

TABLE G – INFRASTRUCTURE AND FACILITIES

Policy IF1 – Development and infrastructure

| <p>Question 32</p> <p>Do you agree with our suggested approach to securing infrastructure as part of new development? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;</p> | <p>NWL Response</p> | <p>Any change required?</p> | <p>Name</p> | <p>Business or organisation name;</p> |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| <p>The Bath Grounds should be identified not merely as Local Green Space but as a significant part of the promotion of the town's economic and tourist development. They provide a corridor/circular walk-way linking the Castle and the main shopping areas. Local people may take these things for granted, but the active promotion of tourism often rests upon the proper identification of tourist routes which combine historical places of interest, leisure facilities and commercial opportunities. The Plan sells Ashby short in this sense.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility. The Plan also recognises that the district benefits from tourist attractions, the part they play in the local economy and the support they can provide for local services and facilities. Policy Ec15 seeks the retention, enhancement and promotion of sustainable tourist attraction and facilities that are well connected to other amenities.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Dr John Blythe</p> | <p>Researcher, University of Birmingham</p> |
| <p>Our previous comments have referred to the fact that public investment will be required to promote development, and relying entirely on developer contributions will not allow the required level of development to proceed. The current proposals for the A511 corridor are welcomed, but they are insufficient to match the ambition of this document.</p> | <p>It is recognised that there may be circumstances in which public money may be required to help support new development. The Council will seek such opportunities where possible, but new development will be expected to make an appropriate provision. We will work with partners and other stakeholders to secure public funding where possible.</p> | <p>Make reference to working with stakeholders to secure public funding, within the policy wording.</p> | <p>Nigel Garnham</p> | <p>Packington Nook Residents Association</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------------|------------------------------|
| <p>. Reading on through the plan I arrive at this half way point with no real sense of where community safety fits despite what NPPF has to say. There are no occasional references to suggest a thread in the plan. As an example there is no content in the draft policies for East Midlands airport.</p> <p>I ask that there is mention of community safety and policing at 8.1 and/or in 8.3 please.</p> <p>The actual policy is silent here again. I appreciate that community infrastructure can be all embracing however as with the background text there is no mention and indeed a continuing repetition of almost everything else eg health and education. At least IF 1 needs to be inclusive in this respect.</p> <p>I believe the policy should also include infrastructure planning as a planning activity with outcomes to be delivered through the plan. I note that the draft IDP is not present in the documents put out to consultation at this stage. NPPF 157 could not be clearer on the need for local plans to plan positively for the infrastructure required and the preceding 156 includes the facilities that need to be delivered. Reflecting on plan content to this point I don't think the plan is doing this and as a result in my view there will be a question of soundness here. Apart from including policing, community safety and crime and disorder in the policy text I ask that the Policy includes the IDP planning process as a demonstration that the Council is planning positively and intending to deliver necessary infrastructure to accompany growth.</p> <p>I appreciate there is mention of the IDP preparation process in text at 8.8 however against the backdrop I describe above and particularly in relation to the way community safety, policing and crime and disorder are excluded from policy I don't think this is enough for the plan to be sound. It doesn't help that the IDP will be prepared and presumably circulated for comment beyond this stage of consultation. Is infrastructure planning and delivery central to the plan as it is in NPPF? I contrast this with the content of many chapters that follow relating to green infrastructure and the environment.</p> | <p>It is considered that community safety would be best addressed under Policy S5 - Design of New Development. However for clarification it would be also useful to reference community safety under Policy IF1 as a form of community infrastructure. Comments reference the Infrastructure Delivery Plan are noted. Such a plan is now being prepared and will highlight the key infrastructure proposed or required.</p> | <p>Amend Policy S5 -Design of New Development and Policy IF1: Development and Infrastructure to refer to community safety.</p> | <p>Michael Lambert</p> | <p>Leicestershire Police</p> |
|---|---|--|------------------------|------------------------------|

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <p>This is such an important part of the development issue, it should be more prescriptive. The option of making a financial contribution is all well and good, however that contribution must go towards an increase in capacity of services, and not get lost in the "big budget" which I suspect it does now.</p> <p>Therefore, all contributions made must go toward actual infrastructure improvement related to the development site.</p> | <p>A legal agreement that will accompany any planning permission will identify the amount of contribution that will be made towards the specific infrastructure/service that would support the development.</p> <p>We will work with infrastructure providers to identify their requirements from a proposed development.</p> <p>As developments are commenced they will be monitored to ensure that the appropriate payments are made.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Stephen Saxby</p> | <p>None</p> |
| <p>The County Council agrees in the principle with the general approach to securing infrastructure for new developments and welcomes the inclusion of Policy IF1-Development and Infrastructure, within the Local Plan. Contributions are important in securing appropriate infrastructure and services, particularly for major new development proposal such as SUEs, to support major new (sustainable) development which accords with the general principles of the NPPF.</p> <p>The following suggestions in relation to the Local Plan policy IF1 and in any future preparation of a SPD on planning obligations should ensure it is consistent and transparent in its approach to the negotiation and securing of contributions and delivery of infrastructure with useful cross reference to the County Council Planning Obligations Policy (adopted December 2014).</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | | <p>Andrew Tyrer</p> | <p>Leicestershire County Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| <p>In effect this plan does not provide any strategy for the necessary infrastructure. This document shows that there are 10,754 properties with various levels of planning approval. Yet no definitive list or plan for the infrastructure changes exists. Changes for water supply, waste water and sewage, medical and educational requirements, broadband and most importantly road infrastructure.</p> <p>These should all be specific and detailed with a time line that shows increases in facilities can keep pace with housing completions.</p> <p>This plan, if it is indeed a plan should detail the metrics and time lines for the increases to support the 10,700 new dwellings and proposed industrial expansion in line with the local plan.</p> <p>Whilst it may be suggested that it's not the Council who provide these services it their local plan and facilities. They should make sure that this is specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely.</p> <p>Looking at each development as an individual case and not considering the big picture means the plan is doomed to failure.</p> <p>It isn't possible to increase the size of a water pipe or sewer each time a new development is built. Any infrastructure study must encompass the whole plan provision.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms ,and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. To date a significant amount of new infrastructure has been secured as aprt of the new development which has been approved. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Steve Palmer</p> | <p>NA</p> |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--|-----------|
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (Transport, Education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms ,and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Julia Fraser & Henry Sharples</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (Transport, Education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms ,and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Jane Harris</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| <p>We do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education ,leisure, healthcare) are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms ,and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>no change</p> | <p>Anne Davis Glynis Gardner</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>its always too little too late, put the development in before the housing.</p> | <p>Noted. The majority of new development that the district requires is already committed as a result of planning permissions. These permissions include for the provision of a range of infrastructure to mitigate the impact of development and has been secured through section 106 agreements. Furthermore an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which highlights the key infrastructure which is proposed or required, which will assist with respect to the funding and delivery and timing of infrastructure.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>david harris</p> | <p>Pyrotect Ltd</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <p>The Plan should make provision for the allocation of Local Green Space. There is none identified in the plan as it stands. The Bath Grounds Green Corridor between the Royal Hotel and Ashby Castle should be protected and designated as Local Green Space.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Colin Eaton</p> | <p>Colin Eaton</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified, the proposed infrastructure improvements(transport, education, leisure, healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Paul Riley</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| <p>I do not agree that a 50o/a increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements:(Transport, Education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are worryingly inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Nick Salt</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (Transport, Education, Leisure, and Healthcare) to support such growth are worryingly inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Joanne Salt</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (Transport, Education, Leisure, and Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> <p>I trust NWLDC will take account of my concerns and carefully reconsider its proposed policies</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>CHRIS AND JILL ARCHER</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements in transport, education, leisure and healthcare to support such a level of growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Nigel Francis</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| <p>I do not agree with a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, leisure, healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Thomas Till</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (Transport, Education, Leisure, and Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> <p>I trust NWLDC will take account of my concerns and carefully reconsider its proposed policies.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Judith K Bancroft</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>The Town Council supports the approach to securing infrastructure as part of new development. This infrastructure needs to be targeted at areas seeing the most development.</p> | <p>Support welcomed</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk</p> | <p>Ashby de la Zouch Town Council</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Philip Bastow</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Terry Hill</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>D.Brearley</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Sophia M</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mrs S Whitehouse</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mrs Lucy Clements</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mr D Spencer</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| <p>Generally this is supported however the policy is proscriptive in stating that certain infrastructure elements are 'required'. They may not be appropriate for the development or achievable. As such it is considered that the policy be re-phrased to states that those infrastructure elements 'may be required' rather than specifically required them.</p> | <p>Noted. However the 'required' is used within the context of the type of infrastructure that supports new development, and will only be required if considered appropriate/necessary and subject to viability.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Angela Cornell</p> | <p>Fisher German</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example, those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. It would be appropriate to amend the definition of open space to clarify this. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Mr Stuart George Smith</p> | <p>N/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>M.S. Bowyer</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
|--|--|---|--------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation.</p> <p>Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>M.M. Knight</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
|--|---|---|--------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Mr David Tweedale</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
|--|--|---|--------------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation.</p> <p>Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Mrs Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Sarah Higgins</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
| <p>The rail link MUST be a priority before any new development is begun as otherwise all the objectives about sustainability and maintaining a safe and pleasant environment cannot be achieved due to increased road traffic which is dangerous, polluting and restricts the movements of vulnerable road users.</p> <p>There is mention of green space as if this is being provided, but green space is being destroyed by the planned developments</p> | <p>In response to the planned housing growth, a recent study has been commissioned to give an indication of the impact on growth on the viability of a reopened rail line.</p> <p>There is an evidenced need for housing growth in the district and the scale of which cannot be solely accommodated on brownfield land. Notwithstanding the loss of areas of open space e.g. countryside, the provision of green infrastructure/network of open spaces, is sought as part of new development. With respect to rail services, the Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic”.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mary Lorimer</p> | <p>Not applicable</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>V Flemwell</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, leisure, healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. Healthcare as an example: The NHS is planning to close the local hospital, fragmenting a potential all in one site, whilst building a new health centre and spend money converting sites such as the Leisure centre to illegal or improper use.</p> <p>I trust NWLDC will take account of my concerns and carefully reconsider its proposed policies.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Brian and Barbara Hick</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (Transport, Leisure, Healthcare, Education) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> <p>I trust NWLDC will take account of my concerns and carefully reconsider its proposed policies.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Pamela Estaugh</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example, those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Mr J Martin</p> | <p>N/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example, those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Dr John Blythe</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
| <p>We do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (Transport, Education, Leisure, and Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> <p>We trust NWLDC will take account of our concerns and carefully reconsider its proposed policies.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Lesley Thom, Iain Thom, Graham Thom</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|----------------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation.</p> <p>Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Mr & Mrs Varden</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
|--|---|---|----------------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation.</p> <p>Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>D & K Butler</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation.</p> <p>Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Pat Wilson</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
|--|---|---|-------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation.</p> <p>Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>C Attenborough and Y Pilkington</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
|--|---|---|--|------------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|----------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>B Mason</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
|--|--|---|----------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Mrs Carole Waterfield</p> | <p>Not applicable</p> |
|---|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|----------------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Mr Ralph Waterfield</p> | <p>N/A</p> |
|---|--|---|----------------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>B M Latimer</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
|---|--|---|--------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Caroline Brown</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Mrs Dawn Gardner</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>A policy is needed to the effect that development will not be permitted unless the required infrastructure has been secured either through the developer or by other means. Viability information provided by developers should be open to public scrutiny.</p> | <p>Noted. Policy IF1 seeks to ensure that new development includes the provision of appropriate new infrastructure. In terms of viability, the Local Plan has been subject to its own viability assessment and has been published as a public document. However the viability information which accompanies planning applications includes commercially confidential information and the courts have held it is appropriate not to release such information.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>David Bigby</p> | <p>Private individual</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, leisure, healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>K.V Percival</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>Infrastructure MUST be secured as part of planning and this should include the reopening of the Leicester - Burton line to passengers</p> | <p>Policy IF1 sets out how we will ensure that new development includes the provision of new infrastructure. Policy IF5 states the Council's support for the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton rail line and seeks to ensure development would not prejudice the route should the appropriate rail providers decided to proceed with its reinstatement.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Paul McCaffrey</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>We agree with the inclusion of flood prevention and sustainable drainage in Policy IF1.</p> | <p>Support welcomed</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Geoff Platts</p> | <p>Environment Agency</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan. And there have been previous attempts to build houses on the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Caroline Ferrier</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
|--|--|---|-------------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|----------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Bernard Noble</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
|---|--|---|----------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| <p>The Local Plan states that "Development will be supported by, and make contributions to as appropriate, the provision of new physical, social and green infrastructure in order to mitigate its impact upon the environment and communities." It states that this will include health infrastructure.</p> <p>There is no evidence in this strategic document that NWLDC have a strategy to deal with longstanding failures in the provision of health infrastructure funded by developer contributions.</p> <p>There is £1.3M of developer contributions sitting in NWLDC some of which is at risk of being returned to developers as it is time expired. A recent planning application close to the Derbyshire border, if approved, would have gone through without the £551 per dwelling required by NHSE because the neighbouring CCGs could not agree how to spend it.</p> <p>A new application for an extensive Care Village in Norris Hill will, if approved, go through without ANY comments from Health or Social Care despite the obvious impact on local services.</p> <p>The failure to spend s106 developer contributions for health has been known for over two years. The Local Medical Committee, the trade association for GP practices, has tried to broker discussions between NHSE, NWLDC and the CCGs.</p> <p>There is nothing in this Local Plan that suggests NWLDC even recognise they have a problem let alone realise how intractable it is.</p> <p>Agreeing to fund GP premises improvements isn't straightforward. The new build has to meet both the health needs of the population and the needs of the practice who may have to put some of their own funds into the pot. The developer's contribution will only arrive after a set proportion of the houses have been built and occupied. There is also the risk that the developer may claim they cannot afford to pay. They can ask the District Valuer to let them off the hook. This leaves GP partners carrying the risk of investing in an extension only to find the houses are never built and the promised cash never arrives. A bigger practice may also attract a higher notional rent, making NHSE think twice about the idea.</p> <p>Under the old scheme, Primary Care Trusts could put in a bid for money without having any clear idea where they were going to spend it.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the NHS on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure health infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district . Once funding is secured it is for the provider to ensure that the money is spent in accordance with the section 106 agreement but the Council will also monitor this.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Theresa Eynon</p> | <p>alderoak</p> |
|---|--|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| <p>This is the situation that has left this District Council holding millions of pounds of unspent funds. While £1.3M is nice to have in the bank, developer contributions have to be spent within a limited time or go back to the developer at a hefty rate of interest.</p> <p>The new CIL planning regulations only make the situation worse. They require NHS England to have a robust plan to spend the money. NHSE have to prove that the development will create a need. They must be able to show that local services lack the capacity to meet that need without improvement. If a number of small developments are coming on stream, the health service can't just add umpteen contributions together to make one sensible sized sum. The new rules are supposed to ensure the community gets the infrastructure improvements it needs. In NWL they are having the opposite effect. NHSE aren't bothering to claim at all.</p> <p>This probably relates to recent changes to health service structure which has also had an impact. Under the old system, the Primary Care Trusts were responsible for claiming and spending developer contributions for health. Under the new rules, the Local Area Team is in charge. Covering a much larger area with fewer staff, they are distant from the practices affected by new housing developments. Caught on the hop, by the time they realise the plans are coming to Committee, the NHS is pushed to come up with the kind of strategic, innovative and robust plans we need if the NHS 'left shift' is going to happen.</p> <p>This Council has a "duty to co-operate" with other agencies to ensure communities needs for infrastructure are met. This Council has, so far, failed to achieve any cross-institutional solution to the failure to spend s106 developer contributions for health.</p> | | | | |
| <p>However, a robust mechanism for monitoring the execution of S106 Agreements by the applicant needs to be operated.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Lesley Birtwistle</p> | <p>not applicable</p> |
| <p>With the reduction in NHS sites how can you guarantee development of key health infrastructure.</p> <p>What about network infrastructure in all areas including rural?</p> | <p>The district Council consult and engage with the NHS on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure health infrastructure is appropriate for the development of development proposed in the district.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mrs Paula Ashfield</p> | <p>Paula Ashfield</p> |
| <p>I would be in favour of the Council adopting a CIL approach</p> | <p>Noted. The Council has undertaken some preliminary work on the issue of CIL and this issues is currently still under consideration.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Hugh James</p> | <p>n/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>I have no confidence in the modelling by highways or the proposals put forward for some junctions - Hugglescote Crossroads is a fine example of this.</p> <p>I note we no longer have the money to remodel the cross roads yet reading the Leics structure plan it is apparently a "top priority"!</p> <p>Clearly there is no joined up thinking across the Councils and this raises serious concerns for me as a local resident.</p> <p>There is far too much reliance on the motor car and the bus service is being reduced every day. More must be done by the Council - including strict rules on the bus service and opening a tram/light railway linking to Leics, Ashby and Burton and, if possible, onto Birmingham.</p> | <p>Noted. The District Council has, throughout the preparation of the Draft Plan, liaised and engaged with the Highway Authority, to ensure the identified highway needs and issues for the district are fed into the process.</p> <p>In addition, most sites identified for housing development within the draft Local Plan have planning permission, and the appropriate infrastructure contributions have been secured, including road improvements, education provision etc.</p> <p>Policy also supports the provision of more sustainable forms of transport and where appropriate provision has or will be sought towards the provision of cycle ways, footpath links and new public transport. Policy IF5 supports the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton rail line and seeks to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Jane Tebbatt</p> | <p>Quarrying</p> |
| <p>No planning application should be approved until the S106 agreement has been signed by all of the relevant parties</p> | <p>Planning permissions are not issued until the required s106 agreement has been signed by all of the relevant parties.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> |
| <p>Para 70 requires authorities to plan positively, without an appropriate assessment of what the existing and understanding the future needs it difficult to ensure that the right facilities are in the right place.</p> <p>See the Governments website</p> <p>http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities/</p> <p>It is Sport England's view that the Open Space Strategy - does not constitute a robust quantitative and qualitative assessment of the need for sport and recreation facilities, a required by paragraph 74</p> | <p>These comments are noted and officers have met with Sport England to discuss the concerns and issues raised. It was agreed that the Council would undertake work on a Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facility Modelling, to inform our understanding of our need for sport and recreational facilities.</p> | <p>Make reference to the work relating to the Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facility Modelling.</p> | <p>Steve Beard</p> | <p>sport England</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------------|---|
| <p>We request that further clarity is given in respect of the pooling of contributions, and, the overall strategy for delivery of – in particular – new highways infrastructure and improvements. It is not clear how the local infrastructure strategy will be implemented, and on what timetable.</p> <p>Specifically, contributions made to schemes on the strategic A511 corridor have been a priority for some time, with contributions secured, but little sign of delivery to date.</p> <p>It is understood an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is currently being prepared, and this should help answer these and related questions</p> | <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan that is under preparation will highlight the key infrastructure proposed and required. It would also help inform discussion and negotiations on proposed developments. The issue of pooling will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis and through the preparation of other strategies, such as that being currently prepared for the A511 corridor.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Steve Harley</p> | <p>Oxalis Planning on behalf of Cordovan Holdings Ltd</p> |
| <p>Agree if public transport prioritised.</p> | <p>Noted. Transport infrastructure/improvements includes public transport and associated facilities, which contribute towards the sustainable planning.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>George F Stapley</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around out town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Ruth Lovett</p> | <p>N/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------|------------|
| <p>The open spaces and park land should be protected by law for the people of the town to enjoy forever.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Alan James Griffin</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
| <p>We emphatically disagree that the population of Ashby be increased by 60% for all the reasons we have mentioned.</p> <p>Medical services are not able to cope with demands/needs of the present population</p> <p>School buildings require additional accommodation for the existing population</p> <p>Roads in the town are already dangerous and additional traffic would greatly increase the problems</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mr DG and Mrs MP Heath</p> | <p>N/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Name unclear</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Lesley Anne Good</p> | <p>n/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>T Anderson</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Do not agree that the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Chris and Monika Ingamells</p> | <p>n/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <p>Homes have people in them, people who have cars, who have children, who need doctors etc etc. They need water, electricity, gas, sewerage. The infrastructure is not in lace. People living in Ashby at this moment are struggling. What madness to make things worse.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>D & P Hamilton</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
| <p>I believe this part of the plan needs to state that any proposal should establish what additional infrastructure the development would require, i.e. how many extra school places are expected to be used. In this way the infrastructure or section 106 agreements can be tailored to meet these requirements. Without establishing the required increase in facilities and whether there is scope to deliver them in the area, there is no way of determining whether the proposal is feasible or sustainable going forwards from the application stage.</p> | <p>The district council consult and engage with the infrastructure providers on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure infrastructure is appropriate for the development of development proposed in the district. If evidence is provided that demonstrates that development will have an impact appropriate infrastructure can be secured through use of section 106 agreements.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Alison Saxby</p> | <p>N/A</p> |
| <p>Yes, development should support community infrastructure. However, Developers are increasingly using viability assessments to avoid making provision for infrastructure. The current accepted approach to viability assessments needs to be reviewed in order to provide a balanced view that isn't weighted in the favour of developers and supports local communities.</p> | <p>National government policy requires that planning obligations (section 106 contributions) do not make a development unviable. Unless there is a change in Government policy the Council will have to continue to consider viability issues.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Vicky Roe</p> | <p>Kegworth Parish Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Christine Iddon</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Anthony Iddon</p> | <p>n/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--------------------|------------|
| <p>Do not agree to the proposed increase to the size of Ashby; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure , Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mr P S Dyer</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Do not agree to the proposed increase to the size of Ashby; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure , Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mrs S Dyer</p> | <p>n/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of Ashby is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission will have been accompanied with a legal agreement detailing the necessary infrastructure improvements/contributions. Infrastructure providers were consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Lorna Titley</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>(a) We feel that the fog, deliberate confusion and uncertainties of the Conservative Administration obscure their lack of desire to provide any 'infrastructure improvements' and doubt these will ever be made. We remain uncertain that Whitehall or the Inspector will require new infrastructure detail before approving the Local Plan?</p> <p>(b) The Conservative Administration's political offensive involves telling communities that all we can offer is 'short term pain' for 'long term gains'. There is no timetable for 'long term gain' nor is there any positive sign of how funding will be achieved.</p> <p>(c) The Labour Group does agree that infrastructure improvement funding needs to be put in place to break the development log jam. We also recognise that developers are put at a marketing disadvantage when developing land with poor infrastructure. New residents will be put off from purchasing a property on land with poor infrastructure if it means travelling long distance for schools, health or time taken to drive to or from site.</p> <p>(d) Current infrastructure funding uncertainties will force developers to seek development sites on land that is more 'deliverable', but unacceptable to nearby communities.</p> <p>(e) The Labour Group had hoped that the draft Local Plan had highlighted fixed and agreed financial infrastructure packages to direct development. Not so.</p> | <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Sue McKendrick</p> | <p>Labour Group leader</p> |
| <p>Infrastructure provision and contributions should only be sought where they satisfy the relevant legal tests and mitigate the impact of development. The provision of superfast broadband communications should be removed from the list.</p> | <p>Noted. The government have highlighted the important role local planning authorities have in supporting the rollout of superfast broadband when developing and updating local plans and considering planning applications. Therefore it is considered appropriate to include broadband communications within this policy.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Andrew Thomas</p> | <p>Thomas Taylor Planning</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| <p>The Local Plan states that "Development will be supported by, and make contributions to as appropriate, the provision of new physical, social and green infrastructure in order to mitigate its impact upon the environment and communities." It states that this will include health infrastructure.</p> <p>There is no evidence in this strategic document that NWLDC have a strategy to deal with longstanding failures in the provision of health infrastructure funded by developer contributions.</p> <p>There is £1.3M of developer contributions sitting in NWLDC some of which is at risk of being returned to developers as it is time expired. A recent planning application close to the Derbyshire border, if approved, would have gone through without the £551 per dwelling required by NHSE because the neighbouring CCGs could not agree how to spend it.</p> <p>A new application for an extensive Care Village in Norris Hill is about to be discussed without ANY comments from Health or Social Care despite the obvious impact on local services.</p> <p>The failure to spend s106 developer contributions for health has been known for over two years. The Local Medical Committee, the trade association for GP practices, has tried to broker discussions between NHSE, NWLDC and the CCGs.</p> <p>There is nothing in this Local Plan that suggests NWLDC even recognise they have a problem let alone realise how intractable it is.</p> <p>Agreeing to fund GP premises improvements isn't straightforward. The new build has to meet both the health needs of the population and the needs of the practice who may have to put some of their own funds into the pot. The developer's contribution will only arrive after a set proportion of the houses have been built and occupied. There is also the risk that the developer may claim they cannot afford to pay. They can ask the District Valuer to let them off the hook. This leaves GP partners carrying the risk of investing in an extension only to find the houses are never built and the promised cash never arrives. A bigger practice may also attract a higher national rent, making NHSE think twice about the idea.</p> <p>Under the old scheme, Primary Care Trusts could put in a bid for money without having any clear idea where they were going to spend it.</p> <p>This is the situation that has left this District Council holding millions of pounds of unspent funds. While £1.3M is nice to</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the NHS on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure health infrastructure is appropriate for the development of development proposed in the district .</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mrs Kurpil</p> | <p>NA</p> |
|---|---|------------------|-------------------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|----------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>have in the bank, developer contributions have to be spent within a limited time or go back to the developer at a hefty rate of interest.</p> <p>The new CIL planning regulations only make the situation worse. They require NHS England to have a robust plan to spend the money. NHSE have to prove that the development will create a need. They must be able to show that local services lack the capacity to meet that need without improvement. If a number of small developments are coming on stream, the health service can't just add umpteen contributions together to make one sensible sized sum. The new rules are supposed to ensure the community gets the infrastructure improvements it needs. In NWL they are having the opposite effect. NHSE aren't bothering to claim at all.</p> <p>This probably relates to recent changes to health service structure which has also had an impact. Under the old system, the Primary Care Trusts were responsible for claiming and spending developer contributions for health. Under the new rules, the Local Area Team is in charge. Covering a much larger area with fewer staff, they are distant from the practices affected by new housing developments. Caught on the hop, by the time they realise the plans are coming to Committee, the NHS is pushed to come up with the kind of strategic, innovative and robust plans we need if the NHS 'left shift' is going to happen.</p> <p>This Council has a "duty to co-operate" with other agencies to ensure communities needs for infrastructure are met. This Council has, so far, failed to achieve any cross-institutional solution to the failure to spend s106 developer contributions for health.</p> | | | | |
| sewerage should be included. | This is covered by 'Utilities and Waste' | No change | C Tandy | Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society |
| 6. Policy IF1 Infrastructure. We would stress that viability and deliverability of development is key in the Local Plan and that the building of new houses should not be constrained by unreasonable infrastructure demands that are unrelated to the development proposed. | Noted and the policy makes specific reference to this. | No change | Andrew Thomson | Thomson Planning Partnership |
| Policy IF1 is generally supported. National Trust particularly welcomes the commitment to seeking contributions for green infrastructure and nature conservation enhancements. | Support welcomed | No change | Kim Miller | National Trust |
| Under Policy IF1 – Development & Infrastructure it is noted that the Council is proposing not to adopt a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) but instead continue to rely upon S106 contributions. The Council should re-consider whether or not the pooling restrictions imposed in April 2015 will have any impact on this proposal. | The Council will consider whether to adopt a CIL approach once this Local Plan is adopted. | No change | Susan E Green | HBF |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <p>Para 8.1: The County Highway Authority would prefer the term 'transport' (as has been used later on in the document) to 'roads' to reflect a multi-modal approach.</p> <p>The County Council agrees in principle with the general approach to securing infrastructure for new developments and welcomes the inclusion of Policy IF1 - Development and Infrastructure, within the Local Plan. Contributions are important in securing appropriate infrastructure and services, particularly for major new development proposals such as SUEs, to support major new (sustainable) development which accords with the general principles of the NPPF.</p> <p>The following suggestions in relation to the Local Plan policy IF1 and in any future preparation of a SPD on planning obligations should ensure it is consistent and transparent in its approach to the negotiation and securing of contributions and delivery of infrastructure with useful cross reference to the County Council Planning Obligations Policy (adopted December 2014).</p> <p>The Local Plan may benefit in paragraph 8.9 by further reference to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the assessment of infrastructure through the development plan process e.g. an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to inform the local plan of the provision for infrastructure and service requirements to support and deliver the planned growth and development, particularly for significant local and strategic development, within North West Leicestershire.</p> <p>An IDP should be consistent with the identified and known programmes and priorities of the service providers in relation to the areas of growth and development in North West Leicestershire. The County Council would express its desire to be fully consulted on any required IDP for the local plan or to inform the preparation of any CIL charge schedule now or in the future.</p> | <p>Noted and suggested changes to Para 8.1 be made</p> | <p>Para 8.1 been amended to replace "roads" with "transport".</p> | <p>Sharon Wiggins</p> | <p>Leicestershire County Council</p> |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements are also inadequate (ie healthcare, leisure, transport and education).</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mr M D Ensor</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
| <p>Do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (Transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Andrew Chapman</p> | <p>n/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|----------------------|------------|
| <p>I have major concerns with regards to the impact on the local infrastructure, schools, health services and roads with such a significant increase in local population.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Susan McEniff</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>The Local Plan states that "Development will be supported by, and make contributions to as appropriate, the provision of new physical, social and green infrastructure in order to mitigate its impact upon the environment and communities." It states that this will include health infrastructure.</p> <p>There is no evidence in this strategic document that NWLDC have a strategy to deal with longstanding failures in the provision of health infrastructure funded by developer contributions.</p> <p>There is £1.3M of developer contributions sitting in NWLDC some of which is at risk of being returned to developers as it is time expired. A recent planning application close to the Derbyshire border, if approved, would have gone through without the £551 per dwelling required by NHSE because the neighbouring CCGs could not agree how to spend it.</p> <p>A new application for an extensive Care Village in Norris Hill is about to be discussed without ANY comments from Health or Social Care despite the obvious impact on local services.</p> <p>The failure to spend s106 developer contributions for health has been known for over two years. The Local Medical Committee, the trade association for GP practices, has tried to broker discussions between NHSE, NWLDC and the CCGs.</p> <p>There is nothing in this Local Plan that suggests NWLDC even recognise they have a problem let alone realise how intractable it is.</p> <p>Agreeing to fund GP premises improvements isn't straightforward. The new build has to meet both the health needs of the population and the needs of the practice who</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the NHS on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure health infrastructure is appropriate for the development of development proposed in the district .</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mr B Carter</p> | <p>n/a</p> |

may have to put some of their own funds into the pot. The developer's contribution will only arrive after a set proportion of the houses have been built and occupied. There is also the risk that the developer may claim they cannot afford to pay. They can ask the District Valuer to let them off the hook. This leaves GP partners carrying the risk of investing in an extension only to find the houses are never built and the promised cash never arrives. A bigger practice may also attract a higher notional rent, making NHSE think twice about the idea.

Under the old scheme, Primary Care Trusts could put in a bid for money without having any clear idea where they were going to spend it.

This is the situation that has left this District Council holding millions of pounds of unspent funds. While £1.3M is nice to have in the bank, developer contributions have to be spent within a limited time or go back to the developer at a hefty rate of interest.

The new CIL planning regulations only make the situation worse. They require NHS England to have a robust plan to spend the money. NHSE have to prove that the development will create a need. They must be able to show that local services lack the capacity to meet that need without improvement. If a number of small developments are coming on stream, the health service can't just add umpteen contributions together to make one sensible sized sum. The new rules are supposed to ensure the community gets the infrastructure improvements it needs. In NWL they are having the opposite effect. NHSE aren't bothering to claim at all.

This probably relates to recent changes to health service structure which has also had an impact. Under the old system, the Primary Care Trusts were responsible for claiming and spending developer contributions for health. Under the new rules, the Local Area Team is in charge. Covering a much larger area with fewer staff, they are distant from the practices affected by new housing developments. Caught on the hop, by the time they realise the plans are coming to Committee, the NHS is pushed to come up with the kind of strategic, innovative and robust plans we need if the NHS 'left shift' is going to happen.

This Council has a "duty to co-operate" with other agencies to ensure communities needs for infrastructure are met. This Council has, so far, failed to achieve any cross-institutional solution to the failure to spend s106 developer contributions for health.

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|---|
| <p>I believe this part of the plan needs to state that any proposal should establish what additional infrastructure the development would require, i.e. how many extra school places are expected to be used. In this way the infrastructure or section 106 agreements can be tailored to meet these requirements. Without establishing the required increase in facilities and whether there is scope to deliver them in the area, there is no way of determining whether the proposal is feasible or sustainable going forwards from the application stage.</p> | <p>The majority of required new development in the district is already committed and includes the provision the infrastructure to mitigate the impact of development. Any further development will be sought to be supported by appropriate infrastructure or contributions. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan that is currently being prepared will highlight the key infrastructure that is proposed or required, with the intention that it is kept up to date as new requirements or needs are identified.</p> <p>The District Council consult and engage with the relevant organisations on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure infrastructure is appropriate for the development of development proposed in the district.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mrs. A Saxby</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Policy IF1 on development and Infrastructure needs to be justified and based on robust evidence. It is important for the evidence base to properly assess the viability of the requirements for affordable housing and infrastructure set out in the Local Plan and Infrastructure Development Plan to ensure consistency with para 173 and 174 of the Framework.</p> <p>Plans should be deliverable and sites should not be subject to such a scale of objections and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. Therefore, the Council should asses the likely cumulative impacts on development in their area of all existing and proposed local standards and policies through ha comprehensive and robust Viability Assessment to ensure that the cumulative impact of these standards and policies do not put the implementation of the Plan at serious risk.</p> <p>It is also essential to test any policy requirements against the CIL tests to ensure that they are appropriate and fit for purpose.</p> | <p>A viability assessment was undertaken of the Local Plan and has been published alongside the Local Plan. This viability assessment considered the various options in respect of affordable housing and the requirements set out in Policy H4 reflect the findings.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Phil Bamford</p> | <p>Gladman on behalf of Wilton Balmore.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (Transport, Education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support: such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The proposed housing growth is based on an objectively assessed housing need and the options for growth within the district have been subject to sustainability appraisal and viability assessment. Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms, and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Ian Retson</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>It is imperative that the inclusion of highway infrastructure and sustainable transport improvements (such as public transport, cycling, walking) are to be included as part of any proposed CIL list. This inclusion of such infrastructure items may be essential to mitigate again adverse impacts of planned large housing growth and to provide a modal shift from the private car to public transport, walking and cycling. Also to include the proposal of the provision of electric vehicle charging points as another type of infrastructure to support new development where appropriate.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Grant Butterworth</p> | <p>Leicester City Council</p> |
| <p>Policy IF1 does not appear to be underpinned by an appropriate quantity of evidence. For example, the supporting text to the policy states that the Council has prepared an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (paragraph 8.8). However, this is not included as appendix to the plan or available as a standalone document. Without it, it is impossible for us to determine whether the infrastructure items are sound, or comment on costs, delivery timescale, and necessity.</p> <p>In addition, the Policy is not consistent with the law and policy on planning obligations (CIL Regulations Section 122 and 123 and NPPF paragraphs 203-205). It does not for example contain reference to the statutory tests applying to planning obligations or the specific circumstances in which the pooling of contributions will be lawful.</p> <p>As currently drafted, Policy IF1 is not therefore legally compliant or sound.</p> | <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan that is under preparation will highlight the key infrastructure proposed and required. It would also help inform discussion and negotiations on proposed developments. It is not necessary to repeat as apt of teh Local Plan the statutory tests applying to planning obligations. The issue of pooling will be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Tim Evans</p> | <p>Bilfinger GVA</p> |

| Question 33 Are there any other general items of infrastructure we should be seeking to secure? - Please provide further comments; | NWL Response | Any changes required | Name | Business or organisation name; |
|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------------|--|
| <p>Much greater emphasis and pressure needs to be given to reopening the Burton to Leicester rail line. The knock on impacts would be massive - greater access to jobs for residents and for employers to potential workforce, people move to or stay in the district improving the local economy, etc.</p> | <p>Noted and Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Lisa Marron</p> | <p>Resident</p> |
| <p>No</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | | <p>Mr s whitehouse</p> | <p>Personal</p> |
| <p>Given the current financial constraints, do better with what you've got.</p> | <p>Noted. An Infrastructure Plan is being prepared and will be kept up to date when new requirements are identified. It will also advise how the Council should manage and co-ordinate the provision of infrastructure in the future.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Dr John Blythe</p> | <p>Researcher, University of Birmingham</p> |
| <p>Our previous comments have referred to the fact that public investment will be required to promote development, and relying entirely on developer contributions will not allow the required level of development to proceed. The current proposals for the A511 corridor are welcomed, but they are insufficient to match the ambition of this document.</p> | <p>It is recognised that there may be circumstances in which public money may be required to help support new development. The Council will seek such opportunities where possible, but new development will be expected to make an appropriate provision. We will work with partners and other stakeholders to secure public funding where possible. The district council has engaged with the Highway Authorities throughout the preparation of the Local Plan and on planning applications to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the development proposed. In addition, an Infrastructure Plan is being prepared and will be kept up to date when new requirements are identified. It will also advise how the Council should manage and co-ordinate the provision of infrastructure in the future.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Nigel Garnham</p> | <p>Packington Nook Residents Association</p> |
| <p>National Forest passenger rail line</p> | <p>Noted. Policy IC5 supports the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton rail line and safeguard its route from development.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mark Chadbourn</p> | <p>Emerald Eye Ltd</p> |
| <p>A small by-pass around Coalville town centre would be good to enable part of it to be pedestrianised</p> | <p>Noted. However there are no proposals for a bypass at this present time.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Alison Wright</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| <p>Policy IF1 should reflected by reference to the seeking of obligations or contributions toward library facilities and civic amenity (waste/recycling). where appropriate.</p> <p>The Local Plan might wish to specify how contributions are considered initially, for example, through master planning, frontloading , pre-application enquiries and/or negotiations. It will be important to understand and emphasise that developer contributions must be applied to specific purposes, facilities, infrastructure and services.</p> | <p>Noted. Waste is already listed as a type of infrastructure and libraries can be considered as part of the Community Infrastructure that may be sought.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Andrew Tyrer</p> | <p>Leicestershire County Council</p> |
| <p>N/A</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | | <p>Samantha Lockwood</p> | <p>Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council</p> |
| <p>Buses, re-open Ashby train station.</p> | <p>Where appropriate new development will be expected to contribute towards transport improvements including the provision of new public transport services and or the enhancement of existing services. Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>None</p> | <p>none</p> |
| <p>Parking in town centres to be relevant to the numbers of dwellings, has this been given any consideration.</p> | <p>These concerns are noted and the Council is currently undertaking a review of parking provision across the district.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>david harris</p> | <p>Pyroprotect Ltd</p> |
| <p>Existing green space should be protected by the designation of Local Green Space. There is none identified in the plan as it stands. The Bath Grounds Green Corridor between the Royal Hotel and Ashby Castle should be protected and designated as Local Green Space.</p> | <p>The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The supporting text identifies that the designation of Local Green Spaces are to be considered as part of Neighbourhood Plans. It is suggested that any proposal for the site to be allocated as a Local Green Space should be submitted through the Ashby Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Colin Eaton</p> | <p>Colin Eaton</p> |
| <p>No</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | | <p>Angela Cornell</p> | <p>Fisher German</p> |
| <p>Manufacturing companies</p> | <p>The provision of manufacturing companies is subject to market forces and the Local Plan cannot require the provision of manufacturing companies.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Andrew Stone</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>More affordable housing but what is affordable should be judged for each area.</p> | <p>Policy H4 seeks the provision of affordable housing as well as the contribution sought for each of the district's settlements.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Measham Parish Council</p> | <p>Measham Parish Council</p> |
| <p>No</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | | <p>Edward Hines</p> | <p>N/A</p> |
| <p>Thank you for your recent consultation on the above. We have considered the proposal relevant to the Mobile Operators Association and would offer the following comment on their behalf.</p> <p>We would take this opportunity to comment that we consider it important that there is a specific telecommunications policy within the emerging Local Plan. We consider that the vital role</p> | <p>Noted and agree that it would beneficial to include a policy that would address Telecommunications development.</p> | <p>Add Telecommunication Policy.</p> | <p>Jacquelyn Fee</p> | <p>Mono Consultants Limited</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>that telecommunications play in both the economic and social fabric of communities merit the inclusion of a policy which refers specifically to telecommunications developments.</p> <p>National guidance recognises this through Section 5: “Supporting high quality communications infrastructure” of National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) which provides clear guidance as to the main issues surrounding telecommunications development.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 42 confirms that;</p> <p>“advanced, high quality communications infrastructure is essential for sustainable economic growth and play a vital role in enhancing the provision of local community facilities and services.”</p> <p>Paragraph 43 of NPPF confirms that;</p> <p>“in preparing local plans, local planning authorities should support the expansion of telecommunications networks”,</p> <p>but should also;</p> <p>“aim to keep the numbers of radio telecommunications masts and sites for such installations to a minimum consistent with the efficient operation of the network. Existing masts, buildings and other structures should be used, unless the need for a new site has been justified.”</p> <p>As indicated above, the formulation of policy does not exist in isolation and there are numerous documents which will affect the formulation of any telecommunications policy, the most important of these being NPPF. On this basis we would suggest that a concise and flexible telecommunications policy should be included within the emerging Local Plan. Such a policy should give all stakeholders a clear indication of the issues that telecommunications development will be assessed against. We would suggest a policy which reads;</p> <p>“Proposals for telecommunications development will be permitted provided that the following criteria are met: -</p> <p>(i) the siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area;</p> <p>(ii) if on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and designed in order to seek to minimise impact to</p> | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>the external appearance of the host building;</p> <p>(iii) if proposing a new mast, it should be demonstrated that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other structures. Such evidence should accompany any application made to the (local) planning authority.</p> <p>(iv) If proposing development in a sensitive area, the development should not have an unacceptable effect on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest.</p> <p>When considering applications for telecommunications development, the (local) planning authority will have regard to the operational requirements of telecommunications networks and the technical limitations of the technology.”</p> <p>We would consider it appropriate to introduce the policy and we would suggest the following;</p> <p>“Mobile communications are now considered an integral part of the success of most business operations and individual lifestyles. With the growth of services such as mobile internet access, demand for new telecommunications infrastructure is continuing to grow. The authority is keen to facilitate this expansion whilst at the same time minimising any environmental impacts. It is our policy to reduce the proliferation of new masts by encouraging mast sharing and siting equipment on existing tall structures and buildings.”</p> | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>The Leicester Burton rail line needs to be reopened for passenger use.</p> <p>Public transport in the District is generally very poor. Ashby needs a public transport link to East Midlands airport.</p> | <p>Policy IF5 supports the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton rail line and will not permit new development which would prejudice the route.</p> <p>Where appropriate, transport infrastructure contributions could be used to improve public transport provision. Local Plan policy also seeks to locate development so as to facilitate sustainable forms of travel.</p> | No change. | David Bigby | Private individual |
| Yes | Noted | | Paul McCaffrey | NA |
| No | Noted | | Lance Wiggins | Landmark Planning |
| No | Noted | | Mr. & Mrs Loveless | Retired |
| <p>With a demographic shift towards living longer but without a commensurate increase in healthy lifespan, we have an increasing population of frail, elderly people with multiple co-morbidities.</p> <p>The narrow definition of "Health" infrastructure limits developer contributions to the provision of GP premises. There is no funding directed to the social care infrastructure needed to support people to live in their own homes.</p> <p>Social care infrastructure, including community hospitals, nursing care beds and accessible affordable homes, should be funded.</p> <p>Accommodation in privately developed Care Villages should be suitable for End of Life Care WITHOUT the resident moving from their home as their health deteriorates. This means ALL the homes should be accessible to wheelchairs and suitable for hospital beds and hoists when needed.</p> <p>All new developments should provide a proportion of affordable, accessible accommodation, close to amenities and suitable for End of Life Care.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the NHS on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure health infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district.</p> <p>Privately developed care is a matter for the market to determine whether to provide.</p> <p>All forms of affordable housing are required to meet the Lifetime Homes 'standard' which means that they are designed with features that adds to the comfort and convenience of the home and supports the changing needs of individuals and families at different stages of life.</p> | No change. | Theresa Eynon | alderoak |
| Bardon By-pass needed. | Noted. The District Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to develop a strategy for managing future growth and improvements to the strategic highway network in the Coalville area and in particular along the A511 corridor. Specific options for highway improvements such as the Bardon Road bypass will be considered as part of this strategy. | No change. | Michael wyatt | Mikewyatt1@hotmail.co.uk |
| No | noted | | mr j lewis | 1950 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------|--------------------|----------------|
| The 30% increase in the size of Ashby already approved will put leisure facilities under unacceptable pressure , Hood Park Leisure Centre needs to be expanded , more football/rugby pitches are needed , more allotments are needed , etc , etc | Noted. A Sports Facilities Study is being undertaken of the district's facilities as well as a Playing Pitch Strategy and these will be used to inform/identify infrastructure needs as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | No change. | Michael Ball | Individual |
| We need more flood prevention measures and tree planting to improve our carbon footprint. Cycle paths and pedestrianisation of town centres if at all possible. | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the Environment Agency on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure flood and flood prevention infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district.</p> <p>Landscaping is a feature that is sought through new development and furthermore new developments within the National Forest will contribute to the provision of tree planting and other areas.</p> <p>Transport improvements that can be sought as part of new development include pedestrian and cycle ways within and around a development.</p> | No change. | steve johnson | YYYY |
| <p>When considering developments in villages, more attention should be given to loss of amenity caused e.g. by increased traffic through the roads, parking difficulties and congestion outside existing amenities e.g. a shop.</p> <p>Also consideration should be given to allocating some S106 monies not merely to secondary schools in a nearby town/large village, but also to a local primary school which, whilst it might have the capacity to absorb additional numbers following residential development, may struggle with extra demands on existing space, to the detriment of the children it serves.</p> | <p>Noted. All of the issues raised are considered when the impact of a proposed development is assessed and considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The District Council consult and engage with the Education Authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure education infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district.</p> | No change. | Lesley Birtwistle | not applicable |
| Yes | Support welcomed | No change. | Mrs Paula Ashfield | Paula Ashfield |
| No | Noted | | Tim Abbott | Householder |

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Tram/train - see above. | <p>Noted. The District Council has, throughout the preparation of the Draft Plan, liaised and engaged with the Highway Authority, to ensure the identified highway needs and issues for the district are fed into the process.</p> <p>In addition, most sites identified for housing development within the draft Local Plan have planning permission, and the appropriate infrastructure contributions have been secured, including road improvements, education provision etc.</p> <p>Policy also supports the provision of more sustainable forms of transport and where appropriate provision has or will be sought towards the provision of cycle ways, footpath links and new public transport. Policy IF5 supports the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton rail line and seeks to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> | No change. | Jane Tebbatt | Quarrying |
| Better health care facilities | The District Council consult and engage with the NHS on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure health infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. | | Heather Parish Council | Heather Parish Council |
| Joined up access to the rest of the country. | Noted. | | George F Stapley | NA |
| We would like to see policy IF1; Development and Infrastructure, bullet point 2 ammended to read; Community Infrastructure including education, health and other public services and facilities including places of worship. | <p>Contributions can be sought from developers towards costs of providing community and social infrastructure to fill the gap of need which has arisen as a result of a new development taking place. However all contributions sought have to be necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and is fairly and reasonably related in scale to the development.</p> <p>It is considered that a place of worship would be covered by Community Infrastructure that is referred to in the policy and therefore the suggested amendments are not necessary.</p> | No change. | Roland Wilson | Loughborough Gospel Halls Trust |
| No | Noted | | Alison Saxby | N/A |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------|---------------------|
| <p>(a) It's a pity that the wording of the question is 'seeking' instead of 'demanding'.</p> <p>(b) There are many needs that are delivered by other parties and outside the control of a Local Plan. Health, Education, Transport and other public services. The Local Plan can 'ask', but private service providers do not have to deliver. This Council currently holds around £1.3m funding from Section 106 agreements for health – but with no provider willing to spend.</p> <p>(c) Transport improvements cannot be delivered due to costly 'ransom strips'. This Council needs a clear public timetabled policy on how & when it can fund infrastructure improvements</p> <p>(d) Each community will have its own specific infrastructure improvement needs. Communities should be encouraged to demand local improvements as a result of development.</p> <p>(e) Priority for improvement must be the re-instatement of passenger rail links on the National Forest Line and the Trent Junction to Stenson Junction (for Castle Donington).</p> <p>(f) Extension of the Nottingham Tram to EMA</p> <p>(g) Kegworth Bypass</p> <p>(h) A511 Improvements</p> <p>(i) A511 Bardon Road (Bardon Road Bypass)</p> <p>(j) A new 'north/south' road to take traffic from the Ellistown area to the A511</p> <p>(k) Measures to reduce/remove traffic from our Town Centres</p> <p>(l) Ashby Town centre requires significant land to be made available additional off street parking spaces. This should take the form of a multi-storey or underground car park in the Town centre rather than using further space suitable for development.</p> <p>(m) Ashby Hood Park leisure centre requires an extension to cater for the large number of new houses being built.</p> | <p>The local authority, as part of the planning application process, can ask developers to either include on site provision or pay a contribution for a variety of types of infrastructure. For such contributions to be valid these requests must meet specific conditions and due regard must be had to viability.</p> <p>The District Council consult and engage with a range of infrastructure providers on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure their infrastructure type is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. Advice will be sought from the providers which works should be priority and which would works would be needed to support particular developments. Where the district council is not a provider, it is beyond their role to ensure that the money is spent within the required timeframe, this is an issue for the infrastructure provider to address.</p> <p>However, to assist the overall process, the Council is preparing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will highlight the key infrastructure that is either proposed or required, as well as funding and delivery.</p> <p>There is the opportunity for local communities to seek infrastructure directly, provided the appropriate mechanisms are in place and their request is evidenced.</p> <p>Policy IF5 shows Council support for the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>The Council are in discussion with the appropriate health bodies to agree how money that has been secured will be spent. We are also working with County Council Highways and Highways England to deliver a strategy for the deliver the transport improvements to the A511. The Kegworth Bypass forms part of the approved Roxhill Strategic Rail Freight Interchange</p> | | Sue McKendrick | Labour Group leader |
|--|--|--|----------------|---------------------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| <p>With a demographic shift towards living longer but without a commensurate increase in healthy lifespan, we have an increasing population of frail, elderly people with multiple co-morbidities.</p> <p>The narrow definition of "Health" infrastructure limits developer contributions to the provision of GP premises. There is no funding directed to the social care infrastructure needed to support people to live in their own homes.</p> <p>Social care infrastructure, including community hospitals, nursing care beds and accessible affordable homes, should be funded.</p> <p>Accommodation in privately developed Care Villages should be suitable for End of Life Care WITHOUT the resident moving from their home as their health deteriorates. This means all the homes should be accessible to wheelchairs and suitable for hospital beds and hoists when needed.</p> <p>All new developments should provide a proportion of affordable, accessible accommodation, close to amenities and suitable for End of Life Care.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the NHS on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure health infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district.</p> <p>Privately developed care is a matter for the market to determine whether to provide.</p> <p>All forms of affordable housing are required to meet the Lifetime Homes 'standard' which means that they are designed with features that adds to the comfort and convenience of the home and supports the changing needs of individuals and families at different stages of life.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mrs Kurpil</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>No comment.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | | <p>C Tandy</p> | <p>Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society</p> |
| <p>Cycling and walking opportunities are to be take advantage of and NWLDC should not ignore the needs of both walkers and cyclists with each new development.</p> <p>The plan has no detail of what will be required. It should be specific and detailed so that residents and developers understand the provision. Dedicated cycle ways should be provided to ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety to encourage people to use green means of transport, particularly to employment areas. This would be in line with the Governments Cycling Strategy.</p> <p>A commitment should be made to allocate funding to provide an improved environment for cycling. The few, grant funded, routes implemented did not provide safe routes. Almost all we have require cyclists to join narrow, dangerous and crowded roads. The current provision of cycle easy is patchy at best with many dangerous on road sections.</p> <p>Cycle parking is not required in residential areas, new or old. Parking provision is required in retail and employment developments.</p> <p>The plan should not allow any developments in areas without pavements or off single carriageway roads.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the Highways Authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure, including cycle provision, is appropriate for the development proposed in the district. This is supported by Local Plan policy which supports the provision of cycle links and footpath links within and beyond the site so as to create a network across the district. However it is not the role of the Local Plan to provide a Cycle or Footpath Strategy. This would be more appropriately addressed by the Coalville Cycling Strategy as well as the Ashby Cycling Strategy that is currently being prepared. Other issues raised are not for the role of the Local Plan and are more appropriately considered at a planning application stage, for example, applications will be assessed against Building for Life Criteria which seeks pedestrian friendly streets, slower vehicle movements, and the Leicestershire 6Cs Design Guide which provides for layouts that provide safe and free movement of all road users and parking for cycles.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Simon Weaver</p> | <p>Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Policy IF1 should refer to seeking obligations or contributions toward library facilities and civic amenity facilities (waste/recycling), where appropriate.</p> <p>The Local Plan might wish to specify how contributions are considered initially, for example, through master-planning, frontloading, pre-applications enquiries and/or negotiations. It will be important to understand and emphasise that developer contributions must be applied to specific purposes, facilities, infrastructure and services.</p> | <p>Library facilities and civic amenity facilities are already covered by the existing identified criteria of 'Community Infrastructure' and 'Utilities and Waste'. It is recognised that contributions need to meet the specific CIL regulations although it is considered that the additional detail suggested is not needed within the Local Plan. It is also recognised that the early consideration of contributions within the planning application process is useful.</p> | <p>Amend supporting text to recognise the benefit of giving consideration to infrastructure contributions early on in the planning process.</p> | <p>Sharon Wiggins</p> | <p>Leicestershire County Council</p> |
| <p>With a demographic shift towards living longer but without a commensurate increase in healthy lifespan, we have an increasing population of frail, elderly people with multiple co-morbidities.</p> <p>The narrow definition of "Health" infrastructure limits developer contributions to the provision of GP premises. There is no funding directed to the social care infrastructure needed to support people to live in their own homes.</p> <p>Social care infrastructure, including community hospitals, nursing care beds and accessible affordable homes, should be funded.</p> <p>Accommodation in privately developed Care Villages should be suitable for End of Life Care WITHOUT the resident moving from their home as their health deteriorates. This means all the homes should be accessible to wheelchairs and suitable for hospital beds and hoists when needed.</p> <p>All new developments should provide a proportion of affordable, accessible accommodation, close to amenities and suitable for End of Life Care.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the NHS on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure health infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district.</p> <p>Privately developed care is a matter for the market to determine whether to provide.</p> <p>All forms of affordable housing are required to meet the Lifetime Homes 'standard' which means that they are designed with features that adds to the comfort and convenience of the home and supports the changing needs of individuals and families at different stages of life.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mr B Carter</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>No</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mrs. A Saxby</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Yes higher levels of parking provision needed.</p> | <p>Local Plan Policy IF7 identifies a preferred level of parking provision, It will be for consideration at the planning application stage for other issues to assessed when considering parking provision, such as car ownership levels and the size and type of development to be provided.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p> | <p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>Highway and transport infrastructure work would be general items of infrastructure to be secured through a proposed CIL, such as transport corridor improvement works, strategic and local cycling infrastructure including the provision of dedicated cycle and shared access routes, infrastructure to facilitate the future uptake of low emission vehicles.</p> <p>Highway improvements are being undertaken along the A50 as part of the North West Leicester Major Transport Project, with further improvements identified to facilitate growth, particularly for the Waterside in the North West Leicester quadrant. Contributions for further</p> <p>view leicester planning information at ... www.leicester.gov.uk/planning</p> <p>highway and transportation measures may be required to support the works implemented as part of the project.</p> <p>Para. 8.21 – page 90 – Highways Agency is now Highways England.</p> | <p>These comments are noted. The A50 improvements that are being referred to are not located with North West Leicestershire district.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Grant Butterworth</p> | <p>Leicester City Council</p> |
|---|---|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|

| Question 34 Is there a lack of any infrastructure in specific parts of the district? If so what are these and what evidence is there to demonstrate this? - Please provide further comments; | NWL Response | Any changes required | Name | Business or organisation name; |
|--|--|--|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| The lack of a rail line through the District is a significant barrier to the improvements desired in Coalville. | Policy IF5 shows Council support for the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic. | No change | Lisa Marron | Resident |
| Yes , health services in the area of ashby are already strained and it's very difficult to see a GP. The new practice on burton road isn't going to provide any additional bandwidth. | The District Council consult and engage with the NHS on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure health infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. The comments raised shall be forwarded to the Clinical Commissioning Group. | No change. Comments to be forwarded to the Clinical Commissioning Group. | Mr s Whitehouse | Personal |
| Ashby town centre remains the focus and should be promoted as such. | Policy EC11 supports Ashby Town Centre as the focus for shopping and other main town centre uses. | No change | Dr John Blythe | Researcher, University of Birmingham |
| Our previous comments have referred to the fact that public investment will be required to promote development, and relying entirely on developer contributions will not allow the required level of development to proceed. The current proposals for the A511 corridor are welcomed, but they are insufficient to match the ambition of this document. | It is recognised that there may be circumstances in which public money may be required to help support new development. The Council will seek such opportunities where possible, but new development will be expected to make an appropriate provision. We will work with partners and other stakeholders to secure public funding where possible. | No change | Nigel Garnham | Packington Nook Residents Association |
| Coleorton (Lowermoor Road) does not have a mains gas supply or a strong broadband as their are no fibre optic cables. Therefore how is this classed as sustainable. | The provision of gas is the responsibility of the utilities provider and with respect to broadband provision, there is a current project named 'Superfast Broadband' currently operating to increase superfast fibre broadband coverage across Leicestershire in partnership with BT. Some areas of Coleorton are identified as having the high fibre broadband. Other areas are planned to be having this broadband commencing late 2016. Coloerton (Lowermoor Road) is defined as a 'Sustainable Village' within the Local Plan due to it having limited range of services and facilities, for example, Post Office and general store, church and public transport provision. | No change | Mark Hutchinson | Mark Hutchinson |
| No | Noted. | | Stephen Saxby | None |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-----------|--------------------|--|
| Poor super fast broadband provision in many rural areas, as speeds much lower than towns. To improve the local economy there is a need to boost this provision to fast speeds - beyond what BT classes as 'fast'. | These specific deliverability issues are beyond the remit of the Local Plan. However, a County-wide initiative 'Superfast Leicester' a public/private partnership, with government funding, aims to take fibre broadband to approximately 72,000 premises across the County by the end of 2018. | No change | Mark Chadbourn | Emerald Eye Ltd |
| As no. 33 | Noted. However there are no proposals for a bypass at this present time. | No change | Alison Wright | Heather Parish Council |
| Yes, there is a distinct lack of safe cycle lanes or paths that link into the retail centre of Coalville. | It is not within the remit of the Local Plan to provide for a cycle strategy but policy does seek, where appropriate, contributions towards the provision of cycle links within and beyond sites so as to contribute towards the creation of a network of cycleways across the district. Work is on-going on the preparation of a Cycle Strategy for the district (primarily led by Leicestershire County Council), Part1 of which relates to Coalville and has been completed. This identifies the existing network and also potential new routes. | No change | Phil Larter | None |
| N/A | Noted. | No change | Samantha Lockwood | Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council |
| The Plan should support Ashby Town Council's Neighbourhood Plan in its recognition of 'Local Green Spaces'. The area between Willesley Gardens and the Hicks Lodge Cycle Centre would qualify under the NPPF criteria (paragraph 77) as an area of attractive, accessible local countryside that needs to be preserved and enhanced by supporting the proposed footpath/cycleway between the two sites, which is already heavily used. | Local Green Spaces can be designated through a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. The Ashby Neighbourhood Plan is considered the more appropriate document within which to identify such designations. | | Frank Bedford, MBE | Willesley Environment Protection Association |
| Trains. | Policy IF5 shows Council support for the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. Leicestershire County Council have however commissioned a feasibility study looking into the possibility of re-opening the Leicester to Burton rail line for passenger use. | No change | None | none |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>Parking, you should have the evidence if done a thorough plan.</p> | <p>Local Plan policy identifies the preferred approach in respect of car parking provision to be made as aprt of new development. The specific requirement will be assessed at the planning application stage, taking into account these requirements, along with other matters such as car ownership levels and the size and type of housing to be provided. The aim of the policy is to support adequate parking provision for vehicles and cycles. In addition, the Council is currently the council is currently undertaking a review of parking provision across the district which may address some of these concerns the council is currently undertaking a review of parking provision across the district which may address some of these concerns.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>David Harris</p> | <p>Pyrotect Ltd</p> |
| <p>Ashby does not have and areas designated as Local Green Space. In particular the Bath Grounds Green Corridor between the Royal Hotel and Ashby Castle should be protected and designated as Local Green Space.</p> | <p>Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss an open space, sport and recreational facility. Furthermore Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. Given that work is being undertaken on the preparation of the Ashby Neighbourhood Plan this is considered a more appropriate document within which to identify such designations.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Colin Eaton</p> | <p>Colin Eaton</p> |
| <p>The Town Council's current consultation on the draft Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plan may highlight where infrastructure is lacking and details will be forwarded separately to this response. The consultation will also highlight infrastructure required alongside the significant volume of new development allocated to the town.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk</p> | <p>Ashby de la Zouch Town Council</p> |
| <p>Doctors surgery in the town centre</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the NHS on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure health infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. The comments raised will be passed onto the Clinical Commissioning Group.</p> | <p>No change. Comments to be forwarded to the Clinical Commissioning Group.</p> | <p>Andrew Stone</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>Public transport in rural areas evidence to demonstrate this can be seen on the bus timetables. Lack of provision for the following services even with S106 provision: Fire, Police, Doctors, schools and libraries.</p> | <p>Consultation has been undertaken with service providers during the Local Plan preparation process as well as on planning applications in order to identify the infrastructure that is needed or required to meet the needs of the planned housing growth. Policy IF1 seeks the provision of appropriate infrastructure contribution. In addition, an Infrastructure Plan has been prepared and will be kept up to date when new requirements are identified. It will also advise how the Council should manage and co-ordinate the provision of infrastructure in the future.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Measham Parish Council</p> | <p>Measham Parish Council</p> |
| <p>Rail links</p> | <p>Policy IF5 shows Council support for the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Edward Hines</p> | <p>N/A</p> |
| <p>Ashby Town centre requires additional parking spaces. This should take the form of a multi-storey or underground car park in the Town centre rather than using further space suitable for development.</p> <p>Ashby Hood Park leisure centre requires an extension to cater for the large number of new houses being built.</p> <p>A town the size of Ashby require a NHS walk-in centre.</p> <p>Ashby Bath Grounds should be purchased from the Royal Hotel to secure its long term future as a public park. It's lease is due for renewal in 8 years and this may not be achieved.</p> <p>The Bardon Road extension to the Coalville bypass is urgently required.</p> | <p>Parking can only be provided if it relates to or serves a development. However the Council is the council is currently undertaking a review of parking provision across the district which may address some of these concerns.</p> <p>The District Council consult and engage with the NHS and leisure services on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure health and leisure infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district.</p> <p>In light of the scale of development approved/proposed within the Coalville Area, consideration has been given to a bypass however at this stage it is not been concluded to be a viable option.</p> <p>Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space as work is being undertaken on the preparation of the Ashby Neighbourhood Plan and this is considered a more appropriate document within which to put forward this designation.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>David Bigby</p> | <p>Private individual</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <p>Rail transport to the airport and new employment areas</p> <p>Public transport from Ashby to the airport employment area</p> | <p>Where appropriate, new development will be expected to contribute towards the provision of public transport services, or the enhancement of existing services, to serve new developments so that accessibility by non-car modes is maximised, for example, bus services.</p> <p>With respect to rail transport, there are currently limited opportunities for passenger rail travel although Policy IF5 shows Council support for the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. The Council is also working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Paul McCaffrey</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>We are aware of issues with the sewerage infrastructure, i.e. lack of available capacity for future development, in parts of Coalville. Modelling for individual developments has indicated potential increase in foul flooding and pollution arising from increase frequency of combined storm overflow operation. However, Severn Trent Water Limited currently have an ongoing program of improvements (the "Coalville Sewerage Strategy") in order to address these issues.</p> | <p>Noted. It is understood that Severn Trent Water have a strategy that deals with these issues.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Geoff Platts</p> | <p>Environment Agency</p> |
| <p>No</p> | <p>Noted</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Lance Wiggins</p> | <p>Landmark Planning</p> |
| <p>Comments made by Highways after the Hugglescote Crossroads Consultation make it clear that Leicestershire lacks the resources to improve the A511 as needed to support the SE Coalville development.</p> <p>After receiving strong opposition to the proposals to demolish the community centre and widen the crossroads, Highways admitted that the Authority had no funding identified in its budgets for the delivery of any scheme at the Crossroads. There is no money to acquire land associated with any approved widening scheme or to fund possible planning blight claims.</p> <p>During the consultation the Crossroads Action Group presented independent evidence showing that pressure on Hugglescote Cross Roads is due to rat-running from the congested A511.</p> <p>It should be noted that the "Bardon Link" mentioned in the Highways report is not a "by-pass". It is merely an estate road that will enable access to the 2700+ houses proposed for land off Grange Road.</p> <p>Risk to economic prosperity and housing growth</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the Highway Authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district .</p> <p>It is however for the Highway Authority to identify which schemes are a priority. One of the matters taken into account when assessing this, is the proposed level and impact of development proposed within the district. At its meeting on 18 November 2015 Leicestershire County Council's Cabinet agreed that none of the proposed options put forward in the consultation for improvement work at Hugglescote Crossroads be pursued further. It is therefore to delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e).</p> <p>With respect to a bid for Single Local Growth Fund this matter will be taken up with County Council Highways.</p> | <p>Delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e).</p> | <p>Theresa Eynon</p> | <p>alderoak</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>I am concerned that, without significant investment in transport in North West Leicestershire we may never see the economic prosperity housing growth is supposed to deliver for Coalville.</p> <p>In my view the SE Coalville development is being put in jeopardy by the lack of provision for the A511 Bardon Road By-Pass.</p> <p>I am concerned that, in the current climate of austerity, there will be insufficient funds for the additional work needed to develop Highways infrastructure, including all junctions between M1 Junction 22 and A42 Junction 13</p> <p>I am concerned that this Local Plan may fail to secure funding for transport infrastructure to mitigate the impact of growth in Coalville including interventions necessary to facilitate the “Bardon Link”</p> <p>I believe the Local Plan should include a reassessment by Highways of the viability of a “Bardon By-Pass” scheme. In the absence of a Bardon By-Pass, there should be an assessment by NWLDC of the viability of the SE Coalville development as a means of maximising the opportunities for developer contributions.</p> <p>The Local Plan should include a joint assessment from LCC Highways and NWLDC as to the likelihood of any future Single Local Growth Fund being successful.</p> <p>Community engagement</p> <p>Most of the housing growth planned for SE Coalville takes place within Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish boundary. In the months preceding the consultation, Hugglescote Parish Council made a number of requests to meet with Highways to discuss how transport infrastructure in SE Coalville could maximise community benefit and facilitate housing growth. No engagement took place prior to the formal consultation exercise.</p> <p>I am concerned that, despite Highways decision not to progress the scheme, widening Hugglescote Cross Roads remains in the Local Plan. This is an unnecessary blight on a valued community facility.</p> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Bardon By-pass | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the highway authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district.</p> <p>The District Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to develop a strategy for managing future growth and improvements to the strategic highway network in the Coalville area and in particular along the A511 corridor. Specific options for highway improvements such as the Bardon bypass will be considered as part of this strategy.</p> | No change. | Michael Wyatt | Mikewyatt1@hotmail.co.uk |
| No | Noted. | No change. | Mr. j Lewis | 1950 |
| The old chestnut; The Ivanhoe Line. | Policy IF5 shows Council support for the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic | No change | Steve Johnson | YYYY |
| Network infrastructure across the area. | Local Plan Policy seeks for development to be supported by appropriate contributions, to support the provision of a range of infrastructure types, including, transport, green infrastructure and broadband. | No change | Mrs Paula Ashfield | Paula Ashfield |
| Yes | Noted | | Hugh James | n/a |
| Suggested shortfall in recreation space in Ashby, against national standards, that cannot really be made good by providing through developer contributions. | Noted. This is a matter that should be considered at a district wide level and it is anticipated that both a Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facility Modelling will be undertaken to identify whether we have surplus and deficit in sport and recreation facilities. Policy IF3 is able to seek the provision of recreation space in connection with new housing development. It also seeks to resist the inappropriate loss of open space. | No change | Tim Abbott | Householder |
| <p>Yes. throughout the district; even parts of Coalville are poorly serviced!</p> <p>Remote communities have little if any public transport.</p> | The District Council consult and engage with the Highway Authorities on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. Contributions provided, maybe put towards the provision of new public transport services or the enhancement of existing services. | No change | Jane Tebbatt | Quarrying |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>There is a huge lack of palliative care provision in the District. Since the closure of Staunton Harold Hospice around 2002, there has been no easily accessible Hospice for the people of N W Leicestershire. LOROS and St Giles Hospices both work to an extent in our area but the provision in this part of the county is minimal and both Leicester and Whittington are not easy to access if you have a severe life limiting illness.</p> <p>The 2011 Census showed that 25.2% of residents of NW Leicestershire have some form of disability (see Parish Liaison meeting September 2015 presentation) which makes such a facility quite high priority</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the NHS on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure health infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. However it is considered that it would be beneficial to seek the views of the NHS on this matter and ask them to respond to Heather Parish Council.</p> | <p>No change to the Local Plan but seek views and response from the NHS on this matter.</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> |
| <p>No useful public transport to EM Airport or EM Parkway.</p> | <p>As it stands East Midalbds Airpot is quite well served by public transport and the need for further improvements is recognised in the East Midlands Airport Sustainable Development Plan. The District Council consult and engage with the highway authorities on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. Where appropriate contributions from development can be used for the provision of new public transport services or the enhancement of existing services. Furthermore the Council works with a range of partners to address accessibility issues around East Midlands Airport and East Midlands Enterprise Gateway.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>George F Stapley</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>(a) It's a pity that the wording of the question is 'seeking' instead of 'demanding'.</p> <p>(b) There are many needs that are delivered by other parties and outside the control of a Local Plan. Health, Education, Transport and other public services. The Local Plan can 'ask', but private service providers do not have to deliver. This Council currently holds around £1.3m funding from Section 106 agreements for health – but with no provider willing to spend.</p> <p>(c) Transport improvements cannot be delivered due to costly 'ransom strips'. This Council needs a clear public timetabled policy on how & when it can fund infrastructure improvements</p> <p>(d) Each community will have its own specific infrastructure improvement needs. Communities should be encouraged to demand local improvements as a result of development.</p> <p>(e) Priority for improvement must be the re-instatement of passenger rail links on the National Forest Line and the Trent Junction to Stenson Junction (for Castle Donington).</p> <p>(f) Extension of the Nottingham Tram to EMA</p> <p>(g) Kegworth Bypass</p> <p>(h) A511 Improvements</p> <p>(i) A511 Bardon Road (Bardon Road Bypass)</p> <p>(j) A new 'north/south' road to take traffic from the Ellistown area to the A511</p> <p>(k) Measures to reduce/remove traffic from our Town Centres</p> <p>(l) Ashby Town centre requires significant land to be made available additional off street parking spaces. This should take the form of a multi-storey or underground car park in the Town centre rather than using further space suitable for development.</p> <p>(m) Ashby Hood Park leisure centre requires an extension to cater for the large number of new houses being built.</p> | <p>The local authority, as part of the planning application process, can ask developers to either include on site provision or pay a contribution for a variety of types of infrastructure. For such contributions to be valid these requests must meet specific conditions and due regard must be had to viability.</p> <p>The District Council consult and engage with a range of infrastructure providers on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure their infrastructure type is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. Advice will be sought from the providers which works should be priority and which would works would be needed to support particular developments. Where the district council is not a provider, it is beyond their role to ensure that the money is spent within the required timeframe, this is an issues for the infrastructure provider to address.</p> <p>However, to assist the overall process, the Council is preparing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will highlight the key infrastructure that is either proposed or required, as well as funding and delivery.</p> <p>There is the opportunity for local communities to seek infrastructure directly, provided the appropriate mechanisms are in place and their request is evidenced.</p> <p>Policy IF5 shows Council support for the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic</p> <p>The Council are undertaking a Playing Pitch Strategy as well as Sports Facility Modelling which will identify leisure needs.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Sue McKendrick</p> | <p>Labour Group leader</p> |
|--|---|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------|-----------|
| <p>Comments made by Highways after the Hugglescote Crossroads Consultation make it clear that Leicestershire lacks the resources to improve the A511 as needed to support the SE Coalville development.</p> <p>After receiving strong opposition to the proposals to demolish the community centre and widen the crossroads, Highways admitted that the Authority had no funding identified in its budgets for the delivery of any scheme at the Crossroads. There is no money to acquire land associated with any approved widening scheme or to fund possible planning blight claims.</p> <p>During the consultation the Crossroads Action Group presented independent evidence showing that pressure on Hugglescote Cross Roads is due to rat-running from the congested A511.</p> <p>It should be noted that the "Bardon Link" mentioned in the Highways report is not a "by-pass". It is merely an estate road that will enable access to the 2700+ houses proposed for land off Grange Road.</p> <p>Risk to economic prosperity and housing growth</p> <p>I am concerned that, without significant investment in transport in North West Leicestershire we may never see the economic prosperity housing growth is supposed to deliver for Coalville.</p> <p>In my view the SE Coalville development is being put in jeopardy by the lack of provision for the A511 Bardon Road By-Pass.</p> <p>I am concerned that, in the current climate of austerity, there will be insufficient funds for the additional work needed to develop Highways infrastructure, including all junctions between M1 Junction 22 and A42 Junction 13</p> <p>I am concerned that this Local Plan may fail to secure funding for transport infrastructure to mitigate the impact of growth in Coalville including interventions necessary to facilitate the "Bardon Link"</p> <p>I believe the Local Plan should include a reassessment by Highways of the viability of a "Bardon By-Pass" scheme. In the absence of a Bardon By-Pass, there should be an assessment by NWLDC of the viability of the SE Coalville development as a means of maximising the opportunities for developer contributions.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the Highway Authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district .</p> <p>It is however for the Highway Authority to identify which schemes are a priority. One of matters taken into that account when assessing this, is the proposed level and impact of development proposed within the district.</p> <p>At its meeting on 18 November 2015 Leicestershire County Council's Cabinet agreed that none of the proposed options put forward in the consultation for improvement work at Hugglescote Crossroads be pursued further. It is therefore recommended to delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e).</p> <p>With respect to a bid for Single Local Growth Fund this is not a matter that would fall within the remit of the Local Plan.</p> | <p>Delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e).</p> | <p>Mrs Kurpil</p> | <p>NA</p> |
|--|---|---|-------------------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|---|
| <p>The Local Plan should include a joint assessment from LCC Highways and NWLDC as to the likelihood of any future Single Local Growth Fund being successful.</p> <p>Community engagement</p> <p>Most of the housing growth planned for SE Coalville takes place within Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish boundary. In the months preceding the consultation, Hugglescote Parish Council made a number of requests to meet with Highways to discuss how transport infrastructure in SE Coalville could maximise community benefit and facilitate housing growth. No engagement took place prior to the formal consultation exercise.</p> <p>I am concerned that, despite Highways decision not to progress the scheme, widening Hugglescote Cross Roads remains in the Local Plan. This is an unnecessary blight on a valued community facility.</p> | | | | |
| <p>The approach to the provision of infrastructure in association with new development is supported. There is the potential for further development in Ibstock to support the provision of new transport infrastructure that would secure wider benefits for the community. Davidsons Developments has interests in land to the north of Leicester Road that offers the potential to provide a new link road in association with housing development. It is considered that this proposal merits consideration for allocation within the Local Plan.</p> | <p>Support noted. With respect to the suggested allocation this issues has been addressed in the response to Question 7.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Guy Longley,</p> | <p>Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.</p> |
| <p>Increased road capacity to cope with proposed developments. Extra public car parking. New senior school facilities. Community hall facilities. Medical outpatient facilities required in Ashby.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the infrastructure providers (such as health, education, community facilities, highway authorities) on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure their infrastructure type is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>C Tandy</p> | <p>Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------|------------|
| <p>Comments made by Highways after the Hugglescote Crossroads Consultation make it clear that Leicestershire lacks the resources to improve the A511 as needed to support the SE Coalville development.</p> <p>After receiving strong opposition to the proposals to demolish the community centre and widen the crossroads, Highways admitted that the Authority had no funding identified in its budgets for the delivery of any scheme at the Crossroads. There is no money to acquire land associated with any approved widening scheme or to fund possible planning blight claims.</p> <p>During the consultation the Crossroads Action Group presented independent evidence showing that pressure on Hugglescote Cross Roads is due to rat-running from the congested A511.</p> <p>It should be noted that the "Bardon Link" mentioned in the Highways report is not a "by-pass". It is merely an estate road that will enable access to the 2700+ houses proposed for land off Grange Road.</p> <p>Risk to economic prosperity and housing growth</p> <p>I am concerned that, without significant investment in transport in North West Leicestershire we may never see the economic prosperity housing growth is supposed to deliver for Coalville.</p> <p>In my view the SE Coalville development is being put in jeopardy by the lack of provision for the A511 Bardon Road By-Pass.</p> <p>I am concerned that, in the current climate of austerity, there will be insufficient funds for the additional work needed to develop Highways infrastructure, including all junctions between M1 Junction 22 and A42 Junction 13</p> <p>I am concerned that this Local Plan may fail to secure funding for transport infrastructure to mitigate the impact of growth in Coalville including interventions necessary to facilitate the "Bardon Link"</p> <p>I believe the Local Plan should include a reassessment by Highways of the viability of a "Bardon By-Pass" scheme. In the absence of a Bardon By-Pass, there should be an assessment by NWLDC of the viability of the SE Coalville development as a means of maximising the opportunities for developer contributions.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the Highway Authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district .</p> <p>It is however for the Highway Authority to identify which schemes are a priority. One of matters taken into that account when assessing this is the proposed level and impact of development proposed within the district.</p> <p>At its meeting on 18 November 2015 Leicestershire County Council's Cabinet agreed that none of the proposed options put forward in the consultation for improvement work at Hugglescote Crossroads be pursued further. It is therefore suggested to delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e).</p> <p>With respect to a bid for a Single Local Growth Fund this is not a matter that would fall within the remit of the Local Plan.</p> | <p>Delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e)</p> | <p>Mr B Carter</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
|--|--|--|--------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|--|---|
| <p>The Local Plan should include a joint assessment from LCC Highways and NWLDC as to the likelihood of any future Single Local Growth Fund being successful.</p> <p>Community engagement</p> <p>Most of the housing growth planned for SE Coalville takes place within Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish boundary. In the months preceding the consultation, Hugglescote Parish Council made a number of requests to meet with Highways to discuss how transport infrastructure in SE Coalville could maximise community benefit and facilitate housing growth. No engagement took place prior to the formal consultation exercise.</p> <p>I am concerned that, despite Highways decision not to progress the scheme, widening Hugglescote Cross Roads remains in the Local Plan. This is an unnecessary blight on a valued community facility.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Policy should be tested against the cumulative impacts of the all Plan requirements or viability.</p> | <p>Noted. The policy requirements in the Local Plan have been tested as part of a viability study.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Phil Bamford</p> | <p>Gladman on behalf of Wilton Balmore.</p> |
| <p>Yes Castle Donington western perimeter bypass has been approved as part of a large planning application for 895 houses however it is felt strongly that if the SFRI is approved for the locality then this bypass should be completed in one phase at the beginning of the development.</p> | <p>The proposed western bypass is being provided in relation to the permission for the houses on land to the south of Park Lane. It is not 'related' to the proposed SFRI which has recently been granted permission - the proposed highway improvements relating to this planning approval include the provision of a Kegworth Bypass.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p> | <p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <p>First of all it is my belief that the land allocated for a future bypass/link road /relief road has now been swallowed up in the proposed development to the rear of houses on the southern side of the Bardon Road in Coalville . This is not acceptable especially in the view of the recent negotiations by NWLDC to give incentives to Amazon, who are in the process of building a huge warehouse as part of Bardon 22 or its extension. It is understood that because of the amount of lorries and extra traffic on Bardon Road the County Council Highways objected to this scheme, but NWLDC have gone ahead with the plan, possibly because it has been stated that Amazon will be paying two million in Council Tax. Surely this amount of money (a superb benefit to the local community) could also be pledged towards a by-pass for the Bardon Road.</p> <p>Members of the BRAG committee; many years ago; were told that Bardon Road could not sustain further developments coming onto the road, but two developments are now ongoing with egress onto Bardon Road. And further developments are also planned in the near future. with the added traffic from and to Amazon; with apparently over four hundred lorries a day plus 2,000 workers; it will be intolerable, and to take away the possibility of a relief road by using the land earmarked for such is somewhat myopic to say the least.</p> <p>District Councillors have begun a campaign to regenerate Coalville, hoping in the future to attract people from outside the area...again causing further stress on an already overburdens and often clogged up infrastructure. I implore you to consider BRAG's letter and put clauses into the final Local Plan, to ensure that there is sufficient provision for an adequate road system.</p> | <p>The District Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to develop a strategy for managing future growth and improvements to the strategic highway network in the Coalville area and in particular along the A511 corridor. Specific options for highway improvements such as the Bardon Road link will be considered as part of this strategy.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Suzanne Gibson</p> | <p>Bardon Residents Action Group</p> |
|---|---|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|

Policy IF2 – Community Facilities

| Question 35 Do you agree with our suggested approach to Community Facilities? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments; | NWL Response | Any change required | Name | Business or organisation name; |
|---|---|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Yes | Noted. | | Lisa Marron | Resident |
| Yes | Noted. | | Mr s whitehouse | Personal |
| But see above. | Noted. | | Dr John Blythe | Researcher, University of Birmingham |
| Yes | Noted. | | Nigel Garnham | Packington Nook Residents Association |
| Allocations for open space are woefully small. These must be doubled at least to be considered reasonable. | Policy IF3 deals with the provision of additional open space and the protection of existing areas. | No change. | Stephen Saxby | None |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Mark Chadbourn | Emerald Eye Ltd |
| Yes | Noted. | | Alison Wright | Heather Parish Council |
| <p>Page 85</p> <p>Item 8.10</p> <p>The council have no control over the retention of community facilities. In fact their rural development plan will result in the loss of schools, pubs, local shops and post offices etc.</p> <p>Item 8.11</p> <p>This will not happen unless the policy of taking 106 monies for sports and recreation from local communities or Parish Councils is discontinued.</p> <p>Policy IF2, Item (d)</p> <p>This is not a policy as the Council have no control over market forces which will result in key facilities being lost.</p> <p>The Council are not resisting the closure of Hugglescote Community Centre, which is a valuable asset. In fact they seem to be supporting its demolition.</p> <p>Page 86</p> <p>Item 8.12</p> <p>The council have no say if a shop, school, post office or pub is to close, and these are valuable local resources. The rural development policy in this plan will certainly cause small communities to diminish and lose irreplaceable key facilities. To retain facilities communities must grow and have new blood. This policies development hierarchy will reduce</p> | <p>It is appreciated that when a service is privately owned there are limitations on the ability of the Council to prevent the closure or loss of such a facility. This is an issues that is not within the remit of the Local Plan. However Policy IF2 is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires planning policy to promote a strong rural economy and promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, public house etc. As supported within national planning policy, we can seek to resist the loss of local facilities and services unless there is demonstrable evidence that the facility is no longer required, and the Local Plan will seek evidence of such. The Local Plan also makes it clear that evidence regarding viability will be required.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Settlement Hierarchy allows for some growth in our Sustainable Villages, where some local facilities and services can be found, and thus facilitating support for these local services.</p> | No change. | Steve Palmer | NA |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| facilities. | | | | |
| No | Noted. | | David Harris | Pyrotect Ltd |
| The Bath Grounds, the field approaching Ashby Castle and the Memorial Field are all used for sport. They should be protected by designating them as Local Green Space. | The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The supporting text identifies that the designation of Local Green Spaces are to be considered as part of Neighbourhood Plans. It is suggested that any proposal for the site to be allocated as a Local Green Space should be submitted through the Ashby Neighbourhood Plan process. | No change. | Colin Eaton | Colin Eaton |
| The aim of bringing new community facilities in to the parish where they are currently lacking is supported e.g. a convenience store in Blackfordby. The treatment of building or land registered as a community asset as a material consideration is welcomed. | Noted. However the provision of some facilities, such as a shop or public house, is driven by market forces. For information, reference to an asset of community value being regarded as a material consideration is being removed from Policy IF2 and the local plan. It is considered that national legislation provides suitable protection for assets of community value. | Section c) of Policy IF2 to be deleted. | Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk | Ashby de la Zouch Town Council |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Andrew Stone | NA |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Measham Parish Council | Measham Parish Council |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Edward Hines | N/A |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | David Bigby | Private individual |
| See comments to question 31 - Whilst agreeing with this policy, it could be expanded to include cultural facilities in order to reflect paragraph 70 of the NPPF. We recommend that the accompanying text and the Glossary contains an explanation for the term 'community facilities'. We recommend this succinct all-inclusive description which would obviate the need to provide examples: 'Community facilities provide for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community' We also recommend the first paragraph of the policy refer to community need rather than viability. There are many essential community facilities that support inclusiveness and well-being that are operated by volunteers or with community grants, etc that are inherently not viable in developers terms, but are essential to safeguard to support sustainable communities. | It is suggested that cultural facilities be included within Policies IF1 and IF2. It is also considered that it would be beneficial to amend the supporting text/and or glossary to explain what community and cultural facilities are. The policy does not solely seek evidence that facility is no longer viable. It also states that when dealing with the proposed loss of a facility it will be resisted unless there is demonstrable evidence that the facility is no longer required, which addresses the issues of community need for the facility. | Policies IF1 and IF2 be amended to include reference to cultural facilities. Amend glossary to provide 'definitions' of community and cultural facilities. | Ross Anthony | The Theatres Trust |
| Yes | Noted | No change. | Lance Wiggins | Landmark Planning |
| Yes | Noted | | Mr. & Mrs Loveless | Retired |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>I wish I could believe that "The loss of key services and facilities will be resisted...."</p> <p>The willingness to sacrifice Hugglescote Community Centre in order to widen the Southern Coalville Rat-Run suggests this is warm words. The failure to support a solution for Snibston Discovery Museum likewise.</p> <p>When under pressure to do more than is possible within their current resources institutions de-couple their publicly pronounced strategy from their objectively received outcomes.</p> <p>The lack of funding for fundamental infrastructure such as affordable homes and transport suggests community facilities will come so far down the "to-do" list they will probably fall off.</p> <p>Community Facilities are currently under threat from the institutions who see them as a resource to be rifled in a desperate search for solutions to their cash-flow problems.</p> | <p>Comments are noted and it is appreciated that when a service/facility is non-Council owned there may be limitations on the ability of the District Council to prevent the closure or loss of such a facility. This is also an issue that is beyond the remit of the Local Plan.</p> <p>However Policy IF2 is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires planning policy to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, and to plan positively for their provision. As supported within national planning policy, we can seek to resist the loss of local facilities and services unless there is demonstrable evidence that the facility is no longer required, and the Local Plan will seek evidence of such.</p> <p>The Local Plan also makes it clear that evidence regarding viability will be required. The Local Plan also makes it clear that evidence regarding viability will be required.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that funding will also be sought for other forms of infrastructure, through the planning application process, taking into account viability, and priority may be given to other forms of infrastructure, depending on particular circumstances.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Theresa Eynon</p> | <p>alderoak</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Noted</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Michael wyatt</p> | <p>Mikewyatt1@hotmail.co.uk</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Noted</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>mr j lewis</p> | <p>1950</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| The closure of some of the local pubs has been driven more by the profit to be gained by changing use than the viability or the lack of willingness of new potential licensees to run them. | It is appreciated that when a service is privately owned there are limitations on the ability of the Council to prevent the closure or loss of such a facility. This is also an issue beyond the remit of the Local Plan. However Policy IF2 is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires planning policy to promote a strong rural economy and promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, public house etc. As supported within national planning policy, we can seek to resist the loss of local facilities and services unless there is demonstrable evidence that the facility is no longer required, and the Local Plan will seek evidence of such. The Local Plan also makes it clear that evidence regarding viability of a particular service or facility will be required in determining proposals that would result in the loss of a service or facility. | No change. | steve johnson | YYYY |
| Yes | Noted | No change. | Lesley Birtwistle | not applicable |
| Not sure how you can increase the community facilities in all areas. | New development will be required to provide or contribute to community facilities as part of the development, or if appropriate off-site. The policy approach could improve such provision across the district but only in those areas that would be related to where the development will occur and where there is demonstrable need. | No change. | Mrs Paula Ashfield | Paula Ashfield |
| Yes | Noted | No change. | Hugh James | n/a |
| Is there scope for IF2 to include / encourage the adaptation and re-use of listed buildings as a means of accommodating new or relocated community uses. | It is considered that Policies S5: Design of New Development and Policy He1: Conservation and Enhancement of North West Leicestershire's Historic Environment would address this matter satisfactory should an application of the suggested nature be submitted. | No change. | Tim Abbott | Householder |
| More facilities based on nature and leaving land undisturbed and less on playgrounds etc. They are rarely used, especially by teenagers and only serve to cause places of conflict and many do not use them as they feel unsafe. | The benefits of access to high quality open spaces and opportunities' for sport and recreation are recognised. There are national standards of provision that are applied to the different types of 'space', so a range of open space types will sought from housing development of 50 or more dwellings, including equipped play area and open recreation space. | No change. | Jane Tebbatt | Quarrying |
| Yes | Noted | No change. | Heather Parish Council | Heather Parish Council |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|-------------------------|--|
| <p>However, Paragraph 73 of the NPPF requires a different approach to determining need for sport and recreation compared to that included in the former PPG17 and its associated documents. The NPPF paragraph 73 requires Local Authorities to assess needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessment should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreation provision is required. For assessing the need for sport and recreation, the Government has advocated the use of Sport England's Playing Pitch Strategy Guidance and Assessing Needs and Opportunities Guidance, it does not advocate the use of the deleted Assessing Needs and Opportunities Companion Guide attached to PPG17 which uses the 'standards' approach.</p> <p>the authorities evidence is not robust or up to date</p> | <p>These comments are noted and officers have met with Sport England to discuss the concerns and issues raised. It was agreed that the Council would undertake work on a Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facility Modelling, to inform our understanding of our need for sport and recreational facilities.</p> | <p>Make reference to the work relating to the Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facility Modelling in the supporting text.</p> | <p>Steve Beard</p> | <p>sport England</p> |
| <p>The Town Hall was "given" away, the hospital is next, what else is left?</p> | <p>It is appreciated that when a service is not owned by the Council there are limitations on the ability of the Council to prevent the closure or loss of such a facility. This is also an issue that is beyond the remit of the Local Plan. Furthermore a lot of the issues are beyond the control of the Local Plan. However Policy IF2 is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires planning policy to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>George F Stapley</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>We would like to see Community Facilities policy 8.10 amended to read; Local shops, community facilities, places of worship, pubs and other services etc</p> <p>Finally, we are concerned that the Core Strategy / Local Plan includes policy for education, including private education facilities and we respectfully draw attention to NPPF paragraph 72 which reads;</p> <p>The Government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. They should;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools; and • Work with schools promoters to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted. | <p>Agree that it would be beneficial to amend Para 8.10 to include places of worship.</p> <p>Policy IF2 allows for the provision of new, or expansion or enhancement of, community facilities, which would include schools. Furthermore The District Council consult and engage with the education authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure education infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district.</p> | <p>Amend para 8.10 to include reference to "places of worship"</p> | <p>Roland Wilson</p> | <p>Loughborough Gospel Halls Trust</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Alison Saxby | N/A |
| (a) The Labour Group will support attempts to gain funding for community facilities from developers. (b) Recent experience shows that developer funding via Sec 106 makes new development projects unviable. It is of course hoped that the situation will improve. But as it currently stands, the wording of proposed Policy If2 is pointless. | Noted. As required by national guidance, in negotiating for the provision of infrastructure, the Council must have due regard to viability issues. | No change. | Sue McKendrick | Labour Group leader |
| The protection of "community assets" should include more than just the built environment and landscapes. The less tangible such as local community spirit itself needs protection from development. | The Local Plan is a land-use planning document and the issues raised are beyond its remit. | No change. | Robert Nettleton | NA |
| I wish I could believe that "The loss of key services and facilities will be resisted...." The willingness to sacrifice Hugglescote Community Centre in order to widen the Southern Coalville Rat-Run suggests this is warm words. The failure to support a solution for Snibston Discovery Museum likewise. When under pressure to do more than is possible within their current resources institutions de-couple their publicly pronounced strategy from their objectively received outcomes. The lack of funding for fundamental infrastructure such as affordable homes and transport suggests community facilities will come so far down the "to-do" list it will probably fall off. Community Facilities are currently under threat from the institutions who should see them as a resource to be rifled in a desperate search for solutions to their cash-flow problem. | Comments are noted and it is appreciated that when a service/facility is non-Council owned there maybe limitations on the ability of the District Council to prevent the closure or loss of such a facility. This is also an issue that is beyond the remit of the Local Plan. However Policy IF2 is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires planning policy to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, and to plan positively for their provision. As supported within national planning policy, we can seek to resist the loss of local facilities and services unless there is demonstrable evidence that the facility is no longer required, and the Local Plan will seek evidence of such. The Local Plan also makes it clear that evidence regarding viability will be required. It is acknowledged that funding will also be sought for other forms of infrastructure, through the planning application process, taking into account viability, and priority maybe give to other forms of infrastructure, depending on particular circumstances. | No change. | Mrs Kurpil | NA |
| Yes? | Noted. | | C Tandy | Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Policy IF2 seeks to protect community services and facilities. The North West Leicestershire Local Plan draft does not include any definition of 'community services and facilities'. Healthcare facilities are not specifically identified as 'community services and facilities,' and the use of such a broad term ambiguous. The emerging policy should specify exactly what is meant by 'community services and facilities,' to prevent misinterpretation. The definition should not include healthcare.</p> <p>Whilst paragraph 70 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decision should 'guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services' the overarching objective of this same paragraph is to ensure the delivery of facilities and services for the community.</p> <p>Policies aimed at preventing the loss or change of use of community facilities and assets, where healthcare is included within this definition, can have a harmful impact on the NHS's ability to ensure the delivery of facilities and services for the community. Where such policies are overly restrictive there can be a direct impact on the provision and quality of healthcare facilities and services, as these policies can prevent and delay the reinvestment of capital in modern and fit for purpose facilities and require on-going revenue to be spent on maintaining inefficient parts of the estate, This is especially the case where such policies require substantial periods of marketing, which is a requirement referred to in paragraph 8.12 of the supporting text for Policy IF2's.</p> <p>It is important to note that there are separate, rigorous testing and approval processes employed by NHS commissioners to identify unneeded and unsuitable healthcare facilities. These must be satisfied prior to any NHSP property being declared surplus and put up for disposal.</p> <p>Policy IF2 states that 'the loss of key services and facilities will be resisted unless and appropriate alternative is provided'. The policy is currently unclear. It should be carefully reworded to ensure it its clear that in cases where an alternative service/facility is provided the Council would not seek to 'ensure sites are retained for other forms of community use' and there would be no requirement to 'demonstrate that a particular facility or service is no longer viable', explain the options that have been investigated to maintain the facility or service' or market' the property for a minimum of 6 months'.</p> | <p>It is considered that health facilities fall under the heading of 'Community Facilities. It would therefore be beneficial to provide examples of community facilities, within the supporting text to the policy.</p> <p>It is also the intention to provide a definition for community and cultural facilities within the glossary.</p> <p>Policy IF2 has been prepared to be consistent with national planning policy however in light of the issues raised it is acknowledged that the wording of the policy be reworded for clarity and take on board the comments made. Where the supporting text makes reference to marketing this is intended to be in relation to commercial services, such as public houses and shops. The text should be amended to clarify this. It would however be useful to also include reference to other matters/forms of evidence that maybe undertaken by the disposal body, for example, internal processes.</p> | <p>Policy IF2 wording and supporting text to be amended to provide clarification on its application. Provide definition of community and cultural facilities in the glossary.</p> | <p>Anna McComb</p> | <p>NHS property Services</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Noted</p> | | <p>Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment</p> | <p>Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|--|--|
| <p>I wish I could believe that "The loss of key services and facilities will be resisted...."</p> <p>The willingness to sacrifice Hugglescote Community Centre in order to widen the Southern Coalville Rat-Run suggests this is warm words. The failure to support a solution for Snibston Discovery Museum likewise.</p> <p>When under pressure to do more than is possible within their current resources institutions de-couple their publicly pronounced strategy from their objectively received outcomes.</p> <p>The lack of funding for fundamental infrastructure such as affordable homes and transport suggests community facilities will come so far down the "to-do" list it will probably fall off.</p> <p>Community Facilities are currently under threat from the institutions who should see them as a resource to be rifled in a desperate search for solutions to their cash-flow problem.</p> | <p>Comments are noted and it is appreciated that when a service/facility is non-Council owned there maybe limitations on the ability of the District Council to prevent the closure or loss of such a facility.</p> <p>This is also an issue that is beyond the remit of the Local Plan.</p> <p>However Policy IF2 is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires planning policy to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, and to plan positively for their provision. As supported within national planning policy, we can seek to resist the loss of local facilities and services unless there is demonstrable evidence that the facility is no longer required, and the Local Plan will seek evidence of such. The Local Plan also makes it clear that evidence regarding viability will be required.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that funding will also be sought for other forms of infrastructure, through the planning application process, taking into account viability, and priority maybe give to other forms of infrastructure, depending on particular circumstances.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mr B Carter</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Noted</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mrs. A Saxby</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Noted</p> | | <p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p> | <p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p> |

Policy IF3: Open space, sport and recreation facilities

| Question 36 Do you agree with our suggested approach to Open Space, Sport and Recreation facilities? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments; | NWL Response | Any change required? | Name | Business or organisation name; |
|--|---|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Lisa Marron | Resident |
| No, children and sports space should be given more space | <p>The policy seeks the provision of additional open space recognising that the size and type of properties being provided will influence the type and amount of open space needed. Furthermore the intention is to undertake a Playing Pitch Strategy and a Sports Facility Model which will look at the existing level of sport and recreation facilities and the likely future provision needed.</p> | No change | Mr s Whitehouse | Personal |
| Except that the potential of the Bath Grounds is understated. | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | No change | Dr John Blythe | Researcher, University of Birmingham |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <p>I support the Ashby Bath Grounds and Ashby Green Corridor being designated as Local Green Space.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Rachel Edgecombe</p> | <p>Friends of Ashby Bath Grounds</p> |
| <p>I wish to express the importance of including protecting the 'green corridor' i.e. the bath grounds, hastings gardens, the sports field leading up to the castle and bullens field, as local, recreational, free public space.</p> <p>Please ensure this becomes protected for ever, as part of this plan. It really must never be developed as it is critical for the well being of residents of Ashby.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Andrea Ingram</p> | <p>CanCan Uk Ltd</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p>The plan does not offer sufficient protection to the Bath Grounds and the green corridor leading to Ashby Castle. This is a very important local amenity and one of the most attractive features of the town. It has very special historical significance and is well used and appreciated by local people. The demolition of the Ivanhoe Baths in 1962 has been bitterly regretted by everyone ever since. Please don't let the same happen to the Bath Grounds. It should be designated as Local Green Space as defined under the NPPF and protected from development which would destroy it.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Wendy Freer</p> | <p>none</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Nigel Garnham</p> | <p>Packington Nook Residents Association</p> |
| <p>We disagree strongly with not designating any areas of Local Green Space within the Local Plan. Placing the responsibility solely on Neighbourhood Plans is a derogation of the District Council's duty to provide planning protection to "green areas of particular importance" to local communities. Only two Neighbourhood Plans are currently being developed within the District and there is no certainty that either of these will be accepted by the District Council and Planning Inspectorate. In particular we would urge you to designate the Bath Grounds Green Corridor between the Royal Hotel and Ashby Castle as Local Green Space as defined under the NPPF and to ensure that this area is protected from development accordingly. This comprises The Hastings Garden, The Bath Grounds, Bullens Field, The Memorial Field, and Manor House School Playing Field. The Bath Grounds Green Corridor is demonstrably special to the local community and holds particular local significance. It provides Ashby's unique "Countryside in the Town" character affording open vistas to Ashby Castle from South Street and the Royal Hotel in the west. It provides continuity between the main historic sites and buildings within the Town and provides valuable recreational space and playing fields. The community's view of the importance of the area was demonstrated by a recent 2000 signature petition to oppose house building on the Bath Grounds. The Bath Grounds, Bullens Field, Memorial Field and Manor House School playing field are currently designated as Sensitive Areas under the 2002 Local Plan saved policy E1. The Bath Grounds, Memorial Field and Manor House School Playing Field were designated as Recreational Open Space under Policy L14 (not saved). These special protections will be</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Friends of Asby Bath Grounds</p> | <p>Friends of Ashby Bath Grounds</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------|----------------|------------------|
| lost when the new Local Plan is adopted if the current draft is not amended | | | | |
| I want to see the council start protecting Ashby from developers, in particular i would like to see the bathgrounds and memorial field protecting from development, the green space from the Castle down to the bathgrounds is an asset to the town and should be given special status. | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | No change | Thomas | Quality Engineer |
| I believe Ashby would benefit greatly by protecting the bath grounds and memorial field ensuring it remains an open space for everyone to use, these areas have been used by generations of children for football, kite flying, practicing the golf swing etc, and should be kept for future generations' i recently made a visit to Ashby castle and marvelled at the view from up the Hastings tower, I thought we are really lucky to have so much open space that is free to use and so well kept, the council should be proud of this area and ensuring it is protected.The Hastings Garden, The Bath Grounds, Bullens Field, The Memorial Field, and Manor House School Playing Field form a green corridor which is a valuable recreational space and should remain untouched and enjoyed by the residents and visitors of Ashby. | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | No change. | David | Retired |
| Yes | Noted. | No change. | Mark Chadbourn | Emerald Eye Ltd |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| <p>I believe Ashby would benefit greatly by protecting the bath grounds and memorial field ensuring it remains an open space for everyone to use, these areas have been used by generations of children for football, kite flying, practicing the golf swing etc, and should be kept for future generations' i recently made a visit to Ashby castle and marvelled at the view from up the Hastings tower, I thought we are really lucky to have so much open space that is free to use and so well kept, the council should be proud of this area and ensuring it is protected. The Hastings Garden, The Bath Grounds, Bullens Field, The Memorial Field, and Manor House School Playing Field form a green corridor which is a valuable recreational space and should remain untouched and enjoyed by the residents and visitors of Ashby.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Marjorie McGibbon</p> | <p>Retired</p> |
| <p>I believe Ashby would benefit greatly by protecting the bath grounds and memorial field ensuring it remains an open space for everyone to use, these areas have been used by generations of children for football, kite flying, practicing the golf swing etc, and should be kept for future generations' i recently made a visit to Ashby castle and marvelled at the view from up the Hastings tower, I thought we are really lucky to have so much open space that is free to use and so well kept, the council should be proud of this area and ensuring it is protected. The Hastings Garden, The Bath Grounds, Bullens Field, The Memorial Field, and Manor House School Playing Field form a green corridor which is a valuable recreational space and should remain untouched and enjoyed by the residents and visitors of Ashby.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Roger McGibbon</p> | <p>Bank clerk</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>I believe Ashby would benefit greatly by protecting the bath grounds and memorial field ensuring it remains an open space for everyone to use, these areas have been used by generations of children for football, kite flying, practicing the golf swing etc, and should be kept for future generations' i recently made a visit to Ashby castle and marvelled at the view from up the Hastings tower, I thought we are really lucky to have so much open space that is free to use and so well kept, the council should be proud of this area and ensuring it is protected. The Hastings Garden, The Bath Grounds, Bullens Field, The Memorial Field, and Manor House School Playing Field form a green corridor which is a valuable recreational space and should remain untouched and enjoyed by the residents and visitors of Ashby.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Suzanne McGibbon</p> | <p>NVQ assessor</p> |
| <p>Although the council must realise that whenever a new facility is created on a residential site the children aren't allowed to play ball games. Where are these children supposed to go. The roads are too busy for them to go off site, especially the younger ones. This needs addressing.</p> | <p>Noted. However the Local Plan is a land use document and the issues raised are beyond the remit of the plan.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Alison Wright</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> |
| <p>pg 89 para 8.17 In Castle Donington a scattering of small paly areas have been found to be difficult and expensive to maintain. When small play areas are to be provided by different developments, if at all possible small paly areas should be amalgamated to provide larger play areas with better play equipment. Play areas should of course remain reasonably close to the housing which they serve and the opportunities to amalgamate small play areas may not occur very often.</p> | <p>Noted. However this level of detail is not for the Local Plan to consider. Such matters would need to be addressed and considered as part of planning applications.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Gerald Dalby</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I agree with this policy if the council support this and follow it. But evidence shows this is not the case currently. 106 monies are being taken from Parish Councils to spend on Hermitage Leisure Centre. Even though Hugglescote and Donington Le Heath Parish fall woefully short of the 1.6 ha per 1,000 people already. The thousands of new homes will only make the situation worse.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted. The Local Plan sets out the overall policy but the details of the requirements in any S106 Agreement are dealt with in a case-by-case basis. When s106 agreement is in place its provision have to be complied with i.e. where the money is to go and on what project</p> | <p>It is suggested that the following wording is added to the supporting text to policy IF1: - Contributions agreed as part of the S106 Agreement can only be spent on these services and facilities specified in the S106 Agreement. Monies cannot be diverted to other facilities or areas.</p> | <p>Steve Palmer</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <p>I would have thought that the value of the 'Loss of open space' part of the policy is only if it is shown where the open space is which I believe the plans do not. With this addition then the acceptability or not of the policy can be commented upon further.</p> | <p>Noted. The policy would benefit from additional wording to refer to the loss of a site which at the time the development is proposed is considered to be an open space, sports or recreation facility within the Limits to Development. The use of such wording would not necessitate the identification of sites. Furthermore, the identification of sites in the Local Plan would be misleading as any new sites which come about after the adoption of the Local Plan, would not be protected. Equally if an identified site was redeveloped but was shown on the Local Plan map as being protected, this would be misleading also.</p> | <p>Amend part 4 of Policy IF3 to read "In assessing the appropriateness of development which would result in the loss of a site which at the time the development proposed is considered, is an open space, sports or recreation facility within the Limits to Development, the following principle will be taken into consideration:"</p> | <p>Phil Larter</p> | <p>None</p> |
| <p>I support the Ashby Bath Grounds and Ashby Green Corridor being designated as Local Green Space. The bath grounds are a vital communal recreation area and must be protected as such to ensure the unique character of Ashby De La Zouch as a town.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Benjamin Bradberry</p> | <p>No Business Interest</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p>We support the Town Council's stronger proposals concerning open spaces, particularly to areas of attractive, accessible local countryside for its recreational and amenity value for the enjoyment and wellbeing of the local and wider community.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Frank Bedford, MBE</p> | <p>Willesley Environment Protection Association</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the Plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Julia Fraser & Henry Sharples</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|----------------------|-----------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the Plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Jane Harris</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not believe our open sites have been adequately safe guarded</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Olive kearins</p> | <p>Na</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|--------------|-------------|
| | to be read together. | | | |
| No | Noted. | No change | David Harris | Pyrotec Ltd |
| The Bath Grounds, the field approaching Ashby Caste and the Memorial Field are all used for sport. They should be protected by designating them as Local Green Space. | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | No change | Colin Eaton | Colin Eaton |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------|-----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies in the Plan | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Paul Riley</p> | <p>NA</p> |
|---|--|---|-------------------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|------------------|-----------|
| <p>do not agree that open spaces that we prize in and around our towns are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the Plan. Please consider and protect the limited space especially with the likely construction of High Speed 2 through some of this precious space.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Nick Salt</p> | <p>NA</p> |
|--|--|---|------------------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| <p>I do not agree that open spaces that we prize in and around our towns are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the Plan. Please consider and protect the limited space especially with the likely construction of High Speed 2 through some of this precious space.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Joanne Salt</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>CHRIS AND JILL ARCHER</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------|----|
| | to be read together. | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the Plan. | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification. | Nigel Francis | NA |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|-----------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Thomas Till</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open spaces across North West Leicestershire are not being properly protected by the authority and are being lost forever. | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Richard Brewin</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------|-----------|
| | to be read together. | | | |
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Judith K Bancroft</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>The draft Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plan has stronger proposals concerning open spaces and allotments, and it is recommended that these be used in the Local Plan. The protection of attractive, accessible open countryside also needs including in the Local Plan; including those designated as 'Local Green Spaces' in line with the NPPF. Once Ashby de la Zouch Town Council has approved the list of Local Green Spaces for inclusion in the Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plan the Town Council requests that these Local Green Spaces are included in future versions of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The definition of an open space needs to be wider than just 'children's play areas' e.g. to include options for all ages.</p> <p>Rigid interpretation of the rules around the allocation of Section 106 monies has made it difficult to get funding to improve existing play areas. Instead small play areas are encouraged and these are underutilised by the community.</p> <p>Within section 9: Environment, reference is made to the expectation that Neighbourhood Plans will be used to protect existing Local Green Spaces. The Town Council understands that only two Neighbourhood Plans are being produced within the District. This will lead to the majority of local green spaces being unprotected.</p> | <p>If Local Green Space is designated in a Neighbourhood Plan, then it does not need to be also designated/included within a Local Plan. With respect to the definition of Local Green Space, para 8.14 can be amended to make it clear that open space is for all ages and can be for formal, active sport (eg. football) but can also be used on an informal basis such as walking.</p> | <p>Amend 8.14 to provide examples of the uses of open space.</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 the openspaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan. | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space that is currently not developed. For example, separate policy seeks to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Philip Bastow</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------|-----------|
| <p>• I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>together.</p> <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Terry Hill</p> | <p>NA</p> |
|--|---|---|-------------------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------|-----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan. | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>D.Brearley</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan. | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Sophia M</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------------|-----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan. | <p>to be read together.</p> <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Mrs S Whitehouse</p> | <p>NA</p> |
|---|--|---|-------------------------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------------|-----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan. | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Mrs Lucy Clements</p> | <p>NA</p> |
|---|--|---|--------------------------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan. | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Mr D Spencer</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mr Stuart George Smith</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, leisure, healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>M.S. Bowyer</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>M.M. Knight</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mr David Tweedale</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mrs Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Sarah Higgins</p> | <p>N/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------------|----------------|
| Green spaces are few and far between. | 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. Other policies in the Local Plan recognise the importance of the countryside and seek to protect it. | No change | Miss C.M. Storer | N/a |
| Yes | Noted. | No change | Andrew Stone | NA |
| Much of our recreation involves the ability to walk in the countryside. This is being compromised by building and by extra traffic associated with this. | Other policies in the Local Plan recognise the importance of the countryside and seek to protect it. In addition, other policies set out the requirement for new development to include provision for cycling and walking. | No change | Mary Lorimer | Not applicable |
| I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | V Flemwell | N/a |
| I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed by the plan. | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification. | Brian and Barbara Hick | NA |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|-----------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the Plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Pamela Estaugh</p> | <p>NA</p> |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the plan. | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification. | J Hackett | N/a |
| I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | Mr J Martin | N/a |
| I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | Dr John Blythe | N/a |
| We do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the Plan. | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | Lesley Thom, Iain Thom, Graham Thom | NA |
| Yes | Noted. | No change. | Measham Parish Council | Measham Parish Council |
| - part 4) Loss of Open Space We support the general thrust of this policy it is clear and consistent with the advice contained within the NPPF. | Noted. | No change. | Paul Stone | Signet Planning |
| Yes | Noted. | No change. | Edward Hines | N/A |
| I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | Mr & Mrs Varden | N/a |
| I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | D & K Butler | N/a |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-----------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| growth are totally inadequate. | | | | |
| I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | Pat Wilson | N/a |
| I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | C Attenborough and Y Pilkington | N/a |
| I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | B Mason | N/a |
| I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. I trust NWLDC will take account of my concerns and carefully reconsider its proposed policies | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | Mrs Carole Waterfield | Not applicable |
| I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. I trust NWLDC will take account of my concerns and carefully reconsider its proposed policies. | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | Mr Ralph Waterfield | N/A |
| I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. I trust NWLDC will take account of my concerns and carefully reconsider its proposed policies. | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | B M Latimer | n/a |
| I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. I trust NWLDC will take account of my concerns and carefully reconsider its proposed policies. | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | Caroline Brown | n/a |
| I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. | The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32) | No change | Mrs Dawn Gardner | n/a |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| <p>See Q1. In particular I would urge designation of the Bath Grounds Green Corridor between the Royal Hotel and Ashby Castle as Local Green Space as defined under the NPPF and to ensure that this area is protected from development. This comprises The Hastings Garden, The Bath Grounds, Bullens Field, The Memorial Field, and Manor House School Playing Field. The Bath Grounds Green Corridor is demonstrably special to the local community and holds particular local significance. It provides Ashby's unique "Countryside in the Town" character affording open vistas to Ashby Castle from South Street and the Royal Hotel in the west. It provides continuity between the main historic sites and buildings within the Town and provides valuable recreational space and playing fields. The community's view of the importance of the area was demonstrated by a recent 2000 signature petition to oppose house building on the Bath Grounds. The Bath Grounds, Bullens Field, Memorial Field and Manor House School playing field are currently designated as Sensitive Areas under the 2002 Local Plan saved policy E1. The Bath Grounds, Memorial Field and Manor House School Playing Field were designated as Recreational Open Space under Policy L14 (not saved). These special protections will be lost when the new Local Plan is adopted if the current draft is not amended.</p> <p>Furthermore, renewal of Ashby Town Council's lease for the Bath Grounds requires them to be designated as "playing fields" in the local plan.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds. The Neighbourhood Plan forms part of the Development Plan and the designation of this in the Neighbourhood Plan is considered to satisfy the requirements of the lease.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>David Bigby</p> | <p>Private individual</p> |
|--|---|------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---------------------|-----------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by policies proposed in the plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>K.V Percival</p> | <p>NA</p> |
|--|--|---|---------------------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <p>We do not agree that the open spaces that we value in and around Ashby are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the Plan. We have a particular interest in wildlife conservation, and hence have emphasised the importance of the Environment sections of the Plan. In particular, we feel that the River Mease and other SSSIs around the District may require more positive protection than the plan provides. We would make the following points:</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Andrew and Anne Heaton</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Caroline Ferrier</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Bernard Noble</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Lance Wiggins</p> | <p>Landmark Planning</p> |
| <p>The Policy should specifically refer to the maintenance of new open space facilities and the need for a mechanism for funding this to be agreed through the planning application process.</p> | <p>This issue is supported and covered by Policy IF1</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Philip Metcalfe</p> | <p>The National Forest Company</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mr. & Mrs Loveless</p> | <p>Retired</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>I would like the Ashby Bath Grounds and Ashby Green Corridor designated as Local Green Space. This is a historic asset to the town, used by people of all ages.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Roger John Murton</p> | <p>retired teacher</p> |
| <p>The Ashby Bath Grounds and Ashby Green Corridor should be designated as Local Green Space.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mrs Margaret Murton</p> | <p>In Context</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Michael wyatt</p> | <p>Mikewyatt1@hotmail.co.uk</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------------|------------------------|
| I completely disagree with plan's approach to the designation of Local Green Space (9.6). To simply leave it to Neighbourhood Plans when there are very few being prepared and it is perfectly possible that there will be none in place for a significant part of the plan period, is a complete abrogation of responsibility to protect much treasured and valuable green spaces. This approach cannot be considered acceptable when it is built on a fallacy, ie assuming neighbourhood plans are or will be in place in all areas. The plan should have the courage to identify those areas that meet the NPPF criteria and make it clear that the full powers of 'green belt' protection should be used. An obvious candidate for Local Green Space would be the Bath Grounds and Green Corridor across to the castle in Ashby de la Zouch. This area is demonstrably special to the local community and holds particular local significance, | The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility. The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds. | No change | Chris Smith | Resident |
| Yes | Support welcomed | No change | Mr. j Lewis | 1950 |
| The policies to protect existing in-town and edge-of-town open spaces need to be MUCH stronger | Noted. It is considered that this policy, together with those in respect of the countryside provide the necessary protection required, whilst also allowing for the new development necessary to meet the districts future needs. | No change | Michael Ball | Individual |
| The targets are far too small. Its getting hard to walk anywhere locally and have any sense of private space. That may be the truth of our overcrowded island. | Noted. It is considered that this policy, together with those in respect of the countryside provide the necessary protection required, whilst also allowing for the new development necessary to meet the districts future needs. | No change | Steve Johnson | YYYY |
| Yes | Support welcomed | No change | Lesley Birtwistle | not applicable |
| Yes | Support welcomed | No change | Mrs Paula Ashfield | Paula Ashfield |
| Would also like to see cultural facilities included here | It is the intention for Cultural Facilities to be included alongside Community Facilities under Policy IF2. This policy will seek the retention of and inappropriate loss of such facilities, as well as support the development of new services and facilities. | Delete reference to cultural facilities under Policy EC15. Amend Policy IF2 to include reference to cultural facilities. | Hugh James | n/a |
| Yes | Support welcomed | No change | Tim Abbott | Householder |
| More of it. Protected via designation and more undisturbed land rather than just restored quarry land etc. or remodelled/replanted land. | Noted. | No change. | Jane Tebbatt | Quarrying |
| We think so | Support welcomed | No change | Heather Parish Council | Heather Parish Council |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------------|--|
| <p>I urge you to protect the area in Ashby de la Zouch between the Royal Hotel and Ashby Castle from development. I understand that this can be accomplished by designating it a Local Green Space. The Friends of the Bath Grounds have already successfully campaigned against the building of homes on the Bath Grounds and have secured the funds and supervised the installation of a footpath from south to north along the perimeter. It is essential that Bullens Field, The Memorial Field and Manor House School Playing field are included in the Local Green Space to enable the existing new footpath to be extended after crossing Prior Park Road to Ashby Castle.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Douglas Cooper</p> | <p>Member of Friends of Bath Grounds</p> |
| <p>The study promotes the use of the Fields in Trust standard this is not considered to be appropriate having regard to NPPF. This standard does not meet the requirements of CIL S 122 tests</p> | <p>Officers met with Sport England to discuss their concerns and the issues raised. The Council are undertaking a Playing Pitch Strategy as well as Sports Facility Modelling and this will help to address the concerns raised. In addition, it is agreed to delete reference to the national standards in the policy.</p> | <p>Include reference to the work being undertaken on the Playing Pitch Strategy and the Sports Facility Modelling within the supporting text to Policy IF3. Delete reference to national standards in policy and reword accordingly</p> | <p>steve Beard</p> | <p>sport England</p> |
| <p>The "approach" should enforce no loss of outside space.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility. Policy has been prepared in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>George F Stapley</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------|------------|
| <p>We support Ashby Town Councils Draft Neighbourhood Plan's stronger proposals concerning open spaces, particularly to areas of attractive, accessible local countryside for its recreational and amenity value for the enjoyment and wellbeing of the local and wider community. 'Local Green Spaces' should be designated within the NWLDC Local Plan as well as in Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>The NWLDC Local Plan should also identify and protect by policy those areas which might not be classified as 'Local Green Spaces', but which nevertheless areas of particularly attractive open countryside of the highest value in terms of environmental value and tranquillity.</p> <p>We believe that the area of open countryside in the Willesley area, at the Heart of the National Forest, between the built up edge of the town and the Hicks Lodge National Forest Cycle Centre and open access areas and trails for walking and cycling, should be designated in the NWLDC Local Plan as 'Local Green Spaces'. In evidence documents to the presently withdrawn Core Strategy, the location was given the 'landscape quality value' of 9, which is the highest value of the sites assessed within Ashby and is only equalled by one other site in the District.</p> <p>Considerable numbers of members of the public, up to 100 a day, walk or cycle through this area from Willesley Road/Wells to the Hicks Lodge cycle centre and trails to gain access to the trails. This provides a safer alternative route to using Willesley Lane and Willesley Woodside. An application has been submitted to Leicestershire County Council to get the route added to the area of open countryside is of the highest value in terms of environmental value and tranquillity, prized for its recreational and amenity value and meeting the needs of local people and visitors, in terms of their enjoyment, health and wellbeing.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Andrew and Julia Ledger</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (Transport, Education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. The routes in and out of town are inadequate in fact, appalling.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Ruth Lovett</p> | <p>N/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------------|-----|
| <p>A 60% increase is far too much for Ashby, several other points must be looked at if this were to happen.</p> <p>(1) Would all the area be covered by bus routes, and by what type of time table</p> <p>(2) Law and order - no police station within the area (Leicester for anything out of normal hours)</p> <p>(3) Would the fire and rescue be able to cope if all these new dwellings went ahead (these at this point in time are looking at cut backs)</p> <p>(4) The main point to look at prior to building new dwellings is could we cope with the current infrastructure, the answer i think is NO!!</p> | <p>In terms of the 60% increase this issues is considered in more detail under Policy IF1. With reference to the other points raised. (1) This not relevant to planning policy and is not a matter for the Local Plan. (2) Police are consulted on planning applications to provide their infrastructure requirements which are sought through s106 contributions. (3) The highway authority advice is sought on this matter and there is guidance available on safety issues. (4) Provision of infrastructure requires involvement from a range of organisations and mechanisms ,and policy seeks infrastructure to support new development and to co-ordinate the parties involved, whilst having regard to viability issues. In addition an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the plan which will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers have engaged with the infrastructure providers in order to inform the draft plan as well as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and on planning applications.</p> | | Alan James Griffin | N/a |
| <p>We are of the opinion that the proposed Plan does not adequately protect the present open spaces. Currently it is a voluntary group set up by residents who are working to ensure their greater protection.</p> <p>Existing green areas in the town must be protected for today's citizens and for future generations.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification. | Mr DG and Mrs MP Heath | N/a |

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate, as are the sewers which are Victorian.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Name unclear</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> <p>The roads and parking facilities in Ashby are not adequate for existing traffic and will not cope with increased traffic from additional housing.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Lesley Anne Good</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> <p>Traffic problems are getting worse, no schools are being developed, there is no hospital and public transport is poor. Roads will be gridlocked and services will be stretched.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>T Anderson</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Chris and Monika Ingamells</p> | <p>n/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------------|------------|
| <p>I support the Ashby Town Council's Draft Neighbourhood Plan's stronger proposals concerning open spaces, particularly to areas of attractive, accessible local countryside for its recreational and amenity value for the enjoyment and well being of the local and wider community. 'Local Green Spaces' should be designated within the NWLDC Local Plan as well as in Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>The NWLDC Local Plan should also identify and protect by Policy those areas which might not be classified as 'Local Green Spaces', but which are nevertheless areas of particularly attractive open countryside of the highest value in terms of environmental value and tranquility.</p> <p>I believe that the area of open countryside in the Willesley area, at the heart of the National Forest, between the built up edge of the town and the Hicks Lodge National Forest Cycle Centre and open access areas and trails for walking and cycling, should be designated in the NWLDC Local Plan as 'Local Green Space'. In evidence documents to the presently withdrawn Core Strategy, the location was given the 'landscape quality value' of 9, which is the highest value of the sites assessed within Ashby and is only equaled by one other site in the District. Considerable numbers of members of the public, up to 100 a day, walk or cycle through this area from Willesley Road/Wells Road to the Hicks Lodge cycle centre and trails to gain access to the trails. This provides a safer alternative route to using Willesley Lane and Willesley Woodside. An application has been submitted to Leicestershire County Council to get the route added to the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way and has the support of the National Forest Company. This area of open Countryside is of the highest value in terms of environmental value and tranquilize, prized for its recreational and amenity value and meeting the needs of local people and visitors, in terms of their enjoyment, health and well being.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example, those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>David Colclough</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
|---|--|---|------------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| <p>No. Current policies [IF3: Open Space, Sport and Recreation facilities] do not adequately recognise that local teams are centres of excellence, catering not just for locals using facilities but that the success of local teams requires additional facilities to cater for current demand. In addition, we already have two football teams and one cricket team that are forced to play games away from the village.</p> <p>A rural community with an increasing elderly population is likely to wish to provide additional allotment provision and needs to make provision for the Village Hall, Community Library and Voluntary run Museum as well. KPC considers that these types of facility form the basis of a strong community base.</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities, including local teams, to have access to high quality open space as well as sport and recreational facilities. This principle is supported by Policy IF3 which protects against the inappropriate loss of open space, sport and recreational facilities and provides suitable support for the provision of new facilities as well as the enhancement of existing facilities.</p> <p>Policy IF1 and IF2 address development and infrastructure provision, including community facilities. They allow for community infrastructure to be sought from new development when appropriate. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will provide a coordinated approach to the infrastructure that is proposed and that which is required. Officers will also engage with relevant stakeholders, including Parish Councils, at the planning application to identify any infrastructure requirements, such as additional allotment etc.</p> | No change | Vicky Roe | Kegworth Parish Council |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | No change | Christine Iddon | n/a |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | No change | Anthony Iddon | n/a |
| <p>8.14</p> <p>I suggest that this needs to be more specific and ambitious in that working with partners a plan should be created to develop large scale, managed urban woodlands in areas of separation and urban fringes to create sustainable, halo or satellite woodlands for the main towns.</p> | <p>Whilst the plan is to be positively prepared it must be supported by an up to date evidence, and contain policies that can be delivered. It is suggested that the issues raised are aspirational with no strategy in place to support. However Policy EN3 seeks 33% woodland cover within the National Forest, which covers a significant part of the district.</p> | No change | Julian Simpson | NWL Tree Officer |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed</p> | No change | Sonia Liff | Chair Appleby Environment |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| <p>(a) The Labour Group considers proposed policy as a minimum</p> <p>(b) The Local Plan needs to reflect developer funding for larger communal 'play hubs' and adult exercise equipment in a safe environment away from residential properties.</p> <p>(c) Many of our open spaces have been community features for many years and need protection from any development. Bath Grounds in Ashby and Snibston Grange in Coalville need protecting in perpetuity and given special status in the Local Plan.</p> <p>(d) Consideration to implement 'village green' status to our valued open spaces.</p> | <p>Local Plan Policy IF3 provides the framework for seeking the provision of open space, sport and recreational facilities, as part of new housing development, in order to meet community needs. Evidence will be needed to justify the contributions being sought. The Local Plan also recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space, sport and recreational facility. The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. With reference to 'Village Green' status, this is covered by separate legislation.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Sue McKendrick</p> | <p>Labour Group leader</p> |
| <p>Open green space and urban green spaces require specific protection in the Local Plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>C Tandy</p> | <p>Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|----------|
| <p>It is important that policies recognise and afford proper protection for our open spaces and Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside, as well as providing valuable wildlife habitat and enhancing biodiversity through protection of green infrastructure within established ecological networks.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Johnathan Bell</p> | <p>n</p> |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|----------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---------------------|------------|
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces around Ashby are adequately protected from future development by policies proposed in the Plan.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Mr M D Ensor</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
|--|--|---|---------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Do not agree that the open spaces in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by policies proposed in the Plan. Please consider the protection of space given the likely construction of HS2.</p> | <p>The representation does not identify any particular area/s that they believe should be protected. The Local Plan recognises the importance for local communities to have access to high quality open space. Policy IF3 protects against the inappropriate loss of an open space which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. The proposed policy is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space for example; those areas identified as countryside are protected by the Countryside Policy S4. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'open space' in glossary to provide clarification.</p> | <p>Andrew Chapman</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mrs. A Saxby</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the Plan. In particular I am concerned that the Bath Grounds are safeguarded from any threat of development.</p> | <p>The NPPF advises that Local Green Spaces can be designated through either a local plan or a neighbourhood plan provided that they meet the specified criteria contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not proposed in this instance for the Council to designate this area as a Local Green Space but rather enable designation through Neighbourhood Plans as these are better placed to be able to justify their designation. The Draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of Local Green spaces including the Bath Grounds. Furthermore this policy does not apply to all open space that is currently not developed. For example, separate policy seeks to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Ian Retson</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p> | <p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p> |

Policy IF4 – Transport Infrastructure and new development

| Question 37 Do you agree with our suggested approach to Transport Infrastructure and new development? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments; | NWL Response | Any change required | Name | Business or organisation name; |
|---|---|----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Needs to be stronger with regards to rail infrastructure. | Policy IF5 supports the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton rail line. It seeks to ensure new development does not prejudice its proposed route. | No Change | Lisa Marron | Resident |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No Change | Mr s Whitehouse | Personal |
| This remains parochial and ignores the flow of communications to Tamworth, Birmingham and the West Midlands. | The impact of development on the highway network will be considered and where appropriate will be expected to contribute towards highway improvements. Some improvements required will relate to the local network and others may relate to the strategic network. Preparation of the draft Local Plan has been done in consultation with Highways England and Policy IF4 itself refers to potential improvements that maybe needed to Junction 13 of the A42 which itself carries traffic to the south towards Birmingham and Tamworth. Regard has also been made to Travel to Work data (2011) which identifies the flow of 'Travel to Work' traffic in and out of the district. This shows that only 7% of the total traffic leaving the district for work accounts for those travelling to East Staffordshire and Birmingham. The majority of traffic travels to Charnwood, Leicester, Hinckley and Bosworth, and South Derbyshire. | No Change | Dr John Blythe | Researcher, University of Birmingham |
| <p>No. The proposals are very limited in scope and vision and will do little to encourage the level of development required, but what is developed will be for a car based economy, with insufficient public transport, and increased overall congestion.</p> <p>Ashby in particular would benefit from the development of orthodox cycle routes around the town and particularly to the supermarkets on Nottingham Road. It is unacceptable to presume that cyclists are being served by simply painting cycles to the side of busy roads.</p> | Policy IF4 supports the provision of cycle links within and beyond sites. However contributions can only be sought when planning permission is needed for development. The provision of cycleways and their routes are outside the remit of the Local Plan. Such matters would more appropriately be considered within the Council's Cycle Strategy that is being prepared for Ashby. | | Nigel Garnham | Packington Nook Residents Association |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No Change | Mark Chadbourn | Emerald Eye Ltd |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>I don't agree with Hugglescote crossroads being developed. It's unnecessary.</p> <p>The huge cycle path along the Coalville Bypass is also a waste of time and money. Hardly any bikes are ever seen along there. The pathway should have been smaller to allow the road to still be 4 lane. That road is continually clogged up</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the highway authorities on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. At its meeting on 18 November 2015 Leicestershire County Council's Cabinet agreed that none of the proposed options put forward in the consultation for improvement work at Hugglescote Crossroads be pursued further. It is therefore suggested to delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e).</p> | <p>Delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e)</p> | <p>Alison Wright</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> |
| <p>pg 90 para 8.19. The draft local plan states that "our settlement hierarchy (policy S3) seeks to reduce the need to travel by locating development in the most sustainable locations" Might not the plan state that "our policy is to encourage development in locations which would entail least reliance on travel?"</p> | <p>The suggested wording within the draft plan has been prepared to reflect the theme of sustainable development with reference to travel that is contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Gerald Dalby</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>Item 8.18</p> <p>This is just never going to happen. The plan shows thousands of new dwellings on road networks that are accepted as being unable to cope currently. Development where there is no money available to improve the network to the point where it may work is ridiculous. Smaller more widespread developments would have less infrastructure impacts and should be considered if funding isn't available.</p> <p>Page 90</p> <p>Item 8.19</p> <p>The plan does not conform to the NPPF.</p> <p>The plan puts development exactly where travel is at a maximum. To comply or be in line with the NPPF development should be close to areas of high employment and employment growth.</p> <p>Item 8.20</p> <p>The plan has no detail of what will be required. It should be specific and detailed so that residents and developers understand the provision. Dedicated cycle ways should be provided to ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety to encourage people to use green means of transport, particularly to employment areas. This would be in line with the Governments Cycling Strategy.</p> | <p>A core principle of the NPPF is to "focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable." As such Policy S3 defines a settlement hierarchy to guide the location of future development. Those settlements with a greater range of services and facilities, will take more growth. There is a objectively assessed housing need for the district and where new development is sought or planned, consideration and provision should be made for the provision of alternative modes of travel to the car.</p> <p>It is not the role of the Local Plan to define cycleways and this is outside of its remit. However policy can be applied and contributions sought for their provision when planning permission is needed for a development. For example by having regard to the provisions of the Coalville Cycling Strategy.</p> <p>The District Council consult and engage with the highway authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. The Highway Authority's Local Transport Plan has identified a number of key improvement schemes in the district, one of which is the Hugglescote crossroads which is recognised as</p> | <p>No change to policy but make reference to the Coaville Cycle Strategy within the evidence base.</p> | <p>Steve Palmer</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------------|-------------|
| <p>Items 8.22 and 8.23</p> <p>LCC may well have their LTP3, but they do not have the resources to make changes on the A511 corridor. Highway spending has been dramatically cut in the latest round of Government cuts.</p> <p>Page 91</p> <p>Item 8.24</p> <p>There is no data to confirm that there is an issue at Hugglescote Cross Roads. In fact an independent review produced by Royal Haskoning DHV, highly regarded infrastructure experts, proves the very opposite. Forty percent of traffic using the cross roads is in fact through traffic which shows the poor state of the A511 and the issues caused by Bardons mineral railway.</p> <p>The comment about HCR should be removed.</p> <p>NWLDC have copies of the full Royal Haskoning DHV report, the plan author should make a point of reading it.</p> | <p>requiring improvement. As such this is identified as a potential local road improvement. As the highway provider, the County Council will provide advice on which road improvements be considered a priority and are currently advising that none of the proposed options for the crossroad improvement be pursued further at this time. However this position may change over the lifetime of the plan (up to 2031) and it is still appropriate to make reference to it within planning policy.</p> | | | |
| <p>As per the County Council's Local Transport Plan this document offers no details on what cycle links beyond development sites would be needed to create a network. This is a key piece of evidence that is lacking from the Local Plan. Clearly the Plan is setting out that the greatest growth (residential, employment and retail) is focused on the Coalville Urban Area and this, it is considered, should be the starting point for any identified improvements to the cycle network. For example, linking Green Lane, Whitwick to the existing cycle network (Stephenson Way and the new link through to the back of the Rugby Club) and identify how links to the retail centre of Coalville can be achieved through routes not in conflict with motorised transport – Ashby Road seems to have the best opportunity because of the width of the paths/highway verge. Such a change would provide credible evidence and certainty to residents and to developers what to expect. It may also allow further funding outside of the planning process to be sought if these projects are identified.</p> | <p>The physical provision of and the specific routing of cycle ways is outside of the remit of the Local Plan. This is a matter that would fall to County Council Highways. Furthermore such matters would more appropriately be considered within the Council's Cycle Strategy for Coalville and also the strategy that is being prepared for Ashby. Furthermore however local plan policy can be applied and contributions sought for the provision of such when planning permission is needed.</p> | <p>No change to policy, but make reference to the Coaville and Ashby Cycle Strategy within the evidence base.</p> | <p>Phil Larter</p> | <p>None</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| <p>There are of course threats to travel routes which do need attention. HS2 is likely to cut or greatly affect 64 rights of way in your area. This can however also be an opportunity. HS2 has wide ranging powers and if an early discussion is started with them highlighting these issues and bringing local knowledge to the table the actual network can sometimes be improved by diverting routes from some way out and through attractive countryside rather than just walking alongside the new track bed to the first available crossing.</p> <p>It is essential that authorities plan to reduce the need to travel and to maintaining access to services and employment sites, shops, schools, sport and recreation opportunities and green space but where travel is required opportunities for off-road sustainable travel must be encouraged. The LLAF are of the view that the benefits of the footpath, bridleway and cycleway network are multi-dimensional and have impacts on sustainable transport, green infrastructure, recreation, tourism, and health & well-being. They are the primary mechanism for linking communities and facilities if we are to reduce motorised transport and the carbon emissions that ensue.</p> <p>The footpath and bridleway network within the District is disjointed, not helped by the line of the A42 and it is further threatened by the possible HS2 route and all opportunities should be taken to create the missing links and improve crossing points in order to encourage non motorised travel. With the National Forest opening up many possibilities for people to enjoy countryside areas and take exercise improving their general health and wellbeing it is important that off road links are created from the major conurbations into these areas. Ashby de la Zouch to the Shellbrook and Hicks Lodge area is one example where improvements are required.</p> <p>The development of the recreational potential of the area, in which the rights of way network plays a large part, will have to be balanced with the needs to protect and enhance the ecology and landscape and enable regeneration and economic growth. These should not be viewed simply as competing demands but as a challenge to use best practice and / or innovative approaches to achieve good quality outcomes to meet each of the aspirations. For these reasons the Leicestershire Local Access Forum (LLAF) recommends that Local Plans include a dedicated section that makes specific reference to the existing network and potential improvements to it.</p> <p>To this end they would suggest following paragraphs be included in any policy or plan.</p> | <p>Representations on HS2 are noted but are beyond the scope of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy seeks to reduce the need to travel and provide non-car mode alternatives, including the provision of footpath/cycle path links within and out of development. This policy can be applied and contributions sought for such when planning permission is needed for development. Furthermore, The District Council consult and engage with the highway authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure all types of transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. The majority of the issues raised and the wording suggested is outside of the remit of or is too detailed for the Local Plan. The responsibility for safeguarding footpaths is a matter for the County Council. However Policy S5 on Design recognises the value of making sure places are connected as well as offering as many connections as possible, be in walking or cycling, to help reduce car dependency. It is anticipated that the Design SPD will provide more advice on this matter.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Terry Kirby</p> | <p>Chairman local access forum</p> |
|---|---|------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|

Footpaths, Bridleways, Cycleways and Access Land

1. Whenever new developments are considered it is important that improvements to the foot/bridle/cycle path network are considered. Such changes should aim to improve sustainable transport, green infrastructure, recreation, tourism, health and general well-being. Improvements will normally have beneficial impact on local economies and the aspiration should be for improvements rather than for maintenance of the status quo. Considering their public utility, footpaths have very low maintenance costs. The larger the scale of any developments, the greater should be the opportunity to enhance all aspects of the foot/bridle/cycle paths network.

2. The most important property of the network is the inter-connectedness of the network itself. Every opportunity should be taken to improve the inter-linking of the network so that it becomes more useful to the public.

3. Opportunities should be taken for giving rights of way a higher status whenever possible. For example, bridleways are legally useable by both cyclists and pedestrians whilst footpaths can only be used by walkers.

4. For the maximum public benefits, the main target groups are schoolchildren and short-distance commuters. In essence, these require direct routes from A to B. Such routes should also provide safe and pleasant access to and from public transport facilities, local shops, medical centres etc.

5. For recreation, families look for attractive circular routes. Based on the experience of the LLAF, recreational routes are preferred where they are away from traffic; beside water; with open space on one side and, whenever possible, having a good surface (pram-pushing, child-biking, walking and riding). They are most popular when free from stiles and gates.

6. New housing developments will contain a large number of dog walkers and these users need to be catered for. Circular routes of about one kilometre are most useful for these users.

7. Where significant mixed foot, horse and cycling traffic is expected, the way needs to be of appropriate width to allow all traffic to pass easily and, where practical, different classes of users should be provided with their own space. Wherever possible, motorised traffic should be kept separate from other users.

8. The surfaces of the foot/bridle/cycle path network should be appropriate for its use and the amount of traffic expected.

| | | | | |
|--|---------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <p>Cycleways for example need an all-weather surface otherwise they soon become too muddy for general use and some bridleways can become so cut up by horses that the surfaces become difficult for use by pedestrians. These problems can be avoided by appropriate drainage and surfacing.</p> <p>9. In order to assist the less able and those pushing buggies etc., gates/gaps/stiles should be as easy to use as the requirements permit. On bridleways, gates should allow operation by riders without dismounting.</p> <p>10. In some circumstances, particularly in built-up areas, lighting of the foot/bridle/cycle path network may be required.</p> <p>11. When a development fronts an existing road, 'behind the hedge' routes should be considered to take walkers, cyclists and horse riders off the road. Every opportunity should be taken to create new routes and to link up with any existing routes, although care needs to be exercised in planning where users can re-access the highway.</p> <p>12. New foot/bridle/cycle paths can often usefully be combined with "green wedges" and "wildlife corridors" thus also fulfilling the need to protect and enhance both the ecology and landscape.</p> <p>13. Longer distance routes for those taking exercise or pursuing treks as a hobby, bring visitors into rural areas boosting local economies and to this end all opportunities should be taken to improve connectivity to local services</p> <p>14. It is often thought that the rights of way network is already fixed, but this is not true. Leicestershire has hundreds of "lost ways" and informal "desire paths". Any proposed development should aim to recover these historic assets or link existing paths together. The LLAF working with the County Council has established a wish list of many of the possibilities and these can be made available to planning authorities or developers.</p> <p>15. As required by statute, Leicestershire County Council has a Rights of Way Improvement Plan which should be consulted when developments are proposed</p> | | | | |
| <p>The County Council has no strategic transport planning observations to make.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Eilidh McCallum</p> | <p>Nottinghamshire County Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Approach? where is the community transport masterplan. Just more cars with nowhere to park.</p> | <p>Policy seeks to locate development in order to facilitate more sustainable means of travel and support alternatives to the car. Furthermore the District Council consult and engage with the highway authorities on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>david harris</p> | <p>Pyrotect Ltd</p> |
| <p>I write regarding the NWLDC Local Plan - I would like the council to consider all the traffic involved with the Bardon Industrial Site - there is a new large 428 lorries a day site being developed there plus Amazon plus an extension to the Industrial site itself. All extra to what is already there. All this extra traffic plus workers coming and going Add to all this the massive housing building programme planned surely demands a By pass . A much needed By pass. I realize that traffic is encouraged to go to the M1 but in reality it will use the M42 traveling via Bardon Road and cause congestion on Bardon Road Forest Road etc. The roads in Coalville are badly congested and need careful planning or gridlock will result.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the highway authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the The District Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to develop a strategy for managing future growth and improvements to the strategic highway network in the Coalville area and in particular along the A511 corridor. Specific options for highway improvements such as the Bardon Road bypass will be considered as part of this strategy.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>elbert.pink@talktalk.net</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road network struggles to meet existing demand, especially around the Nottingham Road/A511 area of Ashby, The A511/ A42 intersection and the A511 through Coalville. Approved developments add even more pressures in these areas without addressing properly the issues. | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the highway authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. Furthermore we are working with Leicestershire County Council and Highways England to develop a strategy for the A511. Policy seeking transport infrastructure contributions can be applied when planning permission is needed for development.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Richard Brewin</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>The acknowledgment of the strategic importance of improvements to junction 13 of the A42 is supported.</p> <p>The list of road improvements completely ignores the proposals that Ashby de la Zouch will be the main site for the allocation of additional housing and employment land. No priority is given to road improvements in the town.</p> <p>Work on low cost schemes to deal with congestion and parking issues around Coalville Town Centre are mentioned. But there is no reference to the need to deal with identical issues in Ashby de la Zouch, which in the settlement hierarchy is also classed as a main town centre.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the highway authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. The infrastructure improvements that are being sought by the highway authorities, as well as those contained within the LTP3, have been made with knowledge of the level of the development that is proposed for Ashby within the draft Local Plan. Specific transport infrastructure requirement for the land at Money Hill, is detailed within policy H3. In the past, parking schemes considered for Ashby have generally not received public support. However the district council is currently undertaking a review of parking provision.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk</p> | <p>Ashby de la Zouch Town Council</p> |
| <p>Policy IF4 (2) states that 'where appropriate' new development will make certain provisions. There is no guidance as to what sites or locations would classify as 'appropriate' for such to be made. Further guidance should be provided/thresholds should be set out for this policy.</p> | <p>Advice will be sought from the highway authorities, as to when a proposal would have an impact on transport infrastructure and whether infrastructure improvements will be required. All of this will depend on a number of factors, such as the nature and size of an application, its location and relationship and impact with existing transport infrastructure.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Angela Cornell</p> | <p>Fisher German</p> |
| <p>Train link is a must !</p> | <p>Although not a transport provider, the reinstatement of a rail passenger services in the district has been a long term ambition of the Council. The Council's response to HS2 has included a request be given to the consideration to the potential for re-opening the Leicester to Burton line. Policy IF5 supports the reinstatement of the line and seeks to ensure that new development in the district will not prejudice this or the location of the route.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Andrew Stone</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>Developments must make provision of cycle routes and public transport routes to the town centres. The A511 needs to be improved as a through route, and traffic calming measures should be considered to prevent other routes being used as rat runs. There should be no measures to increase traffic flow through these other routes.</p> | <p>Noted. Throughout the preparation of the Local Plan and on planning applications, close liaison is undertaken with Leicestershire County Council, in order to identify the impact on the road network and to seek appropriate mitigation. Furthermore we are working with Leicestershire County Council and Highways England to develop a strategy for the A511.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mary Lorimer</p> | <p>Not applicable</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (transport, education, Leisure, Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.</p> | <p>The concerns are noted and this issue is considered in more detail under Policy IF1 (Question 32)</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>J Hackett</p> | <p>N/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>Highways England notes that Policy IF4: Transport Infrastructure and New development identifies improvements to infrastructure to support development. NWLDC has put forward a contribution strategy whereby it will expect, where appropriate, developers to contribute towards: the provision of cycle links and public footpaths across the district and linking to Green Infrastructure; the provision of new public transport services; strategic road network improvements including the M1 Smart Motorway functionality, M1 J22 and A42 J13; local road improvements along the A511 corridor between M1 J22 and A42 J13; and Hugglescote crossroads.</p> <p>Highways England would not expect development to contribute to the M1 Smart Motorway scheme (M1J19 – J23a) as this is included in the government’s Road Investment Strategy for delivery in Road Period 2 (2020 – 2025). The scale of growth planned across North West Leicestershire will, however, directly impact upon the operation of A42 J13 and M1 J22. Highways England welcomes the reference in IF4 for developer contributions towards improvements at these junctions. Highways England and Leicestershire County Council (LCC) have worked together to agree improvements at A14 J13 and M1 J22 in order to support growth proposed in North West Leicestershire. LCC is committed to delivering an improvement to these junctions through a combination of public funding (Growth Deal and LCC funding) and developer contributions. Developments in North West Leicestershire are therefore expected to contribute to improvements at A42 J13 and M1 J22 if they have a significant impact on these junctions. Highways England, for its part, is working alongside LCC and NWLDC to enable delivery of the A42 J13 and M1 J22 improvement schemes.</p> <p>Highways England also expect significant improvements to the strategic road network and local road network to come forward at M1 J24/24A funded through and in conjunction with the Nottingham Gateway SRFI development.</p> <p>However, Highways England considers that NWLDC will need to produce an updated transport evidence base in order to assess the impacts of increased growth in the Plan area. As there is significant housing and job growth, with job growth focused at the SRFI, it is important to understand the changing and evolving travel patterns across the district and how this may impact the strategic road network. In particular, it would help to confirm that schemes already committed, such as M1 J22, M1 J24/24A, A42 J13 and M1 Smart Motorways will be sufficient to meet the demand of growth.</p> <p>Highways England welcomes the opportunity to engage with North West Leicestershire District Council regarding its Draft</p> | <p>Comments are noted. Following discussions with Highways England and Leicestershire County Council, Highways England has advised that it is satisfied that the proposed infrastructure identified for the strategic road network is appropriate.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Shirley Henderson</p> | <p>Highways England</p> |
|---|--|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|-----------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Local Plan consultation document. Highways England considers that an updated transport evidence base should be produced to help understand the impacts of proposed growth on the strategic and local road networks within the Plan Area. Highways England would like to continue engagement with NWLDC during this process and as the Local Plan progresses. | | | | |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No Change | Measham Parish Council | Measham Parish Council |
| Keep pushing for rail not road links | Noted. Policy IF5 supports the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton rail line. | No Change | Edward Hines | N/A |
| HS2 station in Leicestershire Campaign to open the Ivanhoe line to passengers. | The Council's response to HS2 has included a request be given to the consideration to the potential for re-opening the Leicester to Burton line. Policy IF5 supports the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton rail line. | No Change | Mr Richard Hine | Resident of Appleby Magna |
| The need for the Bardon Road extension to the Coalville bypass should be included. There needs to be a specific policy stating that new development will not be permitted unless funding for the necessary transport infrastructure has been secured. The list of road improvements completely ignores the proposals that Ashby will be the main site for the allocation of additional housing and employment land. No priority is given to the road improvements required in the town. I would advocate partial pedestrianisation of the Town Centre with a one way system to improve traffic flow. | The District Council consult and engage with the highway authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. The infrastructure improvements that are being sought by the highway authorities, as well as those contained within the LTP3, have been made with knowledge of the level of the development that is proposed for Ashby within the draft Local Plan. Specific transport infrastructure requirement for the land at Money Hill, is detailed within policy H3. However the district council is currently the council is currently undertaking a review of parking provision across the district which may address some of these concerns. | No Change | David Bigby | Private individual |
| the reopening of the Leicester - Burton line to passengers and extra stations adjacent to settlements including Moira for Hicks Lodge & Conkers both important leisure destinations. It could be reopened as a supertam or even a driverless system similar to London Docklands | Policy IF5 supports the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton rail line. | No Change | Paul McCaffrey | NA |
| Yes | Noted | No Change | Lance Wiggins | Landmark Planning |
| Yes | Noted | | Mr. & Mrs Loveless | Retired |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|---------------|------------|
| <p>I am concerned that, without significant investment in transport in North West Leicestershire we may never see the economic prosperity housing growth is supposed to deliver for Coalville.</p> <p>In my view the SE Coalville development is being put in jeopardy by the lack of provision for the A511 Bardon Road By-Pass.</p> <p>I am concerned that, in the current climate of austerity, there will be insufficient funds for the additional work needed to develop Highways infrastructure, including all junctions between M1 Junction 22 and A42 Junction 13</p> <p>I am concerned that this Local Plan may fail to secure funding for transport infrastructure to mitigate the impact of growth in Coalville including interventions necessary to facilitate the "Bardon Link"</p> <p>I believe the Local Plan should include a reassessment by Highways of the viability of a "Bardon By-Pass" scheme. In the absence of a Bardon By-Pass, there should be an assessment by NWLDC of the viability of the SE Coalville development as a means of maximising the opportunities for developer contributions.</p> <p>The Local Plan should include a joint assessment from LCC Highways and NWLDC as to the likelihood of any future Single Local Growth Fund being successful.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the Highway Authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district .</p> <p>As such reference is made to the Hugglescote Crossroads within the Local Plan, as the Highways Authority have identified that it requires improvement. It is however for the Highway Authority to identify which schemes are a priority. One of matters taken into that account when assessing this, is the proposed level and impact of development proposed within the district.</p> <p>With respect to the issue of a bid for a Single Local Growth Fund this matter will be taken up with the County Council highways..</p> | No Change | Theresa Eynon | alderoak |
| Yes | Noted | No Change | Mr. j Lewis | 1950 |
| <p>Congestion in Ashby is already far worse than at Hugglescote crossroads and that's before the 1350 new homes already approved are built , if "Hugglescote crossroads requires improvements" so does Ashby !</p> | <p>No evidence has been submitted to support this representation. However, the housing and employment allocations in Ashby include the highway requirements identified by Leicestershire County Council and nothing else has been identified. Furthermore, the NPPF advises that development should only be refused on transport grounds where the impacts of development are severe.</p> | No Change | Michael Ball | Individual |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---------------------------|---|
| <p>It shouldn't be beyond the bounds of possibility to explore options other than the car as a primary mode of transport. Encourage commuting and people will do it.</p> <p>We are now in the 21st century so need to progress away from needless car journeys.</p> | <p>Noted. Policy IF4 can be applied and transport infrastructure contributions sought when planning permission is needed for development. The form of transport infrastructure sought will include cycle links, public footpath links as well as public transport services. Furthermore Policy seeks to locate development in order to facilitate more sustainable means of travel and support alternatives to the car. Policy S3 provides a settlement hierarchy which seeks to concentrate development where people have choices in terms of mode of transport.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Steve Johnson</p> | <p>YYYY</p> |
| <p>However, whilst I acknowledge the value of the provision of footpaths and cycleways, I suspect that there is an overestimation implied of how much these will be used for necessary journeys as distinct from recreation. The provision of improved public transport should be highlighted but even then the use of the private car will be predominant and a development only sustainable if adequate provision is made for the impact of this increased traffic.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the highway authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. Comments are noted and suitable highway capacity will be sought to accommodate new development as well as to ensure highway safety. However other forms of transport will be sought to provide alternatives and more sustainable forms of travel.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Lesley Birtwistle</p> | <p>not applicable</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Noted</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Mrs Paula Ashfield</p> | <p>Paula Ashfield</p> |
| <p>Public transport from villages to towns would benefit from enhancement, especially as it has reduced recently (i.e. the removal of a direct bus routes from Nuneaton to Ashby via many villages without any other transport provision)</p> | <p>Noted. The provision of or improvement to public transport services can only be sought through Local Plan policy when planning permission is needed for development. Decisions regarding existing services are beyond the scope of the Local Plan.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Hugh James</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Yes the improvements need to be along the corridor between the M1 and M42 along the ring road north of Coalville. It is important that traffic doesn't get focussed along the southern route through Hugglescote thereby taking more traffic into the community.</p> <p>The concerns about Hugglescote crossroads have been well rehearsed through the consultation with the county Council traffic division - and they remain. In essence the worries that widening the road at that point would drive a wedge through a well functioning connected community. And the continuing concern about the future of the community centre located at the crossroads which functions very well and serves the community and the church.</p> | <p>Noted. The District Council consult and engage with the highway authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. At its meeting on 18 November 2015 Leicestershire County Council's Cabinet agreed that none of the proposed options put forward in the consultation for improvement work at Hugglescote Crossroads be pursued further. It is therefore suggested to delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e).</p> | <p>Delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e).</p> | <p>Olwen Woolcock</p> | <p>The Ecclesiastical Parish of Hugglescote with Donington Ellistown and Snibston</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <p>But note concern elsewhere that residential proposal at Money Hill puts extra loading on A511 for local movements (IF4).</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the highway authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. Advice provided by and the requirements of Leicestershire County Council on highway matters, is reflected in the housing allocations within the Local Plan.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Tim Abbott</p> | <p>Householder</p> |
| <p>Ensure that the County Council do not forget that there is a part of Leicestershire in the North West as well as other directions</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the highway authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> |
| <p>Appropriate cycling and walking routes should be a development requirement.</p> | <p>Noted. Policy IF4 can be applied and contributions sought for such when planning permission is needed for development.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>George F Stapley</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>No, KPC do not agree. Issues with capacity - the M1 in this area is the most congested part of the motorway and remains at 3 lanes with the potential upgrading to smart motorway.</p> <p>If the strategic rail freight interchange is to proceed, the road planned by the development should be moved away from Kegworth in order to create a genuine bypass. The current plan will result in a service road for the development, which will not remove sufficient traffic from the village, create noise and air pollution and will encourage rat-runs through the village. If the Roxhill development does not proceed then KPC would press for the long awaited bypass to be included in this Local Plan.</p> | <p>It is anticipated that a separate funding stream will be sought for the M1 SMART motorway working but Highway England expect development to contribute towards the improvements at Junction 22 of the M1 if they would have a significant impact on these junctions.</p> <p>The Secretary of State of Transport granted consent for the SRFI on 12 January 2016. Its associated transport and highway infrastructure has been approved under this consent, and in doing so consideration was given to the traffic and highway impact of the proposal as part of the formal examination into the scheme.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Vicky Roe</p> | <p>Kegworth Parish Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>IF4(2)c- Public transport to villages has declined to the point where it no longer provides any viable service. This leads to a vicious circle whereby the service is so inconvenient and inappropriate that it is under-used and hence developers can reasonably argue that their housing will not overstretch existing provision. This may be true but is not the same as saying that 'accessibility by non-car modes is maximised'. A different approach needs to be found to the provision of non-car transport for rural locations or there needs to be a recognition that development is inappropriate in locations where there is no viable public transport routes to at least 'Key service centre' level.</p> | <p>Commercial bus services operate without any direct subsidy and the bus operators are responsible for decisions about the running of these services.</p> <p>County Council have also developed a network of financially subsidised bus services, where passenger numbers are too low for a commercial service to be viable. Policy IF4 seeks appropriate contributions towards the provision of new public transport services or the enhancement of existing services, to serve new development in order to seek to improve accessibility by non-car modes.</p> <p>When considering the 'sustainability' of a settlement and whether it is classed as a 'Sustainable Village' consideration is, and will be given, to the availability of a bus service as well as its frequency.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Lindsay Gene</p> | <p>Appleby Magna Parish Council</p> |
| <p>(a) This has been discussed in questions 34 & 35 but re-iterate</p> <p>(b) Priority for improvement must be the re-instatement of passenger rail links on the National Forest Line and the Trent Junction to Stenson Junction (for Castle Donington).</p> <p>(c) Extension of the Nottingham Tram to EMA</p> <p>(d) Kegworth Bypass</p> <p>(e) A511 Improvements</p> <p>(f) A511 Bardon Road (Bardon Road Bypass)</p> <p>(g) A new 'north/south' road to take traffic from the Ellistown area to the A511</p> <p>(h) Measure to reduce/remove traffic from our Town Centres</p> <p>(i) Remove Hugglescote Cross Roads from the draft Local Plan in light of recent deletion of the project by Leicestershire County Council</p> | <p>See response to Question 34 and Question 35.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Sue McKendrick</p> | <p>Labour Group leader</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>Policy IF4 should be amended to acknowledge that despite the Councils focus on directing most development towards the sustainable settlements, there will be occasions when development in the countryside and in less sustainable settlements will be acceptable and will be approved even though the opportunities for public transport and travel choice are more limited.</p> | <p>It is not considered necessary to amend the wording as suggested. All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together. The 'location' of development is and will be assessed against draft local plan Policies S3 and S4. Policy IF4 will address the transport infrastructure of new development, assessed on its individual merits and circumstances and refers to 'where appropriate'.</p> | | <p>Andrew Thomas</p> | <p>Thomas Taylor Planning</p> |
| <p>Improvement of Junction 13 of the A42 is referred to but there is then nothing about the adverse impact on the local transport network</p> | <p>Policy IF4 requires that account is taken of the impact of development upon the highway network and this will include impact on the local transport network.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Robert Nettleton</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>Comments made by Highways after the Hugglescote Crossroads Consultation make it clear that Leicestershire lacks the resources to improve the A511 as needed to support the SE Coalville development. After receiving strong opposition to the proposals to demolish the community centre and widen the crossroads, Highways admitted that the Authority had no funding identified in its budgets for the delivery of any scheme at the Crossroads. There is no money to acquire land associated with any approved widening scheme or to fund possible planning blight claims. During the consultation the Crossroads Action Group presented independent evidence showing that pressure on Hugglescote Cross Roads is due to rat-running from the congested A511. It should be noted that the "Bardon Link" mentioned in the Highways report is not a "by-pass". It is merely an estate road that will enable access to the 2700+ houses proposed for land off Grange Road. Risk to economic prosperity and housing growth I am concerned that, without significant investment in transport in North West Leicestershire we may never see the economic prosperity housing growth is supposed to deliver for Coalville. In my view the SE Coalville development is being put in jeopardy by the lack of provision for the A511 Bardon Road By-Pass. I am concerned that, in the current climate of austerity, there will be insufficient funds for the additional work needed to develop Highways infrastructure, including all junctions between M1 Junction 22 and A42 Junction 13 I am concerned that this Local Plan may fail to secure funding for transport infrastructure to mitigate the impact of growth in Coalville including interventions necessary to facilitate the "Bardon Link" I believe the Local Plan should include a reassessment by Highways of the viability of a "Bardon By-Pass" scheme. In the absence of a Bardon By-Pass, there should be an assessment</p> | <p>Please see response to these points raised under Question 34.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Mrs Kurpil</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|---|
| <p>by NWLDC of the viability of the SE Coalville development as a means of maximising the opportunities for developer contributions.</p> <p>The Local Plan should include a joint assessment from LCC Highways and NWLDC as to the likelihood of any future Single Local Growth Fund being successful.</p> <p>Community engagement</p> <p>Most of the housing growth planned for SE Coalville takes place within Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish boundary. In the months preceding the consultation, Hugglescote Parish Council made a number of requests to meet with Highways to discuss how transport infrastructure in SE Coalville could maximise community benefit and facilitate housing growth. No engagement took place prior to the formal consultation exercise.</p> <p>I am concerned that, despite Highways decision not to progress the scheme, widening Hugglescote Cross Roads remains in the Local Plan. This is an unnecessary blight on a valued community facility.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Reference has been made above to the potential to secure new transport infrastructure in association with further development to the north of Ibstock. The potential benefits of this development and associated transport infrastructure should be considered further by the Council and the site considered for allocation in the Local Plan.</p> | <p>Previous responses have addressed this suggested allocation and the draft Local Plan has allocated land to the North of Ashby to account for any delays in the delivery of South East Coalville to ensure that the districts housing requirement can be met over the plan period.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Guy Longley,</p> | <p>Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.</p> |
| <p>Specific plans for Ashby road systems and car parks is required as well as Coalville.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the highway authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. Their requirements have been incorporated within the draft Local Plan.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>C Tandy</p> | <p>Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------------------|--|
| <p>The comment about HCR should be removed. The recent decisions made by the Leicestershire County Council on these cross roads should be reflected in the document.</p> <p>There is no data to confirm that there is an issue at Hugglescote Cross Roads. The main vehicle use is through traffic which highlights the issues of using the A511 and Bardon railway crossing. It is already envisaged as part of the growth scheme at Bardon quarry that there will be more rail freight crossing Bardon Road which will compound traffic flow which will encourage more traffic to pass through Hugglescote.</p> <p>The proposed South East Coalville development will bring huge increases in vehicular traffic which will overwhelm the existing infrastructure. The Parish reiterates that no developments should begin until the road network is improved with a "punch through" from the A511 relieving Bardon Road.</p> <p>Communities such as Whitwick, Thringstone Greenhill have more access and exit points and most of the small changes needed to support these developments are likely to be more easily accommodated.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the highway authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district.</p> <p>The Highway Authority's Local Transport Plan has identified a number of key improvement schemes in the district, one of which is the Hugglescote crossroads which is recognised as requiring improvement. However since the publication of the plan, At its meeting on 18 November 2015 Leicestershire County Council's Cabinet agreed that none of the proposed options put forward in the consultation for improvement work at Hugglescote Crossroads be pursued further. It is therefore suggested to delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e).</p> <p>However the plan period runs up to 2031 and it is not unreasonable to expect proposed improvements to Hugglescote crossroad to change 'priority' status and therefore reference should remain within the Local Plan.</p> | <p>delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e)</p> | <p>Simon Weaver</p> | <p>Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish Council</p> |
| <p>The infrastructure does not allow for further housing development. The bus service has been removed, speed restriction required on access roads to the A42 and M42.</p> <p>The infrastructure isn't given the level of priority that's necessary to have sustainable development. We are experiencing harsh cuts to public transport in Moira yet expected to take more housing. We have no local medical services. Schools and doctors don't have capacity for the increases and health are not calling for s106 money to increase capacity of primary health services.</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the infrastructure providers on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Andrea Robinson</p> | <p>Ashby Woulds Town Council</p> |
| <p>Agree that economic growth relies on a effective and efficient transport system to move goods and people. The Local Plan should recognise the emerging regional transport agenda being developed by the Midlands Connect Partnership.</p> | <p>Noted. It is also considered that the approach of the partnership and the principles of the Local Plan are complementary. However it is not considered necessary to make reference to the Midlands Connect Partnership within the Local Plan.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Jon Bottomley</p> | <p>East Midlands Airport</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Page 89/90 - Policy IF4: (1) Should read 'Transport Assessment/Statement', (2e) Does this refer to the Contribution Strategy? Again, refer to above comments.</p> <p>Page 90/91: In addition to LTP3, there should also be some reference to 'Travel plans, transport assessments and statements in decision-taking'</p> <p>Page 91 – Paragraph 8.24: The County Highway Authority notes that the Kegworth by-pass is a developer led scheme associated with the strategic rail freight interchange (Roxhill development); however, we would suggest that such a significant piece of infrastructure be included in the Local Plan.</p> | <p>Agree that it would be useful to add 'Transport Assessments/Statement' to section (1) of Policy IF4 and there would be benefit to identifying that travel plans, transport assessments and statements form part of the decision-taking process.</p> <p>The response reference to 2 (e) is addressed under Question 32.</p> <p>Agree that it would be beneficial to make reference to the Kegworth Bypass and the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange within the supporting text to Policy IF4.</p> | <p>Add 'Transport Assessments/Statement' to section (1) of Policy IF4. Add to supporting text the that travel plans, transport assessments and statements form part of the decision-making process. Make reference to the Kegworth Bypass and the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange within the supporting text</p> | <p>Sharon Wiggins</p> | <p>Leicestershire County Council</p> |
| <p>IF4(2)c- Public transport to villages has declined to the point where it no longer provides any viable service. This leads to a vicious circle whereby the service is so inconvenient and inappropriate that it is under-used and hence developers can reasonably argue that their housing will not overstretch existing provision. This may be true but is not the same as saying that 'accessibility by non-car modes is maximised'. A different approach needs to be found to the provision of non-car transport for rural locations or there needs to be a recognition that development is inappropriate in locations where there is no viable public transport routes to at least 'Key service centre' level.</p> | <p>Commercial bus services operate without any direct subsidy and the bus operators are responsible for decisions about the running of these services.</p> <p>County Council have also developed a network of financially subsidised bus services, where passenger numbers are too low for a commercial service to be viable. Policy IF4 seeks appropriate contributions towards the provision of new public transport services or the enhancement of existing services, to serve new development in order to seek to improve accessibility by non-car modes.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment</p> | <p>Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation</p> |
| <p>Comments made by Highways after the Hugglescote Crossroads Consultation make it clear that Leicestershire lacks the resources to improve the A511 as needed to support the SE Coalville development.</p> <p>After receiving strong opposition to the proposals to demolish the community centre and widen the crossroads, Highways admitted that the Authority had no funding identified in its budgets for the delivery of any scheme at the Crossroads. There is no money to acquire land associated with any approved widening scheme or to fund possible planning blight claims.</p> <p>During the consultation the Crossroads Action Group presented independent evidence showing that pressure on Hugglescote Cross Roads is due to rat-running from the congested A511.</p> <p>It should be noted that the "Bardon Link" mentioned in the Highways report is not a "by-pass". It is merely an estate road that will enable access to the 2700+ houses proposed for land off Grange Road.</p> <p>Risk to economic prosperity and housing growth I am concerned that, without significant investment in transport in North West Leicestershire we may never see the</p> | <p>The District Council consult and engage with the Highway Authority on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district .</p> <p>At its meeting on 18 November 2015 Leicestershire County Council's Cabinet agreed that none of the proposed options put forward in the consultation for improvement work at Hugglescote Crossroads be pursued further. It is therefore suggested to delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e).</p> <p>With respect to a bid for a Single Local Growth Fund this matter will be taken up with County Council Highways.</p> | <p>delete reference to Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4(e)</p> | <p>Mr B Carter</p> | <p>n/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------------|---|
| <p>economic prosperity housing growth is supposed to deliver for Coalville.</p> <p>In my view the SE Coalville development is being put in jeopardy by the lack of provision for the A511 Bardon Road By-Pass.</p> <p>I am concerned that, in the current climate of austerity, there will be insufficient funds for the additional work needed to develop Highways infrastructure, including all junctions between M1 Junction 22 and A42 Junction 13</p> <p>I am concerned that this Local Plan mail fail to secure funding for transport infrastructure to mitigate the impact of growth in Coalville including interventions necessary to facilitate the “Bardon Link”</p> <p>I believe the Local Plan should include a reassessment by Highways of the viability of a “Bardon By-Pass” scheme. In the absence of a Bardon By-Pass, there should bean assessment by NWLDC of the viability of the SE Coalville development as a means of maximising the opportunities for developer contributions.</p> <p>The Local Plan should include a joint assessment from LCC Highways and NWLDC as to the likelihood of any future Single Local Growth Fund being successful.</p> <p>Community engagement</p> <p>Most of the housing growth planned for SE Coalville takes place within Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish boundary. In the months preceding the consultation, Hugglescote Parish Council made a number of requests to meet with Highways to discuss how transport infrastructure in SE Coalville could maximise community benefit and facilitate housing growth. No engagement took place prior to the formal consultation exercise.</p> <p>I am concerned that, despite Highways decision not to progress the scheme, widening Hugglescote Cross Roads remains in the Local Plan. This is an unnecessary blight on a valued community facility.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Policy should be tested against the cumulative impacts of all plan requirements for viability.</p> <p>See comments IF1.</p> | <p>When negotiating and when consideration is given to the provision of infrastructure, due regard is had to viability issues, taking into account the impact of all the infrastructure requirements on viability. In addition, all policies of the Local Plan have been subject to a viability assessment.</p> | | <p>Phil Bamford</p> | <p>Gladman on behalf of Wilton Balmore.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|--|--|
| <p>I do not agree that the current walking and cycling plan provides specific plans for separation of cycling into clearly defined lanes, nor are there incentives to cycle from the main areas of housing in Ashby into town. In particular there are no marked cycle paths and routes (as in Coalville) and there is currently a complete lack of adequate cycle parking in Ashby. Most emphasis should be given to a complete connected infrastructure, including links from Ashby to Hicks Lodge Cycle Centre and Coalville without riding on busy main roads; funding should not be sourced solely from new housing developers</p> | <p>It is not the role of the Local Plan to provide this level of information and the district council has separately prepared a Cycle Strategy for the Coalville area, and work has commenced on the Ashby Strategy.</p> <p>However the Local Plan facilitates and supports cycle provision and cycle routes, i.e. by seeking and securing links within new development and beyond its boundaries to the surrounding area, as well as seeking section 106 monies for the cycle related provision. This issue will also be addressed in the Local Infrastructure Plan.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Ian Retson</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>No as CDPC feels that consideration should be given to include western perimeter road for Castle Donington and that improvements should be made to the A42 including the provision of northern slip road at Junction 1 of A42 (Tonge interchange).</p> | <p>The comments reference the Castle Donington bypass are noted and works are proposed as part of the Park Lane housing development.</p> <p>With reference to necessary strategic roads improvements, the district council consult and engage with Highway England on section 106 contributions, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan, and invite them to ensure transport infrastructure is appropriate for the type of development proposed in the district. The suggested improvements have not been sought from Highways England and there is no evidence that has been made available to suggest these improvements are necessary.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p> | <p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p> |
| <p>The section on Ashby Canal and corresponding policy IF6 is strongly welcomed. However, reference to the historic environment at Ashby Canal which as a whole is a non designated heritage asset, which contains a number of listed buildings (such as locks) along its course, would also be welcomed within policy IF4 in order to strengthen its protection. It is disappointing that there is no recognition of the benefits of this upon the cultural heritage objective in the SA.</p> | <p>All the policies in the Local Plan have to be read together. Policy He1 seeks to conserve and enhance the district's heritage assets. There is also a specific policy (IF6) which seeks to support the restoration of the canal.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Emilie Carr</p> | <p>Historic England</p> |
| <p>We support the policy of reducing the need to travel, but to also include that where this is not possible, opportunities to maximise more sustainable modes of transport will be sought. This will help to reduce NO2 and other pollutants and therefore improve air quality, particularly around the designated Air Quality Management Areas.</p> <p>New development needs to be focussed in areas that have access to services and facilities and are well served by a range of transport alternatives.</p> <p>Could the consideration of 'softer' measures, such as discounted bus ticketing for residents be given.</p> | <p>Noted. Schemes such as discounted bus ticketing for residents can be included within Travel Plans that are submitted as part of planning applications and can contribute to a more sustainable form of travel.</p> | <p>No Change</p> | <p>Grant Butterworth</p> | <p>Leicester City Council</p> |

Policy IF5 – The Leicester to Burton rail line

| Question 38 Do you agree with our suggested approach to the Leicester to Burton rail line? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments; | NWL Response | Any change required | Name | Business or organisation name; |
|--|--|----------------------------|------------------------|--|
| <p>Needs stronger commitment and drive to get this reopened. More political pressure. The desired improvements for Coalville would be helped by this.</p> | <p>Noted and Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and seeks to facilitate this. Any successful re-opening of this line will require input from a range of organisation's and stakeholders beyond the role of the Local Plan.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Lisa Marron</p> | <p>Resident</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mr s Whitehouse</p> | <p>Personal</p> |
| <p>This is a dead duck and has little socio-economic potential. Purely an unambitious parochial affair, it is a distraction. The issue of artificial regional boundaries should be addressed, and the impact of the new West Midlands authority, which will border with NW Leics, needs to be considered properly.</p> | <p>It is considered that this is a relevant local issue and Policy IF5 shows Council support for the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Dr John Blythe</p> | <p>Researcher, University of Birmingham</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Wendy Freer</p> | <p>none</p> |
| <p>This is a vanity project that will only serve a very limited corridor, we do not see that a business case exists for it unless the footprint can be widened with the proper integration into local bus services.</p> | <p>There is no passenger rail travel within the district however circumstances may change for there to be a case for the re-opening of this line, for example, population growth, proposed HS2. Rail travel would provide an alternative mode of travel to the car. The opening of the line could provide sustainable transport opportunities.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Nigel Garnham</p> | <p>Packington Nook Residents Association</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| Include provision of stations at key locations along the route e.g. Moira for Conkers/National Forest centre | Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. This policy also supports the provision of new stations at appropriate locations. As there are no firm proposals in place for the rail route it would not be appropriate to identify specific sites for station. | No change. | Mark Chadbourn | Emerald Eye Ltd |
| The money this will cost would be far better spent in subsidising local bus services | The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic”. | No change. | Alison Wright | Heather Parish Council |
| An argument can still be made that the Ivanhoe Rail Line should be upgraded to a passenger line and the possibility should not be lost by proposed developments and provision for possible stations should be accommodated. There would be comparatively modest costs in doing this but a subsidy would be needed for some time but the Robin Hood line shows how quickly such commuter links can become self funding. This might be difficult in today’s financial climate but no development should be permitted which would hinder access to the line for potential halts for passenger pick up. It may also be possible to get infrastructure funding for this as a trade off for HS2. | <p>There is no passenger rail travel within the district however circumstances may change for there to be a case for the re-opening of this line, for example, population growth, proposed HS2. Rail travel would provide an alternative mode of travel to the car. This is a local issue that should be addressed in the Local Plan. The opening of the line could provide sustainable transport opportunities.</p> <p>Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic”.</p> | No change. | Terry Kirby | Chairman local access forum |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | None | none |
| Do it its been talked about for too long. | Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic. | no change. | David Harris | Pyrotect Ltd |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| The Town Council supports the reinstatement of passenger services on the Leicester to Burton Rail line and this support is in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. | Noted and Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic. | No change. | Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk | Ashby de la Zouch Town Council |
| The reinstatement of the rail line is widely supported in helping to make connections to Burton, Leicester and the intervening settlements. | Noted and Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic. | No change. | Angela Cornell | Fisher German |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Andrew Stone | NA |
| The Leicester-Burton line would be far more beneficial than the HS2 line, and cost far less. It is a vital component of any traffic plan for the area and a strong case should be made for its re-opening. | Noted and Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic. | No change. | Mary Lorimer | Not applicable |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | no change. | Measham Parish Council | Measham Parish Council |
| In principle but see previous comment | Noted and Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic. | No change. | Edward Hines | N/A |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| I agree with the Council's decision to support the re-opening of the Leicester to Burton line, but realistically, I do not believe it will ever happen. The line has been used for occasional freight traffic in recent years, but by now, the line will probably need a considerable upgrade before it could even be considered safe for passenger traffic. I also doubt the volume of passenger traffic would be sufficient to justify its re-opening. Stage 1 of the Ivanhoe Line (Loughborough to Leicester) required little more than the provision of intermediate station facility, as the track was already in use for passenger traffic. The Leicester to Burton line is an entirely different matter. | <p>There is no passenger rail travel within the district however circumstances may change for there to be a case for the re-opening of this line, for example, population growth, proposed HS2. Rail travel would provide an alternative mode of travel to the car. This is a local issue that should be addressed in the Local Plan. The opening of the line could provide sustainable transport opportunities.</p> <p>Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | No change. | Stephen Jackson | None |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | David Bigby | Private individual |
| <p>But include stations at Moira for Hicks Lodge & Conkers both important leisure destinations.</p> <p>It could be reopened as a supertam or even a driverless system similar to London Docklands</p> | <p>Noted. Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. The provision of stations at appropriate locations will be supported.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | No change. | Paul McCaffrey | NA |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Lance Wiggins | Landmark Planning |
| The National Forest Company supports the inclusion of this Policy. The reinstatement of passenger services along this line is a long-held ambition. | Support welcomed. | No change. | Philip Metcalfe | The National Forest Company |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Mr. & Mrs Loveless | Retired |

| | | | | |
|---|--|------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>I would like to believe that the Local Plan will support the reinstatement of passenger transport along the Leicester to Burton railway line.</p> <p>I do not see the Plan addressing the barriers and enablers to this project which will fail unless all possible innovative solutions, including using the line for a tram, are considered.</p> | <p>The Local Plan is a land use plan and Policy IF5 shows the Council's support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | No change. | Theresa Eynon | alderoak |
| <p>Ivanhoe line desperately needed to help improve our town and opportunities for our town</p> | <p>Policy IF5 shows the Council's support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | No change. | Michael Wyatt | Mikewyatt1@hotmail.co.uk |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Mr. j Lewis | 1950 |
| <p>The Ivanhoe/National Forest line is long overdue. The worry that it would have to be subsidised may be true, but has the ongoing subsidy, or 'investment' in roads been taken into account? How much is that and how much of it would be saved by people using the railway instead?</p> | <p>Policy IF5 shows the Council's support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | No change. | Steve Johnson | YYYY |
| <p>It would be of great benefit to the area and should be pushed for in every way possible.</p> | <p>Policy IF5 shows the Council's support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | No change. | Lesley Birtwistle | not applicable |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Mrs Paula Ashfield | Paula Ashfield |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Hugh James | n/a |

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| <p>Yes - I live in Coalville and it is very frustrating to have to drive to Loughborough or Tamworth in order to pick someone up from the train or to take a h journey oneself.</p> | <p>Policy IF5 shows the Council's support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Olwen Woolcock</p> | <p>The Ecclesiastical Parish of Hugglescote with Donington Ellistown and Snibston</p> |
| <p>Much of current housing growth in Ashby predicated on strategic 'transport choice' corridor (inc. rail link.) Evaluation of NF line should include environmental benefits of reduced road travel and social benefits of allowing greater freedom of movement to work and study for those without access to personal transport.</p> | <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Tim Abbott</p> | <p>Householder</p> |
| <p>Consider trams as well.</p> | <p>Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic. Reopening of the rail line would allow consideration to be given to the re-use/adaption of existing infrastructure and to utilise existing links and the wider network.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Jane Tebbatt</p> | <p>Quarrying</p> |
| <p>It seems to us that it will not be possible to improve congestion in Coalville Town Centre and reinstate the railway line unless the whole area is pedestrianised.</p> <p>It also does not seem to make it an economically viable project to have the funds to spend that amount on a railway when some local villages, of which Heather is one, doesn't even have a bus service and the subsidy was withdrawn duer to lack of funding!</p> | <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| <p>I agree that re-opening the Ivanhoe line would be an excellent idea for improving Ashby's transport connections</p> | <p>Policy IF5 shows the Council's support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Elaine Robinson</p> | <p>Not applicable</p> |
| <p>As we have no "joined- up" transport to a railway, the potential of the Ivanhoe Line is enormous. Just look at the actual passenger numbers in comparison to those predicted for the re-opened and new lines and stations around Edinburgh and Glasgow.</p> | <p>Policy IF5 shows the Council's support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>George F Stapley</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>The council should continue to lobby for the re-opening of the Ivanhoe line, and passenger stations in Coalville and Ashby.</p> | <p>Policy IF5 shows the Council's support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>the Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Malcom Allsop</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>I would like to add that any development of this line should also be accompanied by development of the cycleways beside the line to link up the area of the district by both rail and cycleway with one project. Cycling beside the rail line on a dedicated cycle and walk way is much safer than road use. The rail line is also very direct and flat, which is equally useful for cyclists and would encourage cycle use to and from the stations also, as part of the general aim in the planning objectives to reduce car reliance.</p> | <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> <p>The issues raised are noted and the benefits of a dedicated cycleway are appreciated. It is suggested that it would be more appropriate to consider these issues further down the line should plans be put in place to reopen the line, with contact made with rail providers and stakeholders involved in the provision of cycleways.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Alison Saxby</p> | <p>N/A</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| <p>(a) Of course yes! We await a report to Leicestershire County Council in the near future.</p> <p>(b) Wording in paragraph 8.25 is incorrect. There is a freight rail line via NWL between Trent Junction and Stenson Junction (Castle Donington)</p> | <p>Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> <p>It is noted that there is also a freight-only rail line from Long Eaton to Willington that runs through the district and it is suggested that Para 8.25 is amended to reflect this.</p> | <p>Amend Para 8.25 to make reference to the other freight line within the district that runs from Long Eaton to Willington.</p> | <p>Sue McKendrick</p> | <p>Labour Group leader</p> |
| <p>We support the plans aspiration to see the line re-opened to passenger traffic and urge the council to campaign with more vigour and review the economics of re-opening it in the light of the increase in experience of light railways obtained in the major cities (Croydon, Sheffield, Nottingham, Manchester, Newcastle etc) over the last few years.</p> | <p>Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Roger Etchells</p> | <p>Roger Etchells & Company</p> |
| <p>I would like to believe that the Local Plan will support the reinstatement of passenger transport along the Leicester to Burton railway line.</p> <p>I do not see the Plan addressing the barriers and enablers to this project which will fail unless all possible innovative solutions, including using the line for a tram, are considered.</p> | <p>The Local Plan is a land use based documents therefore can only deal with such matters. Policy IF5 supports the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and seeks to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. In addition it supports the provision of stations in appropriate location.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mrs Kurpil</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>Do not support National Forest Line. Investment should be on bus services. Any investment in local rail should be for freight.</p> | <p>Noted. The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>C Tandy</p> | <p>Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|--|--|
| <p>The Airport supports the proposed development of HS2. Also recognise the opportunities for the restoration of rail connections within the district and support the approach set out in the Local Plan.</p> | <p>Support welcomed.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Jon Bottomley</p> | <p>East Midlands Airport</p> |
| <p>Page 91/92: Rail infrastructure: Leicestershire County Council is working with NWLDC to understand the impacts of the Burton to Leicester Line through the rail study. Following the conclusion of this study we will continue to work with NWLDC based on the evidence emerging from the study.</p> <p>Please note Leicestershire County Council, together with partners, has commissioned the development of a rail strategy. The outcomes of this work will help us to understand and plan for the impact of HS2 on NWL District and on the County as a whole. As this work progresses we will continue to work with NWLDC to ensure we maximise the opportunities arising from HS2.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Sharon Wiggins</p> | <p>Leicestershire County Council</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment</p> | <p>Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation</p> |
| <p>I would like to believe that the Local Plan will support the reinstatement of passenger transport along the Leicester to Burton railway line.</p> <p>I do not see the Plan addressing the barriers and enablers to this project which will fail unless all possible innovative solutions, including using the line for a tram, are considered.</p> | <p>The Local Plan is a land use based documents therefore can only deal with such matters. Policy IF5 supports the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and seeks to ensure new development will not prejudice the route. In addition it supports the provision of stations in appropriate location.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mr B Carter</p> | <p>n/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|--|---|
| <p>Yes. I would like to add that any development of this line should also be accompanied by development of the cycleways beside the line to link up the area of the district by both rail and cycleway with one project. Cycling beside the rail line on a dedicated cycle and walk way is much safer than road use. The rail line is also very direct and flat, which is equally useful for cyclists and would encourage cycle use to and from the stations also, as part of the general aim in the planning objectives to reduce car reliance.</p> | <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> <p>The issues raised are noted and the benefits of a dedicated cycleway are appreciated. It is suggested that it would be more appropriate to consider these issues further down the line should plans be put in place to reopen the line, with contact made with rail providers and stakeholders involved in the provision of cycleways.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mrs. A Saxby</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Question 38 - The policy of continued promotion of the re-opening of the Leicester to Burton rail line is supported. Financial contributions from new housing development at Ashby should be secured in order to enhance its practicality and to improve the sustainability of the existing and new development. New housing allocations to the south of the town, within walking distance of the station, should form part of the Plan's proposals for a balanced and sustainable development of the Town of Ashby.</p> | <p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic. Sustainable transport infrastructure is sought as part of housing development proposals across the district.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Sigma Plan</p> | <p>Sigma Plan on behalf of Hallam Land Management</p> |
| <p>I do not agree that the proposed lukewarm support for the Leicester to Burton rail link is sufficient to meet future transport needs of an expanding and ageing population at the heart of the National Forest tourist area. There is immense potential to support these aspects of the District's economy</p> | <p>Policy IF5 shows the Council support for the reinstatement of passengers services on the Leicester to Burton line and to ensure new development will not prejudice the route.</p> <p>The Council is working with Leicestershire County Council to look at the potential for re-opening the line to passenger traffic.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Ian Retson</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Yes however HS2 and Roxhill developments should be considered together and not presumed as approved at this stage.</p> | <p>Noted. It is agreed that consideration be given to the relationship of such a proposal with HS2 and this is an issue that has been acknowledged and taken on board in work that is being undertaken. However the Roxhill development proposes freight travel and not a passenger line.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p> | <p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p> |

Policy IF6 – Ashby Canal

| Question 39 | NWL Response | Any changes required | Name | Business or organisation name; |
|---|---|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Do you agree with our suggested approach to the Ashby Canal? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments; | | | | |
| Yes | Noted | No change | Lisa Marron | Resident |
| Yes | Noted | No change | Mr s Whitehouse | Personal |
| Yes | Noted | No change | Dr John Blythe | Researcher, University of Birmingham |
| Yes | Noted | No change | Wendy Freer | none |
| Yes | Noted | No change. | Nigel Garnham | Packington Nook Residents Association |
| Yes | Noted | No change. | Mark Chadbourn | Emerald Eye Ltd |
| Use the money from Leicester to Burton rail link to support this. It will benefit the community more than a train service. | Support welcomed. The specific issues raised are beyond the remit of the Local Plan. | No change. | Alison Wright | |
| Page 92 Item 8.31 The cost in crossing the A42 means that this is not a viable exercise. Nor sadly would it be value for money. | The Local Plan seeks to ensure that development would not prejudice any future or potential restoration of the Ashby Canal. The issue of funding is one that would need to be addressed outside the scope of the Local Plan. | No change | Steve Palmer | NA |
| The Ashby Canal project is going to enhance the area as a tourism destination. The land along the proposed route has been acquired and whilst funding may mean its completion may be some way off, no development should be permitted that will hinder its potential development. | Support welcomed. | No change | Terry Kirby | Chairman local access forum |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | david harris | Pyrotect Ltd |
| I do not think this is good use of public funds. Unfortunately the restored section at Moira does not connect to the rest of the Ashby Canal. To even consider making that connection does not make any sense financially. If there is to be a new canal wharf it should be at Snarestone | Noted. | No change. | Colin Eaton | Colin Eaton |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Andrew Stone | NA |
| The provision of the canal to Measham would be preferred working back from the Museum to Snarestone. Thus connecting with the village and local facilities. | Noted. Such issues are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and relate to the detailed implementation of any restoration works. However policy does seek to ensure new development does not prejudice the restoration of the canal. | No change. | Measham Parish Council | Measham Parish Council |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Edward Hines | N/A |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| I am surprised that reference has not been made here to the threat that HS2 poses to the Ashby Canal restoration. As I understand it, whilst the Snarestone to Measham section may eventually be completed, connecting through to Donisthorpe would be very unlikely if/when HS2 goes ahead. | HS2 is a Government led project. The Council has made representations on the proposed 'preferred route' and have made comments regarding what the Council believe to be a negative impact on the district in terms of businesses, tourism, countryside and residential homes. However as no final route has yet been decided upon it is considered to keep this policy and its wording within the Local Plan at this time. | No change. | Stephen Jackson | None |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | David Bigby | Private individual |
| Make sure that HS2 have to provide access under HS2 and the A 42 and build a section of canal while they are working in the area. NWL will not get any other benefit from HS2 | The issues raised are beyond the remit of the Local Plan. It would be more appropriate for such comments to be submitted through the specific 'HS2 Consultation' | No change. | Paul McCaffrey | NA |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Lance Wiggins | Landmark Planning |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Mr. & Mrs Loveless | Retired |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Theresa Eynon | alderoak |
| needs to be completed as soon as possible | Noted. | No change. | Mr. j Lewis | 1950 |
| The Council's policy for the next 16 years should be far more ambitious , get the canal reinstated from Snarestone to DONISTHORPE , not just to Measham HS2 MUST provide the money to achieve this , bringing pleasure boats into the already built marina at the heart of the National Forest (Conkers) would provide a massive boost to tourism . | Noted. However these are issues are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and can only be taken forward when details of the final route for HS2 is known later in 2016. | No change. | Michael Ball | Individual |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Steve Johnson | YYYY |
| Again, this is an important asset to the District and its extension should be strongly supported. | Support welcomed. | No change. | Lesley Birtwistle | not applicable |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Mrs Paula Ashfield | Paula Ashfield |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Hugh James | n/a |
| Ashby Canal Trust support Proposal IF6 to protect the original route of the Ashby Canal as show on the Main Policies Map, Inset Map 17, and Inset Map 18. We disagree with the proposal only for the following reason: We recommend that in addition to the protection of the historic route there should include a provision for an alternative diversion, along the old railway line, currently the Ashby Woulds Heritage Trail. It is therefore the Trust's view that both routes should be protected. The majority of the railway route is owned by Leicestershire County Council. A diversion from this at each end will connect to the existing or planned Ashby Canal lengths. | Noted and it is considered that it would be beneficial for additional wording to be included within the policy to enable the provision of an alternative route for the canal subject to it being demonstrated that the existing route is no longer appropriate. | Amend policy IF6 wording to support the provision of an alternative route for the Ashby Canal. | Brian Waring | Ashby Canal Trust |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>The protected route would require some additional land acquisitions along the railway route, particularly around the Saltersford Brook, as well as those required at each end of the railway route. These would need to be identified and included in any formal acceptance of this diversion. The new towing path on either route would provide a link between Measham and the existing canal length at Donisthorpe.</p> <p>Whichever route is ultimately selected, it will require an application for the necessary powers under the Transport and Works Act Order process in due course.</p> <p>ACT has no objections to the original route, but there may be some concern about stability and headroom under road crossings due to past mining operations.</p> <p>We consider it important to preserve this alternative route to safeguard the future of the canal restoration, and ultimately maximise the social, economic and environmental benefits of the Ashby Canal restoration.</p> <p>A plan representation of the proposed route has been sent by email to the Planning Policy Team Manager at North West Leicestershire District Council.</p> <p>Note:</p> <p>Ashby Canal Trust includes representatives from Ashby Canal Association, Canal and River Trust, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, Ideal Country Homes, Inland Waterways Association, Leicestershire County Council, Moira Furnace Museum Trust, National Forest Charitable Trust, North West Leicestershire District Council and others with particular knowledge or experience.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Consider reinstatement of former tramway from Willesley Basin along Willesley Lane as part of cycle / footway provision (to match work done by National Trust near Ticknall / Staunton Harold) as part of transport / spa heritage.</p> | <p>Support welcomed. However the issues raised are not within the remit of the Local Plan.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Tim Abbott</p> | <p>Householder</p> |
| <p>But do not sell off other sites to developers in exchange for funding to improve the canal.</p> <p>The Measham site is going to create a section of the canal but it will become a lake without connection to the main Canal and therefore seems rather short sighted!</p> | <p>Support welcomed. However the issues raised are not within the remit of the Local Plan. However it is the intention for Measham to be connected to the canal route and it will be a new terminus instead of the current one at Snarestone.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Jane Tebbatt</p> | <p>Quarrying</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> |
| <p>Ambition too weakly stated to restore the canal to join up at Donisthorpe and connect Moira to the system.</p> | <p>Policy IF6 states support for the project to restore the Ashby Canal. The specific details of how the project is to be implemented are not issues that are within the remit of the Local Plan.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>George F Stapley</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <p>Our comments cover paragraphs 8.31 to 8.36, Policy IF6: Ashby Canal, Question 39, the Policies Map and Inset Maps 17 & 18, and also the Sustainability Appraisal paragraph 5.3.11.</p> <p>The Ashby Canal is a historic waterway and a valuable amenity and recreational corridor, providing leisure boating, walking, angling, cycling and nature conservation benefits to the area. Its restoration north of Snarestone by Leicestershire County Council assisted by the Ashby Canal Trust and the Ashby Canal Association is fully supported by IWA. IWA provides advice through a nominee director on the Ashby Canal Trust, and its Waterway Recovery Group subsidiary provides voluntary labour to assist the restoration.</p> <p>8.31 to 8.36</p> <p>The description of the canal is supported, with two suggested amendments:</p> <p>8.34. The title of the TWA Order should include “Canal” after “Ashby de la Zouch”.</p> <p>8.36. Add an update on restoration progress. After “August 2009.” add “The restored section has since been extended to 600 metres with a new bridge and temporary terminus completed in 2015.”</p> <p>Policy IF6: Ashby Canal</p> <p>IWA supports this policy which will safeguard the route of the canal for further restoration, subject to clarification of the protected route on the policies map (see below).</p> <p>Question 39</p> <p>IWA agrees with the suggested approach to the Ashby Canal, subject to clarification of the protected route on the policies map (see below).</p> <p>Policies Map and Inset Maps 17 & 18</p> <p>The route covered by Policy IF6 is shown partly on the main Policies Map at a small scale, and partly in more detail on Inset Map 17: Measham and Oakthorpe and Inset Map 18: Moira and Donisthorpe.</p> <p>This fragmentation of the route into 4 sections on 3 maps at 3 different scales, with part of the route obscured by the Key to Map 18, is not ideal and could compromise the effectiveness of the policy. IWA suggests that consideration be given to repositioning the Key on Map 18 and also to extending the</p> | <p>Agree to the text changes that are suggested. It is considered that it would be beneficial for additional wording to be included within the policy to enable the provision of an alternative route for the canal subject to it being demonstrated that the existing route is no longer appropriate.</p> | <p>Amend policy IF6 wording to support the provision of an alternative route for the Ashby Canal. In addition to the following changes: -</p> <p>8.34. The title of the TWA Order should include “Canal” after “Ashby de la Zouch”.</p> <p>8.36. Add an update on restoration progress. After “August 2009.” add “The restored section has since been extended to 600 metres with a new bridge and temporary terminus completed in 2015.”</p> | <p>Philip G. Sharpe</p> | <p>Inland Waterway Association</p> |
|---|--|---|-------------------------|------------------------------------|

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------|------------|----------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>area covered by either Map 18 or Map 17 to eliminate the small gap between them.</p> <p>The route identified on the policies map and insets between Snarestone and Measham is that authorised in the TWA Order, which diverts significantly from the historic route. North of the A42 at Measham to where it links up with the already restored section of canal through Moira, the route shown is the historic route, and this distinction should be made clear in the text.</p> <p>As the original line around Oakthorpe has been affected by past mining subsidence the canal will need to be reinstated at a lower level connected by new locks at each end, and it is possible that deviations from the historic line will be needed to provide the necessary clearances at road crossings and elsewhere. It is expected that this will be determined in due course through preparatory work for a further TWA Order.</p> <p>Meanwhile, a survey and engineering feasibility study of an alternative route utilising part of the disused railway line has been carried out by LCC officers, as shown on the attached annotated air photo:</p> <p>“The Connection”, Ashby Canal Restoration, A42 to Donisthorpe.</p> <p>Further information about this is available through LCC’s Ashby Canal Project Officer.</p> <p>Although this route would also require changes of level, it would need fewer new road bridges and much of it is already in LCC ownership. However, other factors may be relevant and no decision has yet been taken about the optimum alignment. In these circumstances it would be most helpful to the restoration project if the Draft Local Plan could be amended to include an additional reference to this alternative restoration route.</p> <p>Ideally, both routes might be shown on the policies map and insets to best protect the restoration project. Alternatively, a separate map might be included showing the full extent of the protected routes at a single scale, to aid understanding of the areas to which Policy IF6 applies.</p> | | | | |
| Yes | Support welcomed. | No change. | Alison Saxby | N/A |
| Yes! | Support welcomed. | No change. | Sue McKendrick | Labour Group leader |
| Yes. | Support welcomed. | | C Tandy | Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Policy IF6: Ashby Canal</p> <p>The Trust owns and operates some 2.2km of the Ashby Canal within North West Leicestershire, from Gopsall Wharf Bridge (Br. 58) to a point just north of Snarestone, which currently represents the limit of the navigable canal. We support the aims of Leicestershire County Council to restore the canal from its current terminus towards Measham and Moira.</p> <p>Local Plans can play an important role in helping to safeguard the routes of canal restoration projects, and are an important tool in helping to support such projects.</p> <p>The Canal & River Trust is therefore pleased to see that the Local Plan provides explicit support for the continued restoration of the Ashby Canal northwards to Measham. Policy IF6 should assist in restricting development proposals which would hinder or prevent restoration of the canal or the provision of canalside facilities which would help to support the use and operation of the restored canal.</p> <p>It is important to note that restoration of the canal may require deviations from the original route of the canal- it is important to ensure that the Plan correctly identifies the proposed restoration route (and not only the historic route) in order to ensure that all proposals which have the potential to affect restoration are fully assessed. We would suggest that you liaise with Leicestershire County Council's Ashby Canal Project Officer for further advice on the current position regarding the restoration project and the anticipated route it will take.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the canal is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and consequently development proposals must also take proper account of the ecological interest and importance of the canal.</p> <p>We would comment that whilst the canal is generally clearly highlighted on the relevant inset maps, it is less clear on the main Policies Map, due to the small scale required, and the Plan might benefit from an additional map to more clearly show the full extent of the proposed restoration route (and the historic route where this deviates), in order to provide greater clarity as to where Policy IF6 will be applicable.</p> | <p>Support is welcomed. However at this stage there is not enough certainty or details of deliverability of what a proposed alternative route would be for the canal. It is therefore not considered appropriate to include such a route on the Local Plan map. Furthermore there is no planning permission in place for an alternative route. However it is recognised that these details may emerge and become clearer over time. It is therefore suggested that the policy wording is amended to accommodate this and allow for consideration to be given to any proposed route away from the historical route subject to it being demonstrated that the existing route is no longer appropriate.</p> | <p>Amend policy IF6 wording to support the provision of an alternative route for the Ashby Canal.</p> | <p>Ian Dickinson</p> | <p>Canal & River Trust</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment</p> | <p>Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mrs. A Saxby</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Support welcomed.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p> | <p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p> |

Policy IF7 – Parking provision and new development

| Question 40 Do you agree with our suggested approach to parking provision as part of new development? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments; | NWL Response | Any change required | Name | Business or organisation name; |
|--|--|----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Given the lack of alternative means of transport to car think that the requirements for new developments to have ample parking is necessary. | Noted | No change | Lisa Marron | Resident |
| No, two parking spaces per dwelling is inadequate. If you drive round any of the new build estates you will see that the roads are much narrower than they used to be. Two parking spaces is never enough even for a two bed semi. Most houses have at least two cars and where do the visitors park. I believe it should be 3 parking spaces as a minimum and the estate roads should be wider to allow for on street parking and flow of traffic | It is important that there is a balance between the demand for parking whilst maintaining the principles of sustainable development. For example, a reduction in the availability of parking spaces is a means of encouraging the use of alternative means of transport. In addition, higher parking standards can have an adverse impact on the design and layout of development, creating a car dominated residential development that is not 'pedestrian friendly'. Although the Local Plan uses the Leicestershire County Council's 6C's Design Guide as a starting point, locally set parking standards are proposed which overall set a higher parking standard than that contained in the 6Cs. However it is suggested that 3 spaces should not be sought unless a property is four bed or more in order to achieve the sustainable balance of the development. | No change | Mr s Whitehouse | Personal |
| Though promoting walkways and cycle paths should be considered...Ashby residents are getting lazier and won't walk into town. | Support welcomed. Policy IF4 seeks the provision of footpath links and cycle links, as part of new development. All policies in the Local Plan have to be read together. | No change | Dr John Blythe | Researcher, University of Birmingham |
| Yes | Noted | No change | Nigel Garnham | Packington Nook Residents Association |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>You make no mention of electric vehicle charging points. I drive an electric vehicle and I base my leisure visits on where I can charge my car while I am visiting somewhere. If you check current maps that show the locations of electric vehicle charge points you will see a huge gap in the area of Ashby, coalville, Swad and Burton . If you want to encourage sustainable travel and new visitors to the area then this is something to consider. The charge points can easily be added to existing car parks to offer that incentive to outside visitors. The vehicles do not add to local air pollution or noise pollution and are increasing in popularity. The majority of charging is done at home but to have a destination you can charge at while visiting extends owners possibilities. Personally I visit Birmingham a lot because I get 3 hours free parking and charging. I could spend that time and money in Ashby but I can't charge my car while I'm drinking coffee!</p> | <p>Planning cannot require people to use low emission vehicles but can only try and ensure development is located so that people have the option to use alternatives. National Planning Policy (NPPF, Para. 34) encourages the use of sustainable transport modes to ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel can be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. Para. 35 of the NPPF states that "developments should be located and designed where practical to incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles". The provision of electric charging points is set out in National Policy and therefore does not need to be repeated in local policy.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Stella Farrar</p> | <p>none</p> |
| <p>Visitor parking must be allowed for, on top of the mandatory requirements already suggested.</p> | <p>Policy has been prepared in line with the Leicestershire County Council 6C's Design Guide. When looking at parking standards this document has not only considered car ownership but also visitor parking allowances. The standards have therefore been prepared to accommodate a need for visitor parking.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Stephen Saxby</p> | <p>None</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Noted</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mark Chadbourn</p> | <p>Emerald Eye Ltd</p> |
| <p>Yes</p> | <p>Noted</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Alison Wright</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> |
| <p>Item 8.39</p> <p>There is no money available to provide an improved environment for cycling. The few routes implemented by a well received grant did not provide safe routes. Almost all we have require cyclists to join narrow, dangerous and crowded roads. The current provision of cycle easy is patchy at best with many dangerous on road sections. There is NO secure cycle provision. Other than the facilities recently created by the grant, NWLDC have been spectacularly absent when it comes to cycle provision.</p> <p>Cycle parking is not required in residential areas, new or old. Parking provision is required in retail and employment developments.</p> <p>The plan should not allow any developments in areas without pavements or off single carriageway roads.</p> | <p>Some of the issues raised are not within the remit of the Local Plan and are matters that would fall within the responsibility of the Highway Authority. However the Local Plan has been prepared taking into account the guidance contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs' Deigns Guide, which includes advice on car and cycle parking requirements and it would be beneficial to make reference cycle parking within the supporting text also. Furthermore Policy IF4 seeks the provision of cycle links as part of new development, in order to create a network of cycleways across the district.</p> | <p>Make reference to cycle parking provision within the supporting text and the detailed guidance contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs Design Guide.</p> | <p>Steve Palmer</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <p>Cycling in the area around Ashby is dangerous so if you want more people to cycle invest in cycle ways.</p> <p>If you think that two parking spaces for new houses is sufficient visit some of the recent housing developments in Ashby with cars all along the roads.</p> | <p>Policy IF4 seeks the provision of cycle links as part of new development, in order to create a network of cycleways across the district.</p> <p>The Local Plan has been prepared taking into account the guidance contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs' Design Guide, which includes advice on car and cycle parking requirements. Policy IF7 identifies the factors to be taken into account when determining the level of parking provision that would normally be sought.</p> | No change. | David Harris | Pyroprotect Ltd |
| <p>The approach is supported, however within the draft Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plan there is an expectation that Travel Plans are specific for that development and the needs of people living in that location, rather than the generic Travel Plans often produced at the current time. The Town Council would like a similar expectation built in to the Local Plan.</p> | <p>The Leicestershire County Council 6C's Design Guide provides a threshold for residential development, as well as other thresholds for other types of development, identifying when a Travel Plan should be submitted for a proposed development. In addition, Policy IF4 seeks the provision of Travel Plans which have to be appropriate for the application that they accompany, and address the specific circumstances of the proposal.</p> | No change. | Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk | Ashby de la Zouch Town Council |
| <p>Policy IF7(2)(a) is not supported. It is considered that specifying 3 parking spaces be provided for 4 bedroom dwellings is not appropriate in many locations and this prospective element should be removed from the policy.</p> | <p>The Local Plan has been prepared taking into account the guidance contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs' Design Guide, which includes advice on car and cycle parking requirements. Policy IF7 identifies the factors such as the size and type of house provided to which regard will be had in agreeing the provision of parking.</p> | No change. | Angela Cornell | Fisher German |
| Yes | Noted | No change. | Andrew Stone | NA |
| <p>Agree to most, but feel regardless of the number of 3, 4, or 5 bedroom houses all properties should have parking spaces accordingly regardless of having good access to other modes of transport.</p> | <p>Noted. The Local Plan has been prepared taking into account the guidance contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6C's Design Guide, which includes advice on car and cycle parking requirements. Policy IF7 identifies the factors such as the size and type of house provided to which regard will be had in agreeing the provision of parking.</p> | No change. | Measham Parish Council | Measham Parish Council |
| Yes | Noted | No change. | Edward Hines | N/A |
| Yes | Noted | No change | David Bigby | Private individual |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| No mention of improved parking facilities in the town centre why not? | The Local Plan is a land use document and one of its overall aims is to seek to ensure that development is located in accessible locations and facilitate and seek contributions for improvements for walking, cycling and public transport, as well as highway improvements. Policy IF7 is specifically concerned with parking as part of new development. In addition, the council is currently undertaking a review of parking provision across the district which may address some of these concerns. | No change | K.V Percival | NA |
| Yes | Noted | No change. | Paul McCaffrey | NA |
| Yes | Noted | No change. | Lance Wiggins | Landmark Planning |
| Yes | Noted | No change. | Mr. & Mrs Loveless | Retired |
| I have serious concerns about the proposal to "agree to reduced car parking provision where the proposed development has, or is proposed to have, good access to other modes of transport". This will put the Planning Authority in a weak position when challenging developers over a lack of parking provision. The re-opened Leicester to Burton line would have a station in the heart of the SE Coalville Development. A whole swathe of houses in Bagworth were planned and built on the promise that this line would create a sustainable transport solution. It never happened. | This approach follows the principles contained within national policy and also advice within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs Design Guide. In agreeing parking provision on a development, limited consideration would only be able to be given to a mode of transport if it does not yet exist or hasn't the benefit of planning permission and other relevant approvals. | No change. | Theresa Eynon | alderoak |
| Yes | Noted. | No change | Mr. j Lewis | 1950 |
| I have heard of developments where the residents agree not to have a car. This could be a viable option in some cases. | Noted. | No change. | Steve Johnson | YYYY |
| I believe that adequate parking space is essential even when there is good access to public transport. On many modern estates at the present time, parking provision is inadequate and this results in inappropriate and unsafe parking on the roads in an estate, often on road humps because there is nowhere else. | Noted. The Local Plan has been prepared taking into account the guidance contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs' Deigns Guide, which includes advice on car and cycle parking requirements. Policy IF7 identifies the level of parking provision and in agreeing the amount of parking provision to be made as part of the development regard will be had to factors such as the size and type of house provided. | No change. | Lesley Birtwistle | not applicable |
| Yes | Noted. | No change. | Mrs Paula Ashfield | Paula Ashfield |
| Yes | Noted. | No change. | Hugh James | n/a |
| IF 7 does not address the need to create new parking areas to serve town centre in Ashby with a substantially increased population. Is limited to new development proposals. | This is a matter that would be more appropriately addressed within the Ashby Neighbourhood Plan. | No change | Tim Abbott | Householder |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <p>We do not understand the fixation that authorities have on cycling as a viable alternative to cars/public transport. Every survey that we are aware of shows that the age of the population is increasing and that there is a decline in 25 - 39 year olds. Why would you want to increase the number of OAP's cycling - many of them find it difficult enough to walk places let alone cycle.</p> <p>It just doesn't make any sense.</p> | <p>Policy IF4 seeks the provision of a range of highway infrastructure, including cycle links, footpath links, public transport provision, as well as road improvements, as part of new development. Policy IF7 seeks to ensure the provision of adequate parking provision as part of new development.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> | <p>Heather Parish Council</p> |
| <p>I believe a planning application should consider the location of the development and vehicle reliance before stipulating the number of parking spaces that are appropriate. If developments are in rural locations where personal vehicle reliance is high more parking spaces would be necessary. Visitor spaces would also need to be additional. If insufficient parking is provided the result is cars get parked on the main roads of the development and the access routes or across pavements. This can result in blocked access for emergency services to get to households or insufficient causeway space for pedestrians with pushchairs or wheelchair users. This is not acceptable in a newly purposely designed development. It needs to be accepted that cars are used if there is not sufficient public transport with effective links to all areas of the district and parking is required for these vehicles to keep the roads safe for all users.</p> | <p>The Local Plan has been prepared taking into account the guidance contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs' Deigns Guide, which includes advice on car and cycle parking requirements. Policy IF7 identifies the level of parking provision and in agreeing the amount of parking provision to be made as part of the development regard will be had to factors such as the size and type of house provided.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Alison Saxby</p> | <p>N/A</p> |
| <p>KPC agrees with the proposals for future development, but consider that the Local plan makes inadequate provision for existing issues with parking, including village centre parking, parking at Student houses and airport parking.</p> | <p>Comments are noted. However it is unclear what the issues are in respect of village centre parking and the parking associated with student housing. Airport parking issues are included with the Surface Access Strategy that is produced by East Midlands Airport.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Vicky Roe</p> | <p>Kegworth Parish Council</p> |
| <p>8.43</p> <p>Car parks provide the opportunity where developers can fully exploit and extend the green infrastructure by ensuring dual use for parking and trees by using modern construction methods and below-ground design, to secure a resilient urban forest.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Julian Simpson</p> | <p>NWL Tree Officer</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|-----------------------|---|
| <p>(a) No. The current policy is clearly not working.</p> <p>(b) NWL has a high dependency on personal transport (mainly cars) due to the lack of effective public transport that can meet shift patterns in employment areas.</p> <p>(c) The Council needs to re-examine home parking policy. The exclusion for developers/private rented providers to provide space for car parking tenants in our Town Centres is causing conflict and difficulties. Private off street parking must be available throughout NWL that meets the number of adults residing in properties ie 6 adults = 6 parking spaces per property.</p> | <p>The Local Plan has been prepared taking into account the guidance contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs' Deigns Guide, which includes advice on car and cycle parking requirements. Policy IF7 identifies the factors such as the size and type of house provided to which regard will be had in agreeing the provision of parking. A balance has to be made as it cannot be known how many adults will be living in a house and this number could change over time.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Sue McKendrick</p> | <p>Labour Group leader</p> |
| <p>I have serious concerns about the proposal to "agree to reduced car parking provision where the proposed development has, or is proposed to have, good access to other modes of transport".</p> <p>This will put the Planning Authority in a weak position when challenging developers over a lack of parking provision. The re-opened Leicester to Burton line would have a station in the heart of the SE Coalville Development. A whole swathe of houses in Bagworth were planned and built on the promise that this line would create a sustainable transport solution. It never happened.</p> | <p>This approach follows the principles contained within national policy and also advice within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs Design Guide. In agreeing parking provision on a development, limited consideration would only be able to be given to a mode of transport if it does not yet exist or hasn't the benefit of planning permission and other relevant approvals.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mrs Kurpil</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>The proposed Policy IF7 outlines proposed parking standards indicating that the Council will normally seek the provision of 2 car parking spaces per dwelling increasing to 3 spaces for four or more bed properties. The overall approach is supported as it is important that new developments make adequate provision for off-street parking.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Guy Longley,</p> | <p>Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.</p> |
| <p>Policy should include development of existing structures.</p> | <p>This policy applied to all proposals for new development (including the reuse of buildings) and cannot be applied retrospectively.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>C Tandy</p> | <p>Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| <p>Policy IF7 seeks to set parking standards for all new development within the District. Paragraph 39 of the NPPF provides that “if setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, LPAs should take into account: the accessibility of the development; the type and mix of development; the availability of and opportunities for public transport; local car ownership levels; and, an overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles.” While DCLGs Written Statement to Parliament (25 March 2015) says that that the following text needs to be read alongside paragraph 39 “local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network.”</p> <p>Policy IF7 is not supported by any evidence to demonstrate that there are clear and compelling reasons for the District Council to impose local parking standards. Accordingly, our view is that the parking provision for new development should be determined on a site by site basis having regard to its location and proximity to existing services and facilities.</p> | <p>Comments are noted and it is suggested that local standards are no longer proposed within policy. The car parking standards and advice contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs Design Guide will be applied to new development.</p> | <p>Policy IF7 be amended to reflect these changes and delete reference to local parking standards.</p> | <p>Tim Evans</p> | <p>Bilfinger GVA</p> |
| <p>The Council should confirm that proposals under Policy IF7 on car parking are consistent with Written Ministerial Statement dated 25th March 2015 which stated that “this government is keen to ensure that there is adequate parking provision both in new residential developments ... The imposition of maximum parking standards under the last administration lead to blocked and congested streets and pavement parking. Arbitrarily restricting new off-street parking spaces does not reduce car use, it just leads to parking misery. It is for this reason that the government abolished national maximum parking standards in 2011. The market is best placed to decide if additional parking spaces should be provided. However, many councils have embedded the last administration’s revoked policies. Following a consultation, we are now amending national planning policy to further support the provision of car parking spaces. Parking standards are covered in paragraph 39 of the NPPF. The following text now needs to be read alongside that paragraph: “Local Planning Authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network.””</p> | <p>Comments are noted and it is suggested that local standards are no longer proposed within policy. The car parking standards and advice contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs Design Guide will be applied to new development.</p> | <p>Policy IF7 be amended to reflect these changes and delete reference to local parking standards.</p> | <p>Susan E Green</p> | <p>HBF</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <p>Policy IF7: (2c) should read 'transport assessment/statement'</p> <p>Page 95 – Paragraph 8.41: This paragraph makes reference to the DCLG method of establishing car parking requirements for residential developments, which is consistent with our 6Cs Design Guide. However, the last sentence then says 'the Council [NWLDC] is of the view that it is beneficial to provide more certainty so we have identified our preferred level of parking provision'. We are unclear what this means and NWLDC's preferred levels have not been presented. This has the potential to result in conflict during the development management process.</p> | <p>Comments are noted and it is suggested that local standards are no longer proposed within policy. The car parking standards and advice contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs Design Guide will be applied to new development.</p> | <p>Policy IF7 be amended to read transport assessment/statement and to reflect these changes and delete reference to local parking standards.</p> | <p>Sharon Wiggins</p> | <p>Leicestershire County Council</p> |
| <p>IF7 Parking provision and new development</p> <p>This section neglects to specify a requirement for additional visitor parking on new development sites. With the ubiquity of cars in modern times, I would suggest that the number of spaces required by the plan under IF7 2(a) would be at the minimum end of the scale. Therefore visitors to the residents of the development would have no choice but to park on the roads and verges, creating genuine hazards and an unsightly appearance.</p> | <p>The Local Plan has been prepared taking into account the guidance contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs Design Guide, which includes advice on car and cycle parking requirements.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Stephen Saxby</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
| <p>I have serious concerns about the proposal to "agree to reduced car parking provision where the proposed development has, or is proposed to have, good access to other modes of transport".</p> <p>This will put the Planning Authority in a weak position when challenging developers over a lack of parking provision. The re-opened Leicester to Burton line would have a station in the heart of the SE Coalville Development. A whole swathe of houses in Bagworth were planned and built on the promise that this line would create a sustainable transport solution. It never happened.</p> | <p>This approach follows the principles contained within national policy and also advice within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs Design Guide. In agreeing parking provision on a development limited consideration would only be able to be given to a mode of transport if it does not yet exist or hasn't the benefit of planning permission and other relevant approvals.</p> | <p>No change.</p> | <p>Mr B Carter</p> | <p>n/a</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|--|--|
| <p>No. I believe a planning application should consider the location of the development and vehicle reliance before stipulating the number of parking spaces that are appropriate. If developments are in rural locations where personal vehicle reliance is high more parking spaces would be necessary. Visitor spaces would also need to be additional. If insufficient parking is provided the result is cars get parked on the main roads of the development and the access routes or across pavements. This can result in blocked access for emergency services to get to households or insufficient causeway space for pedestrians with pushchairs or wheelchair users. This is not acceptable in a newly purposely designed development. It needs to be accepted that cars are used if there is not sufficient public transport with effective links to all areas of the district and parking is required for these vehicles to keep the roads safe for all users.</p> | <p>Policy IF7 identifies the level of parking provision and in agreeing the amount of parking provision to be made as part of the development regard will be had to factors such as the size and type of house provided.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Mrs. A Saxby</p> | <p>n/a</p> |
| <p>No all modern developments are too dense and insufficient off street parking provided.</p> | <p>The Local Plan has been prepared taking into account the guidance contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs' Design Guide, which includes advice on car and cycle parking requirements. Policy IF7 identifies the level of parking provision and in agreeing the amount of parking provision to be made as part of the development regard will be had to factors such as the size and type of house provided.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p> | <p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p> |
| <p>(page 95) – to encourage the future uptake of low emission vehicles, electric vehicle charging infrastructure to be included at new developments, if appropriate.</p> | <p>Planning cannot require people to use low emission vehicles but can only try and ensure development is located so that people have the option to use alternatives. National Planning Policy (NPPF, Para. 34) encourages the use of sustainable transport modes to ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel can be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. Para. 35 of the NPPF states that "developments should be located and designed where practical to incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles". The provision of electric charging points is set out in National Policy and therefore does not need to be repeated in local policy.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>Grant Butterworth</p> | <p>Leicester City Council</p> |