NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY (SUBMISSION)

STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION

JUNE 2013
Statement of Consultation

1. Purpose of this Statement

1.1 This statement has been published in support of the North West Leicestershire Local Plan; Core Strategy Submission Document (March 2013 2012). It describes the consultation undertaken in previous stages of the Core Strategy process. It outlines who was consulted and how they were consulted. It also provides a summary of the main issues raised and explains how these issues have been addressed by the District Council in the Core Strategy Submission Development Plan Document (DPD).

1.2 For the avoidance of doubt the Core Strategy was originally developed to be part of the Local Development Framework (or LDF). Following the publication of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 in April 2012 the term Local Development Framework has been replaced with the term Local Plan instead. Throughout this document there are, therefore, references to the Local Development Framework. However, once adopted the Core strategy will now form part of the Local Plan.

1.3 Because of the extended period of time that this Council’s programme of consultation has covered since preparation began in November 2005 with the Issues & Options consultation, it is important to note that regulatory obligations have been amended and changed at various times throughout the period up to submission. All consultations have had regard to the Council’s approved Statement of Community Involvement and followed the regulations in place at the time of the consultation.

1.4 Throughout the course of preparing the Core Strategy the Council has maintained a database of individuals and organisations that have an interest in the Core Strategy. A list of individuals and organisations that have been consulted at some point throughout the programme of consultation is included at Appendix 1.

2. Why is the document needed?

2.1 Regulation 22(c) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires that as part of the submission of a DPD that as a statement setting out the following

(i) which bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18,
(ii) how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18,
(iii) a summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to regaultion18,
(iv) how any representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account,
(v) If representations were made pursuant to regulation 20, the number of representations made and a summary of tehj main issues raised in those representations; and
3. Previous consultation stages on the North West Leicestershire Core Strategy.

3.1 A number of consultation and engagement exercises were carried out as part of the Core Strategy preparation process. The following table summarises the key stages of the development of the Core Strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage in Core Strategy</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper</td>
<td>11th November 2005 to 23rd December 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy - Highway Agency Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>6th October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy - Environment Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>12th October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy – Economy Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>17th October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Workshop</td>
<td>4th December 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy Additional Consultation</td>
<td>29th June 2007 to 3rd August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy Further Consultation – A Strategy for Growth and Change</td>
<td>10th November 2008 to 13th February 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on October 2009 Cabinet Report</td>
<td>10th November to 7th December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy Consultation: Our District – Our Future</td>
<td>31st May 2011 to 29th July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on October 2011 Cabinet Report</td>
<td>28th October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-submission consultation</td>
<td>28th May – 9th July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on proposed significant changes</td>
<td>12th April – 7th June 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 This Consultation Statement considers each of these stages. It outlines who the District Council consulted and how these consultations were undertaken. It also summarises the main issues raised in the consultation responses and how they have been addressed by the Council in each stage of the Core Strategy Consultation. This Statement is supported by a comprehensive set of appendices which supply further details of each consultation exercise.

3.3 In October 2006 the Council adopted its Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), which sets out how the community and other stakeholders will be engaged in the process of preparing Local Development Documents. All Core Strategy consultation documents since its adoption have been carried out in accordance with the SCI.
3.4 All of the various Cabinet reports referred to in this document can be viewed at http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/core_strategy
4. **Core Strategy and Policies and Issues and Options Consultation Paper**  
Consultation Dates: 11th November 2005 to 23rd December 2005

A copy of the consultation document can be viewed at the Council’s website (www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/core_strategy) or by clicking here.

**Introduction**

4.1 As part of the early work for the Local Development Framework (LDF), consultation was undertaken on the Core Strategy (CS) and Policies Issues and Options Paper, in November and December 2005, following approval of the consultation document by the Council’s Executive Board (1 November 2005). This provided an opportunity to carry out an early stage of stakeholder consultation and to seek views from a wide range of interests, including the general public, to inform the Council’s preparation of its Core Strategy DPD.

4.2 This document explored the key issues and main themes to be addressed and suggested a number of options, seeking views via a series of questions. The main purpose of the consultation was to seek views on the principles of the intended strategy, as well as to identify any additional issues that need to be considered.

4.3 The main issues and key features covered within this consultation document can be summarised as:

**Overarching issues:**
- Spatial Vision for the District
- The time period for the Core Strategy
- The Strategic Aims and Priorities for the District
- The Spatial Objectives for the District

**Strategic Planning Framework**
- A sequential approach to the location of new development
- A sustainable basis for assessing the suitability of land for sustainable development
- Concentrating development in urban areas, including the Sub-Regional Centre of Coalville and the Market Towns such as Ashby-de-la-Zouch
- Designation of Rural Centres, such as Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham, for limited growth.
- Review of the limits of the Coalville/Whitwick/Swannington Green Wedge and the Areas of Separation.
- Providing for appropriate development in the Countryside
- Housing numbers and where they should be accommodated, including market and affordable housing
- New employment development and its distribution
- Protection of the environment, including the National and Charnwood Forest, Strategic River Corridors, good design standards and leisure provision
- Securing sustainable transport provision in the District as well and seeking appropriate development at East Midlands Airport
Who was consulted?

4.4 Organisations and individuals on the Local Development Framework database were notified of the consultation by letter or email.

How were people consulted?

4.5 The Council used a range of methods to ensure that a comprehensive consultation was undertaken. Those on the Local Development Framework database were consulted directly. An article was placed in the Council’s Vision newsletter (Appendix 2), a Press Release was issued and the consultation was advertised in the local newspaper. The relevant documents were made available at the Council Offices and also at the public libraries throughout the period of the consultation for public inspection.

What were the main issues raised in the consultation responses?

4.6 A total of 67 responses were received to this consultation, embracing the development industry, planning consultants, the Airport Authority, public bodies, statutory organisations, local bodies/action groups and the general public. As a general observation development industry submissions related to housing and employment issues, whilst the public responses were generally confined to local and often site related matters of concern. In addition, unfortunately a number of the responses failed to relate to the specific questions asked and accordingly were more applicable to issues concerning the development of individual sites.

4.7 A report summarising the responses to the consultation was prepared and is available on the Council’s website by clicking here.

4.8 In summary, the main strategic issues raised at the consultation stage were as follows:-

- The Core Strategy should assist the delivery of the wider Corporate Strategy Vision and aim to achieve sustainable patterns of development.
- Strategic policies should provide opportunities for all by promoting sustainable patterns of development and the predominant urban focus should not be at the expense of the needs and of the sustainable development of smaller settlements.
- Support of the proposal to concentrate development in the main urban areas of Coalville and Ashby. However Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham should also be recognised as significant rural centres.
- Any future review of the Green Wedge should be closely linked to the identification of suitable sites for new development.
- The housing target of 1250 dwellings for the period 2005-2016 represents an appropriate target.
- Limited levels of housing land to be released in the Rural Centres and the inclusion of a Rural Exceptions Policy
• A mix of new employment development should be provided for and existing employment land protection policies and sites should be reviewed.
• Policy should support the National Forest, including a major Forest Park and new infrastructure, and rural diversification relating to tourism, recreation and the woodland economy
• Support for the revitalisation of Coalville Town Centre.
• Development at or adjoining the airport should be restricted to that which is necessary for the operation of the airport
• Provide the opportunity for the reopening of the National Forest Line for passenger use.

How did the Council address these main issues?

4.9 Generally, the responses tended to be subjective relating to specific areas of interest and involvement. In particular, the general public and local groups responded to individual proposals of local concern. In addition, a number of the responses did not relate to the specific questions asked and were more applicable to issues concerning the development of individual sites. Other responses also failed to support their views with appropriate supporting evidence.

4.10 The responses received were used to inform the subsequent consultations undertaken as part of the development of the Core Strategy, including the ‘Core Strategy: Additional Consultation June 2007’ and the November 2008 Consultation ‘Core Strategy Further Consultation – A Strategy for Growth and Change’.

4.11 The 2007 Consultation included:

• Development of three different spatial visions with the focus of ‘Working together for a Sustainable Future’

• A focus on Coalville as the Sub Regional Centre and the focus for new development in the district, with the identification of Ashby, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Measham and Kegworth as Rural Towns as the next focus for new development in terms of settlement hierarchy.

• Development of a number of options for the distribution of development between Coalville and the Rural Towns, as well the dispersed option and a new settlement option, and potential broad locations for development.

• Examination of the role of the remaining settlements in the district and those villages considered appropriate for local needs development.

• Seek views as to whether a Sustainable Urban Extensions in Coalville should include mixed use developments, including employment uses.

4.12 The November 2008 Consultation ‘included of the following matters in the document:-
• Potential development scenarios for each of the main settlements.

• Publication of a Green Wedge Review Background Paper

• Identification of potential Local Needs Settlements suitable for rural affordable housing exception sites or local needs development.

• Promotion of the creation of a Donington Park/East Midlands Airport economic activity zone based around the aerospace and employment sectors.

• Commitment to the revitalisation of a Coalville Town Centre including the commission of a Master Plan.

• Commitment to working with partners to seek to ensure the re-opening of the National Forest railway line to passenger traffic.

• Work with the National Forest Company and partners to promote opportunities enhance the role of the National Forest, as well as identify other aspects of Green Infrastructure.
5. Core Strategy Workshops Autumn 2006

Who was consulted and how were they consulted?

5.1 Three workshops were held, one on 6th October 2006 with the Highways Agency, one on 12th October 2006 with the Environment Agency and Natural England in respect of environmental issues and one on the 17th October 2006 with economic agencies and stakeholders.

Highways Agency Stakeholder Meeting

5.2 The purpose of the meeting was to identify key issues, including potential constraints and opportunities, relating to the Highways Agency that would influence the strategic direction of growth for the North West Leicestershire Core Strategy. Appendix 3 provides minutes of the meeting.

What were the main issues raised?

5.3 The key points raised by the Highways Agency were:

- The need to minimise car travel and look at sustainable forms of development that maximise use and delivery of public transport and other modes of access.
- Provide clear links to the Local Transport Plan for delivery of some of the transport infrastructure.
- Look to settlement hierarchy and sequential test for guiding development.
- Take the Regional Spatial Strategy as the starting point
- The District Council should provide a strategic and considered reasoning and basis for channelling growth in a particular direction.

How did the Council address these main issues?

5.4 These key issues have been incorporated within the development of the Core Strategy and will continue to do so in the future preparation of the Core Strategy DPD. The Council also suggested that they would welcome further advice on strategic issues facing the highway network as these could have an important impact and bearing on the District’s emerging growth strategy. This will be ongoing during the preparation of the Core Strategy and has led to Transport Modelling work to help inform decisions on the distribution of development across the District. Studies undertaken include the following and are available on the Council’s Planning Policy web pages:

- Coalville Transport Assessment July 2008
- PTOLEMY Transport Assessment June 2009
- Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model 2012
**Environment Stakeholder meeting**

5.5 The main purpose was to identify key issues relating to the Environment that would influence the strategic direction of growth. Appendix 4 provides minutes of the meeting.

**What were the main issues raised?**

5.6 The key points raised were:
- Whether to undertake a Landscape Character Assessment and how to deal with landscape character issues;
- Unfavourable condition of many of the Sites of Special Scientific Interest in the district;
- Need for a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA);
- River Mease is Special Area of Conservation, implications of this need to be considered; and
- Constraints and opportunities associated with development;

**How did the Council address these main issues?**

5.7 A SFRA and Landscape Character Assessment were subsequently undertaken to inform the development of the Core Strategy, whilst the Council has continued to work with the Environment Agency and Natural England to develop a robust approach to accommodating development without having an adverse impact upon the River Mease.

**Economy Stakeholder Meeting**

5.8 The purpose of the meeting was to identify the key economic issues affecting the district and to consider how the Core Strategy DPD and the work of other partners can help to deliver the challenges identified. Stakeholders who attended included representatives from the District Council, Job Centre Plus, National Forest, Invest Leicestershire, LeicesterShire Economic Partnership, Learning and Skills Council and Nottingham East Midlands Airport. Appendix 5 provides minutes of the meeting.

**What were the main issues raised?**

5.9 The key points raised by the stakeholders were:
- Land allocation for specific employment use
- Proactive framework within the National Forest area to encourage business development/diversification linked to climate change research and production.
- Proactive framework that seeks to help encourage the further development of tourism in the National Forest area.
- New development to incorporate unique features related to the National Forest.
• Create conditions to enable local companies to expand as well as the provision of small freehold employment sites.
• Encourage development to have sustainable quality standards.
• Employment development of an identified threshold to contribute to a training fund.
• Provision of small scale industrial units
• Area Action Plan for Nottingham East Midlands Airport
• Master Plan and possible Area Action plan for Coalville town centre
• Proactive policies encouraging rural diversification.

How did the Council address these main issues?

5.10 These key issues have been incorporated within the development of the Core Strategy. For example the 2007 Core Strategy Consultation dealt with the following matters:-

• Consider ways of taking advantage of unique local factors to influence the shape of the local economy for example, opportunities offered by the National Forest.

• Consider opportunities to create a unique Donington Park/East Midlands Airport Zone and create facilities based on design and maintenance of motorsport vehicles and the maintenance of aircraft.

• Seek provision of new floorspace in the form of small units and support development of training infrastructure.
6. Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Workshop 4\textsuperscript{th} December 2006

Introduction

6.1 In addition to the theme specific workshops outlined in Section 5, a more general workshop worth arrange of stakeholders was held in December 2006 to discuss a number of key issues.

Who was consulted and how were they consulted?

- Over 60 stakeholders from the Local Development Framework database were invited to the workshop and over 20 people attended the event ranging from those with a development interest, local residents and specialist agencies. Views were sought on the following:
  - Vision Statement
  - Spatial Objectives
  - Growth Options:- Option 1: The Coalville Focus
    Option 2: The Coalville and Ashby Focus
    Option 3: The Coalville Focus with a significant amount in Ashby
    Option 4: The Coalville Focus with a significant amount in Ashby & Castle Donington
    Option 5: The Dispersed Growth Option
  - Directions for Growth:- Coalville Growth Directions
    Ashby Growth Directions
    Castle Donington Growth Directions

A summary of the workshop is available on the Council’s website (www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/core_strategy) or by clicking here.

What were the main issues raised?

6.2 The key points raised by the stakeholders were:

- Option 1- The Coalville Focus. There was some support as it would be more sustainable in terms of securing infrastructure but there were concerns about the deliverability of such a large concentration of development.
- Options 2 and 3 were considered to be similar in approach
- Option 4 – The Coalville Focus with a significant amount in Ashby and Castle Donington was supported. It would support job opportunities at the airport.
- A further option was suggested by attendees, which involved the majority of development split between Coalville, Ashby and Castle Donington with some development in the other rural towns and local needs development in the larger villages.
How did the Council address these main issues?

6.3 This work fed into the ‘Core Strategy Additional Consultation 2007’ and informed the development of the following options which were consulted upon, including

- Ashby de la Zouch, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham identified as Rural Towns.

- Six different development options for the distribution of development between Coalville and the Rural Towns, including the option of a new settlement.

- The identification of potential broad locations for development in Coalville and the Rural Towns.
7. **Core Strategy Additional Consultation June 2007**
Consultation Dates: 29th June 2007 to 3rd August 2007

A copy of the consultation document can be viewed at the Council’s website (www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/core_strategy) or by clicking here.

**Introduction**

7.1 The next round of consultation on the Core Strategy was undertaken in June 2007 and provided an opportunity for wider discussion of those issues considered at the workshops in late 2006, as well as a number of issues considered to be of importance in the context of the Core Strategy.

7.2 This consultation document presented a number of options in respect of the possible development strategy as well as issues in respect of employment land, climate change and gypsies and travellers. In particular, the consultation was concerned with:

- Seeking to establish as to whether all of the key issues have been identified;
- Considering the spatial vision and objectives;
- Considering the various options for growth and directions for development across the district;
- Considering employment land issues;
- The role of the Core Strategy in helping to combat climate change
- Consider how the issue of the provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers could be dealt with.

**Who was consulted?**

7.3 Organisations and individuals on the Local Development Framework database were notified of the consultation by letter or email.

**How were people consulted?**

7.4 The Council used a range of methods to ensure that a comprehensive consultation was undertaken. Those on the Local Development Framework database were consulted. A Press Release was issued and the relevant documents were made available at the Council Offices and also at the public libraries throughout the period of the consultation for public inspection.

**What were the main issues raised in the consultation responses?**

7.5 A total of 541 responses were received to this consultation, embracing the development industry, planning consultants, the Airport Authority, public bodies, statutory organisations, local bodies and amenity groups and the general public.

7.6 A report providing a general summary of the main comments received from this consultation exercise is available on the Council’s website.
The responses can be summarised as follows:

- Over 60% of the responses did not consider that the consultation document covered all the relevant issues faced by the district. There were also suggestions that specific issues were not given enough emphasis or not considered in sufficient detail.

- There was majority support for the Option 1 Vision. However there was no consensus on the number of objectives nor was there an overwhelming priority objective.

- Overwhelming support for the identification of Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham as Rural Towns. A number of responses suggested Ellistown and Moira be identified Rural Towns.

- Support that settlements outside of Coalville and the Rural Towns be limited to Local Needs Development although the definition of Local Needs development was considered too narrow.

- Overwhelming support for development to be focused in Coalville, including a Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) of 4000 dwellings and allow for a small amount of development to be facilitated in the Rural Towns.

- Some support for development on the Green Wedge site in Coalville and overwhelming support for development on land at South-east Coaville/Bardon Grange. Some support for all other locations suggested although there was significant local opposition to any of the sites in Ashby de la Zouch.

- There was a mixed response to how regional and sub-regional employment needs should be addressed. Some suggested that until the need was made clear no provision should be made. Others suggested that the advantages of being well related to Derby, Leicester and Nottingham, as well as East Midlands Airport and the motorway network, should be recognised.

- General support for making provision for smaller units as part of new developments.

- Several suggestions were put forward as to how climate change issues could be tackled, such as an eco town approach to the Coalville SUE, make green technology available, create sustainable mixed use development in sustainable locations and maximise energy efficiency. There was a fairly even split in favour of and against whether policies should go further than Building Regulations and whether targets should be introduced across the district that reduce carbon emissions.
How did the Council address these main issues?

7.7 These issues were used to inform the preparation of the November 2008 Consultation ‘Core Strategy Further Consultation – A Strategy for Growth and Change’, as can be demonstrated by the inclusion of the following matters in the document:-

- The Core Strategy is a strategic document, setting out the spatial vision and the overarching objectives and policies for the district as well as provides a framework with which future Development Plan Documents will have to conform. The issues to be included as well as their level of detail is considered appropriate for a Core Strategy DPD.

- The Council’s Vision for its Sustainable Community Strategy was prepared in consultation with the community. The 2008 consultation identifies the Vision of the Community Strategy also be used as the Vision for the Core Strategy.

- Given the lack of consensus from previous consultations, the 2008 consultation includes a range of favoured options, taking into account this and previous consultations as well as the Community Strategy.

- Consideration is given to the suggestion that Ellistown and Moira be identified as Rural Towns. However given that Ellistown does not serve its own hinterland and Moira has a limited number of facilities spread out across the village, they are not considered to perform the role of Rural Towns.

- Issues raised regarding the role of Albert Village to be kept under review as part of ongoing discussion with South Derbyshire District Council.

- Coalville, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham are proposed as the focus for development and those settlements outside of Coalville be identified as Rural Towns.

- To limit development outside of the above settlements to solely local needs development could raise potential issues regarding their long term sustainability. The 2008 consultation therefore suggests that some of the larger villages could be suitable for limited infill development, and only local needs development would be allowed in the remaining settlements. Criteria are suggested to determine what a Sustainable Village is.

- Options relating to a dispersed distribution of development and a new settlement option were rejected as they were contrary to the then Regional Spatial Strategy. The consultation therefore suggests a Coalville Focus (Option 1) as well as a number of other options retaining a Coalville focus but with a significant amount of development in 1 or 2 of the Rural Towns.
• The future role of the Green Wedge is investigated further within the 2008 consultation and through the publication of a Green Wedge Background Paper (2008).

• Strategic sites are identified as those being of 100 dwellings or more and a number of potential strategic sites identified.

• Suggestion that the district be proactive in terms of regional employment needs and make specific provision for a Strategic Distribution site. A number of potential sites identified.

• Inclusion of policy which seeks to facilitate the creation of small employment units of up to 200 sq metres.

• Preferred approach is the implementation of district wide renewable energy targets and to require all development taking place on an SUE to be zero carbon.

Consultation Dates: 10 November 2008 to 23 March 2009

A copy of the consultation document can be viewed on the Council’s website (www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/core_strategy) or by clicking here.

Introduction

8.1 On 21 October 2008 the Council’s Cabinet agreed the ‘Core Strategy – a Strategy for Growth and Change’ for consultation purposes to commence on 10 November 2008. The consultation was originally scheduled to finish on 22nd December 2008 but was extended initially until 13th February 2009 and finally until 23rd March 2009.

8.2 The consultation document provided an opportunity for local residents, community groups, developer interests and other key stakeholders to have an input and comment on their favoured approach and offer alternatives, as the Council developed the final submission version of the Core Strategy. It outlines the Council’s emerging thoughts on a number of key issues and the favoured policy approach to address these. It also details the alternative options considered and explains why these are not the preferred way forward. The consultation document was also accompanied by a number of Background Papers including Housing (November 2008), Employment (November 2008) and Green Wedge (November 2008).

8.3 In particular views were sought on the Council’s approach to the following:-

- Overall growth, how much should be planned for and where it should take place. The housing numbers proposed were based on the adopted Regional Plan figures of 12,000 for the District, with a significant focus on Coalville to ensure Regional Plan conformity and to realise the Council’s ambitions to revitalise Coalville.

- A suggested review of the Green Wedge in Coalville and whether its role should be changed or redesignated.

- A number of housing issues, including affordable housing provision and whether new gypsy and traveller sites should be provided as part of future strategic housing sites.

- Employment to be focused in the north of the district and seek to provide a world class employment zone to be focused on the airport and racetrack. The consultation strategy also proposes a Strategic Distribution site north of the airport, and adjacent to the M1.
Who and how were people consulted?

8.4 Individuals and organisations, including community and stakeholder groups and statutory organisations listed on the Local Development Framework database were notified of the consultation and the public meetings by either email or letter.

8.5 The Council also publicised the consultation by a number of different means by

- arranging a series of Drop In Sessions for members of the public. These were attended by officers;
- arranging briefing sessions for all Parish and Town Councils arranging public meetings in Coalville, Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington; and
- Officers attending each of the three Community Forums which operate in the district.

Further details of these can be found at Appendix 6.

8.6 In addition, a presentation was made to the District’s Local Strategic Partnership.

8.7 All District Councillors were notified of the consultation as well as the dates and venues of the Community Forums, the Parish Meeting briefing sessions and public meetings.

8.8 The Parish and Town Councils were provided with a copy of the consultation document, advised of the ‘Drop In Sessions’ and invited to one of three Parish Meeting briefing sessions (at Ashby de la Zouch on 19 November 2008; Ibstock on 20 November 20078 and Castle Donington on 25 November 2008);

8.9 Copies of the consultation document and publicity posters were made available in all of the District’s libraries.

8.10 A Local Development Framework Consultation Web Page was created to provide access to the consultation document and supporting background papers, as well as provide general information on the consultation. A specially developed portal was also created to allow consultation responses to be made online.

8.11 The Council’s Vision Magazine is distributed to all households in the District. The January 2009 edition included a 4-page pull out article on the Core Strategy Consultation, providing a background to the Core Strategy along with meeting and consultation dates (Appendix 7).

8.12 A number of press releases were issued providing consultation details, advertising the ‘Drop In Sessions’ and Public Meetings and the consultation closing dates. All press releases were also displayed on the Council’s website.

8.13 Posters advertising the consultation and associated public events were displayed on Community notice boards, as well as those at Post Offices, Supermarkets, Leisure and Community Centre’s, and Village and Church Halls (Appendix 6).
A number of evening Public Meetings were ran as formal meetings. Officers gave a presentation as well as promoters of potential development sites, which was then followed by a question and answer session. The meetings were as follows:

- Ivanhoe Community College - 28 January 2009
- Castle Donington Community College – 29 January 2009
- King Edwards VII Sports and Science College – 4 March 2009

Copies of the developer presentations were made available on the Council’s website.

8.14 A number of potential housing sites were identified in the consultation and all occupiers of both residential and commercial property located within proximity of these sites, were notified in writing of the consultation. Over 5,500 properties were contacted and their views on the suitability of these sites were also sought.

**What were the main issues the representations raised?**

8.15 A total of 4221 responses were received to this consultation, embracing the development industry, planning consultants, the Airport Authority, public bodies, statutory organisations, local bodies/action groups and the general public. All these responses were summarised within a report providing a general summary of the main comments received from the consultation exercise. A copy of this report is available on the Council’s website (www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/core_strategy) or by clicking here.

8.16 Over 3300 responses were in the form of some type of standard response. The nineteen different forms of standard responses covered the following issues:

- Concern about the possibility of development on the Green Wedge and the implications on infrastructure as a result of new development.
- Opposition to development at Greenhill Farm, Coalville
- Opposition to the potential Strategic Freight Rail Interchange on land west of Junction 24 of the M1
- Objection to the scale of development in Ibstock
- Objection to the overall scale of housing development in the district
- Responses entitled 'Ashby Local Development Survey' which takes the form of a series of options. As a summary, these have majority support for the 'Coalville Focus Option'.
- Suggestion that there be a further fifth alternative in respect of the Development Strategy which proposes to preserve the Green Wedge and keep Whitwick and Thringstone from Coalville

8.17 The other public responses can be summarised as:

- General concern about the scale of housing development across the district as well in specific settlements, including its impact upon local infrastructure such as roads and schools;
• Concern about the potential Strategic Distribution Site west of Junction 24 on the M1;
• Object to potential development on the Green Wedge;
• Concerns about the provision of sites for gypsies and travellers

8.18 Responses from public agencies can be summarised as:

• General support for concentrating development in Coalville;
• Some support for the deletion of the Green Wedge;
• Concern that the threshold for 'Strategic Sites' is too low;
• Affordable Housing Targets should reflect the findings from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment;
• Some support for the identification of a Strategic Distribution Site as part of the Core Strategy although there is an opinion that further work is needed at the regional or sub-regional level;
• Support for addressing need to make provision for gypsies and travellers;
• Potential infrastructure issues, principally highways, flooding and environmental issues which could affect the scale of development in Ashby de la Zouch.

8.19 Responses from the Development Sector can be summarised as:

• Support for the identification of Coalville as the focus for growth and the inclusion of a Sustainable Urban Extension;
• Limited support for Options 1 and 2 due to deliverability of such a high concentration of housing in Coalville. Options 3 and 4 or a hybrid of these options is supported as more realistic and sustainable;
• Some support for identification of Ashby and Castle Donington as 'Principal Rural Towns' and for consideration to be given to be given to other sustainable locations in the district;
• General agreement that housing numbers should be regarded as a minimum and
• the Core Strategy should address potential development needs beyond the end of the plan period;
• General support for the identification of strategic sites;
• No support for the favoured approach for gypsy and traveller sites to be located on housing sites.

How did the Council address these main issues?

8.20 The main issues raised within this consultation were summarised and addressed within reports prepared for the Council Cabinet Meetings on 14 July 2009 and 20 October 2009, to outline emerging views, the key challenges ahead as well as provide a direction of travel and for further discussion and consultation. An overview of their contents is provided below, and how at this stage the main issues raised were to be addressed.
• Green Wedge

8.21 The potential development and deletion of the Green Wedge raised significant concern and objection from local communities, and the Sustainability Appraisal (2009) recognised that Green Wedge policies can play an important role in retaining the unique identity of different settlements. It also notes that the existing Green Wedge has the potential to provide good access to the town centre and employment sites. Therefore whether the Green Wedge should be identified for development (in part or in whole) will depend to a large extent on the overall Development Strategy for the district. It was therefore suggested at this stage that the future of the Green Wedge is considered in this context, whilst recognising the high level of community support for keeping the identity of the individual settlements of Whitwick and Thringstone as well as their separation from Coalville.

• Strategic Sites

8.22 There was support for the identification of strategic housing sites but that the threshold of such sites was too low. It was therefore suggested that GOEM's definition of a Strategic Site be used and the lower threshold be set at 2000 dwellings. In addition, smaller scale 'broad locations' should also be identified outside of the Coalville Urban Area to allow the Council to plan with more certainty over which areas of the district are likely to be supported for development.

• Overall Scale of Development

8.23 The Regional Plan identifies 10,200 dwellings for the period 2006-2026 and taking into account the number of completions, the residual requirements stands at 9275 dwellings. It is suggested that the Core Strategy should only seek to ensure that the requirement of the approved Regional Plan is accommodated during the remainder of the plan period to 2026.

• Settlement Hierarchy

8.24 Having regard to the consultation responses and the Sustainability Appraisal it is suggested that the appropriate approach be that which identifies the Coalville Urban Area as the focus for growth, with Ashby de la Zouch, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham being identified as Rural Towns. In addition, infill development will be allowed in Sustainable Villages and only local needs development allowed in Local Needs Settlements.

• Housing Numbers

8.25 Consultation Options 1 and Option 2 proposed 9,800 and 8,000 houses respectively in Coalville. Consultation responses raised concern over the deliverability of such numbers and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal reinforced these conclusions. Option 3 and Option 4 are considered deliverable
and based on these findings an appropriate split for development within the settlements, to meet the requirements of the Regional Plan, is suggested.

Coalville    6,500 dwellings  
Ashby       1,000 dwellings  
Castle Donington 1,000 dwellings 
Ibstock  1,000 dwellings  
Kegworth    300 dwellings 
Measham    400 dwellings  
Rest of the District  500 dwellings 

• Strategic Distribution

8.26 There were a significant number of objections to this issue and the Sustainability Appraisal noted that if a site were to be identified, it would need to be demonstrated that it has been rigorously tested and there were no suitable alternatives. It is therefore concluded that a criteria-based policy would be a preferable approach as it would allow the Council to be able to address this issue at a future date, including potentially considering other sites which have yet to be identified.

• Provision for Gypsies and Travellers

8.27 Objections were raised to the proposal to make provision for gypsy and traveller sites as part of strategic housing sites, due to the potential impact on the viability of deliverability of such sites. Representatives from the gypsy and traveller community also tended to favour provision via a series of standalone sites. It is therefore suggested that a potential way forward would be for the Core Strategy to contain a criteria-based policy to guide the future identification of appropriate sites, and the provision as part of strategic sites be a matter for further debate.
8 Core Strategy October 2009 Consultation
Consultation Dates: 10th November to 7th December 2009

Introduction

9.1 The 20 October 2009 Cabinet Report provided an update on the main issues that were raised as part of the previous consultation. The Cabinet agreed that the conclusions should form the basis of further discussion with key stakeholders as part of the preparation of the Core Strategy.

Who and how were people consulted?

9.2 Individuals and organisations, including community and stakeholder groups and statutory organisations listed on the Local Development Framework database were notified of the consultation by either email or letter.

What were the main issues the representations raised?

9.3 A total of 13 responses were received and in summary the main issues raised at this consultation stage were as follows:

- Support retention of the Green Wedge whilst another considers that a thorough assessment of the Green Wedge is needed
- General support for the suggested development strategy and hierarchy although some concern about the amount of development in Ashby and Castle Donington
- Some concern expressed about the potential impact of development on the River Mease
- Lack of opportunities for affordable housing in rural areas if development is limited to sites of 0.1ha.
- More development should be allowed in rural areas to protect existing services and facilities.
- Support for the specific provision for Strategic Distribution as well as support for the decision not to allocate a Strategic Site.
- Support for the identification of Gypsy and Traveller Sites is dealt with as part of a subsequent Allocations DPD whilst another suggested that sites should be included as part of the Core Strategy.

How did the Council address these main issues?

9.4 The consultation responses were not considered to have raised any significant issues such that the conclusions previously reached need to be re-examined.

9.5 However during this period of Core Strategy preparation discussions had also been ongoing with a number of key stakeholders regarding a number of issues.

- Strategic Sites

9.6 Officers had previously suggested that Strategic Sites be identified as those sites of 2000 or more dwellings. However following further discussions with GOEM it
was apparent that the designation of a Strategic Site will need to be supported by detailed evidence to demonstrate its deliverability. Although work is ongoing on the collection of such evidence there are concerns the level of evidence required may not be available. Therefore the preferred approach is to identify Broad Locations in Coalville as well as in the other settlements.

- River Mease

9.7 The Core Strategy will include a policy which shall seek to prevent development in the River Mease catchment until such time a solution is found. It will also need to include a scenario where no development is possible in the catchment during the plan period and development is redistributed elsewhere.

- Affordable Housing

9.8 An Affordable Housing Viability Study has also recently been published, and using this evidence alongside public consultation and consultation with members, affordable housing targets have been identified.
Introduction

10.1 A report was considered by the 31 August 2010 Cabinet meeting. This report followed the revocation of the East Midlands Regional Plan, summarising the implications of this for the Core Strategy and also how the Council could move forward on a number of issues. Issues addressed include:-

- Overall development strategy
- Housing Numbers
- Gypsies and Travellers
- Strategic Distribution
- Green Wedge
- River Mease

10.2 Cabinet were asked to consider the conclusions set out in the report and advise on how they wish to respond, and that further consultation be made in respect of the conclusion agreed by Cabinet.

10.3 Cabinet concluded that consideration of the report be deferred pending the resolution of the high court challenge in respect of the revocation of the Regional Plan, as well as the publication of the forthcoming Localism Bill. Also, due to the level and nature of public interest in the following matters, Members requested that officers consider more options relating to development on the Whitwick Green Wedge and the provision of a location in the district of a Strategic Distribution site.
Core Strategy Consultation May to July 2011: ‘Our District – Our Future’
Consultation Dates: 31 May 2011 to 29 July 2011

A copy of the consultation document can be viewed on the Council’s website (www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/core_strategy) or by clicking here.

Introduction

11.1 The 1 March 2011 Cabinet considered a further report on the Core Strategy and agreed to a further round of public consultation with a view to Council determining the pre-submission of the Core Strategy in the autumn 2011. In light of current evidence and previous consultations on the preparation of the Core Strategy the following ways forward were agreed by the Cabinet:

- The Core Strategy plan period should remain as 2006 to 2026
- Overall Development Strategy should remain as per previous consultations, with a Coalville focus and the majority of the remaining development to be directed to the Rural Towns of Ashby, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham.
- Coalville be referred to as the Main Town
- Housing numbers reduced to about 8,000 dwellings across the district to reflect historic rates and new household projections
- Reduction in the amount of development in Coalville to about 4,400 dwellings in total
- Redistribution of 700 dwellings from Coalville to other parts of the district
- One strategic development site should be identified in the district at Bardon Grange to accommodate in total approximately 4,500 houses
- Green Wedge be protected and re-designated as Area of Separation as its role and purpose is to prevent coalescence and protect the identity of individual villages.
- No provision should be made in the Core Strategy for a site for Strategic Distribution

Who and how were people consulted?

11.2 Following approval of the issues contained within the March 2011 Cabinet Report a consultation document was prepared based on its contents in order to allow those with an interest in the Core Strategy to comment before further work commences on the preparation of the pre-submission version of the Core Strategy.

11.3 The consultation sought opinion and views on a series of questions detailed below:

- **Question 1**: Should we have a target of 8,000 or 10,200 new homes for the period 2006-2026.
- **Question 2**: Do you support our proposal to not build on the Green Wedge?
• **Question 3:** A reduced housing figure would facilitate a reduction in the amount of development in Coalville with the majority of these new homes to be located on one strategic site at ‘Bardon Grange’.

The amount of new development across the district, for the period 2006-2026, was suggested as:

- Ashby     430 homes
- Castle Donington  740 homes
- Ibstock   360 homes
- Kegworth   210 homes
- Measham   270 homes
- Rest of the District  260 homes

This would still leave about 700 new homes to be accommodated somewhere within the district. Therefore the question was posed

‘How we should distribute this remaining 700 new homes across the district?’

Options suggested were:-

- Equal distribution across the settlements listed above, or
- Distribute to each of the settlements listed above in some other way, or
- Distribute to the various villages across the district, or
- Distribute to the settlements and the villages across the district.

• **Question 4:** Do you agree that we should not allocate land for strategic distribution?

11.4 Individuals and organisations, including community and stakeholder groups and statutory bodies listed on the Local Development Framework database were notified of the commencement of the consultation. All District Councillors were also notified of the consultation.

11.5 The consultation was advertised on the Council’s web site. Copies of the consultation document and poster were made available in all of the District’s libraries during the consultation period. Press Releases were also used to advertise the consultation.

11.6 All Parish and Town Councils were notified of the consultation and provided with a consultation poster to display on their notice boards.

11.7 Officers attended the three Community Forum meetings that took place within the District during June and July, to promote the consultation, as well as answer any questions that were raised.
11.8 The Vision magazine is prepared by the District Council and is distributed to all households in the District, as well as being available at the Council Offices. The June 2011 edition included a 2-page article on the Consultation, detailing the consultation questions along with the consultation dates (Appendix 8).

**What were the main issues the representations raised?**

11.9 A total of 1,750 responses were received to this consultation. Of these 1,576 took the form of a standard letter prepared by the Whitwick Action Group. The remaining 174 responses received embraced the development industry, statutory consultees, interest and amenity groups, parish and town councils and the general public. The responses have been summarised in terms of responses to individual questions, and a summary of the responses from different types of stakeholders. These can be viewed on the Council’s website (www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/core_strategy) or by clicking here.

11.10 In summary, the main issues raised at this consultation stage are as follows:

- The majority of the responses supported the figure of 8,000 new homes for the district although some of the responses advised that they would prefer to see this figure reduced further.
- Some support for the RSS target figure of 10,200 as it is considered that this has the most robust evidence base.
- Any reduction in the RSS target figure would result in the Core Strategy not being in conformity with the RSS.
- In terms of how the remaining 700 dwellings should be distributed outside of Coalville, the responses did not show a clear consensus but instead showed some support for all of the options.
- Majority support for the proposal not to build on the Green Wedge.
- Majority support for the approach not to allocate land for strategic distribution.

**How did the Council address these main issues?**

11.11 A summary of these responses was detailed in the 18 October 2011 Cabinet Report, alongside recent developments which may affect the Core Strategy. These responses and developments have influenced the contents of the Draft Submission Core Strategy, as detailed below:

- It is become apparent from Core Strategies elsewhere in the country that Inspectors are suggesting that a minimum period for 15 years after adoption is required. Therefore it is proposed that 2031 would represent a logical plan period end date for the Core Strategy.
- The 2011 Core Strategy consultation proposed to reduce the housing requirement figure from 10,200 dwellings to 8,000 dwellings, to the end of 2026, on the grounds that new evidence was available. However based on a longer plan period to 2031, the overall housing requirement would
increase to 10,000 dwellings. Since the consultation the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area Study has been published and looked at a range of scenarios. The 10% employment growth is been regarded as the most appropriate growth scenario and would require 9,700 dwellings for the period up to 2031.

- The consultation did not generate a consensus on the issue of housing distribution outside of Coalville. Therefore in view of the proposal to extend the plan period and the revised housing figures, officers have undertaken further work on this issue and on the basis of available evidence the following distribution is proposed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coalville</td>
<td>5,000 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby</td>
<td>1,400 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Donington</td>
<td>1,000 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibstock</td>
<td>500 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kegworth</td>
<td>450 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measham</td>
<td>450 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of District</td>
<td>900 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,700 dwellings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. **North West Leicestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (Pre-Submission) April 2012**
Consultation Dates: 28th May 2012 to 9th July 2012.

A copy of the consultation document can be viewed at the Council’s website (www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/core_strategy) or by clicking here.

**Introduction**

12.1 On the 24th April a meeting of the Full Council agreed the Council’s Core Strategy for pre-submission consultation. It was also agreed to delegate minor changes to the Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Services in consultation with the Planning & Engagement Portfolio Holder.

**Who was consulted?**

12.2 Organisations and individuals on the Local Development Framework database were notified of the consultation by letter or email.

**How were people consulted?**

12.3 The Council used a range of methods to ensure that a comprehensive consultation was undertaken. Those on the Local Development Framework database were consulted. A Press Notice (see Appendix 9) was issued and the relevant documents were made available on the Council’s website, at the Council Offices and also at the public libraries throughout the period of the consultation for public inspection.

**What were the main issues raised in the consultation responses?**

12.4 In total some 5,781 representations were received from 3,075 respondents (individuals, groups, companies, agents etc)

12.5 Within the overall number of responses there were a standard number of standard letters to some of the policies, particularly Policy CS15 (Distribution of Housing) and Policy CS33 (river Mease Special Area of Conservation) which received over 1,600 responses. In addition two standard letters/tear off slips were circulated in respect of the Bardon Road bypass issue and there was one petition submitted in respect of the Bardon Road bypass which attracted 297 signatures.

12.6 A breakdown of the number of representations by policy is set out as Appendix 10 of this report. A summary of the responses on a policy by policy basis is set out at Appendix 11 of this report.

**How did the Council address the issues raised?**

12.7 A report was considered by a meeting of full Council on 26th March 2013 in respect of the responses received to the consultation. The report can be viewed here. It was considered that the majority of responses did not require any changes to the Core Strategy. However, the report recommended a number of
changes. The majority of these changes were defined as ‘minor’ changes which, having regard to the decision of Council on 24\textsuperscript{th} April 2012, were delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Services in consultation with the Planning & Engagement Portfolio Holder to agree.

12.8 A small number of changes were considered to be ‘significant’ changes which required the approval of Council. In addition, it was considered that the nature of these changes was such that they should be subject to a period of public consultation before submitting the Core Strategy.
13. **North West Leicestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (Proposed significant changes)**
Consultation Dates: 12\textsuperscript{th} April 2013 to 7\textsuperscript{th} June 2013 (originally scheduled to close on 24\textsuperscript{th} May but the consultation period was extended by two weeks).

A copy of the consultation document can be viewed at the Council’s website (www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/core_strategy) or by clicking here.

**Introduction**

13.1 The consultation was concerned with the significant changes agreed by Council on 26\textsuperscript{th} March 2013.

**Who was consulted?**

13.2 Organisations and individuals who had responded to the pre-submission consultation were notified of the consultation by letter or email.

**How were people consulted?**

13.3 The relevant documents were made available on the Council’s website, at the Council Offices and also at the public libraries throughout the period of the consultation for public inspection. In addition, a press release was issued informing people of the consultation.

**What were the main issues raised in the consultation responses?**

13.4 A total of 67 responses were received to the consultation on the proposed significant changes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company/Organisation</th>
<th>Company/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adele Snook</td>
<td>Kingston on Soar Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantage West Midlands</td>
<td>Kirkwells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agar Consulting</td>
<td>Knight Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agar Nook Residents Association</td>
<td>Lambert Smith Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Concern England</td>
<td>Landmark Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Concern Leicestershire &amp; Rutland</td>
<td>Leicester City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Barker</td>
<td>Leicester Friends of the Earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Main</td>
<td>Leicester Housing Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Monuments Society</td>
<td>Leicestershire &amp; Leicester City Learning Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew and Ashwell</td>
<td>Leicestershire &amp; Rutland Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Granger and Co Ltd Chrtd Survys</td>
<td>Leicestershire Chamber of Commerce and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Lee</td>
<td>Leicestershire County and Rutland PCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Martin Associates</td>
<td>Leicestershire County and Rutland Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Donegan</td>
<td>Leicestershire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antony Aspbury Associates Ltd</td>
<td>Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleby Magna Parish Council</td>
<td>Leicestershire Learning and Skills Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Development Services, Arlington Securities Plc</td>
<td>Leicestershire Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Burton Planning</td>
<td>Leith Planning Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arriva Buses Midlands</td>
<td>Lichfield District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby Canal Project Officer</td>
<td>Lichfield Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby Chamber of Trade and Industry</td>
<td>L Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby Coalition for Town Centre Enhancements</td>
<td>Linton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby de la Zouch Endowed Schools Foundation</td>
<td>Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby de la Zouch Town Council</td>
<td>M Patrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby de la Zouch Town Centre Partnership</td>
<td>Macpherson Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby Woulds Forum</td>
<td>M Montandon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby Woulds Town Council</td>
<td>Marine Management Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston on Trent Parish Council</td>
<td>Marron's Solicitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atisreal</td>
<td>M Prosser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrey Parish Council</td>
<td>McCarthy &amp; Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Harrison</td>
<td>McDyre and Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagshaws</td>
<td>Measham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagworth and Thornton Parish Council</td>
<td>Melbourne Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balfours</td>
<td>Melton Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett (East Midlands)</td>
<td>M Bennion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Willmore</td>
<td>M Burrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellway Homes</td>
<td>M Daly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belton Parish Council</td>
<td>M Robson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Davies</td>
<td>M Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidwells</td>
<td>M Ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaby District Council</td>
<td>Miller Homes Limited - East Midlands Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyer Planning</td>
<td>Mobile Operators Association (MOA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaston Parish Council</td>
<td>Moira Replan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breedon on the Hill Parish Council</td>
<td>Mono Consultants Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Barber</td>
<td>Morgoed Estates Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Barber Associates</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs A Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Waterways</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Garside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broxtowe Borough Council</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs J Barnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Wolsey Planning Ltd</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C E Draycott</td>
<td>Mr Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Kong</td>
<td>Mr J Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C McBride</td>
<td>Mr Redfarn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C W Creative</td>
<td>Mr Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadeby Homes Ltd</td>
<td>Mrs J Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calke Parish Meeting</td>
<td>Ms Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign for Real Ale Limited</td>
<td>Nailstone Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Donington and District Volunteer Bureau</td>
<td>National Farmers Union (East Midlands Region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Donington Community Appraisal Group</td>
<td>National Playing Fields Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Donington Parish Council</td>
<td>Natural England East Midlands Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Gresley Parish Council</td>
<td>Nelson Bakewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulmert Ltd</td>
<td>Netherseal Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>Network Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI East Midlands</td>
<td>Network Gold Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Networks (E-on)</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerda Planning</td>
<td>Network Rail Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGMS</td>
<td>Newton Regis Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CgMs Ltd</td>
<td>Newton Regis, Seckington and No Man's Heath Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood and North West Leicestershire Primary Care Trust</td>
<td>N Bromhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood Borough Council</td>
<td>Normanton le Heath Parish Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilcote Parish</td>
<td>Normanton le Heath Village Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Bentley</td>
<td>North Country Homes Group Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Hall</td>
<td>North Warwickshire Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Tandy (Ashby Civic Society)</td>
<td>North West Leicestershire Partnership in Safer Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Thomas Ltd - Outdoor Advertising Consultants</td>
<td>N Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Wade</td>
<td>Nottingham City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Worman</td>
<td>Nottingham Community Housing Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Commissioners for England</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Phillipson</td>
<td>Npower Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Searson</td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Robinson</td>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke Homes Limited</td>
<td>Oakthorpe Donisthorpe Acresford Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Campville with Thorpe Constaintine Parish Council</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cogent Land LLP</td>
<td>Osgathorpe Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleorton Parish Council</td>
<td>Overseal Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Buchanan &amp; Partners</td>
<td>Oxalis Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colliers CRE</td>
<td>Packington Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for Racial Equality</td>
<td>P Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coton-in-the-Elms Parish Council</td>
<td>Paul and Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for British Archaeology</td>
<td>P Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Land and Business Association</td>
<td>P Cudby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside Agency</td>
<td>Paul James Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Name</td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countrywide Homes Ltd</td>
<td>Paul S Winson Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRE (Derbyshire)</td>
<td>P Siddals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRE (Leicestershire)</td>
<td>Peacock and Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRCL</td>
<td>Pegasus Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cresswell Coaches</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes (North Midlands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crest Nicholson (Midlands) Ltd</td>
<td>Persimmon plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSJ Planning</td>
<td>P Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT and EM Stevenson</td>
<td>P Burnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Planning</td>
<td>Peter Diffey &amp; Associates Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVS - The Marlene Reid Centre</td>
<td>P Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D A Love</td>
<td>P Lambert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Hooper</td>
<td>P Storey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D K Clifford</td>
<td>P Thorpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D K Murby</td>
<td>Peveril Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Smith</td>
<td>P Preece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lock Associates</td>
<td>Planning and Development Consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Price</td>
<td>Planning and Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Reed</td>
<td>Planning Prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wilson Homes</td>
<td>R Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBK Back Forward Thinking</td>
<td>Radleigh Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Montfort Housing Society Ltd</td>
<td>Rae Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Montfort Property Co Limited</td>
<td>Ratcliffe on Soar Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby City Council</td>
<td>Ravenstone with Snibston Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire County Council</td>
<td>Redbank Manufacturing Company Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group</td>
<td>Redrow Homes Midlands Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Thomas</td>
<td>Refugee Council Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Living</td>
<td>Refugee Integration and Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Land and Planning Consultants Ltd</td>
<td>R Aldridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue Communicating Planning</td>
<td>R Holt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Rights Commission</td>
<td>Richard Raper Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donington Park Leisure Ltd</td>
<td>R Orr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Hart</td>
<td>Roger Etchells and Co Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPDS Consulting Group</td>
<td>R Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPP LLP</td>
<td>R Coeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers Jonas</td>
<td>RPS - Planning Transport and Environment Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers Jonas Deloitte</td>
<td>RSPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTZ Pieda Consulting</td>
<td>Rural Community Council (Leicestershire and Rutland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'zignuk Group</td>
<td>Rushcliffe Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E J Gray Associates</td>
<td>R Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Airport</td>
<td>S M Poultney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Housing Association</td>
<td>Savills (L &amp;P) Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Regional Assembly</td>
<td>Sawley Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Tourist Board</td>
<td>ScottishPower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Staffordshire Borough Council</td>
<td>Severn Trent Water Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Shires Housing Association Ltd</td>
<td>SF Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Ward</td>
<td>Shackerstone Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevate Planning Consultancy</td>
<td>Shadlow and Great Wilne Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Senior</td>
<td>Shepshed Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellistown Allotment &amp; Garden Society</td>
<td>Shoosmiths Solicitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellistown and Battleflat Parish Council</td>
<td>Sigma Planning Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Signet Planning Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entec UK Ltd</td>
<td>S Grundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Smisby Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erewash Borough Council</td>
<td>Smith Stuart Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWS</td>
<td>Snarestone Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Davenport</td>
<td>South Derbyshire District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairgrove Homes</td>
<td>South West Industrial Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairhurst</td>
<td>Sport England (East Mids Region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallow Bond Limited</td>
<td>SSR Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBP</td>
<td>St David's Vicarage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCH Housing and Care</td>
<td>St Modwen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of Small Businesses</td>
<td>St. Modwen Properties PLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFT Planning</td>
<td>Staffordshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Thorn</td>
<td>Stamford Homes Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firstplan</td>
<td>Stansgate Planning Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher German</td>
<td>Stanton under Bardon Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
<td>Staunton Harold Parish Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Bennett</td>
<td>Stephen Kitchen and Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Allgood</td>
<td>S Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeth Cartwright LLP</td>
<td>Stephenson College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight on Rail</td>
<td>Stewart Ross Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Earth</td>
<td>Stoneleigh Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion Online Ltd</td>
<td>Strategic Land Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Pratt</td>
<td>Stretton en le Field Parish Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL Hearn</td>
<td>Strutt &amp; Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladedale</td>
<td>S Colledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladman Developments</td>
<td>S Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Freeman</td>
<td>SUSTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gough Planning Services</td>
<td>Sutton Bonington Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenpeace UK</td>
<td>Swannington Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide Association</td>
<td>Swepstone Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVA Grimley</td>
<td>Swift Valley Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Tseng</td>
<td>T Mobile UK Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.M. Railway Inspectorate</td>
<td>Tapton Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallam Land Management Limited</td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey East Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough District Council</td>
<td>The British Wind Energy Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow Bros Ltd</td>
<td>The Coal Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Lamb Chartered Surveyors</td>
<td>The Crown Estate Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Lamb Planning Consultants</td>
<td>The Freight Transport Association Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartshorne Parish Council</td>
<td>The Garden History Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harworth Estates</td>
<td>The Georgian Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslam Homes Midlands Region</td>
<td>The Gypsy Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hathern Parish Council</td>
<td>The Heart of the National Forest Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward Exclusive Homes Ltd</td>
<td>The Home Builders Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Executive</td>
<td>The Homes and Communities Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Parish Council</td>
<td>The Lawn Tennis Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaton Planning</td>
<td>The Loughborough Gospel Hall Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help the Aged</td>
<td>The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemington and Lockington Parish Council</td>
<td>The National Forest Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Boot Developments Ltd</td>
<td>The National Trust East Midlands Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepher Dixon</td>
<td>The Planning Bureau Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>The Rail Freight Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</td>
<td>The Scout Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| History and Natural Environment Team | The Society for the Protection of Ancient ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Housing 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Theatres Trust</td>
<td>The Twentieth Century Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howkins and Harrison LLP</td>
<td>The Tyler-Parkes Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Forum</td>
<td>The Victorian Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Woodland Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Baseley Associates</td>
<td>The Youth Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibstock Brick Limited</td>
<td>Threadneedle Investment Services Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibstock Community Enterprises Ltd</td>
<td>Thringstone Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibstock Parish Council</td>
<td>Thrumpton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceni Projects Limited</td>
<td>Ticknall Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Planning</td>
<td>T-Mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigo Planning Limited</td>
<td>T Redfern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isley cum Langley Parish Meeting</td>
<td>Trent Barton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J A Ball New Homes</td>
<td>T J Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J and W Investment Ltd</td>
<td>Turley Associates Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Ball</td>
<td>Twycross Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J M Boardman</td>
<td>UK Coal Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Potter</td>
<td>UK Land Investments Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Toon</td>
<td>UK Rainwater Harvesting Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Design Associates</td>
<td>Ulverscroft Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bailey Planning</td>
<td>URS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Evans</td>
<td>V Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Lingard</td>
<td>Vodafone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL Hearn</td>
<td>Vodafone Group PLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jelson Ltd</td>
<td>Wallbrook Housing Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Abbott</td>
<td>W Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Welth</td>
<td>Walton &amp; Co Planning Lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Church Planning Consultancy Limited</td>
<td>Walton Homes Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Hickton</td>
<td>Ward Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Blaza</td>
<td>Webbir New Homes Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Harbottle</td>
<td>West Leicestershire Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Day</td>
<td>Weston on Trent Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Jackson</td>
<td>White Young Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS Bloor Ltd (Measham)</td>
<td>Whitwick Historical Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Wooderson</td>
<td>William Davis Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd</td>
<td>Williamson Design and Implementation Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Wapples</td>
<td>Wimpey Homes Midlands East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kegworth and District Gardening Club</td>
<td>Wincanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kegworth Parish Council</td>
<td>Woodhouse Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Beaumont</td>
<td>Woodville Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Blaza</td>
<td>World Wide Fund for Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinch Buses</td>
<td>Worthington Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward VII Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Sturge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning policies for the district

RESIDENTS are to be given the opportunity to comment on future planning policies that will affect the way applications are to be dealt with.

North West Leicestershire District Council is proposing to publish two documents on the subject. The first document, ‘Core Strategy: Issues and Options’, will seek residents’ views on the future development in the District.

The second document, which will be published subject to the approval of the Council’s Executive Board, will look at policies which will guide all future planning applications submitted to the Council.

Residents’ answers will assist the Council in the preparation of these documents and as such, people are urged to take part in the consultation process. A series of questions will be highlighted in each of the documents.

Consultation will begin on 11th November and will run until 23rd December. The documents will be available to view at the council offices on London Road, Coalville as well as the district’s public libraries.

Alternatively, visit the Council’s website at: www.nwleics.gov.uk or request a copy by writing to Bryan Wooley, Manager of Planning and Environment, North West Leicestershire District Council, Council Offices, Whitwick Road, Coalville, Leicestershire LE67 3JU.

A NEW addition has been introduced to a number of the District’s recycling banks.

The British Heart Foundation has placed book banks at six points in North West Leicestershire.

The banks will take books, CD’s, videos and old LP’s so residents are being urged to have a clear out to support the charity.

Zoe Evans, Recycling Assistant at North West Leicestershire District Council, said: “By using the banks, people can support the great work of the British Heart Foundation in fighting heart disease.

“The material collected will be sold in the charity stores. Many of us have CD’s, books, videos etc hiding away that we don’t use and by donating it to the charity through the book bank you will be enabling it to be enjoyed by someone else.

“Don’t forget that you can always support your local charity shops by donating a whole manner of items like toys, linen and other household items.”

“Ultimately we can find lots of other uses or homes for many unwanted items that would otherwise end up in a landfill site.”

Local schools will be looking for support from local residents when they take part in a new recycling campaign in January 2008, which will run alongside the Book Bank scheme.

Pupils will be collecting unwanted books and music for recycling as part of the ‘New Books for Old’ Initiative and will receive book tokens and prize money for taking part.

The banks can be found in the car park of Tesco in Ashby, The Co-op in Castle Donington, Mortons and Coalville, the Belvoir Shopping Centre car park in Coalville, the High Street car park in Ketton and the library car park in Measham.

Take them to the bank!

Waste reduction tips no 2 - Christmas

NORTH West Leicestershire District Council is committed to reducing the amount of rubbish that is sent to landfill.

Recycling is one way to achieve this — but it would be better still if we could stop some of our rubbish being created in the first place.

This is the second in our series of useful tips and ideas on how to reduce your waste.

Are you buying rubbish?

With shops and supermarkets stocking up on Christmas goodies and presents it is inevitable that thoughts are turning to the festive season. However, over the Christmas period, a third more rubbish is produced.

Having a green Christmas doesn’t mean you have to be a Scrooge, but you can significantly cut down on the rubbish you produce.

Food and Drink

Avoid goods with unnecessary packaging or choose packaging that can easily be recycled, like glass and food and drink cans.

After peeling the vegetables for Christmas lunch (did you know that Aposta sold 140 million sprouts in the week before Christmas 2004) home compost them. Compost bins cost just £5 each. Call 0845 079 2001 to order your bin.

Shopping for presents

Buy gifts that are durable, especially for children. Toys that break easily will end up in the bin and cannot be re-used by anyone. If you receive a gift you do not want, take it to a charity shop.

When shopping for presents, look out for unusual gifts made from recycled materials. Alternatively, give money or vouchers.

Decorating

Choose decorations that can be re-used or have fun making your own from scraps of material and natural objects like pine cones.
APPENDIX 3

Notes of LDF Highways Agency Stakeholder Meeting held on 6th October 2006, at NWLDC offices, Coalville

Present: Ian Nelson of NWLDC, Vanessa Ryan of Faber Maunsell (Highway Agency representative), Jon Kirby of Turley Associates (Highway Agency representative), Shilpa Rasaiah of Regen Solutions (NWLDC representative).

Purpose: To identify key issues relating to the Highways Agency that would influence the strategic direction of growth for the NWLD LDF Core Strategy

Background
IN outlined that the District had slipped on the preparation of its Core Strategy – it has undertaken an Issues and Options consultation and is developing further work on this with a view to preparing a Preferred Options Core Strategy for June 2008. This is likely now to be aligned to the new RSS.

The main purpose of the focused stakeholder meetings is to help inform the development options for channelling growth in the future.

Discussion
The rest of the meeting was used to explore the potential constraints and opportunities relating to growth options in the three key centres – Coalville as the main focus for growth and Ashby and Castle Donnington as potential for some growth. There was also some discussion on the growth of the airport and the development of the National forest.

Coalville – there are three main strategic sites for consideration – others are constrained due to environmental issues. In each cases, there are key drivers and sustainability issues that would be supported – e.g. regeneration of deprived areas and Coalville town centre, improving the balance of employment / housing linked to the Bardon development, RSS strategic focus, contributions to public transport infrastructure, affordable housing issues and skills development of the population.

Ashby – there are potentially two sites for consideration – the main links to the key drivers and sustainability in this instance are the opportunities presented in helping to restructure the economic base to high value growth clusters and developing a skilled workforce, regeneration of deprived communities and contributions to affordable housing, community and transport infrastructure. There is brownfield development coming forward. Scale of development in Ashby would need to be considered alongside the approach of RSS8 which seeks to focus development upon Coalville as a Sub Regional Centre.

Castle Donnington – There is developer interest in Castle Donnington and a case could be made to have some development to balance the strong economic growth in the area. Though there is a concern that at present CD is very much a ‘car based’ commuter settlement and any development would need to demonstrate strong links to existing and potential future local employment opportunities. There is also a high need for affordable housing here and a concern about the type of employment people may be attracted to – this may go against the grain of the emerging economic driver of development to be targeted to encourage a high value, high skilled and high waged...
Nottingham East Midlands Airport – There was some discussion as to how any growth of the airport would cater for the movement of passengers and staff by means other than the car and whose responsibility it was to ensure this course of action. Mention of a fixed link connection and public transport were mentioned. This is an issue of regional significance to be addressed via the RSS initially but implementation of any such scheme would probably fall to NEMA to undertake.

Reopening of the National Forest Line – there is a local political desire for this to happen. The challenge is the revenue costs to run the line – part of the former Ivanhoe line has been opened but the Coalville section remains to be re-opened. Options may include Continuing to seek developer contributions, safeguard the route and improve allocations of development along route to ensure future passengers. Approaches have been made to Central trains.

The key points emphasised by the Highways Agency representatives were:

- The need to minimise car travel and look at sustainable forms of development that maximise the use and delivery of public transport and other modes of access.
- Provide clear links to the Local Transport Plan for delivery of some of the transport infrastructure.
- Look to settlement hierarchy and sequential test for guiding development.
- Take the RSS as the starting point.
- Provide a strategic and considered reasoning and basis for channelling growth in a particular direction.

Further Guidance requested from the Highway Agency

NWLDC would welcome some specific steer in respect of the strategic issues facing the highway network for which the Highways Agency is responsible. If there are any specific issues in respect of the A42/M1/A50 which the District should be aware of in helping to develop its options for future growth strategy would be positively welcomed. This is an area of information that was not forthcoming from the consultants representing the Highway Agency at the meeting – but perhaps requires further dialogue with yourself and provided in writing.

In particular there has been a suggestion from the Highway Agency relating to the Motorway Service Area at Ashby de la Zouch that the existing junction of the A42/A511 was almost at capacity with little if any opportunity to improve the junction. This type of specific input from the Highways Agency would be welcomed as it could have a very important bearing upon the emerging growth strategy in North West Leicestershire.
APPENDIX 4

Notes of LDF Environment Stakeholder Meeting held on 12th October 2006, at NWLDC offices, Coalville

Present: Ian Nelson of NWLDC, Shilpa Rasaiah of Regen Solutions (Consultant on behalf of NWLDC), David Marsh and Geoff Platts of the Environment Agency and Liz Newman and Anna Collins of Natural England

Purpose: To identify key issues relating to the Environment that would influence the strategic direction of growth for the NWLD LDF Core Strategy

Background
IN outlined that there was a slippage in the preparation of the District Core Strategy – it has undertaken an Issues and Options consultation and is developing further work on this with a view to preparing a Preferred Options Core Strategy for June 2007. This is likely now to be aligned to the new RSS.

The main purpose of the focused stakeholder meetings is to help inform the development options for channelling directions for growth in the future and key issues and drivers for the Core Strategy.

EVIDENCE BASE
IN explained that a separate landscape character assessment plan has not been commissioned, instead the Sustainability Appraisal draws on work undertaken by Leicestershire County Council landscape character assessment and the National Forest’s character assessment.

In addition, NWLDC has commissioned an ecological survey of the district from LCC to look at the issue of local ecological sites which is acknowledged as a major information gap.

Liz confirmed that she is happy to accept the existing LCC research on landscape assessment. There are non statutory sites of local wildlife interest that need to be accounted for.

In respect of SSSI’s Ian noted that these were generally unfavourable and queried as to why this was. In particular, is there any evidence to suggest that the planning system has contributed to the conditions reported.

Action: Anna can compile a report on the non-favourable SSSI to see why they are not favourable – this will assist any future SPD. She was familiar with sites at Breedon the Hill which was due to lack of management.

There was general discuss on how the detailed issues relating to safeguarding, protecting and enhancing landscape character would be taken forward in the absence of the Structure Plan and lack of detailed policies in the core strategy. It was consider that the one way to progress this would be to produce an SPD that picks up on landscape character issues.
Action: NWLDC to consider the need for an SPD on landscape character enhancement in the District – this could provide a steer of what Natural England expects and there are a number of publication to support this – e.g. ‘Environmental Quality in spatial planning’.

The Environment Agency would wish to see a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment carried out as an essential baseline. They have published guidance for briefs and Tim Andrews / Dave Marsh can assist with this work. James Kitchen, based at the Environment Agency in W. Midlands can provide information on the lower Trent.

Sence – water quality is of special conservation?

Mease – is a special area of conservation – European policy obligations apply - due to a rare type of fish species – however, not enough is known about it.

GENERAL DISCUSSION
The rest of the meeting was used to explore the potential constraints and opportunities relating to growth options in the three key centres. Coalville as the main focus for growth as it is the sub regional centre in the RSS and Ashby and Castle Donington as potential for some growth. The key point was to use creative conditions to ensure that new developments contributed to the enhancement of the natural environment and not simply their protection - see ‘Environmental Quality in spatial planning’.

Ashby – North of Ashby is flood retention area. There may be scope to do something creative to relieve current concerns by having new development provide an improved drainage water retention system. David Marsh has some suggestions for this.

Castle Donington –. Flood plain, motor way traffic and noise issues.

Joint Enhancement Initiative of the Mease - There is insufficient information known about what is required to enhance the Mease,. It was considered that this could be part of a wider regeneration project linked to the RDA arm of Natural England, that offers Agri – Environment grants to land owners. So as well as seeking to protect and safeguard through the LDF, there could be an opportunity to explore the scope for regeneration funding to investigate the conditions of the River and to see what is needed to enhance it and how it might contribute to the District’s tourism/ Environmental offer. Natural England have a map of every land owner along the river.

Action: Liz to investigate potential further re: agri-environment grants and the LCC environment team for scope to do feasibility and enhancement work.

Woodville pipe works – could have a potential of sewage impact on the River Mease – not sure what further action is required and who by to remedy this – however, it could be part of the River Mease enhancement project mentioned above.

Oaks in Charnwood and Whitwick / Charnwood Forest – have a major aquifer near Whitwick in need of protection.

Water Pollution - From the Environment Agency’s perspective development should not pollute water courses and this is controlled through development control policy on
drainage systems.

**IN SUMMARY**

The discussion led to the suggestion that the River Mease could be a ‘key driver’ for protection and enhancement purposes for the Core Strategy.

The existing research on the landscape character conducted by LCC is acceptable – and this could be linked to the LDF via an SPD eventually.

Further work will be required to undertake a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment - Sue Hornsby can supply national data sets – she is based in Solihull.
ECONOMY STAKEHOLDER MEETING – 17TH OCTOBER 2006

‘DRIVING THE ECONOMY FORWARD VIA THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK FOR NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE’

NOTES OF MEETING

PRESENT:
Shilpa Rasaiah – Regen Solutions (chair)
Ian Nelson - NWLDC
John Froggatt – NEMA
Bharat Patel – LSC
David Sutton – LSC
Phil Durban - LSEP
Heather Bell – NWLDC
Danny Goodwin – NWLDC
Pankaj Mistry – Invest Leicestershire
Clive Keble – National Forest
Linda Boyd - Job Centre Plus
Emma Bentick - NWLDC

APOLOGIES:
David Friesner – Leicestershire Promotions
Steve Dibnah – Employment Land Study consultant for LSEP
Ian Howden – LCC
David Ward – Wilson Bowden
Tim Puffer – Stephenson College
Sue Jackson – Network Gold
Alex Reid – Mather Jamie

Purpose of Meeting
The purpose of this meeting was to identify the key economic issues affecting North West Leicestershire, and to consider how the Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy and the work of other partners together can help to deliver the challenges identified.

ECONOMIC CHALLENGES AND DRIVERS:

Storage and Distribution
The area has a natural attraction to the sector due to the road networks and access to the airport. It is not clear what type of employment and value created by this sector is – there are some HQ centres establishing, bringing high skilled and highly paid jobs, but
there are also large computer automated warehouses with little employment potential. There is an emda study currently looking into this sector. There is demand (calls to the Inward Investment team) from logistics and call centre operators to locate in this area too.

**Net Importer of Employees - NEMA**
Currently there are some 6,500 jobs provided on the airport site – 800 of these reside in NWL and 5,700 contribute to the in-migration figure. The airport is seen as part of the regional dimension and any growth in jobs associated with this should be accommodated in keeping with the RSS – thus focus on the three cities and Loughborough.
Research by Experian suggests that 89% of England is closely accessible to NEMA.

There maybe scope for expanding the NEMA expressway hub based on high value service and manufacturing – however, there was an acknowledgement that any such growth related to the airport should be directed to the Principle Urban Areas as described in the RSS.. An area action plan for the airport is suggested.

**Coalville Town Centre Regeneration**
There is a need to regenerate Coalville town centre and revive the other key centres in the District – there should be an improved retail offer, improved services – especially aimed at visitors. The Council has appointed Consultants to undertake a Master planning exercise for Coalville.

**Rural Economic Diversification**
There is a need to revive the rural economy too – by encouraging diversification.

There was some discussion to identify what was unique about the District and to consider what intervention was required to capitalise on potential new opportunities to help stimulate growth in these unique aspects.

**Climate Change and Environmental Businesses**
The implementation of the National Forest and climate change concerns globally could provide a unique opportunity to focus the forest area as ‘centre for green, sustainable industries, inventions - linked to the Science Park at Loughborough University. This could be linked to either facilitating the development of a ‘sustainability type Business Park based in the Forest or it could be creating a planning framework via the Local Development Framework Forest area that will contribute to the creation of sustainability research and development based companies. Scope to explore cross border working too with Charnwood and S. Derbyshire.

There was agreement from partners - National Forest, LSEP and the District Economic Development to meet and explore this concept further to see how to take this idea and convert it into an action and a reality.

**Developing the Tourism Offer– ‘A Distinctive National Forest Image’**
Have a clear idea of the tourism offer for the District – there are a number of initiatives linked to the Heart of the National Forest Park, improving the quality of the service sector hospitality and retail offer in the area. Encouraging specialist forest related employment e.g. woodland economy. The LDF could provide a proactive framework or Area Action Plan for the forest that seeks to help to encourage the further development
of the tourism offer in the area. Other partners need to develop programmes, promote inward investment and skills development to compliment this sector.

**Unique clusters – High Value product development**

Ashby is attracting a number of businesses that have the potential to become potential local growth sectors – in health product manufacture and other hi tech manufacturing businesses. There is a suggestion that these firms will require room for expansion – something for the LDF to consider and also business support to help focus on key growth sectors.

**Construction Sector – for the future**

There was potential to take the current concentration of the Construction Sector – ranging from the quarrying of raw materials, specialist construction training courses on offer at Stephenson College, and the fact that there are a number of major construction company HQ’s such as Ibstock Brick, Wilson Bowden, Bloor Homes in the area all present an opportunity to develop something visionary for the future. There is scope to see if this sector can be linked to National Forest – looking at how they can develop more sustainable mores – ‘living villages’ concept – with greater use of timber in the construction and unique design selling points – all helping to create a district that is distinct. How can this area become a specialism in the constructions sector – how can this generate higher value and quality jobs?

**BUILDING ON OPPORTUNITIES**

General comment of the need for a local Economic Partners to form a partnership to take forward some of the ‘opportunist’ ideas discussed today – historically the Partnership was around issues associated with the rundown of the local mining industry and the need to deal with negative attributes of the area – this focus has changed.

**Rich and poor divide**

There are growing disparities within the district in terms of wealth. There was some discussion to consider how we might ensure that those who are living in the neighbourhood renewal areas are included in the economic growth of the district. There is a willingness to explore further the scope to develop creative planning policies that link skills training to new employment development. The actual training base could be situated within an existing training provision, however, there will be a mechanism to attract funding to help engage hard to reach residents in the priority areas and provide comprehensive training and job placement opportunities. This will involve a multi-agency involvement, with planning also playing a part in the regeneration by seeking funding contributions towards a central training fund.

**Supporting Indigenous Companies to expand**

There is emerging evidence from Economic Development and Inward Investment to suggest a shortage in freehold sites for ‘smaller industrial units’ which are no longer developed by the large employment developers. The planning system could work with partners to help to safeguard a % of units for this purpose – but further work would need to be undertaken to link this to where such sites are needed, which developments they will be linked to and what should be the threshold for development to provide the units.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Driver</th>
<th>LDF</th>
<th>Other Partner Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate change</strong> – green industries linked to National Forest and Science Park at Loughborough University.</td>
<td>Land allocation for specific employment – business park.</td>
<td><strong>Economic partners</strong> – to investigate the potential of this further – what, how, where, and who – possible study and funding to help kick start development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTION:</strong> Proactive framework within the National Forest area to encourage business development/ diversification linked to climate change research and production.</td>
<td><strong>ACTION:</strong> Heather Bell to set up exploratory meeting.</td>
<td><strong>Targeted inward investment programmes to attract specialist firms and to support local indigenous companies.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic partners</strong> – to investigate the potential of this further – what, how, where, and who – possible study and funding to help kick start development.</td>
<td><strong>Targeted training development programmes to develop an expertise in this field in the local area by linking with Stephenson College.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clear idea of the tourism offer for the District</strong> – build on the distinctiveness of the National Forest.</td>
<td>The LDF could provide a proactive framework that seeks to help to encourage the further development of the tourism offer in the area. This could perhaps be in the form of an Area Action Plan for the Forest.</td>
<td><strong>Economic support programmes to help implement tourism initiatives and connect these with transport networks.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The LDF could also take the stance to encourage a % of housing and employment development to incorporate unique features related to the National Forest – either by developing in timber, or via % for art features linked to the forest. The key is to build a common thread throughout the development process that recognises and seeks to celebrate the distinctiveness of the National Forest.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Focus inward investment on the quality of the National Forest.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Develop specialist training programmes focused on tourism development and quality service skills.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Hi Tech Manufacturing / Economic strategy to have** | **Economic strategy to have** | }
| Health products | Look at creative conditions to enable local companies to expand and also the provision of small freehold employment sites to enable local indigenous companies to expand. | a clear view on local sectors to target for expansion and growth. Provide business support, inward promotion, and skills development to meet specific sector needs. |
| Construction Industry | Encourage greater construction / development to have sustainable quality standards and unique timber designs. e.g living villages concept. Look at how this sector can be supported to expand in terms of quality, support local employment from those in deprived communities and via the allocation of land for development. | Enter into dialogue with the sector to see how economic development support can assist the sector to expand. support local employment for from those in deprived communities and via the allocation of land for development |
| Skills Training linked to new employment | Proactive policy linking the need for employment above a certain threshold to contribute to a District training fund specifically targeted at the neighbourhood renewal areas – linked to the community strategy for detailed delivery. | Community strategy and Economic strategy to develop the threshold levels and delivery mechanisms linking various other agencies. |
| Provision of small scale industrial units | Proactive policy linked to new employment development – more work needed on identifying sites and thresholds. | Economic strategy and Inward Investment to provide evidence of thresholds need and where sites are needed. |
| NEMA | Area Action Plan | NEMA master plan, emda influence, RSS steer, transport plan influence, |
| Coalville/ other town centre | Master Plan and possible Area Action Plan | Economic partners to play a key role in helping to implement the regeneration plans. |
| Rural diversification | Proactive policies | Rural Partnership and National Forest already active in developing a range of initiatives. |
CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS 2008/09

Copy of Notice to advertise public Drop in Sessions

The Local Development Framework is a series of documents which will set out the District Council’s planning policies for the district of North West Leicestershire for the next twenty years. The Core Strategy is the first document to be produced and the most important – it will set out the overall framework for future development.

We want to hear your views on our suggested approach. Copies of the consultation document can be viewed at www.nwleics.gov.uk/development_planning. In addition copies can be viewed at the following locations:

District Council Offices, Whitwick Road, Coalville – 8.45am to 5.00pm Monday to Friday

Public Libraries (during normal opening hours)

- North Street, Ashby de la Zouch
- Delven Lane, Castle Donington
- High Street, Coalville
- Community College, Ibstock
- High Street, Kegworth
- Thorpe Road, Measham

Planning officers will also attend a series of drop in sessions to provide advice and answer queries at the following locations:

Ibstock Community Shop, Chapel Street – Monday 17th November, 4pm to 7pm
Moira Village Hall, Ashby Road - Monday 17th November, 4pm to 7pm
Ashby de la Zouch Public Library, North Street – Tuesday 18 November, 10am to 1pm
Castle Donington Parish Rooms, Hillside – Tuesday 18th November, 4pm to 7pm
Church Hall, Appleby Magna – 19th November, 4pm to 7pm
Kegworth Public Library, High Street – 20th November, 10am to 1pm
St John’s Community Centre, Hugglescote – 20th November, 4pm to 7pm
Measham Public Library, Thorpe Road – 21\textsuperscript{st} November, 10am to 1pm
Community Market, Coalville Christmas light switch on – 22\textsuperscript{nd} November, 12pm to 3pm
Castle Donington Public Library – 24\textsuperscript{th} November, 10am to 1pm
Hermitage Leisure Centre, Whitwick, 24\textsuperscript{th} November 4pm to 7pm
Ibstock Public Library – 25\textsuperscript{th} November, 2pm to 5pm
Measham Leisure Centre – 26\textsuperscript{th} November, 4pm to 7pm
Kegworth Community Centre– 27\textsuperscript{th} November, 4pm to 7pm
Ashby Town Council Offices, South Street – 2\textsuperscript{nd} December 4pm to 7pm
Belton Village Hall - 2\textsuperscript{nd} December 4pm to 7pm

Responses to the consultation are to be received by 5.00 PM on 22 December 2008

Copy of notice to advertise extended consultation until 13 February 2009

NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
CORE STRATEGY – CONSULTATION EXTENDED
A STRATEGY FOR GROWTH AND CHANGE

North West Leicestershire District Council has extended the consultation period on the Core Strategy until 13 February 2009. The Core Strategy is the first document to be produced and the most important – it will set out the overall framework for future development.

We want to hear your views on our suggested approach and the consultation has been extended due to the high level of interest we have received from residents, communities and businesses in the district. We want to ensure as many people as possible get the chance to put their views forward.

The Council are also adding more meetings where promoters of the schemes, plus officers from the Council, will be on hand to discuss, advise and answer questions. The meetings will be chaired by an independent member of the community and the new dates and venues are:

- Monday 26 January 2009: 6.30pm to 9.00pm at Snibston Discovery Park
- Wednesday 28 January 2009: 6.30pm to 9.00pm at Ivanhoe Community College
- Thursday 29 January 2009: 6.30pm to 9.00pm at Castle Donington Community College

The consultation document can be viewed on the Council’s website at: www.nwleics.gov.uk/development_planning

In addition copies can be viewed at the following locations:
District Council Offices, Whitwick Road, Coalville – 8.45am to 5.00pm Monday to Friday
(Offices closed 24, 25 and 26 December 2009 and 1 January 2009)

Public Libraries (during normal opening hours)

- North Street, Ashby de la Zouch
- Delven Lane, Castle Donington
- High Street, Coalville
- Community College, Ibstock
- High Street, Kegworth
- Thorpe Road, Measham

Responses to the consultation are to be received by 5.00 PM on 13 February 2009

SUMMARY OF DROP IN SESSIONS

17 November 2008 (Monday)

- **Ibstock Community Shop (12 Chapel Street) Drop In Session 4.00pm to 7.00pm**

  **Attended**

  None

- **Moira Village Hall Drop In Session 4.00pm to 7.00pm**

  **Attended**

  None

18 November 2008 (Tuesday)

- **Ashby Library Drop In Session 1.00pm to 4.00pm (AB/SS)**

  **Attended**

  Two local residents attended:-

- **Castle Donington Parish Rooms Drop In Session 4.00pm to 7.00pm**

  **Attended**

  Twelve

19 November 2008 (Wednesday)
• Appleby Magna Church Hall, Drop In Session 4.00pm to 7.00pm

Attended
One

• Ashby Parishes Meeting 7.00pm to 9.00pm

Attended
Eight

20 November 2008 (Thursday)

• Kegworth Library Drop In Session 10.00am to 1.00pm

Attended
Seven

• St Johns Community Centre, Hugglescote Drop In Session 4.00pm to 7.00pm

Attended
25-30

• Ibstock Parishes Meeting, Community College 7.00pm to 9.00pm

Attended
Two Parish Councillors

21 November 2008 (Friday)

• Measham Library Drop In Session 10.00am to 1.00pm

Attended
2 Swepstone residents
6 Measham residents

24 November 2008 (Monday)

• Castle Donington Library Drop In Session 10.00am to 1.00pm
Attended

2 local residents, 1 Councillor and representative from EMA

- *Hermitage Leisure Centre Drop In Session 4.00pm to 7.00pm*

Attended

35+ residents plus Councillors

**25 November 2008 (Tuesday)**

- *Ibstock Library Drop In Session 2.00pm to 5.00pm*

Attended

15-20

- *Northern Parishes Parish Councils Meeting 7.00 to 9.00pm*

Attended

12 attendees

**26 November 2008 (Wednesday)**

- *Measham Leisure Centre Drop In Session 4.00pm to 7.00pm*

Attended

Two Parish Councillors

**27 November 2008 (Thursday)**

- *Kegworth Community Centre Drop In Session 4.00pm to 7.00pm*

Attended

20 attendees
2 December 2008 (Tuesday)

- *Ashby Council Drop In Session 4.00pm to 7.00pm*

  **Attended**

  7 people attended

- *Belton Village Hall Drop In Session 4.00pm to 7.00pm*

  **Attended**

  1 person attended
CORE STRATEGY UPDATE

Public consultation on emerging planning strategy completed

Late last year we consulted on our emerging Core Strategy which will set out our planning framework for the area up to 2026. Over 4,000 responses were received in response to the consultation. The Council would like to say a big thank you to everybody who responded or attended one of the public meetings or drop-in sessions which took place.

Over the next few months the responses will be looked at, along with other evidence, to help the Council decide what should go in to its final plan. The current anticipated timetable is as follows:

TIME TABLE

AUTUMN 2009
Cabinet to give an indication as to its favoured approach on a number of key issues. This will then be followed by a further opportunity for public comment

NEW YEAR 2010
Council makes a decision on what goes in to what is called a Submission document

MARCH/APRIL 2010
Consultation for six weeks on Submission document

JULY 2010
Document submitted to the Secretary of State

LATE 2010
Public Examination chaired by an independent Planning Inspector to consider whether the plan is sound

SPRING 2011
Adoption of Core Strategy

For up to date information about the Core Strategy and its progress go to our website at

www.nwleics.gov.uk/development_planning

Local councils are talking RUBBISH

Do you generate waste in the course of your business?
Do you take or clear waste on behalf of other people?
Do you use other people to take away your waste?
Do you carry or move building waste of any sort?

If the answer to any of these questions is yes, are you meeting your legal responsibilities?

If you carry waste for gain or carry building waste, you have to be registered as a waste carrier.

Any time you take or hand over waste, you must ensure it is to a registered carrier or an authorised disposal site and obtain a waste transfer note.

Proof of proper documentation for carriage or disposal of waste can be required by Council Officers, Environment Agency Personnel, and Police Officers. Spot checks will be carried out. Failure to produce proper documents could result in prosecution or issue of a £300 fixed penalty notice.

For further information or to register as a waste carrier contact the Environment Agency or contact your local council.

Environment Agency:
08708 506 506

Visit Website:
http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk,
The Future of North West Leicestershire

Our District

WHAT IS THE ‘CORE STRATEGY’?

The Council is required to produce a ‘blueprint’ for how the district will develop over the next 20 years which is called the Core Strategy.

We have previously consulted with a wide range of people including local residents; interest groups; Parish and Town Councils; service providers; developers and landowners and have been working to take their views into account in producing the following questions. We would welcome your feedback relating to the four questions below as we are now approaching the point of making final decisions on the allocations based on the level of need within the District itself.

The Government has made it clear that it expects Councils to continue to make progress on the preparation of their Core Strategies. If we don’t do this as quickly as possible then there is a real danger that new developments could be approved across the District without taking into account the views of communities.

WHAT CHANGES ARE WE NOW PROPOSING?

Amount of new housing development

We previously said - that 10,200 new homes would be built in the period 2006-2026 (510 new homes every year) – this was based on regional targets which we were required to meet.

You said – this was too many new homes and would change the very nature of the District in terms of its character and natural beauty. It was clear that the number should be reduced.

What we are doing – the Coalition Government has changed their National Planning Policy so we can set our own housing targets, as long as we can back this up with evidence. We have listened to your concerns and looked at the evidence and are proposing to reduce the amount of housing to 8,000 which equals to 400 new homes every year. This is the same as the average number of new homes built per year in the District as from 1991 to 2011.

Question

Should we have a target of 8,000 or 10,200 new homes?

Where should the new housing go?

We previously said – most of the new development (9,800 new homes or 490 every year) would take place in the Coalville area, with the remainder in Ashby de la Zouch, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham.

You said – this was too much development in Coalville, particularly if it meant building on the Green Wedge between Coalville, Whitwick and Thringstone.

What we are doing – if we reduce the total amount of development in the district to 8,000 we can reduce development in Coalville to 4,400 homes. 700 have already been or are being built. This means we only need to find land for about 3,700 new homes i.e. 185 new homes every year. We are proposing to put most of this on the south-east side of Coalville, between Coalville/Hugglescote and Bardon industrial area. This amount of development will require the provision of new facilities, such as schools and will also be expected to provide for the provision of the Bardon Relief Road. In reducing the number needed overall we will not need to allocate housing to the Green Wedge.
Consultation Document on the Core Strategy for the District

- Our Future

Question

2. Do you support our proposal to not build on the Green Wedge?

The amount of new development elsewhere will indicatively be as follows:

- Ashby: 430 homes
- Castle Donington: 740 homes
- Ibstock: 360 homes
- Keighill: 210 homes
- Measham: 270 homes
- Rest of the District: 260 homes

This would still leave about 700 new homes (35pa) to be accommodated somewhere within the District.

Question

3. How should we distribute the remaining 35 homes per annum across the rest of the District?
   - (a) Equally distribute to each of the settlements listed above or
   - (b) Distribute to each of the settlements above in some other way or
   - (c) Distribute to the various other villages across the District or
   - (d) A combination of (b) and (c) above?

Provision for strategic distribution

We previously said – that of the three potential sites in the District which could be identified as being suitable for rail based strategic distribution (i.e. warehouses), the site north of East Midlands Airport and west of junction 24 of the M1 should be identified for development.

You said – this development would affect the surrounding villages and countryside and result in more road congestion.

What we are doing – we are now proposing to not allocate any land for strategic distribution in the District.

Question

4. Do you agree that we should not allocate land for strategic distribution?

Further information

The latest report on the Core Strategy was considered by the Council on 1st March 2011. This report provides more details about our proposals than can be covered in this leaflet. This report together with all other Cabinet reports on the Core Strategy can be viewed at http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/core_strategy

To look at the evidence base go to http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/evidence_base

HOW TO COMMENT

Your views are important to us and we are seeking your opinion on a number of the key issues for future development in the District.

The consultation runs from 31st May 2011 to 12th July 2011. All comments must be received no later than 5pm on 12th July 2011.

You can send your comments in writing to:
Planning Policy, North West Leicestershire District Council, Council Offices, Coalville, Leics LE67 3FJ

Or responses can also be sent by email to: planning.policy@nwleicestershire.gov.uk

Please do not send in any previous comments as we still have these on file. Instead please respond to the specific questions in this document.

If you would like to obtain copies in Braille, audio tape, large print, or another language please contact us on 01530 454676 / 454653.
North West Leicestershire District Council is publishing the Semi-Draft of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document for consultation from 26th May 2012 until 9th July 2012. The Council is also consulting on the Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy.

Copies of the Semi-Draft Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Sustainability Appraisal can be viewed online at www.nwleics.gov.uk and are available for public inspection at:

- North West Leicestershire District Council Offices, Whitefriars Road, Cradock, L67 9JH between the hours of 9.00am and 5.00pm on Mondays to Fridays inclusive except on Bank Holidays, and at the following public locations:
  - North West Leicestershire District Council Offices, Whitefriars Road, Cradock, L67 9JH
  - North West Leicestershire District Council Offices, Whitefriars Road, Cradock, L67 9JH
  - North West Leicestershire District Council Offices, Whitefriars Road, Cradock, L67 9JH

Representations may be made in writing using the representation form which can either be downloaded from the Council’s website or can be obtained from the Council. Representations should be sent to:

- Planning Policy/Planning Applications, Planning Policy, District Council Offices, Whitefriars Road, Cradock, L67 9JH

By 5.00pm on 9th July 2012.

At the examination into the Core Strategy.

Anyone making a representation may also request to be notified at a specified address of the outcome of the Core Strategy examination by contacting the Planning Policy Team by calling 0116 255 65 30 or by contacting the Planning Policy Team at planning.policy@nwleics.gov.uk.

Further information is available from the Council during normal opening hours on 0116 255 65 30.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY NO</th>
<th>POLICY TITLE</th>
<th>NO OF REPRESENTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>District Housing Provision</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>District Employment Provision</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS3</td>
<td>East Midlands Airport</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4</td>
<td>Strategic Highway Network Improvements</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS5</td>
<td>Rail Infrastructure</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS6</td>
<td>Strategic Rail Freight Interchange</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS7</td>
<td>Location of Development</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS8</td>
<td>Countryside</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS9</td>
<td>Development Adjoining Swadlincote</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS10</td>
<td>Meeting the Development Needs of Business</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS11</td>
<td>Education and Training in Connection with New Developments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>Town and Local Centres</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS13</td>
<td>Rural Economy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS14</td>
<td>Donington Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS15</td>
<td>Distribution of Housing</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS16</td>
<td>Housing Density</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS17</td>
<td>Housing Mix</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS18</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS19</td>
<td>Rural ‘Exception’ Sites for Affordable Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS20</td>
<td>Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS21</td>
<td>Well-Designed Buildings and Places</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS22</td>
<td>Infrastructure and Developer Contributions</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS23</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS24</td>
<td>Climate Change and New Development</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS25</td>
<td>Sustainability and New Development</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS26</td>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS27</td>
<td>Groundwater Protection and Land Instability</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS28</td>
<td>Strategic Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS29</td>
<td>Open Space, Sport and Recreation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS30</td>
<td>The National Forest</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS31</td>
<td>Charnwood Forest Regional Park</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS32</td>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS33</td>
<td>River Mease Special Area of Conservation</td>
<td>1696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS34</td>
<td>Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS35</td>
<td>Coalville Urban Area</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS36</td>
<td>Coalville Urban Area Broad Growth Locations</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS37</td>
<td>Ashby de la Zouch</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS38</td>
<td>Castle Donington</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS39</td>
<td>Ibstock</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS40</td>
<td>Kegworth</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS41</td>
<td>Measham</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS42</td>
<td>Rural Area</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>Introduction (non-policies)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>District Profile (non-policies)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
<td>Vision and Objectives (non-policies)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
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Policy CS1: District Housing Provision
53 representations were made to this policy of which 8 were broadly in support of the housing provision and 15 considered the scale of housing provision as being too high. The reasons for latter included:

- Amount of development is in excess of local needs;
- Insufficient jobs to meet housing growth;
- Increased commuting, traffic and pollution/CO2 emissions;
- Loss of greenfield land and biodiversity;
- Loss of quality of life;
- Largest house growth option has been chosen;
- Housing provision should be reviewed annually.

There were 26 representations which considered that the scale of housing provision was too low because:

- The housing provision does not accord with the East Midlands Regional Plan which makes provision for 510dw per annum and so is not in general conformity with the Regional Plan;
- More recent data suggests a higher housing provision;
- The provision is at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) objective of boosting housing supply;
- There is inconsistency between the level of housing and employment provision;
- There is no up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA);
- The plan does not meet the market and affordable housing needs of the district;
- Past completion rates are not a sound method of projecting housing needs;
- There is no agreed housing provision or distribution across the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA);
- Provision will not meet the full needs of the HMA. If the housing needs of the HMA are to be met this may result in other authorities making up the shortfall;
- Scale of development needs to increase to respond to delivery issues and social and economic problems;
- The GL Hearne Study was based on a limited range of options;
- Working Draft Sustainability Appraisal identified negative sustainability issues associated with this level of growth;
- Concerns about the need to make-up any past shortfall in housing provision.

There were 3 objections to the use of the term ‘at least’.

Policy CS2: District Employment Provision
22 representations were received, with the majority supportive of the principle of the policy, although some queries were raised as to the amount of employment land proposed (there was a mathematical error in the Policy wording that has been corrected). Suggestions were made that a buffer should be applied to the amount of employment land required. Some queries raised by the development industry and residents about the relationship between level of employment land provision / distribution and existing and proposed level of housing land provision / distribution.
Policy CS3: East Midlands Airport
There were 15 representations to this policy. Of these 7 supported the overall approach made. The remaining 10 representations identified a number of concerns including the definition of airport related [or operational] development; a need to address odours from kerosene; failure to address the issue of general noise and its impact upon nearby areas; no clarification provided as to the limit to the amount of residential development in the vicinity of the airport and does not offer any mitigation for existing residents; policy too restrictive and fails to comply with the NPPF intentions to promote growth; Part A too restricted and needs more flexibility regarding the type of uses that will be allowed and concerns about the impact upon the local area, including the road network, and the loss of Greenfield land.

Policy CS4: Strategic Highway Network
6 representations were made to this Policy. Some support for the Policy and the reduction of traffic congestion generally but also concern that the cumulative impacts of developments have not been modelled; that cross-boundary issues have not been addressed; the Policy is not underpinned by an objective assessment of the Strategic Highway Network; lack of clarity on how improvements will be procured and completed or how they will impact on the determination of planning applications.

Policy CS5: Rail Infrastructure
6 representations were made to this policy and the reinstatement of a passenger rail line. 2 responses detailed that land should be protected for the railway line and for railway stations.

Policy CS6: Strategic Rail Freight Interchange
Some 377 representations were made to this policy of which 4 were broadly in support of the SRFI policy including support from Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Council.
The remaining comments were objections, most of which were from residents in the Castle Donington, Hemington and Lockington area. The reasons for resident’s objections included:
- Loss of greenfield land;
- Loss of high quality agricultural land;
- Other suitable sites are available, many of which are brownfield;
- Traffic impact;
- Air, noise and light pollution;
- Landscape impact;
- Lack of demand;
- Drainage and flood risk;
- Area already has to cope with East Midlands Airport, Donington Racetrack, East Midlands Distribution Centre and motorways;
- Development would be out of proportion to local communities;
- Impact on character of area principally through urbanisation;
- Impact on conservation areas and listed buildings;
- Impact on nature conservation;
- Loss of strategic green infrastructure;
- Loss of recreation land;
- Lack of job opportunities or unemployment is not a big problem in the area.
Policy CS7: Location of Development
There were almost 45 representations relating to this policy. The strategy of concentrating development on Coalville received broad support though there were some objections from local residents seeking a more equitable distribution of development. Otherwise, the broad development strategy received relatively few objections.

Policy CS8: Countryside
17 representations were made. Some word changes and additions to types of acceptable development in the Countryside were suggested by several respondents.

Policy CS9: Development Adjoining Swadlincote
There were 8 representations to this policy of which 3 provided some support and 1 more supported but suggested some changes to the policy. The remaining representations considered that more explanation was required; no evidence to support development in NWL to meet the needs of South Derbyshire; that part A required clarification as to how decisions will be made whilst Part D does not define an area of separation; policy should positively allow for a mixed use development comprising employment, housing and community facilities and the regeneration and growth of Swadlincote is a strategic matter that has not been addressed as a cross-boundary matter.

Policy CS10: Meeting the Development Needs of Business
11 representations were received. Some respondents questioned the amount of employment land proposed and the fact that no distribution is proposed. Some minor clarifications were also requested.

Policy CS11: Education and Training in Connection with New Developments
4 representations were made which generally supported the policy.

Policy CS12: Town and Local Centres
9 representations were made to this policy. Changes were requested to the policy wording seeking reference be made to the historic environment and for consistently with the NPPF and the sequential test. Support was stated for the overall policy, the role of Ashby and the rural centres. Others expressed concern that Ashby should be afforded equal status as Coalville, a new approach is needed to regenerate Coalville and the policy is restrictive in that it only deals with retail uses.

Policy CS13: Rural Economy
3 representations were made to this Policy and which were generally supportive although some concerns that it may be more restrictive than the NPPF.

Policy CS14: Donington Park
3 representations were made and the continued use of the race circuit is supported as is the commitment to public consultation of any future masterplan. Concern raised regarding intensification at the race circuit and the potential noise and traffic congestion that it may produce.

Policy CS15: Distribution of Housing
1,767 representations were made of which 1,606 were in the form of a standard letter and were concerned that this policy allowed too much housing in Ashby to the detriment of the River Mease SAC. There was some support for the overall distribution and
specifically for the amount proposed in Ashby. The remaining representations raised a number of concerns including too much housing which will result in more commuting; too much development in Ashby; not enough development in Ashby; not considered all options in Ashby; the amount of development in Ashby based on ease of delivery rather than on the principles of the RSS; too much development in Coalville; not enough development in Castle Donington; more development needed in Ibstock; not enough development in the sustainable villages; distribution not based on an objective assessment of needs of individual settlements; inconsistent with NPPF and not enough development; use of the words ‘at least’; impact upon the historical environments of Ashby and Castle Donington; distribution needs to be amended in the event of higher figures, with more development going to the sustainable villages and issues around S106 and transparency.

**Policy CS16: Housing Density**
8 representations were made to this Policy which supported the objectives of the policy. There were objections to the specification of a minimum density as the policy should be flexible, and concerns that it may conflict with the NPPF; the policy is not based on an assessment of local circumstances (e.g. character of the settlement, marketing issues and infrastructure requirements) that justify the proposed density.

**Policy CS17: Housing Mix**
6 representations were made with no objection in principle; one respondent noted that there was a logical approach to the types of housing required in the District. However, housebuilders in particular identified the need for a commitment to regularly update the information upon which decisions regarding mix are made. One representation suggested that housing mix should be determined on a site by site basis. Whilst another welcomed the recognition that future development needs to make provision for the elderly population. A further representation detailed that priority should be given to family homes and single story homes for the elderly and disabled.

**Policy CS18: Affordable Housing**
23 representations were made. There was general support for the provision of affordable housing. However, several representations considered the wording of the policy to be over-restrictive as it sets a minimum requirement and therefore the Policy lacks flexibility. A number of representations considered the viability evidence to be out of date and that there is a failure to recognise the cost implication of other policy and infrastructure requirements.

**Policy CS19: Rural ‘Exception’ Sites for Affordable Housing**
1 representation was received which welcomed the recognition that market housing may be needed in order to make affordable provision viable.

**Policy CS20: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople**
7 representations were made to this policy. There was some general support for the policy. Clarification was sought as to how provision would be made after 2016 and it was stated that more background information would be useful. Amendments sought to policy wording as it was considered too restrictive and not in accordance with national policy.
**Policy CS21: Well-Designed Buildings and Places**

8 representations were made, with the primary concern being that of the impact on the financial viability of housebuilding and that this had not been tested. Statutory consultees and amenity groups were supportive of the principle and content.

**Policy CS22: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions**

There were 50 representations on this policy. Many of the representations from local people were concerned that there was not sufficient capacity in the existing infrastructure—especially roads, drainage, education and health—to cope with additional growth. Other representations wanted the Infrastructure Plan to contain more detail. Developers tended to highlight the need for developments to be viable and were concerned that there was no assessment of the likely costs and viability impacts of all the proposed requirements placed on development.

**Policy CS23: Transport**

This Policy attracted 5 responses. Some concern was raised about the following elements; residual cumulative impact of new development on the road network, that new housing should be linked to new employment areas and that the Policy should refer to connectivity between tourist centres. Another representation highlighted concern in relation to the first part of the policy which does not allow for development on farms which would prevent diversification projects and conflict with the NPPF.

**Policy CS24: Climate Change and New Development**

17 representations were made. Some concern was raised by the development industry over the use of the terms “low and zero carbon” and the impact of the policy on the financial viability of housebuilding had not been tested. Some support for the principle of the of the policy.

**Policy CS25: Sustainability and New Development**

12 representations were made, following similar lines to the comments made to CS24 although there was minimal support for CS25 either in principle or its specifics. There was some concern over duplication in respect of both CS24 and Building Regulations.

**Policy CS26: Flood Risk**

Some 38 representations were made, of which 22 were in the form of a standard objection letter in respect of pre-existing flooding issues. The primary issue raised was concern over the impact that new housing development would have in exacerbating existing or causing new, flooding problems.

**Policy CS27: Groundwater Protection and Land Instability**

2 representations were made to this policy. There was support for the principle of the policy but amendments were sought to policy wording in order to provide clarification and to be in line with Environment Agency Model Procedures.

**Policy CS28: Strategic Green Infrastructure**

6 representations were made to this policy, 4 of which stated support for the policy. Amendments were sought to policy wording to include clarification of role of new development and Green Infrastructure. Comments were also received with respect to Areas of Separation and that these should be agreed with community groups and parish councils.
Policy CS29: open Space, Sport and Recreation
15 representations were made. There was support for the protection or replacement of facilities and the requirement for new housing to make provision for appropriate sport, open space and recreation facilities based on an up to date assessment of need. There was some concern that the open space requirements do not reflect district variations and that the Policy should provide for more recreation not less whilst there were also concerns regarding the potential loss of open spaces in urban areas as this is where it is most needed for health and well-being reasons. A number of responses from developers suggested that the 2008 study needs updating as it cannot be considered up to date and robust evidence.

Policy CS30: The National Forest
10 representations were received, with both support (particularly for the principle) and objections. There were some requests for revisions and also objections related to clarity and scope of the policy.

Policy CS31 Charnwood Forest Regional Park
4 representations were made of which two supported the overall approach whilst one considered that part a) should be amended to include agricultural development as a means to maintaining the traditional working landscape of the area and one that policy should include reference to the ecological significance of the Charnwood Forest.

Policy CS32 Natural Environment
9 representations were received, with the principle of CS32 being considered appropriate. A number of key additions and alterations to both the supporting text and policy itself were requested from statutory consultees for purposes of clarity and NPPF-compliance.

Policy CS33: River Mease Special Area of Conservation
1,696 representations were made of which 1,604 were in the form of a standard letter which considered that the amount of new housing development proposed in Ashby is too high as it will impact upon the River Mease SAC and that the Habitats Regulations Assessment and Strategic Environmental are based on flawed information. Other concerns raised included that the policy should be reworded so as to support development proposals which could improve water quality; land south of Ashby (Packington Nook) has the potential to improve water quality; the Water Cycle Study did not consider all options for resolving issues in River Mease; improvements should be funded by OFWAT and not through the Developer Contributions Scheme; package treatment plants and cesspits should not be allowed; the Saltersford Brook which is a tributary of the River Mease is being contaminated by minewater and that some reference should be made to this and the current joint work with Severn Trent and the Coal Authority. There were 2 representations which supported the overall approach but which suggested some amended wording whilst there was 1 representation in support.

CS34: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment
2 representations were made to this policy. One supported whilst one representation considered that some changes would be required to make it sound in relation to the NPPF.
Policy CS35: Coalville Urban Area
There were around 500 individual objections (excluding petition signatories) to the exclusion of the Bardon Relief Road from the Plan’s proposals (these were registered as objections to Chapter 8). These objections focussed on the environmental consequences of additional traffic using Bardon Road. Otherwise, Policy CS35 itself attracted 45 representations- mainly from local residents. These included objections to the scale of development proposed at Coalville, loss of community identity and issues relating to the Green Wedge/Area of Separation. There were several developer representations seeking more development in Coalville and raising more detailed, site-specific issues. Concern about the lack of reference to local heritage assets was also raised.

Policy CS36: Coalville Urban Area Broad Growth Locations
Policy CS36 attracted 160 representations. Local people raised concerns about the Bardon Relief Road, the scale of development being proposed for Coalville and the ability of infrastructure to cope with new development. Some developers questioned the deliverability of the SE Coalville Growth option. There were particular comments about the need to improve the Hugglescote Crossroads and concerns about the impact upon the existing rail crossing at Grange Road as well as heritage assets.

Policy CS37: Ashby de la Zouch
There were 35 representations on Policy CS37 with many residents raising objections to the scale of development proposed for Ashby and the capacity of infrastructure to cope with more housing growth. In addition to developer support for the proposed direction of growth, other housing options were put forward. Some concerns relating to the impact of development on heritage assets.

Policy CS38: Castle Donington
There were 13 representations relating to a variety of matters. Some concerns raised regarding heritage issues.

Policy CS39: Ibstock
There were 434 representations concerning this policy- most were objecting to the review of the Area of Separation between Ibstock and Heather and the broad location of housing growth to the west of the village. A number of developers/landowners put forward alternative development options.

Policy CS40: Kegworth
There were 9 representations concerning policy CS40, some of these concerned similar matters raised elsewhere e.g. heritage.

Policy CS41: Measham
12 representations were made. Most of the comments concerned the infrastructure requirements associated with the proposed housing growth location.

Policy CS42: Rural Area
8 representations were made and largely concerned level of housing development in the Sustainable Villages, with a number of developers seeking a higher level of provision.