. The County Highways Authority have been consulted and have not raised an objection to the proposed allocation.</p>		Mr DG and Mrs MP Heath	N/a
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 1350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residul housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Name unclear	n/a
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 1350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Lesley Anne Good	n/a
<p>My wife and I moved to Ashby de la Zouch nearly 4 years ago. Our reason for moving here was essentially that it is a small market town with a unique character. The centre of Ashby, based on its 3 thoroughfares, has remained in its present layout for 800 years.</p> <p>To consider increasing the housing stock/population in the manner proposed, it to threaten the very future of Ashby. Small</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the district's needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land at Ashby de la Zouch. The Draft Local Plan has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal which has assessed the settlement hierarchy and the distribution of development throughout the district. It highlights the most sustainable option is to allocate the majority of development in the Principal Town (Coalville) and Key Service Centres (Ashby de</p>		MJ Knight & AA Knight	N/a

<p>development on brownfield sites are acceptable and can be accommodated without undue changes to the historically important layout of the town centre.</p> <p>Major increases in dwellings on the outskirts will be detrimental to Ashby de la Zouch. Should your proposals go ahead, it is only a matter of time before changes to Ashby will be proposed/forced through, on the basis that they are for the greater good of the new enlarged population. Ashby will no longer be a small, attractive, historically important market town. It will, in fact, become a convenient place to live for masses of commuters working in Nottingham, Leicester and Birmingham.</p> <p>In time local planning laws relating to existing listed buildings, conservation areas etc, will be cast aside to accommodate 'growth at any cost'.</p> <p>We are sure that there are many other areas within North West Leicestershire where additional housing stock would be welcomed, and would indeed bring welcome revenue to those areas. But please allow Ashby to develop in its own way, without masses of new build housing.</p>	<p>la Zouch and Castle Donington).</p>			
<p>Object to the level of development proposed for Ashby.</p> <p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 1350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the residual housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby.</p>		<p>T Anderson</p>	<p>n/a</p>

<p>Do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>Do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 1350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Chris and Monika Ingamells	n/a
<p>1,350 new dwellings are already approved for Ashby and little or no more should be added, as the existing and proposed infrastructure is inadequate for any further housing development. Such a high level and concentration of development in the Ashby area as proposed in the NWLDC Local Plan would ultimately put under threat 'high value' open countryside at the Heart of the National Forest. I would support the Draft Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plan target of 1,434 dwellings.</p>	<p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the residual housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p>		David Colclough	N/a
<p>We should certainly only be building on brown field sites. Our countryside is too precious to be lost. It provides leisure, food and space for wildlife. We consider it extreme short term thinking to build houses without considering the consequences. Ashby cannot cope with any further developments, Ashby is not alone in this.</p>	<p>The development of brownfield sites is the preferred approach in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. There are not currently enough brownfield sites that are suitable and viable for housing provision.</p> <p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby</p>		D & P Hamilton	N/a
<p>I am very concerned (as are many others) about the plans to build on Moneyhill. There are many reasons why this should not happen.</p> <p>1) We live in this area designated as The National Forest. The presumption is that an extensive forest of trees will be grown over a period of time - NOT a forest of houses/buildings etc. As Ashby is almost at the centre of 'The National Forest', it appears ludicrous to cover the open land with new development (buildings) and not trees. Ashby will be increased by 61% if all of the proposed building goes ahead. What an eyesore in 'The National</p>	<p>New development within the National Forest will be required to contribute towards the creation of the forest through on-site or off-site tree planting in accordance with National Forest Planting Guidelines.</p> <p>In terms of industrial buildings the former Lounge disposal point has permission for storage and distribution use, however it could be affected by the currently preferred proposed route for HS2.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as</p>		Mrs Mary M Smith	N/a

<p>Forest'.</p> <p>2) Anyone consenting to the Moneyhill scheme will be contributing to a 'disappearing Britain'. Our beloved countryside is quickly being lost under bricks and concrete. If building goes ahead to fill in the land up to the bypass, there will soon be a conurbation up to the boundary and then all the way to Burton-on-Trent and beyond. Industrial units are already spreading from the Smisby Road roundabout towards Boundary. Land near Sinope has gone up for sale so it begs the question, will more houses be built coming towards Ashby? How soon will it be before Ashby and Coalville are joined? Woodland is also for sale on the other side of the bypass.</p> <p>3) More land will be lost to the HS2 if it goes ahead. Also, are warehouse buildings going to be built as you leave Ashby for Coalville.</p> <p>4) There is a highways issue for construction traffic. The proposed access to the Moneyhill site is in a dangerous position. Also congestion has to be considered. Adding a possible 3,400+ cars (envisaged development = 1,750 houses) to Ashby's road system would not be sustainable. This does not include the many other development already going ahead and those passed to be built soon *e.g near the new health centre).</p> <p>5) We were assured by the estate agent when we purchased our home that the countryside behind it was green belt and would not be built on. What happened to this assertion? Has the land legally had to change of use approved? It is also constantly under cultivation (food crops). We have been told we need more land for food production (be aware of the rising population). In fact many fields are cultivated in the proposed building area. What a nonsense to take production land to build on. Do not take away what is needed and what is already there! All brownfield sites should be redeveloped before any more fields are taken. It is also a haven for wildlife. There is concern about bees, birds, animals etc: where are they to go? Their habitat is being destroyed.</p> <p>We have had more than our quota of building which is spoiling our historical market town. Once we have lost the land it is lost forever!</p>	<p>discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>In terms of green belt, there is no land defined as green belt within Leicestershire. The land at Moneyhill is identified on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map as Countryside. The development of brownfield sites is the preferred approach in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. There are not currently enough brownfield sites that are deliverable and viable for housing provision. The draft Local Plan has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal which has assessed the settlement hierarchy and the distribution of development throughout the district. It highlights the most sustainable option is to allocate the majority of development in the principal town and the key service centres.</p>			
---	---	--	--	--

<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 1350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Christine Iddon	n/a
<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 1350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Anthony Iddon	n/a
<p>I do not agree that a further 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby.</p> <p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district.</p> <p>Permission should be given to develop the Brownfield former Arla dairy site, after which no further allocations should be given for any development in Ashby.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Mr P S Dyer	n/a
<p>I do not agree that a further 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby. I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district. Permission should be given to develop the Brownfield former Arla dairy site, after which no further allocations should be given for any development in Ashby.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Mrs S Dyer	n/a

<p>I do not agree that an additional allocation of 1,845 new dwellings (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) is needed in the district.</p> <p>Ashby has become a disproportionate urban sprawl.</p> <p>No justification for 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby</p> <p>On top of the 1350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the brownfield Arla Dairy Site) should be allocated.</p> <p>Ashby, a town at the Heart of the National Forest, is at risk of being left with barely any green spaces.</p>	<p>Housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation would be to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		Lorna Titley	n/a
<p>We object to the proposed new allocations on the basis that they fail to take into account the land that adjoins Woodville and Swadlincote as expressed above. They rely on a settlement hierarchy that we fundamentally question as set out in our comments above.</p> <p>We suggest that an allocation is made for 200 homes and open space on 9 hectares of land north of Occupation Lane making use of land in a sustainable location, that has been previously mined and remains underutilised. This should be a priority before resorting to greenfield lands in alternative locations which are in agricultural production and which may result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the residents of Albert Village will use the services and facilities within neighbouring settlements that may be outside the district boundary. The settlement hierarchy takes into account the services and facilities within individual settlements to meet day to day needs. Sufficient land has been identified elsewhere to meet the identified housing needs.</p>		Tom Beavin	jvh planning
<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposed local plan 2011 - 2031</p> <p>As the number of new homes required by the government have already been consented I do not consider that an additional 1700+ houses proposed on the site known as Money Hill in Ashby are needed as the NWLDC can already meet its obligation in this area until 2031.</p> <p>The infrastructure within the town is simply insufficient to accommodate the excessive number of houses over and above those which have already been consented and satisfies the government requirements.</p> <p>A proposed 60% increase in the size of Ashby, or any town with an ancient infrastructure cannot be</p>	<p>The evidence of housing need is detailed in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) the housing requirement in the Local Plan also takes into account future employment growth. The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby.</p> <p>Whilst there maybe brownfield sites available within the county the housing requirement identified is for the district and whilst the development of brownfield sites is the preferred approach in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, there are not currently enough brownfield sites in the district that are deliverable and viable for housing provision.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new</p>		Paul Andrew	NA

<p>justified especially when it is known that brownfield sites are already available or will be coming available for possible future development in other parts of the county.</p> <p>The traffic which will be generated by the proposed development will mean that the capacity of the road network leading into and out of the town, will be exceeded. The junction of the A42 at junction 13 already has massive queues during the peak hours. Any "improvements" to this junction will NOT reduce traffic moving into the town centre it will only contribute to causing gridlock.</p> <p>Therefore, I request that any reference to future development at the Money Hill site is removed from the local plan to ensure the greenfield which remains is outside the limits of permitted development.</p> <p>Please confirm that my objection will be registered and that all the members of the planning committee will also be notified of both mine and all the other objections raised in connection with the local plan.</p>	<p>requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p>			
<p>(a) It's not a simple yes or no answer. The Labour Group recognise that land needs to be made available for new housing – but there has been a failure to engage with communities (large and small) in discussions where the best location is for new housing</p> <p>(b) There should be a 'brownfield first' policy</p> <p>(c) 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>(d) The Public Inquiries on the applications at Money Hill will determine an appropriate response to this question.</p> <p>(e) Communities are likely to be offered a false choice between Money Hill and the 'Whitwick Green Wedge'. Neither are acceptable and a lot of political energy will be wasted on this debate. We should be looking at other solutions, a freestanding Garden Village for example.</p> <p>(f) Development deliverability will reflect the</p>	<p>Noted. The development of brownfield sites is the preferred approach in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. There are not currently enough brownfield sites that are deliverable and viable for housing provision. In terms of the issue of a garden village, no sites have been promoted for this purpose which raises significant questions regarding the deliverability of such a proposal. Furthermore, the residual housing requirement is likely to be too small to support a viable garden village.</p>		<p>Sue McKendrick</p>	<p>Labour Group leader</p>

<p>outcome of this question</p> <p>(g) We question why this council has not taken up the Government's position on building a new Garden Village? This option needs to be seriously considered. A site could be found that will not overwhelm existing larger settlements. A situation close to the trunk road network would be convenient for the commuters who appears to this council's priority.</p> <p>(h) Measham. The policy document indicates alternative provision for 420 houses if development is unviable at the Measham Waterside site, due to HS2. The draft statement doesn't make it clear what would happen if Measham Waterside site was able to be partly developed. The policy should make it clear that the Ashby Road / Leicester Road allocation should only allow enough houses to make up any shortfall from the Waterside site.</p>				
<p>We support the proposed housing allocation H3a (Land North of Ashby) which provides the most sustainable option for planned growth of Ashby.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Andrew Thomas</p>	<p>Thomas Taylor Planning</p>
<p>The extent of the Money Hill landholding is approximately 118 hectares and comprises an area of land that is bound by the A511, Nottingham Road and Smisby Road. The extent of the land subject in control by the Money Hill Consortium is identified in the plan at Appendix A.</p> <p>Money Hill has been positively identified in previous iterations of the Local Plan (LDF Core Strategy) as the preferred location for the future growth of Ashby-de-la-Zouch. This has been reinforced by a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that has both assessed Money Hill site and, importantly, alternative options for development in the District that were rejected on sustainability grounds.</p> <p>NWLDC resolved to withdraw its Local Plan on 29 October 2013. Former draft Policy 37: Ashby-de-la-Zouch identified Money Hill as being capable of accommodating a minimum of 605 units in response to the available evidence regarding capacity at Packington Water Treatment Works. Since the decision</p> <p>to withdraw the Local Plan further evidence has been produced by Severn Trent Water (March</p>	<p>Noted</p>		<p>James Bompas</p>	<p>Moneyhill Consortium</p>

2014) that has confirmed Packington Water Treatment Works has capacity for between 2,170 and 2,500 additional properties, thereby overcoming the restrictive element contained within former draft Policy 37: Ashby-de-la-Zouch that limited growth to circa. 605 homes.

The Core Strategy was accompanied by a SA that made specific reference to the application site after having considered alternative locations for residential growth in Ashby-de-la-Zouch. Paragraph 9.19 of the SA stated that:

“The preferred Broad Location identified in the Submission version Core Strategy in to the north [Money Hill], this location could support a mix of new development, including housing and local shops and services. The location of the site should mean there are also existing nearby services although

new links would need to be provided into neighbouring residential areas to ensure these are a walkable distance and to reduce the need to travel by car. There is no current bus service to the site although the scale of growth here may be able to support an extension of an existing route. Policy CS37 sets out a list of types of social, environmental and physical infrastructure that should be provided as part of this development”.

b. Preparing a Sustainable Development Plan

Since the Local Plan was withdrawn NWLDC has embarked upon the preparation of a new Local Plan that is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Money Hill is a strategically well-positioned and is immediately adjacent to a Key Service Centre that offers an established wide range of services and facilities. These are comprehensively set-out in the NWLDC Settlement Hierarchy Background Paper. However, in summary, Money Hill is close to a vibrant town centre and is easily accessible by foot, cycle and bus. Ashby-de-la-Zouch itself has a good level of shops; financial institutions; post office; places of worship, and health-related uses (e.g. opticians, dentist, pharmacy and GP surgery) as well as providing a strong social fabric, with cafes, restaurants and bars / pubs. Ashby-de-la-Zouch

also has several foodstores, including a Co-operative, Aldi and Tesco Extra superstore within a short-distance of Money Hill. The settlements existing commercial and community infrastructure is also complemented with a range of employment uses at the Ashby Business Park, Ivanhoe Business Park and Nottingham Road Industrial Estate.

Critically, through the strategic allocation of 1,750 homes at Money Hill and the Former Arla Dairies a robust policy platform can be achieved through the Local Plan that would guide complementary land-use decision-making over the next 15 years. A visionary and aspirational approach to forward planning would set-out business, infrastructure, environmental, and health and well-being needs on a single, comprehensively planned site. Draft Policy H3: Housing Provision seeks to achieve this by establishing the parameters in which residential development at Money Hill / Former Arla Dairies would be acceptable. This includes:

- access to the A511, Smisby Road, and Nottingham Road;
- provision of suitable and safe walking and cycling connections from the site to Ashby town centre and adjoining employment areas;
- provision of a range of infrastructure including a new primary school, extensions to secondary schools, affordable housing, open spaces, green infrastructure and community facilities and enhanced public transport provision and;
- design and layout of the proposed development should minimise the impact upon the setting of Ashby de la Zouch Conservation Area and;
- provision for the discharge of wastewater into the River Mease catchment in accordance with the provisions of policy En2.

In addition to the above, an unparalleled strength of the Money Hill site is its ability to also bring-forward employment opportunities. This ability to provide a multi-dimensional approach to forward planning means that new homes would not be delivered in isolation and alongside new jobs would positively contribute towards the overall objective of the Local Plan – sustainable development.

--	--	--	--	--

<p>Complimentary land uses would also deliver the strategic priorities of NWLDC. In particular, it wholeheartedly accords with Objective 2 (p.20) which states “[the new plan] supports the delivery of new homes balanced with economic growth to provide a stock of housing that meets the needs of the community, including the need for affordable housing”. The Money Hill site is of a size and location that affords good access to the wider Strategic Highway Network and is likely to appeal to broad spectrum of employers.</p> <p>Not only is the Money Hill site capable of delivering NWLDCs strategic priorities, but at the site-specific level also offers few planning constraints. The site is not positioned in a Flood Zone, is not in an ecologically sensitive location, or does it has adverse ground conditions. The site is also not hampered by constraints that could affect deliverability, such as land ownership, development finance, or drawn-</p> <p>3</p> <p>out build out rates. Instead, Money Hill has the combined backing of two national housebuilders that are financially well-equipped and resourced to respond to economic cycles within the plan period and have a strong track-record of delivery in the District.</p> <p>The MHC would like to emphasise the associated-risks of not allocating Money Hill. To allocate further development in Coalville (beyond the +35% total distribution) risks undermining the Local Plan given the known challenges associated with development viability and costs. This is also emphasised in Paragraph 173 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Likewise, to apportion growth lower down the settlement hierarchy would mean that development would occur in those locations that are less well equipped in terms of services and facilities and also place a greater reliance on travel by car due to their more isolated characteristics. Any apportionment of housing growth would also most also present greater challenges in terms of infrastructure delivery and would most likely mean there would be a need for physical extensions to settlements, rather than infilling, as afforded by the A511 bypass.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

c. The Role of the Neighbourhood Plan

Ashby Town Council is simultaneously consulting on its draft Neighbourhood Plan.

The MHC is actively engaged in the promotion of development at Money Hill in line with both the pending planning applications for 605 residential units and with respect to the wider scheme as envisaged within the draft NWLDC Local Plan. As such the MHC warmly welcome the vision shown by Ashby Town Council and other contributors in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan, aimed at supporting the future of Ashby as a balanced and vibrant community.

Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan has been proactively prepared and we commend the excellent work done to date, we are concerned that since the current consultation in effect precedes both the appeal decision and the outcome of the consultation process on the Local Plan, residents are not able to assess the full picture. Nor can the Neighbourhood Plan fully reflect local concerns or aspirations with regard to the development of Money Hill. As such we have recommended to Ashby Town Council whether it would be appropriate for the current consultation process to be extended, or even reinvigorated following confirmation of the appeal decision and receipt of feedback from the Local Plan consultation.

d. Summary

In summary, the MHC strongly believe that a strategic allocation at Money Hill is both a positive and sustainable response to the need to deliver a residual housing shortfall of 1,500 homes. As confirmed in the accompanying SA the site scores particularly strongly in terms of its proximity to local amenities, including health, education, and community facilities.

We trust you find this consultation response helpful and look forward to working alongside NWLDC and other stakeholders in developing a robust Local Plan.

--

--

--

--

<p>Proposed Policy H3 makes provision for one single large housing allocation at Ashby de la Zouch to provide some 1,750 dwellings, along with a reserve site at Ashby Road/Leicester Road Measham in the event that the route of HS2 prohibits development on land west of High Street.</p> <p>Whilst we have no comments on the specific sites proposed for allocation, we have real concerns that the plan does not provide a sufficiently flexible approach to development over the plan period that is able to respond to changing circumstances or that sufficient provision is made to allow for further growth over the plan period in the larger sustainable settlements.</p> <p>We have indicated above that the Council, working in conjunction with its HMA partners, should commission an updated Housing Market Assessment and also look to extend the plan period to 2036. This could potentially have implications for the scale of future development required in the district.</p> <p>There are sustainable opportunities for some further development through the extension of consented development at Hugglescote, and at Ibstock, Ravenstone and Packington. These opportunities should be considered for allocation as a means of providing a degree of flexibility for the plan in terms of housing delivery. Plans of the potential sites where Davidsons has an interest are attached at Appendix 1 to these submissions.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which has assessed the settlement hierarchy and the distribution of development throughout the district. The SA identifies the most sustainable option is to allocate the majority of development around the principal town and the key service centres. Local Service Centres and Sustainable settlements will still receive small amounts of growth to support the current services and facilities, a number of these settlements already have extant permissions.</p> <p>The Leicester and Leicestershire HMA are in the process of commissioning a Housing and Economic Needs Assessment which will provide updated housing and employment requirements. There is no intention to extend the plan period and the Memorandum of Understanding across the Leicestershire Authorities is to 2031.</p>		Guy Longley,	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.
<p>Whilst policy S2 provides for a housing allocation of a minimum of 10,700 dwellings over the plan period, whilst the number of sites under construction, permitted, or subject to a resolution to grant provide for 10,754 dwellings, the further allocations of H3a, H3b and H3c allow for a further 2,265. This provides for a total of 13,019 dwellings. This, whilst noted to be marginally over a 20% buffer of the minimum (12,840) by 179 dwellings (21.7%), this is considered to be a tight margin even with an assumption of a number of windfall developments.</p> <p>As such, the three new housing allocations (based on assumed figures), are not considered to be enough to ensure that the local planning authority is able to meet its proposed housing allocation during the plan period. It is therefore suggested</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to ensure the housing requirement can be met over the plan period. The allocation of sites has been done in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and these sites have been assessed through the SA process.</p> <p>The site at The Green, Donington le Heath is subject to a planning application and will be assessed on it's own merits.</p>		Alan Hardwick	rg+p

that a number of suitable additional sites are included within this policy to ensure this allocation is achieved. Given current market conditions and the associated viability impacts of housing development, alongside the potentially reduced housing numbers resulting from detailed design and landscaping (as part of reserved matters applications), there is a further risk that the number of dwellings anticipated over the plan period may not be achieved.

Should the Council not deem it appropriate to identify specific sites, the policy should be adapted to allow, subject to appropriate design and compliance with other proposed planning policies, that planning applications for sites of up to 100 dwellings may be acceptable within the District to achieve the housing allocation numbers.

Whilst each site must be assessed on its own individual merits, it is proposed that the development of land south of The Green, Donnington le Heath would be an appropriate additional allocation (45 dwellings) to add to the proposed housing allocations. The site, subject to a current planning application (reference 15/00951/OUTM) was identified in the 2014 SHLAA as potentially suitable, subject to a change to the limits of development, and the removal of the Area of Separation Designation (the latter which has been incorporated within the Local Plan Draft). The document confirms that there are no fundamental highway or ecological concerns. The site is available and achievable. It is also well screened from the surrounding countryside via existing planting and the site's topography; whilst there are a few vantage points within the countryside designation to the south that would offer a restricted visibility of parts of the site, there is no resulting significant impact on the landscape and hence no conflict with Countryside Policy S4.

<p>This site therefore provides a logical new housing allocation which could be developed in addition to the proposed allocations. Further, the site at The Green, Donnington le Heath is more strongly related to the</p> <p>settlement of Coalville, specifically with regards to the accessibility of the town centre than a number of the larger allocations to the southeast (1,665m from the centre of the site to the edge of Coalville Town Centre, compared to 2,200m from the allocation H2g).</p> <p>In support, the Landscape and Visual Appraisal, as submitted with the planning application, concludes that 'It is anticipated that the proposed development on relatively low ground can be sympathetically</p> <p>accommodated within the existing landscape and will not have a significant adverse effect on the character of the local and wider landscape.</p> <p>The Site is visually contained by existing boundary vegetation and existing neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Views of the Site from the south are not possible due to the vegetation along the disused railway line and localised topography. From the north, views of the Site are restricted by existing vegetation and maturing woodland. Direct views will be possible from residents of neighbouring properties on The Green and Midland Road.</p> <p>The potential for adverse effects on landscape and visual amenity have been recognised and mitigation measures recommended for the scheme to avoid or reduce adverse effects.</p> <p>Opportunities for landscape enhancement have also been considered. The outline layout proposals incorporate landscape features, including appropriately located multi-functional public open space. The proposals, that are subject to further detailed design, look to respond to local character and</p> <p>provide a housing development to enhance the overall quality of the area'.</p> <p>A full copy of the Assessment can be provided</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>upon request, but is also available, alongside further information with regards to the suitability of this site, included within the submitted application (under consideration), reference 15/00951/OUTM.</p>				
<p>There is a risk that the Draft Plan does not provide sufficient mix of sites of varying sizes to ensure that future housing requirements are met. A more flexible approach would be to provide for further development opportunities in sustainable locations to complement the proposed strategic allocation at Ashby de la Zouch.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to ensure the housing requirement can be met over the plan period. The allocation of sites has been done in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and these sites have been assessed through the SA process. The Local plan allows for appropriate development in the sustainable villages and the re-use and adaptation of buildings for appropriate uses in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. It also allows for development of brownfield land in the small villages. The affordable housing policy exceptions site policy allows for a limited number of market houses on rural exceptions sites to ensure their viability. The Council will monitor the implementation of the Local Plan policies and 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 Policy IM2.</p>		Helen Prangley	Western Range
<p>We should be developing the Brown Fields and derelict sites around the town centre to minimise Car Use so the work force is near to the employment centres within Coalville.</p> <p>We should be retaining the beautiful countryside around Coalville for future generations to come and also for the wildlife habitat (not for a quick profit for Developers .)</p>	<p>Noted. The development of brownfield sites is the preferred approach in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. There are not currently enough brownfield sites in the District that are suitable and viable for housing provision.</p>		Mr & Mrs M Bennion	N/a
<p>I object to the proposed Draft Local Plan, particularly the proposed Housing Development sites proposed for Ashby-de-la-Zouch.</p> <p>Ashby is now gridlocked and the access roads to the Town Centre are already inadequate for existing Housing provision, never mind those new sites already given planning permission.</p> <p>No new Development should be proposed, supported, or given permission to access any of the roads feeding into the Town Centre Nottingham Road, Wood Street, Leicester Road, Station Road, Kilwardby Street, Burton Road.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>The County Council, as the Highways Authority, have been consulted as part of the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>		Alan Mason	N/a

<p>windfall sites should be included in the projection. Arla dairy site and Moneyhill</p> <p>should be separate allocations. Allocation of Moneyhill is not required to meet revised housing numbers suggested.</p> <p>Allocating shortfall in Coalville to Ashby goes against proposed hierarchy. 61%</p> <p>growth in Ashby is unsustainable. Arla dairy site is supported. Public car parking facilities in ashby is critical and should included.</p>	<p>National planning guidance states that local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in their five-year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. There is not currently any compelling evidence to suggest that windfall sites will continue to come forward in the district.</p> <p>Moneyhill and Arla Dairies adjoin and are proposed as a single allocation.</p>		C Tandy	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society
<p>3. Policy S5 New Development. We support the identification of Site A 22, the Dairy site at Ashby for development within the Plan period.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		Andrew Thomson	Thomson Planning Partnership
<p>In our view the Plan's housing allocations appear to be an exercise in hitting targets but not meeting the identified needs of the District as a whole. It is a strategy that is led by the need to accommodate large numbers of new homes with minimal interaction and engagement with existing communities.</p> <p>The NPPF makes clear that the planning system should deliver a wide choice of high quality new homes. Indeed, this is the title of Section 6 of the Framework. Widening the choice of new homes is also a key objective of the Framework as set out in paragraph 9. It is clear that any strategy that concentrates development in only a few locations and curtails development elsewhere will fail to deliver the wide choice of housing demanded by the NPPF. The consequences of Policy H3 will be that no further planned development outside the three locations specified in the policy will come forward for the remaining 6-7 years of the Plan period. This is not considered to be an appropriate or justified position.</p> <p>In addition, it is unrealistic to expect two large sites to deliver substantial levels of housing year on year. This is not just a factor of a developer's ability to build but is more closely related to the ability of the market to provide buyers for that many properties in only two or three locations. In turn, this has implications for the Council's ability to maintain its housing trajectory. In our view a wider distribution of development would significantly increase the potential for annual delivery rates to be maintained and the housing trajectory to be</p>	<p>The allocations for development have been determined in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and have been assessed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process. The Local plan allows for small scale development in sustainable villages and for development of brownfield land in the small villages, in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. The affordable housing exceptions site policy allows for a limited number of market housing on rural exceptions sites to ensure their viability.</p> <p>The Council will monitor the implementation of Local Plan policies and 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 Policy IM2.</p>		Tim Evans	Bilfinger GVA

met.				
<p>Whilst policy S2 provides for a housing allocation of a minimum of 10,700 dwellings over the plan period, whilst the number of sites under construction, permitted, or subject to a resolution to grant provide for 10,754 dwellings, the further allocations of H3a, H3b and H3c allow for a further 2,265. This provides for a total of 13,019 dwellings. This, whilst noted to be marginally over a 20% buffer of the minimum (12,840) by 179 dwellings (21.7%), this is considered to be a tight margin even with an assumption of a number of windfall developments. Additional consideration should be given to the need for housing figures to be updated to account for historic under supply.</p> <p>As such, the three new housing allocations (based on assumed figures), are not considered to be enough to ensure that the local planning authority is able to meet its proposed housing allocation during the plan period. It is therefore suggested that a number of suitable additional sites are included within this policy to ensure this allocation is achieved. Given current market conditions and the associated viability impacts of housing development, alongside the potentially reduced housing numbers resulting from detailed design and landscaping (and/or reserved matters applications), there is a further risk that the number of dwellings anticipated over the plan period may not be achieved.</p> <p>Should it not be deemed appropriate to identify specific sites, the policy should be adapted to allow, subject to appropriate design and compliance with other proposed planning policies that planning applications for sites of up to 100 dwellings may be acceptable within the District to achieve the housing allocation numbers.</p> <p>Whilst each site must be assessed on its own individual merits, it is proposed that the development of land at Butt Lane/Hepworth Road, Woodville would be an appropriate additional allocation (91 dwellings) to add to the proposed housing allocations. The site, whilst subject to a recent refusal (15/00306/OUTM) against Officer recommendation, is the subject of a further planning application to address the concerns of coalescence between settlements.</p>	<p>The allocations for development have been determined in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and have been assessed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process. The site at Butt Lane/Hepworth Rod, Woodville has a resolution to grant planning permission, subject to a Section 106 Agreement being finalised.</p>		Alan Hardwick	rg+p

<p>In support of the potential allocation as referred, and the impact on the Countryside Policy S4 as referred above, the Landscape and Visual Assessment as submitted with the revised application, concludes that 'The development site falls outside the development boundaries as identified in the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan [as regards the existing local plan]. The proposed development would not result in the loss of separation between the settlements of Blackfordby and Woodville. The NW Leicestershire Local Planning [as existing] does not protect the Site Location through its Area of Separation policy.</p> <p>The development proposals are for residential development with areas of multifunctional public open space. Retention of existing woodland and hedgerow features on Site and the provision of additional woodland and tree planting in line with National Forest Guidelines.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed development can be sympathetically accommodated within the existing 'rurban' landscape and will not have a significant adverse effect on the existing landscape character and visual amenity of the area. An opportunity exists for housing development at the Heart of the National Forest that would contribute to the changing rural appearance of the locality.'</p> <p>A full copy of the report can be provided upon request, but it considered to reaffirm the limited impact of edge of settlement development within the area of Woodville, specifically regarding the site to the northeast of Butt Lane.</p> <p>Summarising, this site should be considered jointly with regard to planning policies both within the districts of North West Leicestershire (as the local planning authority) and South Derbyshire (as the adjacent local planning authority) given the sites position at the District boundaries. This should result in the site being assessed as adjoining the 'urban area' of Swadlincote (incorporating Woodville). Woodville is identified as providing a range of higher order facilities and services and will be widely accessible by public transport. As a result the site should be given similar consideration to that of other areas as adjacent to the Principal Towns as identified in the settlement hierarchy</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>within NWLDC. The site would not appear isolated, being viewed against the backdrop of the existing development within Woodville, and the urbanising effect provided by the eastern section of the recent link road (Hepworth Road). The Local Plan, nor the background policy paper 4 gives any consideration to such cross-boundary development potential.</p>				
<p>We strongly disagree with the proposal to promote Ashby, and Money Hill in particular, as a housing growth zone and the preferred site for almost the entire proposed new allocation of 1750 dwellings, housing 4500 people and giving a growth of over 36% in the town population.</p> <p>The district is a mixture of market towns, where the plan objectives (10,11,12) of environmental protection and conservation are paramount, and former mining settlements where the key objective (6) of the plan is to continue to promote regeneration. It also benefits from a potential employment growth area on its northern boundary. For the following reasons we think the proposal fails to meet the plan objective 2 of balanced housing and employment growth and seriously misaddresses these objectives, needs and opportunities.</p> <p>Development in Ashby</p> <p>1) The need for the high level of district-wide housing development now proposed in policy S2 is highly questionable. In this context to concentrate such major expansion on Ashby is premature and would needlessly pre-empt the opportunity for the careful enhancement and conservation of the town and surroundings. Ashby is currently a relatively prosperous, self-sustaining vibrant Market Town community and stands to derive little if any additional benefit from the over rapid large scale growth suggested for Money Hill. DLPlan para 6.16</p> <p>2) Many local employment sites in the town have recently been sacrificed for new housing development. Accordingly there is no clearly demonstrated need to promote substantial additional housing in Ashby to accommodate local workers. The concentrated major housing growth proposed for the town provides primarily for workers from possible employment growth</p>	<p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>The majority of the housing has been allocated to Coalville in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. Swadlincote is within South Derbyshire District and their Local Plan would set out the development requirements for Swadlincote. In North West Leicestershire the Local Plan provides for Local Service Centres and Sustainable Settlements to accommodate growth to support current services and facilities, a number of these settlements already have extant permissions.</p>		David Owen	Cliftonthorpe Management Company

elsewhere. Thus to promote this in one immediate allocation in Ashby would simply add to the high level of out-commuting, unnecessarily upset the environment and balance of the town services and pre-empt the proper planning of facilities in the developing Neighbourhood Plan. It fails to meet balanced growth objective 2 and is therefore not the most sustainable option.

3) In contrast Coalville, and adjacent Swadlincote in South Derbyshire, have remaining environmental and infrastructure problems and would derive substantially greater benefit from well planned future investment. Similarly the smaller former mining communities could benefit substantially from the benefits of scale which further investment would bring. If the overall requirement for new housing allocations is approved it should be carefully split between the districts disparate settlements in accordance with the key objectives and identified needs referred to above. No detailed options for spreading the investment were properly and fully considered.

4) Ashby has witnessed a high level of housing investment recently and is known to be a far more attractive and profitable location for housing investment. Accordingly to focus major new housing allocations on Ashby is a flawed strategy. It would put unnecessary pressure on Ashby while further undermining efforts to attract investment to the former mining communities undergoing regeneration. These are currently less attractive to developers and in Coalville the possible deficiency in housing land take-up should be tackled rather than a replacement allocation transferred to Ashby. DLPlan para 6.6-8. It would also exacerbate the current imbalance between housing growth in Ashby and employment growth elsewhere.

5) The strategy seems more based on acceding to development pressures in relatively desirable Ashby than one designed to steer investment to meet needs in the major employment and former mining areas which are less attractive for developer housing projects. As such it will only exacerbate the differences in the fortunes of these areas and lead to overheating in Ashby.

6) A more positive approach which benefits all communities requires imaginative steps to

--	--	--	--	--

<p>positively promote investment on outstanding allocations and other brownfield sites in and around Coalville and the other former mining towns.</p> <p>Development on Money Hill</p> <p>1) We object to proposal to promote a major built up growth zone on the prominent Money Hill greenfield landscape and so pre-empt future consideration of its wider leisure potential in the development of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. To do so without a thorough impact analysis on Ashby is an unnecessarily reckless, ill advised and unacceptable scenario.</p> <p>2) To allocate the whole of Money Hill for housing in one step is very risky and blocks the opportunity to develop the wider health benefits which could be achieved by exploiting the unique opportunities for improved and forested footpath, bridleway and cycling links northwards and across the A511 to the Ivanhoe Way and the outstanding countryside areas of the Pistern Hills, Staunton Harold and Calke Abbey. Regrettably neither appraisal of these and other equally appropriate uses- including perhaps senior school and college parking and expansion- of Money Hill nor impact analysis of the effect on Ashby of this major growth proposal have been undertaken.</p> <p>3) Strong arguments and feelings were expressed against such highly visible and prominent development, both badly connected to the town and adding to congestion, when the last plan was considered.</p>				
<p>Policy S3 proposes a settlement hierarchy comprising of :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Principle Town – Coalville Urban Area ; · Key Service Centres of Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington ; · Local Service Centres of Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham ; · 17 named Sustainable Villages ; · 16 named Small Villages ; 	<p>Noted. The Local Plan needs to ensure the housing requirement can be met over the plan period. The allocation of sites has been done in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and these sites have been assessed through the SA process.</p> <p>The Local plan allows for small scale development in the sustainable villages to meet local need. The Local Plan also allows for the re-use and adaptation of buildings for appropriate uses in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. It also allows for development of brownfield land in the small villages. The affordable housing policy exceptions site policy allows for a limited number of market houses on rural exceptions sites to ensure their viability.</p> <p>The Council will monitor the implementation of the Local</p>		Susan E Green	HBF

<p>· Hamlets (subject to Policy S4 on the Countryside).</p> <p>Paragraph 6.4 of the Local Plan explains that 10,754 dwellings already exist on consented sites or on sites with resolutions to approve subject to legal agreements. These sites are listed in Policies H1 and H2. However paragraph 6.8 anticipates that only 9,100 of the 10,754 dwellings will be built throughout the plan period up to 2031. Therefore a further provision of 1,600 dwellings is proposed. Policy H3 sets out proposed new housing allocations including a Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) for 1,750 dwellings in Ashby de la Zouch and a reserve site for 420 dwellings at Measham.</p> <p>In allocating sites the Council should be mindful that to maximize 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. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets. Whilst some SUEs may have multiple outlets, in general increasing the number of sales outlets available means increasing the number of housing sites. So for any given time period, all else been equal, overall sales and build out rates are faster from 20 sites of 50 units than 10 sites of 100 units or 1 site of 1,000 units. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand. In summary a wider variety of sites in the widest possible range of locations ensures all types of house builder have access to suitable land which in turn increases housing delivery.</p>	<p>Plan policies and 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 Policy IM2.</p>			
<p>New allocations: The County Highway Authority is pleased to see that the previously considered 'Money Hill' land and the land off Smisby Road are being considered as a whole, as this will enable more options for access. However, we previously advised against defining a specific number of dwellings to be accessed off Woodcock Way (70 dwellings specified in Para 6.17) as there has not been any detailed work undertaken to support this in evidence. It is noted that the description given in Policy H3 (i) is acceptable and more in line with our previous discussions.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In terms of education provision it is considered that this matter is already covered by H3a (iv).</p> <p>On the issue of mineral consultation areas, it is considered that it would be appropriate to include an additional generic policy to require the need for applications for development in such areas to be accompanied by a minerals assessment to assess the potential effect on the mineral resource.</p> <p>In terms of the settlement hierarchy the Limits to Development have been defined to accommodate additional</p>	<p>Include an additional generic policy in respect of Minerals Consultation Areas to require the need for applications for development in such areas to be accompanied by a minerals assessment to assess the potential effect on the mineral resource</p>	<p>Sharon Wiggins</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>

<p>Education: The majority of new housing that the District requires has already secured planning permission and we have a S106 in place, or planning permission has been given but we are still dealing with the drafting of the S106. The only area where further development may happen is the Money Hill site in Ashby, depending on the outcome of an appeal for 605 dwellings on this site, it is possible a further 1000 homes may be built on adjoining land. We have already secured a site for one new primary school in Ashby, however if there was to be an additional 1000 homes we should ask for the reserving of a further site for a new primary school given the location of the Money Hill area in relation to the Ashby town.</p> <p>Given the changing nature of education provision in the area, with the advent of Academies and the number of secondary schools that are planning to change their age range it is important that all S106 agreements whilst still being CIL compliant, give the flexibility to provide the additional places in the locations and establishments they are required at.</p> <p>p.40/41 Sites H3a (north of Ashby) and H3c (Ashby Road/Leicester Road, Measham) both lie within Mineral Consultation Areas (and proposed Mineral Safeguarding Areas) because they contain potential near surface coal resources. A mineral assessment of the potential effect of the proposed development on the mineral resource beneath and adjacent to the site should be carried out. (It is noted however that most of the Ashby proposal lies within the development area proposed in planning application 15/00512/OUTM. The MPA had no objection to this application on mineral safeguarding grounds based on information supplied indicating that the shallow coal seams underlying the site were not viable to be worked.)</p> <p>With regards to the Money Hill, Ashby de la Zouch site ecology commented at the SHLAA stage and at the formal application for a Scoping Opinion last year. Ecology surveys will be needed to inform the development, but given the habitats on site (mainly improved grasslands and arable land, but with a cluster of wetlands and associated habitats around Ivanhoe House) consider the conservation of these features is possible and that any other adverse impacts can be mitigated. There should also be opportunities for biodiversity enhancement as part</p>	<p>developments so as to ensure that the housing needs will be met.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

of the open space and sustainable drainage provisions for the site.

In light of the existing and likely housing commitments detailed in Policy H1 it is noted that there is an outstanding housing requirement of 1600 dwellings. In line with the settlement hierarchy the distribution of outstanding housing requirements recognises that substantial development has already been committed to the principle town of Coalville and the main town of Castle Donington. It is therefore logical given its position as the second largest town in the District with a wide range of services and facilities that some of the additional housing be centred on Ashby de la Zouch. However, there is a concern that the distribution of housing should take account of the need to support the sustainability of settlements within other layers of the hierarchy. Whilst there has been a strong bias towards allocations within the rural centres and sustainable villages during the plan period to date, significantly eroding further potential allocations, the plans needs to adopt a flexible approach enabling deliverable opportunities to be brought forward within settlements to further support sustainability and the maintenance of services.

The delivery of sites on an opportunity basis, such as the land at Newton Lane Heather, would complement a strategy of major development at Ashby de la Zouch and contribute to the maintenance and a 5 year + 20% supply in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

The proposed Housing Policy needs to positively take account of the availability of brownfield sites such as Ramscliffe Road Donisthorpe, Hill Street Donisthorpe and Highfield Street Coalville to support the delivery of overall needs across the District.

<p>William Davis do not agree with the Councils proposals for housing allocations in Policy H3. They particularly wish to object to the proposal for the new housing allocation at Money Hill, Ashby de la Zouch for 1750 dwellings. They seek the deletion of this allocation and the replacement with an allocation for housing in the Stephenson Way area of Coalville.</p> <p>The principle reasons for objecting to the proposed allocation north of Ashby are as follows:</p> <p>1) the scale of the allocation would be out of proportion with what should be the appropriate settlement strategy for development as outlined above. it would lead to an imbalance of housing and overconcentration of provision in Ashby compared to Coalville. In this regard (as one example) the town centre of Ashby is regarded as the Councils retail consultants as trading successfully whereas Coalville is not and requires investment in regeneration. The addition of more dwellings as Ashby is not required to support the town centre nor is it required to support the proposals for the employment growth zone around Coalville. For the Council to have a reasonable prospect of securing this objective in terms of employment growth and protection and enhancement of Coalville Town Centre, more housing than simply the current population needs to be allocated.</p> <p>2) There a specific issues relating to the proposed allocation of more housing at Ashby these particularly related to the matters of environment, heritage and infrastructure.</p> <p>(I) Environment - the key constraint is the difficulties with discharge of wastewater into the Mease catchment area, there have been specific constraints identified with regard to the amount and flow of wastewater into the River Mease catchment area. This has resulted in a number of potential housing developments being either delayed or refused. In order for the proposed allocation to proceed, it must be demonstrated through an appropriate comprehensive study that the scale of housing and land proposed to the north of Ashby an be developed to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency and Natural England.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby. The majority of growth is allocated to Coalville, in line with the settlement heirarchy and to ensure regeneration of Coalville town centre. Furthermore, one of the Council's priorities is the regeneration of Coalville town centre and a dedicated Coalville Project has been established.</p> <p>In regards to heritage, Historic England have been involved in the preparation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan identifies, in Policy IF4, that development needs to take account of the impact upon the highway network and regard will be had to Transport Assessments and Travel Plans prepared to support planning applications. Policy IF4 also identifies that where appropriate new development will be expected to contribute towards a range of transport improvements including, strategic road improvements to junction 13 of the M42 and local road improvements to the A511 corridor between J22 of the M1 and J13 of the A42.</p> <p>There is a current consultation underway on the Developer Contributions Strategy 2 (DCS2) for the River Mease. Once adopted it will enable North West Leicestershire District Council to continue to allow developments within the river catchment provided a financial contribution is made in line with the DCS2.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the site at Stephenson Way.</p>		Simon Chadwick	Signet Planning on behalf of William Davis
---	--	--	----------------	--

<p>Objection in relation to the second developer window for the River Mease yet to be agreed and this is identified within our policy.</p> <p>Heritage - the arrival of 1750 dwellings on the fringes of the Conservation Area is not a matter that can be treated lightly. Need to gain the views of Historic England.</p> <p>(iii) Infrastructure- doubtful of deliverability to overcome the existing highways issues on the A511. it would be necessary for a transport assessment to be carried out confirming or not whether this scale of development could be accommodated within the local road network before H3A can be confirmed.</p> <p>William Davis therefore recommend the Council reconsider the suitability for housing of the Stephenson Way site to the north of Coalville, the benefits of allocating this land as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) it provides a more focus of new development in Coalville in accordance with economic and retail objectives2) it provides an alternative major housing site to the Hugglescote site for some 2,700 dwellings as the site has a number of delivery constraints which include viability of development and the provision of the relief road.3) it can play a positive role in contributing towards required improvement of junctions on the A511 corridor. Proposed policy IF4 identifies the need for local road improvements between J22 of the M1 and j13 of the A42 but without CIL it is difficult to see how these improvements can be secured without additional development. <p>Allocation of all the houses within the Hugglescote area for Coalville is over concentration of deliverable housing.</p> <p>The Stephenson way site is well known to the Council in that it was considered as planning appeal in 2012. The appeal was dismissed due to the role that Stephenson Way site performed in the separation between what was described as Coalville and Whitwick.</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>Development should now be reconsidered on this site in a different form to that in 2012 which could maintain the separation between Coalville and Whitwick.</p> <p>object to the land being designated as an area of separation.</p> <p>Since 2012 appeal decision, the Government has placed increased priority on ensuring the delivery of housing across the country.</p>				
<p>Objection – At the time of writing the Council’s website was not functioning. The Coal Authority could therefore not find the SA or any site assessment methodology published for comment.</p> <p>Consequently, The Coal Authority assumes that the site allocation process has taken due cognisance of the issues of mineral sterilisation and unstable land alongside other appropriate criteria. The Council need to publish such evidence to avoid the need for The Coal Authority to maintain an objection at the publication/submission stage.</p> <p>Reason – To ensure that the site allocations take due cognisance of advice in paragraphs 109, 120, 121, 143, 144 and 166 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Noted. The Coal Authority were provided with additional time to make comments but to date nothing has been forthcoming.</p>		<p>Chris MacArthur</p>	<p>The Coal Authority</p>
<p>We object to the plan on the following grounds:</p> <p>We do not agree over 3,000 new houses should be built in and around Ashby de la Zouch. We will lose the identity of our Market town, and it will become a large satellite town for commuters to cities such as Leicester and Birmingham.</p> <p>I accept that we need some new suitable affordable housing for our young first time buyers, and a proportional increase of other good quality housing. But I can't accept the massive increases you are proposing.</p> <p>Even Brown field sites such as the old dairy would be better off being given to over to businesses. NWLDC should be concentrating on trying to attract high grade high tech companies and retail for jobs for local people.</p>	<p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby de la Zouch.</p>		<p>Mr Chris Garner and Mrs Joanna Garner</p>	<p>n/a</p>

<p>We write to you as we are very much concerned with the above plan which proposes a 60% increase to the size of Ashby.</p> <p>Although we understand that some new housing is necessary, a further 3,100 new dwellings seems excessive. The town has had considerable growth in the last few years putting a strain of the infrastructure and the proposed infrastructure improvements ie healthcare, education, transport and leisure are totally inadequate.</p> <p>As residents of Ashby we hope you will take our concerns and those of many others into consideration.</p>	<p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2.The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the residual housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p>		G G & J M Edwards	N/a
<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposed local plan 2011 - 2031</p> <p>As the number of new homes required by the government have already been consented I do not consider that an additional 1700+ houses proposed on the site known as Money Hill in Ashby are needed as the NWLDC can already meet its obligation in this area until 2031.</p> <p>The infrastructure within the town is simply insufficient to accommodate the excessive number of houses over and above those which have already been consented and satisfies the government requirements.</p> <p>A proposed 60% increase in the size of Ashby, or any town with an ancient infrastructure cannot be justified especially when it is known that brownfield sites are already available or will be coming available for possible future development in other parts of the county.</p> <p>The traffic which will be generated by the proposed development will mean that the capacity of the road network leading into and out of the town, will be exceeded. The junction of the A42 at junction 13 already has massive queues during the peak hours. Any "improvements" to this junction will NOT reduce traffic moving into the town centre it will only contribute to causing gridlock.</p> <p>Therefore, I request that any reference to future development at the Money Hill site is removed from the local plan to ensure the greenfield which</p>	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure. The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2.The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby. The development of brownfield sites is the preferred approach in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. There are not currently enough brownfield sites in the District that are deliverable and viable for housing provision.</p>		Paul Andrew	N/a

<p>remains is outside the limits of permitted development.</p> <p>Please confirm that my objection will be registered and that all the members of the planning committee will also be notified of both mine and all the other objections raised in connection with the local plan.</p>				
<p>Formal objection to plan: I am writing to formally object regarding the proposals set out in the local plan, relating to the number of new homes required in Ashby.</p> <p>In making this response; I am reminding you of previous advice NWLDC relied on in a planning appeal; from NWLDC own planning expert; concerning the impact of more homes (above 530) on Ashby and how this would not be sustainable and would have a disastrous impact on Ashby's infrastructure. It is essential that members attention is brought to this previous advice in making a final decision regarding the plan.</p> <p>NWLDC own expert has stated that the impact on Ashby's infrastructure is not sustainable: The facts are that the level of housing development proposed is not sustainable.</p> <p>In evidencing this statement, I would rely on the evidence that NWLDC used at the Holywell Spring Farm Appeal. NWLDC own planning expert, Andrew Murphy in his proof of evidence states making reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Holkywell Spring application for 400 homes, and • At that time the application for Money Hill that had been submitted for just 130 homes <p>(A total of 530 new homes).</p> <p>His findings in the proof of evidence was (8.11), 'the development of both will place a considerable infrastructure burden on Ashby'.</p> <p>The clear case was that an application for 400 homes at Holywell Farm should be rejected as the infrastructure burden on Ashby would be too great. It was subsequently approved.</p> <p>Flawed proposal: The latest proposal is for no just</p>	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared, the impact of development on infrastructure has been discussed with appropriate infrastructure providers in preparing the draft Local Plan. The Proof of Evidence of Mr Murphy stated that their would be an impact on infrastructure (albeit considerable in his view) it was not considered an unacceptable impact.</p>		<p>Stephen Clayton</p>	<p>N/a</p>

130 homes on Moneyhill but 1750! This based on NWLDC own expert can therefore only be a flawed proposal. The residents of Ashby will have to live with the consequences of NWLDC decision for generations to come. You cannot afford to get it wrong!

In 2013; 400 homes was not supported because of the impact on Ashby's infrastructure, but the proposal in the plan is 5 times that number! What has changed since 2013? Nothing! You can therefore reasonably take the position, based on evidence from NWLDC own planning expert that any proposal to build close to 2000 more homes in Ashby can at best be described as foolhardy.

Response required: Please ensure that this specific point is responded to in the formal response to the plans consultation. If NWLDC ignore previous advice from your own planning expert and the final plan continues to support such high numbers of new homes; you must refer to the previous advice of your own planning expert and on what grounds that advice is now being ignored (particularly now I have brought this to your attention).

I expect that in any reports to Committee regarding the plan, members attention is brought to this previous advice.

Confirmation required: Can you please confirm this will happen? thereby negating the need for me to contact members individually and bring this to their attention.

--	--	--	--	--

<p>I object to the development plan in Ashby on the following grounds:</p> <p>The houses that have been built in Ashby in about the last five years are: two substantial areas along Smisby Road which will be three after The Dairy site is developed, one on The Callis, one on Moira Road and one on Leicester Road and collectively these areas have caused much more congestion than the town can easily cope with, making it unhealthy due to excessive car fumes and dangerous for pedestrians to cross the road safely. To build yet more houses seems to me to be very bad planning for the residents of what still is a pleasant town to live in. More traffic and more congestion on top of what we already have is not practical. It would be better to build a new town because at least the roads will be incorporated into the new design. What Ashby needs now are schools and shops. There are still five primary schools and one secondary school in Ashby, the same as there was before these recent developments.</p> <p>Apart from this building more houses will, as it were, swallow up Ashby, the town will lose its unique identity. The town has already lost some of its flood plains to new developments and the more recent areas which are being considered for developed are again on flood plains. Having green areas around us is good for us, areas for wildlife, for us to walk, exercise our dogs and children, especially as many of the new houses have handkerchief-sized gardens. It is even said that green is a restful colour for us. Some people probably have to walk long distances to be able to even see a green field, let alone walk in it.</p> <p>Finally, there are very few houses being built for people of low income, making me believe that this housing is for the benefit of the developers, not really those who need the houses.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>The Local Plan requires a percentage of dwellings on development sites of certain sizes to provide affordable housing to meet the needs of the community.</p>		Sue Golightly	N/a
---	---	--	---------------	-----

<p>I am writing to object to certain elements contained within the consultation document pertaining to Ashby de la Zouch.</p> <p>The infrastructure within Ashby is already creaking at the seams. Road congestion, particularly along Nottingham Road and at the access road to the Tesco store and the roundabout onto the bypass is a serious problem, and one which is growing, not to mention the queues at the junction with the top of Market Street and Upper Church Street. The proposed installation of traffic lights will not alleviate the problem. There are insufficient car parking spaces near the town centre, which must deter shoppers to the detriment of the town centre.</p> <p>Planning permission has already been granted for the building of an excess of houses, the full impact of which is yet to be felt but will inevitably aggravate the situation outlined above. To grant planning permission for 1.750 further houses on Money Hill would be irresponsible in the extreme and would turn the present frustrating and annoying experience of driving along Nottingham Road into an absolute nightmare.</p> <p>It beggars belief that anyone should contemplate the building of 3,100 houses in and around Ashby. Every generation should endeavour to pass on to the next generation something of which they can be proud. In 30 years time will you be proud to look back and say "The decisions I helped take were responsible for ruining Ashby?"</p>	<p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will highlight the key infrastructure which is proposed or required. This will be kept up to date and added to as new requirements or needs are identified and will be used to inform negotiations on proposed developments as well as discussions with other organisations in respect of funding and delivery of infrastructure.</p>		John Bate	n/a
---	---	--	-----------	-----

<p>I do not agree we need an additional allocation of 1,845 (including 1,750 on Moneyhill) new dwellings in the District.</p> <p>I do not agree that 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby.</p> <p>On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than a further 150 (to be built on the old Arla Dairy site) should be allocated.</p> <p>Any new development should be carefully considered with priority going to brownfield sites across the county not pandering to builders clamoring to build houses in Ashby because they can command higher prices than they might in other locations.</p> <p>Example - the current David Wilson development on Leicester Road (and their subsequent promise to pay for traffic measures on Wood Street) will choke the town when in operation as it has proved whilst the works were being done, the crossing that has been installed is simply not needed and is a waste of money - how can the heritage planners have agreed to these eyesores when they are so pedantic when it comes to any changes, maintenance or alterations.</p>	<p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. The Local Plan needs to ensure enough housing can be built to meet the districts needs over the plan period. In order to ensure the residual housing requirements are met and in conformity with the settlement hierarchy it is proposed to allocate land in Ashby.</p> <p>The development of brownfield sites is the preferred approach in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. There are not currently enough brownfield sites that are suitable and viable for housing provision.</p>		Mr M D Ensor	N/a
<p>Policy H3 makes provision for new housing allocations; land north of Ashby de la Zouch for 1,750 dwellings and land off Waterworks Road, Coalville for about 95 dwellings. There is also a reserve site for about 420 dwelling at Ashby Road/Leicester Road, Measham.</p> <p>Whilst we have no comments on the proposed allocations, we do have concerns that that draft Local Plan does not provide a sufficiently flexible approach to development over the plan period. Sites within defined Limits to Development can provide an opportunity for development within Sustainable Villages such as Packington.</p>	<p>Noted. 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. The Council will monitor the policies implementation of Local Plan policies and 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 Policy IM2.</p>		Pegasus Group on behalf of Stuart Andrews	Pegasus Group
<p>The allocation of 1,750 dwellings on land north of Ashby de la Zouch at policy H3a is supported, subject to the boundary being amended to include the Ivanhoe Equestrian site, as set out below.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan at policy S2 sets out a requirement of 10,700 dwellings (535 per annum), for the plan period 2011-2031. Policy commentary</p>	<p>In principle it is acknowledged that the inclusion of Ivanhoe Equestrian Centre into the wider Money Hill allocation would be appropriate.</p>	Amend the site area of H3a to include additional land at the Ivanhoe Equestrian Centre	Pegasus Group on behalf of Miller Homes	Pegasus Group

at H1 considers that it is likely that only 9,100 dwellings will be built until 2031, and therefore the local planning authority need to make provision for an additional 1,600 dwellings to ensure that the required number (10,700) will be achieved.

Policies H1 (permissions), H2 (resolutions) and H3 (allocations) set out how this increased housing requirement will be met over the plan period. Policy H3 of the draft Local Plan proposes new allocations for housing development to ensure that the required number of dwellings can be met. Policy H3a – Land north of Ashby de la Zouch is a proposed allocation for 1,750 dwellings. This includes the Money Hill and Woodcock Way sites, which are both the subject of recent appeals, as well as the Arla Dairy site.

The NWLDC draft Local Plan at 6.16 is clear that the local planning authority have considered a range of potential locations and sites to make provision for the required housing figure for the district across the plan period, concluding that “the most appropriate location would be north of Ashby de la Zouch”. Background Paper 4 and the draft Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal accompany the NWLDC Local Plan consultation documents, and detail why land north of Ashby is the most appropriate location for growth.

The draft Sustainability Appraisal at 8.3.2 notes that north of Ashby scores well in relation to accessibility, with the southern part of the site having good access to the town centre, Tesco and existing employment sites. The document continues that “there are no known highway constraints of viability issues which could result in the site not being deliverable over the plan period”.

The evidence base clearly supports NWLDC’s preferred strategy to allocate land north of Ashby for housing development; and therefore this approach is supported.

Miller Homes have land interests at Ivanhoe Equestrian Centre as shown on the Site Location Plan at Appendix 1. The site is located to the east of Smisby Road, Ashby de la Zouch, and is currently in use as an Equestrian Centre, which is accessed via Cliftonthorpe, from Smisby Road. The David

--	--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--	--

<p>Wilson Homes development off Smisby Road lies further south of the site. Appendix 1 also shows the site in the context of draft policies H3a and EC2. H3a lies immediately to the north, east and south of the Equestrian Centre site, and EC2 to the west of the site. Policy EC2 proposes to allocate land at Money Hill for up to 16ha of employment uses, as part of a comprehensive development involving housing. It is our submission that the Equestrian Centre site can be delivered for housing as part of a comprehensive strategic development for the land north of Ashby de la Zouch, covered by draft policy H3a.</p> <p>Miller Homes are in discussions with the Money Hill Consortium who control the wider land interest the subject of policy H3a. Miller Homes will work collaboratively with other interested parties to bring forward the Equestrian Centre site as part of a larger comprehensive development to the north of Ashby. The existing Equestrian Centre site can be relocated.</p> <p>It is understood that draft allocation has been proposed on the basis of previous SHLAA submissions of the Money Hill Consortium. The Ivanhoe Equestrian Centre site has not been included as the local planning authority were unaware that this site is available for development.</p> <p>Suggested change: policy H3a is amended to include the Ivanhoe Equestrian Centre site within the allocation.</p>				
<p>On top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby no more than 150 (to be built on Arla brownfield site) should be allocated.</p>	<p>The housing requirements for the plan period are set out in Policy H2. A range of potential sites have been considered to meet the residual housing requirements and the most appropriate allocation is to the north of Ashby de la Zouch. The Money Hill site was considered the most sustainable site when assessed through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>		<p>Andrew Chapman</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>I also have major concerns with impact on the local environment and green spaces that we enjoy so much that exist in and around Ashby-de-la-Zouch.</p>	<p>Noted. Policy IF3 supports the provision of new open space whilst also protecting against the loss of existing open space should it not be surplus to requirements. A Supplementary Planning Document is also proposed to provide further guidance on this matter. Local Green Space can be designated through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p>		<p>Susan McEniff</p>	<p>n/a</p>

<p>The allocations do not deliver the full OAN for North West Leicestershire and further allocations need to be sought. Land south of Greenhill Road, Coalville should be allocated for residential development of up to 180 dwellings.</p> <p>The plan does not represent the Full Objectively Assessed Need for Housing, it is considered that the OAN for NWL should be between 534 and 739 per annum mid point 637 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>the council will need to find additional sites in sustainable locations that are available, achievable and deliverable in the plan period that should be allocated through the plan.</p> <p>it is suggested that one of the sites that could meet this need and allocated is Land South of Greenhill Road, Coalville. The site is available and deliverable within the Plan period and would make significant contribution to the Councils' 5 year housing supply in the short term.</p> <p>The site could deliver up to 180 dwellings as well as a retail unit, associated open space and landscaping which would bring significant benefits in the form of much needed market and affordable housing, improved retail facilities for existing and new residents and economic benefits both through the construction phase and through increased spending power of new residents.</p> <p>The site is well related to existing shops, services and community facilities in Coalville as well as public transport links to the wider local area. Coalville is the most sustainable location for new development in the district and is supported by a range of employment opportunities. The site is connected to the existing built form of the settlement, including the recently permitted David Wilson Homes site to the north of Greenhill Road and there are no technical reasons which should preclude the development of the site for housing.</p>	<p>The site at Greenhill Road, Coalville has now been granted planning permission at appeal., although it is the subject of a legal challenge.</p>		<p>Phil Bamford</p>	<p>Gladman on behalf of Wilton Balmore.</p>
--	--	--	---------------------	---

<p>Question 12 - Land north of Ashby-de-la-Zouch is too large as a single allocation and is unlikely to be fully delivered in the Plan period. Issues of connectivity with the town centre have not been resolved and major new infrastructure is required. The site has been identified for housing development for many years but has made very slow progress to date. This is due to a combination of the large scale of the development and the fact that key areas of the site are in different ownerships. The allocation at Ashby-de-la-Zouch should be made on a number of smaller sites that can be delivered more easily and can make financial contributions towards local infrastructure that needs to be improved as a result of the new housing and is located in the best position to serve the needs of the town as a whole. Land at South Ashby would provide better choice and flexibility as an additional housing allocation.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that the site at Money Hill can be delivered during the plan period. The land south of Ashby would also be a large scale development therefore subject to the same issues as other sites such as Money Hill. The Council will monitor the implementation of Local Plan policies and 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 Policy IM2.</p>		Sigma Plan	Sigma Plan on behalf of Hallam Land Management
<p>I do not agree that in order to cater for debatable distant jobs 3,100 new dwellings should be built in Ashby on top of the 1,350 new dwellings already approved in Ashby. This compromises the plans balanced growth objectives 2 and 8.</p>	<p>The Council's evidence shows that if the districts housing need is to be met, as required by the NPPF, then additional provision is required. Objective 2 is concerned with achieving a balance for the district as a whole. Furthermore, it is proposed that about 16Ha of employment be developed as part of the Money Hill development. This will help offset some of the employment land that has recently been lost to housing. Significant new growth is already planned for Coalville which will contribute towards the regeneration of the town through attracting new people. However, it would not be appropriate to allocate additional development there having regard to the evidence relating to deliverability and viability. Ashby de la Zouch is a more sustainable settlement than the smaller mining communities, some of which (such as Ibstock and Measham) are themselves subject of growth proposals. The strategy seeks to achieve a balanced approach by ensuring that most new development is located in the major towns which by their nature are the most sustainable settlements. This approach is consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The suitability of the Money Hill site for housing has been assessed through the sustainability appraisal. The development of the site will incorporate additional recreation provision, including footpath and cycle links, which would be unlikely to be achieved without new development.</p>		Cliftonthorpe Residents c/o Robert Yates	n/a

<p>For the reasons set out in the response to Questions 4 & 7, Rosconn Group supports the allocation of additional development sites in the plan period. On the basis of the available site information and the justification given in the Background Paper, there is no objection to the specific sites proposed for allocation at this time. However and as highlighted in the response to Question 4, given the market issues in Coalville, with the anticipated flooding of the housing market through the development of South-East Coalville, further allocations here seem unlikely to be viable. Similarly, the potential limitations imposed by the Mease catchment could significantly reduce the deliverability of the additional sites at Ashby de la Zouch and Measham, both in terms of quantum and timing, which make up the majority of the further housing allocations proposed. As such, the deliverability of additional allocations needs to be carefully examined and demonstrated to avoid any shortfall in provision within the 5 year period following the Local Plan's adoptions, and indeed, over the duration of the residual plan period.</p> <p>Moreover, it is apparent that the additional allocations only further emphasise the focus of future delivery on the Principal Town and Key Services Villages, and ignores the role Sustainable Villages can play in assisting in the delivery of housing across the District, and the need to make appropriate allocations to support those settlements (refer to response to Question 7).</p>	<p>Noted. The Council will monitor the implementation of Local Plan policies and 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 Policy IM2.</p> <p>The Local Plan allows for appropriate development within the sustainable settlements, in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. 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 assessed the settlement hierarchy and the other realistic options to accommodate growth. The distribution of growth is considered strategically and allocating the development on one site reduces the need to travel to services and facilities and ensures the supporting infrastructure is provided 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
<p>We note policy H3 which seeks to allocate two adjoining sites north of ashby de la Zouch, comprising two sites identified in your SHLAA (Site A5 Land north of Ashby (Money Hill) and Site A22 (Former Arla Dairy, Smisby Road). The site at Money Hill has the potential to cause harm to Ashby Castle (Scheduled Monument 17121), its designated landscape and the Parish church of St Helen (listed grade I). We are disappointed that this is not adequately addressed by the policy, nor are the impacts properly recognise by the SA. We consider that there will be harm, which must be assessed and balanced in terms of housing allocations for the borough. In terms of the policy wording and its supporting text, this must recognise that harm to heritage assets must be mitigated.</p>	<p>Noted. This matter is the subject of ongoing discussions with Historic England.</p>		Emilie Carr	Historic England

<p>Ashby Castle is a Scheduled Ancient Monument in the guardianship of the Secretary of State for Culture Media and Sport, designated on the basis of its national archaeological importance this important home of the Hastings Family has extensive gardens and parkland associated, both it and the Church of St Helen are Grade I listed buildings and like within a Conservation Area. An area of ridge and furrow will be lost to the south of the site. There will be harm, which must be assessed and balanced in terms of housing allocations for the borough. We would recommend that you are guided by the advice of your conservation specialist.</p> <p>Reference to the protection of Ashby de la Zouch and Measham Conservation Areas within policies H3a and H3c is welcomed; however there is no reference to other heritage assets. Both policies should be worded to include reference to heritage assets and paragraph 141 of the NPPF in order to protect all heritage assets, rather than just the conservation area as stated, we suggest an additional criteria as follows within policy H3a:-</p> <p>"Protection and enhancement of heritage assets, including their setting" within policy H3c.</p> <p>It is noted that four sites are proposed in total for both employment and housing. Are these the only allocated sites?</p>				
<p>I would like to seriously object to building 1750 houses on Money Hill, I think it will totally spoil Ashby its already being built on too much. I wish to protect our local green space.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>C Wheatley</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Development should be focused where highway and transport links can be easily integrated into the existing network, i.e. locations which are accessible by walking, cycling and public transport and will also have good access to key services, thereby reducing reliance on the private car. Comprehensive development proposals should come forward as one application for each of the strategic development areas, rather than coming forward as individual development parcels, to ensure that the highway and transport infrastructure necessary to facilitate development can be secured.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Protection and enhancement of heritage assets, including their setting within policy H3c.</p>	<p>Grant Butterworth</p>	<p>Leicester City Council</p>

<p>Standard Ashby response submitted plus the following comments :</p> <p>We moved to Ashby from Nottingham in 2002 to be able to live in a small market town. Over the years since we have seen much more of the industry that existed in Ashby then disappear to be replaced with residential properties - McVities, the Soap Factory, Arla Dairy and a number of smaller companies, every bit of spare land has been has been filled with houses. There has been little to no improvements in the transport infrastructure, despite campaigns to re-open the railway . The bus service has declined in terms of both the number of routes and the frequency.</p> <p>When we arrive in Ashby a lot of people lived and worked here. however with the reduction in the number of companies in Ashby, most working people have to travel out of the area and the new homes that are being built are filled with people moving out of the cities as we did, but who now commute back to those cities for employment adding extra strain on the already busy commuter routes.</p> <p>We trust NWLDC will take into account our very deeply held concerns and carefully reconsider its proposed policies.</p>	<p>Whilst the retention of businesses within the District is important it is outside of the control of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan supports the reinstatement of the Leicester to Burton rail line. The Council will work with the highway authorities to ensure that development takes account of its impact on the highway network. In addition the Local Plan requires new development (where appropriate) to contribute to the provision of new public transport services or the enhancement of existing services.</p>		Mrs and Mrs P Montgomery	NA
<p>H3A there should be no vehicular access to Nottingham road only pedestrian and bikes paths and for busses if a sevice is provided to serve the whole development.</p>	<p>Policy H3 a(i) details the principal and secondary vehicular access points for the site to the north of Ashby. Access from Nottingham Road would be primarily for sustainable transport modes such as buses, walking and cycling.</p>		Paul McCaffrey	NA

Policy H4 – Affordable housing

<p>Question 13</p> <p>Do you agree with our suggested approach to the issue of affordable housing? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;</p>	<p>NWL Response</p>	<p>Any changes required</p>	<p>Name</p>	<p>Business or organisation name;</p>
Yes	Noted.		Lisa Marron	Resident
Yes	Noted.		Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
Yes	Noted.		Sue Colledge	colledge's florists
<p>It is agreed that a standard rate across the District is preferable - Option 1. The policy appears to recognize the practicality of negotiating differing rates t s106 negotiations. Skewing the allocations higher in Ashby where market conditions are such that the demand is for higher value houses seems counter intuitive.</p>	Noted.		Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
<p>Affordable housing sites should be targeted on brown field sites first! Rural sites should be protected wherever possible and only considered after brown field sites have been used up. Coalville, Ashby, Castle Donnington etc have lots of vacant ex-industrial land in the town centres.</p>	<p>Whilst the NPPF supports the redevelopment of brownfield sites, it also provides support for the provision of affordable housing in rural areas through rural exceptions sites. Policy H5 sets out those circumstances in which such proposals will be supported and could include brownfield sites. As such this policy accords with the NPPF. Affordable Housing is allowed on rural exception sites to allow local people to live in their local community.</p>		Mark Hutchinson	Mark Hutchinson
Yes	Noted.		Stephen Saxby	None
Yes	Noted.		Mark Chadbourn	Emerald Eye Ltd
Yes	Noted.		Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council
Yes	Noted.		Phil Ellis	Whitwick Parish Council
<p>Page 43</p> <p>Policy H4 and question 13</p> <p>Too often the authority has on affordable housing provision. Even with perfect financial conditions the council has accepted affordable housing as not being viable. It is vital the plan and associated policies force adherence to the published percentages.</p> <p>The published and detailed need of this plan for affordable housing would mean a high percentage of all housing would be affordable. Obviously the plans own Policy H4 will not produce this result.</p> <p>It is important to have no flexibility on affordable</p>	<p>Noted. The local planning authority has to work within national planning guidelines when assessing the viability of new developments. The National Planning Policy Framework para 173 requires plans to be deliverable. Therefore, development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable. Policy H4 is consistent with the NPPF.</p>		Steve Palmer	NA

percentages.				
The Parish Council feels that along with affordable homes built by Housing Associations, developers should build a stock of homes that are affordable and available to buy outright. All developments, regardless of size, should have to provide affordable homes. The rule that only larger developments have to incorporate starter homes means that none get built in villages where developments all tend to be quite small.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is important to note that the number of affordable homes that can be provided is constrained by both available public sector funding and the amount of cross subsidy that can realistically be achieved from increased land values associated with planning permissions for general market housing. If planning policies push for too high a quota of affordable homes it may both reduce the overall dwellings built, and the proportion of those that are affordable.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan also includes policy H5 Rural Exception Sites for Affordable Housing which seeks 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.</p> <p>Since the publication of the draft Local Plan, the Government through the Housing and Planning Bill introduced starter homes for people under the age of 40, with a price cap on all houses outside of London at £250,000.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans can also set policies in relation to affordable housing and allocate rural exception sites to meet the needs of the local area.</p> <p>The implications of changes in government policy in respect of affordable housing and thresholds needs to be considered.</p>		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
Yes	Noted		David Harris	Pyroprotect Ltd
Yes	Noted		Simon Litchfield	Resident
The Town Council is currently consulting on the draft Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plan which sets a different affordable housing target of 40% for developments of 5 or more dwellings for Ashby. However this figure may change as a result of the current consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted.		Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council

The suggested approach is not supported. It is considered that a standard rate across the district of 20% should be applied (Option 1b) on 10 or more dwellings. This would ensure conformity across the District amongst the higher and lower hierarchy settlements. Failing this, Option 2b would be preferred to Option 2a and 2c which would render too many developments to be unviable therefore impacting on delivery of market and affordable housing per sae. It is considered that the levels set out in Option 2b could be accommodated in most developments.	The different percentages and thresholds reflect economics of development and viability. The proposed policy has been tested and is supported by the viability assessment that has been undertaken.		Angela Cornell	Fisher German
Use the land you already have !	Noted.		Andrew Stone	NA
Developments of any sort should include more affordable houses. We do not need more commuter housing which is bad for the environment, bad for the local communities and increases the traffic on the roads causing pollution, danger to vulnerable road users and has no benefits to our district. We need houses for our young people, and for those who work locally. Development should only be allowed if it is good for the area, not good for the profits of the developers.	Noted. This Policy seeks to ensure the provision of affordable housing.		Mary Lorimer	Not applicable
Yes	Noted.		Trevor Davis	None
Cannot answer this question as National Policy gives developers an easy option to get out of providing affordable housing.	Noted.		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
Yes	Noted.		Edward Hines	N/A
We agree with the provision of affordable housing but due to the changes in government criteria in terms of housing tenures and many registered providers being affected, the council may need to remain flexible on the tenures. This will be dependent on the need of housing in the defined areas.	Noted. The implications of changes in government policy in respect of affordable housing need to be considered.		Helen Stockdale	Lovell Partnerships
it is a very high proportion and already the house builders have struggled to sell on all of the available plots for affordable housing on recent estates that have been built.	Noted. Affordable housing is required to meet the identified need within the District. The Policy recognises that actual provision needs to take account of viability issues.		Lynn Bradbury	Retailmap Ltd

<p>To reduce the growth rate of affordable housing deficit, there should be a requirement for at least 40% affordable homes on developments where this is viable. The District Council's Viability Study shows this should be achievable in Ashby at least.</p> <p>Why is affordable housing only required for developments of 15+ in Ashby, Castle Donnington and Coalville but 11+ elsewhere? Surely it should be 11+ (or less) for all areas. I would advocate a threshold of 5+ across the district as per the current Affordable Housing SPD for "elsewhere in the district". It is unlikely that development viability has reduced since publication of the 2011 SPD.</p> <p>To ensure that developer's viability analyses are properly undertaken they should be open to public scrutiny.</p>	<p>The requirements for affordable housing are based on economics and viability. The provision of affordable housing is linked to the provision of market housing, therefore if the requirement for affordable housing is too high it may reduce the overall amount of market housing and subsequently the amount of affordable housing that is provided. It is important that the delivery of housing is not undermined by viability.</p> <p>The implications of changes in government policy in respect of affordable housing need to be considered. Viability assessments are submitted to the Council on a confidential basis as they include commercially sensitive information.</p>		David Bigby	Private individual
Yes	Noted		Nick Wilkins	NW
Yes	Noted		Lance Wiggins	Landmark Planning
H4(5) Bungalow provision is beneficial to the ageing population be it affordable housing or not. Developments of 2 storey dwellings are not suitable for elderly residents.	Noted.		Mr. & Mrs Loveless	Retired
<p>We need homes for the future, but the Local Plan is allowing the wrong kind of development. The houses for the people are far away from their jobs. The cost of improving the roads is cutting into funds for affordable homes. The New Local Plan does not deal with the real challenges facing NWLeics over the next twenty years.</p> <p>Most of the jobs in the Local Plan are near the airport in the north. Most of the houses are being planned around Ashby, Coalville and Measham in the south. New housing estates will pour commuters onto our congested highways. Funds are being diverted to unaffordable road schemes and away from building affordable homes.</p> <p>Building housing estates on green fields does nothing to regenerate town centres blighted by empty shops and derelict industrial sites. Frail, older and disabled people need affordable adapted homes in town centres. There is no plan for the extra care an ageing population needs.</p>	<p>The concerns are noted. The need for affordable housing has to be balanced against the need for other types of infrastructure, including education and health, as well as transport. The NPPF requires that viability issues be taken in to account when setting any requirements to be attached to developments, including affordable housing. A Viability Study was undertaken in support of the Local Plan and the targets set out in policy H4 reflect its findings.</p> <p>Policy H6 seeks to ensure that a suitable balance is achieved in terms of types and sizes of dwellings.</p> <p>Whilst there are a significant number of jobs around East Midlands Airport there are also significant employment opportunities in Coalville and Ashby de la Zouch, whilst additional employment land has yet to be developed in these localities therefore providing more employment opportunities.</p>		Theresa Eynon	alderoak

The plan recognises that there has been a shortfall in the provision of affordable housing in previous years and that the need is at least 40% of future allocations. The plan does not meet the test of recovering from the previous shortfall or meeting the future need. The plan should be driven by needs. I recognise that viability is an issue for developers but the plan should be based on the need of the residents of NWL. Viability can be tested for each application as it is made. The assessment of viability should be made public so that residents can be confident that it is reasonable to have less affordable housing than is needed by residents.	The National Planning Policy Framework Para. 173 requires plans to be deliverable. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable. Policy H4 is consistent with the approach in the NPPF. Viability Assessments are submitted to the Council on a confidential basis as they contain commercially sensitive information.		Chris Smith	Resident
there should be no more housing developments in the Ashby area.	Noted.		Christopher Bush	NA
developers should not be allowed to make a cash payment instead of affordable housing	The NPPF recognises that a financial contribution may be appropriate in certain circumstances. Whilst the council's preference is for on-site provision of affordable housing, there may be exceptional circumstances where a financial sum may be accepted instead (as per the NPPF). This money would be used to make provision for affordable housing on other site/s.		Mr. j Lewis	1950
Developers will not adhere to the 30% recommended . What's important anyway is the mix of 2 , 3 and 4/5 bedroom houses . There need to be far more 2 and 3 bedroom houses built for sale .	Noted. The Local Plan (Para 6.41) identifies that there is a need for 2 and 3 bedroom properties in order to provide a better balance in the housing market.		Michael Ball	Individual
Yes	Noted		Steve Johnson	YYYY
Yes	Noted		Lesley Birtwistle	not applicable
No	Noted		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
Agree with option 1 in that a standard rate is most straightforward but it is not clear from the plan which of the sub-options (1a to 1e) is the preferred one.	The different percentages and thresholds reflect economics of development and viability. The option reflected in Policy H4 is Option 2a and is supported by the Viability Study.		Hugh James	n/a
Yes	Noted		Tim Abbott	Householder
Make them genuine council homes not private landlords. Also, include a Policy which states that affordable homes must be sold on to other affordable home buyers when they are finished with. The current owner had help to buy theirs, they should not be allowed to sell on to just anyone. That house must remain as an affordable home. This will not affect their sales price if the Council put in sufficient provision into the deeds. We must have a tool in place to keep affordable homes as affordable homes for future generations.	The Council is considering the issue of a future housebuilding programme, but it is not the role of the Local Plan to determine who should provide affordable housing. Government policy allows for the purchase of affordable homes by their occupiers.		Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying

Yes	Noted		Heather Parish Council	Heather Parish Council
No	Noted		JON WALTERS	LPT
<p>For the plan to be sound, it has to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Objection is raised with the level of affordable housing contributions required under Policy H4 as it is not justified by the evidence base.</p> <p>Paragraph 173 of the NPPF emphasises that in the pursuit for sustainable development there is a requirement for</p> <p>‘careful attention to viability in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.’ (our emphasis)</p> <p>The current proposed affordable housing contribution of 30% for residential developments of 11 or more dwellings in Measham is not viable. Sections 8 – 10 of the ‘Draft Local Plan for Consultation Viability Review – Parts 1 and 2’ specifically looked at the viability of site H3c. At the beginning of the Review, it clearly outlines the measurement of viability using a traffic light system, which confirms:-</p> <p>Green Light – wholly viable if return is 20% or above</p> <p>Amber Light – marginally viable if return is 17-19.9%</p> <p>Red Light – unviable if return is below 17%</p> <p>The Review goes on to state that some archetypes returning amber results and all archetypes returning a red result, are representative of sites that the modelling suggest will require negotiation with the developer over contributions within the</p>	<p>The Viability Study considered both a Current Market Scenario and a Growth Scenario when testing viability. The Market Scenario concluded that, for the Local Service Centres of Kegworth and Measham, the rate of 30% affordable housing to be viable on the larger site archetypes. The Growth Scenario concluded that, for the Local Service Centres of Kegworth and Measham, the rate of 30% to be viable, or marginally viable at all of greenfield archetypes modelled for each centre. However, both scenarios concluded that a rate of 25% affordable housing at Measham, whilst arguably more appropriate for a wider range of the site archetypes, the rate potentially risks an under provision against the rate that is potentially viable on the larger greenfield sites.</p> <p>The Viability Study shows (in both scenarios) that whilst the viability of a 1 hectare Greenfield site in Measham would only be marginally viable at 30% affordable housing a 5 hectare greenfield site would be viable at 30% affordable housing. Site H3c is approximately 15.41 hectares and therefore exceeds the 5 hectare site tested in the Viability Study.</p> <p>Therefore, the Viability study confirms that greenfield sites of 5 hectares at 30% affordable housing are viable in Measham. Reducing the affordable housing requirement to 25% in Measham could result in an under provision of affordable housing, specifically on the larger Greenfield sites, of which H3c would be categorised.</p> <p>In addition, the greenfield viability issue in Kegworth and Measham @30% relates to smaller sites in the range, and clearly it would not be practical to have a policy that is sensitive to site sizes at this level of development (SUEs are another case) as well as geography. There is no apparent reason to suggest the larger site archetype is any less valid than the smaller archetype for the purposes of modelling and analysis.</p>		Miss Marie Stacey	Pegasus Group

parameters of the policies. Accordingly, including affordable housing requirements that are either red or amber would not be justified. The whole purpose of viability appraisals is to ensure that plan policies give developers certainty about the contributions required to ensure that viable development is possible.

The viability modelling for site H3c suggests that with 30% affordable housing contribution, the site is very close to being unviable at 17.3% return (Section 10.4 Table on pg 62 of Draft Local Plan for Consultation Viability Review – Parts 1 and 2, DTZ, 24 July 2015) . The NPPF emphasises at paragraph 173 that plans need to be deliverable. The Local Plan should therefore not be relying on sites to come forward that are on the margins of viability and could potentially risk the deliverability of housing sites and the plan as a whole.

The Review also modelled 25% affordable housing provision for site H3c with calculations showing 19.6% profit (Section 10.4 – Table on pg 62 of Draft Local Plan for Consultation Viability Review – Parts 1 and 2, DTZ, 24 July 2015) . This level of return is still within the ‘marginally viable’ amber category, however provides more certainty that development could be wholly viable. In this respect, the level of affordable housing provision would not be of a scale that would completely risk the deliverability of the site and therefore would be a more effective level of provision in comparison to 30% provision.

In respect of the 30% affordable housing provision, the conclusions of the viability of the site contained within the Review outline that ‘it would not be appropriate to suggest that this target is unobtainable during the Local Plan period, particularly on the basis that the modelling is based on a high level allowance for site specific abnormal costs, which may be overstated.’ (Section 10.4 of Draft Local Plan for Consultation Viability Review – Parts 1 and 2, DTZ, 24 July 2015). This uncertainty of costs or suggestion of overstating the costs in addition to the suggestion that the 20% profit target could be obtained over the plan period does not provide a good foundation for the assessment of viability of the site and does not conform to the National Planning Policy Guidance, which makes it clear that ‘Current costs and values should be

<p>considered when assessing the viability of plan policy. Policies should be deliverable and should not be based on an expectation of future rises in values at least for the first five years of the plan period.' (Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 10-008-20140306) (our emphasis).</p> <p>Accordingly, the affordable housing contribution for development of 11 dwellings or more in Measham should be lowered to a level of provision where there is confidence that it can be achieved and to an appropriate level that is supported by the evidence base. This will ensure the Local Plan is sound by being positively prepared, justified and effective, and also avoid a future, detailed viability appraisal once a planning application is submitted.</p> <p>Proposed Changes to the Policy:</p> <p>The affordable housing contribution for residential development of 11 dwellings or more in Measham should be set at no more than 25%.</p>				
<p>Affordable housing allocations should be directed according to the areas where there is the greatest need.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Elaine Robinson</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p>Almost entirely affordable housing. This makes less profit for the builders, but is more use to the local community.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Lesley Colley</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>It is noted that option 1 has been applied with a standard rate. However, this is stated a minimum of 30%. If a minimum is applied it seems appropriate to also have a maximum. The study did not consider what impact 35% or 40% would have. A maximum should also be applied to ensure that the area brings in enough council tax, employment revenue and expenditure in the area to ensure it is sustainable. Otherwise the area will not afford its own upkeep, which is essential otherwise all new developments could be unsustainable.</p>	<p>The affordable housing requirements are set out in Policy H4. There is a significant need for affordable housing within the district therefore it would not be appropriate to set a maximum requirement.</p>		<p>Alison Saxby</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>No. In principle, the percentage of affordable housing in most locations appears to be sensible. However, recent experience suggests increasing use of skewed viability assessments, which needs to be addressed in order to protect the share of affordable housing.</p> <p>The current viability guidelines are tilted in the developers' favour, using current sale values and future construction costs, providing a smaller visible profit margin. The current approach should be challenged in order to protect affordable housing and contributions to local communities, thus protecting the design principles of connectivity, ease of access and well-managed community facilities.</p>	<p>Viability will be assessed using best practice to ensure assessments can be objectively scrutinised. Viability assessments are independently verified by the District Valuer.</p>		<p>Vicky Roe</p>	<p>Kegworth Parish Council</p>
<p>Policy H4(2) The policy should detail of how viability is to be assessed. If a developer wishes to seek exemption on this ground then they should be required to make their submission and its evidence base public.</p>	<p>Financial viability assessments for planning purposes should use best practice and be objective so that the conclusions are capable of scrutiny. Viability assessments are independently verified by the District Valuer.</p> <p>Generally, viability Assessments are submitted to the Council on a confidential basis as they contain commercially sensitive information.</p>		<p>Lindsay Gene</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Parish Council</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>Noted</p>		<p>Sonia Liff</p>	<p>Chair Appleby Environment</p>

<p>(a) Under current planning direction in NWL – there has been under-provision of so-called ‘affordable homes’. The figures drafted are unacceptable. In the Coalville and Ashby Urban areas the figure should be 40%</p> <p>(b) However, the Housing Bill being debated in the HoC, if approved by both Houses, will alter housing provision and the notion of ‘affordable housing’. It is not clear at the time of writing how this issue will pan out to provide a coherent answer. The Labour Group will reserve judgement on the issue.</p> <p>(c) There are over 800 persons (and growing) on the Council’s ‘waiting list’. The draft Local Plan rattles on about ‘affordable housing’ but does not reflect needs for those who cannot afford or obtain a mortgage. Nor does it identify land within the draft to build new social housing</p> <p>(d) The 2011 Census there were 16,930 people in NWL whose day to day activities are limited by disability. This was an increase of 11% since 2001. Demographic change suggests the figure will increase further over the plan period. The draft Local Plan shows no evidence that it can meet the housing and employment needs of an ever growing ageing population with multiple disabilities. It is disappointing that the issue is not discussed in the document.</p>	<p>The requirements for affordable housing are based on economics and viability. The affordable housing requirements have been tested as part of the Viability Study. It is important that the delivery of housing is not undermined by viability, therefore the affordable housing requirements reflect those tested in the Viability Assessment.</p> <p>The implications of changes in government policy in respect of affordable housing need to be considered. The majority of affordable housing will be provided as part of general market housing developments. However, recent changes by the Government have allowed the District Council to begin investigating the possibility of providing some housing itself.</p> <p>Policy H6 requires, on sites of 50 or more dwellings, provision of dwellings that are suitable for occupation by the elderly and provision of dwellings suitable for occupation or that are easily adaptable for people with disabilities.</p>		Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader
<p>The Council’s approach to affordable housing should be re-assessed with a view to considering the contribution that low cost market housing might provide as well as innovative self-build projects and also allow for a greater emphasis on off-site financial contributions to better enable the Council to play a role in provision. The role of the private sector in</p> <p>The explicit reference to the need to take into account viability is welcome and must be an essential part of any policy for the provision of affordable housing. The policy should also make it clear that the identified provision is a target which developers should seek to achieve although recognising that it will not be possible to do this in all circumstances.</p>	<p>The NPPF defines affordable housing as: social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing. For planning purposes low cost market housing is not considered to meet the definition of affordable housing</p> <p>Policy H4 reflects the NPPF which advocates that on-site provision of affordable housing should be sought unless off-site provision can be robustly justified. Policy H4 does make it clear that it may not always be possible to achieve the targets due to viability issues. The implications of changes in government policy in respect of affordable housing need to be considered.</p>		Andrew Thomas	Thomas Taylor Planning

<p>The definition of affordable housing and the document as a whole need to take account of recent and emerging Government initiatives in terms of the provision of low cost house and starter homes. This will potentially be a significant factor in the delivery of both market and affordable housing over the next few years.</p>	<p>The implications of changes in government policy in respect of affordable housing need to be considered.</p>		<p>sigma planning services</p>	<p>Sigma Planning Services</p>
<p>We need homes for the future, but the Local Plan is allowing the wrong kind of development. The houses for the people are far away from their jobs. The cost of improving the roads is cutting into funds for affordable homes. The New Local Plan does not deal with the real challenges facing NWLeics over the next twenty years.</p> <p>Most of the jobs in the Local Plan are near the airport in the north. Most of the houses are being planned around Ashby, Coalville and Measham in the south. New housing estates will pour commuters onto our congested highways. Funds are being diverted to unaffordable road schemes and away from building affordable homes.</p> <p>Building housing estates on green fields does nothing to regenerate town centres blighted by empty shops and derelict industrial sites. Frail, older and disabled people need affordable adapted homes in town centres. There is no plan for the extra care an ageing population needs.</p>	<p>The concerns are noted. The need for affordable housing has to be balanced against the need for other types of infrastructure, including education and health, as well as transport. The NPPF requires that viability issues be taken in to account when setting any requirements to be attached to developments, including affordable housing. A Viability Study was undertaken in support of the Local Plan and the targets set out in policy H4 reflect its findings.</p> <p>Policy H6 seeks to ensure that a suitable balance is achieved in terms of types and sizes of dwellings.</p> <p>Whilst there are a significant number of jobs around East Midlands Airport there are also significant employment opportunities in Coalville and Ashby de la Zouch , whilst additional employment land has yet to be developed in these localities therefore providing more employment opportunities.</p>		<p>Mrs Kurpil</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Proposed Policy H4 sets out the Council's approach to affordable housing provision. The policy indicates that, in agreeing the provision of affordable housing, account will be taken of site size and site constraints and financial viability. It is important that the Council takes account of potential issues of viability in determining the appropriate level of affordable housing provision on sites.</p> <p>The Housing and Planning Bill sets out the Government's commitment to the delivery of Starter Homes and the likely requirement that an element of starter homes will be required on housing sites. In preparing the Local Plan the Council will need to take account of emerging policy in relation to the Starter Homes initiative and the potential implications this may have for the provision of affordable housing.</p>	<p>The implications of changes in government policy in respect of affordable housing need to be considered..</p>		<p>Guy Longley,</p>	<p>Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.</p>

<p>We support option 2 but Ibstock should have 30% affordable housing? New</p> <p>government proposals will introduce affordable market housing to replace some or all affordable housing. This needs to be taken into account.</p>	<p>The requirements for affordable housing are based on economics and viability. Policy H4 will be reviewed and updated as necessary to take account of government proposals as the Local plan progresses.</p>		C Tandy	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society
<p>This policy may need to be revised in response to the contents of the Planning and Housing Bill and the recent Autumn Statement regarding changes in Government policy.</p>	<p>Noted. The implications of changes in government policy in respect of affordable housing need to be considered.</p>		Andrew Thomson	Thomson Planning Partnership
<p>If the North West Leicestershire Local Plan is to be compliant with national policy, the Council must satisfy the requirements of paragraphs 173 and 174 of the NPPF whereby development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that viability is threatened. Therefore the Council must properly assess viability and accordingly the Council has commissioned a Viability Study by DTZ dated July 2015.</p> <p>The residual land value model is highly sensitive to changes in its inputs whereby an adjustment or an error in any one assumption can have a significant impact on viability. So it is important to understand and test the influence of all inputs on the residual land value as this determines whether or not land is released for development. The Harman Report highlighted that “what ultimately matters for housing delivery is whether the value received by land owners is sufficient to persuade him or her to sell their land for development”. In this context of sensitivity of inputs it is noted that a number of assumptions are set at the low end of any possible range of figures.</p> <p>Policy H4 sets out that on sites of 15 or more and 11 or more units 30% affordable housing provision should be provided in Ashby de la Zouch, Castle Donington, Kegworth, Measham and elsewhere and 20% affordable housing provision in Coalville Urban Area and Ibstock subject to viability. However the Council’s viability study shows that smaller sites and brown-field sites are not viable at the affordable housing provisions set out in Policy H4. Whilst it is accepted that developers can negotiate lower affordable housing provision on the grounds of viability such negotiations inevitably incur additional costs in terms of both time and money which impairs housing delivery. It is unrealistic to negotiate every site on a one by one basis because the base-line aspiration of a policy or</p>	<p>The Viability Study was undertaken in consultation with housing developers, including testing of the various assumptions used in the study.</p> <p>Whilst the Viability Study identifies that the affordable housing requirements set out in Policy H4 would not be viable on brownfield sites the majority of sites identified in the housing policies (H1, H2 and H3) are greenfield sites.</p> <p>At present the site thresholds require sites of 11 or more or 15 or more dwellings to provide affordable housing, these would be classed as large sites therefore there is no requirement for small sites to provide affordable housing.</p> <p>The affordable housing requirements have been tested in the Viability Study. Policy H4 allows for the renegotiation of affordable housing requirements (where providing the full requirement would adversely affect viability) to ensure the delivery of housing.</p>		Susan E Green	HBF

<p>combination of policies is set too high as this will jeopardise future housing delivery. The purpose of whole plan viability assessment is to ensure that the bar of policy expectations is not set unrealistically high. If the bar is set too high then the majority of schemes instead of the exception will be subject to site by site viability negotiations. It is suggested that the Council re-considers Policy H4.</p>				
<p>Affordable housing: Whilst this is mainly a matter for the District to deal with, the Coalville Urban Area contribution is set at 20% affordable housing. It is unclear how this has been aligned with the Coalville Contribution Strategy to date. It has been our understanding that the affordable housing and transport infrastructure contributions to date have been balanced out to enable the transport infrastructure required for growth to be delivered. There appears to be no mention of this here or elsewhere in the document.</p>	<p>The need to secure affordable housing needs to be balanced against all the infrastructure requirements on a case by case basis and having regard to other policies in the Local Plan and any other material considerations.</p>		<p>Sharon Wiggins</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>
<p>Policy H4(2) The policy should detail of how viability is to be assessed. If a developer wishes to seek exemption on this ground then they should be required to make their submission and its evidence base public.</p>	<p>Viability will be assessed using best practice to ensure assessments can be objectively scrutinised. The viability assessment would be independently verified by the District Valuer.</p> <p>Viability Assessments are submitted to the Council on a confidential basis as they contain commercially sensitive information.</p>		<p>Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment</p>	<p>Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation</p>
<p>Policy H4 sets out the Council's approach to affordable housing provision. The policy sets out that, when agreeing the provision of affordable housing, account will be taken of the size and constraints on a site, as well as financial viability, having regard to the individual circumstances of the site. It is important that the Council takes account of potential issues of viability in determining the appropriate level of affordable housing provision on sites.</p> <p>The Housing and Planning Bill sets out the Government's commitment to the delivery of Starter Homes and the likely requirement that an element of Starter Homes will be required on housing sites. In preparing the Local Plan the Council will need to take account of emerging policy in relation to the Starter Homes initiative and the potential implications this may have for the provision of affordable housing.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The implications of changes in government policy in respect of affordable housing need to be considered.</p>		<p>Pegasus Group on behalf of Stuart Andrews</p>	<p>Pegasus Group</p>

<p>Policy H4 sets out the Council’s approach to affordable housing provision. The policy indicates that, in agreeing the provision of affordable housing, account will be taken of site size and site constraints and financial viability, having regard to the individual circumstances of the site. It is important that the Council takes account of potential issues of viability in determining the appropriate level of affordable housing provision on sites.</p> <p>The Housing and Planning Bill sets out the Government’s commitment to the delivery of Starter Homes and the likely requirement that an element of starter homes will be required on housing sites. In preparing the Local Plan the Council will need to take account of emerging policy in relation to the Starter Homes initiative and the potential implications this may have for the provision of affordable housing.</p>	<p>Noted. The local planning authority has to work within national planning guidelines when assessing the viability of new developments. The National Planning Policy Framework para 173 requires plans to be deliverable. Therefore, development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.</p>		Pegasus Group on behalf of Miller Homes	Pegasus Group
<p>We need homes for the future, but the Local Plan is allowing the wrong kind of development. The houses for the people are far away from their jobs. The cost of improving the roads is cutting into funds for affordable homes. The New Local Plan does not deal with the real challenges facing NWLeics over the next twenty years.</p> <p>Most of the jobs in the Local Plan are near the airport in the north. Most of the houses are being planned around Ashby, Coalville and Measham in the south. New housing estates will pour commuters onto our congested highways. Funds are being diverted to unaffordable road schemes and away from building affordable homes.</p> <p>Building housing estates on green fields does nothing to regenerate town centres blighted by empty shops and derelict industrial sites. Frail, older and disabled people need affordable adapted homes in town centres. There is no plan for the extra care an ageing population needs.</p>	<p>The concerns are noted. The need for affordable housing has to be balanced against the need for other types of infrastructure, including education and health, as well as transport. The NPPF requires that viability issues be taken in to account when setting any requirements to be attached to developments, including affordable housing. A Viability Study was undertaken in support of the Local Plan and the targets set out in policy H4 reflect its findings.</p> <p>Policy H6 seeks to ensure that a suitable balance is achieved in terms of types and sizes of dwellings.</p> <p>Whilst there are a significant number of jobs around East Midlands Airport there are also significant employment opportunities in Coalville and Ashby de la Zouch , whilst additional employment land has yet to be developed in these localities therefore providing more employment opportunities.</p>		Mr B Carter	n/a

<p>It is noted that option 1 has been applied with a standard rate. However, this is stated a minimum of 30%. If a minimum is applied it seems appropriate to also have a maximum. The study did not consider what impact 35% or 40% would have. A maximum should also be applied to ensure that the area brings in enough council tax, employment revenue and expenditure in the area to ensure it is sustainable. Otherwise the area will not afford its own upkeep, which is essential otherwise all new developments could be unsustainable.</p>	<p>The affordable housing requirements are set out in Policy H4. There is a significant need for affordable housing within the district therefore it would not be appropriate to set a maximum requirement.</p>		<p>Mrs. A Saxby</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>The policy should be kept under review as the Governments agenda for the future of affordable housing and starter homes emerges.</p> <p>Policy H4 should be kept under review to ensure it reflects the latest guidance from government on the provision of affordable housing including starter homes.</p> <p>Criterion 4 of the policy is not required as affordable housing and can be dealt with by way of a condition and in fact the Planning Inspectorate include a model condition on the provision of affordable housing on the Planning Portal and therefore criterion 4 should be deleted.</p>	<p>The implications of changes in government policy in respect of affordable housing need to be considered.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to use S106 Agreements(Planning Obligations) to secure the provision of affordable housing as set out in criterion 4.</p>		<p>Phil Bamford</p>	<p>Gladman on behalf of Wilton Balmore.</p>
<p>Question 13 - Recent Government initiatives in relation to low-cost market housing need to be taken into account in Policy H4, either as part of the regular affordable housing provision, or as a separate part of the Policy. The affordable housing target for Ashby-de-la-Zouch could be more ambitious and a proportion of 40% should be achievable if a greater variety of sites were to be allocated which are capable of using existing infrastructure. The policy should seek 40% affordable housing at Ashby as a target with lower figures being agreed only in response to viability issues in relation to individual sites being demonstrated by the developer. Option 2c is therefore proposed.</p>	<p>Low cost market housing does not meet the definition of affordable housing and is therefore not defined as affordable housing for the purposes of Policy H4. However, the implications of changes in government policy in respect of affordable housing need to be considered. The requirements for affordable housing are based on economics and viability. The provision of affordable housing is primarily linked to the provision of market housing, therefore if the requirement for affordable housing is too high it may reduce the overall amount of market and affordable housing provided. It is important that the delivery of housing is not undermined by viability. The Viability Study concluded that whilst certain sites in Ashby may be able to exceed a 30% target quite comfortably (given the amber results for 40%), a 30% affordable housing target in Ashby would be the best fit given the results of the viability modelling</p>		<p>Sigma Plan</p>	<p>Sigma Plan on behalf of Hallam Land Management</p>
<p>Agree with the suggested approach but would insist that NWLDC actually maintains their suggested level of affordable housing for sites and not reduce it due to developer pressures, the planning application for the 895 houses off Park Lane in Castle Donington has only 8% affordable housing!</p>	<p>Noted. The local planning authority has to work within national planning guidelines when assessing the viability of new developments. The National Planning Policy Framework Para 173.</p>		<p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p>	<p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p>

Policy H5: Rural Exceptions Sites for Affordable housing

Question 14 Do you agree with our suggested approach to the issue of rural exceptions sites for affordable housing? 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		Sue Colledge	colledge's florists
Yes	Noted		Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
<p>As above, Affordable housing sites should be targeted on brown field sites first! Rural sites should be protected wherever possible and only considered after brown field sites have been used up. Coalville, Ashby, Castle Donnington etc have lots of vacant ex-industrial land in the town centres. Rural sites in many cases are not really sustainable and encourages ribbon development.</p>	<p>Whilst the NPPF supports the redevelopment of brownfield sites, it also provides support for the provision of affordable housing in rural areas through rural exceptions sites. Policy H5 sets out those circumstances in which such proposals will be supported and could include brownfield sites. As such this policy accords with the NPPF.</p>		Mark Hutchinson	Mark Hutchinson
Yes	Noted.		Stephen Saxby	None
<p>No rural exception sites, no development outside the limits of development, non-subsidised by market building. If the need is there, the onus should be on housing associations to provide.</p>	<p>The NPPF supports the provision of affordable housing in rural areas through rural exceptions sites. Policy H5 sets out those circumstances in which such proposals will be supported. As such this policy accords with the NPPF. The SHMA identifies that there is a need for affordable housing in rural areas and the provision of exceptions sites is one way in which some of this need can potentially be met.</p>		Mark Chadbourn	Emerald Eye Ltd
<p>One way to help do this is to have an exceptions site policy. 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.</p> <p>Clearly you are again using agricultural land (which of course is easier to develop) instead of brown field sites.</p> <p>Brown field should ALWAYS be your first priority</p>	<p>Whilst the NPPF supports the redevelopment of brownfield sites, it also provides support for the provision of affordable housing in rural areas through rural exceptions sites. Policy H5 sets out those circumstances in which such proposals will be supported and could include brownfield sites. As such this policy accords with the NPPF.</p>		Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council
<p>Housing development should not be restricted in rural areas. It's vital that rural facilities are not lost and perhaps some new facilities would be provided with some rural development. Ref NPPF page 19 item 28.</p>	<p>As well as rural exception sites, a percentage of affordable housing will also be provided on market housing sites as set out in Policy H4. Other policies in the local plan set out the distribution of development in the district. Rural exception sites can help support rural services and facilities.</p>		Steve Palmer	NA
<p>Agree. However, should apply to all developments - not just on developments greater than 10 houses. Especially in rural areas.</p>	<p>Noted. The exceptions site policy is not restricted to sites of 10 or more.</p>		Samantha Lockwood	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council

Yes	Noted.		Mr Robert Harlow	Harlow Bros Ltd
<p>Thringstone is included within the Coalville Urban area. It is however a distinct semi rural village community. As such the specific needs of Thringstone village residents should be addressed and provided for in their own immediate locality as is the case for other villages. In particular</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure provision of a sufficient volume of housing to meet the needs of Thringstone's community, including provision of housing for older people and families as well as affordable housing. • Create small scale, proportional and sustainable addition/s to Thringstone contributing towards the housing needs of the village. • Plan the location of new homes in Thringstone which deliver sustainable patterns of development ie minimise the need to travel and to maintain access to services and facilities. • Release Countryside (as defined on on the Policies Map) for sustainable development for affordable housing in accordance with Policy H5 ie identify rural 'Exception' sites for affordable housing in Thringstone • In releasing Countryside, utilise the Thringstone SHLAA Countryside site/s assessed by the Council and considered acceptable for development 	<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. It is considered that the provision of affordable housing will largely be made as a percentage of market housing developments, as per the requirements of Policy H4. However, there may be occasions where 100% affordable housing schemes come forward for development.</p>		F J ALLGOOD	Land Owner
An Affordable Housing Needs Survey was conducted in Blackfordby during 2012 and highlighted the need for a rural exception site for the village of up to 4 affordable homes. To date no rural exception site has been identified and priority needs to be given to allocating a rural exception site in Blackfordby.	Noted.		Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
No	Noted.		Andrew Stone	NA
No	Noted.		Trevor Davis	None
We agree with the policy however only if it is strictly adhered to and future classes cannot be added to find a way around this policy.	Noted.		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
No exceptions should be made. Affordable housing crosses all boundaries and is required in all areas.	Noted.		Edward Hines	N/A

We agree with the provisions put in place however, this would need to be monitored in relation to the housing need as stated. Should there be a housing shortfall in village locations, alternative sites will be need to be sought. However they may not have necessarily been granted planning permission and we believe early consultation will be required in order to achieve this.	Noted.		Helen Stockdale	Lovell Partnerships
Yes	Noted.		David Bigby	Private individual
Yes	Noted.		Nick Wilkins	NW
Affordable housing should be grouped together, it's worked before so why not now.	Noted. An exception site would be one site for the development of affordable housing.		Mrs Melanie Warren	Mrs Melanie Warren
Yes	Noted.		Lance Wiggins	Landmark Planning
there should be no more housing developments in the Ashby area.	Noted. The SHMA identifies that there is a need for affordable housing in rural areas and the provision of exceptions sites is one way in which some of this need can potentially be met.		Christopher Bush	NA
Yes	Noted.		Mr. j Lewis	1950
With the proviso that these don't end up in the clutches of buy to let landlords or become second homes for the better off.	Currently Planning permission for Exception Sites will be subject to conditions (or planning obligation) to ensure that all initial and subsequent occupiers of the affordable dwellings will be local people in housing need and they will benefit from the status of the dwellings as affordable housing in perpetuity. The Government is consulting on changes to the NPPF which suggests that such in perpetuity clauses may not always be appropriate. No changes to the policy are proposed at this time but the matter will be kept under review.		Steve Johnson	YYYY
Affordable housing in rural areas is not real, the demand for housing is where there is employment potential and the village properties that have been developed are not affordable to young families.	The SHMA identifies that there is a need for affordable housing in rural areas and the provision of exceptions sites is one way in which some of this need can potentially be met. Exceptions sites can provide affordable homes for young families with a local connection to a specific settlement.		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
Yes	Noted.		Hugh James	n/a
Yes	Noted.		Tim Abbott	Householder
You should also allow for some windfall sites otherwise there is no incentive for a local resident to develop their home/site/land if they will only be able to secure affordable homes on it. Also, remote locations are no use as affordable homes as the residents will be reliant upon a car which, in theory, they possibly/probably cannot afford to run.	An allowance for windfall sites has not been made as the provision of such sites is uncertain. An exceptions site will be a windfall site as they are not sites identified in the Local Plan. In terms of the location of an exceptions site the policy requires that they are well related to a settlement.		Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying
Our council are anxious that Dawson's Yard is an exception site in case it is sold in the future. We are fairly unhappy about it just being left without some possibility of supervised management by the District Council.	Noted. It is not the role of the Local Plan to allocate exceptions sites.		Heather Parish Council	Heather Parish Council
No	Noted.		JON WALTERS	LPT

Yes	Noted.		Lesley Colley	None
I agree with this suggestion and would also like to add that this should only be applicable on an individual basis. Large Developments should not be granted under this clause which allow developers to profit on the development of countryside. It should be for individual need only.	Noted. The SHMA identifies that there is a need for affordable housing in rural areas and the provision of exceptions sites is one way in which some of this need can potentially be met. The NPPF supports the use of exceptions sites to help meet needs. Policy H5 specifies that the development of exceptions sites should be well related to and respect the character and scale of the settlement and its landscape setting.		Alison Saxby	N/A
No. KPC does not agree with the suggested approach. The use of exception sites appears to take no account of the other aspects that restrict development to acceptable sites. This would enable developers to build on valuable open country beyond permitted development areas in the name of affordable housing, with developments including commercial housing to subsidise the work. This is a loophole that developers will deploy to their advantage, damaging quality of life for others. Executive estates only will result, with minimal affordable housing.	The NPPF supports the provision of affordable housing in rural areas through rural exceptions sites. Whilst a small number of market homes may be provided on an exceptions site to cross-subsidise the affordable housing, it would need to be demonstrated that there is insufficient subsidy for the scheme to go ahead without the provision of market housing and that the scale of market housing was the minimum necessary to ensure the scheme was deliverable.		Vicky Roe	Kegworth Parish Council
Modify Policy H5 to say 'Rural Exception Sites will not be allowed in villages where there has already been allocation of housing sites with affordable housing in the plan period'. H5(3) Delete – this policy is inappropriate. Allowing a site outside the limits of development provides land at agricultural prices which is already a significant 'subsidy for the scheme' and so there is no need to allow market housing.	As the Local Plan covers the period to 2031 it is possible that additional needs will arise during in that period therefore it would be unreasonable to apply a blanket prohibition on any further schemes in those settlements where affordable housing has been provided. The provision of market housing on an exceptions site would be required to demonstrate that there is insufficient subsidy for the scheme to go ahead without the inclusion of market housing.		Lindsay Gene	Appleby Magna Parish Council
(a) Yes, the Labour Group does agree with the proposed rural exception site policy H5. (b) The caveat is that the Labour Group insist that social housing for rent be included in policy H5 (c) Family and or work ties to the community be the main priority.	Noted. The type of affordable housing provided on exceptions sites would depend on the housing need identified and could include social rented housing. Affordable housing provided on exceptions sites housing would be for existing residents or those with a family or employment connection to the local community.		Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader

<p>We agree that here should be a policy to guide the provision of affordable and market affordable housing on rural exception sites. However, Policy H5 as presently worded needs to be reviewed in-line with a general review of affordable housing as suggested above (Question 13, Policy H4). In particular, a wider definition of affordable housing and affordable housing providers should be adopted.</p> <p>Some opportunities for exception sites will occur outside settlements so the reference to</p> <p>“ ... and its landscape setting” at H5 1 (b) should be changed to “ ... or its landscape setting”.</p> <p>Policy H5 addresses the provision of exception sites outside Limits to Development so the reference to the inclusion of market housing on “exception sites” in Sustainable Villages and Small Villages at H5 3 is confusing. This seems to suggest the policy applies to sites within these settlements which are not outside Limits to Development so would not be “exception” sites. Further clarification is needed on this point.</p>	<p>The definitions of affordable housing will need addressing in light of the Housing and Planning Bill.</p> <p>An exceptions site would be outside the limits to development and within Countryside and would therefore have to respect the character of the settlement <u>and</u> it's landscape setting.</p> <p>Point 3 will be amended to provide clarification.</p>	<p>Part 3 to be reworded "On sites that are outside of, but well related to, a sustainable village or a small village the inclusion of an element of market housing ..."</p>	<p>Andrew Thomas</p>	<p>Thomas Taylor Planning</p>
<p>Market housing allowed to support development of exception sites should be limited to 60% of total site.</p>	<p>It is intended that only a small number of market homes would be permitted on an exceptions site to cross-subsidise the provision of affordable housing. It would have to be demonstrated that there was insufficient subsidy without the market housing and that the market housing element was the minimum necessary for the delivery of the scheme. It would not be appropriate to include any form of blanket restriction as suggested.</p>		<p>C Tandy</p>	<p>Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society</p>
<p>Modify Policy H5 to say ‘Rural Exception Sites will not be allowed in villages where there has already been allocation of housing sites with affordable housing in the plan period’.</p> <p>H5(3) Delete – this policy is inappropriate. Allowing a site outside the limits of development provides land at agricultural prices which is already a significant ‘subsidy for the scheme’ and so there is no need to allow market housing.</p>	<p>As the Local Plan covers the period to 2031 it is possible that additional needs will arise during in that period therefore it would be unreasonable to apply a blanket prohibition on any further schemes in those settlements where affordable housing has been provided.</p> <p>The provision of market housing on an exceptions site would be required to demonstrate that there is insufficient subsidy for the scheme to go ahead without the inclusion of market housing.</p>		<p>Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment</p>	<p>Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation</p>

<p>I agree with this suggestion and would also like to add that this should only be applicable on an individual basis. Large Developments should not be granted under this clause which allows developers to profit on the development of countryside. It should be for individual need only.</p>	<p>Noted. The SHMA identifies that there is a need for affordable housing in rural areas and the provision of exceptions sites is one way in which some of this need can potentially be met. The NPPF supports the use of exceptions sites to help meet needs. Policy H5 specifies that the development of exceptions sites should be well related to and respect the character and scale of the settlement and its landscape setting.</p>		<p>Mrs. A Saxby</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Agree with the suggested approach but would insist that NWLDC actually adheres to their own policy.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p>	<p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p>

Policy H6: House types and mix

Question 15 Do you agree with our suggested approach to the issue of house types and mix ? 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.		Sue Colledge	colledge's florists
Yes	Noted.		Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
<p>The mix of housing private developers build is determined by market conditions.</p> <p>Prescriptive mixes based on 2014 SHMA evidence fails to introduce flexibility needed to respond to ever changing market conditions.</p> <p>In short building houses people don't want because a SHMA projection estimated a certain mix several years ago is not satisfactory.</p>	<p>Noted. However the NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to plan for a mix of housing to meet the different needs of the community including families with children, older people and people with disabilities.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment indicate the need for various types and sizes of housing, but particularly smaller housing in order to better balance the housing market.</p> <p>It is recognised that there may be the need for local variations and therefore dwelling mix identified in the SHMA are not intended to be prescriptively applied to every site. The policy is clear that it will have regard to a variety of factors including population profiles, location, balancing recent local delivery, rebalancing the current mix and the turnover properties at the local level as well as the nature of the development site and character of the area.</p>		George Breed	Persimmon Homes NMID
Yes	Noted.		Stephen Saxby	None
East Leake Parish Council supports this section on Housing Mix	Noted.		East Leake Parish Council	East Leake Parish Council
Yes	Noted.		Mark Chadbourn	Emerald Eye Ltd
Bungalows need to be a priority for older people who can't manage stairs	Noted.		Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council
Yes	Noted		Phil Ellis	Whitwick Parish Council
<p>Page 51</p> <p>Question 15</p> <p>Only by making suggested numbers in table 3 can this be considered a plan.</p>	<p>The new local plan policy H6 house types and mix states that we will seek a mix of house types and sizes and tenures in all new housing developments in order to meet the identified needs of the whole community.</p> <p>In considering proposals of 10 or more dwellings we will have regard to the evidence of housing needs, this would therefore include the information included within table 4.</p>		Steve Palmer	NA

Agree. However, should apply to all developments - not just on developments greater than 10 houses. Especially in rural areas.	Noted. A threshold of 10 was tested as part of the Viability Study undertaken to inform the Local Plan. It is considered that it would not be appropriate to apply this policy to all developments as it is likely that it would impact upon viability on smaller schemes, some of which are purpose built for a specific end user who has particular needs.		Samantha Lockwood	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council
Yes	Noted.		Mr Robert Harlow	Harlow Bros Ltd
Yes	Noted.		F J ALLGOOD	Land Owner
Yes	Noted.		david harris	Pyrotect Ltd
No	Noted.		Simon Litchfield	Resident
Recent planning approvals mean that 70% of new dwellings in Ashby are for 4 and 5 bed roomed properties. The proposal to focus development on 2 and 3 bed properties is welcomed and this echoes the draft Neighbourhood Plan which suggest at least 60% of dwellings in developments of 5 or more shall be 2 and/or 3 bedroom dwellings. However there needs to be a balance of accommodation provided and this should include bungalows.	Based on evidence in the SHMA there is a need to focus on the delivery of 2 and 3 bedroom properties to provide a better balance in the housing market. Policy H6 provides for the provision of a proportion of dwellings suitable for the elderly, such as bungalows, on developments of 50 or more dwellings.		Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
Housing sites already approved may not necessarily come forward for development and so to take this into account, rigidly, when assessing other proposals, may not be considered as meeting the needs of the community as intended. This should only be a guide and not proscribed, and therefore not built within a specific policy. In addition, Policy H6 (3) part (a) sets out that a proportion of dwellings (on proposals for 50 dwellings or more) will provide bungalows. It may not be appropriate in the proposed location, or the particular scheme to make provision for bungalows (i.e. it could be a high density apartment scheme in the centre of Coalville which would not be appropriate for bungalow development. As such it is considered that this should be omitted from the proscriptive policy and used in the supporting text as guidance only.	It is important that a range of house types and sizes are provided to meet the different needs of the community. Whilst the evidence in the SHMA identifies a requirement for 1, 2 and 3 bed dwellings the Local Plan recognises that there may a need for local variation and therefore Policy H6 is not prescriptive and it is not intended that the percentages identified in the SHMA are prescriptively applied to every site. The Local Plan needs to ensure that a mix of housing is provided and requires that a proportion of dwellings on developments of 50 or more dwellings are suitable for the occupation of the elderly. The provision would need to be appropriate to the scheme and whilst the preferred provision would be bungalows alternative provision could include Extra Care accommodation and where a high demonstrable need was identified flat/apartment accommodation may also be suitable.	Amend (2) (b) to state "the mix of house types and sizes already built and/or approved when compared to the available evidence". Amend 3(a) to by including after bungalows "having regard to factors (c) and (g) above"	Angela Cornell	Fisher German
No	Noted		Andrew Stone	NA
Yes	Noted		Trevor Davis	None
We agree there should be a better mix however we believe that 1 bed housing is also needed for elderly residents for whom household composition is unlikely to change.	Noted. Local Plan Policy H6 requires development of 50 or more dwellings to provide a proportion of dwellings that would be suitable for occupation by the elderly.		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
Yes	Noted.		Edward Hines	N/A

We agree with the suggest approach to the house types and mix. We believe it is important when seeking a new mix of house type schemes, extensive market research should be undertaken to identify the local requirements and characteristics of the local community and housing need in terms of dwelling size.	Noted.		Helen Stockdale	Lovell Partnerships
Yes	Noted.		David Bigby	Private individual
there is no specific mention of bungalows, these are sought after by older people and should be included as part of any development.	Local Planning Authorities are required to plan for a mix of housing to meet the different needs of the community, which includes older people. Policy H6 (part 3a) requires development sites of 50 or more dwellings to provide a proportion of dwellings suitable for occupation by the elderly, including bungalows.		Paul McCaffrey	NA
See above	Noted.		Mrs Melanie Warren	Mrs Melanie Warren
There is no size qualification in policy H6 (1). It would not be practical or desirable for developers to provide a mix of housing types, sizes and tenures on schemes of less than 10 dwellings. The text should be revised such that it relates to major applications only. Schemes of 10-14 dwellings in the largest settlements are not subject to affordable housing requirements and should not therefore be required to provided a varied tenure. Whilst a limited mix of sizes may be desirable, this should not be rigidly imposed as it would potentially jeopardise viability, contrary to the aim of paragraph 173 of the Framework.	It is acknowledged that as worded there is inconsistency between parts 1 and 2. It would be inappropriate to apply the provision of H6 to all schemes. Therefore, it will only apply to those of 10 or more dwellings. The Local Plan recognises that there are other relevant factors that need to be considered in agreeing a housing mix and tenure on a site. There may be need for local variations and therefore the percentages identified in the SHMA are not intended to be prescriptively applied to every site.	Amend part (1) - by including reference to 10 or more dwellings instead of "all".	Lance Wiggins	Landmark Planning
Yes	Noted		Mr. & Mrs Loveless	Retired
Frail, older and disabled people need affordable adapted homes in town centres. There is no plan for the extra care an ageing population needs.	Local Planning Authorities are required to plan for a mix of housing to meet the different needs of the community, including older people and people with disabilities. Policy H6 requires developments of 50 or more dwellings to provide a proportion of dwellings suitable for occupation by the elderly as well as a proportion of dwellings suitable for occupation or easily adaptable for people with disabilities.		Theresa Eynon	alderoak
there should be no more housing developments in the Ashby area.	Noted.		Christopher Bush	NA
Yes	Noted.		Mr. j Lewis	1950
Policy H6 needs to be much stronger and tell the developers what we want ie a much higher percentage of 2/3 bedroom houses that our children can buy and get started in , and a much lower percentage of 4/5 bedroom properties for people from outside the area to move into and then long-distance commute to Birmingham and Nottingham .	The supporting text to Policy H6 identifies an oversupply of 4 bed dwellings and the need for future developments to provide 2 and 3 bed dwellings to provide a better balance in the housing market. The requirements for the mix of housing are set out in the supporting text to Policy H6. The Local Plan cannot be too prescriptive as this would be contrary to government policy.		Michael Ball	Individual
Yes	Noted.		Steve Johnson	YYYY
Yes	Noted.		Lesley Birtwistle	not applicable

No	Noted.		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
Yes	Noted.		Hugh James	n/a
Yes	Noted.		Tim Abbott	Householder
Caution is required. Conflict is arising in many places due to affordable homes being interspersed with private homes as more and more residents are affected by the minority of neighbours and this affects their ability to sell their home and the price they can achieve which, if they paid a high price, is a problem and can lead to negative equity. The Council should have tools in place to remove unruly residents and not put existing private residents into difficult situations. As always, it is the minority who affect things for the majority!	Noted. The issue of who occupies a property is beyond the remit of the Local Plan. National policy requires that the needs of all sections of the community are met. The council can only have policies in place regarding unruly tenants in respect of those properties owned by the council.		Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying
Yes	Noted.		Heather Parish Council	Heather Parish Council
No	Noted.		JON WALTERS	LPT
but consideration should be given to self/custom build opportunities.	Noted. Further consideration is required in respect of the issue of self build.		Mrs Penny Bicknell	Les Stephan Planning Ltd
Far too many 4 beds.	Planning permissions granted since 1st April 2011 includes provision for significantly more 4 bed market houses than the evidence in the SHMA suggests are required. The Local Plan seeks to ensure that future developments (including the sites where only outline permission has been granted) focus on delivering 2 and 3 bedroom properties in order to provide a better balance in the housing market.		Lesley Colley	None
I believe that 4+ bed homes should not be overlooked. As we diversify in our cultures and the population ages more families are starting to live with multiple generations under one roof. This addresses child care, elderly care and rising house cost issues. Therefore I see a need to ensure we have enough 4+ homes to allow this. By having multiple generations under one roof looking after one and other it reduces the burden on other local services and is good for community. So I would say that the current market mix is good and we do not need to focus on smaller properties too much.	Since 1st April 2011 (where specified in the planning application) there have been 1,546 4 bed dwellings granted planning permission. This is more than 3 beds (1,167) and significantly more than 2 beds (588). The focus in the future needs to be the delivery of 2 and 3 bed dwellings to ensure a better balanced housing market. However, it is acknowledged that the need for different dwellings sizes may change over the plan period (to 2031) and hence the policy is not prescriptive.		Alison Saxby	N/A

<p>Kegworth Parish Council cannot support NWLDC's approach for a balanced portfolio of house types. The reality is that NWLDC is only able to 'seek' a community-centred distribution, whereas developers are driven to maximise their profit from available land irrespective of local need. Until the council determines a distribution the community will be provided with what the developers want to offer, reducing the affordability / choice for local people and elderly residents.</p> <p>NWLDC has the power, under the Approved Document to the Building Regulations to require a percentage of homes to meet 'Lifetime Homes' standards and for an additional percentage to either fully meet the 'wheelchair accessible' homes standard or be easily adapted to meet this standard. KPC would like to see a high percentage of houses meeting standard M2 and a reasonable percentage meeting standard M3, subject to further analysis of Housing need, including affordable homes. Setting a requirement that a development of fifty or more dwellings 'will include a proportion' of homes suitable for the elderly or those with disabilities is meaningless.</p> <p>A 'proportion' is likely to be the absolute minimum that a developer feels it can get away with as the council's wishes are purely aspirational and entirely unenforceable. Developers will use viability assessments to avoid fulfilling anything but a rigid target, as they do with affordable housing.</p> <p>We believe a rigid target is necessary as Kegworth has a disproportionately older population. The local plan suggests that bungalows are the only means of addressing their needs. KPC would also like consideration by NWLDC of acquiring Mill Lodge, designed as an old peoples home and due to be vacated by the NHS in 2016 . KPC believe that the opportunity of building fewer larger homes and more sustainable housing should be taken when the applications for the planning or reserved matters for outstanding outline applications are determined to ensure appropriate housing for our existing population.</p>	<p>Evidence identifies that there has been a significant provision of 4 bed dwellings in the District since 2011, Policy H6 seeks to redress the housing market balance by ensuring future developments focus on the delivery of 2 and 3 bed properties.</p> <p>In regards to Lifetime Homes standards the Government, in March 2015, announced new housing standards for England. As part of the new standards planning authorities are only able to specify housing standards provided in the 'New National Technical Standards' which provide specifications for accessible homes in three categories, ranging from a base line largely aligned with the existing Part M of the Building Regulations to a category designed to meet the needs of wheelchair users as occupants. To require anything other than the base line standard would require clear evidence that a more specific requirement was needed and it would not impact on viability.</p> <p>The proportion of dwellings to be provided on sites of 50 or more dwellings for the elderly and/or those with a disability would be assessed on a site by site basis and would be dependent on a range of factors including site location, topography and proximity to services and facilities.</p> <p>In terms of the provision of bunaglows, these would be the preferred choice however alternative provision could be through Extra Care or if a high demonstrable need was identified then flat accommodation may be also suitable.</p>		Vicky Roe	Kegworth Parish Council
<p>(a) We do not agree</p> <p>(b) The 2011 Census there were 16,930 people in NWL whose day to day activities are limited by</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy H6 (point 3a) requires development of 50 or more dwellings to provide a proportion of dwellings suitable for</p>		Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader

<p>disability. This was an increase of 11% since 2001. Demographic change suggests the figure will increase further over the plan period. The draft Local Plan shows no evidence that the housing and employment needs of an ever growing ageing population with multiple disabilities. The District needs a significant number of single storey 'bungalows' to be placed in the mix equation.</p> <p>(c) No indication for Social Housing needs. There are over 800 persons (and growing) on the Council's 'waiting list'. The draft rattles on about 'affordable housing' but does not reflect needs for those who cannot afford or obtain a mortgage. Nor does it identify land within the draft to build new social housing</p>	<p>the elderly, including bungalows and also a proportion of dwellings suitable for occupation or easily adaptable for people with disabilities in accordance with the relevant building regulations.</p> <p>Affordable housing is considered in policies H4 and H5 of the Local Plan.</p>			
<p>We welcome the Council's acknowledgement that there may be a need for local variations and that the identified percentages are not intended to be prescriptively applied to every site. Policy H6 should also state that consideration will be given to evidence in support of proposed mix provided by applicants and should also confirm that the Council will publish regularly updated statistics for each of the indicators identified in Policy H6 to enable a consistent approach across the District.</p>	<p>Consideration will be given to a range of factors when considering dwelling mix, these are listed in Part 2 of Policy H6, evidence submitted as part of a planing application would be also be considered to ensure identified needs are met.</p> <p>The Council, as part of its Annual Monitoring Report will publish dwelling sizes permitted, as well as the dwellings sizes built during the relevant monitoring period.</p>	<p>Amend (2) (a) to include reference to "other evidence of market demand"</p>	<p>Andrew Thomas</p>	<p>Thomas Taylor Planning</p>

<p>Secondly the emphasis on increasing the provision of one and two bedroom dwellings needs to be approached with caution. The SHMA looks at demographics of the population and concludes that, because household formation sizes are falling and the housing stock is predominately larger properties that, as a consequence, more one and two bedroom accommodation should be provided. This is not necessarily the case. Many people require an additional bedroom for visitors , working at home or simply for storage. One bedroom accommodation is therefore rarely adequate for most circumstances, event for single - person households.</p> <p>Whilst the need for one and two-bedroom dwellings is more precisely identifiable in terms of social housing, where individual requirements are recorded by your housing departments, similar statistics for the markets sector are not recorded and if, as required by the NPPF, market demand is to be met, then decisions on the proportion of one and two bedroom market dwellings to be provided, should be made by reference to information on market demand. This can be provided by local estate agents and developers and it is important that any housing policies and planning policies have regard to evidence of market demand . In many cases developers seek advice from local experts as to the market requirements and then find that this advice is different from that which they are being required to address through the planning policy and housing strategy. This difficulty needs to be addressed by policy and practice</p>	<p>In terms of market 1 bed properties the SHMA suggests that 5-10% of the overall dwellings should be 1 bed properties, current planning permissions identify that 5.2% of the permitted dwellings are 1 bed, this is within the percentage boundaries identified in the SHMA. Therefore, the focus is to be on the delivery of 2 and 3 bedroom properties.</p> <p>The Council's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) records the number of different sized dwellings granted planning permission as well as the size of dwellings built during the relevant monitoring period. This provides information on the mix of dwellings that have permission as well as those being delivered.</p> <p>The Local Plan does provide flexibility and it is recognised that there may be a need for local variations and the percentages detailed are not intended to be prescriptively applied to every site.</p>	<p>Amend (2) (a) to include reference to "other evidence of market demand"</p>	<p>sigma planning services</p>	<p>Sigma Planning Services</p>
<p>Frail, older and disabled people need affordable adapted homes in town centres. There is no plan for the extra care an ageing population needs.</p>	<p>Local Planning Authorities are required to plan for a mix of housing to meet the different needs of the community, including older people and people with disabilities. Policy H6 requires developments of 50 or more dwellings to provide a proportion of dwellings suitable for occupation by the elderly as well as a proportion of dwellings suitable for occupation or easily adaptable for people with disabilities.</p>		<p>Mrs Kurpil</p>	<p>NA</p>

<p>Policy H6 sets out the Council's suggested approach to house types and mix, indicating that in considering proposals for developments over 10 dwellings, the Council will have regard to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · evidence of housing needs from the SHMA and other sources; · the mix of house types and sizes already approved; · the size of the proposed development; · nature of the housing sub-market; · needs and demands of all sectors of the community; · character and context of the individual site, and <p>#localplanmysay</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · development viability and deliverability. <p>It is important that in seeking to secure an appropriate mix of house types and sizes on sites, the Council does not apply an overly formulaic approach that seeks to secure fixed percentages on every site in accordance with SHMA evidence irrespective of other more site specific evidence and potential issues of viability. The commitment in the policy to take account of more site specific issues in considering the mix of housing types, sizes and tenures is supported.</p>	<p>Noted. The Local Plan recognises that there may be a need for local variations and as such the percentages are not intended to be prescriptively applied to every site.</p>		<p>Guy Longley,</p>	<p>Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.</p>
<p>Ashby is weighted to 4 bedroom houses encouraging commuters rather than local residents. Housing mix should be as per neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there has been significant provision of 4 bed homes since 2011 throughout the district. Therefore, future developments are encouraged to focus on delivering 2 and 3 bedroom properties to provide a better balance in the housing market. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan, once agreed at referendum and made by the Council will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.</p>		<p>C Tandy</p>	<p>Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society</p>
<p>We would question a blanket policy that seeks to impose a standard mix across the area and would suggest that a more locally assessed need would be more appropriate.</p>	<p>The Local Plan recognises that there may be a need for local variations and therefore the dwelling mix percentages are not intended to be prescriptively applied to every site.</p>		<p>Andrew Thomson</p>	<p>Thomson Planning Partnership</p>

<p>It is known that the Government wishes to streamline the planning system and rationalise many differing existing standards into a simpler system which will reduce policy burdens and increase the delivery of more housing. The Deregulation Bill 2015, which received Royal Assent in March 2015, specifies that Councils should not set any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings. Therefore the only technical standards that can be considered and incorporated into Local Plans are restricted to the nationally described space standard, an optional requirement for water usage and optional requirements for adaptable / accessible dwellings. Policy H6 – House Types & Mix proposes on sites of more than 50 units a proportion of homes for elderly will be provided together with a proportion of Part M4(2) Accessible & Adaptable Homes. The Council should provide appropriate justification for this policy requirement.</p>	<p>The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to plan for a mix of housing to meet the different needs of the community including older people and people with disabilities. Further consideration is required in term sof part 3(b).</p>		Susan E Green	HBF
<p>In relation to housing mix the needs of the ageing population should be taken into account. With regard to the provision of the affordable housing, thresholds should be set at a maximum level in order to give flexibility and not to prejudice the viability of developments. Further there would be significant advantage to having a common threshold over the total plan with proportions varied to take account of the needs of individual settlements.</p>	<p>Local Planning Authorities are required to plan for a mix of housing to meet the different needs of the community, including older people. Policy H6 requires developments of 50 dwellings or more to provide a proportion of dwellings that are suitable for occupation by the elderly, including bungalows. Affordable housing is considered under Policy H5.</p>		Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>		Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment	Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation
<p>Frail, older and disabled people need affordable adapted homes in town centres. There is no plan for the extra care an ageing population needs.</p>	<p>Local Planning Authorities are required to plan for a mix of housing to meet the different needs of the community, including older people and people with disabilities. Policy H6 requires developments of 50 or more dwellings to provide a proportion of dwellings suitable for occupation by the elderly as well as a proportion of dwellings suitable for occupation or easily adaptable for people with disabilities.</p>		Mr B Carter	n/a
<p>I believe that 4+ bed homes should not be overlooked. As we diversify in our cultures and the population ages more families are starting to live with multiple generations under one roof. This addresses child care, elderly care and rising house cost issues. Therefore I see a need to ensure we have enough 4+ homes to allow this. By having multiple generations under one roof looking after one and other it reduces the burden on other local services and is good for community. So I would say</p>	<p>Since 1st April 2011 (where specified in the planning application) there have been 1,546 4 bed dwellings granted planning permission. This is more than 3 beds (1,167) and significantly more than 2 beds (588). The focus in the future needs to be the delivery of 2 and 3 bed dwellings to ensure a better balanced housing market. However, it is acknowledged that the need for different dwellings sizes may change over the plan period (to 2031).</p>		Mrs. A Saxby	n/a

that the current market mix is good and we do not need to focus on smaller properties too much.				
The proposed Policy H6 is supported, but the dwelling mix promoted by the SHMA is misleading in suggesting that 80 – 90% of new market dwellings should be 2 or 3 bedrooms. The dwelling mix for market housing set out in Table 4 where 78% are three to four bedroom dwellings is more representative of market demand. Often purchasers who only need 2 or 3 bedrooms prefer to buy a home with an extra bedroom and this may explain the lack of reality in the SHMA mix. Developers must, however, build to suit the market for their product and this will include a larger proportion of three and four bedroom properties.	The dwelling mix set out in table 4 shows the dwelling sizes permitted since 1st April 2011. The Local Plan acknowledges that there may be a need for local variations. Therefore, the percentages identified in the SHMA are not intended to be prescriptively applied to every site and other relevant factors will be considered when agreeing an appropriate housing mix.		Sigma Plan	Sigma Plan on behalf of Hallam Land Management
Yes. Market demand will decide.	Noted.		Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council	Castle Donington Parish Council