

Respondent Number	Name	Comments (inc. question number where possible)
CS/AC1	Richard Raper Planning Ltd. Planning Consultants to Marshalls Plc	<p>Comments refer to “Employment Requirements” Section. They note the fairly high requirement for the allocation of additional employment land in the District in particular industrial and warehousing land. They urge the Council not to overlook the need to expand existing industry rather than identify wholly new employment areas.</p> <p>Para 9.13 key issue of “new and expanding business” identified. Then smaller units are only addressed and not the expansion needs of existing businesses. They feel that “to attend to the expansion requirements of existing businesses” should feature in the Core Strategy.</p>
CS/AC2	Phillipa Edmunds Freight on Rail	<p>Catering for Rail Freight – the following actions can help:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make sure the RTS and Regional Economic Strategy and LDFs evaluate rail freight thoroughly. Freight strategies are a good mechanism to achieve this. • Planning Policy should encourage rail connected sites for distribution and industrial development. Avoid mistakes of the 1980s. Protect sites, especially those with rail connection for interchanges/terminals. • Promote new terminals and the upgrade of existing ones that have good road and rail access. • Expansion of existing sites is commonly a faster and simpler way to increase modal shift. • Planning Policy should identify and protect track beds and sidings with existing or possible future rail potential taking into account PPG13. <p>Also see best practice approaches</p>
CS/AC3	Terry Nash Company Secretary UK Rainwater Harvesting Association	<p>General comment that the LDF currently does not reflect the issue of water shortages. The latest EA report on the topic (“Hidden Infrastructure”) shows the District to be one where water supplies are under a high level of stress and one where every effort needs to be made to reduce mains water demand. This requirement is echoed in the “Code for Sustainable Housing”.</p> <p>Rainwater harvesting and comes together with flood risk that is highlighted in the consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic systems reduce mains water consumption by 50%. • Commercial systems reduce mains water consumption by 80% • The holding tanks of both systems have a natural capacity to attenuate storm water – a capacity that could be increased if thought appropriate for storm-water management reasons. <p>For these reasons, water shortages should be headlined in the LDF, along with flood related warnings, and that “rainwater harvesting” should be given an explicit mention in both contexts where appropriate.</p>
CS/AC4	Martin Prosser, Ellistown	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>3. Option 1 – I think that the vision should be specific</p> <p>5. Why do you consider it necessary to reduce the number</p>

		<p>of objectives?</p> <p>7. Yes</p> <p>8. I would suggest that the assessment of Ellistown (appendix 1) is incorrect as there is a small post office and community facilities at the school, which may lead to a change in your views as to the potential of the area.</p> <p>9. See (8) above</p> <p>10. No</p> <p>11. Yes</p> <p>12. Yes</p> <p>13. Yes</p> <p>14. Option 2b</p> <p>15. Location A – least detrimental and most beneficial</p> <p>16. No</p> <p>17. Yes</p> <p>18. Yes</p> <p>19. I would suggest that Plan 2 (Ashby) would be more appropriate as this would concentrate additional development in the larger of the rural town areas, although this raises the question of the River Mease SAC, and with Plan 3 (Castle Donington) as the second option. Splitting between the two may therefore be appropriate, although this then raises the issue of commuting – not an easy answer.</p> <p>20. No</p> <p>21. Yes</p> <p>22. No</p> <p>23. Yes</p> <p>24. If one wishes to reduce commuting as a green strategy, local employment needs to be encouraged back into the communities as a mixed use. This might also help in encouraging a community spirit, and thus reduce vandalism. As such, development of small sites for small industry in mixed use areas should be positively encouraged.</p> <p>25. Measham (plan 6) for the reasons stated in (24) above</p> <p>26. All rural communities</p> <p>27. Yes</p> <p>28. Yes</p> <p>29. see (24) above</p> <p>30. Positively - development should be encouraged in areas close to or within existing communities.</p> <p>31. Yes – all planning approvals should specifically stipulate that only materials below a certain carbon footprint level should be used, heating and electrics should only be with the use of sustainable technologies.</p> <p>32. If (31) and (32) are followed, then this should not be necessary. A target is totally meaningless unless your policies can be shown to meet it, and if the target is not met, who is to blame – the local authority, not the developers.</p> <p>33. Nothing more than identifying the need for a specific number of sites</p> <p>34. No</p> <p>35. If there is potential for identifying a site which will not have a significant detrimental effect on existing communities, then 'yes', otherwise 'no'.</p>
CS/AC5	Mrs Hazel Fitzgibbon Isley Cum Langley Parish Chairman	<p>1. Think so</p> <p>2. No</p> <p>3. 4.2 seems to be the most comprehensive and thought through.</p> <p>4. No</p> <p>5. Yes; this seems overloaded. Important to keep those</p>

		<p>which make us 'greener' as these will be the most easily overlooked.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. No 7. Yes 8. No 9. No. I question about half of them, but think this should be decided by those in villages 10. No 11. Yes 12. Yes 13. Yes 14. Option 2E 15. Area A would solve the commuter problem to Leicester better 16. Don't know 17. No. Mixing especially industrial sites with housing is bad. 18. Not particularly 19. Ashby B, Ibstock A, Measham B? Optimise roads there. 20. No 21. No. Planning resources are best directed at more significant builds. Make sure those are completed in a timely manner and of a suitable quality rather than spreading resources. 22. Put a moratorium on builds of under 10 houses. 23. Don't know 24. Don't know 25. Castle Donington and Ashby 26. Probably..... 27. No 28. yes 29. Don't know 30. Minimum building specifications for 'greener' houses to be developed 31. Biggest CO2 comes from transportation and should be addressed in their remit 32. Yes. Not quite sure how, there should be work in the 'arena' by no to enable educated guesses. If every new build had solar panels, you could save say 10% per unit on each new dwelling. 33. None unless that community contributes to the costs. 34. No
CS/AC6	Dennis Singer Swift Valley Partnership Lutterworth	<p>The assumption that Coalville should be the main focus of development due to the Regional allocation of hierarchical criteria is flawed as it does not take into account the practical assessment of the availability of suitable sites. Of the 4 proposed in the consultation, 3 are already dismissed as having major flaws on highway communications grounds.</p> <p>Previous Core Strategy Consultation was not influenced by the RSS and had promoted Ashby on an equal footing with Coalville. The land shown on the Ashby Plan 2, location B is a far more suitable site for major development than any of those proposed for Coalville.</p> <p>Whilst regeneration of Coalville may be desired, suitable land availability severely restricts the amount of development possible. The land at Ashby should therefore be considered on at least an equal footing to sites proposed at Coalville.</p>

CS/AC7	Phillipa Edmunds Freight on Rail	<p>Need to make sure that rail freight does not fall between Regional and Local Plans. Rail Freight is extremely well placed to meet key objectives of LTPs in terms of congestion, road accidents reduction and improvements in air quality (DfT Guidance Chapter 3.4/ Value for Money Chapter 4.50, 4.52)</p> <p>The following statistics highlight Rail Freight's economic, environmental and social benefits-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Excluding congestion, rail freight's external costs are eight times less per tonne kilometre than air freight and four times less than road, 2. An aggregate train can remove 120 HGVs from the roads 3. Rail freight produces about one tenth of the emissions per tonne km of HGVs 4. Heavy goods vehicles only pay for about 58-69% of the costs they impose on society. 5. Lorries are almost entirely responsible for road repairs. <p>The markets for freight are, bulk freight, high value freight, premium freight and international freight.</p> <p>Freight strategies are a good mechanism to evaluate rail thoroughly which should be done in the RTS, RES and LDFs. Cross referencing is necessary between these documents (DfT Guidance para. 2.10)</p> <p>Make provision to understand rails and road freight better through statistics and enhanced monitoring.</p> <p>Understand the major freight flows, infrastructure, who the players are and what could go by rail (LDF issue).</p> <p>Rail freight normally flows cross regional boundaries & awareness of cross regional and national rail freight flows are important.</p> <p>Separate treatment between local and long distance traffic does not work for rail freight.</p> <p>Encourage rail connected sites for distribution and industrial developments and avoid previous mistakes where factories were built without rail access.</p> <p>Protect sites with rail connection for interchanges/ terminals.</p> <p>Promote new terminals, upgrade existing ones that have good road and rail access and push for expansion where feasible.</p> <p>Providing and safeguarding sufficient capacity on rail routes to ports should be a high priority.</p> <p>Identify and protect track beds and sidings with existing or future rail potential taking into account PPG13.</p> <p>If lines are preserved in rural areas they may be used by quarries.</p> <p>Dialogue with Office for Rail regulation to protect rail paths for rail freight through conurbations.</p> <p>Promote waste strategies to use rail as the preferred mode for access to larger landfill, incinerator or recycling centre.</p> <p>Allocate funds to improve road access to existing or new rail freight terminals.</p> <p>Have road signage for existing and new sites.</p> <p>Promote Rail freight benefits to business.</p> <p>Establish FQPs relating to management of all modes freight traffic.</p> <p>Promote mineral strategies to use rail as the preferred route.</p> <p>Set targets to measure progress – eg number of lorry journeys saved and growth of rails share in local freight market.</p> <p>Establish dialogue with SRA.</p>
--------	-------------------------------------	--

		<p>Advice is given on what makes a good rail head. It should be-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On an existing railway line, 2. Have good road access suitable for HGVs, 3. Be of sufficient size – freight trains are often 500m long, 4. Be capable of 24 hour operation. <p>Understand local factors and consult and understand local opposition. Promote wider environmental benefits and choose the right location and size, use green vehicles, sustainable building design and landscaping.</p> <p>Advice is given on what makes a good freight route – trains should use routes with capacity which provides time tabled pathways for predictable, consistent and reliable train operation.</p> <p>Clearances to take the type of wagons the customer demands.</p>
CS/AC8	James McKay	<p>Question 7- Does not agree with Kegworth as a rural town due to its unsuitability for future development due to the following factors-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To the west and northwest the proximity of the M1/ A453 + EMA renders much of this area unsuitable for housing – considers small scale industrial use could be appropriate. 2. Some homes on Sutton Road have suffered vortex strikes as a result of aircraft passing and considers more homes to the south would not be prudent. 3. To the east is the River Soar and land to the east and north east is affected by flooding therefore making it unsuitable for development. <p>Questions 33 – 35 Travellers. Considers that many travellers conduct their lives in a way that appears to have little regard for the permanent residents in the area re mess left behind (eg Lockington, Hemmington and Castle Donington)</p> <p>Considers that the modern travellers way of life is not a longstanding traditional country way of life to be preserved at all costs. Considers the modern traveller to be an economic opportunist and if they are to welcome them, permanent residents need to be convinced that travellers will act responsibly regarding waste disposal.</p> <p>Considers the best sites are those chosen by travellers themselves such as to the north of Castle Donington and Lockington but away from residential areas. Considers a no tolerance policy be adopted for problems that travellers are currently blamed for including illegal waste disposal.</p>
CS/AC9	Mr KA Payne	<p>Transport links into and out of NW leics are considered abysmal and the Leicester to Burton passenger railway should be reinstated in the very near future. Demand for this will be increase with the potential for 2000 new homes. There will also be benefits of improved tourism with links to the National Forest and the Eurostar at St Pancras with a reduction in traffic on the road.</p>
CS/AC10	Anon	<p>Concerned regarding the number of houses to be built on greenfields particularly given the National Forest location and the significant amount of development carried out in the last 20 years. Considers congestion to be poor in Coalville.</p>

CS/AC11	John Evans	Considers that land off Grange Road, the UK Coal site on Beveridge Lane and his land in between should be developed all of which is low grade. With this land a better road network could be put in together with a shopping centre, a park, housing, bowling cinema and Industrial units. All would have good access to the A511.
CS/AC12	John Patrick	Q7 – Yes Q13 – Yes Q14 – Option 2a Q18 – Yes Q19 – Ashby because of its strategic position for the National Forest and the A42 + its attraction to tourists. Q20 – Looking at locations A, B and C considers that there should be an additional site east of Leicester Road previously designated Ha and Hb. Considers that this land should be developed before any further incursions into 'Green Belt' land.
CS/AC13	Paul Tame NFU	Paragraph 4.2 Bullet point 6 – Concern about emphasis on car travel when this is the only alternative for many people especially in rural areas. Option 2 for the vision is preferred as it is less restrictive than the others. Paragraph 5.1 EN3 - Would not want to see development prevented in particular areas(Charnwood Forest) if it complemented the landscape. EN7 – Concern that new farm and rural diversification development would be hampered by the development patterns alluded to, and concern for designating more green wedges in SC5. Like policies EN8, EC6, EC8 and EC9 Q21 – Some allowance must be made for small sites as they will contribute to housing supply. Q27 and 28 – Yes the Core Strategy should address the need for smaller industrial units, but no there should not be a requirement for all employment sites to include a minimum provision for smaller units. Q30, 31 and 32. LDF should encourage renewable energy development throughout the district and equipping new homes with renewable energy, but should not be so restrictive on car transport to stifle farm and rural diversification development.
CS/AC14	B Feisler	Questions how to ensure that all the houses to be built will be sold to first time buyers.

CS/AC15	Kegworth Parish Council	<p>2.2 Pleased that a SFRA has been commissioned which is important in Kegworth due to its location next to the River Soar.</p> <p>3.1 Agreed that there is an unmet demand for smaller industrial units for new and expanding businesses. National Forest and EMA offer unique economic opportunities + small rural businesses. Coalville Town Centre does need revitalising perhaps by redevelopment.</p> <p>Page 3 – Would like to see more support on issues of noise, air pollution and risk of flooding as Kegworth is particularly affected by all three.</p> <p>Q1 – No. Improve Road infrastructure.</p> <p>Q2 – Although not the remit of the District Council they feel that it should at least be mentioned in the CS to support local communities who are trying to obtain road improvements.</p> <p>Q3 – Option 3- considers the best option for Kegworth although not ideal. District is split – one half has an identity with the national forest but the northern half does not with their identity more with EMA or Donington Park.</p> <p>Q4 – Should not rely on the district being a “whole” with a single identity, but celebrate differences which are quite marked from one village to another.</p> <p>Q5 – No. Less reliance on Coalville and the National Forest. Too much emphasis on buses, when there are too few with buses not the option in most cases.</p> <p>Q6 – There should be more involvement of the rural areas.</p> <p>Q7 – Kegworth should be a rural town.</p> <p>Q8 – No.</p> <p>Q9 – If Kegworth is not a rural town it should be included here.</p> <p>Q10 – Did not consider there to be.</p> <p>Q11 – Yes.</p> <p>Q12 – Yes.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes.</p> <p>Q14 – Option 5.</p> <p>Q15 – 7.2.1</p> <p>Q16 – Did not know of any.</p> <p>Q17 – Yes. Page 15 7.3.4. missing (no C), 7.3.7 Should be housing only.</p> <p>Q18 – Yes.</p> <p>Q19 – Location B between Ashby and Lount.</p> <p>Q20 – No.</p> <p>Q21 – Yes.</p> <p>Q22 – Allowance should be made.</p> <p>Q23 – Employment land relating to the airport should remain within the confines of the airport perimeter. There is more than enough employment land within the vicinity of Kegworth with the Airport, Castle Donington Regional distribution Centre and the Willow Farm Development. People from Kegworth cannot access these facilities on Sunday by bus. People from Kegworth will not be able to apply for jobs at EMA or the Regional Fire Control Centre unless they have their own transport.</p> <p>Q24 – Should be near major roads or have a rail link.</p> <p>Q25 – Ashby.</p> <p>Q26 – Ashby and Bardon.</p> <p>Q27 – Yes.</p> <p>Q28 – Yes if required.</p> <p>Q29 – Include retail, tourism and catering.</p> <p>Q30 – The District is detrimentally affected by CO2 emissions from aircraft, and much of the pollution is caused by passing traffic on the M1, A42, A50, A6 and on aircraft.</p> <p>Q31 – all development should have stringent controls on insulation, forms of renewable energy and energy saving appliances. A more lenient approach is needed in giving</p>
---------	-------------------------	---

		<p>permission for renewable energy schemes. No use is made of generating energy from river water.</p> <p>Q32- Yes</p> <p>Q33 – Consent of the local community.</p> <p>Q34 – Yes.</p> <p>Q35 – Yes on a suitable site and with the consent of the local community.</p>
CS/ AC16	EMRA	<p>Vision – Options for the Spatial Strategy generally accord with the vision in the core strategy of the draft RSS, but Option 1 is very detailed and contains elements which may be more appropriate in the objectives, Option 2 appears to have some text missing, and option 3 places particularly strong emphasis on the National Forest.</p> <p>Objectives – Comprehensive list which are generally considered to be in accordance with the 10 core objectives for the Region set out in Policy 1 of the Draft RSS. May be scope for reducing the number of these to more closely align with Policy 1.</p> <p>EN8 the possibility of renewable energy generation within the district, e.g. geothermal or solar and PV panels and limited wind development at an appropriate scale could be specifically referred to. Policy 3 of the Draft RSS provides a checklist of measure to promote better design in new development.</p> <p>Policy SC5 – Points out that the three Cities Strategy Policy 3 of the Draft RSS refers to the circumstances in which the modification of the Green Wedge boundaries will be appropriate.</p> <p>Strategic Development – Directions for growth – Location of land allocations for housing and employment purposes should be in accordance with the sequential approach set of in Draft RSS Policies 2 and 4.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.11 of the Draft RSS refers to SUE for Colaville which will support its role as an SRC. Development in the SRCs should support their roles and functions and not be of a scale and character that prejudices the urban renaissance of the PUAs.</p> <p>Re options for focussing development Appendix 2 of the Draft RSS provides a figure of 12,000 dwellings or NW Leics of which 5,335 would be additional dwellings. Policy 5 provides the regional priorities for development in rural areas and promotes the vitality and viability of rural towns but also identified other settlements or groups of settlements which are accessible to the rural population, as the preferred location outside of rural towns for local needs housing.</p> <p>Potential locations for growth in Appendix 2 will lead to the discussion of where development should be focussed earlier in the document.</p> <p>Climate Change – Policies 38 and 39 of the Draft RSS refer to energy reduction and efficiency and low carbon energy generation, also relevant to refer to the regional approach to behavioural change set out in Policy 44.</p>
CS/AC17	Peter Bailey	<p>Q3 – Considers that option 3 is the most preferable – more achievable but not as specific as option 1 and more robust than option 2.</p> <p>Q5 – Considers that a more limited list of objectives would be more achievable and less accountable to scrutiny. Considers the following would be appropriate - EN1; EN5; EN6; EN8: EC2: EC3; EC5: EC9: SC2: SC4; SC6: AC1; AC2; AC5.</p>

		<p>Q7 Ashby, Kegworth and Measham do not have an adequate bus service, so unless they are financially viable and improved it is questioned how they can be included in this category.</p> <p>Q8 – Cannot see why local needs settlements need to be defined.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 1 seems best, enabling the preservation of rural towns. Does not consider Ashby should be included unless flooding in Packington is sorted out first.</p> <p>Q15 – Option D appears best as it infills an area already linked by housing along the road links.</p> <p>Q17 – Yes</p> <p>Q18 – Yes, why was Leicester Road coloured in on the map?</p> <p>Q19 – Measham is the best option as it would encourage more growth and provide affordable housing, employment and investment in the town.</p> <p>Q21 – Considers that small development sites are more acceptable on the community with less impact on infrastructure – brownfield sites should be a priority.</p> <p>Q29 – Should be a strong link between the provision of housing and employment to reduce travel and carbon footprint.</p> <p>Q34 – Cannot see this being of practical use unless long consultation is carried out with travellers and gypsies who follow the historical routes and campsites of their ancestors and do not change easily.</p> <p>Q35 – No.</p>
CS/AS18	Chris Tandy (RAID)	<p>Q1 – No – Would have expected the Core Strategy to address all topics in the RSS which the LDF should expand upon such as quarrying and waste, The National Forest, regeneration, sequence of release of allocated land.</p> <p>Agree with the subjects chosen but no solutions offered for discussion.</p> <p>Q2 – Questions on key issues should be in the introduction. Core Strategy is about a vision for the future and not a list of issues to be addressed.</p> <p>Q3 – Vision 2 – 1 is a list of objectives and 3 is too wooley.</p> <p>Q4 – No</p> <p>Q5 – Lists are too long and not objectives. They are tactics to meet the objectives. Option 1 (vision) on p4 are the objectives.</p> <p>Q6 – No</p> <p>Q7 – Yes</p> <p>Q8 – Moira should be considered a rural town. Falls down on Drs surgery and transport, but Ashby and Woodville surgeries are shedding patients and Moira could meet the need for an additional surgery. Its proximity to Swadlingcote (a proposed SRC) makes Moira well placed for growth. Its industrial and leisure facilities are some of the best in the District.</p> <p>Q9 – Moira should be a rural town – agree with the rest.</p> <p>Q10 - Strategy is over 20 years with growth and status change and as such there should be some vision as to which locations may move up the league.</p> <p>Q11 – No – it would not be possible to discriminate between locals and outsiders.</p> <p>Q12 – Local needs will be linked to affordable housing need. One measure is the number of locals on the Council's waiting list, another would be to build affordable housing as a percentage of the existing stock.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes.</p> <p>Q14 – Option 1 – Most sustainable and supports the RSS.</p> <p>Q15 – A & D</p> <p>Q16 – Yes, regeneration sites in the town centre.</p> <p>Q17 – Yes, but positioning and type of employment would need to be carefully placed.</p>

		<p>Q18 – Yes but only in rural towns.</p> <p>Q19 – Expansion of Ashby should be minimal due to River Mease SAC, Packington flooding and unsuitable internal traffic system. Area C should not be allowed as it is Green Belt extension outside of the core town and already refused by the Inspector. Area B is more sustainable than Area A as it has the potential to allow traffic directly onto the A511. Ideal area for mixed development but size should be constrained by local needs.</p> <p>Expansion of Castle Donington will be constrained by planning restrictions in the airport masterplan. Proposed location for employment in Castle Donington is the worst possible position due to road network being seriously overloaded already with a busy junction. Location East of the town is preferable to allow traffic to disperse before hitting the A50 and encourage use of the Parkway Rail terminal.</p> <p>In Measham – B for housing and C for employment.</p> <p>Q20 – No major expansions associated with rural towns.</p> <p>Q21 – No allowance should be made as per PPS3.</p> <p>Q22 – Re housing targets windfall sites should be welcomed, prevention of excessive housing is unlikely to be a problem.</p> <p>Q23 – No – the calculations seem to be a best guess. The calculation should be – Existing trend + employment for new housing occupants + region allocation + contingency.</p> <p>Q24 – as Q23.</p> <p>Q25 – As Q19.</p> <p>Q26 – Moira.</p> <p>Q27 – Yes but not in detail.</p> <p>Q28 – No.</p> <p>Q29 – No should be left to the ADPD.</p> <p>Q30 – Design to maximise walking, cycling, public transport, concentrate development on main towns.</p> <p>Mixed use developments.</p> <p>Provide extra employment to cut out of district commuting.</p> <p>Q31 – Yes, should include the above strategies.</p> <p>Q32 – Be carbon neutral by the end of the period.</p> <p>Q33 – Where there is identified by need.</p> <p>In areas frequented by Gypsies.</p> <p>In areas that can be assimilated into the surroundings.</p> <p>Q34 – Yes, otherwise objections will stop site development.</p> <p>Q35 – Yes.</p>
SC/AC19	J.M. Boardman	<p>2.2 Glad re FRA commissioned – It is badly needed.</p> <p>3.1 Housing needs – higher value economy will not necessarily result in less demand for affordable housing.</p> <p>Transport – Surprised that more people come into the area than go out to work – Castle Donington has significant out commuting.</p>
SC/AC20	Heart of the National Forest Foundation	<p>Refer to their previous representations and reiterate their recommendations about the importance of defining the location of the Heart of the Forest park for the location of a concentration of tourism and leisure related developments.</p> <p>Equally important to define the broad locations for tourism and leisure developments as for housing and industrial growth (Qs 18 and 19)</p> <p>National Forest & Heart of the National Forest Park represent a unique opportunity for the transformation of the economy and community of NW Leics towards the higher value/ quality based vision. A positive and supportive policy context for the development of the Forest park set out in the Core Strategy is vital to the successful implementation of the Heart of the National Forest Park and equally vital to the economic and community development aspirations for the District as a whole.</p> <p>Existing approach to support Forest related development is</p>

		<p>somewhat confused which generates uncertainty and discourages investment in major leisure and recreation sector projects. The development of clear unambiguous policies in the Core Strategy represent the best opportunity to move away from this.</p> <p>Economic Issues – The Core strategy is one dimensional re the potential of edge of town industrial/ warehousing sites that are unlikely to move the economy to the higher value/ higher wage state sought. The Core Strategy could do more to provide for the expansion of other sectors particularly tourism and leisure. The district has great potential in terms of the growth of tourism and leisure due to the high accessibility from motorway connections, EMA, further connection of the canal and rail network, together with its position central to the National Forest. Although this is discussed at 3.1 there is no spatial expression of how and where such development potential can be realised to maximise its benefit.</p> <p>They support objective EC9 but recommend the Core Strategy should include spatial/ locational preferences for the concentration of tourist/ leisure development, including the Heart of the Forest park as a key location. Broaden the definition of tourist attractions to include sports and leisure related activities, and show how such development will contribute to other objectives e.g. environment and community (Q 1 and 2)</p> <p>Transport issues – Moira should be included as a Rural Town based on (inter-alia) tourism and leisure development (Q8) recognising that such development cannot be met in other settlements which do not have Moira's particular locational advantages. Potential offered by opening the National Forest Railway for passenger use is strongly supported, objective of locating as much development as possible in areas well served by public transport supports the Heart of the National Forest as a major location for the provision of tourism and leisure facilities.</p> <p>What Should the vision be? – supports a vision building on the National Forest identity to provide a high quality built and natural environment and promoting the broadening of the economic base of the District towards higher value/ skills/ quality by developing the potential of the district for tourism and leisure developments (Q3 and 4).</p> <p>What should the objectives be? – Considers that they are described too generally to lead to full discussions on how they can be realised, the objectives generally are not a sufficient development of the vision statements to promote debate about their value and there are too many. However they particularly endorse objectives EN3, EN4 (with further definition of what is meant by appropriate development), EN5, EN7, EN8, EC1, EC2 (Include the tourism and leisure sectors), EC4, EC6, EC8, EC9, SC1, SC3, SC4, SC5, AC4.</p> <p>Building on vision options 1 and 2 and the social inclusion issue in 3.1, the fostering of community enterprise, cutting across economic, social and environmental issues should be an important objective of the Core Strategy (Q5 and 6)</p> <p>Climate Change – the Core Strategy should recognise the role of the National Forest and heart of the Forest park in combating and adapting to climate change through forest planting and the opportunities it presents for carbon offsetting or environmental accreditation schemes for local and regional businesses (Q30).</p>
--	--	---

SC/AC21	Ian Cantrill	<p>Q3- Agrees with Option 1. Measham is already a rural town with good facilities which need to be maintained by new large and small industrial developments, affordable and special needs housing and old peoples accommodation within the community. Every opportunity should be given to people to live in or near the area in which they work. Public transport / transport run by businesses to be improved thereby reducing the use of the private car. Promotion of a strong community links is very important to maintain a healthy and secure lifestyle.</p> <p>Q14 – Option 5 is most appropriate and would address issues in respect of social sustainability.</p> <p>Q21 – Allowance should be made for small sites due to their historical contribution.</p> <p>Q27 – Core Strategy should address the need for smaller industrial units in all areas of development.</p> <p>Q32 – Targets for reducing Carbon emissions across the district should be included in the Core Strategy. Local employment for local people reducing imported labour would be one benefit.</p>
SC/AC22	Woodland Trust	<p>They have 19 sites in the National Forest.</p> <p>Q3 – Option 1 is too detailed for a vision statement and contains points better included in the objectives and policies. Option 3 appears to have the right balance of being concise and including the importance of sustainable development and providing a high quality environment. Suggests additional wording regarding reducing carbon emissions to minimise the impact of climate change.</p> <p>Q5 and 6 – Support the broad groupings of objectives but consider that 29 objectives are too many with some duplication – e.g. National Forest Railway Line. Strongly support objective EN4 regarding appropriate development in the National Forest and point out that 47% of the District is within the National Forest. Their existing sites are mainly woodland creation sites (90%) which have created approx 370Ha of new Woodland within the National Forest and they are looking for opportunities to acquire others.</p> <p>Support EN5 re protecting biodiversity but this should be extended to include giving protection to essential semi-natural habitats such as ancient woodland and ancient trees. Refers to the importance of ancient woodland re biodiversity/ eco systems and the point that they are irreplaceable. Only 2% of land in Great Britain is covered by Ancient Woodland with this figure 0.84% in Leicestershire. Refers to The UK Biodiversity Action Plan and PPS9 regarding the importance of Ancient Woodland as a biodiversity resource. Keepers of Time – A statement of policy for England's Ancient and Native Woodland -2005 refers to maintaining and increasing the area of native woodland. It is therefore essential that this habitat be protected from development.</p> <p>Support objective EC8 re renewable wood fuels industry.</p> <p>Have concerns re objective EC7 with the significant expansion of EMA resulting in a significant increase in CO2 emissions. Refers to the Sustainability Appraisal of EMA (2006) regarding support for expansion of the airport expected to have significant long term negative effects on energy and greenhouse gas emissions and is therefore inherently environmentally unsustainable. They would not wish to see the Council adopt policies giving support to environmentally unsustainable expansion.</p> <p>Support objectives SC4 and SC5 but consider that woodland should be specifically mentioned in this policy.</p> <p>Woodland is valuable to local people and has the ability to contribute to 10 of the 20 new UK Framework Indicators of sustainable development, including contributing to biodiversity,</p>

		<p>reducing air pollution, improving health, education, employment, environmental quality, well being and helping the economy grow. Refers to evidence of links between healthy communities and the quality of the environment particularly trees and Woodland. Refers to the importance of access to Woodland in Urban and Rural areas and have Woodland Access Standards endorsed by Natural England specifying minimum distances people should live from accessible woodland. See Space for nature at www.woodland-trust.org.uk/publications</p> <p>Q30 Support EN7 and EN8. Refers to the Stern report on climate change and points out that mitigation measures are insufficient to prevent climate change taking place. Refers to evidence that the effects of climate change are already being felt in the natural world. They would therefore wish to see Core Strategy policies on adaption to climate change and in particular measures to enable wildlife to adapt to a changing climate.</p> <p>In their current state key habitats including ancient woodland are not sustainable given their fragmented nature and immobile nature of many of their species, and Local Authorities should take action to identify new areas for habitat creation in the face of climate change.</p>
SC/AC23	Strategic Land Partnerships.	<p>Q1 – No mention of waste facilities. Some merit must be given to climate change e.g. renewable energy in housing and commercial allocations.</p> <p>Q3 – Vision 2 is most appropriate as it is concise and locally distinctive.</p> <p>Q5 - Range of objectives is comprehensive but there is overlap between them. AC1, AC3 and AC5 could be combined and reworded.</p> <p>Q6 – Within EC policies, suggested additional objective of a higher standard of housing provision to encourage professionals to live closer to places of work. This would be in line with the wish to move away from reliance on the manufacturing industry. Within EC5 and EC10 there is no mention of the quantity or quality of retail provision.</p> <p>Within SC3 mention could be made of further housing provision if supported by services or enabled community benefit.</p> <p>Q7 – Agree with the selection process and list as it appears to be in compliance with RSS8. Refers to statement 6.1 and point out that PINS guidance is that the Core Strategy is where tough decisions need to be made. The Core Strategy must not be driven by the content of subsequent site allocations DPD.</p> <p>Q10 – An element of flexibility must be built into the Core Strategy, and should not preclude development from settlements which would benefit from additional housing to facilitate delivery of additional local services and facilities. A policy should be included whereby larger villages can sustain further growth to allow development to be permitted outside but adjoining the village providing a 50:50 mix of affordable and market housing. This could be informed by Land Registry details and Housing Needs Survey re demand and need.</p> <p>Q11- Yes</p> <p>Q12 - Should also be provision for key workers</p> <p>Q13 - Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 1 (Coalville Focus) but multiple urban extensions should be considered.</p> <p>Q15 – Area A is the most appropriate but areas B and C should not be discounted as it may be appropriate to consider more than one Urban extension.</p> <p>Q16 – No</p> <p>Q17 – Yes</p>

		<p>Q18 – Yes</p> <p>Q21/22 – An allocation of 10 years supply must be made in line with PPS3 but flexibility can be built in under 'plan, monitor, manage' principle to take account of suitable smaller sites which may come forward sooner.</p> <p>Q31 – Introduction of Policy regarding on site renewable energy on sites of 10 or more houses of commercial sites larger than 1 Ha.</p> <p>Q32 – Core Strategy should follow the targets set in RSS8 but with flexibility built in.</p> <p>Q34 – A DPD will deal with this.</p> <p>Q35 – No Gypsies and travellers needs should be assessed in a separate context.</p> <p>As the Core strategy progresses an appropriate monitoring and implementation framework should be included with clear objectives for delivery beyond an annual monitoring report.</p>
SC/AC24	Harvey Ingram Solicitors	<p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 1 is consistent with RSS8, most logical in terms of national policy and the most defensible in planning terms. In line with RSS8 the focus for new development must be on Coalville. Coalville is by far the largest settlement within the district and requires considerable investment as part of its regeneration. This will only come as a result of development in and adjacent to the town itself as well as the provision of associated infrastructure, improvements to the town centre and public transport links that justify the majority of the development within and adjoining Coalville. For these reasons option 5 is not considered feasible. Options 2 -4 raise issues which are difficult to resolve partly as no distinction is drawn between those settlements identified as possible rural towns in para 6.11. A justification would need to be made as to why a rural town(s) should be the focus of significant development. Such development should not be on a scale comparable with Coalville as this would be inconsistent with RSS8. Option 2 is not therefore feasible. In terms of Options 3 and 4 there is the difficulty in determining why 1 or 2 rural towns should be singled out from the rest for development, particularly as the rural towns generally satisfy the same criteria. In terms of option 3 it seems development is already pre-empted towards Ashby.</p> <p>Q15 – Option A. There is already an allocated site (H4g) in this area, which could meet 2,000 of the SUE dwellings, and the site has been through the local plan process, has an application submitted with a full EIA and at no time has the suitability of the site been questioned. Development of this site would not lead to Coalescence but would relate well to the substantial employment development at Bardon 21. The accommodation of workers in this area may reduce in travelling to Coalville along the dangerous Bardon Road and minimise cross town movements with direct links to J21 of the M1 and the A50. In terms of sustainable transport, there is scope for pedestrian and cycle links to Coalville as well as providing a railway station.</p> <p>Q16 – No.</p> <p>Q17 – No objections in principle but with the need for 4,000 dwellings they question the availability of land and do not consider that employment development should compromise the housing requirement in RSS8. Suggests that the expansion of Bardon 21 in conjunction with the housing development should be considered.</p> <p>Q18 – Notwithstanding the Colville Focus, some rural towns will have to play a role in the provision of development and in line with advice in PPS3 they should be in site specific allocations in due</p>

		<p>course (not windfalls). Questionable whether this justifies identifies locations in a Core Strategy, this should be considered in housing allocations DPDs.</p> <p>Q21 – No – par 59 of PPS3 is quite clear that windfall sites should not be used in the first 10 years.</p> <p>Q22 – Any shortfalls should be identified in the AMR then suitable windfall sites may have to be released possibly through an SPD on managing the supply of housing.</p>
SC/AC25	Vashti Homes Ltd	<p>Q14 – Supports Option 1 as Coalville is identified in the RSS, is in accordance with RSS Policy2 (Second priority) and Policy 4, an SUE can build on proposed and existing infrastructure and can integrate with the existing urban area, is in line with the Leicestershire Sustainable Urban Extensions Sustainability Appraisal which concludes that an SUE to Coalville may improve the vibrancy of the area and would require relatively low levels of development in other settlements in the district.</p> <p>Q15 – Considers Location A most appropriate. This is in accordance with RSS Policy 2 as it is within walking/cycling distance to the town centre, and Bardon 22 unlike other options, can tap into existing public transport routes and would be a pleasant place to live. Sustainable transport could be achieved by substantial investment in the bus services and would support the reopening of the Leicester- Burton railway to passenger traffic. Location A would be the only option not to increase cross town movements.</p> <p>Location C does not have the same level of accessibility to the town centre as other options, is slightly further away and looks more towards Ashby than Coalville.</p> <p>Location D would involve the loss or reduction of green wedges which should be protected to prevent coalescence of settlements and to maintain the identity and integrity of settlements.</p> <p>Scale of growth must be based on sound evidence to ensure deliverability.</p> <p>Q16 – Land to the north and East of Coalville should be protected as particularly attractive countryside.</p> <p>Q17 – Yes if large enough which would be particularly achievable in location A in close proximity to Bardon 22, with strong transport links to Leicester which do not require cross town traffic.</p> <p>Q25 – Location A is most appropriate as the potential for the expansion of Bardon 22 and would be of value to integrate employment into the SUE.</p>
CS/AC26 CS/AC40 CS/AC47-472 (inc) CS/AC490 CS/AC514 CS/AC493 CS/AC518 CS/AC519 CS/AC524 CS/AC528	J. Rigby	<p>Q14 – Supports the Coalville Focus Option as-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is in line with the RSS 2. It releases growth point funding for the regeneration of Coalville which would benefit the whole region. 3. It is the most sustainable option. <p>Q19 – Oppose and significant development of Ashby due to-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The negative impact on the River Mease SAC. 2. Worsening the flooding situation in Packington. 3. Poor Road infrastructure in the town. 4. Lack of general infrastructure to support development. <p>Area of land for development should be a size limit to the agreed number of houses and employment sites.</p> <p>Q25 – Oppose location C in Ashby. No development should take place outside of the natural boundaries of the A511/ A42, recent Inspectors decision that this land must be put back to Greenfield status.</p>
CS/AC27	Dr Douglas Hart and Peter Storrie on behalf	<p>Q1 – The Economy needs additional emphasis. An important issue is airport related development that could generate high</p>

	of Goodman International	<p>quality employment opportunities. Possibly the single most important economic asset the district has is EMA which has an important and positive role to play in the future.</p> <p>Q2 – EMA needs to be seen in strategic terms as a catalytic generator for the entire region. If properly managed it could have the effect of attracting advanced firms, increasing investment, and modernising the economy of the whole area.</p> <p>Q3 – Vision 1 is most appropriate as it sets out key aspects of the Core Strategy in a clear and coherent manner.</p> <p>Q4 – Should be a specific reference to the economic importance of EMA and potential airport related development.</p> <p>Q5 – No.</p> <p>Q6 – secure the provision of employment land for airport related development close to the EMA together with sustainable transport options particularly between EMA and Coalville.</p> <p>Q18 – Yes, consistent with para 2.10 of PPS12.</p> <p>Q19 – Castle Donington/ EMA area on Plan 7 is the most appropriate location for potential development as it is best served by road, rail and air transport infrastructure and reflects the need for employment land to serve the logistics and airport related development highlighted in the Regional Economic Strategy and the RSS8 review.</p> <p>Q20 – Yes. Land south of EMA should be safeguarded for future airport related development including logistics.</p> <p>Q23 – No. Considers the need for employment land to serve the logistics and airport related sectors are grossly under-estimated. Refers to evidence relating to the large size of EMA for freight, Largest in UK outside London, one of the fastest growing in UK and 5th most rapidly growing cargo airport in Europe.</p> <p>EMAs contribution to the process of structural economic change and growing international airports, extends well beyond the airport itself in employment and investment terms. This needs to be recognised and encouraged in the Policy documents of the Council and it is felt that EMA should play a critical and explicit role in developing a positive and prosperous vision for the district.</p> <p>Q24 – Land should be safeguarded for future employment needs in strategic locations. Emphasis on quality of employment as well as quantity, with emphasis on finding ways of attracting businesses that provide higher quality jobs with better pay. Refers to North West Leics Community Strategy (2004) in this regard. This raises the question in terms of up skill and up tech the economy as to how and where it should be done in sustainable development terms. EMA provides a partial answer in line with the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan para 5.69 and para 12.9.</p> <p>Q25 – As Q19.</p> <p>Q26 – Yes Land South of EMA –answer to Q20 and Q24.</p> <p>Conclusion – the overall rate of growth of EMA has been consistently underestimated and they are concerned with how the issue of sustainable development is being interpreted in and around EMA. A critical issue for the present is how the growing impact of the airport is to be managed with a view to long term growth potential rather than seeking in the short term to minimise the perception of and their actual impact. It is acknowledged that no international airport is sustainable but some are less sustainable than others, and the historical policies for EMA make it less sustainable in the long term.</p> <p>Their overall position is that they accept the further significant expansion of EMA is necessary and desirable for modernising the economy of the East Midlands Region as EMDA and UK economic policy is seeking to achieve. However the approach of accommodating continuing growth on the airport site or distances as great as 60 miles away is flawed for two reasons-</p>
--	--------------------------	---

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would be extremely unlikely that EMA would be the only rapidly growing international airport in the world whose expansion has no major developmental consequences, positive and negative, for the surrounding area. Even if this were possible it would stunt development and give undue power to the airports owners. 2. Airports aren't simply traffic generating devices and there are real benefits which could be gained for the local area in terms of improvements in infrastructural, environmental and economic terms. Knowledge based firms are particularly attracted to international airports and it is these firms the plan is seeking to encourage. <p>Three specific concerns with regard to the effects of EMAs growth on the district which could fatally undermine the concern for achieving a positive vision, for real sustainability and medium and long term sustainable development potential-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planning policy seeks to minimise the perceived and actual impact of the airports development on the surrounding area 2. Current policy seeks to perpetuate the unsustainable position of scattering airport related development up to 60 miles away. 3. There is a lack of vision and imagination about how the benefits which could flow from the airport could be used in an effective and integrated way to benefit the district and attract knowledge based firms. <p>In economic terms although employment is low in the district so is pay, with growth dominated by the service sector with this to continue over the next 10 years. EMA has a role in attracting modern firms which should be encouraged by pro-active planning. Within the context of a sustainable, efficient EMA a compact rather than scattered form of development is required with the proposed logistics facility on the airports edge forming part of the airports medium and long term development. This compact form of development could promote the regions sustainable development. This will not be possible without a significant increase in the airports surface access infrastructure so that access by public transport is considerably improved.</p>
CS/AC28	Michael Ward	Q33 - Considers that travellers should pay Council Tax if they wish to settle on a site.
CS/AC29	Cllr Nigel Smith	Objects to the present housing structure plan as does not take account of the need to attract families who wish to have a large newly built home. By providing such housing which will be much needed, this will attract families with high disposable incomes which will help regenerate the district and encourage the formation of new businesses. Such housing has been built in Loughborough.
CS/AC30	Smith Stuart Reynolds	<p>Q14 – Support the Coalville focus option as it contains and ample amount of services and facilities with other towns less able to accommodate development due to their obvious constraints as identified in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Q15 – Location B due to its excellent links to the town centre, its lack of constraints and is considered the most sustainable. The landowners intention is to bring a SUE forward at the earliest opportunity. In comparison Location D will cross the constraint of the A511 and would be development in a green Wedge. Location C will also cross a main road and will be unsustainable due to its remote distance and poor relationship with the town centre.</p>
CS/AC31	John Coleman. William Davis Ltd	Q1/2 – reference should be made to the substantial housing requirements in the district identified in the RSS. Points on p2/3 give the impression that the main issues are providing for an

		<p>aging population and the provision of affordable housing. They separately questioned the robustness of the Housing Needs Assessment.</p> <p>Further question the potential to open the National Forest passenger railway unless there is a realistic business case. In the absence of this it should not influence the overall strategy to be adopted.</p> <p>Q3/4 – Support option 1 for the Vision.</p> <p>Q5/6 – Spatial Objectives – does not agree with EN1 and consider that an appropriate balance of development should be made within the settlement hierarchy. Suggest EN1 should be deleted or amended to refer to Coalville and the other Rural Towns.</p> <p>Q7/8 – Support identification of rural towns – no others suggested.</p> <p>Q10/11 – Considers there may be problems with enforcement and suggests local needs development restricted to smaller scale development of not more than 5 dwellings, conversions and exceptional affordable housing schemes.</p> <p>Q13/14 – Additional option suggested as 5a-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Majority of Development in Coalville with a reduced SUE as option 2 2. Remaining Development dispersed between other rural towns 3. Local needs only in larger villages. <p>Q17 – SUE should be appropriate for a mixed use development including employment.</p> <p>Q18/20 – Do not consider it necessary for the Core Strategy to identify directions for growth in other rural towns due to the likely small scale of the development. Detailed allocation should be left to the allocations DPD. If directions for growth are retained for the rural towns an arrow should be shown to the north east of Kegworth (North of Station Road/ East of Long Lane) where there is scope for expansion without conflict with the floodplain, sustainable location close to employment and local services.</p> <p>Q21/22 - PPS3 para 59 – No justification for identifying small sites in the first 10 years in the absence of robust evidence of local circumstances preventing specific sites being identified.</p> <p>No attempt should be made to prevent small sites coming forward. Overprovision could be accounted for in a review of the LDF.</p> <p>Q23 – Employment – If no employment land requirements are specified in the RSS they consider and estimate on past trends to be realistic. They advocate provision of 15.5 Ha per annum as a continuation of the trend 1996-2006, giving a total requirement of 341 Ha up until 2026. Considers that 106.1Ha is too low and at 4.8Ha per annum would not deliver the spatial objectives for increased economic prosperity.</p> <p>Q25 – SUE in Coalville, and smaller scale development at other rural towns left for later detailed allocation.</p> <p>Q27/28/29 – Smaller sites should be left for the detailed allocations.</p> <p>Q30/31/32 Climate Change – Much will depend on the supplement to PPS1. Core Strategy should pursue options but considers it is unreasonable to go further than the Building Regulations in terms of controlling CO2 emissions – level playing field for developers. Effective measuring and monitoring across the district would be too difficult.</p>
CS/AC32	Katanya Barlow, Hinckley and Bosworth.	<p>Vision – Supports option 3 but without the word 'encourage'.</p> <p>Spatial Objectives – Considers some should be removed or combined with others to limit their number.</p> <p>e.g. EN3, EN4, EN5 to be combined but illustrate the difference between Charnwood and National Forests. EN2, 7 & 8 could be combined. EC1 and 4 could be combined. SC3, 4 and 6 could be</p>

		<p>combined. EC2 could be deleted from this section and used later as source of evidence/ guidance in the economic section. Could remove the section on travel and access and input this into the other sections.</p> <p>Definition of local need would work best as explained and not left open to interpretation.</p> <p>Urban growth – A wide and comprehensive list of options have been considered. Option 3 is preferred as it ensure a SUE is incorporated whilst allowing for growth elsewhere.</p> <p>Locations for development – suggest issues of cross boundary road networks are considered. Question whether growth to the North of Thringstone and East of Whitwick has been considered given the size of these settlements are similar to Coalville.</p> <p>Essential for the Sue to be mixed use and include employment.</p> <p>Q18 – Core Strategy is best placed to mention growth.</p> <p>Q21 & 22 – Due to national policy (PPS3) housing through windfall is likely to result in overprovision but there is no realistic planning mechanism to prevent this.</p> <p>Climate Change – should be mentioned in Core Strategy to ensure weight is given to a central target that will govern subsequent DC policies SPDs – sliding scale suggested. Should not be left entirely to Building Regs.</p> <p>Gypsies and Travellers – RSS Sequential approach should be incorporated and attention paid to the emerging DCLG guidance on site design of G & T sites. Areas of search should be provided and if a historical link is made within the SUE then consideration should be given. More in depth consideration through Issues and Options Site Allocations.</p>
CS/AC33	Sheba Harper	<p>Q1 – Yes</p> <p>Q3 – Vision 1</p> <p>Q5 – EN1, EN2, EN3, EN5, EN6, EN7, EC1, EC4, EC5, EC6, SC3, SC4, SC6, AC3, AC4</p> <p>Q6 – Sewers, doctors and schools to increase with any new developments.</p> <p>Q7 – Yes</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q10 – Norris Hill was separate from Moira until a few years ago when the village sign was moved, hence the reason there are only very few buses, a post office and a village hall in the actual village.</p> <p>Q11 – Yes</p> <p>Q12 – Yes. The new estates in Moira and Donisthorpe are mainly inhabited by people from Tamworth and Birmingham and the majority still travel to these places to work and shop.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – 2a</p> <p>Q15 – 7.2.1 because it may add weight to the opening of the National Forest Line.</p> <p>Q16 – No</p> <p>Q17 – Yes</p> <p>Q18 – Yes</p> <p>Q19 – 7.3.3</p> <p>Q21 – Yes</p> <p>Q22 – refusal of planning permission.</p> <p>Q25 – Ashby – near the A42 and if the rail line is opened than this could be used as well.</p> <p>Q27 – Yes</p> <p>Q28 – No</p> <p>Q30 Ensure house purchaser works locally.</p> <p>Q31 – Yes</p> <p>Q33 – Considers that if gypsies and travellers want to settle then</p>

		<p>they should live in a house and pay council tax, water rates, insurance, road tax and other outgoings.</p> <p>Q34 – No</p> <p>Q35 – No</p>
CS/AC34	Castle Donington Parish Council	<p>The Parish Councils opinions have not changed since their response to the Statement of Community Involvement (Copy enclosed). They have the following comments to the Questions in the Core Strategy Additional Consultation-</p> <p>Q1- Yes</p> <p>Q3 – Option 2</p> <p>Q4 – No</p> <p>Q5 – Yes, all embracing</p> <p>Q6 – To broaden the tourism appeal across the district</p> <p>Q7 – Yes</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q10 – No</p> <p>Q11 – Yes</p> <p>Q12 – Yes but must take account of a sensible proportion of affordable housing</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 5</p> <p>Q15 – Should be decided locally</p> <p>Q16 – Should be decided locally</p> <p>Q17 – Should be decided locally</p> <p>Q18 – Yes</p> <p>Q20 – Not at this stage</p> <p>Q21 – Yes providing they fit in with the local area</p> <p>Q23 – Yes – Castle Donington already has its share in the East Midlands Distribution Centre, the Airport, Willow Farm and the Racetrack.</p> <p>Q24 – By local consultation</p> <p>Q25 – Land within Plan 7 is in the floodplain</p> <p>Q27 – Yes</p> <p>Q28 – Yes</p> <p>Q29 – Make Q28 a Policy Issue</p> <p>Q30 – Do not build on the floodplain.</p>
CS/AC35	Peter & Louise Bailey	<p>Q14 – Supports the Coalville Focus Option as-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.This is in line with the RSS 2. It releases growth point funding for the regeneration of Coalville which would benefit the whole region. 3. It is the most sustainable option. <p>Q19 – Oppose and significant development of Ashby due to-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The negative impact on the River Mease SAC. 2. Worsening the flooding situation in Packington. 3. Poor Road infrastructure in the town. 4. Lack of general infrastructure to support development. <p>Area of land for development should be a size limit to the agreed number of houses and employment sites.</p> <p>Q25 – Oppose location C in Ashby. No development should take place outside of the natural boundaries of the A511/ A42, recent Inspectors decision that this land must be put back to Greenfield status.</p>
CS/AC36	T Bullick	<p>Q7 – Considers that Moira should be included. In the adopted local plan Moira is within a 'Transport Choice Corridor' along with Coalville and Ashby based on the potential reopening of the Leicester to Burton Railway which remains an aspiration as part of the Core Strategy. Commensurate levels of development were</p>

		<p>proposed within Ashby and Coalville to reflect the sustainability of this concept. The principle of this has not been abandoned which is not reflected in the proposals for Moira which is considered to be fundamentally unsound.</p> <p>EN1 and AC4 are Core objectives which reflect this and follow the important locational principles for accommodating sustainable development embodied in the existing local plan. A site for a new railway station in Moira was specifically allocated in the existing local plan.</p> <p>The point of the Core Strategy objective to promote the Ivanhoe Line does not sit comfortably with 'downgrading' Moira to a rural centre on grounds of lack of a Medical Practice, services are centred around Norris hill and a 90 minute bus service.</p> <p>Considered that the aspirations for the Ivanhoe Line outweigh the reasons for not having Moira as a Rural Town. A medical Practice could be provided with developer contributions, proximity of services can be enhanced by ensuring development is appropriately located and provision of bus services are linked to demand and developer contributions can be utilised.</p> <p>Q9 – Moira should be a rural town for reasons previously stated.</p> <p>Q14 – Option 5 is considered most appropriate with greatest potential to serve housing needs in a range of settlements allowing greater choice for people and recognises the reality of housing delivery which has been a failing of the Council in the past (e.g. William Davis appeal decision in Measham). Also a significant lead in time for large Urban extensions because of planning/ s106 delays/ infrastructure provision all of which will have a detrimental impact on housing delivery. No recognition of this issue which would be in evidence if there was a better distribution of the proposed development and variation of the type of sites proposed to be released.</p>
CS/AC37	David Price	<p>Point out that Bardon and EMA as major employers are near the district boundaries so inevitably draw labour from outside the district. Housing development should be located as near as practical to the large centres of employment to reduce car travel distances.</p> <p>One area the district is likely to export labour is towards South Derbys/ South Staffs, with the document failing to recognise that Moira Residents will look to south Derbys for shopping, medical, recreational and other services. Document contains no evidence of co-ordination with neighbouring authorities taking this into account.</p> <p>Existing bus routes should not determine strategy. Bus provision will follow development, not vice versa.</p> <p>Historic villages need protection including keeping their setting rural with a 'green skirt'</p> <p>Ashby is an historic market town and such historic towns deserve similar protection to villages with a clear strategy, with development potentially destroying the appeal of such settlements.</p> <p>Appendix maps take no account of the topography or watercourses. Leicester Road development is considered poorly thought through and this should not be allowed to occur in incremental stages. Does not support any new development in or adjacent to Ashby.</p> <p>Re climate change it is considered that the Council should already be pressuring developers to anticipate the governments' objective that by 2016 all new homes will be carbon neutral. Supports a policy in line with Q32.</p>
CS/AC38	Mrs Ruth Cox	<p>Use should be made of existing resources such as her Mothers field on Leicester Road which is considered to enhance and give additional character, while remained part of Ibstock Village life.</p>

		<p>Added community growth and offers access to the motorway network surrounding villages, employment opportunities and hospitals/ doctors, fulfilling the villages needs as required by government.</p> <p>Q21 and 22 – Smaller sites should be considered as they make a significant contribution to the housing supply.</p>
CS/AC39	English Heritage	<p>Vision – no strong preference although concerned that none of the options recognise the need to protect and enhance the existing historic environment/ cultural heritage of the area.</p> <p>Welcome the inclusion of objective EN6 covering the historic environment. Consider this should be developed as a policy in the Core Strategy that sets out how this objective will be implemented in a locally specific way e.g. commitment to the preparation of Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans, the protection of the historic character of Ashby and other historic settlements, the maintenance of local distinctiveness, consideration of the impacts of the operation and development associated with EMA on historic settlements and sites, the recognition of the Industrial Heritage of the National Forest area including the restoration of the Ashby Canal and the tourism potential of the area.</p> <p>Do not consider that the list of objectives should be reduced but if they are the list should be reflected in the policies and they would wish to see EN6 retained.</p> <p>Strategic Development – Directions for Growth – consider that in determining directions for growth they advise that landscape and urban character, consideration of historic assets and their setting should be key determinants in identifying locations for growth (see their previous letter), recommend that the County Historic Environment Record are consulted to identify any areas of significant undesignated archaeology. Evidence base should be informed by this analysis to demonstrate soundness with reference to national guidance and Regional Plan policies 26, 30 and 31. CLG may now wish to see major strategic sites shown on the key diagram for the Core Strategy rather than directions for growth.</p> <p>Potential Broad Locations for development-</p> <p>Coalville – Location B – nearest designated site is Snibston Colliery scheduled monument.</p> <p>Location D – could affect the setting of the Grade II* Whitwick Castle Scheduled monument.</p> <p>Ashby – Location B – The impact on listed buildings in Wood Street, setting of the town centre, historic and landscape character should all be assessed.</p> <p>Castle Donington – South West – impact on the setting of listed buildings in the High Street should be assessed.</p> <p>Ibstock / Kegworth – no sites affected</p> <p>Measham – Location B – impact on the setting of listed buildings in Chapel Street and High Street should be assessed.</p> <p>Housing requirements – An oversupply could be avoided through the monitoring process. Windfalls can be taken into account once committed.</p> <p>Employment Requirements – Do not appear to any designated sites affected except the listed mile post at the junction of the A6 and A453.</p>
CS/AC41	Derbyshire County Council	<p>Summary is given of the issues and options for the spatial objectives in the consultation document. Their strategic planning comments are-</p> <p>Landscape</p> <p>Strategy Policy 8 Generally supportive, in accordance with PPS7, regional Plan Policy 31 and places duty of LPAs to produce a Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) to inform their LDF.</p>

		<p>Limits to Development – LCAs and SPDs should inform interface between urban/ rural environments if they are defined. If criteria based option is pursued Landscape Character should be one of the criteria by which a development proposal should be judged.</p> <p>Housing and Industrial Land – LCA should form part of the evidence base as per Regional Plan Policy 31 which may allow some Greenfield land to be included.</p> <p>Landscape Character – LCA should be used including in design, tourism the National Forest etc and allows cross boundary compatibility with neighbouring authorities. Any change to the boundary of Charnwood Forest should be done in the context of the LCA.</p> <p>Planning Obligations – should still be used as a means of providing integrated environmental solutions to offset impacts of new development.</p> <p>In terms of housing they do not consider that the broad direction of new development will have any direct implications for housing in South Derbyshire</p> <p>In terms of employment they question the potential development north of Castle Donington given the possibility of a Green belt extension in this area. They consider the potential development in the vicinity of the A50 junction north of Castle Donington to be contrary to Policies 13 and 19 of the draft RSS8 as additional employment within this area would be incompatible with sustainable development and would encourage out commuting of longer distances from neighbouring centres.</p> <p>Do not object to the Sustainability Appraisal Report.</p>
CS/AC42	John Richardson	<p>Considers document not to be focussed and misses significant opportunities for service industry development including tourism/ visitor economy. Would have thought stronger references would be made to EMA and related developments, Snibston, Donington Park, Market Towns development/ sustainability, adjacent positioning and activities in neighbouring authorities e.g. Loughborough University, NEC, Coventry Airports; stronger reference to rural diversification opportunities, integrated transport solutions, little/ no mention of ICT infrastructure, role of DMOs and East Midlands Tourism, including Regional tourism Strategy, Waterways and Ashby Canal.</p>
CS/ AC43	Rose Freeman The Theatres Trust	<p>Q1 – Regeneration – Leisure and recreation Policies are not mentioned.</p> <p>Q2 – Headings must relate to objectives using the same headings.</p> <p>Q3 and 4 – Vision does not need to be detailed but should encompass the aspirations from the Issues and Objectives.</p> <p>Q5 – objectives should relate directly to the future Core Strategy Policies and some items could be combined.</p> <p>Q6 – Parks could be excluded as it would be incorporated in Green Spaces.</p> <p>General – should be policies to promote and protect community, cultural and leisure facilities which should also be provided to meet the needs generated by new development. Loss of existing facilities should be resisted. Cultural activities have several social, health and economic benefits.</p> <p>Developer contributions are necessary for the infrastructure of, and for new leisure and community activities and facilities, and a policy in the Core Strategy and Supplementary Planning Documents are necessary in this regard.</p>
CS/AC44	Bagshaws on behalf of Mr J Adkin	<p>Q14 – Supports option 1. Considers this meets the requirements of PPS1 and the emerging RSS8.</p> <p>Q15 – Supports location D. This would encourage town centre links and provided good access to the A522 minimising cross town movements.</p>

		Q17 – The SUE should provide a mix of uses subject to constraints and employment uses should be considered where appropriate.
CS/ AC45	UK Coal	<p>Q5 and 6 – Too many objectives and contradictions between them e.g. EN1 and EC3, SC2, SC3 and AC1. EN1 is considered premature and should be rewritten. EN4 is too generalised and EC8, 9 and 10 could be amalgamated.</p> <p>Q7 – Yes</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – Does not consider it helpful to classify villages as local needs, as individual applications will be treated on their merits. Local need as currently defined is unrelated to the provision of local facilities.</p> <p>Q10 If local needs settlements are to be so defined small scale local employment should be included on sustainability grounds.</p> <p>Q11 There also has to be a definition of local need.</p> <p>The settlements strategies fail to recognise the importance that growth can have on smaller settlements by providing additional population and jobs which supports facilities thereby making them more sustainable.</p> <p>Q15 to 20 – The Core Strategy should not be prescriptive about directions for growth as this would pre-empt site allocations DPDs. Reiterate their support for development in Location A (Coalville), which should be linked to employment development at Ellistown.</p> <p>Ilstock – Development to the south west of the town would have to incorporate a landscaping scheme as the land falls away. Land to the east of the A447 offers a limited amount of infill development and is adjacent to Sense Valley Forest Park and development could impact on the ecological value of the park.</p> <p>Q21 and 22 – there should not be any attempt to stop Windfall sites coming forward in line with the Governments White Paper on planning and Green Paper on housing.</p> <p>Allowance for small windfall sites should only be factored in with evidence to indicate their historic rate of coming forward and that this is likely to continue.</p> <p>Q23 to 29 – Core Strategy should acknowledge the need for smaller employment units which can meet local needs employment in smaller settlements, reduce the need to travel and meet economic prosperity objectives.</p> <p>Proportion of small units must be evidence based if a target is set. Unless there is a demonstrable lack of supply of small employment units there should not be a requirement for all employment proposals to include a proportion of smaller units.</p> <p>Q30 to 32 – The notion of locating development at Colville may be counter productive in reducing carbon emissions from transport. The ability of limited housing and employment growth at smaller settlements can meet local needs and reduce the need to travel.</p>
CS/AC46	Appleby Environment	<p>Q1 – Social inclusion in addition to addressing economic deprivation includes addressing rural isolation from services and social activity, particularly children and the elderly.</p> <p>Q3 – Vision 1 is most appropriate as it is most focussed</p> <p>Q4 – No</p> <p>Q5 – No</p> <p>Q6 – No – re EC6 there are places where conversion of redundant rural buildings into small scale housing may be more appropriate than conversion to some economic uses.</p> <p>Q7 – Agree</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – Agree</p> <p>Q10 – No</p> <p>Q11 – Yes</p> <p>Q12 – Definition is too wide ranging and could be used as the</p>

		<p>basis for a major expansion of housing in rural areas. – Questions meaning of ‘cannot be met from existing housing stock’. If this is about affordable, social housing then it should say so explicitly with policies for how such housing will remain social housing. Priority local need should be based on small dwellings for elderly residents who want to downsize.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 1 preferred. There is an opportunity to transform Coalville through focussing all resources and development there. This would be the best way to raise the quality of the whole district and to include innovations in low carbon development. The twons link with the coal industry could be used re low carbon future development.</p> <p>Q15 – Option 1 – to preserve existing green wedge and minimise cross town traffic.</p> <p>Q16 – No</p> <p>Q17 – Yes</p> <p>Q18 – Yes</p> <p>Q19 – Measham is not suitable for further expansion as it has undergone major expansion in the last 15 years.</p> <p>Q21 – Yes</p> <p>Q25, 26 and 29 - Brownfield sites (Brickworks or car auction sites) would be most suitable in Measham rather than developing any further Greenfield sites. Westminster estate has been under utilised and priority should be to ensure what is already designated as employment land is well used and the planning/ tax system does not encourage dispersed inappropriate sites.</p> <p>Q30 – through carbon-efficient development, support of community initiatives and through micro generation.</p> <p>Q31 – Policies should go further</p> <p>Q32 – Targets should reflect government targets but should be for greater reductions given the districts high carbon footprint.</p>
CS/AC473	Ashby Woulds Town Council	<p>Q3 – Option 1</p> <p>Q5 – Yes – EC1, EC3, EC4, EC5, SC2, SC3, SC6, AC1, AC2, AC4.</p> <p>Reduce the emphasis on building large housing in villages denoted as local needs settlements and discuss different housing needs to include affordable housing for young people and suitable housing for an increasing ageing population.</p> <p>Q7 – Yes</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q11 – Yes</p> <p>Q12 – Yes</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 1</p> <p>Q15 – Location A</p> <p>Q17 – Yes</p> <p>Q18 – Yes</p> <p>Q19 – Ashby – Location A, Kegworth – West of Kegworth</p> <p>Q21 – Yes</p> <p>Q27 – Yes</p> <p>Q28 – Yes</p> <p>Q29 – Yes reduce the anticipated requirement for warehouse development as this is over subscribed in the whole district</p> <p>Q30 – Item 10.5 ‘eco-development’</p> <p>Q31 – Yes</p> <p>Q32 – Yes</p> <p>Q33/34 – Refers to the meeting at County Hall on 19th March to discuss travellers sites in NW leics, and the disturbing fact of the number of illegal sites in the district between 1997 – 2006. Could select locations for authorised sites throughout the County and</p>

		<p>then the police could move on illegal encampments to an authorised site.</p> <p>Q35 - Yes</p>
CS/AC474	Cllr Nigel Smith	<p>Refers to a report in the Sunday Times relating to demand for a variety of homes with an argument from Prof Stephen Nickells that it is not enough to just build affordable homes for first time buyers, but logjams would build up in the market unless new houses of all types including five and six bedroom homes were also build.</p> <p>Refers to the Barker Report that this scale of housing would mean encroaching on the Green Belt, although Gordon Brown has ruled this out.</p>
CS/AC475	East Midlands Airport	<p>Q1 – Final bullet point under transport would be better under the Environment and Heritage sub heading perhaps merged with the fifth bullet point. Refers to the Draft RSS policies concentrating on surface access to EMA and that LDFs should consider this paying particular regard to cycling, walking and public transport with policies on access to national and regional airports. It seems appropriate the EMA bullet point should refer to this.</p> <p>Q2 – It would be useful to refer to the EMA Master Plan which outlines how the Airport will implement the predicted growth in air travel, including mitigation measures.</p> <p>Q3 – Option 2 seems most appropriate</p> <p>Q5 – Given the size and importance of the airport as an employer of local people (802 within NW Leics) it is vital that the relevance of the airport is maintained within the Core Strategy and essential that one of the Spatial Objectives continues to refer to the Airport.</p> <p>Q6 – May be an argument for having a separate objective relating to surface access to the airport and considers that 'continue' should proceed the phrase 'to develop sustainable transport options to access the airport' as these are being done already.</p> <p>Q7 – Rationale for defining rural towns seems sensible</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q10 – Add availability of public transport / bus service.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Refers to RSS8 and the Coalville focus and considers that even acknowledging that a lot of the issues relating to public transport are out of the Council's hands, new development should be sited where it can contribute towards improving public transport links. They refer to their Surface Access Strategy (SAS) which illustrates their commitment to improving surface access opportunities to the airport with several regular links to and from the airport within the district and beyond. The provision of these links together with those to Derby, Leicester and Nottingham and the future links to the Parkway station can build on a transport link and interchange for the District.</p> <p>Q18 – Seems sensible to indicate where significant new development outside of Coalville will be.</p> <p>Q19 No objections to development north of Park Lane. Have strong concerns over the proposed locations indicated for new development in Castle Donington to the south of Park Lane, west of Kegworth, and Kegworth. These proposed broad locations for development all lie within areas currently impacted upon from Airport related noise now or are likely to be in the future. Refers to advice in PPG24 relating to guidance on minimising the impact of noise with a main principle being wherever practicable noise sensitive developments (Dwellings) are separated from major types of noise including air transport. The southern two broad locations for development in Castle Donington fall within PPG24 categories A or A/B for daytime noise and B for night time noise.</p>

		<p>The land in Kegworth is within A for daytime noise and B for night time. These noise contours relate to the airport only and do not include other noise from the motorway including its potential widening. They recommend the Highways Agency are invited to comment on this matter.</p> <p>Q21 Seems sensible to allow for windfall sites although acknowledged that national guidance is against this.</p> <p>Q22 – Short of extremely restrictive policies, this would be very difficult.</p> <p>Q23 – Methodology seems appropriate.</p> <p>Q24 – EMA is a very important employment site and by 2016 their economic strategy (2003) estimates that there will be 14,300 jobs on the site. The adopted and emerging RSS8 both refer to the need to focus development associated with the airport where possible in surrounding urban areas with Derby, Leicester, Nottingham and Loughborough all mentioned and is considered that Coalville could also be seen in this context with its proximity, size and improving public transport links to the airport.</p> <p>Q26 – Consider that current local plan policy including an employment allocation for the Pegasus Business Park on the airport site is outdated and does not reflect up to date policies in the RSS and the EMA Master Plan with such development encouraged to locate in or on the edge of the Regions major urban areas. They therefore wish for the Pegasus park/ Finger farm employment site to be de-allocated and included within the Airport Limit as indicated in the airport master plan to enable it to be used for passenger and cargo ancillary facilities such as car parking and hotels which will enable the growth forecast at the Airport to be contained within the airport site until after 2020.</p> <p>Q30 – Seems sensible to reflect RSS policies on Climate change within the Core Strategy and points out that the EMA Master Plan includes a commitment for EMA to be carbon neutral by 2012 with recent airport development having borne this in mind.</p> <p>Q31 Accepts as a good idea in principle but only in general terms. The detail of internal design issues should be left to Building Regs.</p> <p>Q32 – Any target should match the Governments targets and not exceed it.</p>
CS/AC476	Holmes Antill	<p>Comments on Freight distribution but in the context of Coalville with questions 23 – 26 forming the main context. Refers to section 9 and the need for 100 Ha of land being required for warehousing and industry until 2026 but as a local requirement and not regional. Refers to the Regional Employment Land Priorities Study (RELPS 2003) prepared by Innes England and Sinclair Knight Merz concluded that subject to further research there is merit in exploring the allocation of a major new strategic distribution site within NW Leics in the area of Coalville, due to good access to population catchments and is crossed by the Ivanhoe Line which has capacity to support an inter modal facility. Refers to the 2005 NW Leics Employment land Study (Innes England/ Tymns) looking at the situation until 2021 which left the situation open ended albeit with a demand for big sheds which the district could attract in the short or medium term. Also refer to the East Midlands regional Freight Strategy (EMRA 2005) and the East Midlands Strategic Distribution Study (MDS Transmodal, Roger Tym, Savills for EMDA 2006)</p> <p>Considers that NW Leics will continue to be an excellent location for distribution activities both locally and strategically and that the Core Strategy should recognise and explore this as a specific issue rather than on which is subsumed within a general approach to employment land.</p> <p>Does not consider that a SUE would be suitable for large scale</p>

		<p>distribution uses which could be in addition to and complementary to the approach to SUEs.</p> <p>Consider that the Core Strategy should contain a commitment to a strategic distribution proposal well related to Colville as foreshadowed by the 2003 RELPS report together with a criteria based enabling policy. East Midlands Strategic Distribution Study identifies the following characteristics which could form the basis of a framework-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 40 Ha of development land 2. Good rail access 3. Good quality road access 4. Suitable configuration to allow intermodal terminal facilities 5. A confirmed need for such facilities due to demand from the logistics sector 6. A location to allow 24 hour operations 7. Good access to labour.
CS/AC477	Holmes Antill	<p>Confine their comments to their proposal for a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) adjacent to EMA. Questions 24, 26 and 30 are most relevant to this. They recognise that the primary basis for the delivery of regionally important facilities is the RSS and they draw attention to Appendix 6 (Item 5) of draft RSS8. District Council should be alert to the wider economic and environmental advantages such a proposal could bring to the sub-region and district such as reducing carbon emissions, improve the efficiency of the economy and promote widespread beneficial mitigation of the impacts of development generally.</p> <p>There is recognition at RSS level of the need to deliver more SRFI in the East Midlands particularly in the three cities sub area with a location thus far not found.</p> <p>SRFI must have good high speed access to the main cities of Nottingham, Derby and Leicester must be capable of 24 hour, 7 day working and above all excellent rail access. SRFI would facilitate rail access to the airport to serve freight and passenger needs and in this respect the ambitions of the RSS, EMDA and the airport would be met.</p>
CS/AC478	Barton Willmore on behalf of Bellway Homes	<p>Q7 – The proposed rural towns provide the best fit for Structure Plan Policy 2C. However they consider that Castle Donington and Ibstock perform best particularly in terms of public transport, and as such should be identified for development ahead of the rest.</p> <p>Q14 – Option 2c or Option 4 is considered the most appropriate strategy for growth which would allow the majority of development in Coalville with the remainder spread between one or two principal rural towns. Agrees that Castle Donington should be identified as a principal rural town they consider that Ibstock scores higher than Ashby against the criteria in SP Policy 2C and provides various employment opportunities which would support a higher level of housing development and further reduce the need to travel by providing new homes and employment opportunities within the same settlement.</p> <p>Q18 – Although it is acknowledged that the bulk of new development should be directed towards Coalville in line with RSS8, other broad locations need to be identified and failure to do so would risk a finding of unsound (PPS12 para. 2.10).</p> <p>Q19 – Considers that Castle Donington and Ibstock represent the most appropriate settlements outside of Coalville for additional growth to be focused in line with Option 4. Considers that for Ibstock Location B to the west of the village is the most sustainable direction for growth. The land is well contained by topography and physical landscape features such as Sence Valley Country Park and the newly planted woodland area to the east of Mill Farm both of which represent strong natural barriers to</p>

		development. The land has good links to the local road network (A447 and Ashby Road). Development in this location would benefit from a significant sports facility which has the potential to be upgraded as part of any development proposal. Locations A and C do not offer the same natural containment or access to the highway network. They enclose plans showing their clients land and potential access points.
CS/AC479	GOEM	<p>Q1 – Refer to the identified dependency of the district on manufacturing employment which is identified as a structural weakness in the economy elsewhere in the region as the size of the manufacturing sector in the UK is expected to continue to decline, which is a significant economic issue. Questions whether the potential link has been examined between in commuting and desire to seek higher skilled employment.</p> <p>Q3 – 3 is the preferred option.</p> <p>Q4 – Vision is a matter for the local community although they point out that generally a short overarching vision can communicate more clearly and be more effective than a string of topic related statements. They note the most locally distinctive element of the vision is building on the distinctive identity of the National Forest which they consider to be quite ambitious given the industrial legacy of the district. Other issues to consider in a vision could be the intended role of the airport and the degree of self containment and/ or integration into a wider poly-centric urban region which is sought for the district as a whole and the proposed Sub Regional Centre of Coalville in particular.</p> <p>Q5 – More limited number of objectives will improve the focus of the Core Strategy. Ranking objectives could help to indicate priorities and objectives that are locally distinctive could be more useful. May consider the 9 bullet points under Vision Option 1 to encapsulate priorities. Need to consider how to measure progress against each of the final objectives.</p> <p>Q7 – Draft RSS Policy 2 priorities development in “other urban areas” above “rural towns” and points out that Ashby with a population of over 10,000 according to ONS definition is an urban area, and as such could be considered separately from rural towns. May be worth considering the extent to which some of the rural towns act as commuter settlements for towns outside the district which could provide an additional category of town.</p> <p>Q10 - Several of the local needs settlements are closely located to Coalville or other small towns and questioned whether these nearby towns could meet local needs associated with these villages.</p> <p>Q13 – The urban extension of Coalville presents the opportunity to improve the relationship of the town to surrounding and adjoining settlements and the Beveridge lane employment area. Concerns regarding loss of identity could be addressed through careful design and outweighed by the gains of a more coherent Colville urban area with a greater critical mass to support jobs and services.</p> <p>Q18 – Any significant development sites outside of Coalville should have general locations determined.</p> <p>Q21 – Refer to PPS3 advice regarding providing broad locations and specific sites for a 15 year continuous supply of housing (para 33). May be Coalville and other specified towns could constitute general locations from which an evidence based supply of small brownfield sites could be proposed, however that supply can not be relied upon for the first 5 years (PPS3 para. 54). Paragraph 55 also indicates that general locations should not be relied on for years 6-10 however, if the assumptions of windfall delivery from a general location prove justified and an adequate supply is maintained, then this would amount to a rationale to hold back</p>

		<p>other sites from the 5 year supply until they are needed.</p> <p>Q22 – No need to hold back small brownfield windfalls generally, although such development in small poorly located settlements that lack services should be restrained.</p> <p>Q23 – The 2004 Tym, Innes England Employment Land Study for the District is the best current evidence base on which to make projections.</p> <p>Q24 – Main regional employment land demands may be for operational airport related uses and / or a sub regional distribution park. The submission Core Strategy will need to indicate if more land is required for either of these and the general location.</p> <p>Q28 – Consider whether such a requirement could unduly affect the viability of employment development</p> <p>Q29 – Core Strategy can refer to other programs such as those of emda and the Leicestershire Economic Partnership.</p> <p>Q30 – Renewable energy should be actively considered.</p> <p>Q31 – Draft annex to PPS1 raises the possibility of enhanced building standards being provided on schemes where they are viable, and major urban extensions could constitute such schemes. Hosing Green Paper indicates that the Code for Sustainable homes is intended to become mandatory soon so the Core Strategy may be overtaken by legislation.</p> <p>Q33 – Criteria must not lead to the contradictory circumstances where proposal fail for being too far from services or too close to residential areas.</p> <p>Q34 – PPS12 prefers general locations to criteria. If a range of services is a basic criteria work in identifying rural towns and local needs settlements may guide appropriate locations for gypsy and traveller and showpeople sites.</p> <p>Q35 – Areas of major development including SUE may be appropriate for G & T Sites. However advice in the joint study that provision should be made in small sites suitable for family groups should be followed. Providing for most of the need through a single large encampment in Coalville may not be appropriate.</p>
CS/AC480	Michael Hopkins	<p>Q1 – Yes</p> <p>Q2 – Core Strategy can provide an overarching strategy for delivering sustainable development in NW Leics which provides for growth that improves the social, economic and environmental well being of the district.</p> <p>Q3 – Option 2 is the most appropriate as it sets out the most coherent principles of sustainable development.</p> <p>Q5 – Does not consider the strategy should have a more limited range of objectives. Most appropriate objectives are those which set broad strategic goals. Most appropriate are – EN1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, EC3, 4, 5, and 8, SC1, 3, and 4, and AC1, 2, 3 and 5.</p> <p>Q7 – Yes</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q11 – No</p> <p>Q12 – Definition is too narrow given the timescale of the strategy. Questions how it could be enforced.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Options 1 and 4 are considered most consistent with the RSS and concentrating new development in existing urban centres according to an urban hierarchy.</p> <p>Q1 – Option A is most appropriate as it provides best fit with transport infrastructure and movements.</p> <p>Q17 – Yes</p> <p>Q18 – Yes</p> <p>Q19 – Option A is most appropriate for Ashby as development remains within the surrounding road boundary.</p> <p>Q21 – Yes</p> <p>Q22 – sites should not be prevented from coming forward</p>

		<p>Q24 – Areas for possible employment land should be identified as part of the Core Strategy and linked to evidence of existing need or new areas of development.</p> <p>Q25 – Coalville SUE is most appropriate. Development in Ashby west of A42 risks encouraging a spread of the town rather than concentrating urban development.</p> <p>Q27 – Yes</p> <p>Q28 – Yes</p> <p>Q30 – By seeking sustainable mixed use developments with local facilities reducing the need to travel and by encouraging energy saving buildings.</p> <p>Q31 – May not be appropriate to cover matters dealt with under the Building Regs.</p> <p>Q32 – May be appropriate for Core Strategy to refer to other Council policies which set targets – e.g. climate change strategy, environmental strategy or Nottingham declaration.</p> <p>Q34 – Yes</p> <p>Q35 - Yes</p>
CS/AC481	Highways Agency	<p>Broadly support the document which revolves around a vision of promoting sustainable communities and development. Refers to the fundamental need for a firm evidence base underpinning the strategy and consider that further work is required in relation to transport. No indication that a sufficient evidence base is in hand to accurately identify the relevant transport issues, assess the potential implications of broad site allocation, or the measures required to address transport in the district and to support the housing and employment provision until 2026 including the proposed Growth Point at Coalville. Comprehensive modelling is essential to provide suitably sustainable growth points and a strategic model (PTOLEMY) has been developed with DCLG and will shortly be available to test planning policies.</p> <p>Considers that Coalville as a SRC is the most sustainable location for development and considers employments land provision with housing in an SUE could contribute positively to sustainability objectives. Accepts that some development may need to be considered in rural towns and it would be important to demonstrate that this is consistent with delivering the overall objectives of the Core strategy particularly in relation to traffic growth and car travel.</p> <p>In the event of applications coming forward in advance of a decision on the location of a SUE then such applications would need to be determined in accordance with advice in PPS12, PPG13 and Circular 02/2007.</p>
CS/AC482	British Waterways	<p>Q4 – Options 2 & 3 contain references to those visiting the District and Option 3 includes the provision of recreational facilities. The final version should include both of these elements.</p> <p>Q6 – Increased economic prosperity, diversity and competitiveness. Spatial objectives should also encourage the use of assets, such as the inland waterways network outside the national Forest, for the development of tourism, leisure and recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Q20 – Refers to EC6 as encouraging sustainable diversification of the rural economy. Core Strategy should take account of para.2.1.2 of Draft RSS8 Policy 2 in respect of regional approach to selecting land for development without allocating sites for development. It may be necessary to find suitable sites e.g. tourist sites away from existing settlements which satisfy the sustainability criteria in line with this Policy.</p> <p>They refer to their comments in respect of Q6 of the previous Core Strategy Consultation which related to the non-footloose nature of the waterways and associated development.</p>

CS/AC483	Iceni Projects on behalf of the Money Hill Consortium (MHC)	<p>Q1 and Q2 – Most of the issues have been identified. Commuting patterns is not specifically identified and the high levels of in and out commuting especially from Ashby result in NW Leics having one of the highest rates in England for the use of private cars which is fundamentally unsustainable. Also not identified is the need and potential for new development to physically, economically and socially improve and regenerate existing settlements and they refer to their illustrative masterplan is this regard with such an approach in accordance with PPSs 1, 3 and 6. Many issues are intertwined and whilst the district is an attractive place to live and work there are some characteristics which have created unsustainable patterns of living working and travelling which can only be addressed through a spatial approach which channels housing to locations where residents have good access to employment, services and shops through walking and cycling with access to public transport also imperative.</p> <p>Q3 and Q4 -Option 3 is most appropriate.</p> <p>Q5 and Q6 – No.</p> <p>Q7 – Disagree with the notion that Ashby should be identified as rural town within the same hierarchy as settlements such as Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham. Ashby is identified as a main town in the Structure Plan and as such should not be considered with the context of SP Policy 2C. It is identified as an other urban area in the Draft RSS8 spatial diagram for the 3 cities and within the Regional Public Transport Diagram is identified as a 'selected other centre'. Its character is that of a market town and not a rural character. It should be identified as an 'other urban area' in the Core Strategy as over many years it has been significant as a major contributor to housing and employment growth and has potential to accommodate more growth in the future. It is evident from the RSS that Ashby is recognised ahead of all other settlements in the district apart from Coalville and the hierarchy should reflect this. In preparing their illustrative masterplan several studies were commissioned which included an Economic Profile and a transport Review which are included in the appendices but the main findings in terms of settlement hierarchy are –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 2001 Ashby has a population of 11,594 some 13% of the district and comfortably the second largest settlement in the district. 2. Ashby provides 20% of the districts employment, and has 3000 more jobs than economically active residents (substantial in commuting with 8734 jobs and 5837 economically active) 3. Only 43% of economically active residents in Ashby work in Ashby which demonstrates higher levels of out commuting than in commuting. 4. Since 2001 employment has grown by 900 jobs (11%) 5. The town has excellent road links but poor public transport with 88% on in commuters travelling by private car. 6. The economy is continuing to diversify into high value sectors. <p>There is clear imbalance between the levels of residents and workers in Ashby and this has resulted in unsustainable travel patterns, and the only way to correct the imbalance is to direct further residential development into the settlement within the plan period.</p> <p>Q13 and 14 – Should be an additional tier within the hierarchy in accordance with the RSS. Considers that development could contribute to the opening of the National Forest Line and development of Money Hill would improve public transport. Does</p>
----------	---	--

		<p>not consider that development to the north of Ashby will have any detrimental impact on the River Mease SAC.</p> <p>Considers Option 2a to be most appropriate both in terms of sustainability and land to the north of Ashby is sequentially preferable to land to the south. In terms of delivery the Coalville/ Ashby approach has worked well over the past decade and there is no reason to abandon this tried and tested approach. This approach has resulted in homes coming forward at 441 per annum above the Structure Plan level of 368 with this requirement to increase to 480 per annum. It is not considered that Colville can meet this alone which will result in inappropriate and unsustainable greenfield applications coming forward in line with PPS3 because the district will be failing to meet its targets. In terms of the sustainability implications of not developing Ashby this would have serious implications. The Coalville focus option will result in an over reliance on the SRC and Greenfield applications when targets are not met plus negative impacts on the vitality and viability of Ashby Town Centre. Considers that Money Hill is the only Greenfield development that presents a genuine opportunity to extend and improve the town centre regeneration (Masterplan). The absence of strategic housing development at Ashby potentially weakens its attractiveness as a business location in the future, with the proximity of an accessible labour supply a key determinant for business when choosing a location which is evident from the census. This imbalance of jobs to workers is fundamentally unsustainable and is more likely to be exacerbated if the trend is not corrected through spatial planning.</p> <p>Q17 – Considers an SUE to Coalville will need to be mixed use with neighbourhood retail provision, small businesses and home working as it will be remote from the town centre. They are concerned if major areas of land are identified for mass employment simply because significant levels of new housing is directed to a particular location. There needs to be correlation between housing, employment and the critical mass of an existing settlement although proximity of labour is only one factor business will take into account when deciding on location. A balance needs to be struck between locating business close to residential areas where people can sustainably commute to work and locating businesses in areas they do not wish to be located as this will lead to stagnation of the districts economy.</p> <p>Q18 and Q20 – An SUE will be required outside of Coalville and in line with the RSS Ashby must be prioritised ahead of other settlements in this regard. The Core Strategy must identify the broad location for such an SUE and when considered against Policy 2 of the RSS, PPS1, PPS3, PPS6 and PPS25 and detailed sustainability appraisal, land to the north of Ashby is sequentially preferable to land to the south and will deliver a more sustainable pattern of development.</p> <p>Q25 -29 – Core Strategy must consider and identify new employment locations for significant new commercial development. Successful commercial development could be incorporated into development at Money Hill, which could include the provision of small affordable business units through S106 agreements, improvements to the town centre through an extension northwards with relocation of the college to a new purpose built site as well as an extension of the existing industrial estate on the eastern edge of the proposed development area. These submissions are supported by a Masterplan, a review of the Economy of Ashby by Roger Tym & Partners and a Transport Strategy and Review by Peter Brett Associates.</p>
--	--	---

CS/AC484	Natural England	<p>Q1 – Supports the list of key issues. Challenge is to enhance the existing Ecological, Geological and landscape value, e.g. River Mease, and Charnwood but also Local Wildlife sites, local nature reserves and habitats in the National and Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland biodiversity Action Plan, also to increase areas of green space and access to natural assets.</p> <p>Q3 – No preference but refer to importance of increasing access to and enjoyment of the natural environment and sustainable development in the local context.</p> <p>Q5 – Strongly support spatial objectives relating to safeguarding and enhancing the environment. EN5 should be clarified explaining what is meant by priority habitats and species and should make reference to contributing towards the targets in the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Biodiversity Action Plan. Advise that there should be a separate objective for open spaces/ green infrastructure with natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace target (ANGSt) is a useful target.</p> <p>Q6 - A green Infrastructure objective</p> <p>Q7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25 and 26 – Their comment in regard to any allocations is that the environmental constraints are factored in at the earliest possible stage in accordance with government advice particularly in terms of European sites. Good practice to factor in all environmental constraints when making any type of site/ growth allocation so that any options that may have an adverse effect on biodiversity, landscape or geology are avoided. Sustainability Appraisal will be useful in this regard (hierarchy of avoid, mitigate, compensate) Point out that there is a requirement to undertake a Habitat Regulations Assessment (Appropriate Assessment).</p>
CS/AC485	FLOAT (Graham Saunt)	<p>Q1 – No. In the Environment Section should be included reference to adequate disposal of sewerage with capacities quoted for new developments and Severn Trent's input. Need confirmation the storm drains are adequate for 40mm/ hour rainfall.</p> <p>Q3 – Option 2 is preferred.</p> <p>Q5 – Yes – most appropriate objectives are EN1, EN2, EN5, EN7, EC1, EC3, EC4, SC2, SC4, SC6, AC1, AC2 and AC4.</p> <p>Q6 – Yes, should include an objective to ensure that there is adequate provision for foul drainage and sewerage.</p> <p>Q14 – Support Option 1 – Coalville focus as it fits in with other objectives of regenerating Coalville Town Centre, RSS directs growth in this area and it is considered to be the most sustainable option.</p> <p>Q19 – Believes there is a direct link between the upstream development of the Ashby and Smisby areas and flooding in Packington, hence they oppose development in Ashby for this reason, as well as a lack of infrastructure, negative impact on the River Mease SAC and detrimental impact on road traffic.</p> <p>Q25 – Supports industrial development of location C in Ashby due to the flooding in Packington issue, no development should take place outside of the natural boundaries of the A511/ A42, and also refers to the recent inspectors' decision.</p>
CS/AC486	Pegasus on behalf of Persimmon (North Midlands) Ltd	<p>Q1 - Most key issues are covered in Section 3 but retail should be identified as a separate matter. Housing section should recognise the importance of the contribution of market housing that is affordable. The section on affordable housing should refer to affordable housing needs to be met at a local level.</p> <p>Q2 – Updated retail capacity study should be used to inform a policy on retail provision that recognises the importance of shopping provision in Colville Town Centre.</p> <p>Core Strategy should encourage the provision of a mix of housing having regard to the strategic Housing market Assessment and to</p>

		<p>the different types of households requiring housing over the plan period. Housing Needs Assessment should inform policies on affordable housing including thresholds, tenure split, size and type. Should also support forms of development most able to deliver affordable housing provision such as SUEs.</p> <p>Q3 – Option 1 is supported.</p> <p>Q4 – No alternative statement is required although option 1 should be altered with the word “facilitate” included in place of “secure” ...well designed sustainable developments.</p> <p>Refers to paragraph 2.9 of PPS12 in terms of a Spatial vision to include a bullet point to provide opportunities for people to live close to where they work and to promote high quality housing to encourage people who presently commute into the district to work. These are key to achieving a sustainable future.</p> <p>Q5 – No</p> <p>Q6 – suggested revisions- EN1 add Focus new development in and adjoining the main urban area of Coalville</p> <p>Social objectives – new objective – Enable everyone to have the opportunity of living in a decent home by facilitating delivery of high quality housing for all.</p> <p>Creating Accessible Communities focussing on sustainable transportation – new objective – locate new development such that it will improve the balance between employment and housing in order to minimise unsustainable commuting patterns and enable travel by non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>Q7 – Agreed that listed settlements should be rural towns but not that they should be considered equal in their suitability for accommodating further development.</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q10 – No</p> <p>Q11 – Difficult to define local need particularly as this may change over the plan period. Could require development to improve the sustainability of the 'local needs settlements' and contribute positively to retaining services and creating mixed and balanced communities.</p> <p>Q12 – No. Section 6.14 has taken a very narrow view of what constitutes local need and this does not fully reflect policy guidance in PPS3 or Policy 5 of draft RSS8, with these having a broader view of developments in settlements outside of rural towns which should be reflected in the Core Strategy. E.g local needs housing could be that which ensure the provision of an element of affordable housing to meet the identified needs of the local community or market housing that contributes towards the retention of existing services and supports local facilities.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 4 is the most appropriate. Coalville is already recognised as an SRC in draft RSS8 with an SUE proposed with 195 dwellings required per year until 2026. In line with PPS3 and PPS12 regard has to be had to this to enable the Core Strategy to be sound. Option 4 would enable Coalville to develop its status as an SRC and would support the delivery of a regenerated town centre and opportunities for improved public transport to improve sustainability. Designating two principal rural towns, Ashby and Coalville within the hierarchy would be consistent with emerging RSS policy in terms of strengthening of the vitality and viability of rural towns. Option 4 is appropriate as it recognised that smaller scale development can be appropriate in other rural towns and local needs settlements.</p> <p>Q15 – More than one SUE can be accommodated which is not precluded in draft RSS8 and will be necessary for delivery of RSS8 housing figures. Location A is considered appropriate for an</p>
--	--	---

		<p>SUE which includes the current allocation with the potential to extend this to the south of Grange Road. This would be sustainable development through supporting service provision and having the potential to accommodate a mix of uses and also facilitate the delivery of infrastructure improvements re a bypass to Bardon Road and link to the A511. This would avoid congestion in the town centre and minor roads, would have good accessibility to employment land (Bardon) and facilities in Colville and there is the potential to create a passenger railway station in this general location.</p> <p>Location D should also be considered as an SUE. A review of Green Wedge areas is required (Structure Plan Strategy Policy 6) and will be necessary to meet the tests of soundness (test vii). Considered that location D would be a sustainable location for new development – has excellent accessibility to the town centre, employment areas, public transport and leisure uses. Close proximity to the A511 would divert traffic away from the town centre and could take advantage of public transport along this route.</p> <p>Q16 – No.</p> <p>Q17 – No strategic requirement of RSS8 particularly Policy 4 (3 Cities) to require urban extensions to provide for a mix of uses. In Coalville, census information reveals significantly more jobs than economically active residents, which leads to in commuting and high car usage. As such SUE in Coalville should be heavily or completely biased towards housing on sustainability grounds to enable people to live near their place of work.</p> <p>However, acknowledged that problems of localised demand for starter and follow on industrial premises and offices, lower incomes and lack of higher skilled jobs could be some way addressed with an element of employment use within an SUE.</p> <p>Q18 – Important for the Core Strategy to identify broad locations for growth outside of Colville in line with Policy 2 of draft RSS8 and advice in PPS12.</p> <p>Q19 – majority of development in and adjacent to Coalville with development also at Ashby and Castle Donington.</p> <p>Q20 – No</p> <p>Q21 – No allowance should be taken of windfall sites in line with Paragraph 59 of PPS3. No guarantee that such sites would come forward in the future and a settlement hierarchy would prevent windfall sites coming forward in the smaller villages.</p> <p>Q22 – They shouldn't. An overprovision of housing in the first 10 years is not necessarily problematic.</p> <p>Q23 – No. The Core Strategy will need to reflect any revisions to RSS8 in terms of employment requirements and full account should be taken of the RES and housing growth proposed for NW Leics by the RSS.</p> <p>Q24 – The Core Strategy should recognise opportunities within NW Leics by facilitating development which would take advantage of these opportunities and meet market demand.</p> <p>Q25 – SUE to Coalville would be the best location to meet demand for small starter and follow on units. Access to sustainable modes of transport is the decisive factor.</p> <p>Q26 – No</p> <p>Q27 – Yes</p> <p>Q28 – Yes</p> <p>Q29 – No</p> <p>Q30 – Ensure development is located where it will create sustainable patterns of development, also encourage developers to meet recognised national targets where feasible and viable (Code for Sustainable Homes), and on or off site renewable energy generation.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Q31 – No</p> <p>Q32 – No</p> <p>Q33 – Refers to C01/2006 requirement for a G and T accommodation assessment and in the absence of this the level of need is difficult to ascertain. Where need is established the Core Strategy should set the criteria relating to the location of sites in line with paragraph 64 of C01/2006, and should seek to meet sustainability objectives in terms of access to services and coexistence with the local community.</p> <p>Q34 – No, Criteria approach would provide adequate steer.</p> <p>Q35 – No – insufficient evidence to justify this at present.</p>
CS/AC487	Pegasus on behalf of Thomas Harley's charity.	<p>Q1 – Most key issues are covered in Section 3 but retail should be identified as a separate matter. Housing section should recognise the importance of the contribution of market housing that is affordable. The section on affordable housing should refer to affordable housing needs to be met at a local level.</p> <p>Q2 – Updated retail capacity study should be used to inform a policy on retail provision that recognises the importance of shopping provision in Colville Town Centre.</p> <p>Core Strategy should encourage the provision of a mix of housing having regard to the strategic Housing market Assessment and to the different types of households requiring housing over the plan period. Housing Needs Assessment should inform policies on affordable housing including thresholds, tenure split, size and type. Should also support forms of development most able to deliver affordable housing provision such as SUEs.</p> <p>Q3 – Option 1 is supported.</p> <p>Q4 – No alternative statement is required although option 1 should be altered with the word “facilitate” included in place of “secure” ...well designed sustainable developments.</p> <p>Refers to paragraph 2.9 of PPS12 in terms of a Spatial vision to include a bullet point to provide opportunities for people to live close to where they work and to promote high quality housing to encourage people who presently commute into the district to work. These are key to achieving a sustainable future.</p> <p>Q5 – No</p> <p>Q6 – suggested revisions- EN1 add Focus new development in and adjoining the main urban area of Coalville</p> <p>Social objectives – new objective – Enable everyone to have the opportunity of living in a decent home by facilitating delivery of high quality housing for all.</p> <p>Creating Accessible Communities focussing on sustainable transportation – new objective – locate new development such that it will improve the balance between employment and housing in order to minimise unsustainable commuting patterns and enable travel by non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>Q7 – Agreed that listed settlements should be rural towns but not that they should be considered equal in their suitability for accommodating further development.</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q10 – No</p> <p>Q11 – Difficult to define local need particularly as this may change over the plan period. Could require development to improve the sustainability of the 'local needs settlements' and contribute positively to retaining services and creating mixed and balanced communities.</p> <p>Q12 – No. Section 6.14 has taken a very narrow view of what constitutes local need and this does not fully reflect policy guidance in PPS3 or Policy 5 of draft RSS8, with these having a broader view of developments in settlements outside of rural towns which should be reflected in the Core Strategy. E.g local</p>

		<p>needs housing could be that which ensure the provision of an element of affordable housing to meet the identified needs of the local community or market housing that contributes towards the retention of existing services and supports local facilities.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 4 is the most appropriate. Coalville is already recognised as an SRC in draft RSS8 with an SUE proposed with 195 dwellings required per year until 2026. In line with PPS3 and PPS12 regard has to be had to this to enable the Core Strategy to be sound. Option 4 would enable Coalville to develop its status as an SRC and would support the delivery of a regenerated town centre and opportunities for improved public transport to improve sustainability. Designating two principal rural towns, Ashby and Coalville within the hierarchy would be consistent with emerging RSS policy in terms of strengthening of the vitality and viability of rural towns. Option 4 is appropriate as it recognised that smaller scale development can be appropriate in other rural towns and local needs settlements.</p> <p>Q15 – Locations A and D are generally supported although more options will need to be considered and. More than one SUE can be accommodated which is not precluded in draft RSS8 and will be necessary for delivery of RSS8 housing figures.</p> <p>Q16 – Yes land north of Berryhill Lane – sustainable location, well related to existing built form, contribute to housing delivery around Coalville, would not compromise integrity of countryside or lead to coalescence.</p> <p>Q17 – No strategic requirement of RSS8 particularly Policy 4 (3 Cities) to require urban extensions to provide for a mix of uses. In Coalville, census information reveals significantly more jobs than economically active residents, which leads to in commuting and high car usage. As such SUE in Coalville should be heavily or completely biased towards housing on sustainability grounds to enable people to live near their place of work. However, acknowledged that problems of localised demand from starter and follow on industrial premises and offices, lower incomes and lack of higher skilled jobs could be some way addressed with an element of employment use within an SUE.</p> <p>Q18 – Important for the Core Strategy to identify broad locations for growth outside of Coalville in line with Policy 2 of draft RSS8 and advice in PPS12.</p> <p>Q19 – majority of development in and adjacent to Coalville with development also at Ashby and Castle Donington.</p> <p>Q20 – No</p> <p>Q21 – No allowance should be taken of windfall sites in line with Paragraph 59 of PPS3. No guarantee that such sites would come forward in the future and a settlement hierarchy would prevent windfall sites coming forward in the smaller villages.</p> <p>Q22 – They shouldn't. An overprovision of housing in the first 10 years is not necessarily problematic.</p> <p>Q23 – No. The Core Strategy will need to reflect any revisions to RSS8 in terms of employment requirements and full account should be taken of the RES and housing growth proposed for NW Leics by the RSS.</p> <p>Q24 – The Core Strategy should recognise opportunities within NW Leics by facilitating development which would take advantage of these opportunities and meet market demand.</p> <p>Q25 – SUE to Coalville would be the best location to meet demand for small starter and follow on units. Access to sustainable modes of transport is the decisive factor.</p> <p>Q26 – No</p> <p>Q27 – Yes</p> <p>Q28 – Yes</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Q29 – No</p> <p>Q30 – Ensure development is located where it will create sustainable patterns of development, also encourage developers to meet recognised national targets where feasible and viable (Code for Sustainable Homes), and on or off site renewable energy generation.</p> <p>Q31 – No</p> <p>Q32 – No</p> <p>Q33 – Refers to C01/2006 requirement for a Gand T accommodation assessment and in the absence of this the level of need is difficult to ascertain. Where need is established the Core Strategy should set the criteria relating to the location of sites in line with paragraph 64 of C01/2006, and should seek to meet sustainability objectives in terms of access to services and coexistence with the local community.</p> <p>Q34 – No, Criteria approach would provide adequate steer.</p> <p>Q35 – No – insufficient evidence to justify this at present.</p>
CS/AC488	Cllr John Legrys	<p>Refers to different understanding of 'Coalville' and considers that this needs to be better defined – possibly in terms of wards.</p> <p>Issues – Agree with conclusion but add that there is an urgent need to promote tourism in the district with many people passing through the district on the M1/ A42 with need to encourage camping/ caravan sites & B& Bs particularly adjacent to Charnwood Forest and the Measham area.</p> <p>Housing – Agree with conclusions but add there should be a wider community discussion on where additional housing should be located, a definition of 'affordable' housing, and linking housing growth to 'community gain' including infrastructure projects such as the National Forest Line.</p> <p>Transport – Agree with conclusion but adds that the champion the opening of the National Forest Line a planning legacy should be ensured. Promote cycling, walking particularly to home and work and home working.</p> <p>Social inclusion – agree with the conclusion but considers that the Core Strategy should include the elderly not in work.</p> <p>Vision – Option 1 takes a clearer direction.</p> <p>Objectives – Questions how many understand 'spatial objectives' and needs to be convinced that EN1 is essential. Considers the shown objective show a right balance and EC8 should be extended to include the Charnwood Forest.</p> <p>Strategic Development – Directions for Growth– Refers to RSS8 and considers that a lot more thought needs to be given to the Sub Regional Centre for the final Core Strategy Draft. Challenges bullet point 1 in 6.5. Lots of text on Regional Centres but no indication of growth benefits to urban communities or infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Option 1 – no clear indication if the SUE is to be one block or several. Original County Suggestions are remote form the older urban centre and are unlikely to generate funding (S106) for town centre regeneration. If SUE is undertaken in one block then should be considered making this a new self contained community.</p> <p>Option 2 – Coalville must not be the sole focus of development</p> <p>Option 5 is preferred</p> <p>Option 6 has merits</p> <p>Potential Broad Locations for development - 7.2 – Location A on the Stud Farm is not new and has been held back in line with GOEM demands to focus on Brownfield land. Questions requirements of RSS and additional growth for a SUE and questions whether this site needs to be extended?</p> <p>Location B will require a town centre north / south by pass.</p> <p>Location C will lose separation from the village and urban centre.</p>

		<p>Location D will generate considerable opposition.</p> <p>Travel to work problems will occur on all sites unless considerable infrastructure improvements are made.</p> <p>Housing Requirements – Yes provision should be made for small sites.</p> <p>Q23 – Flexibility is required</p> <p>9.12 – The A42 should be the delineation of the built up area. In the event of the Rapid Loader site being lost on appeal, Corkscrew Lane should be the delineation line.</p> <p>Q25 and 27 – There will be a need for smaller units near or in residential areas (e.g. for car repairs).</p> <p>Q28 – Yes</p> <p>Q29 – Provision of small working hubs in all new build – similar to units in rural areas.</p> <p>Climate Change – carbon emissions are not the only issue associated with climate change, and the consequences of climate change need to be a central thread through the LDF and Core Strategy – Inclusion of the ‘Merton Rule’ would be convenient.</p> <p>Q31 – Ye, but questions whether it is enforceable.</p> <p>Q32 – Targets that cannot be regulated by the LA will be unenforceable.</p> <p>Gypsies and travellers – proper and controlled transit site will be of benefit. Q35 makes too many assumptions about SUE. Sites adjacent to existing sites would perhaps be of most benefit to the travelling community. Core Strategy needs to address the needs of the settled community.</p>
CS/AC489	John Evans	<p>His property covers 143 Ha of former agricultural land which is now set aside. His land is in close proximity to adjacent communications infrastructure and potential development being considered by others.</p> <p>Considers that land similar to his meets government policy in terms of local requirements, protecting the environment, boosts local employment and helps to sustain local businesses. Town centre employment and leisure uses would all benefit from development within the area. Sustaining local businesses is vital to retaining community values and ensuring that by reducing the need for using remote amenities.</p> <p>Current road and utility infrastructure would allow easy access to the M1 corridor, proposed Bardon Road bypass and M42.</p> <p>Reduction in congestion in or around the town centre at peak times would benefit the environment. Developing his land would allow local residents to experience country living by retaining the mature and established copse and tree lined River Sence. He encloses a map illustrating the points made and also refers to adjacent land which a house builder has an option on.</p>
CS/AC491	South Derbyshire	<p>Housing Numbers - Consider it to be important to ensure that NWLDC makes full provision for its housing requirements as to be confirmed in RSS8 to discourage unnecessary in migration into South Derbyshire.</p> <p>Directions for Growth – A possible northwards extension to Ashby may have highway implications on the A511 into Swadlingcote which already suffers from Congestion at Woodville, and would need to avoid harm to rural areas in South Derbys including the Smisby Conservation Area. Employment Development to the North of Castle Donington will need to be carefully assessed in terms of its impact on the highway network and any visual intrusion into South Derbys.</p> <p>Transport – In terms of EMA clear and robust wording will be needed to ensure full mitigation of avoidable environmental damage is achieved together with a step increase in sustainable access.</p>

		They are supportive of development in NW Leics which would maximise the viability of the National Forest Line.
CS/AC492	Savills	<p>Issues – Economy (3.1) – Consider that the need to revitalise Coalville Town Centre is linked with new attractive retail and commercial floorspace in Coalville with development close to the town centre and key public transport nodes should be considered. The centre of Colville lacks a convenience store of great choice and quality and addressing this will be the best way of securing investment in the town.</p> <p>Transport – public transport provision is generally quite poor – S106 money from new retail development could be used to improve public transport in Coalville.</p> <p>Q1 – Specific need for a new convenience store (in Coalville) has not been made clear enough and a principle issue for the Core Strategy to address is retail spend out of the district.</p> <p>Q3 – Option 1 is supported but the following statements should be added-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minimise the impact of the district upon climate change, particularly focusing on reducing the need to travel by car and re-opening the National Forest passenger line, improved public transport, cycle ways and pedestrian links, and building design to encourage energy efficiency. 2. Regenerate those areas in need including neighbourhood renewal areas, and Coalville Town Centre. 3. Promote healthy, secure, strong communities through design and infrastructure provision. <p>5 – EN1 Should be highlighted as a key statement. A high quality development with public transport improvements would result in more people visiting the town (Coalville) and attracting new retail business and employment opportunities.</p> <p>New bus waiting facilities and info displays in Coalville Town Centre would support objectives AC1 and AC2. New development close to the town centre should incorporate dry cycle storage facilities.</p> <p>Q5 – Core Strategy should have greater emphasis on revitalising Coalville town Centre in line with RSS designation of Coalville as an SRC.</p> <p>Q14 – Support the Colville Focus option which would help to preserve the character of rural towns and would increase sustainable methods of travel with (retail) development in Coalville.</p> <p>Q17 – Yes in principle but should not take growth away from Coalville town centre.</p>
CS/AC494	Bloor Homes	<p>Q7 – Ashby should be treated separately to the other rural towns which would result in their support for Option 2a – the Coalville and Ashby focus.</p> <p>Q20 – There is potential for small scale development on the west side of Ashby south of Moira Road with additional small peripheral sites in this area, supports the north east direction for growth in Measham and point out that the Core Strategy should make clear that there may be development potential within the settlement boundaries as well such as Slack and Parr in Kegworth. Unclear whether locations for growth are for large scale SUEs only.</p>
CS/AC495	Mrs Suzanne Gill	<p>Q9 – Considers that the listed villages are capable of accommodating development in particular Appleby Magma.</p> <p>Q11 – Suggests that the definition of local needs should be more widely drawn than that suggested in paragraph 6.14 with these criteria reflecting a rural exceptions policy, as government policy</p>

		<p>does not seek to restrict local needs in the way proposed. Paragraph 38 PPS3 makes clear that housing in smaller settlements are necessary to support a range of housing needs and The Core strategy should consider a range of market and affordable properties in the local needs settlements.</p>
CS/AC496	GVA Grimley on behalf of Jelson	<p>Number of objectives should be reduced and be broader in nature. Delivery of housing to meet RSS targets in a way that promotes local housing opportunity and choice should be included.</p> <p>In general terms support Option 1 – Coalville Focus – most sustainable option and accords with the draft RSS. They have concerns regarding a single SUE of the size proposed in terms of putting a lot of pressure on a single site to deliver quickly and consistently over a long period. They suggest a series of smaller SUEs would reduce this pressure providing greater flexibility and choice.</p> <p>Broad locations for development – Consider that option D in Colville represents a significantly less harmful option to the open countryside and overall form of the Colville Urban Area than the other options put forward. The green Wedge needs to be critically re-assessed as Whitwick is already connected to the wider urban area and it is considered that the green wedge functions more as an oversized village green without the recreation and public access benefits. Development would allow open space to be at the heart of the urban area.</p> <p>Allowance for small sites – Object to the inclusion of small site windfalls as this is contrary to PPS3. No action is necessary to prevent such small sites coming forward due to monitor and review requirement (paragraph 76 PPS3).</p> <p>Climate Change – Are cautious over more stringent policies than the national requirements due to a possible disincentive to inward investment. Policies supporting the voluntary adoption of measures would be more helpful.</p>
CS/AC497	David and Derry Benson	<p>Q14 – Support Option 1 – Most sustainable, in line with RSS8 and puts the regeneration of Coalville as a high priority.</p> <p>Q19 – Oppose significant development of Ashby because-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There has already been considerable growth 2. River Mease SAC has not been adequately addressed 3. Flooding of Packington has not been resolved 4. Inspectors reports have supported the view that the road system in Ashby cannot support major growth. <p>Q25 – Development in Ashby - Location B looks feasible in terms of access to the A511 and if amenities are planned – but this is to ignore the impact of development on the wider town community. They oppose location A as this is a low lying part of Ashby close to the Gilwiskaw Brook with no access to decent roads. Siting houses alongside what is effectively a motorway will be unhealthy.</p>
CS/AC498	CGMS on behalf of the Royal Bank of Scotland	<p>Kegworth is of sufficient size with appropriate facilities to be identified as a rural town. Its status will be enhanced with the opening of the parkway Railway Station.</p> <p>Of the 6 options they support option 5 with all of these settlements identified because they are of sustainable size and would be sensible to spread the 'burden' of development amongst a number of settlements and maintain local facilities.</p> <p>If Kegworth is to be expanded this should be to the east (Para 7.3.7 away from the floodplain. The RBS site would be available for redevelopment and is within the limits to development as residential/ employment with RBS maintaining a presence on the site.</p>
CS/AC499	Pegasus on behalf of Ashby Park Investments	<p>Q1 - Most key issues are covered in Section 3 but retail should be identified as a separate matter. Housing section should recognise the importance of the contribution of market housing that is</p>

		<p>affordable. The section on affordable housing should refer to affordable housing needs to be met at a local level.</p> <p>Q2 – Updated retail capacity study should be used to inform a policy on retail provision that recognises the importance of shopping provision in Colville Town Centre.</p> <p>Core Strategy should encourage the provision of a mix of housing having regard to the strategic Housing market Assessment and to the different types of households requiring housing over the plan period. Housing Needs Assessment should inform policies on affordable housing including thresholds, tenure split, size and type. Should also support forms of development most able to deliver affordable housing provision such as SUEs, and make provision for rural exceptions housing (Para 30 PPS3).</p> <p>Q3 – Option 1 is supported.</p> <p>Q4 – No alternative statement is required although option 1 should be altered with the word “facilitate” included in place of “secure” ...well designed sustainable developments.</p> <p>Refers to paragraph 2.9 of PPS12 in terms of a Spatial vision to include a bullet point to provide opportunities for people to live close to where they work and to promote high quality housing to encourage people who presently commute into the district to work. These are key to achieving a sustainable future.</p> <p>Q5 – No</p> <p>Q6 – suggested revisions- EN1 add Focus new development in and adjoining the main urban area of Coalville</p> <p>Social objectives – new objective – Enable everyone to have the opportunity of living in a decent home by facilitating delivery of high quality housing for all.</p> <p>Creating Accessible Communities focussing on sustainable transportation – new objective – locate new development such that it will improve the balance between employment and housing in order to minimise unsustainable commuting patterns and enable travel by non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>Q7 – Agreed that listed settlements should be rural towns but not that they should be considered equal in their suitability for accommodating further development.</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q10 – No</p> <p>Q11 – Difficult to define local need particularly as this may change over the plan period. Could require development to improve the sustainability of the 'local needs settlements' and contribute positively to retaining services and creating mixed and balanced communities.</p> <p>Q12 – No. Section 6.14 has taken a very narrow view of what constitutes local need and this does not fully reflect policy guidance in PPS3 or Policy 5 of draft RSS8, with these having a broader view of developments in settlements outside of rural towns which should be reflected in the Core Strategy. E.g local needs housing could be that which ensure the provision of an element of affordable housing to meet the identified needs of the local community or market housing that contributes towards the retention of existing services and supports local facilities.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 4 is the most appropriate. Coalville would be able to develop its status as an SRC in conformity with the draft RSS8. Designating two principal rural towns within the hierarchy would be consistent with emerging RSS policy in terms of strengthening of the vitality and viability of rural towns. Having Ashby and Castle Donington within this tier of the settlement hierarchy makes geographical sense with each serving its rural hinterland with opportunities for sustainable transport. Additional housing is</p>
--	--	---

		<p>necessary in Castle Donington to balance employment growth. Ashby and Castle Donington have the potential for services and facilities to keep place with housing growth. Option 4 is appropriate as it recognised that smaller scale development can be appropriate in other rural towns and local needs settlements.</p> <p>Q15 – More than one SUE can be accommodated which is not precluded in draft RSS8. Location A is considered appropriate for an SUE which includes the current allocation.</p> <p>Location D should also be considered as an SUE. A review of Green Wedge areas is required (Structure Plan Strategy Policy 6). Considered that location D would be a sustainable location for new development – has excellent accessibility to the town centre, employment areas, public transport and leisure uses.</p> <p>Q16 – No.</p> <p>Q17 – No strategic requirement of RSS8 particularly Policy 4 (3 Cities) to require urban extensions to provide for a mix of uses. In Coalville, census information reveals significantly more jobs than economically active residents, which leads to in commuting and high car usage. As such SUE in Coalville should be heavily or completely biased towards housing on sustainability grounds to enable people to live near their place of work.</p> <p>However, acknowledged that problems of localised demand for starter and follow on industrial premises and offices, lower incomes and lack of higher skilled jobs could be some way addressed with an element of employment use within an SUE.</p> <p>Q18 – Important for the Core Strategy to identify broad locations for growth outside of Colville in line with Policy 2 of draft RSS8 and advice in PPS12.</p> <p>Q19 – majority of development in and adjacent to Coalville with development also at Ashby and Castle Donington.</p> <p>Q20 – No</p> <p>Q21 – No allowance should be taken of windfall sites in line with Paragraph 59 of PPS3. No guarantee that such sites would come forward in the future and a settlement hierarchy would prevent windfall sites coming forward in the smaller villages.</p> <p>Q22 – They shouldn't. An overprovision of housing in the first 10 years is not necessarily problematic.</p> <p>Q23 – No. The Core Strategy will need to reflect any revisions to RSS8 in terms of employment requirements and full account should be taken of the RES and housing growth proposed for NW Leics by the RSS. Regard should be had to deliverability.</p> <p>Q24 – The Core Strategy should recognise opportunities within NW Leics by facilitating development which would take advantage of these opportunities and meet market demand.</p> <p>Q25 – SUE to Coalville would be the best location to meet demand for small starter and follow on units. Access to sustainable modes of transport is the decisive factor.</p> <p>Q26 – No</p> <p>Q27 – Yes</p> <p>Q28 – Yes</p> <p>Q29 – Consider SUES for accommodating smaller employment units.</p> <p>Q30 – Ensure development is located where it will create sustainable patterns of development, also encourage developers to meet recognised national targets where feasible and viable (Code for Sustainable Homes), and on or off site renewable energy generation.</p> <p>Q31 – No</p> <p>Q32 – No</p> <p>Q33 – Refers to C01/2006 requirement for a Gand T accommodation assessment and in the absence of this the level of need is difficult to ascertain. Where need is established the</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Core Strategy should set the criteria relating to the location of sites in line with paragraph 64 of C01/2006, and should seek to meet sustainability objectives in terms of access to services and coexistence with the local community.</p> <p>Q34 – No, Criteria approach would provide adequate steer.</p> <p>Q35 – No – insufficient evidence to justify this at present.</p>
CS/AC500	Pegasus on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments and David Wilson Estates	<p>Q1 - Most key issues are covered in Section 3 but retail should be identified as a separate matter. Housing section should recognise the importance of the contribution of market housing that is affordable. The section on affordable housing should refer to affordable housing needs to be met at a local level.</p> <p>Q2 – Updated retail capacity study should be used to inform a policy on retail provision that recognises the importance of shopping provision in Colville Town Centre.</p> <p>Core Strategy should encourage the provision of a mix of housing having regard to the strategic Housing market Assessment and to the different types of households requiring housing over the plan period. Housing Needs Assessment should inform policies on affordable housing including thresholds, tenure split, size and type. Should also support forms of development most able to deliver affordable housing provision such as SUEs.</p> <p>Q3 – Option 1 is supported.</p> <p>Q4 – No alternative statement is required although option 1 should be altered with the word “facilitate” included in place of “secure” ...well designed sustainable developments.</p> <p>Refers to paragraph 2.9 of PPS12 in terms of a Spatial vision to include a bullet point to provide opportunities for people to live close to where they work and to promote high quality housing to encourage people who presently commute into the district to work. These are key to achieving a sustainable future.</p> <p>Q5 – No</p> <p>Q6 – suggested revisions- EN1 add Focus new development in and adjoining the main urban area of Coalville</p> <p>Social objectives – new objective – Enable everyone to have the opportunity of living in a decent home by facilitating delivery of high quality housing for all.</p> <p>Creating Accessible Communities focussing on sustainable transportation – new objective – locate new development such that it will improve the balance between employment and housing in order to minimise unsustainable commuting patterns and enable travel by non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>Q7 – Agreed that listed settlements should be rural towns but not that they should be considered equal in their suitability for accommodating further development.</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q10 – No</p> <p>Q11 – Difficult to define local need particularly as this may change over the plan period. Could require development to improve the sustainability of the 'local needs settlements' and contribute positively to retaining services and creating mixed and balanced communities.</p> <p>Q12 – No. Section 6.14 has taken a very narrow view of what constitutes local need and this does not fully reflect policy guidance in PPS3 or Policy 5 of draft RSS8, with these having a broader view of developments in settlements outside of rural towns which should be reflected in the Core Strategy. E.g local needs housing could be that which ensure the provision of an element of affordable housing to meet the identified needs of the local community or market housing that contributes towards the retention of existing services and supports local facilities.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p>

		<p>Q14 – Option 4 is the most appropriate. Coalville is already recognised as an SRC in draft RSS8 with an SUE proposed with 195 dwellings required per year until 2026. In line with PPS3 and PPS12 regard has to be had to this to enable the Core Strategy to be sound. Option 4 would enable Coalville to develop its status as an SRC and would support the delivery of a regenerated town centre and opportunities for improved public transport to improve sustainability. Designating two principal rural towns, Ashby and Coalville within the hierarchy would be consistent with emerging RSS policy in terms of strengthening of the vitality and viability of rural towns. Option 4 is appropriate as it recognised that smaller scale development can be appropriate in other rural towns and local needs settlements.</p> <p>Q15 – More than one SUE can be accommodated which is not precluded in draft RSS8 and will be necessary for delivery of RSS8 housing figures. Location A is considered appropriate for an SUE due to its size. This would be sustainable development through supporting service provision and having the potential to accommodate a mix of uses and also facilitate the delivery of infrastructure improvements re a bypass to Bardon Road. There is the potential to create a passenger railway station within the site.</p> <p>Q16 – No.</p> <p>Q17 – No strategic requirement of RSS8 particularly Policy 4 (3 Cities) to require urban extensions to provide for a mix of uses. In Coalville, census information reveals significantly more jobs than economically active residents, which leads to in commuting and high car usage. As such SUE in Coalville should be heavily or completely biased towards housing on sustainability grounds to enable people to live near their place of work. However, acknowledged that problems of localised demand for starter and follow on industrial premises and offices, lower incomes and lack of higher skilled jobs could be some way addressed with an element of employment use within an SUE.</p> <p>Q18 – Important for the Core Strategy to identify broad locations for growth outside of Coalville in line with Policy 2 of draft RSS8 and advice in PPS12.</p> <p>Q19 – Majority of development in and adjacent to Coalville with development also at Ashby and Castle Donington. Castle Donington and Ashby qualify as Principal Rural Towns having a full range of facilities and services. Castle Donington has an imbalance between the number of jobs in the area and economically active residents attributable to EMA and contributes to high levels of car commuting into the area. Significant housing development on land east of Castle Donington (Plan 3) would assist in redressing the imbalance between jobs and homes, could provide accommodation for airport employees and has prospects for delivering access improvements. Employment uses should also not be ruled out.</p> <p>Q20 – No</p> <p>Q21 – No allowance should be taken of windfall sites in line with Paragraph 59 of PPS3. No guarantee that such sites would come forward in the future and a settlement hierarchy would prevent windfall sites coming forward in the smaller villages.</p> <p>Q22 – They shouldn't. An overprovision of housing in the first 10 years is not necessarily problematic.</p> <p>Q23 – No. The Core Strategy will need to reflect any revisions to RSS8 in terms of employment requirements and full account should be taken of the RES and housing growth proposed for NW Leics by the RSS.</p> <p>Q24 – The Core Strategy should recognise opportunities within NW Leics by facilitating development which would take advantage of these opportunities and meet market demand.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Q25 – Outside of SUE to Coalville land north of Castle Donington i(Plan 7) would be most appropriate with a large site in this location in single ownership outside the floodplain which is in accordance with Policy 20 of the draft Regional Plan. The location has excellent road links making it suitable for a range of employment uses with the Employment Land Study recommending at para 7.8 that if demand for industrial and distribution uses is to be met, priority must be given to the most accessible sites. Land around the A50 will maintain a broad portfolio of sites in a range of locations to meet the objectives of the RES 2006. Land around EMA is recognised in the Employment Land Study as amounting to a Strategic opportunity to provide higher income jobs, and has the advantage of proximity to the East Midlands Distribution Centre and the area in general is suitable for strategic logistics sites. An SUE to Colville has the potential to accommodate employment uses, particularly to meet demand for smaller units.</p> <p>Q26 – No</p> <p>Q27 – Yes</p> <p>Q28 – Yes and a threshold site area should be established with a percentage floorspace requirement imposed only once this threshold is exceeded.</p> <p>Q29 – Consider SUEs for accommodating smaller units.</p> <p>Q30 – Ensure development is located where it will create sustainable patterns of development, also encourage developers to meet recognised national targets where feasible and viable (Code for Sustainable Homes), and on or off site renewable energy generation.</p> <p>Q31 – No</p> <p>Q32 – No</p> <p>Q33 – Refers to C01/2006 requirement for a Gand T accommodation assessment and in the absence of this the level of need is difficult to ascertain. Where need is established the Core Strategy should set the criteria relating to the location of sites in line with paragraph 64 of C01/2006, and should seek to meet sustainability objectives in terms of access to services and coexistence with the local community.</p> <p>Q34 – No, Criteria approach would provide adequate steer.</p> <p>Q35 – No – insufficient evidence to justify this at present.</p>
CS/AC501	Pegasus on behalf of Miller Homes	<p>Q1 - Most key issues are covered in Section 3 but retail should be identified as a separate matter. Housing section should recognise the importance of the contribution of market housing that is affordable. The section on affordable housing should refer to affordable housing needs to be met at a local level.</p> <p>Q2 – Updated retail capacity study should be used to inform a policy on retail provision that recognises the importance of shopping provision in Coalville, Ashby and Castle Donington Town Centres. Sufficient retail provision should be made to match anticipated housing growth.</p> <p>Core Strategy should encourage the provision of a mix of housing having regard to the strategic Housing market Assessment and to the different types of households requiring housing over the plan period. Housing Needs Assessment should inform policies on affordable housing including thresh holds, tenure split, size and type. Should also support forms of development most able to deliver affordable housing provision such as SUEs and should make provision for rural exceptions housing (PPS3 para 30).</p> <p>Q3 – Option 1 is supported.</p> <p>Q4 – No alternative statement is required although option 1 should be altered with the word “facilitate” included in place of “secure” ...well designed sustainable developments.</p> <p>Refers to paragraph 2.9 of PPS12 in terms of a Spatial vision to</p>

		<p>include a bullet point to provide opportunities for people to live close to where they work and to promote high quality housing to encourage people who presently commute into the district to work. These are key to achieving a sustainable future.</p> <p>Q5 – No</p> <p>Q6 – suggested revisions- EN1 add Focus new development in and adjoining the main urban area of Coalville</p> <p>Social objectives – new objective – Enable everyone to have the opportunity of living in a decent home by facilitating delivery of high quality housing for all.</p> <p>Creating Accessible Communities focussing on sustainable transportation – new objective – locate new development such that it will improve the balance between employment and housing in order to minimise unsustainable commuting patterns and enable travel by non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>Q7 – Agreed that listed settlements should be rural towns but not that they should be considered equal in their suitability for accommodating further development.</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q10 – No</p> <p>Q11 – Difficult to define local need particularly as this may change over the plan period. Could require development to improve the sustainability of the 'local needs settlements' and contribute positively to retaining services and creating mixed and balanced communities.</p> <p>Q12 – No. Section 6.14 has taken a very narrow view of what constitutes local need and this does not fully reflect policy guidance in PPS3 or Policy 5 of draft RSS8, with these having a broader view of developments in settlements outside of rural towns which should be reflected in the Core Strategy. E.g local needs housing could be that which ensure the provision of an element of affordable housing to meet the identified needs of the local community or market housing that contributes towards the retention of existing services and supports local facilities.</p> <p>Development in rural settlements should address more than housing to meet a persons specific needs in line with Policy 5 draft RSS8 and this matter could be dealt with in broader terms including market housing that contributes towards the retention of existing services and supports local facilities.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 4 is the most appropriate. Coalville is already recognised as an SRC in draft RSS8 and this option would be in conformity with this, would support the delivery of a regenerated town centre and would provide opportunities for improved public transport links. Designating two principal rural towns within the hierarchy would be consistent with emerging RSS policy in terms of strengthening of the vitality and viability of rural towns. Having Ashby and Castle Donington within this tier of the settlement hierarchy makes geographical sense with each serving its rural hinterland with opportunities for sustainable transport. Additional housing is necessary in Castle Donington to balance employment growth. Ashby and Castle Donington have the potential for services and facilities to keep pace with housing growth. Option 4 is appropriate as it recognised that smaller scale development can be appropriate in other rural towns and local needs settlements.</p> <p>Q15 – More than one SUE can be accommodated which is not precluded in draft RSS8. Location A is considered appropriate for an SUE which includes the current allocation.</p> <p>Location D should also be considered as an SUE. A review of Green Wedge areas is required (Structure Plan Strategy Policy 6). Considered that location D would be a sustainable location for</p>
--	--	---

		<p>new development – has excellent accessibility to the town centre, employment areas, public transport and leisure uses.</p> <p>Q16 – No.</p> <p>Q17 – No strategic requirement of RSS8 particularly Policy 4 (3 Cities) to require urban extensions to provide for a mix of uses. In Coalville, census information reveals significantly more jobs than economically active residents, which leads to in commuting and high car usage. As such SUE in Coalville should be heavily or completely biased towards housing on sustainability grounds to enable people to live near their place of work. However, acknowledged that problems of localised demand from starter and follow on industrial premises and offices, lower incomes and lack of higher skilled jobs could be some way addressed with an element of employment use within an SUE.</p> <p>Q18 – Important for the Core Strategy to identify broad locations for growth outside of Colville in line with Policy 2 of draft RSS8 and advice in PPS12.</p> <p>Q19 – A combination of development at Ashby and Castle Donington with these settlements being principal rural towns having a full range of facilities and services. Ashby has the necessary services for new development with Location B north of the A5111 most appropriate for development. Development South of Park Lane Castle Donington would deliver access improvements and would redress the imbalance in Castle Donington between jobs and homes.</p> <p>Q20 – No</p> <p>Q21 – No allowance should be taken of windfall sites in line with Paragraph 59 of PPS3. No guarantee that such sites would come forward in the future and a settlement hierarchy would prevent windfall sites coming forward in the smaller villages.</p> <p>Q22 – They shouldn't. An overprovision of housing in the first 10 years is not necessarily problematic.</p> <p>Q23 – Section 1 - No. Roger Tym Employment Land Study (ELS) predicted land requirements to 2021 rather than 2026. Employment forecasts used in the study were provided in February 2005 with the final report published in May 2005 with no account therefore taken of the significant increase in housing being proposed for NW Leics from 368 to 480 dwellings per annum. This will impact on predicted job growth, floorspace requirements and therefore the amount of land to be identified. The table on which the calculations are based is baseline and does not take into account the impact of growth at EMA or the RES the key themes of which are to increase productivity across the region, improve productivity and maximise business growth. The Councils method only takes into account the demand for floorspace with employment land requirements should also consider how much supply exists, taking into account the attractiveness of sites to the market (qualitative). The method of calculating gives aggregate industrial and warehousing requirements, which is misleading.</p> <p>Section 2 – Whilst at present the draft RSS does not mention qualitative requirements this may change and the Core Strategy will have to reflect these revisions. Full account should be taken of the objectives set out in the RES and housing growth proposed in the RSS. If the ELS is used as the basis for employment land requirements the higher growth scenario should be used to ensure adequate allowance for increase housing growth and expansion at EMA. Basing requirements on the baseline scenario could lead to constrained employment land supply and failure to deliver on the objectives of the RES. Any requirement should be disaggregated into B1, B2 and B8 uses, and any employment land requirement should take account of existing supply.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Q24 – The Core Strategy should recognise opportunities within NW Leics by facilitating development which would take advantage of these needs particularly where bringing enhanced opportunity for skilled jobs and higher incomes. Provision should be made for demand for distribution and industrial uses in NWLeics (Tym study refers). Draft Policy 13 of RSS does not preclude other locations outside of three cities and Loughborough for airport associated development. Work undertaken at Regional level (East Midlands Strategic Distribution Study by MDS) highlights NW Leics as a suitable location for Strategic logistics sites. Land to the North of Castle Donington is particularly suitable for regional and sub regional B class development given its proximity to the proposed terminal at the East Midlands Distribution Centre. Land in the vicinity of J24 and 24a of the M1 is recognised as having locational advantages in RELPS with opportunities for sustainable transport with the proposed East Midlands parkway station.</p> <p>Q25 – Should be located in order to maximise the opportunity for access by sustainable modes of transport, and SUE to Coalville has the potential to accommodate employment uses including small units.</p> <p>Q26 – No</p> <p>Q27 – Yes</p> <p>Q28 – Yes.</p> <p>Q29 – Consider SUEs for smaller employment units.</p> <p>Q30 – Ensure development is located where it will create sustainable patterns of development, also encourage developers to meet recognised national targets where feasible and viable (Code for Sustainable Homes), and on or off site renewable energy generation.</p> <p>Q31 – No</p> <p>Q32 – No</p> <p>Q33 – Refers to C01/2006 requirement for a Gand T accommodation assessment and in the absence of this the level of need is difficult to ascertain. Where need is established the Core Strategy should set the criteria relating to the location of sites in line with paragraph 64 of C01/2006, and should seek to meet sustainability objectives in terms of access to services and coexistence with the local community.</p> <p>Q34 – No, Criteria approach would provide adequate steer.</p> <p>Q35 – No – insufficient evidence to justify this at present.</p>
CS/AC502	Pegasus on behalf of Clowes Developments (UK) Limited	<p>Q1 - Most key issues are covered in Section 3 but retail should be identified as a separate matter. Housing section should recognise the importance of the contribution of market housing that is affordable. The section on affordable housing should refer to affordable housing needs to be met at a local level.</p> <p>Q2 – Updated retail capacity study should be used to inform a policy on retail provision that recognises the importance of shopping provision in Coalville, Ashby and Castle Donington Town Centres. Sufficient retail provision should be made to match anticipated housing growth.</p> <p>Core Strategy should encourage the provision of a mix of housing having regard to the strategic Housing market Assessment and to the different types of households requiring housing over the plan period. Housing Needs Assessment should inform policies on affordable housing including thresh holds, tenure split, size and type. Should also support forms of development most able to deliver affordable housing provision such as SUEs and should make provision for rural exceptions housing (PPS3 para 30).</p> <p>Q3 – Option 1 is supported.</p> <p>Q4 – No alternative statement is required although option 1 should be altered with the word “facilitate” included in place of “secure” ...well designed sustainable developments.</p>

		<p>Refers to paragraph 2.9 of PPS12 in terms of a Spatial vision to include a bullet point to provide opportunities for people to live close to where they work and to promote high quality housing to encourage people who presently commute into the district to work. These are key to achieving a sustainable future.</p> <p>Q5 – No</p> <p>Q6 – suggested revisions- EN1 add Focus new development in and adjoining the main urban area of Coalville</p> <p>Social objectives – new objective – Enable everyone to have the opportunity of living in a decent home by facilitating delivery of high quality housing for all.</p> <p>Creating Accessible Communities focussing on sustainable transportation – new objective – locate new development such that it will improve the balance between employment and housing in order to minimise unsustainable commuting patterns and enable travel by non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>Q7 – Agreed that listed settlements should be rural towns but not that they should be considered equal in their suitability for accommodating further development.</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q10 – No</p> <p>Q11 – Difficult to define local need particularly as this may change over the plan period. Could require development to improve the sustainability of the 'local needs settlements' and contribute positively to retaining services and creating mixed and balanced communities.</p> <p>Q12 – No. Section 6.14 has taken a very narrow view of what constitutes local need and this does not fully reflect policy guidance in PPS3 or Policy 5 of draft RSS8, with these having a broader view of developments in settlements outside of rural towns which should be reflected in the Core Strategy. E.g local needs housing could be that which ensure the provision of an element of affordable housing to meet the identified needs of the local community or market housing that contributes towards the retention of existing services and supports local facilities.</p> <p>Development in rural settlements should address more than housing to meet a persons specific needs in line with Policy 5 draft RSS8 and this matter could be dealt with in broader terms including market housing that contributes towards the retention of existing services and supports local facilities.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 4 is the most appropriate. Coalville is already recognised as an SRC in draft RSS8 and this option would be in conformity with this, would support the delivery of a regenerated town centre and would provide opportunities for improved public transport links. Designating two principal rural towns within the hierarchy would be consistent with emerging RSS policy in terms of strengthening of the vitality and viability of rural towns. Having Ashby and Castle Donington within this tier of the settlement hierarchy makes geographical sense with each serving its rural hinterland with opportunities for sustainable transport. Additional housing is necessary in Castle Donington to balance employment growth. Ashby and Castle Donington have the potential for services and facilities to keep place with housing growth. Option 4 is appropriate as it recognised that smaller scale development can be appropriate in other rural towns and local needs settlements.</p> <p>Q15 –More than one SUE can be accommodated which is not precluded in draft RSS8. Location A is considered appropriate for an SUE which includes the current allocation.</p> <p>Location D should also be considered as an SUE. A review of Green Wedge areas is required (Structure Plan Strategy Policy 6).</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Considered that location D would be a sustainable location for new development – has excellent accessibility to the town centre, employment areas, public transport and leisure uses.</p> <p>Q16 – No.</p> <p>Q17 – No strategic requirement of RSS8 particularly Policy 4 (3 Cities) to require urban extensions to provide for a mix of uses. In Coalville, census information reveals significantly more jobs than economically active residents, which leads to in commuting and high car usage. As such SUE in Coalville should be heavily or completely biased towards housing on sustainability grounds to enable people to live near their place of work. However, acknowledged that problems of localised demand for starter and follow on industrial premises and offices, lower incomes and lack of higher skilled jobs could be some way addressed with an element of employment use within an SUE.</p> <p>Q18 – Important for the Core Strategy to identify broad locations for growth outside of Coalville in line with Policy 2 of draft RSS8 and advice in PPS12. In identifying locations outside Coalville Core Strategy should give consideration to the scope of settlements to meet associated increased need for facilities such as shopping.</p> <p>Q19 – A combination of development at Ashby and Castle Donington with these settlements being principal rural towns having a full range of facilities and services. Ashby has the necessary services for new development with Location B north of the A511 most appropriate for development. Development South of Park Lane Castle Donington would deliver access improvements and would redress the imbalance in Castle Donington between jobs and homes.</p> <p>Q20 – No</p> <p>Q21 – No allowance should be taken of windfall sites in line with Paragraph 59 of PPS3. No guarantee that such sites would come forward in the future and the settlement hierarchy would prevent windfall sites coming forward in the smaller villages.</p> <p>Q22 – They shouldn't. An overprovision of housing in the first 10 years is not necessarily problematic.</p> <p>Q23 – Section 1 - No. Roger Tym Employment Land Study (ELS) predicted land requirements to 2021 rather than 2026. Employment forecasts used in the study were provided in February 2005 with the final report published in May 2005 with no account therefore taken of the significant increase in housing being proposed for NW Leics from 368 to 480 dwellings per annum. This will impact on predicted job growth, floorspace requirements and therefore the amount of land to be identified. The table on which the calculations are based is baseline and does not take into account the impact of growth at EMA or the RES the key themes of which are to increase productivity across the region, improve productivity and maximise business growth. The Councils method only takes into account the demand for floorspace with employment land requirements should also consider how much supply exists, taking into account the attractiveness of sites to the market (qualitative). The method of calculating gives aggregate industrial and warehousing requirements, which is misleading.</p> <p>Section 2 – Whilst at present the draft RSS does not mention qualitative requirements this may change and the Core Strategy will have to reflect these revisions. Full account should be taken of the objectives set out in the RES and housing growth proposed in the RSS. If the ELS is used as the basis for employment land requirements the higher growth scenario should be used to ensure adequate allowance for increase housing growth and expansion at EMA. Basing requirements on the baseline scenario could lead to</p>
--	--	---

		<p>constrained employment land supply and failure to deliver on the objectives of the RES. Any requirement should be disaggregated into B1, B2 and B8 uses, and any employment land requirement should take account of existing supply.</p> <p>Q24 – The Core Strategy should recognise opportunities within NW Leics by facilitating development which would take advantage of these needs particularly where bringing enhanced opportunity for skilled jobs and higher incomes. Provision should be made for demand for distribution and industrial uses in NWLeics (Tym study refers). Draft Policy 13 of RSS does not preclude other locations outside of three cities and Loughborough for airport associated development. Work undertaken at Regional level (East Midlands Strategic Distribution Study by MDS) highlights NW Leics as a suitable location for Strategic logistics sites. Land to the North of Castle Donington is particularly suitable for regional and sub regional B class development given its proximity to the proposed terminal at the East Midlands Distribution Centre. Land in the vicinity of J24 and 24a of the M1 is recognised as having locational advantages in RELPS with opportunities for sustainable transport with the proposed East Midlands parkway station.</p> <p>Q25 – Outside of SUE to Coalville which has the potential to accommodate employment uses, land North of castle Donington on Plan 7 would be appropriate and would fulfil the requirements of regional Policy 20. Land around EMA is recognised in the Employment Land Study as amounting to a Strategic opportunity to provide higher income jobs, and has the advantage of proximity to the East Midlands Distribution Centre and the area in general is suitable for strategic logistics sites. Mixed use development may be appropriate south of Park Lane.</p> <p>Q26 – No</p> <p>Q27 – Yes</p> <p>Q28 – Yes and a threshold site area should be established with a percentage floorspace requirement imposed only once this threshold is exceeded.</p> <p>Q29 – Consider SUEs for smaller employment units.</p> <p>Q30 – Ensure development is located where it will create sustainable patterns of development, also encourage developers to meet recognised national targets where feasible and viable (Code for Sustainable Homes), and on or off site renewable energy generation.</p> <p>Q31 – No</p> <p>Q32 – No</p> <p>Q33 – Refers to C01/2006 requirement for a Gand T accommodation assessment and in the absence of this the level of need is difficult to ascertain. Where need is established the Core Strategy should set the criteria relating to the location of sites in line with paragraph 64 of C01/2006, and should seek to meet sustainability objectives in terms of access to services and coexistence with the local community.</p> <p>Q34 – No, Criteria approach would provide adequate steer.</p> <p>Q35 – No – insufficient evidence to justify this at present.</p>
CS/AC503	Castle Donington Appraisal Group	<p>4 – Favour Option 3 although point out that Castle Donington receives no benefit from the National Forest. Recent employment development in Castle Donington is low skill, low wage and unsustainable, and is dependent of workforce being brought in from deprived areas of larger towns and cities outside the district with no unemployment problem within Castle Donington. Employment surrounding the village is totally dependent on oil based transport contributing to CO2 and NOX.</p> <p>5.1 – Nothing in the spatial objectives to protect or enhance</p>

		<p>Castle Donington's environment. Recent appraisal emphasises the importance of the countryside around Castle Donington.</p> <p>EN2 – This means restricting night flights at the airport, hours of operation of the race track and HGVs in the area.</p> <p>EN7 – Cannot be achieved whilst allowing unfettered increase in night flights.</p> <p>EC7 – Does not see the relevance of this to an LDF and consider meeting the needs of small local firms would be more appropriate as they mainly provide local people with employment. Considers EMAs claims re jobs to be exaggerated and figure for complaints to be inaccurate.</p> <p>6.15– Comments as above.</p> <p>7.3.5 and 9.11 – any further development can only make flooding problems worse in Derbys as well as Castle Donington. Point out there was a 96.7 response against the loss of further greenfields in or around Castle Donington.</p> <p>Q33 – Considers pressure should be brought to bear on central government to make camping and dumping on private property or highways without the owners consent a criminal offence. Does not consider showpeople and 'itinerants' should be classed together, as showpeople tend to pay taxes and leave places cleaner than they found them. Does not consider the site close to the A50 to be suitable and will add to existing problems.</p>
CS/AC504	Indigo on behalf of Sainsburys	<p>Q1 – The need for further retail development should be included as one of these points.</p> <p>Point out that in January 2007 BDP and Donaldsons produced a town centre vision for Coalville which included a need for additional convenience and comparison retail, in particular an 8000 sq m anchor foodstore to attract shoppers to Coalville and claw back some of the trade leakage to Morrisons out of centre store. Accepts the 2004 retail study concludes there is a limited need for additional convenience retail, the BDP report evidence shows otherwise and the Core Strategy should reflect this.</p> <p>Refers to Spatial Objective EC5 as promoting the regeneration of Coalville town centre to perform as a vibrant SRC which reflects Draft Policy 4 and paragraph 2.3.9 of draft RSS8.</p> <p>In order to perform as a strong SRC the need for further retail development should be encouraged, and they support Option 1 to strengthen the future role of retail in Coalville.</p>
CS/AC505	David Lock Associates on behalf of the Woodville Woodlands Consortium	<p>Q1 – Yes</p> <p>Q5 – Core Strategy should set out the key elements of the strategic planning framework and should not be overly prescriptive (PPS12 para 2.31 test iv of soundness)</p> <p>Q6 in line with PPS6 and the Housing Green Paper (July 2007) a fundamental aim of the core strategy should be to ensure that suitable land is available to achieve their housing and previously developed land delivery objectives.</p> <p>Q7 – Core Strategy will provide a strategic framework.</p> <p>Q9 – Does not consider the evidence base as existing for the Core Strategy is robust or credible (PPS12 paragraph 4.24). Refer to practice guidance in preparing Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (DCLG July 2007) with the need for employment land no longer required to be assessed as potential housing sites. In light of this guidance the 2005 District Council studies of Urban Potential and Employment Land Review should re-assess all potential sources of housing, including that at Woodville Woodlands an SUE to Woodville.</p> <p>Q13 – No. Refer to Housing Green paper and PPS3 in terms of housing delivery to meet demand with 15 years continuous delivery. Core Strategy should be flexible in response to identifying housing land including allocated land, or with permission, for employment or other uses no longer required.</p>

		<p>Reiterate their earlier points in response to Q9.</p> <p>Q14 – None – repeat their earlier points re lack of evidence re housing delivery/ capacity.</p> <p>Q18 – Repeat response to Q13 and Q14.</p> <p>Q19 – All sites with potential for housing should be considered including Woodville Woodlands.</p> <p>Q20 – Repeat response to Q9, Q13, Q14, Q18.</p> <p>Q21 – Given RSS requirement for 9,500 additional dwellings it is considered essential that any windfall opportunities are controlled within an overall framework. Allowance should therefore be made. Housing provision should be considered in light of potential increase in provision following the panel report into the EIP and the identification of Derby, Leicester, Nottingham as a new growth point in the Housing Green Paper.</p> <p>Q23 – Repeat previous points re review and update the Employment Land Review (Tyms 2005) and the Strategic Housing land Availability Assessment (2005) in order for the evidence base of the plan to be sound.</p> <p>Q24 – Up to date info in the Employment Land Review undertaken by NWL indicates that the Structure Plan requirement is excessive in relation to actual needs.</p> <p>Q27 – The Core Strategy should contain a policy setting out the districts commitment to providing sufficient land, in terms of range and quantity to meet its employment needs.</p> <p>Q30 – Core Strategy should focus primarily on the ways in which spatial planning, through the siting and location of development aimed at reducing the need to travel and improving the efficiency of buildings, can contribute towards reducing the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>Q31 – Refers to advice in the supplement to PPS1 in respect of planning and climate change and the relationship between planning and building regulations particularly in terms of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Does not consider the Core Strategy should duplicate other legislation, with the risk that a variable approach by which local authorities set different standards may cause significant detrimental harm to delivery.</p> <p>In line with the consultation on PPS1 on Climate Change LPAs should engage with developers to secure sustainable buildings with locally specific opportunities for higher levels of building performance set out in DPDs and founded on robust and credible evidence base. Any proposed approach must have regard to commercial viability.</p> <p>Q32 – No.</p>
CS/AC506	Hallam Land Management	<p>Q1 – Housing is not given sufficient consideration as sufficient housing should be provided to allow the workforce to live in the district and reduce the need to travel. Currently a net importer of labour. District has an ageing population and housing needs to be provided to attract people of working age. Special needs and affordable housing is also required and the 305 affordable dwellings will not be provided with the 480 dwellings per year re RSS figures.</p> <p>Increased affordable housing requirements above RSS suggestions is not viable which, will have the effect of reducing supply further.</p> <p>Point out that there is currently a deficit of over 700 dwellings and if housing figures are increased in line with DCLG trend figures, development will be needed in the rural towns and in the north and south of Ashby.</p> <p>Q2 – Sufficient land needs to be allocated in sustainable locations across the district. Focussing development in Coalville alone will not be sufficient.</p> <p>Q5 – EN1 – Demand for housing across the district and significant</p>

		<p>amounts need to be allowed in other towns within the district. Policy should be limited to stating that new development is needed across the district and focussed in areas in need of regeneration, previously developed land in sustainable locations.</p> <p>Q6 – Providing an adequate supply of housing to meet the needs of the district should be identified as a key objective in line with PPS3 para 9.</p> <p>Q7 – Ashby should be identified alongside Coalville as the main towns in the district with a greater market demand for housing in Ashby than Coalville, with extensive bus services in Ashby. Development in Kegworth and Castle Donington is necessary to provide housing to meet the growth of the airport.</p> <p>Q14 – Option 2a is the most appropriate as it is in line with Structure Plan Strategy policy 2A treating Ashby and Coalville equally. This also allows for development of the rural towns with a greater opportunity to achieve deliverability of the districts housing numbers. More development along the National Forest Line transport corridor will increase the possibilities of the line opening and more frequent bus services in Ashby. Due to the SAC development in Ashby should include consultation with Natural England and the EA.</p> <p>Q18 – Yes</p> <p>Q19 – Ashby Plan 2 location A – Plan enclosed with their comments showing an area of land which is available and deliverable. This has existing infrastructure and services with this area closest to the J12 of the A42 which has more capacity than J13. Local highways issues could be resolved by a new road linking Measham Road and Lower Packington Road with a separate access to a new employment area. Primary and secondary schools and the town centre are all within walking distance with two buses every hour to Coalville. Flooding in Packington could be alleviated by incorporating a flood relief scheme within the development.</p> <p>Kegworth – plan 5 housing growth is needed to keep pace with airport/ employment growth with land to the west of Kegworth available for development.</p> <p>Q21 – No (PPS3)</p> <p>Q22 – No need (PPS3)</p> <p>Q26 – Ashby Location A. Part could be employment land with good links to J12 of the A42. J13 is at capacity and for this reason Location C should be disregarded in favour of a mixed scheme elsewhere.</p>
CS/AC507	Andrew Martin Assocaites	<p>Q7 – Yes but a finer grain of assessment is necessary to identify potential options for planned growth as it may not be possible to extend a settlement with good public transport and services in a way that would take advantage of these credentials without a significant landscape or other impact. Development may also create opportunities for sustainability benefits, e.g. Ashby may benefit from new development to secure bus service improvements.</p> <p>Q14 – Option 2a is preferred as it reflects the current Structure plan and the historic precedent of treating Coalville and Ashby as equals in development terms. The development of Coalville and Ashby would contribute to opening of the National Forest line to passengers. The A511 is now fully open and has relieved Ashby of significant through traffic and created good access to growing employment. The town has a good range of shops and amenities in its accessible town centre and good links to the strategic road network. The town will attract people to live there and is therefore strong on deliverability grounds. Development in Ashby will provide a lever for improved bus services. This complies with development directions in the draft RSS and will create</p>

		<p>sustainable communities. Impacts on the SAC is surmountable through environmental mitigation and sustainable urban drainage measures.</p> <p>Option 1 has deliverability issues and will potentially restrict regeneration options elsewhere. In terms of Option 2b it is acknowledged that this could help to provide a better balance between housing and jobs in this part of the district with the potential to address significant need for affordable housing and may be appropriate for further employment expansion. However Castle Donington is a significantly congested settlement with strain on local services and the airport restricting directions for growth in terms of flight paths, public safety zone and noise issues. Option 2c and 2e have arguments in favour of development to facilitate regeneration of Ibstock / Measham and encourage improved services, but development of the scale envisaged is beyond the capacity of these villages to sustain it. Large scale urban expansion would dwarf the settlements. In terms of Option 2d there are no realistic options for creating a significant urban expansion to Kegworth which would be acceptable in environmental terms due to flood risk to the north and east, the motorway to the west and the EMA flight path to the south. Options 3 and 4 would not provide the same focus for reopening the National Forest Line to passengers. Option 5 would not reflect the emerging RSS or sustainability objectives. Option 6 would have significant landscape and Environmental impact and would limit environmental enhancement and regeneration of other settlements.</p> <p>Q19 – Potential areas for growth in Ashby (Plan 2). Location A is a significant distance from the retailing areas of the town centre with a narrow and constrained road leading to the town centre. In this location residents would be most likely to use their cars to access the town centre. This land comprises attractive pasture land noted by the Inspector in the Local Plan Inquiry to form a particularly attractive area of open countryside, with wide views and a special character which should be safeguarded. Measham Road has a designated 'Area of Special housing in the Countryside' within the visual influence of this site with proposals to develop this land having a detrimental impact on the rural landscape setting of this housing. The site is also poorly related to employment areas of Ashby with sustainability issues.</p> <p>Location B is highly visible from the A511 bypass with attractive landscape giving important views and a rural character to the setting of this market town. Development would be visually harmful and would not fulfil the Councils sustainability objectives set out in the matrix. The landscape is special in terms of its agricultural quality with around 70% of the land Grade 2 and 3a agricultural land. The land would be accessed from the busiest road into the town centre with capacity issues affecting the accessibility and vitality of the town centre. Deliverability issues with different land ownerships. Location c is physically divorced from the built up area of Ashby by the A42 with expansion here not integrating with the town and would function as an independent settlement with residents visiting Ashby only by car. It is far from the town centre and facilities.</p> <p>Q20 – Urban expansion North West of Ashby at Holywell Spring Farm should be considered with a separate document submitted as to why this is considered a sustainable option for growth.</p> <p>In summary the main points advanced in favour of development to the north west of Ashby are-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creation of a new area of National Forest Planting and protection and enhancement of landscape features and hedgerows along green corridors;
--	--	---

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Consolidating residential development to the west of Ashby with a strong landscaped edge and a new neighbourhood centre; 3. Provision of a new primary school in a highly accessible location 4. Excellent access to major and growing employment opportunities and provision of a bus service extension to serve the town centre; 5. Accessible and well connected land to the existing settlement; 6. Land is visually well contained and its topography relates well to the settlement; 7. There are no significant constraints in terms of ecology, utility or water resources; 8. The site has a considerable number of opportunities including an SUE and well contained urban expansion, highway safety with new roundabout access, public transport improvements with the close proximity of the site to the town centre, cycle connections, a walkable place with the existing public footpath retained, infrastructure support, neighbourhood facilities, a primary school, energy efficient growth, variety of housing choice, sustainable urban drainage, green infrastructure, a net gain for biodiversity with the creation of a significant area of native broad leaved woodland. Constraints are identified as topography, short term views (before the national forest planning is established) and noise with the proximity of the adjacent employment development. 9. A number of development principles are shown on an indicative site layout including neighbourhood facilities, open spaces and landmarks and a network of green routes. A sustainability review is provided to demonstrate that the overall the site scores very highly on sustainability grounds.
CS/AC508	Andrew Martin Associates	<p>Q9 – With regard to local needs settlements it is considered that Policy 5 of the emerging RSS8 should be considered in its entirety, and in NW Leics it is considered that many rural settlements are interlinked. E.g strong physical and socio-economic links between Donisthorpe, Oakthorpe and Moira with public footpaths linking Donisthorpe to Oakthorpe and Moira where a wider level of service provision can be found which is by definition accessible. They consider therefore that groups of settlements should be considered when defining the role of the remaining settlements within the district.</p> <p>Donisthorpe in isolation does not meet every suggested local needs settlement criteria as it does not have a general store, however the level of services provided including a mobile greengrocer are considered to provide a sustainable level of service provision to support additional housing reflective of local needs. It is also considered that housing in rural settlements should be supported by a minimum level of service provision, the Core Strategy should meet 'need where it arises' rather than 'where best provided for' which was a key concern raised during the RSS8 EIP.</p> <p>They therefore consider a more holistic approach is necessary to take account of groups of settlements which require local needs housing, to help strengthen the vitality and viability of rural areas within the district.</p> <p>They are also concerned with the static nature of the list of villages provided in Q9 and they consider more flexibility is required in relation to meeting local housing needs. In the case of Donisthorpe the parish Plan has revealed a desire within the local</p>

		<p>community for a local shop, and if one is provided Donisthorpe would then fall wholly within the definition of a local needs settlement and they submit that any LDF policies should take into account the potential of settlements to develop their sustainability, and it should be recognised that local services could form part of a proposed housing development.</p> <p>Q10 – Criteria to define local needs is lacking. Housing Needs Assessment should be undertaken to identify areas which are in need of additional affordable / local needs housing and this information then used to define local needs settlements. The consideration would then be whether taking into account the level of service provision, it is appropriate to meet those needs in that particular settlement or in a more accessible and sustainable location nearby. The policy approach currently set out would direct housing to settlements which may have an appropriate level of service provision but a limited level of local need.</p> <p>Q11 – Yes</p> <p>Q12 – No. People with a family connection to a village who have not lived in the village for 3 years (to go to university) would be excluded from the definition, which is not in the interests of community wellbeing. The definition of local need should consider the particular local characteristics of settlements, and there may be particular regeneration objectives for providing housing in a settlement and greater flexibility could be achieved by adding a criterion for particular needs particular to the wellbeing of the settlement being identified.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes, but consider that options for local needs development in rural locations are limited with an adequate supply of local needs housing required in village locations.</p> <p>They conclude that the Core Strategy should seek to locate local needs housing in an accessible location to the settlements where that need arises, the connectivity between groups of settlements should be considered with the developing nature of services within villages. Donisthorpe should be considered as an appropriate location to meet local needs.</p>
CS/AC509	Andrew Martin Associates	<p>Q14 – In line with RSS8 the Core Strategy should seek to locate major growth at Coalville which they consider should be in more than one SUE. A single SUE of the scale proposed would have the effect of attaching an independently functioning settlement to Coalville, which would not integrate well with existing communities and which would dwarf existing neighbourhoods. One larger and further smaller SUEs will deliver a more holistic pattern of growth to the dispersed urban area of Coalville and will also ensure deliverability.</p> <p>Q15 – Considers location B in Coalville is most appropriate as it has the best relationship to the town centre which is a major strength in terms of sustainable movement with the possibility for new pedestrian and cycle links to be formed along with road improvements, which would benefit existing communities. Other locations away from the town centre would not provide support for the proposals in the Colville Vision and would create peripheral areas encouraging commuting, would affect the Green Wedge and undermine physical separation. The Inspector at the last Local Plan Inquiry considered part of this area as appropriate for development. In terms of landscape impact and the creation of sustainable communities Location B is the most sustainable option for growth.</p> <p>Q16 – No</p> <p>Q17 – Yes. They consider that Location A in Coalville should be considered for a significant employment development to build on the success of Bardon with this location more appropriate for employment given its good relationship with the wider road</p>

		network, but unsuitable for housing with its poor relationship with the town centre.
CS/AC510	Leicestershire County Council	<p>2 – Evidence base should not rely solely on district level documents and needs to build on and refer policies and targets in national guidance, existing and proposed RSS, Structure Plan and Community Strategy and transport Assessments carried out by the County Council.</p> <p>Q1 – Economy – First bullet point is inaccurate as NWL is a net importer of labour but it should be made clear that this is largely to do with EMA. However they question the accuracy of this import of labour having implications for sustainability and the ability of local people to find employment. Considers the existence of lots of jobs in the district is a positive thing for local people. Also pointed out that EMA is on the periphery of the district so people could be travelling short distances from outside the district to work. The statement that there is limited need for additional shopping floorspace does not seem to take account of SUE proposals. Housing Section should contain reference to the proposed SUE at Coalville.</p> <p>Transport - Add a point to identify the need for substantial additional investment in public transport.</p> <p>Environment and Heritage - Additional points needed relating to the quality and design of the built environment and town centres, adding green infrastructure and greenspace to green networks, should identify the need to minimise waste and encourage recycling.</p> <p>Social Inclusion – Should be reference to the District and County Community Strategies and will need to consider the needs of a more diverse community.</p> <p>Q2 – Environment and Heritage – Minimum standards to be set for waste issues, particularly for larger developments.</p> <p>Social Inclusion – Seek to attract BME related services to locate in the area to help retain BME spending power in the district.</p> <p>Q3 & 4 – Considers options 2 and 3 should be combined with Option 2 in terms of reducing economic and social inequalities and joint partnership working in Option 3.</p> <p>5 – EN1 – Development along the National Forest Line can be unsustainable in advance of the line opening.</p> <p>EN2 – A separate section regarding flood and drought management is required across the whole district.</p> <p>EN5 – Biodiversity should relate back to RSS policies and County BAP targets.</p> <p>EN7 and EN8 – Appear to be 3 policy areas here – need for energy reduction and efficiency, embedding renewable energy generation and standards for free standing renewable energy generation.</p> <p>Q5 the key objectives for SC and AC are SC2, SC3, SC4, SC6, AC1, AC2 and AC5.</p> <p>Q6 – EN – Reference to giving priority to previously developed land should be extended geographically to cover appropriate urban locations with an additional objective relating to the role of rural towns.</p> <p>EC – Reference to achieving balanced/ mixed communities.</p> <p>SC – Could reflect the Housing Green Paper and its main objectives of producing more homes, well designed and greener homes and more affordable homes.</p> <p>AC – Locate new development such that it will improve the balance between employment and housing to minimise unsustainable commuting patterns and enable travel by non car modes.</p> <p>6 – Bullet point 6.2 is unnecessary as it does not relate to Leicestershire. Reference to SP Policy 2a is supported.</p>

		<p>Option 1 – replace ‘few opportunities’ with ‘less need’</p> <p>Q7 – Yes although this does not imply they should be considered equals re suitability for further development.</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – Broadly agree with the settlements but a narrow view is taken of what constitutes local need which does not reflect policy guidance in PPS3 or Policy 5 of draft RSS8.</p> <p>Q10 – Choice of Local needs Settlements could be based on local needs as well as services available which should be identified through an assessment of need, e.g. Housing Market Assessment. Policy 5 of draft RSS8 states Local needs Settlements should be accessible to the rural population (in addition to the service requirement) which is not currently expressed in the consultation document.</p> <p>Q11 – Yes</p> <p>Q12 – More flexibility required.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 1 would be favoured and point out that splitting the SUE across Coalville plus one or more rural towns will not provide the critical mass to support the infrastructure required. Also support Option 1 as Waste Planning Authority.</p> <p>Q15- From an adult social care and health standpoint it is essential that the location of the SUE takes into account the needs of the community, in particular the need to support existing facilities/ services and have easy access to them some of which may be located outside of the SUE in the town centre. They should be readily accessible to all and supported by public transport. Location A would relate well to a potential recreational link on the former railway line between Coalville and Sence Valley Forest Park. Location D would be in Charnwood Forest. In transportation terms, there is little merit in Option C.</p> <p>Q17 – Yes</p> <p>Q18 – In line with national guidance (PPS12 para 2.10) and Draft RSS policy 5 there should not be significant development outside of Coalville and it may be appropriate for the Core Strategy to identify broad locations for development in conformity with Policy 2 and to enable infrastructure requirements to be properly considered.</p> <p>Q19 – Ashby – unclear how sustainable any substantial growth may be given high car borne out commuting and only 1% of the population travelling to work by bus.</p> <p>Castle Donington – may have possibilities for some extra housing provided it is matched by wages/ skills of the workforce in the expanding employment areas. 3.6% travel to work by public transport.</p> <p>Ibstock – Consideration of growth should be in the light of where the Colville Sue will be. Opportunities for better bus services and access to local facilities through coordinated development with a SUE either at Grange Road or South West of Snibston. 3.5% travel to work by public transport</p> <p>Kegworth – Has 4.5% travel to work by public transport, but if the wrong type of development is built it could be a dormitory estate with good access to M1, A50 and EMA for commuting.</p> <p>Measham – Does not consider this is suitable for substantial development – limited facilities, fairly poor bus service and good links to the A42.</p> <p>Transport and sustainability do not come across as core, underpinning issues.</p> <p>Q20 – No</p> <p>Q21 – difficult to justify the inclusion of small sites in line with PPS3.</p> <p>Q22 – No need</p>
--	--	---

		<p>9 – Employment Requirements – Para 9.10 identifies 106.1ha of employment land to 2026 split as 7.8ha office and 98.3ha industry and warehousing which does not appear to fit with the economy issues identified in 3.1, the visions or most of the EC objectives that seek to refine the economy to higher value, higher income and higher skills base.</p> <p>Q23 – Concern that suggested method for identifying the amount of employment land required continues past trends rather than necessarily identifying what is needed to support future growth. Leics CC in advice to EMRA recommended 24 Ha employment land as part of the planned SUE to Coalville, in addition to employment land to meet more local needs. This advice drew on the findings of the SQW sub regional employment land study.</p> <p>Q24 – The inclusion within a SUE of 25ha of employment land will enable Regional and Sub-Regional needs to be addressed. Issue over the correlation between scale and location of the SUE to address the imbalance (particularly in Coalville) between the provision of new housing which has traditionally been larger more expensive properties probably out of reach of the workers at the employment provision which has been industrial/ distribution.</p> <p>Q25 – See Q18 and Q19 responses.</p> <p>Q26 – No.</p> <p>Q27 – Yes and a separate employment land provision for B2 uses should be included to help achieve this wider portfolio.</p> <p>Q28 – Yes</p> <p>10 – Climate Change – Should be made clear that a considerable contribution to the poor performance of the East midland Carbon Footprint is related to EMA.</p> <p>Q30 – Climate change should be one of the key factors underpinning housing and employment location rather than being considered in isolation.</p> <p>Infrastructure to minimise effects of extreme weather conditions is important and the core Strategy should highlight standards that need to be achieved by new developments for housing and employment. Particular attention need to be paid to the downstream effects of development ,e.g. development in Ashby can potentially increase run-off into Gilwiskaw Brook and cause flooding in Packington.</p> <p>Q31 – Yes – Specific policies on Green Energy use/ production and policies on integrated waste management facilities in an SUE could be developed.</p> <p>Q32 – the government has indicated that Merton type policies should be developed but the percentage target should be for district councils. More balanced set of policies may be more appropriate with opportunities for some form of Carbon locking mechanism through development of the National Forest.</p> <p>Q33 – should be set out as per C1/06</p> <p>Q34 – G & T provision should be considered at the earliest stage with the G & T community consulted on appropriate locations.</p> <p>Q35 – This would be supported and pointed out that G & Ts form the largest ethnic minority within NW Leics.</p>
CS/AC511	McDyre & Co on behalf of St Modwen Developments	<p>Refer to their response dated 23rd December 2005.</p> <p>Q3 – Options overlap and consider that ensuring regional policy contributes positively to the district economy and environment should be preferred.</p> <p>Q5 – Consider there should be some order of priority led by EN1, EC3 and SC1.</p> <p>Strategic Development – Directions for Growth –Coalville as the focus for new development should be stated as a policy objective in its own right.</p> <p>Q14 – Option 1 is preferred – respects emerging RSS8, would help to regenerate Coalville and preserve the character of the</p>

		<p>rural towns.</p> <p>Q15 – Location B is preferred as an SUE as this is closest to Coalville town centre and more accessible on foot and cycle with a strong employment base.</p> <p>Q21 – Disagree that allowance should be made for small sites (PPS3).</p> <p>Q22 – They can be prevented from coming forward by refusing planning permission.</p> <p>Q25 – Potential employment areas would be most appropriate in SUE location B with an existing significant employment base close to the town centre which can be further extended towards the A447. This should be tied in to residential development of the SUE.</p>
CS/AC512	Home Builders Federation	<p>Are disappointed that this consultation exercise has been carried out as it is not required (PPS12) and within the context of the current housing shortage the Core Strategy and land allocation documents should be fast tracked.</p> <p>Section 3 – Issues – Development outside of areas not best served by public transport should not be excluded for development as developer contributions can provide public transport. The Core Strategy should seek to reduce commuting by providing more housing adjacent to the areas of existing and new employment sites.</p> <p>Section 4 – the Vision should include a reference to meeting housing need and demand in line with PPS3.</p> <p>Section 5 – Insufficient reference to delivering market and affordable housing with PPS3 objectives (para 25 and 26) better reflected. In terms of the distribution of housing a more flexible approach should be adopted (EN1) with additional housing to the rural areas to will assist in revitalising and diversifying the rural economy (EC6).</p> <p>Section 6 – Concern re defining rural towns and other settlements based on functionality which does not bear reference to need and demand and capacity for further development, and further work is needed in this regard.</p> <p>In terms of local needs settlements they consider that there can be a local need for open and low cost market housing as opposed to simply associating local needs as affordable housing. The PLA Strategic Housing Market Assessment should inform this.</p> <p>In terms of development option they consider a dispersed option in accordance with the Strategic Housing market Assessment will provide a better opportunity to meet housing delivery targets as opposed to locating development in one or one type of location. SUEs can be successful as mixed use or for housing.</p> <p>Section 8 – they believe the RSS does not sufficiently take into account need and demand. The Core Strategy should as a minimum meet the 2004 ONS household projections which identify a projected growth of households of 10,000 between 2006 and 2026 which would provide an average of 500 households per annum. Taken with vacancy rates from the Annual Monitoring Report of 3.4% (340 dwellings) which would give a requirement of 517 dwellings per annum, with the 480 RSS figure leading to a shortage of 925 dwelling over the plan period. Windfall allowance should not be included in the first 10 years and should not be necessary as it should be included within the LPAs Housing Land Availability Assessment, and the LPA should be mindful of past windfalls.</p> <p>Section 10 – Energy efficiency should be maximised before considering renewable energy. Energy efficiency can CO2 emissions and renewable energy technologies are not proven, will need to be maintained and the lifetime of the development will considerably exceed the lifetime of most renewables. Policy must</p>

		<p>be flexible and in some cases large scale developments can contribute to off site renewable energy generation.</p> <p>New homes are already committed to reducing carbon output in the Code for Sustainable Homes (2006), Building A greener Future (2006) and the industry/ government concordat of achieving Code level 6 for carbon reduction by 2016. LPAs should not move faster than the timetables outlined in these national documents. Policy framework should focus effort to encourage reduced carbon emissions from the second hand housing stock and new and existing non – residential development. A target for reducing carbon emissions must be supported by an evidence base to ensure the target is realistic and deliverable.</p>
CS/AC513	Andrew Martin Associates on behalf of Commercial Estates Group	<p>Q1 – No. One key issue is the overall distribution of development which is key to securing a sustainable pattern of future growth.</p> <p>Q2 – An appraisal of existing settlement pattern and urban forms should be made including SWOT analysis and RSS guidance.</p> <p>Q3 – All visions currently read as objectives, Vision 1 is too detailed, Vision 2 relies of undefined and subjective notions of quality, and Vision 3 is unspecific. Vision 2 is preferred.</p> <p>Q4 – Alternative suggested to represent a vision of where and how the district might be in the future.</p> <p>Q5 – Yes – the objectives should be stripped of how they will be achieved. Everything after 'by' is effectively a policy rather than an objective and should appear separately.</p> <p>6 – First Spatial objective to 'concentrate most new development in the main urban area of Coalville' needs adding to since alone it is not in general conformity with the RSS which requires 'most new development within and adjacent to the main urban areas of Coalville and Swadlingcote' with Swad directly abutting the district boundary.</p> <p>Q7- No, Ashby is some 4 times bigger than Kegworth and some means of reflecting this needs to be incorporated into the hierarchy.</p> <p>Q8 – Unless a tire is created between Coalville and the Rural towns that includes Ashby and the villages adjacent to Coalville and Swadlingcote, then villages adjacent to Coalville and Swadlingcote should be raised above local needs settlements to reflect their status as more substantial locations.</p> <p>Q9 – No. the identification of Albert Village ignores its location immediately adjacent to the SRC of Swadlingcote with its wide range of facilities. Albert village is a five minute walk form schools and other facilities in Church Gresley and 15 minute walk from Swadlingcote town Centre. To ignore this risks non conformity with the RSS.</p> <p>Q10 – Yes – functional relationship with and distance from other higher order settlements should be a factor as should the compactness of the settlement so that villages such as Albert Village would be recognised as being more sustainable than some of the quiet remote villages it is currently categorised with. May be possible to identify levels of dual home ownership and local housing need to help define 'local needs settlements.'</p> <p>Q11 – Yes.</p> <p>Q12 – No – it should allow for enabling development where market housing could fund affordable or local needs housing. Local need should reflect more than just housing issues and flexibility should be incorporated to allow limited balanced mixed use growth to allow rural diversification.</p> <p>Q13 – No – Need to reflect the sustainable location of villages in walking distance of Colville and Swadlingcote SRCs and Ashby has been missed and is arguably essential in order to ensure conformity with the emerging RSS.</p> <p>Q14 – Option 2a since it presents an acceptable level of delivery</p>

		<p>risk and is greatest opportunity for conformity with the RSS.</p> <p>Q18 – Yes</p> <p>Q19 – Ashby location B would effectively utilise existing infrastructure and would consolidate the town in terms of urban form and in terms of the range of facilities it might support. The town serves as an important gateway to settlements in South Derbyshire.</p> <p>Q20 – Yes development adjacent to Swadlingcote such as Albert Village.</p> <p>Q21 – No. Contrary to National Policy. Monitoring process should allow for the managed release of sites.</p> <p>Q22 – Incorporating a policy that gets housing delivery up to a level that achieves and maintains the necessary trajectory.</p> <p>Q23 – No – The higher forecast should be adopted since it relates to the period before which the Core Strategy is likely to be reviewed.</p> <p>Q24 – By committing to the early joint reviews required in the emerging RSS and building in the flexibility for the site allocations DPD.</p> <p>Q26 – Yes – locations adjacent to Swadlingcote should be considered.</p> <p>Q27 – Yes</p> <p>Q28 – No – because employment sites vary in what they can deliver for the local economy and to do so may jeopardise other objectives.</p> <p>Q29 – By ensuring that the objective is identified so that the site allocations DPD must provide a suitable portfolio of sites.</p>
CS/AC515	Measham Parish Council	<p>Q1 – No mention of Medical/ Schools/ Libraries/ Local Transport and general infrastructure provision</p> <p>Q2 – More flexibility and local ownership of S106 monies which should be granted to parish level.</p> <p>Q3 – Option 1 is preferred.</p> <p>Q4 – no. However there needs to be more markers to the vision and point 3 needs to be refined to address local employment issues and not just addressing higher value, income and skills.</p> <p>Q5 – No</p> <p>Q6 – Yes – Locally run sport and entertainment facilities, improved support for local policing units, youth facilities and youth empowered decision making, infrastructure capabilities.</p> <p>Q7 – No – Measham should not be included as a rural town. Their village should remain with its current status due to the belief that their village has had a lot of internal development and the available finance will be better spent improving the Coalville area and enabling the provision of additional housing to the high employment demands around Castle Donington.</p> <p>Q8 – No.</p> <p>Q9 – Yes – include Measham as a local needs settlement.</p> <p>Q10 – No</p> <p>Q11 – Yes</p> <p>Q12 – Yes – with the provision that starter homes should be affordable to the local community and should be developed in preference to buy to let.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 2b – Coalville for regeneration and Castle Donington for work force requirements of EMA.</p> <p>Q15 – Location A due to the incorporation of the train link.</p> <p>Q16 – No</p> <p>Q17 – Yes – but careful consideration needs to be given to the impact on local housing when allocating industrial use.</p> <p>Q18 – yes</p> <p>Q19 – Castle Donington and Kegworth to meet work force</p>

		<p>requirements of EMA.</p> <p>Q20 – Redevelopment of brown field sites as a priority over green field to assist in regeneration.</p> <p>Q21 – Yes – housing should be developed with affordable housing to meet local needs only.</p> <p>Q22 – Set standards for minimum house footprint size and building height.</p> <p>Q23 – Yes</p> <p>Q24 – Compare existing availability of brown field sites and current needs against the local workforce that is available, which enables regeneration as a priority but in areas that need employment.</p> <p>Q25 – Castle Donington.</p> <p>Q26 – No</p> <p>Q27 – Yes but with consideration to Q17.</p> <p>Q28 – Yes</p> <p>Q29 – Employ greater use of existing transport links and be more creative with the use of brown field sites.</p> <p>Q30 – Enforce current legislation for commercial and industrial development, improve existing transport systems, improve availability of greener technologies.</p> <p>Q31 – Yes</p> <p>Q32 – Yes, aggressive targets with penalties going to green power projects.</p> <p>Q33 – review existing Brown field sites which the local infrastructure and facilities can support all the needs of the family units while adhering to the vision.</p> <p>Q34 – Yes in conjunction with Local Parish Authorities.</p> <p>Q35 – yes subject to responses to Q33 and 34.</p>
CS/AC516	L.R. Burbank	<p>Comments relate to the potential release of land for development at Hugglescote Grange.</p> <p>This land contains large areas of locally and nationally recognised endangered wildlife habitats, outstanding wildflower meadows a variety of ponds and wetland habitats, maturing woodland and hedgerows with the land not being disturbed since 1882 and possibly not since medieval times as suggested by the ridge and furrow plough forms.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the areas benefit to the local community with many recognised and unofficial well used public footpaths, with value as open space.</p> <p>Considers the disused railway should be safeguarded for future transport use.</p>
CS/AC517	Mrs Gwyneth Tseng	<p>Considers the consultation document to be confused, rambling, repetitive, obscure, full of inconsistencies, no evidence presented with unclear and unstated implications and hidden agendas. If Rural Town status give a green light to development without coordinated improvement to services then she opposes this.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should be simpler and more direct with clear signals to developers and the public as to what is being sought to achieve with suggested policies to protect the built and natural environment and flood protection.</p> <p>Is in favour of the intention to improve the national Forest but it should not be given such prominence without also recognising the particulars of other parts of the district.</p>
CS/AC520	Richard J Pollard	<p>Q14 – Considers option 5 is the most appropriate.</p> <p>Section 7 and Q15 – Refers to allocated housing land of 1500 dwellings at location A. If development has to happen her it should be restricted to land east of the former railway, thereby allowing the A511 bypass and providing a buffer zone between the new housing and Hugglescote which he considers would allow some</p>

		<p>1,100 homes.</p> <p>An SUE of 4000 houses would have a huge negative impact on residents and users of SE Coalville/ Hugglescote. Does not see how this number of houses can be built without building up and/ or spreading south of Grange Road into existing countryside.</p> <p>Considers that even 1,100 dwellings would have an unacceptable impact on the area.</p>
CS/AC521	Ashby Coalition for Town Enhancement	<p>Q5 – The Core strategy should have a more limited range of objectives.</p> <p>Q6 – The missing prime objective is that local needs is defined before broad policies are applied.</p> <p>Establishing the priorities and possibilities for each place allows a coordinated plan for the area to be put in place to avoid the situation where housing appears on any available patch of land with no regard to the provision of services.</p> <p>Q7 – Castle Donington and Kegworth cannot be considered for the generality of development alongside the need to support further development of the airport.</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q11 – Local needs should be defined for both rural towns and local needs settlements.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – 2e is considered most appropriate, with the limited expansion of Ibstock also possible.</p> <p>Q17 – Considers that housing and employment land should be separated where possible, as mixed developments increases the amount of land required and encourages local opposition.</p> <p>Q18 – Yes</p> <p>Q19 – The canal development at Measham makes the area extremely attractive to live with the area undeveloped with immediate access to the A42 and A444 with few additional burdens on local roadways and is virtually the only option that does not threaten to engulf another village into its borders.</p> <p>Areas B and C are favoured in Ibstock as A fronts the already overused Leicester Road. Development in Kegworth and Castle Donington is most suited to meeting warehouse and industrial development in support of the airport.</p> <p>Ashbys prospects for development are severely restricted by the proliferation of recent developments on services with mixed developments to be avoided at all costs. Location B is particularly unsuitable as it threatens to make the A511 a border to the town to result in Ashby becoming an island within roadways and would also add to congestion on Nottingham Road. In Colville the bypass has become a main congested access into the town and the same should be prevented in Ashby. If housing development is allocated in Ashby location A allows easier access to the southern connection with the A42 and would place far less burdens on existing roadways particularly the A511.</p> <p>Q21 – Some allowance should be made.</p> <p>Q25 – Ashby already has employment development on Green field land and any further mixed development should not be considered in that it adds to an unplanned appearance of what is the prime gateway to the national Forest. Location C is considered suitable for the future subject to S106 contributions. Expansion of Measham would require employment development which should not detract from the environmental and aesthetic benefits of the canal project and they consider sites in castle Donington would be suitable for employment.</p> <p>Q27 – Ashby and Coalville have seen the continuous provision of smaller units and major developers focus on this need. It is recognised that provision of smaller units in villages meets local needs.</p>

		Q28 – Not considered appropriate to include a requirement for all industrial sites to specify a minimum provision for smaller units, with smaller brown field sites encouraged for smaller firms.
CS/AC522	Ravenstone with Snibstone Parish Council	<p>Preamble – Executive summary would have been helpful and insufficient time was allowed to comment.</p> <p>Introduction - Tension between economic development and protecting the environment and reducing carbon footprint is identified but not addressed and pointed out that the protection of the environment is a matter of life and death, and the precautionary principle with regard to climate change should be applied. The choice as they see it is being satisfied with enough or reaching the point where there is not enough to go round.</p> <p>Economy – Emphasis should be on developing higher skills levels amongst local people to increase competitiveness in the internal district labour market. Unclear whether dependency upon manufacturing for employment is seen as a good or a bad thing although the dangers of exporting manufacturing capacity are seen as immense. Revitalising Colville Town Centre has been much talked about with little substance. A visionary, radical, inescapably expensive, long term plan is required.</p> <p>Housing – Housing for the elderly need to be dovetailed with LCCs recent proposals for older peoples accommodation and it is vital that changes in ageing peoples housing needs do not lead to them becoming dislocated from where they have spent their lives.</p> <p>Transport – Questions the likelihood of the National Forest passenger railway proposals being realised. Does not see how the Council can achieve the balance sought between EMAs economic opportunities with protecting the local environment.</p> <p>Social Inclusion – How the Core Strategy can support community engagement is an issue that needs as much attention as any other and is not helped by the low expectations and respect local communities have for different tiers of government and vice versa.</p> <p>Waste, Recycling and Renewable Energy – all appear to be significantly under played in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Q1 – With the exception of the above issues most appear to have been identified.</p> <p>Q2 – Option 1 (Vision) – Appears impossible to reconcile the implications of growth and a refined local economy producing higher value and income with a sustainable long term future. More radical proposals are needed. Does not consider that safeguarding areas of local importance is evidenced in Ravenstone re Long Moor opposition. Healthy, secure and strong communities require more than design and infrastructure provision and more research into developing/ regenerating community spirit is recommended although efforts to achieve this will only succeed if it is from within and from the grassroots up.</p> <p>Options 2 and 3 – Considers these two to be in effect indistinguishable.</p> <p>Q3 – Merit is transferring features from Options 2 and 3 not already included to Option 1.</p> <p>Q4 – After this transfer, include the above suggestions into Option 1 and have this reworded as the Vision Statement.</p> <p>Objectives – Enhancing and Safeguarding the Environment – A more radical approach to EN7 is required. Agriculture is given insufficient emphasis in view of potential food shortages as a result of climate change. Only indirect reference to agriculture at EN8 with the Rural Economy. Rising sea levels (20 feet) would have drastic effects on large parts of the UK putting pressure on remaining land for agriculture, industry and housing and proper provision should be made for such eventualities. National Forest is welcome although there may be conflicts between its acting as a source of wood fuel and the Clean Air Act.</p>

		<p>Spatial Objectives – Increased economic prosperity, diversity and competitiveness – EC1-4 – Question the appropriateness of this economic growth in potential times of shortages of food, energy and raw materials which will mean that people will have to make do with less, and this eventuality should be planned for gradually rather than amounting to an emergency. It would be about consolidation and personal rather than economic growth. The chronic failure to deliver on Regeneration of Coalville (EC5) casts doubt on other objectives which are more difficult.</p> <p>Social Objectives – Creating safer stronger and healthier communities – SC1 has little appeal and something more talismanic is needed for the amorphous district. More community spirit locally will increase the prospects of such communities combining to regard themselves as say 'National Forresters'. Building or regenerating community spirit could produce a return way out of proportion to the cost.</p> <p>Q5 – only grounds for reducing the range of objectives concern achievability.</p> <p>Q6 – The discarding of the tenet that 'economic growth is good and sustainable' would lead to a very different set of objectives.</p> <p>Strategic development – Directions for growth – Ravenstone designated as a rural settlement is welcomed – concern over Ravenstone being swallowed up into Coalville.</p> <p>Q7 – Considers there is logic underpinning definitions but will not comment on other towns.</p> <p>Q8 – No.</p> <p>Q9 – Considers Ravenstone would be appropriate as a local needs settlement.</p> <p>Q10 – Other settlements including the very smallest should have a definition.</p> <p>The general view is that Ravenstone has reached its limit for sustainable development and there needs to be an appreciable period without any further development so that the community can properly absorb residents in more recently built housing.</p> <p>Definition of local needs may not be possible on a one size fits all but this would be a small price to pay for greater local democracy and ownership of this element of the strategy.</p> <p>Q11 – The need for definition is agreed, but should be on the basis of the widest meaningful consultation with the communities concerned.</p> <p>Q12 – No.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 1.</p> <p>Potential Broad Locations for Development – Coalville location B is concerning with the potential to extend close to Ravenstone and considers that the Limes development was a big mistake.</p> <p>Q15 – Location A or D is preferred.</p> <p>Q16 – Probably not.</p> <p>Q17 – Yes depending on the nature of the business with ideally these being the greenest.</p> <p>Q18 – Yes</p> <p>Q19 – Considers it inappropriate to select from options that have no impact on Ravenstone but do on other settlements. They would however be anxious if location A in Ibstock was to be too close to Ravenstone.</p> <p>Q20 – Probably None.</p> <p>Housing Requirements – Sensible to incorporate the entire housing numbers within the LDF.</p> <p>Q21 – Considers it may be better to hold small sites in reserve.</p> <p>Q22 – may be unnecessary to prevent small sites coming forward, and consent can be refused if so needed relying on the LDF (policies).</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Employment Requirements – Need proper recognition in planning.</p> <p>Q23 – Suggested method is agreeable as far as it goes but potential land loss and affected population needs to be modelled on the basis of the capacity of remaining land and existing populations to accommodate and support them.</p> <p>Q24 – refer to previous comments re economic consolidation and loss of land to rising sea levels.</p> <p>Q27 – Qualified yes taking into account their comments re economic growth.</p> <p>Q28 – A calculated/ modelled minimum provision should be made for smaller units which should make a modest contribution to reducing distribution transports carbon footprint.</p> <p>Climate Change – Reduction of Carbon Footprint may prove too little too late and exclusive focus on energy consumption reduction/ efficiency could be akin to putting all the eggs in one basket. Considers private car owners are made scapegoats with their targeting substitutes the absence of anything approaching a national integrated transport policy which needs to be addressed in terms of rationalising goods vehicles and buses wasteful journeys as well as improving the availability, quality and reliability of public transport. With investment in public transport it may be acceptable to restrict car ownership to one per household subject to qualifications.</p> <p>Q30 – Would be sensible for SUEs to be designated as eco-developments.</p> <p>Q31 – Yes</p> <p>Q32 – District wide reduction targets must be sensible and time periods of two to three years would have more meaning in terms of targets with Carbon emissions used as a target.</p> <p>Council tax is criticised.</p> <p>Meeting the needs of Gypsies, travellers and showpeople</p> <p>Q33 – would seem possible and desirable for sites to be segmented among the three classes. Rights (to sites) must come with responsibilities to respect the rights and property of neighbouring permanent residents.</p> <p>Q34 - Identifying areas of search or preferred locations for sites should be included in the core strategy.</p> <p>Conclusion – the Core Strategy is an excellent opportunity for real dialogue with the districts people and may encourage greater participation in shaping the districts future. This relies on the Core Strategy being regarded as a process with follow through and maintenance being pre-requisites.</p>
--	--	--

CS/AC523	Ian Baseley Associates on behalf of Mr D Jones and colleagues (Travelling Showpeople).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern that the existing Local Plan distinction between Gypsies/ travellers and travelling showpeople is retained to reflect different planning legislation. The two groups should not be combined for ease. 2. Refers to a recent appeal decision relating to his clients unauthorised site which acknowledged a need for 15 showmen facilities. 3. Confirmation sought as to whether the 10 pitches referred to are for this particular group of travelling showpeople, and it is considered that they should be. In the event of the 10 pitches being available for other groups from outside the district, then this would not address his clients' accommodation needs. <p>Q33 – There should be separate criteria included in the Core Strategy in respect of the location of sites for travelling showpeople (as opposed to Gypsies) with reference to the DCLG document 'Consultation on revised planning guidance in relation to Travelling Showpeople' with the thrust of this advice that sites on the edge of settlements or in rural areas not subject to special planning constraints may be acceptable in principle, with LPAs to be realistic about the availability or likely availability of alternatives to the car in accessing local services.</p> <p>Q34 – The Core Strategy should identify areas of search, avoiding areas of constraint.</p> <p>Q35 – Travelling showpeople should included to form part of the need for the SUE.</p> <p>In the absence of a positive allocation they will pursue their existing site off Rycroft Road, Hemmington as an allocated site for Travelling Showpeople.</p>
CS/AC525	Savills	<p>Q7 – They support in principle with the qualification that new development must be of an appropriate scale to ensure a more even spread across the whole district supporting Coalville as an SRC.</p> <p>Q14 – Option 2 is preferred as providing a more even spread across the district with option 1 severely restricting growth in areas other than Coalville over the plan period. Option 2d is considered most appropriate with the strategic links of Kegworth to the M1 and east midlands growth with further growth to help the economic prosperity of the Region without necessarily resulting in outward intrusion into the countryside.</p> <p>Q18 – Yes – this is crucial to informing the site specific allocations stage and ensuring more holistic growth in the district.</p> <p>Q19 – Kegworth is most appropriate due to links to the M1 and EMA, key location bordering three counties, its sustainability credentials with shops, services employment and excellent public transport links and the nature / pattern of the settlement which can support further growth without detrimental impact on the countryside.</p>
CS/AC526	P.D. Beddoe	<p>Questions the inclusion of the provision of sites for gypsies and travellers</p> <p>Economy – It is inevitable that a district adjoining two other counties will be a net importer of labour and is considered to facilitate a false need for additional housing. Depending on manufacturing industry for employment rings hollow given taxes and restrictions forcing firms into bankruptcy, aeroplanes will never be carbon neutral and outdated freight aircraft are seriously polluting, Colville shopping area is seen as a drag on the Council, is irredeemable and should be left to market forces.</p> <p>Housing – rejects the need for more affordable housing, considers there is ample available housing and Greenfield development is a</p>

		<p>sin.</p> <p>Transport - Opening of the National Forest line for passengers has been on the agenda for decades and no progress is discernable. EMAs airfreight results in environmentally damaging road haulage although their passenger bus initiative is to be applauded.</p> <p>Environment and Heritage – River Mease is identified as SAC but questioned why the River Trent is not recognised.</p> <p>Conservation Area financial aid has been partisan with Castle Donington being neglected.</p> <p>Flood Risk is being ignored re housing developments, as are noise and air pollution in the north of the district.</p> <p>Vision – Option 1 – Distinctive identity of the National Forest is supported as is the ambition to refine the economy to a higher value/ higher income/ higher skills base. Singling out Coalville for regeneration is rejected as is favouring the River Mease over the River Trent – Appears to be a southern bias.</p> <p>Option 2 – Considered a hazy notion of an idyllic utopia which does not reflect the reality of the situation particularly re operational abuses by Donington Park and EMA.</p> <p>Option 3 – Considered more realistic.</p> <p>Q1 – Relevant issues have been identified but disagrees with preferential treatment for Coalville.</p> <p>Q3 – Option 3 preferred.</p> <p>Q4 – No.</p> <p>Objectives – generally supportive but do not consider that the district Council is obliged to meet the operational demands of EMA (EC7), Concern regarding reducing Green Wedges (SC5) and potential viability of the national Forest Line (AC4) is too vague.</p> <p>Q5 – No</p> <p>Q6 – Consideration should be given to the above provisos.</p> <p>Strategic Development – Q7 – Yes</p> <p>Q8 – Ellistown may be considered.</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q10 – The minimum level of service provision as described must be adhered to as a minimum and once an element ceases to be active, the need for additional housing also ceases.</p> <p>Clarification sought as to who will be involved in assessing 'local need'.</p> <p>Q11 – Local need should be defined without skewed preferences.</p> <p>Q12 – Agree in principle but is years too late.</p> <p>Considered that Coalville should share development with one of the rural towns but not Castle Donington which has noise constraints from EMA and Donington Park with no housing shortage and the doctors' surgery being fully stretched. The remains of an English 'village experience' are at risk with the settlement growing from 3500 forty years ago to some 8000 now.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 Option 1 provided planning gain is invested.</p> <p>Employment Requirements – Concern that the potential employment site north of Castle Donington may be used for gypsies and travellers. Does not consider that showpeople should be associated with itinerants.</p> <p>Q33 - None – it is a self defeating exercise.</p> <p>Q34 – Should stop hiding behind 'areas of search'</p> <p>Q35 – An SUE at Colville could incorporate a 73 pitch caravan site but the need is disputed.</p>
CS/AC527	N.W. Cave	<p>Opposes development at Grange Road and refers to a previous proposal that was thrown out. Grounds for objection are –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Previous similar plans rejected. 2. 1200 previously considered too many with 1500 creating

		<p>more danger</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Existing services are already stretched 4. Other brownfield sites are available in the district. 5. There would be a loss of leisure areas 6. Any development permitted should be greatly reduced. 7. No development whatsoever without the full bypass.
CS/AC529	Alice de la Rue	<p>Q33 – Site location criteria should follow guidance in C01/2006 and draft guidance issues by DCLG and should not include restrictive criteria covered elsewhere, such as excessive description of the impact of G&T sites on the surrounding area which is not used for other types of residential development as such would imply discrimination.</p> <p>Q34 – If areas of search are to be identified this should be done in close consultation with Gypsies and Travellers. There may be preferred areas relating to continuation of education or healthcare, but she would not be in favour if other potential sites outside of such areas were not considered suitable. If areas of search place additional restrictions on which sites are most likely to be given planning permission it is felt they are best avoided.</p> <p>Due to land value issues some Gypsies and travellers have no option other than to buy the cheapest land which may be subject to restrictive policies. An exception policy should therefore be included in the Core Strategy. Sites owned by the LPA or RSL should be considered affordable housing and as such can be funded through S106 contributions as one of the forms of affordable housing.</p> <p>Q35 – May be appropriate to locate a G& T site within the SUE but this should be decided in consultation with them. Creating a mixed community would be in accordance with Government objectives.</p>
CS/AC530	Thomas Redfern	<p>Issues – The issues relating to the district being a net importer of labour must be addressed for environmental and social reasons with one way to achieve this being to make the district more attractive to live in by allocating small sites in attractive larger villages.</p> <p>Vision – Option 1 is considered most appropriate as being more outcome focussed and practical.</p> <p>Spatial Objectives – Objectives must not conflict but does not consider a more limited range is necessary.</p> <p>Directions for growth – Five settlements identified in Q7 should be identified as rural towns.</p> <p>Q9 – does not agree.</p> <p>Q11 – Yes</p> <p>Q12 – One of the local needs criteria could be amended to include someone who is employed or has a business in the district within a 10 km radius of the settlement.</p> <p>Options – Considers Option 5 is the optimum one although does not consider that all settlements should be considered as equals and a hierarchy can still be maintained with most development in Coalville, Ashby and the larger rural towns with some development allocated in the larger villages such as Albert Village and Appleby Magma. Considers that the advantages of this option in terms of social sustainability (Addressing the lack of housing investment in a village) would outweigh small disbenefits in terms of sustainability generally.</p> <p>Potential Broad locations for development – Q18 – Yes</p> <p>Housing Requirements – Q21 – Some allowance should be made as smaller windfall sites have made a significant contribution to housing provision historically.</p>

CS/AC531	Fisher German	<p>Acting for Walton Homes who have an interest in Drift Side, Blackfordby.</p> <p>Q1 & Q2 – No further issues are put forward</p> <p>Q3 and Q4 – Option 3 is preferred re National Forest identity. However important to embrace regional influences to ensure they contribute to the district economy and environment through sustainable development and partnership working.</p> <p>Q5 and Q6 – Objectives are supported and understood that the main focus for development is on sustainable locations such as Coalville, but should include reference to supporting and enhancing existing facilities within main towns and villages in addition to Coalville with reference to sustainable growth based on local needs.</p> <p>Q7 – Yes</p> <p>Q9 & 10 – Disagree with the current settlement hierarchy and suggest a greater number of tiers with consideration given to vitality of villages such as Moira and Appleby Magma which are sustainably located with other villages not mentioned also given consideration. Blackfordby has a number of facilities including a school, church, pub, village hall and playing fields with a regular bus service and Norris Hill is within walking distance of the village and Ashby and Swadlingcote are a short distance away. Refers to Paragraph 38 of PPS3 re the importance of providing housing in rural areas and that the strategy at present prevents development in these smaller villages which will lead to them stagnating with negative impacts in terms of loss of local services and facilities, property prices rising further / lack of affordability causing out migration. Developer contributions from housing development can provide much needed investment in local services.</p> <p>Q11 & Q12 – Yes to both.</p> <p>Q13 & Q14 – Preferred option is Option 2 with 2a and 2b to be considered due to the current and potential levels of service provision. This allows limited development in larger villages which could aid improvement projects, social facilities and local needs housing within the smallest settlements.</p> <p>Q18, 19 and 20 – Broad locations for development outside of Coalville should be identified with the majority of development to be in areas with existing facilities and good transportation. Consideration for growth within towns and larger sustainable villages should be given in the site allocations DPD.</p> <p>Q21 & 22 – In line with PPS3 (Paragraph 59) Windfall sites should not be included.</p> <p>Housing sites should be clearly identified within the LDF proposals maps and a phased approach adopted to prevent oversupply with windfall sites monitored and phased development of larger sites managed accordingly.</p>
CS/AC532	Fisher German	<p>Acting for Mr M Price who has an interest in land at Bowleys Lane, Appleby Magma.</p> <p>Q1 & Q2 – No further issues are put forward</p> <p>Q3 and Q4 – Option 3 is preferred re National Forest identity. However important to embrace regional influences to ensure they contribute to the district economy and environment through sustainable development and partnership working.</p> <p>Q5 and Q6 – Objectives are supported and understood that the main focus for development is on sustainable locations such as Coalville, but should include reference to supporting and enhancing existing facilities within main towns and villages in addition to Coalville with reference to sustainable growth based on local needs.</p> <p>Q7 – Yes</p> <p>Q9 & 10 – Refers to Paragraph 38 of PPS3 re the importance of</p>

		<p>providing housing in rural areas. In light of PPS3 they disagree with the current settlement hierarchy and suggest a greater number of tiers in the classification of towns and villages and disagree that Appleby Magma should be classed as a 'local needs settlement'. Considers that there is a significant difference between villages such as Albert Village and Newton Burgoland on the one hand and Appleby Magma on the other. It is accepted that Albert village and Newton Burgoland do have a primary school, village hall and general store but Appleby Magma is sustainably located and offers additional rural employment opportunities and benefits from good access to the A42 and motorway network with appropriate local services such as the post office, pubs and school. New development in the village could help fund further projects through financial contributions to improve facilities such as bus services, environmental schemes and local health facilities. The tiered system would therefore include rural towns, rural villages and local needs settlements and Appleby Magma should be classed as a village and therefore able to regenerate further within the plan period.</p> <p>Q11 & Q12 – Yes to both.</p> <p>Q13 & Q14 – Preferred option is Option 2 with 2a and 2b to be considered due to the current and potential levels of service provision. This allows limited development in larger villages which could aid improvement projects, social facilities and local needs housing within the smallest settlements.</p> <p>Q18, 19 and 20 – Broad locations for development outside of Coalville should be identified with the majority of development to be in areas with existing facilities and good transportation. Consideration for growth within towns and larger sustainable villages should be given in the site allocations DPD.</p> <p>Q21 & 22 – In line with PPS3 (Paragraph 59) Windfall sites should not be included.</p> <p>Housing sites should be clearly identified within the LDF proposals maps and a phased approach adopted to prevent oversupply with windfall sites monitored and phased development of larger sites managed accordingly.</p>
CS/AC533	Fisher German	<p>Acting for Mr G Barney and Miss M Fairbrother who have an interest in land at Ashby Road, Moira.</p> <p>Q1 & Q2 – No further issues are put forward</p> <p>Q3 and Q4 – Option 3 is preferred re National Forest identity. However important to embrace regional influences to ensure they contribute to the district economy and environment through sustainable development and partnership working.</p> <p>Q5 and Q6 – Objectives are supported and understood that the main focus for development is on sustainable locations such as Coalville, but should include reference to supporting and enhancing existing facilities within main towns and villages in addition to Coalville with reference to sustainable growth based on local needs.</p> <p>Q7 – Yes</p> <p>Q9 & 10 – Disagree with the current settlement hierarchy and suggest a greater number of tiers. Disagree that and disagree that Moira should be classed as a 'local needs settlement'. Considers that there is a significant difference between villages such as Albert Village and Newton Burgoland on the one hand and Moira on the other. It is accepted that Albert village and Newton Burgoland do have a primary school, village hall and general store but Moira offers a wide range of employment opportunities and benefits from facilities such as Conkers and Moira Furness. It is considered that this is a sustainable location for growth with development in the centre of the village benefiting from local</p>

		<p>services at Norris Hill, Conkers and employment on Rawdon Road. New development in the village could help to fund further projects through financial contributions to regenerate the area such as traffic calming, greater choice of bus services, environmental schemes and local health facilities to serve Moira, Donisthorpe and Overseal. It is essential for other villages within close proximity including those outside of the District are considered for the greater regeneration of the Forest. The LDF is actively encouraging 'place making local identity' within the National Forest and promoting Ashby as the gateway to the National Forest and pointed out that Moira is the main village between Ashby and the most popular forest attractions such as Moira Furness and Conkers. There is much room for improvement in Moira which will attract a greater number of visitors and higher waged earners into the village as Moira becomes a more desirable place to live. Classifying Moira as a local needs settlement effectively limits its growth and stagnates development for the plan period. The tiered system would therefore include rural towns, rural villages and local needs settlements and Moira should be classed as a village and therefore able to regenerate further within the plan period through small housing projects and community initiatives.</p> <p>Q11 & Q12 – Yes to both.</p> <p>Q13 & Q14 – Preferred option is Option 2 with 2a and 2b to be considered due to the current and potential levels of service provision. This allows limited development in larger villages which could aid improvement projects, social facilities and local needs housing within the smallest settlements.</p> <p>Q18, 19 and 20 – Broad locations for development outside of Coalville should be identified with the majority of development to be in areas with existing facilities and good transportation. Consideration for growth within towns and larger sustainable villages should be given in the site allocations DPD.</p> <p>Q21 & 22 – In line with PPS3 (Paragraph 59) Windfall sites should not be included.</p> <p>Housing sites should be clearly identified within the LDF proposals maps and a phased approach adopted to prevent oversupply with windfall sites monitored and phased development of larger sites managed accordingly.</p>
CS/AC534	Packington Parish Council	<p>Q1 – No – Sewerage systems in some areas are inadequate to cope with further housing expansion. Better transport arrangements should be in place adjacent to working environments.</p> <p>Q2 – the above points should be identified.</p> <p>Q3 – Vision 1 – improving the quality of life for people in NW Leics.</p> <p>Q4 – No</p> <p>Q5 – No</p> <p>Q6 – No but EN2 should be amended to remove reference to the northern part of the district as it is not just that area that floods, and EC7 should not mean any expansion in night flights.</p> <p>Q7 – Yes</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – Yes</p> <p>Q10 – Yes, bus routes to areas of employment should be used as a criteria.</p> <p>Q11 – Yes</p> <p>Q12 – Yes</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 1</p> <p>Q15 – Area A</p>

		<p>Q16 – No Q17 – Yes Q18 – No Q19 - Coalville A 7.3.7 or 7.3.5 but not 7.3.3 Q20 – No Q21 – Yes Q22 – N/A Q23 – Yes Q24 – N/A Q25 – Castle Donington Plan 7 as EMA is the major employer in the district. Measham Plan 6 as it is adjacent to the M42. Q26 – No Q27 – Yes Q28 – Yes Q29 – No Q31- No Q32 – No Q33 – Not wanted and no sites identified</p>
CS/AC535	B Noble	<p>Q1 – Yes Q2 – Involve the National Forestry Commission in order to provide a natural environment for the benefit of existing and new residents. Avoid excessive density by siting green areas of forestry between old and new housing with housing responsible for more carbon than cars and woodland the best way to counter carbon emissions and preserve local wildlife. Public transport will not reduce car use unless heavily subsidised. Q3 – Vision 1 Q5 – Favour EN1 – EN8 Q7 – Agree except that there is no 15 minute bus service to out of town shops such as Tesco where most people shop and need clarification re bus service routes. Q9 – Yes Q11 – Yes Q14 – Option 1 or 2b Q15 – 7.2.1 Q18 – Yes Q19 – 7.3.6 Q21 – Yes Q27 – Yes Q28 – Yes Q30 – By making provision for extensive national Forestry green areas around new developments. General criticism regarding the lack of plain English in the consultation document.</p>
CS/AC536	The National Trust	<p>Provide background to the trust and points out that they have specific interest at Staunton Harold Church and just outside the district at Calke Abbey and Ulverscroft. Q1 – Considers the first Environmental issue takes too limited a view of landscape character and could be broadened with the sentence – ‘there is a need to understand the character of the landscape of NW Leicestershire and ensure that future development is appropriate that it respects and reinforces that character.’ Biodiversity should present a separate issue in its own right to redress the decline in the East Midlands. The second environmental issue should be re cast as ‘How will designated heritage sites and their settings be protected and enhanced?’ – List of assets has excluded Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and these should be included. Q3 – Option 3 is preferred. Q4 – Option 3 would be improved by a specific reference to addressing the causes of climate change and the phrase ‘building on the National Forest Identity’ is a little unfortunate and ‘building’</p>

		<p>should be changed to 'promoting'.</p> <p>Q5 – No but is not clear how EC2 will be achieved and EC9 and 10 could be amalgamated.</p> <p>EN3 should be broadened, EN5 should not be limited to priority habitat areas, EN7 should be widened to encompass the concept of adaption to those climate changes that are now unavoidable, EN8 should be reworded, EC7 reference to operational needs should be tempered with the prefix 'reasonable'</p> <p>Q6 – No</p> <p>Q7 – Yes</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 –Yes</p> <p>Q10 – No</p> <p>Q11 – Yes</p> <p>Q12 – Yes</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 1 – more in line with emerging RSS</p> <p>Q15 – Concern regarding Option 4 as it is essential that Green Wedges are maintained and expanded.</p> <p>Q16 – No</p> <p>Q17 – Yes but the scale of employment needs careful consideration to ensure that it properly reflects demand based on existing and anticipated population levels.</p> <p>Q18 – Only if significant development outside of Coalville becomes the preferred option.</p> <p>Q19 – Areas around Ibstock are the next most sustainable as sites at Castle Donington are not considered to be suitable for mixed use development.</p> <p>Q20 – No</p> <p>Q21 – Considers that even allowing for PPS3 advice, there are specific circumstances in respect of the historically high proportion of all new dwellings on windfall sites to justify such an approach.</p> <p>Q22 – Unrealistic to prevent all such sites coming forward.</p> <p>Q23 – They are doubtful about the higher growth scenario that was previously considered in the York Aviation study.</p> <p>Q24 – Regional/ sub-regional requirements are unclear and until this is rectified it is not appropriate to make provision.</p> <p>Q25 – Colville SUE are most appropriate.</p> <p>Q26 – No</p> <p>Q30 – Colville SUE is most appropriate for new housing and employment with an eco town approach with zero carbon should be vigorously pursued, with a rigorous approach re minimising energy use applied to all new development.</p> <p>Q31 – Support an approach that goes beyond Building Regs standards, and refer to a case in greater Manchester in support.</p> <p>Q32 – Targets should meet RSS and possibly be 5% higher given the poor performance of the District.</p> <p>Q33 – Consideration will need to be given to access to services, landscape character impacts, and any implications for designated historic assets and their settings.</p> <p>Q34 – Yes</p> <p>Q35 – Yes subject to a suitable location being identified.</p>
CS/AC537	Derbyshire County Council	<p>Refer to the issues /objectives identified and have the following specific comments-</p> <p>Landscape Comments – Countryside Strategy Policy 8 – should be clear reference that development in the countryside should be informed by the character of the landscape, its sensitivity to development and the capacity of the landscape to accept and mitigate the effects of the proposed development in line with PPS7 and draft RSS policy 31 that places a duty of LPAs to produce a Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) to inform their LDF which also allows for cross boundary compatibility with</p>

		<p>neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Limits to Development – If development limits are defined they should be informed by an LCA and if criteria based policies are used then landscape character should be one of the criteria.</p> <p>Housing & Industrial Land – LCA should be used to inform the selection of Urban Extension Areas.</p> <p>Charnwood Forest – Any review of the boundary should be informed by an LCA in line with PPS7.</p> <p>Planning Obligations – Planning Obligations should still be sought as a means of providing integrated environmental solutions to offset the impacts associated with new developments.</p> <p>Housing Comments – Do not consider that the identified issues and options are likely to have any direct implications for housing patterns in the south of Derbyshire.</p> <p>Employment Comments – Reference should be made to the potential extension of the Nottingham Green Belt which would be a significant factor in determining the acceptability of development proposals north of Castle Donington. Considers that the proposed area of search regarding employment land in the vicinity of the A50 junction north of Castle Donington is incompatible with RSS8 draft policies 13 and 19 as additional employment opportunities within this area would be incompatible with the established principles of sustainable development, and would encourage out commuting of longer distances from neighbouring centres including Derby.</p>
CS/AC538	Heather Parish Council	<p>Q1 & Q2 – Main Issues are covered – suggested national government constraints should be included as an appendix.</p> <p>Q3 & Q4 – Option 2 is preferred. In relation to Option 1 it is considered that the level of finance needed to make this happen will make it unworkable particularly in terms of transport/ rail.</p> <p>Q5 and Q6 – Considers the range of objectives is exceeding large and probably impractical. Policies to reduce energy requirements and support for public transport are supported in principle.</p> <p>Considers attention to improving the opportunities for skills to be learnt in this area should be given priority. Healthy and strong communities such as Heather would benefit from more help from the District Council. In rural communities the car will always be necessary and an essential means of transport.</p> <p>Q7 and Q8 – The Belvoir Shopping Centre needs a revamp and it is assumed that Whitwick is included as part of Coalville given that the leisure facilities cited are in Whitwick. Considers Whitwick should be included as one of the Rural Towns instead of Ibstock.</p> <p>Q9 & Q10 – Agree with the addition of having the addition of including a church/ place of worship in the list.</p> <p>Q11 & Q12 – To define too closely may not give the required flexibility in terms of housing needs, and considered more appropriate to define local needs as the conditions and criteria which must be met to qualify for the allocation of a property, rather than as a person.</p> <p>Q13 and Q14 – No other options than the ones presented.</p> <p>Considers that Ashby should take a high priority but housing without the infrastructure to support it could bring serious problems in relation to employment opportunities and education. The programmes of affordable housing should be maintained in villages like Heather.</p> <p>Q15, 16 & 17 – Location A is most appropriate, SUE should be suitable for employment and may also be possible to reclassify to provide further Green Wedges between Coalville and the rural villages to the west of Coalville.</p> <p>Q18, 19 & 20 – Subject to allowing some flexibility in the future, inclusion of some potential areas for development should be</p>

		<p>included. Development in Ashby and Kegworth will have noise issues from the M42 and M1 and In Castle Donington from the airport. Development in Ibstock could lead to coalescence with surrounding villages. Location C would appear most suitable for Measham.</p> <p>Q21 and 22 – Allowance should be made for such sites, with a requirement for such properties at least in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Q23 & 24 – Considers the Council has made a pretty good job over the last 15 years of allocating and developing allocated land and attracting businesses to the area, and would expect the method of the Council to take into account the requirements for the area as it has in the past.</p> <p>Q25 and 26 – Location listed in Coalville and in para 9.12 all seem suitable.</p> <p>Q27, 28 and 29 – The Core Strategy Should address the need for smaller industrial units and flexibility in relation to demand must control whether each site must include smaller units.</p> <p>Q30, 31 and 32 – Much of the success of the area in attracting new business has been based on the position in relation to the road network and easy access to almost any part of the country via the motorway network. Considers the focus for the area should be the following –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Flood Defences wherever needed 2. Some developments of economic renewable energy generation 3. Some aspects of improved insulation of buildings and corresponding energy saving. <p>Do not advocate target setting in relation to carbon emissions, nor to go further than building regulations.</p> <p>Q33, 34 and 35 – Policies in C1/2006 are not accepted by the local population in the light of their experiences. The study described in 11.3 should be widely publicised and any site should be accepted and supported by the local population in order for it to work well. Difficulties in solving the 'Not in my back yard' syndrome.</p>
CS/AC540	Marrons (on behalf of Mr P Hatton)	<p>Object to location A on land South of Ashby on the following grounds-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Landscape Character – Ashby is located within the national Forest which is unique and of national importance and it is therefore considered that this area of land is inappropriate for future strategic development. 2. The majority of Ashby lies within the River Mease catchment which is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and a site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and it is considered that major development here will have an adverse impact on the SAC and SSSI. In addition part of the golf course land is identified as a Site of Ecological or Geological interest. 3. The golf course and agricultural land to the east of Measham Road contain a large number of trees covered by a tree preservation Order (TPO) which are prominent within the landscape and have a historical link to the Hall which was once inhabited by the Countess of Loudon. 4. There is not a credible evidence base in line with advice in PPS12 to justify a broad location for growth to the south of Ashby particularly given its special character. Specifically there is a lack of landscape character and ecology studies to justify this location.

C541	Marrons (on behalf of Packington Nook Residents Association)	<p>Objects to the allocation of land in Ashby particularly to the south of the town being identified as a potential area for growth.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In terms of the distribution of housing development in the emerging RSS Ashby would fall in the lowest category of settlements for new development – namely 'other settlements and rural areas' and in line with various emerging RSS policies it is not considered that Ashby is an appropriate area for strategic development. 2. Q7 and Q8 – Ashby should not be identified as a rural town 3. Q9 & Q10 – Ashby should be identified as a local needs settlement where only new development is allowed to meet local needs. 4. In view of these points Option 2 giving Colville and Ashby equal status is opposed and Option 1 (Coalville Focus) is supported. 5. Also considers that major development in the open countryside outside the settlement limits of Ashby is highly unsustainable given that the majority of employment in North West Leicestershire is located in Colville and Castle Donington. Also local schools are located in the centre of Ashby some way away from the identified broad locations for growth and this together with Ashby's poor and infrequent public transport service will promote commuting by car contrary to sustainable development promoted in PPS1 and PPS3. 6. Highway concerns in terms of congestion and adverse impact on the strategic road network 7. Adverse impact on the national forest contrary Policy Three Cities SRS5 in the emerging RSS. 8. Adverse impact on the River Mease SAC/ SSSI. Policy 12 of emerging RSS8 seeks to direct new development in locations which respect environmental constraints, in particular the River Mease SAC. They refer to the Appropriate Assessment carried out in respect of the Secretary of States proposed changes to the RSS which states that the River Mease SAC is likely to be at risk of further water quality problems owing to the increase demand on the sewage infrastructure arising from proposed new housing in the area. 9. They consider that in view of the Appropriate Assessment strategic housing development in Ashby, particularly location A, will have a significant and immediate impact on the quality and quantity of water of the River Mease SAC and SSSI. 10. They also consider that Location A will result in adverse ecological, geological and historical implications given that the land includes part of a site of Ecological or Geological Interest to the west and two areas of protected open space to the north and west of the land. There area also TPO trees lining the driveway to a listed building (Rothwood House) with proposed residential development wrapping around the curtilage of this listed house. 11. There is insufficient evidence in line with PPS12 to justify the identification of this location as a broad location for growth due to a lack of landscape character assessment and ecological studies, which is also not in accordance with Policy 31 of the emerging RSS. In addition the Council will need to demonstrate that all other options have been considered.
------	--	--

--	--	--