

# **NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE LOCAL PLAN**

**Publication Stage**

**Statement of Consultation**

**September 2016**

## **North West Leicestershire District Council Statement of Consultation (September 2016)**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1. Purpose of this document**

- 1.1 This Consultation Statement has been published in support of the North West Leicestershire Publication Plan (June 2016). It sets out how the district council has undertaken community consultation and stakeholder engagement in preparation of the proposed Publication Local Plan (2016). It identifies the 'consultation stages' undertaken and outlines who was consulted and how they were consulted. This document also provides a summary of the main issues raised and explains how these issues have been addressed and how they have informed the preparation of the Publication Local Plan.

#### **2 Why is the document needed?**

- 2.1 Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's principles for community engagement;

"Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision, and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made."

- 2.2 Regulation 19 of the Town and Country planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires that before submitting a Local Plan that the 'proposed submission documents' be made available. The 'proposed submission documents' include this Consultation Statement which forms the statement defined in regulation 17 comprising;

a statement setting out:

- (i) which bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18,
- (ii) how those bodies and persons were invited to make such representations,
- (iii) a summary of the main issues raised by those representations, and
- (iv) how those main issues have been addressed in the local plan

#### **3 Relationship with the Statement of Community Involvement**

- 3.3 The Consultation Statement also shows how the District Council has met the requirements of its Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which was adopted in January 2015. The SCI sets out how we will involve and engage with the local community, through a range of methods, in preparing its Local Plan, as well as other planning policy documents and in processing planning applications.

3.4 This SCI replaces the previous SCI which was adopted in 2006 as over recent years there have been changes to the planning system and related legislation. For example, the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amended) Regulations 2008 altered the stages of production of a development plan document. These changes resulted in the removal of the Regulation 26 and Preferred Option stage and now there are just two stages where the document should be subject to consultation, namely Regulation 18 where issue and policy options are explored and Regulation 19, the formal consultation on the publication draft plan.

#### **4 Duty to Co-operate**

4.1 The Localism Act 2011 places a duty on local planning authorities and other bodies to co-operate with each other to address strategic issues relevant to their areas. The duty requires ongoing constructive engagement on the preparation of development plan documents and other activities in relation to the sustainable development and use of land.

4.2 We must work with neighbouring local authorities, Leicestershire County Council and the following organisations:

- The Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Natural England
- The Civil Aviation Authority
- The Homes and Communities Agency
- Clinical Commissioning Groups
- The Office for Rail Regulation
- Highways England
- Leicestershire County Council (Highway Authority)
- The Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership
- The Leicestershire Local Nature Partnership

4.3 Partnership working has been a key element in the preparation of the Local Plan. The Council have collaborated and cooperated with other public bodies and stakeholders and organisations throughout the preparation of its Local Plan. This duty also requires ongoing constructive engagement on the preparation of development plan documents and other activities in relation to the sustainable development and use of land. A separate published document entitled 'Duty to Co-operate Background Paper – June 2016' sets out in detail how the Council has discharged its responsibilities under the Duty to Co-operate. The document should be read in conjunction with this Consultation Statement

## CONSULTATION STAGES

### 5.0 Introduction

- 5.1 The Council has recognised the importance of engaging the community and stakeholders from the outset of the Local Plan preparation process. A number of consultation and engagement exercises have been carried out and this section of the Consultation Statement sets out the consultation arrangements that have been carried out to date by the Council in the development of its Publication Local Plan.
- 5.2 The timetable below shows the key consultation stages that have been involved in the preparation of the Local Plan. The Council is currently at the stage of 'Submission of Local Plan to the Secretary of State'.

Stage in Local Plan	Date
1. Local Plan Consultation – My Say (Regulation 18)	20 June 2014 to 19 September 2014
2. Draft Limits to Development and Town Centre Boundary Consultation (Regulation 18)	17 November 2014 to 9 January 2015
3. Draft Local Plan Consultation (Regulation 18)	29 September 2015 to 30 November 2015
4. Publication Local Plan Consultation (Regulation 19)	4 July 2016 to 15 August 2016

- 5.3 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/informed the preparation of the Local Plan. This statement is supported by a comprehensive set of appendices which supply further details of each consultation exercise.

## 6. LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION – HAVE YOUR SAY

**Consultation Dates: 20 June 2014 to 19 September 2014**

### Introduction

- 6.1 Following withdrawal of the Core Strategy work commenced on the preparation of a comprehensive Local Plan. In June 2014 North West Leicestershire District Council published its first consultation document specifically towards its Local Plan. This 'Local Plan Consultation – My Say' allowed for an initial consultation on the scope and broad content of the new Local Plan. It provided an opportunity to seek views at an early stage in the

process, and to seek views from a wide range of interests, to inform the Council's preparation of the Local Plan.

- 6.2 In addition to providing useful background information on the role of a Local Plan and its preparation process, the consultation focused on the Council's initial thoughts on the key issues that should be included within the Local Plan. The consultation document suggested possible contents for the Local Plan and stakeholders were invited to express whether these were supported and/or whether there were any issues that were missing or should be excluded. We asked local people, businesses and organisations what they thought should be included in the Local Plan. This included things like where jobs and businesses should be located, how we would protect green spaces and how many houses we need to build. The consultation document can be found on the Council's website by [clicking here](#).

### **Who was invited at this stage and how?**

- 6.3 Differed methods of public consultation were used to maximise community and stakeholder engagement in the process. These included:
- All organisations and individuals, including statutory consultation bodies and general consultation bodies such as interest groups, developer and agents and other interested parties on the Local Plan consultation database base were contacted by letter and email (where provided) to inform consultees of the consultation. The letter explained the purpose of the consultation, how to find further information, the consultation period and how to make representations. These stakeholders were also advised of the consultation on the Statement of Community Involvement that was running alongside.
  - Paper reference copies of the consultation document were made available throughout the period of the consultation, to view in North West Leicestershire District Council's main reception at the Council Offices as well as all of the districts libraries at Ashby de la Zouch, Castle Donington, Coalville, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham. A reference copy of the Statement of Community Involvement consultation document was also provided.
  - The Local Plan consultation webpage on the Council's website provided information on the consultation, a copy of the consultation document available to download, consultation dates and where further information could be sought. In addition consultees were able to submit comments online by registering on the consultation system.
  - Planning officers attended a number of community events during the consultation period, to raise awareness of the consultation, explain the purpose of the consultation and answer attendees' questions. The all day events took place at the following venues:-

Venue	Date
Heart of the Forest Festival (Measham Leisure Centre Grounds)	Saturday 21 June 2014
Picnic in the Park (Coalville Park)	Sunday 29 June 2014
Music in the Park (Spital Park, Castle Donington)	Sunday 6 July 2014

- A press release was sent advising of the Council's attendance at these events.
- A separate press release was sent advising of the Local Plan consultation, what it was about and how people could have their say.

#### **What were the main issues raised by the respondees?**

6.4 A total of 77 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. The key topics that stakeholders felt were missing from the possible contents of the Local Plan were identified as:

- Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technologies
- Heritage
- Telecommunications
- Tourism
- Health and well-being of the community to include access to sports and recreational facilities
- Social and Community facilities
- Economic policies to include East Midlands Airport
- Housing mix to include the provision for the elderly and the delivery of affordable housing
- Infrastructure delivery
- Environment policies to include landscape character, geodiversity and the protection of air, water and soil resources

6.5 A summary of the responses to the consultation was prepared and reported to Cabinet on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2014. The summary of responses is attached as Appendix A.

#### **How, where necessary, these issues were addressed.**

6.6 The responses received identified a number of matters, detailed below, which should be included and addressed within the Local Plan.

- Heritage assets from a strategic and local view;
- Design policies;
- Policies to be protect and enhance the National Forest;
- Affordable Housing policies;
- Flood risk policy
- Climate change policy including delivery of renewable energy and low carbon technologies; ;
- Infrastructure policy;
- Policies providing for sport and recreation facilities;
- Policies providing for the enhancement and provision of community facilities;
- Policies on landscape character, geodiversity and protection of air, water and soil resources;
- Policies which support and promote economic development.

6.7 These responses have informed the content and policies of the Local Plan. The draft Local Plan included policies which covered all the issues detailed above.

## 7.0 **LIMITS TO DEVELOPMENT AND TOWN CENTRE BOUNDARIES CONSULTATION**

**Dates: 17 November 2014 to 9 January 2015**

### **Introduction**

7.1 One of the first stages in the preparation of the Local Plan was to review the Limits to Development boundaries of the districts sustainable settlements and the Town Centre boundaries. With respect to the Limits to Development, these are defined in our current Local Plan from 2002. However the evidence supporting them dates back to at least 1993 so they have not been fully reviewed for over 20 years. Therefore it was considered appropriate to undertake a review to provide a more up to date approach to this matter within the new Local Plan.

7.2 A similar scenario was faced with respect to the town centre boundaries. Once again many years have passed since they were designated and the uses and the character of these centres have changed. A review was considered necessary to make sure our new Local Plan is based on realistic and up to date information.

7.3 The consultation focused on the role of these designations, the need for them to be reviewed and the methodology used to prepare the suggested draft boundaries. Views were not only sought on the suggested boundaries but also to gain an understanding and greater insight into how our settlements and town centres have been performing, and to ensure the information being used was correct. It was considered that consultation at this stage would allow for local representations early on in the planning making process rather than waiting until the completion of a draft Local Plan. The consultation document can be found on the Council's website by [clicking here](#).

## **Who was invited at this stage and how?**

7.4 An initial workshop was held on October 2014, with Council Members in respect of the Draft Limits to Development. Council Officers were also in attendance and Members were provided with a presentation covering the following matters:

- Role of the Limits to Development designation
- Why the need for a review
- New Limits to Development designations –advantages and disadvantages
- Methodology use to review the designation
- Next Steps

This workshop provided an opportunity for officers to keep Members informed on Local Plan progress and to raise their awareness and understanding of the forthcoming consultation.

7.5 A targeted consultation on the revised draft Limits to Development and Town Centre boundaries was then undertaken with Town and Parish Council between 17 November 2014 and 9 January 2015. Due to tight timescales for responses some flexibility was allowed for those Parish and Town Councils unable to consider the proposals at a parish/town meeting within the consultation period.

7.6 Parish Councils were contacted by letter and email (where provided) advising of the consultation and included the following detail:

- The letter explained the background and context to the consultation, how to find further information, the consultation period and how to make representations.
- Supporting background papers were provided as were maps, relevant to their area, of the proposed new Limits to Development and the Town Centre boundaries.
- Advised of the opportunity to discuss with Council Officers at the Parish Liaison Meeting on 3 December 2014.
- Consultation material, including posters and leaflets, setting out the details of the consultation was also provided to the Parish Councils to allow these bodies to promote the consultation should they wish to do so. The use of display boards was also offered.

7.7 The Ashby Neighbourhood Plan Group and the Ellistown Neighbourhood Plan Group were also advised by letter/email of the consultation and drop in events and invited to make representations.

7.8 In addition all consultation material was placed on the Council's website and community engagement software Citizen Space, in order to allow representations to be made online.

7.9 During the consultation period officers attended the Parish Liaison Meeting on 3 December 2014. Representatives from 27 Parish Councils attended this meeting. Information on, dates and venues, was provided on the three drop in sessions that Officers were running. These were open to all of the Parish Councils as well any other interested parties. Parish Councils were also encouraged to hold similar events for their local residents should they wish and supporting material could be provided if necessary.

7.10 Planning officers attended three drop-in sessions during the consultation period, to raise awareness of the consultation and also to provide an opportunity for larger scale plans to be viewed and for stakeholders to talk to Council officers. The rooms were set up to allow for the display of maps of the proposed boundaries and supporting literature, including information sheets on both Limits to Development and Town Centres, as well as paper copies of questionnaires. The events took place at the following venue:-

Venue	Date	Time
Ravenstone Village Institute, Ravenstone (Coalville Area)	Wednesday 10 December 2014	3.00pm to 7.30pm
Kegworth Village Hall, Kegworth (Northern Parishes)	Thursday 11 December 2014	3.00pm to 7.30pm
St Laurance's Church, High Street, Measham (Ashby, Measham and Moira)	Tuesday 16 December 2014	3.00pm to 7.30pm

There were 8 attendees to the Ravenstone event, 11 attendees to the Kegworth event and 14 attendees to the Measham event.

7.11 The Coalville Town Team and the Ashby Town Team were also advised by letter/email of the consultation. Officer subsequently met representatives of the Coalville Town Team on 7 January 2014 and representatives of the Ashby Town Team on 11 November 2014 matter further.

#### **What were the main issues raised by the respondees?**

##### *Draft Limits to Development*

7.12 A total of 22 responses were received to this consultation on the draft Limits to Development embracing Parish Councils, Civic Society, residents, resident associations and the development industry.

7.13 A number of respondents disagreed with the methodology used to prepare the draft Limits to Development. They suggested it be amended to include:-

- Public parks
- Protected Open Spaces
- Playing fields

- Allotments

7.14 Other representations made from developers and landowners felt that the Limits to Development should also be defined for smaller settlements to help clarify their visual relationship with their surroundings and to help distinguish where built development ends and the surrounding countryside begins.

#### *Draft Town Centre Boundaries*

7.15 A total of 12 responses were received to this consultation on the draft Town Centre boundaries embracing Parish Councils, Civic Society, Town Teams, residents and resident association.

7.16 A number of the responses make comments on the methodology used and there was some disagreement over the proposed boundaries.

#### **How, where necessary, these issues were addressed.**

7.17 The main issues raised within this consultation were summarised and addressed within reports prepared for the Local Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC) meeting on 17 February 2015. These are provided as attachments in Appendix B and Appendix C. An overview of the issues which were addressed is detailed below. Where changes were made these were incorporated within the draft Local Plan.

#### *Limits to Development*

7.18 A number of suggested amendments to the boundaries arising from the consultation were not felt appropriate based on a number of matters, for example, the size of the extension, the impact on the countryside, more appropriately dealt under other policy areas of the Local Plan.

7.19 A number of changes were made to the draft Limits to Development, namely in the settlements of Ashby de la Zouch, Diseworth, Heather, Ibstock, Moira and Packington, based on a number of matters such as planning permissions, resolutions to grant permission and reconsideration of the sites relationship with the settlement and the countryside.

#### *Draft Town Centre Boundaries*

7.20 Amongst the issues raised was a need for clarification with respect to the methodology. The report to LPAC provided a more detailed overview of the methodology used. Advice was also provided with respect to the future work that would inform this policy issue, namely the commissioning of a Retail Capacity Study that would in turn be used to inform retail strategy which may necessitate the allocation of retail sites, and a further review of boundaries.

- 7.21 A number of suggested amendments to the boundaries arising from the consultation were not felt appropriate based on a number of matters, for example, a sites relationship with the spread and location of town centre uses, or the characteristics an area.
- 7.22 A number of areas were re-examined based on representations made and consequently changes were made to the draft boundaries in Ashby de la Zouch and Kegworth. Factual corrections were also made in response to comments submitted.

## 8.0 COMMUNITY EVENTS - SUMMER 2015

- 8.1 Although not a specific consultation stage, it is worth noting that officers attended a number of community events, to maintain the profile of the Local Plan, to raise awareness of the forthcoming consultation and to answer any attendees questions. The all day events took place at the following venues:-

Venue	Date
Heart of the Forest Festival (Measham Leisure Centre Grounds)	Saturday 20 June 2015
Picnic in the Park (Coalville Park)	Sunday 28 June 2015
Music in the Park (Spital Park, Castle Donington)	Sunday 5 July 2015
Jim's Tractor Run, Ashby de la Zouch	Sunday 26 July 2015

A press release was sent advising of the Council's attendance at these events.

## 9.0 DRAFT LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

**Consultation Dates: 29 September 2015 to 30 November 2015**

### Introduction

- 9.1 On 15 September 2015 Full Council agreed the Draft Local Plan for consultation to commence September 2015. A copy of the draft plan consultation document and accompanying documents can be viewed on the Council's website by [clicking here](#).
- 9.2 The consultation document provided an opportunity for local residents, community groups, developers, public bodies and other key stakeholders to have an input and comment on the contents of the draft Local Plan. It identified the Council's favoured policy approach. In addition a number of questions were asked throughout the draft Local Plan seeking views on whether this approach was supported and whether any changes should be made.
- 9.3 This consultation was also accompanied by consultation on accompanying draft Policies Maps, a draft Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal, a draft Local Plan Habitats Regulation Assessment, and a draft Local Plan Viability Study.

9.4 A series of background papers to the policies in the draft Local Plan were prepared and published alongside the consultation document.

**Who was invited at this stage and how?**

9.5 Prior to the commencement of the consultation, officers attended the Parish Council liaison meeting on the 9 September 2015 to advise that the draft Local Plan would be going to the Full Council at the end of September 2015 and then subsequently out for public consultation. Attendees were also informed that a number of events as well as a number of drop-in events were to be held throughout the course of the consultation and these details would be provided shortly. In addition all Parish Clerks were invited to help engage communities, for example, holding open sessions, and officers would provide support and materials where possible. Representatives from 23 Parish Councils attended this meeting.

9.6 Parish Clerks were emailed a copy of the published Full Council Papers and the outcome of the Full Council meeting.

9.7 Once the consultation commenced different methods of public consultation were used to maximise community and stakeholder engagement in the process. These included:

- All organisations and individuals, including statutory consultation bodies and general consultation bodies and general consultees such as interest groups, developer and agents and other interested parties on the Local Plan consultation database base were contacted by letter and email (where provided) to inform consultees of the consultation. The letter explained the purpose of the consultation, how to find further information, the consultation period, how to make representations and provided with details of the drop in events.
- A letter/email was sent to all business on the Business Focus database, alerting them of the local plan consultation. The Council's Business Focus Team offers wide range of information and services to existing and new business within the district or those wishing to relocate to the district. In addition a further letter/email was sent to large business organisations in the district, such as East Midlands Airport, advising of the consultation and asking if they could circulate this information to their staff.
- An email was sent out to the district's secondary school, setting out the role of the local plan, where to view the local plan and how to respond. It also included a request for the message to be passed onto both students and parents.
- Paper reference copies of the consultation documents were made available throughout the period of the consultation, to view in North West Leicestershire District Council's main reception at the Council Offices as well as all of the districts

libraries at Ashby de la Zouch, Castle Donington, Coalville, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham.

- The Local Plan webpage on the Council’s website provided information on the consultation, with a copy of the consultation documents available to download, consultation dates and where further information could be sought. In addition consultees were able to submit comments online by registering on the consultation system; Citizen Space. Comments could also be submitted via the Planning Policy email or in letter form.
- Publicity for the consultation was undertaken using a variety of means including the issuing of regular, themed press releases and social media releases through the Communications team.
- Requests were made of libraries, parish councils, leisure centres, supermarkets and council and community offices, to display posters advertising the consultation at their premises or on their notice boards.
- Officers met with the Chambers of Commerce, the Ashby Town Team and the Coalville Town Team, during October, to discuss the consultation and to answer any questions that they may have had.
- The consultation letters sent to landowners and developers as well as infrastructure providers, included an invitation to a drop in event at 29 October 2015 should they wish to discuss the draft local Plan face to face, particularly in relation to any sites that they may have an interest in. In total we had two attendees.
- Planning officers attended a number of drop-in events during the consultation period, to raise awareness of the consultation and provide advice and information to members of the public. These events took place in a range of locations including at supermarkets and in outdoor locations so as to try and bring the Local Plan to the attention of as many people as possible. The drop in events took place at the following venues:

Venue	Date	Time
Coalville Market	Tuesday 6 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	11.00am-3.00pm
Ashby Tesco	Thursday 8 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	11.00am-3.00pm
Ibstock Co-op	Tuesday 13 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	11.00am-3.00pm
Measham Tesco	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	11.00am-3.00pm
Kegworth Market Place	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	10.00am-12.00pm
Castle Donington Library	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> October 2015	2.00pm-5.00pm

Greenhill Community Shop	Monday 26 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	11.00am-3.00pm
Market Street, Castle Donington	Tuesday 27 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	4.00pm – 8.00pm
Coalville Morrisons	Wednesday 28 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	11.00am-3.00pm
Coalville Market	Friday 30 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	11.00am-3.00pm
Ashby Market Street	Saturday 31 <sup>st</sup> October	11.00am- 3.00pm

- Three evening events were arranged, one for each of the Community Forum Areas, for Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Plans. They consisted of a presentation on the local plan setting out the key highlights and how to get involved in the consultation. It was the intention that if Parish Councils wished, they would then be in a position to hold their own events. These events took place at the following venues:-

Venue	Date	Time
Parish Meeting (Ashby, Meahsm and Moira Forum Area) at Ashby Town Council	5 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	5.30 to 8.00pm
Parish Meeting (Coalville Forum Area) at Council Offices	7 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	5.30 to 8.00pm
Parish Meeting (Northern Parishes Community Forum) at Kegworth Village Hall	15 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	5.30 to 8.00pm

### **What were the main issues raised by the respondees?**

- 9.8 A total of 326 individuals and organisations made 1,935 detailed comments, In addition a further 424 standard letters were received, principally in relation to the proposed development north of Ashby de la Zouch (Money Hill) and concerns regarding possible development south of the A453 near East Midlands airport. All responses are available to view in summary by [clicking here](#). These tables provide a summary of the responses received and are split into the separate chapters of the Local Plan.
- 9.9 A lot of the issues raised did not specifically resulted in the change to policy. A large number required clarification on the planning process, why a certain approach had been taken place

i.e. local evidence, NPPF compliant. These issues are detailed within the summary tables of responses that are available on the council's website and it was not felt necessary to duplicate these and include the within the statement of consultation.

#### *Chapter 4 – The Issues and Objectives*

##### 9.10 Issues raised included:-

- Need to recognise that will need to work with infrastructure providers to implement policies and make for the provision of infrastructure;
- Assumption being made that the issues are in no particular order of importance;
- The provision of housing should meet the needs of the community, including provision of housing for older people and families, as well as affordable housing;
- Wording should be more positive in terms of dealing with pollution

##### **How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

##### 9.11 Comments received led to the following changes:-

- Clarification that issues are in no particular order of importance
- Amended to state that housing issues should be to meet the needs of 'all' communities
- Pollution issues referred to improving air quality and contamination issues
- Made reference to working with infrastructure providers to deliver future infrastructure needs.

#### *Chapter 4 – The Objectives*

##### 9.12 Issues raised included:-

- More positive wording reference community safety;
- Objectives should include reference to flood risk and water environment;
- Plan should safeguard cultural facilities;
- Unclear what is meant by 'historical heritage';
- Wording for the design objective and the landscape character objective could be improved';
- Plan should support the development of tourism and leisure.

- 9.13 Objectives 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 were amended to include reference to cultural facilities, tourism and leisure, enhancing community safety, flood risk, rural heritage and heritage assets, water environment and landscape character. Objective 3 was rewritten to state “Ensure new development is of a high quality of design and layout whilst having regard to the need to accommodate national standards in a way that reflects local context and circumstances.”

*Chapter 5- Policy S1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development*

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

- 9.14 The policy is based on wording suggested by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore no amendments are considered necessary although it was agreed that some changes be made to the supporting text.
- 9.15 However prior to the ‘publication’ version of the Local Plan, it was decided to delete this policy as it is understood that the Planning Inspectorate no longer requires the inclusion of such a policy, as this is already engrained in National Planning Policy. This means that subsequent Policies S2 to S5 in the draft Local Plan are renumbered in the Publication Local Plan.

*Chapter 5 – Policy S2: Future housing and economic needs*

- 9.16 The draft Local Plan identified a housing requirement of 535 dwellings each year for the plan period, higher than the Objectively Assess Need identified in the SHMA. It had been set at a higher level to take account of the potential impact of the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (Roxhill) which had since been approved by the Secretary of State on 12 January 2016.
- 9.17 A significant number of residents considered that the housing requirement was too high, with particular concerns regarding the impact upon existing infrastructure. A lot of these responses were opposed to the Money Hill site allocation in particular.
- 9.18 Concerns were also expressed by Charnwood Borough Council and Oadby and Wigston Borough Council regarding the level of housing requirement. The specific issues raised included:-
- The proposed housing requirement had been put forward without agreement across the Housing Market Area;
  - The methodology used to identify the housing requirement could be used by developers to undermine the local authorities five year supply position;

- Alternatively, an increase provision of housing in North West Leicestershire could impact upon the delivery of housing sites elsewhere, specifically the Loughborough Sustainable Urban Extensions;
- Any (as yet unquantified) impact upon the OAN for the other HMA authorities as set out in the SHMA and MOU need to be understood and agreed across the HMA;
- No consideration had been given as to the possible impact upon affordable housing resulting from a higher housing requirement.

9.19 On the other hand some house builders considered that the requirement was too low.

9.20 In view of these representations, the desire to get a new Local Plan in place having regard to the age of the current Local Plan, and the new HEDNA unlikely to be finished until late 2016 at the earliest, officers sought legal advice on how to proceed with the Local Plan. Also work was commissioned from an independent consultant to provide more evidence regarding the likely impact of the Roxhill development, which had been approved by the Secretary of State for Transport on 12 January 2016 (check date), on housing figures.

9.21 Advice from external advisers and Counsel, as well as a senior official from the Department for Local Government and Communities, and a former senior Planning Inspector, was that the Council should continue with the current planned preparation of the Local Plan and not delay for the new HEDNA to be finalised or for a new Memorandum of Understanding.

9.22 The additional commissioned work has taken account of more recent demographic evidence since the SHMA was published and concludes that a figure of 520 dwellings per year would be appropriate (10,400 in total over the plan period). It is this figure that is used on the now renumbered Policy S1: Future housing and economic development needs.

#### *Chapter 5 – Policy S3: Settlement Hierarchy*

9.23 The following were raised as the main issues:-

- Suggested greater clarification was needed in terms of how the distinction has been made between Sustainable Villages and Small Villages.
- Neither Appleby Magna nor Blackfordby should be identified as Sustainable Villages.
- Current wording indicated that development beyond the proposed Limits to Development might be appropriate.

#### **How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

9.24 The following changes were made in response to these representations:-

- Supporting text amended to clarify to explain the methodology used to determine sustainable villages.
- Given the range of services and facilities in Appleby Magna and Blackfordby it was considered appropriate to define them as Sustainable Villages.

- To avoid confusion surrounding development beyond the Limits to Development the policy wording was amended to read:-

“Settlements which have limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth through infilling and/or physical extensions has already been factored in when defining the Limits to Development were drawn. It is not the case that other extensions to these settlements is supported in principle.”

- It was also considered that reference to local needs with respect to Small Villages would be beneficial, to read the following:-

“Settlements with very limited services, where open market will be restricted to conversion of existing buildings or the redevelopment of previously developed land (as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework). New build development on Greenfield sites which is to meet a local need, including affordable housing in accordance with policy H5 (Rural exceptions Sites for Affordable Housing) may be supported.”

#### *Chapter 5 – Policy S4: Countryside*

9.25 The following were raised as the main issues:-

- The Limits to Development at Appleby Magna included land which has the benefit of planning permission for 39 dwellings. Objections had been received to this on the grounds that a large part of the approved site was shown as open space on the plans approved as part of the planning application, and this should be shown as countryside given that it adjoined an area shown as countryside.
- A number of the Limits to Development did not reflect planning permissions since the draft Local Plan was agreed by the Council.
- No mention of the protection of valued landscapes.
- Policy should identify what is meant by the countryside.
- Places of worship can meet a proven need.
- Policy should identify and protect most productive agricultural land
- Policy overly restrictive with lack of consistency with Policy S3.
- Not appropriate for the Local Plan to cover minerals and waste. This would be best delivered in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

#### **How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

- Limits to Development at Appleby Magna were amended to reflect the extent of the approved built development and exclude the area of open space.
- The next reiteration of the Local Plan would take into account recent planning permission when drawing up the Limits to Development.
- Provided definition of countryside in the glossary.
- Policy would include reference to places of worship
- Merged parts 1 and 2 of the policy and reworded to be more positive i.e. do not say that development will be limited.
- Included statement on agricultural land in supporting text.

- Policy amended to include reference to Natural Character areas and the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Landscape Character Assessment.
- Included reference to the conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings.
- Deleted reference to minerals and waste.

*Chapter 5 – Policy S5: Design of New Development*

9.26 A number of the comments received criticised the lack of clarity in the policy. It was also observed that there was no mention of housing density.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

9.27 Comments received led to a significant rewording of this policy which would also require the submission of a comprehensive site and contextual appraisal. The issue of amenity would be dealt with in a separate policy rather than part of the design policy. In addition, to improve the read and layout of the Local Plan, these two policies, Policy D1 – Design of Development and Policy D2 – Amenity , would be included as part of a new chapter in the Publication Local Plan, namely ‘Chapter 6 – Design’. As a consequence all following chapters would have to be renumbered.

9.28 It was concluded however that it would not be necessary to set out housing density in the Local Plan as this should be judged on a site by site basis as the overall density of the site is dependent on location, topography and character of the local area.

*Chapter 6 – Policy H1: Housing Provision: planning permissions*

9.29 The main issue raised with respect to this policy was that the list included as part of Policy H1 was out of date or would become out of date very quickly as developments were built.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

9.30 It was initially suggested that a list not be included as part of the policy and that a list of sites with planning permissions be included as a separate list and maintained as part of the Annual Monitoring Report.

9.31 However it was concluded to include a list of sites which had planning permission as at 1 October 2015 and where development had not commenced so as to provide clarity regarding which sites are included in this policy and to re-title the policy ‘Housing allocations: permissions’.

*Chapter 6 – Policy H2: Housing Provision: Resolutions*

- 9.32 A similar issue was raised with respect to this policy in that it could become out of date. Another matter raised related to the fact that sometimes a delay occurred between the resolution to grant planning permission and the signing of a Section 106 agreement. This representation stated that in these circumstances there should not be automatic presumption permission will be granted.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

- 9.33 It was initially suggested that a list not be included as part of the policy and that a list of sites with planning permission be included as a separate list and maintained as part of the Annual Monitoring Report. However it was concluded to include a list of sites which were subject of a resolution to grant planning permission as at 1 October 2015 so as to provide clarity regarding which sites are included in this policy and to re-title the policy ‘Housing allocations: resolution’.
- 9.34 Policy wording was amended to make it clear that in those circumstances where there is a delay between the resolution to grant planning permission and the signing of a Section 106 Agreement, it may be necessary for the application to be referred back to Planning Committee to take account of any material change in circumstances.

*Chapter 6 – Policy H3: Housing Provision: new allocations*

H3 (a) Land north of Ashby de la Zouch

- 9.35 A total of 384 standard letters were received objecting to the proposed allocation on land north of Ashby de la Zouch (referred to locally as Money Hill), although no specific reason was stated. A number of detailed representations were also received objecting to the development on grounds of impact on infrastructure and the loss of identify of Ashby. A separate representation suggested that additional adjacent land be included as part of the allocation.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

- 9.36 In light of the recent planning permission on land that forms part of the allocation it was considered that this allocation should be maintained. With reference to the suggested additional land, the issue of deliverability having been addressed it was proposed that the allocation be amended to include this additional land.

H3 (c) Land off Ashby Road/Leicester Road, Measham

- 9.37 Concerns were raised from Historic England in respect of the protection of heritage assets. Other issues raised related to potential land stability issues and also that the site’s location is located in a Mineral Consultation Area.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

9.38 Responses to these issues were as follows:-

- Reference made in the policy to the protection and enhancement of heritage assets
- Investigate the matter of land stability with the assistance of the Coal Authority. It was concluded that Policy EN6: Land and Air Quality would address such an issue as where there are land instability issues, any planning application would need to be accompanied by a detailed investigation and assessment of the issues with appropriate mitigation identified if appropriate.
- It was initially suggested that a new generic policy be included in the Local Plan to require the need for applications for development in a Mineral Consultation Area to be accompanied by a minerals assessment to assess the potential effect on the mineral resource. However advice from the County Council was that this would be unnecessary as the existing and emerging Mineral Plans address this issue. It was therefore concluded that reference be made to the need for a Minerals Assessment and also that text be added to draw attention to the fact that specific sites were within the Minerals Consultation Area and that development should respond to the minerals safeguarding policies in the relevant Minerals Plan. These amendments have been made to the supporting text to Policy H3 with respect to the sites at Land north of Ashby de la Zouch and Land off Ashby Road/Leicester Road, Measham and to the policy wording relating to these two sites.

*Chapter 6 – Policy H4: Affordable Housing*

9.39 Issues were raised with reference to rural exceptions sites and viability but as detailed within the summary response table, the draft Local Plan was considered NPPF compliant with no changes necessary. Other issues raised related to the Governments Agenda for the future of affordable housing and the provision of starter homes.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

9.40 It was suggested that implications of any Government changes in respect of affordable housing and thresholds, including starter homes, be kept under review and considered when appropriate. When clarification is forthcoming on these issues changes will be considered and brought forward.

*Chapter 6 – Policy H5: Rural exceptions sites for affordable housing*

9.41 Objections were raised to the principle of exception sites but as detailed within the summary response table the draft Local Plan was considered NPPF compliant with respect to this matter and no change would be necessary. Other issues raised related to the

Governments Agenda for the future of affordable housing and the provision of starter homes, and some confusion over the wording.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

9.42 It was suggested that implications of any Government changes in respect of affordable housing and thresholds, including starter homes, be kept under review and considered when appropriate. When clarification is forthcoming on these issues changes will be considered and brought forward.

9.43 In order to provide greater clarification the policy was amended to read:-

Part (3) "On sites that are outside of, but well related to, a Sustainable Village or a Small Village the inclusion of an element of market housing on 'Exception' sites will be supported where...."

*Chapter 6 – Policy H6: House types and mix*

9.44 Issues raised included:-

- Policy was too prescriptive in parts
- Inconsistency between parts 1 and 2 and policy should only apply to schemes of 10 or more dwellings.
- Evidence supported with a planning application should also be considered.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

9.45 The following changes would be made in response to these representations:-

- Amended part (1) of policy to refer to developments of 10 or more dwellings as it is not considered that it would be appropriate to apply to all developments.
- Amended 2(a) to also include reference to "other evidence of market demand"
- Amended 2 (b) to make it clear that account will be taken of development which has been built to date and not just those with permission.
- Amended 3 (a) to state after bungalows "subject to having regard to factors (c) and (g) above".

*Chapter 7 – Policy H7: Provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople*

9.46 A number of responses submitted required an explanation of the Local Authority's duty with respect to the provision of accommodation for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople and clarification regarding the role of the Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation Development. As such changes to the policy wording were not considered necessary.

9.47 Other issues raised included:-

- Reference should be made to heritage
- Criteria 4 (a) is too prescriptive with respect to a sites location to services
- Policy unreasonably requires service to already exist

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

9.48 The following changes were made in response to these representations:-

- Criteria 4a was amended to read “Be located with reasonable access to a range of services, such as shops, schools, welfare faculties or public transport.”
- Criterion 4e was amended to read “Be capable of being provided with adequate services, including water supply, power, drainage, sewage disposal and waste disposal facilities.”
- Criterion 4 (f) was amended to read “Be compatible with landscape, environment, heritage and biodiversity as well as the physical and visual character of the area.”

*Chapter 7 – Policy Ec1: Employment Provision: permissions*

9.49 It was raised that the list of sites in Policy Ec1 will over the lifetime of the plan would become out as date as sites are either built or new sites comes forward which are not included in the list. It was also suggested that the policy needs to be clear that it is referring to net area calculation figures.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

9.50 It was initially suggested that a list not be included as part of the policy and that a list of sites with planning permissions be included as a separate list and maintained as part of the Annual Monitoring Report. However it was concluded to include a list of sites which had planning permission as at 1 October 2015 and where development had not commenced so as to provide clarity regarding which sites are included in the policy and to re-title the policy ‘Employment allocations: permissions’.

9.51 Amended policy to make it clear that the employment land figure is a net figure and insert the following into the supporting text "The employment land requirement is net of land occupied by major peripheral structural landscaping and main distributor roads. Other on-site infrastructure, such as access roads, ancillary landscaping, car parking and buildings are all included in the net figure".

*Chapter 7 – Policy Ec2: Employment Provision: new allocations*

9.52 A significant number of representations objected to the allocation of up to 16 hectares of employment land north of Ashby de la Zouch (Money Hill). Issues raised were loss of

countryside, more suitable alternative and Brownfield sites should be included instead and impact on highway infrastructure. The Councils response advised there is a need for an adequate supply of employment land to meet identified requirements and a number of options have been considered. This site was considered to be the most appropriate and its allocation for employment in conjunction with the proposed housing development would provide an opportunity to create a mixed use, sustainable development. Furthermore there were no objections to the allocation from Highways England and there were not any Brownfield sites currently available, achievable and deliverable to meet the districts employment land needs over the plan period. Other representations required an explanation of the Councils' methodology/approach to identifying the employment needs and how sites were allocated. Given the lack of alternative sites and the sustainability credential of the Money Hill site, no changes were proposed to the draft Local Plan with respect to these matters.

- 9.53 Other issues raised included a request for reference to be made to the protection of heritage assets, the impact of landscape and biodiversity as well as the creation of a green infrastructure network. It was also noted that the Money Hill allocation's location within a Mineral Consultation Zone.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

- 9.54 Plan was amended to make reference to:-
- the impacts of development on biodiversity and landscape,
  - development should minimise the impact upon the setting of the Ashby de la Zouch Conservation area and the Ashby Castle Scheduled Ancient Monument
  - the provision of green infrastructure links, providing both ecological and footpath/cycle links within the development and to the wider area
  - It was initially suggested that a new generic policy be included in the Local Plan to require the need for applications for development in a Mineral Consultation Area to be accompanied by a minerals assessment to assess the potential effect on the mineral resource. However advice from the County Council was that this would be unnecessary as the existing and emerging Mineral Plans address this issue. It was therefore concluded that reference be made to the need for a Minerals Assessment and also that text be added to draw attention to the fact that specific sites were within the Minerals Consultation Area and that development should respond to the minerals safeguarding policies in the relevant Minerals Plan. These amendments have been made to the supporting text to Policy H3 with respect to the site at Land north of Ashby de la Zouch.

*Chapter 7 – Policy Ec3: Existing employment areas*

- 9.55 A number of representations received suggested that this policy conflicts with paragraph 22 of the NPPF in that its para 22 which states that “Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment uses where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.”
- 9.56 A separate representation suggested that the policy should be clear in that account will be taken of other Local Plan policies and the impact of development upon supporting infrastructure. It was also requested that site at Lount, as recommended in the Employment Land Study 2010 as being a site that should be protected, should be included in the list of sites to which Policy Ec3 applies.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

- 9.57 The policy was not considered to conflict with the principle of the NPPF as those sites identified under Policy Ec3 (1) are key strategic employment sites and are largely the more modern sites and more likely to remain more attractive for employment use. Some of the sites are also still in the process of being developed. It does not apply to all employment sites. Furthermore, part 2 of the policy allows for other employment generating uses on the sites subject to satisfying specified criteria. However it was considered that this should be explained in the supporting text in more detail.
- 9.58 The following amendments were also considered worthwhile in order to strengthen the policy or provide clarification:
- Amended the Local Plan to include the TNT Lount site under Ec3.
  - Amended Ec3 (1) to also include consideration of the impact of a development upon existing infrastructure and any other policies in the Local Plan;
  - Amended Ec3 (3) to make it clear that only one of (a) to (c) need to be satisfied, not all three;
  - Amended Ec3 (3) to include reference to ‘economic viability’

*Chapter 7 – Policy Ec4: Brickworks and Pipeworks*

- 9.59 Leicestershire County Council raised a number of issues with respect to this policy. They questioned the value of the policy and also raised the issue that it appeared to relate to those sites that had restoration conditions. As it became apparent that all the sites had restoration conditions in place it was concluded that the policy would no longer be needed.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

- 9.60 The policy has been deleted.

*Chapter 7 – Policy Ec5: East Midlands Airport*

9.61 Generally, the responses to this policy were positive. However the following points were made:

- Understand the Council seeks to deliver the East Midlands Enterprise Gateway;
- Should incorporate measures to ensure that local air quality remains above the relevant standards;
- Policy should recognise the impacts of airport noise on the wider landscape;
- No reference to heritage assets despite there being a number of heritage assets within the vicinity of the airport which are vulnerable to the effects of noise and disturbance;
- Reference should be made to improvement to public transport and parking and well as development which require and benefits from an airport location.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

9.62 As a response the following amendments were made to provide clarification:

- A statement was included to specify the role of the Local Planning Authority working with the LLEP and a range of organisation to deliver the East Midlands Enterprise Gateway;
- New criterion added to Ec5(1) to include reference to heritage assets;
- Amended Ec5(1)b to include reference to impact upon the wider area;
- Amended Ec5(1)c to state “satisfies the relevant standards” for clarity;
- Amended Ec5(2) to include a new criterion to include reference to public transport infrastructure and airport car parking;
- Amended Ec5(2) to include reference to development which requires and benefits from an airport location.

*Chapter 7 – Policy Ec6: East Midlands Airport: Safeguarding*

9.63 It was clear from some responses that it would be useful if greater clarity on the subject matter of this policy be provided.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

9.64 Changes made to the supporting text to provide greater clarity as to what the process of aerodrome safeguarding is.

*Chapter 7 – Policy Ec7 East Midlands Airport: Public Safety Zones*

9.65 Generally responses were supportive and no changes have been made due to representations made in respect to this policy.

## *Chapter 7 – Policy Ec8 Donington Park*

9.66 Generally, the responses to this policy were positive and supportive of this policy. However in light of the following representation it was considered that a number of changes were required;

- Confusion over what is meant by the Western Extension to Donington Park;
- Prudent to make provision for reducing the impact of event traffic on local and strategic road network;
- Should be proactive support for the delivery of the East Midlands Enterprise Gateway;
- Should take into account the impact of noise generated by the race track on the wider area;
- Suggest a comprehensive list of vehicle related activities;
- Suggest a comprehensive list of other activities that take place at Donington Park;
- Reference to the heritage assets within the site would be welcomed

### **How, where necessary, were these issues addressed.**

9.67 In terms of the Western Extension, the area concerned is already part of Donington Park and is largely a tarmac area which is used for a number of activities. In effect the reference to extension is in terms of an extension to the policy area from that shown in the current adopted local Plan. Therefore reference to the western extension has been deleted but this area has been included within the overall area covered by Policy Ec8. Also included are additional land and buildings which are functionally related to the Racetrack including the museum and offices which adjoin the main entrance. In addition to the changes, and those detailed below, corresponding changes are also made to the supporting text.

9.68 Other amendments made to this policy, following receipt of representations, are summarised as:-

- Reference made to ensure that any landscaping proposals do not have a negative impact upon the flight safety and operation at East Midlands Airport;
- Reference made to “automotive infrastructure” in Ec8(2)(c)
- Reference made to mitigating the impact of development upon heritage assets
- Reference made to the need to improve public transport access to the racetrack and other measures that will reduce the impact of event traffic on the local and strategic road network.
- A statement was inserted regarding the District Council continuing to work with the LLEP and a number of other organisations on the delivery of East Midlands Enterprise Gateway.
- Amended EC8 (1) (a) to state "incorporates measures to reduce the impact of noise as a result of the racetracks operation on local residents and the wider area "

- Policy was amended to specify the following vehicle related activities: vehicle launches by car manufacturers, driver training for commercial vehicles, cars and motorbikes, various types of off-road and 4x4 use, including a purpose built 4x4 track, Operational centre for track day operators and use of the Western Paddock as the International Head Quarters for a new electrically powered global race championship - FIA Formula E
- Paragraph was inserted to read “Other activities within the estate include a large long-term car park for East Midlands Airport, a plant and machinery auction site and the Museum housing the Grand Prix as well as, now, the Wheatcroft Military Collections.”

*Chapter 7 – Policy Ec9: Town and Local Centres: Hierarchy and management of development*

9.69 Generally, the responses to this policy were supportive of the town and local centre hierarchy. A number of the response talked about the need to regenerate and improve Coalville.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

9.70 The regeneration of Coalville and its town centre is a priority. Therefore reference within the supporting text was made to the work being undertaken by the Council under the auspices of the Coalville project.

*Chapter 7 – Policy Ec10: Town and Local Centres: Thresholds for Impact Assessments*

9.71 Responses generally supported the policy approach and there were no changes to the policy as a result of the consultation responses.

*Chapter 7 – Policy Ec11: Town and Local Centres: Primary Shopping Area: Non-shopping uses*

9.72 Responses were generally supportive of the suggested approach and the proposed shopping areas. Concern was raised that the policy was too vague however changes were not considered necessary as the suggested approach allows for consideration to be given to the merits of the application and to take account of local circumstances and the locality.

9.73 Other issues raised included:

- New development at Coxon Mews Ashby de la Zouch should be incorporated with the boundary of the primary shopping area;
- Duplication between Policy Ec11 and EC13, for example Ec13 (1) duplicates Ec11 (1) whilst Ec13 (3) duplicates Ec11(2);

### **How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

- 9.74 The following changes were made as well as changes to the supporting text where necessary:-
- Amended the boundary of the primary shopping area to incorporate Coxon Mews, to the rear of South Street/Bath Street;
  - Made it clear in Ec11(1) that all three bullet points have to be satisfied;
  - Amended the last sentence of Ec11 (1) before the bullet points to state “Development of other main town centre uses within the Primary Shopping Areas will be acceptable where, at the time that an application is determined...”
  - Removed reference in the policy to a specific length of time for marketing attempts but instead include reference to it within the supporting text;
  - Removed reference to primary and secondary frontages

- 9.75 Representations were also received requesting revision be made to the defined Castle Donington Town Centre/Primary Shopping Area boundary. Local officers met with the Parish Council to discuss their representations further, and to walk the area together. Following this meeting amendments were made to the defined Town Centre boundary for Castle Donington.

#### *Chapter 7 – Policy Ec12: Town and Local Centres: Primary Shopping Area: Hot Food Takeaway Balance.*

- 9.76 Overall the response was supportive although reference was made to duplication in part with part of Policy Ec9.

### **How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

- 9.77 Significant changes were not considered necessary and only the two following were made;
- Deleted Ec12 (1) as this issue was already covered by policy Ec9 (1);
  - Amended Ec12 (2) by the addition of the words “at the time that an application is determined” before the bullet points.

#### *Chapter 7 – Policy Ec13: Primary and Secondary Frontages*

- 9.78 Although the responses were generally supportive, as a result of some concerns raised over the duplication of policy, officers felt it would be a good opportunity at this stage to review the overall purpose of the ‘Town and Local Centre’ policies and the respective designations proposed.
- 9.79 Consideration was given as to whether the designation of Primary and Secondary frontages were required. As defined by the NPPF Primary Frontages are those which contain a high

proportion of shops uses whilst Secondary Frontages have a greater variety of uses. These frontages are only identified for Ashby de la Zouch and Coalville Town Centres.

- 9.80 A key aim of the Town Centre policies is to help maintain and enhance their vitality and viability. Policy Ec11 identifies a Primary Shopping Area for both these town centres where the predominant use is to be shopping, so ensuring that the shopping element of the town centres will remain. Therefore it was questionable as to whether having a distinction between Primary and Secondary Frontages, in addition, in what are relatively small centres assists with the aim outlined above. Arguably having such a distinction could provide less flexibility.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

- 9.81 On balance the view was taken that having regard to the duplication with Policy Ec11 and the above consideration, that it would be appropriate to delete Policy Ec13 and to not have any Primary and Secondary frontages.

*Chapter 7 – Policy Ec14: Local Centres*

- 9.82 Generally responses were supportive and as a result no changes were proposed to this policy.

*Chapter 7 – Policy Ec15: Tourism and Cultural Development*

- 9.83 A number of the issues raised are not within the remit of the Local Plan and changes were not considered necessary. An explanation of this is provided in the summary table.
- 9.84 Issue was also raised reference the wording of the policy title which refers to ‘Cultural Development’. However the policy is only concerned with tourism development and there is no mention of the district’s valued cultural facilities in either the supporting text or the policy.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

- 9.85 The Policy title amended to read ‘Tourism Development’ and Policies IF1 (Development and Infrastructure) and IF2 (Community Facilities) amended to address issues relating to culture and include reference to cultural development and facilities.
- 9.86 Other changes, for clarification, included:-
- Amended Ec15 (2) to include reference to the re-use of land/buildings’ for tourism and tourism related development;
  - Amended Ec15 (3) by deleting the word ‘sustainable’ in the context of ‘sustainable tourism’;

- Amended Ec15 94) to include reference to rural tourism.

#### *Chapter 8 – Policy IF1: Development and Infrastructure*

9.87 The three questions asked in respect of this policy generated a significant number of responses, including a lot of objections to the policy. The detail of these is contained and addressed in the summary tables. The main relevant issues raised to the policy and that have had implications on the content of the Local Plan included:-

- Public investment maybe required to promote development;
- Community safety should be recognised as a form of community infrastructure;
- Lack of clarification of what is meant by ‘open space’;
- View that the Council does not have a robust quantitative and qualitative assessment of the need for sport and recreation facilities;
- The County Highway Authority would prefer the term ‘transport’ to ‘roads’ to reflect a multi-modal approach.
- Important that there is a specific telecommunications policy
- Some confusion how section 106 monies can be used/spent

#### **How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

9.88 In response to these representations the following amendments were made to the Local Plan;

- Included reference in the text to working with a range of stakeholders to secure public funding to deliver new infrastructure where possible;
- Included specific reference to community safety;
- Amended the definition of open space in the glossary to make its meaning clearer;
- Made reference to the work relating to the Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facility Modelling in Policy with respect to Policy IF3;
- Amended paragraph 8.1 to refer to “transport’ rather than “roads”;
- Included a specific policy in respect of telecommunications development.
- Added wording to supporting text that clarifies that Contributions agreed as part of the S106 Agreement can only be spent on these services and facilities specified in the S106 Agreement. Monies cannot be diverted to other facilities or areas

#### *Chapter 8 – Policy IF2: Community Facilities*

9.89 Issues raised included the following:-

- Policy could be expanded to include cultural facilities in order to reflect paragraph 70 of the NPPF;
- Would welcome the reference of ‘places of worship’ as a community facility;

- Support the approach of regarding as an asset of community value as a material consideration.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

9.90 In response to these representations the following amendments were made to the Local Plan;

- Made reference to cultural facilities in this policy and include reference to ‘places of worship’ in paragraph 8.10;
- Amended supporting text for greater clarity reference cultural facilities and definitions to be included in the glossary for community and cultural facilities.

9.91 In respect of the issue of community value, the draft policy stated that a listed asset of community value “will be regarded as a material consideration.” However government guidance issued on this matter states the following:

*“it is open to the Local Planning Authority to decide whether listing as an asset of community value is a material consideration if an application for change of use is submitted, considering all the circumstances of the case.”*

The words “*all the circumstance of the case*” suggest that a decision about whether a community facility is listed as an asset of community value should be regarded as a material consideration should be taken on a case-by-case basis rather than having a policy presumption one way or the other. Therefore criterion c) was deleted in order to allow each case to be considered on its merits in accordance with the guidance.

*Chapter 8 – Policy IF3: Open, sport and recreation*

9.92 A significant number of the responses objected to the Council’s Policy IF3 and suggested that the Local Plan should identify Local Green Spaces. In particular a number of respondents suggested that land at the Bath Grounds and around Ashby Castle should be identified as Local Green Space. Having regard to the quite specific restrictions which the NPPF , sets out for Local Green Spaces and the fact that it would be far easier to justify Local Green Spaces through a Neighbourhood Plan, the Council took the view that the Local Plan should not designate Local Green Spaces . As such no changes are suggested in response to these representations.

9.93 A number of other residents expressed concerns that sites identified in the adopted Local Plan as Sensitive Areas were no longer proposed to be identified as such, in relation to sites in Appleby Magna. It is considered that the designation of Local Green Space is best placed for Neighbourhood Plans to address. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.

(Policy S3 of the Publication Local Plan). As such no changes were suggested in response to these representations.

- 9.94 Other representations included the use of out to date standards and unclear what was meant by open space.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

- 9.95 The following changes were made to improve the wording of the Local Plan and to provide clarification:

- Amended part 4 of Policy IF3 to read “in assessing the appropriateness of development which would result in the loss of a site which at the time of the development proposed is considered, is an open space, sports and recreation facility within the Limits to Development, the following principle will be taken into consideration”
- Amended the definition of open space in the glossary to make its meaning clearer;
- Amended the paragraph 8.14 to provide examples of the uses of open space and;
- Deleted reference in the policy to specific national standards and to refer to local evidence being used to determine the amount of open space requirement as part of new development.

*Chapter 8 – Policy IF4: Transport Infrastructure and new development*

- 9.96 Issues raised included the following:-

- Objection raised to the inclusion of Hugglescote Crossroad in Policy IF4(e);
- A number of responses objected to the Local Plan in the respect that it does not provide detail on cycle ways;
- Reference should be made to Transport Assessment, travel plans and statement in decision taking;
- Kegworth bypass is a significant piece of infrastructure that should be included in the Local Plan.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

- 9.97 Following the publication of the Draft Local Plan, at its meeting on 18 November 2015 Leicestershire County council agreed that none of the proposed options put forward in the consultation for improvement work at Hugglescote crossroads could be pursued further. The reference to the Hugglescote crossroads in Policy IF4 (e) was removed although reference to it was retained in the supporting text to Policy IF4.

9.98 Other changes made included:

- Included reference to the Coalville and Ashby Cycle Strategy within the evidence base but not the role of the Local Plan to define cycleways.
- Included reference to 'Transport Assessment' in part (1) of the policy
- Identified as part of the supporting text that travel plans, transport assessments and statements form part of the decision-making process.
- Reference was made to the Kegworth Bypass and the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange within the supporting text.

#### *Chapter 8 – Policy IF5: Leicester to Burton rail line*

9.99 Generally there was support for the policy and for the re-opening of the line to passenger traffic. It was also mentioned that there is an existing freight rail line between Trent Junction and Stenson Junction (Castle Donington) that runs through the district.

#### **How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

9.100 The changes made to the policy included:

- Policy amended to refer to the “provision of public transport services” rather than the “reinstatement of passenger services” as the latter suggested that the only option would be rail services. This may not be the case and so it was considered it would be prudent to keep the options option.
- Amended paragraph 8.25 to make reference to the Long Eaton to Willington freight line which cuts across the northern part of the district.

#### *Chapter 8 – Policy IF6: Ashby Canal*

9.101 Most of the responses to this policy were supportive and have not necessitated any changes. However it was raised that the current proposed route of the canal, which follows the line of the former canal, may no longer be the most appropriate. Therefore an alternative route maybe identified.

#### **How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

9.101 It was not considered appropriate to identify an alternative route as at present there is a uncertainty about what an alternative route might or its technical feasibility. There are also potential issues relating to blight. Therefore the policy has been amended to allow for a

possible alternative route subject to it being demonstrated that the existing proposed route is no longer suitable and that the alternative route is technically feasible.

9.102 Other amendments made to improve wording and provide clarification included:-

- Amended paragraph 8.34 to include the correct title for the Transport and Works Act;
- Updated paragraph 8.36 to reflect the existing status of the extent of restoration undertaken.

*Chapter 8 – Policy IF7: Parking provision and new development*

9.103 A number of the response made required clarification and the remit of the Local Plan with respect to this matter. This is detailed within the summary tables. Other representations raised included:-

- Lack of reference to cycle parking;
- What guidance had been referred to in preparing this policy;
- Policy not supported by any evidence to justify the imposition of local parking standards.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

9.104 As a result the following changes were made to the draft Local Plan:

- Reference was made to cycle parking provision within the supporting text;
- Reference was made to the detailed guidance contained within the Leicestershire County Council 6Cs Design Guide
- Deleted reference to the requirement to normally seek the provision of 2 car parking spaces per dwelling. This is because a written statement from the Department for Culture and Local Government to Parliament on 25 March 2015 says the following text needs to be read alongside paragraph 39 of the NPPF:

*“local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network.”*

In this instance the Council does not have compelling evidence to justify a standard of 2 spaces per dwelling and so does not comply with this statement.

*Chapter 9 – Policy En1: Nature Conservation*

- 9.105 A number of the responses raised concerns over the loss of the designation relating to ‘Sensitive Areas’, and the lack of the identification of Local Green Spaces within the Local Plan. These have however been addressed under Policy IF3.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

- 9.106 A number of refinements and corrects were made to the bullet point relating to ‘Irreplaceable habitats’. Reference made to ‘aged or veteran’ trees rather than ‘ancient’ trees and to ‘trees and hedges’ rather than ‘hedgerows and tree lines’ in point (3)

*Chapter 9 – Policy En2: River Mease Special Area of Conservation*

- 9.107 There was general support for the approach to development within the River Mease Special Area of Conservation. Two responses, in particular, raised the following issues:-

- Information provided on the impact of agriculture on the phosphate issue is incorrect;
- Would be helpful to identify which parishes in the District are affected by the River Mease SAC.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

- 9.108 The following changes were made:

- Amended text at 9.17: Agriculture contributes to the phosphate issues from organic (farm yard manure) and inorganic (manmade fertilisers). These can directly end up in watercourses via different pathways or when soil with phosphate and other nutrients bound to it are washed into a watercourse.
- Included a list of the parish areas with the River Mease catchment within the supporting text.

*Chapter 9 – Policy En3: The National Forest*

- 9.109 Responses were generally supportive and some changes were requested with respect to clarification or improvements to the wording.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

- 9.110 The changes made are as detailed below:

- Amended the supporting paragraph 9.30 by including the wording “There is also increasing evidence that woodland creation and woodland management can help in reducing flood flows, particularly in smaller catchments;

- Amended (1) (e) to state ‘achieve the National Forest Company’s woodland cover targets’ rather than a specific target of 33%;
- Inserted the words ‘associated with woodland’ in paragraph 2 after ‘open space provision’

*Chapter 9 – Policy En4: Charnwood Forest*

9.111 Responses were generally supportive of this policy. A number sought the permanent designation of the Charnwood Forest as a Regional Park. However Regional Parks are non-statutory partnership led initiatives. The Charnwood Forest Regional Park falls within Leicestershire County Council, Charnwood Borough Council, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and North West Leicestershire District Council. The Policy is not a protection policy as such, but recognises the importance of the Charnwood Forest area in terms of landscape etc.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

9.112 The only change made to this policy was the deletion of the word ‘sustainable’ before tourism in order to be consistent with previous comments in respect of Policy EC15.

*Chapter 9 – Policy En5: Area of Separation*

9.113 A number of respondents suggested that more Areas of Separation should be identified in the Plan as a means of providing protection against development which would undermine the character and identify of a particular settlement. However Policy S4 (Countryside) of the draft Local Plan made it clear that that the potential impact of a development, either individually or cumulatively with other development, which would threaten separation between different settlements will be resisted in any areas subject to countryside policies. Therefore the approach set out in draft Local Plan Policy S4, now Policy S3 in the Publication Local Plan, would allow separation issues to be legitimately considered in any circumstances. Therefore there was considered to be no need to amend the policy in light of these representations.

9.114 Of the responses that were supportive of the principle of the Area of Separation, a large number did object to the inclusion of the word ‘significant’ as it was not seen as being stringent enough.

9.115 There were also objections to the principle of the designation of Areas of Separation on the grounds that it would restrict development, contrary to the presumption in favour of sustainable development. However the Council are of the opinion that development on this area would represent the unwarranted and unnecessary loss of this important open and undeveloped area, and undermine the overall strategy of the local plan, with respect to

Coalville and also the wider district. No changes were made to the policy in response to these objections.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

9.116 The word 'significant' has the effect of quantifying the extent of any adverse impact. Whilst it is accepted that it would be appropriate to delete the word 'significant' however it would not be appropriate to leave the wording of the policy so open. Therefore the word 'significant' was deleted and replaced with 'demonstrably' so it would be necessary to demonstrate that there would be an adverse impact on the open and undeveloped character of the area.

*Chapter 9 – Policy En6: Land and Air Quality*

9.117 A number of changes to the policy were requested as detailed below:-

- Information should be added covering groundwater protection and land contamination;
- Amended reference to Coal Mining Development Referral Area with defined Development High Risk Area.
- Identified the need for Coal Mining Risk Assessment in specific circumstances

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

9.118 As a result the following changes were made:-

- "The Environment Agency set out their position on the protection of ground water resources in their document 'Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice'. Regard should be had to this document for any proposed development was added in at the end of Paragraph 9.48
- "Further information regarding the management of land contamination can be found in advice published by the EA as part of the risk management framework (CLR11). Regard should be had to this document for any proposed development" added in after paragraph 9.46
- Deleted reference to Coal Mining Development Referral Area and replaced with "defined Development High Risk Area".
- Deleted last sentence of 9.46 and replaced with " and those exceptions as identified on the Coal Authority's exemptions list, all new development proposals within the defined Development High Risk Area must be supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment, or equivalent, in order to identify any potential risks to the new development and any required remediation measures required. These assessments must be carried out by a suitably qualified person to the current British Standards and approved guidance"

*Chapter 10 – Policy HE1: Conservation and enhancement of North West Leicestershire’s historic environment*

9.119 Comments received were generally supportive and did not require changes to the policy. Responses however which have resulted in changes can be summarised as follows:

- A number of changes need to be made to ensure the policy wording is consistent with the NPPF;
- Make reference to Coalville’s heritage;
  - Heritage assets should be identified on maps;
  - Regard should be had to settlement policy and the protection of significant views.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

9.120 The following changes were suggested in response to the issues raised:-

- Policy HE1 (1) amended to state " To ensure the conservation .....of a heritage asset, must:';
- "Provide clear convincing justification for any works that would lead to harm to a heritage assets and, there are overriding public benefits and mitigation measures are secured" added at the end of Policy HE1 (1);
- Part 2 of the policy amended to state " There will be a presumption against development, alteration, advertising or demolition that will be harmful to the significance of a heritage asset and their setting. Any development proposal that would cause harm to a heritage asset will be refused permission, unless the works are justified, there are overriding public benefits or one or all of the following apply:
  - the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
  - no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
  - conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
  - the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.Amend supporting text to make reference to Coalville's heritage.
- Amended supporting text to Policy He1 to include 'heritage' web link. Amend Policy He1 (d) to state b) Retain buildings, settlement pattern, features and spaces, which form part of the significance of the heritage asset and its setting;
- Amended Policy He1 (1) (a) to refer to protecting 'significant views'

9.121 In addition to the above, representations were received from Historic England as well as the Council’s Conservation Officer (who commenced employment with the Council after the preparation of the Draft Local Plan). Other issues of consistency with the NPPF were raised.

As such it was felt appropriate to undertake discussion with both parties as a result of the number of extensive changes proposed and to seek to ensure that all various concerns be addressed.

- 9.122 Discussion undertaken with all parties led to revised wording to Policy He(1) – Conservation and enhancement of North West Leicestershire’s historic environment, as well as the insertion of an additional Policy He2 – Shopfront Design.

*Chapter 11 – Policy Cc1: Renewable Energy*

- 9.123 A number of the representations stated that this policy should include a section on transport as this generates significant emissions. It is acknowledged that transport has an impact on climate change issues. The transport policies of the plan seek to address this and the plan has to be read as a whole. Therefore it would not be appropriate to duplicate transport issues in this climate change policy.

- 9.124 In addition, since the draft Local Plan was prepared Government have issued new guidance in respect of proposals for renewable wind energy. Areas suitable for wind energy development should be identified within a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. The policy in the draft Local Plan did not identify any area which may be potentially suitable for wind energy proposals.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

- Included reference to Policy IF1: Development and Infrastructure at paragraph 11.4;
- A study was commissioned to consider the height of wind turbines and distance from residential properties and then identifies those areas which, in respect of these matters, may be suitable for wind turbines. The policy was amended so that the first part addresses the landscape impact of all renewable energy proposals and the second part addresses wind turbine development.

*Chapter 11 – Policy Cc2: Sustainable Design and Construction*

- 9.125 As a result of the outcome of the housing standards review in March 2015, local planning authorities can require additional requirements over and above those covered by the Building Regulations within their local plans provided they have the evidence to support this approach. However as this evidence is not available locally this policy was deleted from the Local Plan although a list of measures which can be incorporated to mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change, was added to the supporting text of the Design Policy D1.

*Chapter 11 – Policy Cc3: Water: Flood Risk*

- 9.126 A number of the responses raised issues that would improve the wording of the policy:

- Reference should be made to the impact that increased rainfall will have on the risk of flooding from rivers.
- Object to the policy in that it states that surface water run-off should be attenuated by 20% on the site, but in some cases this may not be sufficient and higher attenuation would be required.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

- Amended the wording to paragraph 11.16 to state "Increased rainfall, which is one of the predicted consequences of climate change, will result in increasing the risk of flooding from rivers".
- Draft Local Plan policy stated as part of section one '...Ensuring development does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere...'. It would therefore be appropriate to amend the final bullet point to reflect more recent guidance. Amended the final bullet point to state: "There will be no increase in the risk of flooding for properties elsewhere. For previously undeveloped sites the rate of runoff from the development sites should be no greater than the existing (greenfield) rate of runoff from the site. For developments on previously developed (brownfield) sites the rate of runoff should not exceed the runoff of the site in its previously developed condition."

*Chapter 11 – Policy Cc4: Water: Sustainable Drainage Systems*

9.127 A number of the responses raised issues that would improve the wording of the policy. Other representations were generally supportive of the policy or required clarification on how such issues are addressed:-

- Suggest that the word "urban" is removed from the title of this section as the 'urban' label was dropped a number of years ago as their use is not limited to urban situations.
- Leicestershire County Council is now the Lead Local Flood Authority and is the lead organisation for providing advice and guidance on surface water runoff and runoff rates.
- There is a lack of information on what SUDS can achieve, we suggest a new paragraph 11.22 that informs that they can reduce flood risk, increase biodiversity and improve water quality.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

- Amended heading of policy to state Sustainable Drainage Systems
- Reference was made to Leicestershire County Council as the Lead Flood Authority in paragraphs 11.9 and 11.2

- Included an additional paragraph to support draft policy Cc4 in relation to reducing flood risk, increasing biodiversity and improving water quality.
- Included reference to preparing a Supplementary Planning Document to support the policy on the delivery of SuDs and other mitigation mechanisms.

*Chapter 12 – Policy IM1: Water: Implementation and monitoring of the Local Plan*

9.128 Representations generally only required clarification of information relating to Neighbourhood Plans, SPDs, and the role of the SHLAA, the SCI and the AMR. Other representations included:-

- Engagement should also be undertaken with Statutory Consultees;
- Policies S4 (Countryside), En1 (Nature Conservation) and He1 (Historic Environment) should be regarded as strategic policies.

**How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

- Policy IM1 (3) amended to include engaging with statutory consultees.
- Amended list at appendix 4 to refer to policies S4 (Countryside), En1 (Nature Conservation) and He1 (Historic Environment) as strategic policies

**10.0 PUBLICATION LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION**

**Consultation Dates: 4 July 2016 to 15 August 2016**

**Introduction**

10.1 On 28 June 2016 Full Council agreed the Publication Local Plan, and accompanying documents. A copy of the publication local plan and supporting documents can be viewed on the Council's website by [clicking here](#).

10.4 The consultation was accompanied by Policies Maps, Sustainability Appraisal Report, a Habitat Regulations Assessment, Statement of Representation, Viability Report and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

10.5 A series of background papers were prepared and published alongside the Publication Local Plan. These technical papers provided further background information to show how the Local Plan policies have been prepared.

**Who was invited at this stage and how?**

10.6 Different methods of public consultation were used to maximise community and stakeholder engagement in the process. These included:

- All organisations and individuals, including statutory consultation bodies and general consultation bodies such as interest groups, developer and agents and other interested parties on the Local Plan consultation database base were contacted by

letter and email (where provided) to inform consultees of the consultation. The letter explained the purpose of the consultation, how to find further information, the consultation period and how to make representations. These stakeholders were also advised of the consultation on the Statement of Community Involvement that was running alongside.

- Paper reference copies of the consultation document were made available throughout the period of the consultation, to view in North West Leicestershire District Council's main reception at the Council Offices as well as all of the districts libraries at Ashby de la Zouch, Castle Donington, Coalville, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham.
- The Local Plan consultation webpage on the Council's website provided information on the consultation, a copy of the consultation document available to download, consultation dates and where further information could be sought. In addition consultees were able to submit comments using the provided standardised representation form.
- A press release was sent advising of the Local Plan consultation, what it was about and how people could have their say. A reminder to the press release was sent at a later date.

#### **What were the main issues raised by the respondees?**

10.7 A total of 110 individual and organisations (representors) made 406 detailed comments (representations). The key issues raised were identified as:

- What is the correct housing requirement?
- What is the correct employment land requirement?
- Are Limits to Development too restrictive?
- Are Policies H1, H2 and Ec1 appropriate policies?
- Is Money Hill the correct allocation (both housing and employment)?
- Should the Local Plan designate Local Green Space?
- Is the Area of Separation justified?

#### **How, where necessary, were these issues addressed**

10.8 A number of minor changes have been proposed in response to the representations raised and these are included within the 'Schedule of Minor Changes to the Publication Local Plan (Document Library Reference LP/03).



## **Regulation 18 Community Consultation Summary of Responses – Draft**

### **Introduction**

North West Leicestershire District Council has begun work on preparing a new Local Plan for the District. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (local planning) Regulation 18 (2012), the district council invited stakeholders from the 20<sup>th</sup> June to the 19<sup>th</sup> September 2014 to comment on what the local plan ought to contain.

A total of 77 responses were received. The key topics that stakeholders felt were missing from the possible contents of the Local Plan are:

- Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technologies
- Heritage
- Telecommunications
- Tourism
- Health and well-being of the community to include access to sports and recreational facilities
- Social and Community facilities
- Economic policies to include East Midlands Airport
- Housing mix- to include the provision for the elderly and the delivery of affordable housing
- Infrastructure delivery
- Environment policies to include landscape character, geodiversity and the protection of air, water and soil resources.

The remainder of the document sets out a summary of the responses received and the District Councils responses to each of the representations.

Appendix A

Name	Form Reference	Agree with our list of issues	Summary of Representation on Missing or Excluded Information	Summary of Council's Response
Abbott, Tim	LP14971	No	<p>No reference to the 'historic environment'. English Heritage advises on how local plans should approach this issue as part of the wider package of policies, rather than as a standalone issue. They should 'set out a positive and clear strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment'.</p> <p>The District is rich in heritage assets, particularly in its industrial and transport past. Not all of these sites will be picked up by the prospective Neighbourhood Plans. These assets are of importance to tourism as well as to local residents.</p> <p>The protection of the National Forest Line is fine but there needs to be some pressure brought to bear on this! The Structure Plan's Transport Choice Corridor was a prerequisite to the allocation of housing in Ashby and Coalville.</p>	The District Council acknowledges that there will be a requirement for policies in relation to heritage from both a strategic and local perspective.
Allsop, Freda & Malcom		No	<p>We wish you to exclude Greenhill Farm for housing land in the Local Plan. This land should not be considered for housing development in the foreseeable future, based on the following factors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The land is an area of particularly attractive countryside.</li> <li>b) It is outside the eastern boundary of the built up area.</li> <li>c) The land is on steeply rising ground and whatever</li> </ul>	Noted.

Appendix A

			<p>attenuation might be proposed there would be a significant risk of flooding from water runoff, not only in the immediate vicinity of Vercor Close and Drome Close, but also further downstream at Abbots Oak Drive</p> <p>d) It is more than a mile from the nearest shops at the junction of Meadow Lane and Blackwood. This would simply add to traffic congestion.</p> <p>e) Following the granting of planning approval for the David Wilson development at Agar Nook Lane, traffic volumes at the top of Greenhill Road will exceed capacity at its junction with Warren Hills Road. Any further development would obviously significantly exacerbate this situation.</p> <p>f) The building of a development encircling the existing farmhouse would be visually bizarre.</p> <p>g) Following the publication of the Leicestershire SHMA earlier this year which proposes a range of 5700 -7000 dwellings between 2011 and 2031, it is obvious that there is no need to include marginal or controversial sites to meet the District's housing targets.</p> <p>h) The housing development cannot be considered to be sustainable.</p>	
Appleby Magna Parish Council		No	Appleby Magna Parish Council members would like, as part of the Local Plan, to include the existing Village Design Statement for Appleby Magna	The new local plan will include design policies to be used by officers and members when determining planning applications.

Appendix A

Ashmore , David	LP11910	Yes	Can't think of anything but if housing is to be developed then imperative that infrastructure developed to cope with additional demands on roads local amenities and health care.	Noted.
Ball , Mr & Mrs J		No	<p>Our request is that the specific area of land classed as 'land at Greenhill Farm, off Greenhill Road, Coalville' be protected against any future development plans of NWLDC, for the below mentioned specific reasons:</p> <p>This specific area of land is classed as National Forest / Charnwood Forest, and is particularly beautiful countryside.</p> <p>As a major housing development has already recently been approved by NWLDC, for the opposite side of the road to the 'Greenhill Farm' area of land, we have concerns reference to the existing highways infrastructure, and would subsequently not welcome any additional possible development, resulting in an increase in traffic.</p> <p>Continued concerns of previous flooding, and the increased risk of further flooding, to the housing estates directly next to the 'Greenhill Farm' area of land.</p> <p>Concerns for existing wildlife within this specific area.</p>	Noted.
Bareford , Helen	LP15024	Yes		
Bartram,	LP14830	Yes		

Appendix A

Brian				
Bates, Elaine	LP11481	Yes		
Bigby, David	LP12806	No	<p>General - Support of neighbourhood plans</p> <p><u>Housing</u> - preference for brown field sites</p> <p><u>Transport</u> - Protecting potential transport routes - Completion of Coalville Bypass to Bardon roundabout.</p> <p><u>Transport</u> - Protecting potential transport routes - National Forest line "and potential station sites"</p> <p><u>Design and development</u> - designation of and policies for design within conservation areas</p> <p><u>Ashby Area</u> - Protection of Bath Grounds from non recreational development (designation as playing fields)</p> <p><u>Environmental policies</u> - protection of flood plains from inappropriate development</p> <p><u>Town Centre Policies</u> - Betting shops</p> <p><u>Town Centre Policies</u> - Provision of adequate off road car parking</p> <p><u>Town Centre Policies</u> - Protection of area designated for bus stops</p>	Noted
Birtwistle, Lesley	LP15592	Yes	<p>The Local Plan should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) S106 identification of payments of direct benefit to the immediately surrounding settlement.</li> <li>b) Landscaping – including edges of development to protect amenity of existing dwellings</li> <li>c) Density – ass “positioning “ of houses to cause the lease loss of amenity to houses in</li> </ul>	Noted

Appendix A

			<p>surrounding settlement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>d) Numbers of houses to be built</li><li>e) Where brownfield sites available, these should be developed first</li><li>f) Town Centre – adequacy of parking and effect on traffic flow</li><li>g) “Footprint” of town centre and limitations on its size and therefore amenities, to be assessed in relation to the maximum number of houses to be built in the areas which it serves.</li><li>h) Environmental factors to include “flooding”- effect loss of land which provides natural drainage, replaced by concrete etc with consequent discharge of water.</li></ul>	
--	--	--	---	--

Appendix A

<p>Buck, Claire</p>	<p>LP13499</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Whilst I understand the need for development I fail to comprehend why you allowing more and more developers to build houses on green field sites. Enough of our countryside has being taken away - we're all constantly being told we need to do our bit for the environment, recycle more, compost more, plant trees etc. Why then it is okay for you to allow our beautiful countryside to be destroyed in this way? Classic example recently is the planning approval of the 79 houses on the Agar Nook development. I'd personally like to know how many of the Councillors who approved this actually live within the area being impacted upon, not many I can bet. When you've finished allowing housing developers to build on our countryside, what next? Why are more brown sites not being looked at? The old Stardust site would be perfect for housing; the road infrastructure is there, numerous businesses and employment opportunities on the Bardon Industrial Estate. By taking away the countryside and Greenfield sites you are removing the places we love to walk with our children, places that allow us to get them out walking and running, seeing the local wildlife. The Councils continual failure to look after the town centre in order to attract more retail business to the area is also appalling.</p>	<p>The new local plan may need to allocate sites to meet the Districts housing needs. As part of the preparation of the plan a large number of sites including brown field sites will be assessed in order allocate the most sustainable sites for development.</p>
<p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>Comments in respect of the policies for discussion and inclusion I the new Local Plan.</p> <p>Having reviewed the document where it lists the possible contents, the Parish Council feels that there are a large number of areas that are not included, although some may be hidden in the generic headings.</p> <p>For avoidance of doubt, the Parish Council would</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Appendix A

			<p>propose that the attached list of policies, as taken from the existing Local Plan for 1991-2006, off your own website (saved/not saved policies), and as highlighted in orange on the attached scan should be included and considered in the new Local Plan.</p> <p>One of the main areas that appears not be included in the List is Recreation, Leisure and Tourism!</p>	
Denney, Roy		No	<p>The National Forest covers large parts of the District and any new housing should reflect this. Extensions to existing villages should not be of such size as to lose their rural character but should accommodate the open countryside on their doorsteps. There is the opportunity for the Garden City Concept.</p> <p>Full consideration should also be given to the rights of way network and not just within the confines of the actual development. Further to that footpaths should not be subsumed into estate roads as the therapeutic benefits of walking include the sense of calm etc coming from walking a footpath through green wedges.</p> <p>We do not support mega commercial areas being created involving the workforce having to travel considerable distances. New housing developments should be near employment, where it is not you, should ensure off road access is available both by way of footpaths and cycle ways.</p> <p>Within the National Forest there are two different types of habitat. You have the developing areas of new plantings and housing There are also well established areas of considerable wildlife importance and development should not encroach on, or even approach closely to these</p>	<p>It is proposed that the Local Plan will include references to the protection and enhancement of the National Forest.</p> <p>An Affordable Housing policy will also be required to be included as part of the local plan.</p>

Appendix A

			<p>areas as they maintain the gene bank from which species will migrate into the newly created areas. All other developments should be sympathetic to the needs of wildlife to migrate and green corridors should be left linking open areas. These can be dual purpose if wide enough; also providing footpath links for residents as well. Opportunities to incorporate key landscape features such as woodlands, ponds, rivers and streams should be used to create high quality design incorporating a wide range of high quality, functional and useful open spaces and links sympathetic to the local topography. It is important to ensure that everyone has access to green space; adequate supporting infrastructure is essential and the accessibility of sites should be maximised. Opportunities to improve access between sites and other green spaces in the vicinity must be considered, especially taking advantage of planning gain from larger developments.</p> <p>It is essential to protect the District's natural environment, landscape and geology and to monitor, protect and enhance biodiversity, wildlife habitats and green corridors. Through the design of new developments and the protection and/or management of existing areas, as appropriate, working with partners where relevant;</p> <p>Affordable housing should not be concentrated in largish areas but should be spread throughout the area including any extensions to rural communities where first time buyer properties at affordable prices are rare and force younger people out of their communities. In locating housing the means of travel must be a major consideration.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>Apart from the provision of off road routes public transport must be available which does suggest that the existing bus corridors should be considered first. HS2 alone is likely to cut or greatly affect 64 rights of way in our area. This can however also be an opportunity. HS2 has wide ranging powers and if an early discussion is started with them highlighting these issues and bringing local knowledge to the table the actual network can sometimes be improved by diverting routes from some way out and through attractive countryside rather than just walking alongside the new track bed to the first available crossing.</p> <p>The Ashby Canal project is going to enhance the area as a tourism destination and whilst funding may mean its completion may be some way off, no development should be permitted that will hinder its potential route. The Ivanhoe Rail Line should be upgraded to a passenger line. There would be comparatively modest costs in doing this but a subsidy would be needed for some time but the Robin Hood line shows how quickly such commuter links can become self funding.</p> <p>As pressure mounts on the London airports the use of EMA is bound to increase, development should be avoided where a potential extension would be made. The new transport hub near the airport will increase freight traffic from this airport and consideration of the noise impacts along the flight paths should also form part of deliberations as to where new housing should go. The Leicestershire Local Access Forum (LLAF) recommends that Local Plans include a dedicated</p>	
--	--	--	--

Appendix A

			section that makes specific reference to the existing network and potential improvements to it.	
Dexter, Fiona	LP11909	No	Clearer reference to provision/development of local services e.g. education, healthcare. Also don't recall seeing anything specific about the road infrastructure and pollution impact.	Noted
Dyer, Nigel	LP14694	Yes		
East Midlands Airport		No	The inclusion of an economic policies section and policies relating to East Midlands Airport are supported. It is considered these policies should seek to promote employment around the airport and on key transport routes. Development on the East of Finger Farm site would help promote the long term future of the services, facilities and growth at East Midlands Airport. The existing allocation on this site and the acknowledgement of an implemented permission establishes the principle of development on the site. East of Finger Farm site should continue to be allocated for employment generating purposes. To ensure the 'protection of services and facilities' and the general support for growth at East Midlands Airport, potential alternative future uses of the site should be broadened and promoted. Alternative uses that would support the airport/tourism related function of the area and facilities on the strategic highway network would include continued identification of the suitability of the site for road related service facilities as well as a range of other uses. The latter include tourist related accommodation including a hotel (Use Class C1) and business uses including a range of B Class uses incorporating high quality employment development in	Noted

Appendix A

			the form of B1 and B8. Other airport related uses which we consider would be appropriate in this location would included long-stay parking and park and ride facilities associated with the airport.	
Ellis, Phil and Lorraine	LP14181	No	While we agree with your list, we would like to see an additional policy with more emphasis on schemes which reflect the ageing population. Not just affordable or social housing, but quality schemes for private ownership, perhaps in a continuing care community. There is a lack of such facilities in the district and they would free up existing larger family homes.	Agree, the district council as part of preparing the new Local Plan will need to prepare policies for the delivery of different types of housing.
English Heritage		No	<p>The local plan ought to contain policies relating to the historic environment at both a strategic level and development management policies. Site allocations should also take account of the historic environment. In relation to the other topics we have made the following comments.</p> <p>Development Strategy- In setting out the distribution of new housing and employment development across the District, consideration must be given to the historic environment at an early stage.</p> <p>Housing and Economic Policies- it is considered that polices are required to support housing and employment allocations to provide further guidance, where relevant, these should include reference to the historic environment considerations. A reference should also be made to the historic environmental character of the town centres.</p> <p>Environment Policies- Concern has been raised that there are no historic environment policies proposed in this chapter and also that there is no reference to broader matters which are often interrelated to the</p>	Agree that heritage needs to be covered by both a strategic and development management policy.

Appendix A

			<p>historic environment, including landscape, and the natural environment. Consideration also needs to be given where development would be inappropriate for instance because of its environmental or historic significance. In addition there is no reference to planning for climate change. It is important that, where policies are required for energy efficiency and renewable energy, these recognise the historic environment.</p> <p>Transport - These should aid the protection of the historic environment at Ashby Canal.</p> <p>East Midlands Airport- There are a number of heritage assets, within the vicinity of the airport which are vulnerable to the effects of noise and disturbance, it is there considered that recognition of this is essential in setting out the general approach.</p> <p>Design and Development - It is recommended given the local character of historic settlements within the district; we would also encourage reference to shop fronts and advertisements in design policies.</p> <p>The following comments have been made in relation to the area based policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Coalville Area (including Ibstock) - Reference should be made to heritage as part of this. Policies on Green Wedge/ Areas of separation are encouraged as this ensures the separation of distinctive communities, which are part of the local character of the town; it may also help to protect undesigned heritage assets.</li> <li>- Ashby-de-la-Zouch (including Measham and Moira) and Castle Donington Area (Including Kegworth) - Reference should be made to shop fronts and advertisements as part of town centre policy.</li> <li>-Donington Park- Reference should be made to heritage assets in developing policy in this location.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix A

<p>Environment Agency</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>Good local plan policies should support sustainable drainage, water efficiency, ‘daylighting’ (de-culverting) of streams and rivers and the sensitive integration of water in a development can improve the water quality and the water environment. Making space for water in a development can also protect people from flooding while increasing the value and desirability of a development.</p> <p>The EA has advised that Flood Risk should be its own strategic policy. Local Plan policies can support better flood risk management; policies which support a sequential approach to land allocation will ensure land at lowest flood risk is developed first. The local plan could also promote the use of indicative drainage strategies on developments. The EA propose the plan supports integrating more natural systems of flood risk management which would control surface water run-off near to its source and to Greenfield run-off rates. There is a need to develop a policy which promotes sustainable drainage, the re-instatement of the natural flood plain and the retention and restoration of watercourse including de-cultivating.</p> <p>All strategic sites must consider the implications for flood risk, contaminated land, water infrastructure as well as opportunities to use development to improve and enhance the environment. It is important to ensure that the local plan promotes best practice in the construction and helps to reduce environmental impact of new buildings in the longer term.</p> <p>Spatial planning has a significant role to play in protecting and enhancing wildlife areas. We consider your plan should have policies to protect both national and local nature sites. The plan should include policies which support the inclusion of space for wildlife and</p>	<p>The District Council welcomes the Environment Agency's representation and agrees that flood risk should be its own strategic policy. Flood risk will also be taken into consideration when preparing further policies and site allocations as part of the local plan. The District Council note the advice by the Environment Agency in relation to the River Mease and other water management issues.</p>
---------------------------	--	-----------	--	---

Appendix A

			<p>water in all new development in the plan area. SUDS and green/ blue infrastructure should be a part of any development that has the potential to negatively impact on surface water quality and dynamics regardless of where development is in a catchment.</p> <p>There is an opportunity for the plan to be innovative and consider the wider ecosystem services provided by existing wildlife habitats within the district, what ecosystem service benefits are derived from these habitats in terms of economic, social and environmental benefits and how these can be enhanced, protected and where possible created through the proposed development allocations.</p> <p>The EA note that the River Mease has been identified as a policy area; however the Local Plan should include clear guidance for developers on the need to manage phosphate discharges into the River Mease Catchment which is a designated SAC.</p>	
Erewash Borough Council	LP15068	Yes	<p>Erewash Borough Council appreciates being given the opportunity to contribute to this early stage of developing the Local Plan for North West Leicestershire and in this regard considers that the Duty to Cooperate is being fulfilled.</p> <p>The list appears to be fairly comprehensive, focusing on a good range of topic areas that will be important in the delivery of wider as well as more specific Local Plan ambitions for North West Leicestershire.</p> <p>Erewash Borough Council will watch closely as policies develop and details emerge before undertaking a more comprehensive assessment of the contents of the North West Leicestershire Local Plan. Clearly, the headings</p>	<p>The District Council acknowledges that the Local Plan will need to tackle climate change as part of the local plan and proposes a section on renewable energy and low carbon technologies.</p>

Appendix A

			<p>provided as part of the list at this stage are broad and could take many different directions. Indeed a number of more focused themes, such as in relation to the tackling of climate change, may well surface across numerous sections of the document as they evolve in view of the fact that they are not afforded a specific chapter within the current list. Whether this will adequately deal with such topics or not will become clear as the Local Plan emerges.</p>	
Fuller, Andrew	LP12805	No	<p>Although it is encouraging to see the National Forest and Charnwood Forest included, I do not like this term 'Green infrastructure'. It's become quite a plague amongst those that cannot see the value of woods and trees and forests and hedges and meadows and grassland. I really do not mean to be rude or pompous. Nature is nature, not infrastructure. A mention of the newly created Charnwood Forest Regional Park – how it's to be protected and whatnot – would be a boon as too would the Charnwood forest canal. A concerted effort to provided for a more wooded Charnwood Forest would be welcome; there is simply not enough large woodland close to Leicester in which we can all get lost – going out to Packington (for the new Diamond Jubilee wood) or Moira could be a trek too far for some. Adding to and increasing the circle of nature (Bardon Hill, Beacon Hill, Broombriggs Farm and Windmill Hill, Bradgate Park, Swithland Wood, and the Outwoods) in the regional park would be a delight for someone like me: a Sussex man who grow up surrounded by large dense woodlands for playmates.</p>	<p>The term Green Infrastructure is the term used within the NPPF.</p>

Appendix A

<p>Gladman Developments</p>		<p>Yes</p>	<p>We are supportive of the proposed topic areas. However in order to be in accordance with the NPPF and NPPG, we have highlighted a number of issues regarding the evidence base.</p> <p>In a recent application, the Councils SHMA was assessed against a SHMA completed by Barton Wilmore. The inspector stated in such circumstances, and having regard to the NPPF, I can place little or no reliance on these new SHMAs, especially given the huge disparity between the outcomes. Consequently, I am unable to accord to either any significant weight in the determination of this application, still less use their conclusions in substitution for the housing requirement “.</p> <p>Gladman’s SHMA was considered to be ‘Policy on’ in that it incorporated findings from the Leicestershire LEP which sought to boost economic growth for the region.</p> <p>The Leicestershire SHMA is considered to underestimate the scale of housing likely to be required across the HMA which has ramifications for housing figures in NWL. The following issues in the Leicestershire SHMA have been highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Headship Rates – one of the key variables in forecasting housing need and do not take account of the level of need that might arise if the trends prior to the recession return before the end of the plan period;</li> <li>• The migration trends rely heavily on data which is likely to be skewed by the recession;</li> <li>• Adverse market signals are identified, but uplifts</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p>
-----------------------------	--	------------	---	---------------

			<p>applied to alleviate them are inconsistent and likely to be too small in scale to make a difference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A high level need of affordable housing is identified but only minimal adjustments are made to the OAN. The SHMA also seeks to clear the backlog of need over a 25 year period; contrary to the NPPG assertion that backlog should be made within the first five years.</li> </ul> <p>A full review of the settlement hierarchy is required to be undertaken in order to apportion growth in a flexible manner which adheres to sustainable development. Some Councils no longer using settlement boundaries and utilising a criteria based policy for the appropriate location of development. We would advise upon using a similar flexible approach as it means that local communities can encourage development in order to support their communities. Rural economic regeneration is not just about the biggest settlements taking all the growth, as smaller sustainable settlements also need new development to maintain and grow their population, services and facilities.</p> <p>A review of the settlement hierarchy should focus on the relationships with other villages and proximity to transport routes and employment sites as a determinant to their sustainability.</p> <p>Our experience, as well as significant research which we have undertaken indicates that larger allocation sites above 500 dwellings are particularly difficult to deliver. We have undertaken research indicating that out of 100 sites (greater than 500 dwellings) across the country, it took on average 8 years to go from outline planning</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix A

			<p>permission to actual development ‘on the ground.’  The Council should aim to select a variety of different sized sites for allocation, ranging from 100. Smaller sites are typically in less complex ownership and are more readily deliverable than larger sites, which will assist the Council in delivering a 5 year supply of housing sites. We act on behalf of two sites these sites are located at Green Hill, Coalville; and Whitehall Road, Ellistown and we believe should be included as allocations in the forthcoming Local Plan.</p> <p>The SA is an important piece of work although there is no prescribed list of indicators to make an assessment of the appropriateness of particular sites; indicators must cover social, environmental and economic aspects.</p>	
Hallam Land Management		No	<p>In terms of the housing requirement, an assessment of objectively assessed housing needs has been prepared by DLP consultants and shows that a housing figure within the range of 510-650 dwellings per annum is appropriate to accompany the projected economic growth. This is at considerable odds with the GL Hearn 2014 SHMA study which we consider to be flawed in terms of its assumptions to the extent that it will not deliver the economic growth that the district and national Government require over the Plan period.</p> <p>The status of Ashby de la Zouch as a location for strategic growth is emphasised. It is the second largest settlement within the District and is well provided with facilities. It has capacity within the Packington Sewerage Works and as assessed in the Water Cycle Study. However, over the period concerned the Plan should</p>	Noted.

Appendix A

			<p>include proposals for the improvement of water quality to achieve the protection of the River Mease SAC, whilst at the same time avoiding any restraint upon new development. This can be achieved by promoting enhancements to surface water drainage and foul water treatment in conjunction with the relevant statutory authorities. The Local Plan needs to give a lead in respect of these matters so that the necessary works can be programmed.</p> <p>In terms of housing land allocations, land on the south east side of the town in the vicinity of Packington Nook Lane is a suitable candidate for an urban extension. The planning considerations and merits in relation to this area are well known to you and it forms part of the pool of strategic development sites that should be released at Ashby where market demand is strong, affordable housing need is high and generally, the river Mease aside, the town is unconstrained and is able to offer a wide range of employment, retail, leisure, health and recreational facilities which are unmatched elsewhere in the District.</p>	
Harley, Julia	LP12400	No	<p>The housing numbers just don't make sense; it predicts 285 - 350 new homes will be needed each year starting from 2011 for the whole of the district. At the moment there are many planning applications going through allowing hundreds of houses to be built in Ashby and surrounding villages alone in the next few years, so where does that leave the predictions? The New Homes bonus seems to be having a detrimental influence on planning decisions. The Council's duty of care should be to look after what we have already got and not allow our developing National Forest get concreted over before the trees get going. Recent planning permissions are being</p>	<p>The housing target is for the plan period until 2031. The number of applications that are built out will be top sliced off that yearly housing requirement. A five year housing land supply identifies sites that are deliverable now, mainly sites with planning permission or allocated sites as part of the adopted Local Plan.</p>

Appendix A

			<p>passed on land that isn't even identified in the five year land supply so what faith can we have that the new local plan has any meaning?</p>	
Hill, Roy	LP12391	No	<p>When I read the Local Plan - Possible Contents June 2014, I see little about ensuring the sewage infrastructure can support further developments. The recent sewage discharge to my garden would indicate it cannot. I see nothing about attracting high quality employment rather than yet more warehouse type activity. I see nothing about maintaining a separation between Coalville and the surrounding villages. Your Schedule of included sites SHLAA 2014 seems to be a recipe for joining Coalville with all of its satellite villages as one enormous housing estate. I appreciate they are proposals for consideration but you have given the green light to developers to start promoting the sites though the planning process way before a full assessment of the sites has been completed. I see nothing about encouraging or initiating renewable energy generation.</p>	<p>A review of infrastructure requirements to support new developments will be assessed as part of preparing the new Local Plan.</p>

Appendix A

<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>Thank you for inviting comments on the scope of the emerging North West Leicestershire District (NWLDC) Local Plan. The Borough Council has considered the 'Appendix: North West Leicestershire District Local Plan – possible contents' document in preparing the comments below. The Borough Council notes and welcomes the intention of NWLDC to include overarching policies addressing strategic matters relating to the amount of land to be allocated for housing and employment uses over the plan period and policies which allocate and enable the delivery of the objectively assessed housing need.</p> <p>In addition you may be aware that Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council have recently consulted upon the Pre-submission version of the Site Allocations DPD. The Council proposes a policy (Policy DM2) which supports proposals for the development of renewable energy and low carbon installations to deliver at least 14% of the Borough's energy consumption up to 2026. The policy is supplemented by 'Opportunity Area' maps which identify areas that have the greatest potential for energy delivery based upon resource availability with the fewest constraints. NWLDC may wish to consider the inclusion of a similar policy to contribute towards the sustainability credentials of the plan and assist in providing policy guidance on where such facilities may be considered appropriate. The Borough Council would be happy to discuss the approach towards preparing the supporting technical evidence base and the policy approach with NWLDC.</p>	<p>The District Council acknowledges that the local plan will need to plan positively for renewable energy and low carbon technologies.</p>
--	--	-----------	---	---

Appendix A

Horsman, Sue	LP14515	No	<p>You should consider more provision for older people - 'retirement villages' - like in Clifton, Nott's; or 'Assisted Living' developments; and also the provision of bungalows on new developments. Many older people want to downsize, but there are not enough suitable bungalows. I object to HS2 as it is a waste of money and will cause more damage than achieve benefits. In Donington, whilst the surgery has been expanded it is a nightmare trying to park in the village. This will only get worse when more houses are built.</p>	Noted.
Johnson, Stuart	LP15033	No	<p>I believe there needs to be a great emphasis / recognition placed on increasing and improving the provision of sport and recreation facilities throughout North West Leicestershire. A quality facility stock will help to ensure an increased population can remain fit and healthy ready for work, ensure increased community cohesion through sustained growth in community sports clubs and importantly help to tackle existing health inequalities such as childhood obesity. The North West Leicestershire School Sports Partnership currently works across 42 primary and secondary schools helping to improve the quality and quality of PE and sports provision within schools, creating links with community clubs and developing vital life skills such as leadership and teamwork. In the consultation I saw little, if any, mention of this particular area that I believe will be vital in making the whole plan work.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the Local Plan will need to place an emphasis on providing new or enhancing existing sport and recreational facilities as part of new development.</p>

Appendix A

<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>LCC support the principle of a policy on infrastructure requirements in the local plan and whilst there is a reference to support infrastructure provision to support growth and development included within the first stage consultation it is suggested that within the local plan policy itself to deliver development and support infrastructure it would be enhanced and strengthened through the suggested elements :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) explanatory paragraph/s for the policy and link it to any strategic development policies for growth, housing and development.</li> <li>(ii) the policy itself should include reference to overall development within the District which would be required to contribute to the funding of infrastructure either through planning obligations or in due course through a combination of payment of a community infrastructure levy on commencement of development and planning obligations for site specific measures.</li> <li>(iii) any schedule of infrastructure should be updated regularly on for example an annual basis</li> <li>(iv) where necessary or appropriate make reference to further guidance being provided in a District Council Supplementary planning Document on supporting infrastructure/developer contributions, for example, the recently published 'Priorities for Developer Financial Contributions for Infrastructure provision relating to Major Residential Development Proposals in and around Coalville'</li> <li>(v) in relation to planning obligations the effect on viability of development schemes would need to be taken into account in particular cases and independently assessed in terms of viability.</li> <li>(vi) It is also important to make sure the overall development and growth is supported through developer</li> </ul>	<p>Agree</p>
--------------------------------------	--	-----------	---	--------------

Appendix A

			<p>contributions and/or other sources of funding in the District and the needs of the local community are met through the appropriate funding &amp; support of infrastructure and services</p> <p>(vii) An infrastructure/contributions policy should reference the other service providers such as the County Council and their role in for example supporting education, highways, civic amenity and libraries. If possible cross reference to the County Council's (revised) contributions policy once it is adopted too.</p>	
Leicestershire County Council		No	<p>What will end date of the plan be? Reference needs to be made to the Coalville Contribution Strategy, which covers a 'must do' list for 14 schemes.</p> <p>Need for housing mix to take account of the ageing population, ensure provision for affordable rural housing specific to local identified needs, 'local market' housing to complement affordable housing. Are allocations going to be made within the local plan or follow through in a separate allocations document?</p> <p>The Local Plan needs to reflect, and be supportive of the economic ambitions of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and include positive robust policies to deliver the East Midlands Enterprise Gateway.</p> <p>The recent Growth Deal announcement (July 2014) included improvements to M1 J22 and A42 J13 and this scheme needs to be reflected in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Bardon link, or an alternative approach which provides the housing growth in SE Coalville with similarly good</p>	<p>The current end date for the Local Plan is until 2031 as the NPPF requires local planning authorities to plan for a 15 year period. Reference will need to be made to the delivery of infrastructure and developer contributions. As part of the preparation of the local plan, policies in relation to affordable housing, type and mix will be reviewed against the most up to date evidence available. The District Council notes that the aspirations of the SEP will need to be presented within the local plan supporting text.</p>

Appendix A

		<p>connectivity to the town and through the site, is still a priority of the County Council to provide access for the whole corridor of growth.</p> <p>Need to ensure that the Plan is underpinned by robust, but proportionate, transport evidence and that it sets out clearly the mitigation measures required to support growth and the approach to funding and delivery</p> <p>Coalville Town Centre employment policies need to be linked closely to the SEP. Positive, supportive policies to encourage the regeneration of the town centre need to be included; including consideration of other suitable alternative uses to enable the town centre to thrive and become vibrant.</p> <p>The Local Plan needs to include reference to how assets affected by the HS2 proposal will be replaced.</p> <p>Sufficient child care provision is needed. Will CIL be sought or will the local authority stick with the existing S106 approach?</p> <p>-School places need to be considered when planning growth in NWL because of the significant impact particularly in the larger settlements of Coalville, Ashby, Ibstock and Measham.</p> <p>Regard should be had to mineral safeguarding areas and the protection of mineral sites from development particularly when allocating sites for development.</p> <p>It is likely that the Waste Local Plan will bring forward</p>	
--	--	---	--

Appendix A

			<p>policies to safeguard waste sites. Policies should be included that reflect the likely impact of proposed, non-waste related development on existing waste management facilities, and on sites and areas allocated for waste management, is acceptable and does not prejudice the implementation of the waste hierarchy; new, non-waste development makes sufficient provision for waste management and promote good design to secure the integration of waste management facilities with the rest of the development, including provision of waste storage facilities at residential premises to facilitate a high quality household collection service, and, in less developed areas, with the local landscape; the handling of waste arising from the construction and operation of development is handled to maximise reuse/recovery opportunities, and minimise off-site disposal.</p> <p>No mention as to how the historic environment will be enhanced and protected in terms of built and underground assets of value, this needs to be included.</p>	
Longley, Guy		No	<p>The representation is made on behalf of Bloor Homes, Davidsons Developments, SECP Limited, Harworth Estates, Miller Homes and Hallam Land Management.</p> <p>The proposed plan period from 2011-2031 presents a risk that the plan will again be found unsound, additionally the transport modelling work only extends until 2028. The proposed approach means the Council is failing to work positively and proactively with the other HMA authorities to plan for growth to meet the longer term requirements. A plan period extending to 2036 would also enable the local planning authority to plan strategically so that supporting infrastructure, including</p>	<p>The SHMA is due to be examined at the Charnwood Core Strategy examination; the outcome of the examination could potentially have implications for the housing requirements across the HMA.</p>

		<p>any necessary highway improvements and education facilities, can be delivered in a planned way.</p> <p>The housing requirement for the proposed plan period is based on as yet an untested SHMA. This level of provision with a figure of 510 dwellings a year set out in the now revoked East Midlands Regional Plan. Evidence prepared in relation to the forthcoming Packington Nook Appeal identifies an annual rate of 651 dwellings as more accurate reflection of, objectively assessed housing needs.</p> <p>On behalf of the consortium of house builders, Pegasus is undertaking further modelling work to test and challenge the conclusions of the SHMA. This work will be based on the latest 2012 Sub National Population Projections (SNPP).</p> <p>The SHMA makes no provision for unmet needs in calculating future housing requirements, there is a total backlog of 618 for NWL, and how this is addressed in the assessment of full objectively assessed housing requirements needs further consideration.</p> <p>In establishing household formation rates, the SHMA tracks the mid-point between the 2008 and 2011 headship rates. There is a concern that this approach continues to apply recessionary trends which have seen the propensity of the population to form households restricted. A more positive view on economic recovery would see a faster return to 2008 base headship rates which would have implications for the assessment of future housing requirements.</p> <p>Achieving economic growth, together with balancing jobs</p>	
--	--	--	--

Appendix A

			<p>and workers are fundamental components of achieving sustainable development. The SHMA does not take account of local policies for economic growth, including the Strategic Economic Plan, and that the alignment of policies for housing, employment and other land uses is a relevant consideration in the development of local plans, and needs to be considered as the strategy for development is progressed.</p> <p>Leicester City Council is suggesting that they can accommodate their full need for 22,950 homes through identified SHLAA sites. There must be serious reservations about the ability of the City to deliver this requirement and the extent to which a number of SHLAA sites represent realistically developable opportunities. The assumption that there are no unmet needs arising from the City is therefore highly questionable.</p>	
Loughborough Gospel Halls		No	<p>Social and Community Facilities including Places of Worship are required in both rural and urban locations in accordance with the advice of NPPF paragraphs 28, 70 and 71. The Plan should fully embrace the economic, environmental and social aspects of plan making and reflect the wider needs of sustainable communities including a range of community facilities in order to foster community cohesion, as well as meeting the needs of the area for new housing and employment. The Council will be aware that the plan will need to be positively prepared and based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure in order to be sound (NPPF paragraph 182). This should include social infrastructure as well as roads and sewers.</p>	<p>Agree the local plan will need to make reference to the enhancement and provision of community facilities.</p>

Appendix A

Marsden , Joanna	LP15058	No	<p>Various areas should be specifically mentioned in The Plan to protect their ecological significance and value: The Greenhill Farm site, areas at the bottom of Bardon Hill bordering the Ivanhoe Way and Kenmore Crescent, fields near Holly Hayes Woods and areas adjacent to Warren Hills Road. These are areas of natural beauty and scientific interest close to the Charnwood Forest and in the National Forest boundary. Coalville needs the natural habitats and scenery to enhance its reputation as a good place to live and work.</p>	<p>As part of the preparation of the local plan an ecological study is being updated so this evidence can be referenced and included as part of the local plan.</p>
Marsden , Penny	LP15057	No	<p>The Greenhill Farm site, areas at the bottom of Bardon Hill bordering the Ivanhoe Way and Kenmore Crescent, fields near Holly Hayes Woods and areas adjacent to Warren Hills Road should be retained as areas of natural beauty and scientific interest. Coalville needs the natural habitats and scenery to enhance its reputation which is not always favourable. Filling them with houses detracts from this and current highways infrastructure is not sufficient for additional homes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Appendix A

Measom , L D	LP11855	No	<p>The district's historical sites need preserving and enhancing for future generations i.e. Snibston, Swannington Railway etc. There is no mention of conservation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Coalville is supposed to be the main town and thus the nerve centre of North West Leicestershire yet has been allowed to become run down and shabby - is that why a photo of attractive Ashby was included in the leaflet? What plans does the Council have to give Coalville credence as the hub of the area?</p> <p>With all the new build of industrial areas and houses giving rise to greater air pollution, can the Bardon Road Bypass be built to help disperse toxic fumes from people and their homes?</p>	<p>The District Council agree that the new Local Plan will need to make a reference to heritage. While a Bardon Relief Road would have some impact in reducing forecast traffic flows on the A511 Bardon Road between Stephenson Road and Grange Road, it would lead to an increase in forecast traffic on Waterworks Road. Elsewhere the impact would be minor. As a consequence, the Highway Authority concluded that there was no evidence to suggest that a business case could be made to secure public funding for a Bardon Relief Road nor, given the constraints imposed by the planning system, could developers be required to fully fund it.</p>
Measom , Mrs L	LP14909	No	Leisure facilities, historic sites	<p>The District Council agree that the new Local Plan will need to make reference to both historic sites and leisure facilities.</p>
Melbourne Trust		No	<p>This representation has been prepared by Clarendon Planning &amp; Development Ltd on behalf of Melbourne Trust. As part of the representation a SHLAA site has been submitted to the Council for consideration as part of the preparation of the local plan for land at Main Street, Wilson which is in the ownership of the Melbourne Trust.</p> <p>General Comments Given the outdated nature of the adopted Local Plan</p>	<p>The site will be assessed as part of the SHLAA review 2015.</p>

		<p>(2002) and the withdrawal of the Core Strategy 2013, there is a real need to streamline the preparation timescales of the new Local plan to provide a plan led basis for growth. It is considered every effort should be made to bring forward the draft plan stage to facilitate earlier delivery of the approved plan.</p> <p><b>Housing Need</b>          The SHMA was agreed recently in June 2014 and provides a requirement of 5,700- 7,000 houses between 2011 and 2031, equating to a need of 285-350 new houses per year. Whilst the majority of these new sites will be in larger settlements, there is a requirement for smaller rural communities to access housing, whether private or affordable, to provide local choice, growth and security. This objective is supported by the NPPF and NPPG.</p> <p><b>Strategic Policies</b>          In terms of development strategy, the settlement hierarchy should identify Wilson as a sustainable village will capacity for small scale growth given the existing bus connection and leisure amenities.</p> <p><b>Housing Policies</b> Land at Main Street, Wilson has been identified as having potential to provide a small- scale residential development site to augment local supply. This site should be added to the SHLAA as a potential housing site.</p> <p><b>Design Policies</b> The inclusion of design policies to ensure high quality design is supported.          The representation has included a description of the submitted SHLAA site.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Appendix A

<p>Mobile Operator s Associati on</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>It important that there is a specific telecommunications policy within the emerging Local Plan. Telecommunications play in both the economic and social fabric of communities merit the inclusion of a policy which refers specifically to telecommunications developments. Such a policy should give all stakeholders a clear indication of the issues that telecommunications development will be assessed against. We would suggest a policy which reads; Proposals for telecommunications development will be permitted provided that the following criteria are met: -(i) the siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area; (ii) if on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and designed in order to seek to minimise impact to the external appearance of the host building; (iii) if proposing a new mast, it should be demonstrated that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other structures. Such evidence should accompany any application made to the (local) planning authority. (iv) If proposing development in a sensitive area, the development should not have an unacceptable effect on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest. When considering applications for telecommunications development, the (local) planning authority will have regard to the operational requirements of telecommunications networks and the technical limitations of the technology. We would consider it appropriate to introduce the policy and we would suggest the following;</p>	<p>This representation has been noted and the delivery of infrastructure will be included as part of the new local plan.</p>
---	--	-----------	---	--

Appendix A

			<p>Mobile communications are now considered an integral part of the success of most business operations and individual lifestyles. With the growth of services such as mobile internet access, demand for new telecommunications infrastructure is continuing to grow. The authority is keen to facilitate this expansion whilst at the same time minimising any environmental impacts. It is our policy to reduce the proliferation of new masts by encouraging mast sharing and siting equipment on existing tall structures and buildings.</p>	
<p>Money Hill Consortium</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>The Money Hill Consortium (comprising Cogent Land, Taylor Wimpey and Bloor Homes) has controlling interest in approximately 118 hectares of land in Ashby-de-la-Zouch, comprising land that is bound by the A511, Nottingham Road and Smisby Road. Money Hill has been identified in previous iterations of the Local Plan (LDF Core Strategy) as the preferred location for the future growth of Ashby-de-la-Zouch.</p> <p>In summary, the Money Hill site offers a unique opportunity to plan for the growth of Ashby-de-la-Zouch in a sustainable and comprehensive way. Furthermore, it offers the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site has been identified as a broad location for development identified for at least 605 new dwellings in the Council’s draft Local Plan Core Strategy</li> <li>• The site has been considered the most sustainable site in Ashby-de-la-Zouch as part of</li> </ul>	<p>As part of the preparation of the local plan, a number of sites will be assessed through the SHLAA and the SA process, to ensure that the most suitable sites are allocated within the plan.</p>

			<p>the NWLC Sustainability Appraisal;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site would make efficient and effective use of land, in a location which is highly accessible to the town centre and public transport links;</li> <li>• The proposed development would add to the vitality of the Ashby-de-la-Zouch town centre;</li> <li>• The proposed development would provide considerable on-site direct jobs;</li> <li>• Money Hill is not subject to the same infrastructure and market demand constraints</li> <li>• One third of the site would be public open space, and also includes sustainable urban drainage measures to enhance the protection of the wider residential area;</li> <li>• The proposals would make financial contribution to the River Mease DCS</li> <li>• new provision for public transport, with a new bus service and greater local provision for walking and cycling, and</li> </ul> <p>With regard to the L&amp;L SHMA, the following concerns have been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It fails to justify the choice of HMA or assess the potential interaction with neighbouring HMAs</li> <li>• Identified the sources of information for determination of OAN</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply relevant considerations to the OAN to determine needs of specialist groups</li> <li>• Make adjustment to take account of socio-economic trends and aspirations</li> <li>• Adequately consider the relationship between the HMA and neighbouring HMA to determine the need to accommodate overspill;</li> <li>• Identify a range of potential scenarios for housing need</li> <li>• Undertake rigorous sensitivity testing to determine the most relevant, robust and justified OAN figure.</li> </ul> <p>The most straightforward approach in structuring the Local Plan would be to have five principal sections, including: main strategic objectives; economic policies; societal policies; environmental policies, and implementation and review mechanisms.</p> <p>The Local Plan should also make provision for alternative and deliverable options. An example of such would be polices associated with High Speed 2 (HS2) and its associated spatial implications. For those development sites potentially lost through the routing of HS2 provision should be made elsewhere to ensure that NWLDC meets its housing and employment targets within the plan period.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix A

Moore, Elaine	LP13872	Yes		
Narrain, Mrs C	LP15011	Yes		
National Trust		No	<p>The 15-20 year timescale for North West Leicestershire's Local Plan is supported.</p> <p>The current list of policies to be included in the Local Plan falls short on environmental policies, and in particular in relation to heritage. We consider that the expansion and strengthening of these policies will be particularly important in light of the likely routing of HS2 through NW Leicestershire.</p> <p>We recommend that the suite of 'environment' policies are re-branded as 'natural environment' policies and that a new section is created for 'historic environment policies'. Built environment policies already appear to be covered by the 'design and development' section and other policy areas.</p> <p>We strongly suggest that a framework of historic environment policies is included in the plan. Without policies relating to the historic environment there is a considerable risk that an Examination Inspector will find the plan unsound.</p> <p>We suggest that a 'strategic' policy and additional lower level policies are included in the plan.</p> <p>We recommend that the policy on 'sites of ecological importance and value' is extended to cover sites, habitats and species and ecosystem services</p> <p>It is recommend that an additional policy is included to protect geological resources. This may be a distinct</p>	<p>The District Council agrees that the local plan needs include policies in relation to heritage. The Regulation 18 document was only a guide to potential topics to be included in the local plan, it is expected that these topics will be expanded; we therefore note your comments in relation to the environment.</p>

Appendix A

			<p>policy or may be combined with biodiversity policies as is commonly the case.</p> <p>An additional policy relating to landscapes is required to ensure that development protects and enhances and responds appropriately to the landscapes context. This should not just relate to protected landscapes such as AONBs. It is distinct from the proposed policy on 'landscaping as part of new development' within the Design and Development section and would complement that policy.</p> <p>It is suggested that provisions are out in place to protect existing green infrastructure and to extend, enhance and connect the green infrastructure network. The policy should recognise that green infrastructure networks extend beyond the local authority boundary and should plan accordingly.</p>	
Natural England		No	<p>Environment policies should also include landscape character, geodiversity and protection of air, water and soil resources. Natural England's key interests and those which we would expect to see addressed through development include biodiversity; geodiversity; landscape character and quality; green infrastructure; climate change; access to the countryside and other open space; the protection and enhancement of soils; and environmental land management.</p> <p>The plan should include a clear strategy for protecting and enhancing the natural environment and landscape, supported by policies, and based on robust and up to date evidence. You may wish to consider how the local plan can reflect the value of the environment to the local</p>	<p>The District Council welcomes Natural England's representation and agrees that the new Local Plan should include policies on landscape character, geodiversity and protection of air, water and soil resources.</p>

		<p>economy, and how it can incorporate the role of the ecosystem services. There are a number of environmental constraints that should be considered when allocating sites for development.</p> <p>Of particular relevance to NWL is the River Mease, it is advised that any development proposals should aim to avoid damage to existing biodiversity features, particularly designated sites, and to create opportunities for enhancing biodiversity through the delivery of Local Biodiversity Action Plan targets.</p> <p>Of particular relevance to North West Leicestershire is the River Mease which is designated as both a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC). North West Leicestershire District Council will need to carry out a screening assessment under the Conservation of Habitats &amp; Species Regulations 2010 (the Habitat Regulations) to assess the impact of the proposed development on the River Mease. We advise that any development proposals should aim to avoid damage to existing biodiversity features, particularly statutorily designated sites, and to create opportunities for enhancing biodiversity through the delivery of Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) targets.</p> <p>Planning policies should take a strategic approach to the conservation, enhancement and restoration of geodiversity, and promote opportunities for the incorporation of geodiversity interest as part of development.</p> <p>Early consideration should be given to the quality of soil resource on potential development sites and therefore</p>	
--	--	---	--

Appendix A

			<p>the Local Plan process provides a useful opportunity to consider soils and to ensure their protection during the plan making process.</p> <p>Where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable, poorer quality land should be used in preference to that of higher quality, except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations.</p>	
NFU East Midlands Region		No	<p>The NFU will be looking to see that the new local plan has policies which positively encourage the above and do not deter them because of, for example, restrictive landscape designations and sustainable transport policies which imply that all development needs to be by a bus stop. There can also be issues about new buildings being sited too close to noisy or smelly farm buildings which cause nuisance to new householders and lead to abatement notices being served on longstanding businesses. We would urge the Council to be especially careful before granting permission to residential development near to bad neighbour uses.</p>	Noted.
Nigel and Andrea White		No	<p>As long term residents of Agar Nook, with respect to the applications off Greenhill Road we are disappointed that they are being considered as this land forms a natural buffer to Coalville.</p> <p>The land in question is essential to maintain the beauty of the area and a crucial habitat for local wildlife/ ecology, especially given the magnitude of quarrying works proposed behind this area</p> <p>Greenhill Road currently suffers from insufficient capacity</p>	<p>As part of the local plan, the District Council may have to allocate sites for development. In order to allocate sites for development, sites will be assessed against several pieces of evidence in order allocate the most sustainable sites.</p>

Appendix A

			<p>for current traffic levels, plus excessive speed, this will only be made much worse by further developments. Essential improvements need to be made to Greenhill Road, plus traffic calming added.</p> <p>With regard to flooding there have been four occasions on Romans Crescent in the last 20 years due to insufficient capacity of sewers. New development will make this situation worse even with SUDs drainage measures being in place.</p> <p>In our view the area has ample housing, available plus granted housing permissions in place, so we ask applications now be discouraged from this area.</p>	
Oxalis		No	<p>The document should include a specific policy relating to the proposed East Midlands Gateway Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SFRI), which is a nationally significant scheme which has the potential to deliver significant private sector investment in the local economy and infrastructure.</p> <p>It is important that the Local Plan strikes a balance in the delivery of development throughout the plan area, taking into consideration the improved access to both Nottingham and Derby to the north of the District and the current employment opportunities at East Midlands Airport and the future employment opportunities by East Midlands Gateway Scheme. Proposals for a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange [SRFI] in North West Leicestershire have been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate as an application for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>The East Midlands Gateway proposal should be</p>	<p>The District Council welcomes the Oxalis representation and acknowledges that the local plan will need to make a reference to the planned SFRI and the impact this will have on the local economy.</p>

		<p>embraced by the new Local Plan in a similar way to that taken in the earlier submitted Core Strategy. The scheme represents significant proposed private sector investment in the local economy and infrastructure. It would be a nationally significant development which would directly support inward investment and wider economic activity in the Three Cities area of the East Midlands.</p> <p>There is evidence to suggest that North West Leicestershire has seen a strong and rapid growth in office based employment over recent years. As most methodologies for forecasting start from a position of reflecting past trends, the forecast is for further, similar growth into the future. The PACEC report forecasts a demand of 31,900 sqm of office space between 2010 and 2031 and equally emphasises the importance of a flexible supply of employment sites.</p> <p>Kegworth has previously been identified as a 'Rural Centre' and, as such, of being capable of accommodating some growth. This will benefit the community by meeting local need and ensuring that the facilities, enjoyed by local residents currently, remain viable.</p> <p>The SHMA indicates that the housing delivery requirement for the District in the Plan Period [2011 – 2031] will be between 5,700 and 7,000 dwellings. Due to the numbers being lower than the Core Strategy requirement, it is important to recognise that these results could be an anomaly following the recent recession which has resulted in the level of net inward migration to the area. Therefore, any current forecast of reductions in demand for housing may simply reflect short term trends and the new Local Plan must ensure</p>	
--	--	--	--

Appendix A

		<p>that the District is prepared to accommodate a likely increase in dwelling requirements as the economy continues to recover.</p> <p>Even though there is merit placing larger levels growth around Coalville, a more even distribution should be considered having regard to the recent transport infrastructure to the north of the District. Recent infrastructure developments have improved links to both Nottingham and Derby, this should have considerable benefits to residents in the northern area of the District especially Kegworth.</p> <p>Employment opportunities both now and in the future should also be a consideration when assessing where new residential development should take place.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates sites for development across the Plan area. However, the allocation of sites for housing needs to not only relate to the qualitative contribution to the housing requirement aspects of the District's need. It also needs to consider the qualitative aspects of not only the scheme itself but also the benefits which that scheme can bring to the wider community through, for example, the delivery of otherwise absent infrastructure and facilities.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Appendix A

Palmer, S	LP13111	No	<p>Any building on class 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land in line with the statements contained in the NPPF. With an emphasis on firstly utilising brown field sites, which we have plenty of.</p> <p>Protection for village identities and the removal of development sites which cause coalescence.</p> <p>The sale of disused council land at low prices to allow affordable homes to be built.</p> <p>The development of infrastructure first before development.</p> <p>Allowing significant development in rural villages to ensure they have a future. Without some development we will continue to see schools, pubs and community facilities lost.</p>	<p>National Planning Policy supports the use of brownfield sites before the development of Greenfield sites. The latest Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment identifies a small number of brownfield sites. The new Local Plan will need to set out a policy on affordable housing for the Borough. Rural areas are currently assessed to see how sustainable they are to ensure that they have enough local services and facilities to support new development.</p>
Parry, Bruce	LP14190	Yes		
Pymm, Gareth	LP15009	No	<p>Areas where no development should be permitted, i.e. green field and Charnwood forest. Need for new houses to be of forward thinking, contemporary, green design and built to high standard. Need to improve cycle infrastructure and consider impact of new developments on existing residents and road users.</p>	Noted.
RES UK		No	<p>It is suggested that the Council include a specific Policy to support the delivery of stand-alone renewable and low carbon energy developments.</p>	<p>The District Council agree that a policy will be required for the delivery of renewable energy and low carbon technologies.</p>
Richborough Estates		No	<p>Fisher German LLP has been instructed by Richborough Estates Ltd to submit a representation to the North West Leicestershire Local Plan consultation.</p> <p>The representation focuses on the settlement of Ashby</p>	

		<p>de la Zouch and planning application reference 14/00578/OUTM which is an outline application for up to 275 dwellings on land off Burton Road and Moira Road. The strategic policies possible contents are supported, with the provision of a settlement hierarchy which in turn should see development directed to the Districts main towns, such as Ashby and Coalville.</p> <p>The amount of housing for delivery is crucial in the plan making process and the established housing requirements will need to be a robust figure across the plan period. The SHMA figures put forward by the Council are currently being questioned by a number of developers given the low figures advanced in comparison to the RSS figures despite growing housing need.</p> <p>Once those figures are established it is important to include housing policies which identify sites for housing development. Those sites should be considered on the basis of sustainable locations in areas of directed growth e.g. larger settlements for larger sites which can be assimilated in to the neighbourhood. Affordable housing policies should also be included including the required percentage and threshold values, will flexibility built into the policy for cases where viability of a scheme would be compromised. Other contents such as design and development are also supported to ensure high quality schemes with a high standard of amenity are created.</p> <p>Place-based policies are also supported for inclusion with the plan with focus on Coalville, Ashby and Castle Donington which should include sites identified for new housing as suggested.</p> <p>The representation seeks to the highlight the Ashby site subject to the planning application should be identified for residential use within the plan, due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current shortage of land for housing in the District</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

Appendix A

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution of affordable housing</li> <li>• Creation of a high quality sustainable development</li> <li>• Negligible impact on the natural environment</li> <li>• Offers a logical extension to Ashby de la Zouch</li> </ul> <p>Further details have been submitted in relation to the site</p>	
Sport England	LP13608	No	The Local plan should have an overall vision to support the health and well being of the community through sport and active recreation. Playing fields and sports facilities should be protected in accordance with paragraph 73 and 74 of NPPF with relevant policies. In this regard Robust and up to date evidence should be available to aid the positive planning of the area with regard to sports facilities and playing fields.	The local plan will have to make reference to the enhancement of existing and the delivery of new sports facilities and playing fields through development. As part for the local plan the existing protected open spaces will need to be reviewed.
Surrey, Jennifer	LP12716	Yes		

Appendix A

Talbot, Neill	LP15026	No	<p>There needs to be more detail on environmental policies, particularly those relating to nature conservation. Given the stated aim of building several thousand new houses, there will need to be strong policies on environmental protection. In particular, we would want to see policies that protect:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Designated sites such as SSSIs and SPAs + Ancient woodlands.</li> <li>2. Local Wildlife Sites [LWS] including candidate/potential LWS and RIGS.</li> <li>3. Charnwood Forest.</li> <li>4. The National Forest.</li> <li>5. Habitat networks including the Soar Valley and other river corridors.</li> <li>6. Other species-rich habitats such as ancient hedgerows, mature trees and wetlands</li> <li>7. Protected species including bats, great crested newts, water voles and others</li> </ol> <p>Up to date habitat surveys (Phase 1) of the whole of NWL are required, with more detailed surveys of some areas that provide good wildlife habitats - the last phase 1 survey was undertaken in 2007 as far as we are aware. Adaptation to climate change/eco-system services need to be fully integrated into policy e.g. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS); creation of wetland areas; green roofs etc. The need for Green spaces in towns to be managed more sympathetically for wildlife, and areas linked together better.</p>	<p>The District Council agrees that the local plan needs include policies in relation to the environment. The Regulation 18 document was only a guide to potential topics to be included in the local plan, it is expected that these topics will be expanded.</p>
Taylor, Tony	LP13007	Yes		

Appendix A

<p>Tebbatt, Jane</p>	<p>LP15060</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>There needs to be a focus on policy and strategy to create sustainable communities and not simply piecemeal development. New development should have adequate transportation and other key amenities in place prior to granting development particularly surface water drainage etc.</p> <p>There needs to be a policy to enforce/encourage sustainable design and renewable energy built into any and all new development i.e. photovoltaic's.</p> <p>Adequate policy protection of open spaces and particularly attractive countryside, through policies which cannot be quickly withdrawn.</p> <p>Modern and innovative design implemented in new buildings.</p> <p>Protection of town centres, by allowing healthy competition for consumers.</p> <p>Adequate sustainable methods of transport policies to enable cycle paths and the reinstallation of the tram/ rail link to neighbouring town locations /away from London and create more traffic on the roads.</p> <p>A better approach to stakeholder engagement is needed, with better methods to submit comments. Many residents feel intimidated by the planning system and do not know how best to communicate their objections support for planning situations.</p> <p>Policies which will limit/restrict the politics of the "elected" planning committee influencing development in certain, less politically favourable locations and the use of party politics to control planning decisions. Planning Committee members must provide better justification -</p>	<p>The Local Plan will cover a 15 year period to 2031, the purpose of the local plan is to allocate site for development for this time period. The District Council agree that there will need to be a policy on renewable energy and good quality design.</p>
--------------------------	----------------	-----------	---	--

Appendix A

		<p>open to challenge - where planning officer recommendation is overruled, to avoid political agendas developing and party whips forming. A Planning Committee which does not comprise too many members who work/ make profit from development. This will remove the perception of "bias"/influence in favour of development when reviewing controversial planning applications.</p> <p>Better protection of land of particular attractive countries - e.g. maintain the current limit of development for the Greenhill Road area. These are the last few fields, have significant importance to the local area and provide a link to the wildlife at the top, and over, the hills. Remember - the topography of this area means not all open space is readily accessible to all.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Appendix A

<p>The Coal Authority</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>The emerging Local Plan needs to address the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion on the Policies Map of the adopted Leicestershire Mineral Safeguarding Areas, and where relevant Mineral Consultation Areas, for surface coal resources as defined in the Leicestershire Minerals Plan;</li> <li>• Appropriate development management policies for the Mineral Safeguarding Areas to ensure that mineral resources are not needlessly sterilised – these should include criteria to encourage the prior/pre-extraction of surface coal resources where it is necessary for non-minerals development to take place within safeguarded areas; and</li> <li>• Ensuring that areas and sites identified/allocated for non-minerals development take account of the presence of surface coal resources in the site assessment methodology process and do not unnecessarily conflict with or sterilise safeguarded areas.</li> <li>• The inclusion of suitable policies to ensure that all development proposals within coalfield areas take adequate account of any coal mining-related land stability or other public safety risks and, where necessary, incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address them;</li> <li>• The identification, where appropriate, of areas that are particularly likely to be subject to land stability and other public safety hazards resulting</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p>
---------------------------	--	-----------	--	---------------

Appendix A

			<p>from former coal mining activities; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ensuring that areas and sites identified/allocated for development take account of the presence of mining legacy and other unstable land issues in the site assessment methodology process</li></ul>	
--	--	--	---	--

Appendix A

<p>The National Forest Company</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>The drafting of a new Local Plan is an opportunity for The National Forest to be fully integrated into the document to ensure that new development aids the creation of The National Forest but also benefits from being sited within the Forest. More of the Forest is within North West Leicestershire than any other District which provides justification for strong references to the Forest throughout the document and an expectation that the impact of the development on the Forest and the impact of the Forest on development will be addressed through the plan. The NFC were pleased with the references to The National Forest within the withdrawn Local Plan and the wording of the proposed National Forest Policy. This will need to be updated in the emerging plan to reflect our new Strategy and changes in national policy but the withdrawn policy will provide a good starting point. A specific National Forest policy should be retained and the District's strong emphasis on urban design should be continued. Consideration should be given to an overarching green infrastructure policy which aims to connect habitats across the District. Connectivity and enhancement of Public Rights of Way, especially around the Heart of the Forest area, may warrant a specific reference within the Plan with an expectation for new developments to contribute to enhancements. This would add Policy support to discussions that have taken place on a number of proposed schemes across the Heart of the Forest recently.</p>	<p>The District Council agrees that it is important for the local plan to have a strong reference to the National Forest. The Local Plan subject to the viability of development will encourage the enhancement of the National Forest.</p>
<p>TNT Ltd</p>	<p>LP13785</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The primary purpose of this submission is to request that the area hatched red on the attached plan (east of the A42 at Newbold/Lount) be identified as an extension to the existing employment site, in order to provide for the</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Appendix A

			future growth of the business.	
Waltho, Chris	LP14350	No	I do agree with the proposed content of the Local Plan. I am concerned, however, that the Council must include a strategy for the provision of affordable homes as the NPPF and NPPG, coupled with the Government's Growth and Infrastructure legislation, have seriously undermined any realistic prospect of meeting the Authority's Affordable Housing SPD targets. It is important to look very closely at the sustainability of housing developments, not just in this respect but also in connection with job opportunities in the District. What strategies will there be for exploiting the National Forest Line, the Ashby Canal and HS2 during the plan period and beyond? Finally, we must not lose sight of the importance of all statutory designations and the need to protect our natural and historic environment. Robust policies must be put in place to protect all Conservation Areas as well as nationally recognised reserves such as Charnwood Forest.	As part of the preparation of the new Local Plan, it will be important to review the delivery of affordable housing based on the most up to date evidence. The District Council agree that there will need to be specific heritage policies included within the local plan.
Whitehouse, Scott	LP12087	No	Major infrastructure upgrades... Roads and junctions to improve traffic flow through NWL	The new local plan will review infrastructure provision within the District.
Whitwick Action group		No	Whitwick Action Group would like to support the policy that retains the land currently being saved by policy E20 Green Wedge. The policy has recently been tested at appeal and later through the High Court. We ask that the Green Wedge should be protected and enhanced by a robust policy within the Local Plan.	Noted.

Appendix A

Whitwick Parish Council		No	<p>Whitwick Parish Council has resolved that in this Council's opinion, the contents of the Local Plan should include specific reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under seeking developer contributions, that parish councils should be fully consulted at the earliest opportunity regarding which local needs should be prioritised for benefit.</li> <li>• Under Environment Policies, the need to protect areas of countryside in addition to sites of ecological importance and value</li> <li>• Under Housing Policies, the need for housing mix on new developments to include adequate provision of both affordable and market properties for the needs of the ageing population.</li> <li>• Under economic policies, the need for the protection of services and facilities to include assets of community value.</li> </ul>	Noted.
Wilson Bowden Developments Limited		No	<p>Wilson Bowden considers that the forthcoming new Local Plan should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A pro- growth employment land requirement supported by a robust evidence base. This would be a minimum figure over the plan period.</li> <li>• An economic policy which not only includes that requirement but promotes and support</li> </ul>	The District Council agrees that local plan includes a policy that promotes and supports economic development.

Appendix A

			<p>employment development. It is vital that this policy provides for a flexible approach to employment development. This approach will include allowing non-allocated sites to be developed if a particular occupier is needed. It is important that the employment figure is a minimum figure again to provide flexibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify land to be allocated for employment development. These allocated sites should be included in a specific policy, which would either be a single policy with all allocations or individual place-based policies as part of a wider suite of policies for each settlement.</li> <li>• One of these employment allocations should be Wilson Bowdens Sawley Crossroads site at Castle Donington; it should be allocated for B1, B2 and B8.</li> </ul>	
Wright, Alison	LP12181	Yes	<p>As I live in a village with no bus service then it is important to either</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 .Include a provision to ensure that public transport is available</li> <li>2 .Limit the number of houses being built in the village</li> </ol>	Noted.
Yarwood , A	LP15013	No	<p>The plan needs to include criteria to assess planning applications for Gypsy sites as well as possible sites for allocation. This is a requirement of national policy as set out in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites</p>	Noted, a separate site allocations document will also be prepared for Gypsy, Travellers and Show People.

Appendix A

	LP12563	No	Conservation and heritage are missing	The District Council agrees that these topics will need to be included within the Local Plan.
	LP11908	Yes		
	LP11807	No	Need to take account of the huge amount of 'uncontrolled' development that has taken place since the last plan ran out. We are not starting from zero here since the last local plan was rejected. The quantity of development sites allocated should consider what has happened during the period when no plan was in force. Ashby in particular is creaking at the seams. No school places, overstretched health facilities and roads that cannot cope with the current volumes of traffic. The allocation for the next 15/20 years has already been used up. Residents are fed up.	The sites that already have planning permission or that have been developed since 2011 will be top sliced off the housing requirement for the District. The Local Plan may still have to make allocations for further housing requirements to meet the Districts housing needs. As part of allocating sites for development existing school and highway capacity will be assessed.
		No	<p>The Plan does not respond to the recently published national community energy strategy or NPPF paragraph 97 to support community-led initiatives for renewable and low carbon energy. A letter issued by DCLG to all local authorities dated 27 January 2014 highlighted the importance of local plans in supporting community energy with recommendations for work to develop and implement community energy which could form part of the Local Plan process including:</p> <p>Developing and implementing a community energy strategy at the local level and identifying strategic sites for community energy as part of Local and Neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>We request that the Local Plan better considers this and</p>	The District Council recognises the importance of including a standalone renewable energy and low carbon technology policy.

Appendix A

			opportunities and support for community energy is reflected within the Local Plans evidence base and policies.	
	LP13502	No	So far as Castle Donington is concerned, there should be some policy about parking in the village. Parking is already quite difficult and, with so many houses being built beyond easy walking distance, extra space must be found - or the centre of the village will not attract the custom needed to preserve it as an active part of village life.	Noted.
	LP13174	No	<p>The published possible policy is so high level as to be more or less meaningless. Weasel words.</p> <p>What I particularly would like to see is a little more proactive approach to the problem of rural transport - villages like Appleby Magna are slowly being cut off, and as the population ages this is becoming an increasing problem. Appleby Magna is also about to have a quite significant population growth due to new housing, more stress for an already underwhelming transport system. What is the Local Plan for rural transport (HS2 and the Ashby canal are of zero benefit to the transport problems around Appleby?)</p>	The Local Plan will review highway capacity issues as part of new development.

Appendix A

	LP14696	Yes	Not sure how overarching plans will be linked together but biggest concern is the impact on housing growth on town infrastructure. For example, there have been a number of housing developments approved around Ashby and at planning stages but little new investment seen in town facilities, e.g. roads, schools, traffic congestion, car parking. Some provision has been made for extra primary school but none as yet for secondary places. Ashby cannot keep building additional housing without investment in other facilities to support the new and current population.	As part of the preparation of the local plan, when allocating development sites there will be a review of the capacity of the existing infrastructure and infrastructure requirements to support further growth.
	LP14677	Yes		
	LP15090	No	Effect of traffic in planning for rural areas	Noted.
	LP11433	No	<p>The Plan does not respond to the recently published national community energy strategy or NPPF paragraph 97 to support community-led initiatives for renewable and low carbon energy. A letter issued by DCLG to all local authorities dated 27 January 2014 highlighted the importance of local plans in supporting community energy with recommendations for work to develop and implement community energy which could form part of the Local Plan process including:</p> <p>Developing and implementing a community energy strategy at the local level and identifying strategic sites for community energy as part of Local and Neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>We request that the Local Plan better considers this and opportunities and support for community energy is reflected within the Local Plans evidence base and</p>	The District Council recognises the importance of including a standalone renewable energy and low carbon technology policy.

Appendix A

			policies.	
--	--	--	-----------	--



**APPENDIX A**

<b>Representor</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
	Ravenstone	Suggests a western extension to the Draft Limits to Development to allow for development through to the end of the Plan period	The proposed revision would represent a large western extension to the built-up area of Ravenstone and the inclusion of large areas of countryside contrary to the Limits to Development methodology. Development in this area may be considered if there is a need to allocate more housing development sites in Ravenstone. However, it should be noted that landowners/developers have not actively promoted the development of this area through the North West Leicestershire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.	No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development
Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society	Ashby de la Zouch	Wants to see town centre open space protected.	The purpose of defining Limits to Development is to contain development within broad settlement/built up areas. The issues outlined above represent other possible policy areas which might be included in the Local Plan and/or Neighbourhood Plans and for which different methodologies would be required. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to include these as part of the methodology for Limits to Development.	No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development
Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society	Ashby de la Zouch	Money Hill area to be included if identified in the Local Plan as an area for development.	Development boundaries include peripheral sites where there is an extant planning permission for residential or employment	The need for the Local Plan to allocate Money Hill, Ashby de la Zouch as a residential/ employment site be considered. If the site is allocated as

<b>Representor</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
			development. This is not the case with Money Hill but this will be kept under review.	part of the Local Plan, the Limits to Development will need to be adjusted accordingly.
	Measham	Identifies the need for infrastructure improvements to cope with population growth.	Infrastructure providers will be consulted as part of the process of preparing the new Local Plan, as to ensure that the need for new infrastructure is identified.	No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development
Heather Parish Council	Heather	Reconsider Draft Limits to Development to allow for development between St Johns Football Club And 9 Ravenstone Road	Planning permission has been granted on this site.	Revise Heather Draft Limits to Development to include land between St Johns Football Club And 9 Ravenstone Road. Please see the amended plan 1 within Appendix A
Heather Parish Council	Heather	Need to consider the proposed Re-development of existing site to provide 14 residential units at MTS Logistics, Mill Lane, Heather	This site is currently the subject of planning application ref: 14/00396/FULM and has yet to be determined. Even if the site is granted planning permission, the site is isolated and clearly detached from the principal built-up area and so in accordance with the Limits to Development methodology should be excluded from within the boundary.	No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development.
Measham Parish Council	Measham	Planning decisions are not made adhering to the current local plan so how can we be sure future planning decisions will be. We know there are already developments underway that are outside these limits. Take into consideration existing planning applications.	The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. So, while the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing sites, Limits to Development	No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development.

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		<p>The current application being considered for Atherstone Road contravenes the existing Local Plan. It is requested that Local Plan policy M2 is retained and applied to this whole site.</p>	<p>have to be considered as not being up-to-date. In view of this, an increasing amount of development, particularly housing, has been granted beyond Limits to Development. This is partly the reason for reviewing Limits to Development as part of the preparation of the new Local Plan. Current planning applications have not been included within the draft revised Limits to Development and will only be included if they are approved. The draft Limits to Development may need to be reviewed, to include any further planning permissions before the Local Plan is submitted to the Secretary of State for examination.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the brickworks site is a separate matter from the Limits to Development and will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>	
Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society	Ashby de la Zouch	<p>Limits to Development should take into account approved planning applications and protect Protected open space. Proposed allocations. The Limits to Development currently proposed bear no relationship to limits</p>	<p>Development boundaries include peripheral sites where there is an extant planning permission for residential or employment development.</p> <p>The purpose of defining Limits to</p>	<p>Revise Ashby de la Zouch Draft Limits to Development include land between Buton Road and Moira Road, Shellbrook. Please see the revised amended plan 2 for Ashby de la Zouch within Appendix A.</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		<p>that will form part of the final local plan. It is therefore pointless consulting on maps that will bear no relationship to the final plan.</p> <p>Burton Road part 2 should be included as approved application.</p>	<p>Development is to contain development within broad settlement/built up areas. The issues relating to open spaces outlined in the Civic Societies comments are other possible policy areas which might be included in the Local Plan and/or Neighbourhood Plans and for which different methodologies would be required. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to include these as part of the methodology for Limits to Development.</p> <p>The development of up to 275 dwellings on land between Buton Road and Moira Road Shellbrook Ashby De La Zouch, has been permitted (14/00578/OUTM) subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement and should be included within the Limits to Development.</p>	
David Bigby	Ashby de la Zouch	<p>They include the buffer between the new Leicester Road Housing and the Coalfield Way Business Park which should NOT be designated for development.</p> <p>Also they include various school playing fields on the edges of Ashby which should be excluded. Namely, Ashby School, Willesley School and Woodcote School</p>	<p>The Limits to Development do not identify sites for development but only areas which cannot be considered as countryside. The methodology excludes playing fields and other open spaces where these are on the periphery of the built area and not well related to the settlement. The inclusion of playing fields and other open spaces within the LTD does not mean that such sites are</p>	

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		<p>Also I would prefer a distinction to be drawn between areas designated for housing development and areas designated for commercial, industrial and business development. It is important that the business parks on the outskirts of Ashby are not developed for housing. E.g. Smisby Road (Tournament Field) and Dents Road.</p>	<p>automatically suitable for development. Other policies in the Local Plan will need to consider these issues.</p>	
Chris Smith	Ashby de la Zouch	<p>The criteria seem to be land that is either developed or has approval for development. It is not clear why there needs to be a consultation on the current status of development as this is a matter of fact rather than opinion or views on development. Surely the criteria should be about the limits of development that will meet the Local Plan objectives. The proposal may be that but it doesn't say so.</p> <p>I would argue that the area between the Royal Hotel and Castle is not an area of development or development potential. Any development in Ashby should be confined to outside of this area.</p>	<p>If there is a need for the settlement to accommodate housing or employment growth this will be done by the allocation of development sites within, or most likely, adjoining Limits to Development.</p> <p>The area of land between the Royal Hotel and the Castle represents another policy area which might be included in the Local Plan and/or Neighbourhood Plans and for which different methodologies would be required. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to include these as part of the methodology for the Limits to Development.</p>	<p>No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development.</p>
Packington Nook	Ashby de la Zouch	<p>We very much agree with the proposal to route the southern limit of</p>	<p>The council is under obligation to discuss proposals with potential</p>	<p>No revisions to the proposed Limits to</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
Residents Association		<p>development to exclude the site known as Packington Nook. In this case, we would want the Council not only to adopt this boundary as a long term policy but also to ensure that officers are clearly instructed not to "coach" planning applications that would lie outside the boundary.</p> <p>We are concerned that there are no boundaries within the outer limits that would protect green spaces, specifically:</p> <p>public parks, including Bath Grounds, Western Park;</p> <p>school and recreational playing fields;</p> <p>the undeveloped areas around Ashby Castle ancient monument;</p> <p>allotments</p>	<p>applicants even if the proposal is contrary to the Councils policies.</p> <p>In response to protecting green spaces, these are other possible policy areas which might be included in the Local Plan and /or Neighbourhood Plans and for which different methodologies would be required. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to include these as part of the methodology for Limits to Development.</p>	Development.
Thomas Taylor Planning Ltd	Moira	<p>An area of land between Moira Primary School and Driftside was previously within Limits to Development on the Proposals Map of the adopted Local Plan. This site had previously had the benefit of an unimplemented planning permission which was allowed on appeal in 2002. In 2014 it was resolved to grant outline permission for up to 18 dwellings on this land subject to the prior completion of a S106 Agreement. This is the current position and therefore it would seem logical to place this land within the proposed limits to</p>	<p>The erection of up to 18 dwellings (Outline - 14/00175/OUTM) on land South of Drift Farm, Blackfordby Lane Moira is to be permitted subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement. There is also outline planning permission for (13/00951/OUT) for a dwelling north of Drift House.</p>	<p>Revise Moira Draft Limits to Development to include land with planning consent at Drift Farm, Blackfordby Lane. Please see the amended plan 3 within Appendix A</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
Castle Donington Parish Council	Castle Donington	<p>development.</p> <p>The proposed Limits of development as per the plan document are acceptable. However, the Parish Council feels strongly that the Area of Separation between Castle Donington and Hemington cum Lockington should be retained, including up to the A150 corridor.</p>	Comments noted.	No revisions to the proposed limits to development.
Nicola Bullivant-Parrish	Donisthorpe	<p>These seem to be exclusive of other important factors, one of which I consider to be traffic and associated road safety. The infrastructure of the village is such that it is already under strain at times from large and heavy goods vehicles. Should extra housing be built, then it is hard to see how this extra traffic is going to be dealt with. Secondly, the EYFS at the village primary school now has 30 children in it and inconceivable as to how more children could possibly be accommodated within the school and its facilities.</p>	<p>Sustainable settlements should allow for some rural housing development to help retain local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Although the North West Leicestershire Core Strategy was subsequently withdrawn, its approach to identifying sustainable rural communities received little or no objection. In it, Sustainable Villages were identified as those places which contained at least five community services and facilities. Donisthorpe has a primary school, shop, Post Office, Public house, Recreation Ground, community Hall and Place of Worship. The inclusion of any site within the Limits to Development does not automatically mean that proposed development would be approved. It will also be necessary to consider other matters such as the impact upon the</p>	

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
			<p>highway network, impact upon the amenity of adjoining properties and the wider area as well as the impact upon infrastructure.</p>	
<p>Thomas Taylor Planning Ltd</p>	<p>Breedon</p>	<p>Broadly yes although it would be helpful if LtD could also be identified around smaller settlements and groups of buildings to help clarify their visual and functional relationship with their surroundings and to help to distinguish (with some degree of certainty) where built development ends and the surrounding countryside begins. There remains some potential for accommodating small-scale development within these locations (eg leisure, tourism and employment - as well as housing) and the identification of LtD in these locations (including groups of buildings separated from, but close to, the edges of larger settlements) will provide additional policy guidance to help protect the wider countryside from unrestricted sprawl without fundamentally harming the Council's focus on directing the majority of development to the sustainable settlements identified elsewhere. The "hierarchy" implied by the current list of "sustainable" settlements need not be affected by this and could be distinguished through</p>	<p>Smaller settlements with no or very limited services and facilities are not sustainable locations for development. While there will be no blanket restriction on all housing development in these places, opportunities will be more limited. As a consequence, there will be no need to identify Sustainable Settlement Boundaries for settlements with no or limited services and facilities. The Limits to Development Policy will need to be read in conjunction with the Countryside policy which will allow for some appropriate development, which could include leisure and tourism.</p> <p>Breedon Priory is a garden centre that has diversified into a range of uses including craft shops, cafe etc. The buildings and their surroundings still have an agricultural appearance and retain a relationship with the surrounding open area. The site is quite different in character and use to the adjoining homes and business around The Green and the housing along the east side of Ashby Road.</p> <p>The site has a well landscaped frontage</p>	<p>No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		<p>appropriately worded planning policies.</p> <p>The LtD should be extended at the western edge of Breedon to include the land within and surrounding Breedon Priory Nurseries. There is an extensive area of buildings and parking/delivery areas associated with the existing uses there. They form a clearly definable part of the settlement and are both visually and functionally well-related to the settlement being close to the village green and the centre of the village. A small area of land to the rear of the pub car park between the Nurseries and properties on Melbourne Lane should also be included as it is also visually well-related to the nurseries and enclosed by mature hedges.</p>	<p>to Ashby Road so that when entering the village from the south, the site appears to be a continuous part of the countryside. Agricultural buildings and nurseries will only be included within the Limits to Development where they relate well to the existing settlement.</p>	
Thomas Taylor Planning Ltd	Diseworth	<p>The LtD should be extended at the eastern edge of Diseworth to the rear of properties on Grimes Gate and Clements Gate to include a small area of land which adjoins the northern boundary of the Bull &amp; Swan car park. The car park (which is included within LtD) together with this adjoining land are well-related to each other visually and are within the same ownership. They form a single parcel of land and are separated from adjoining countryside to the east by a strong,</p>	<p>The small area of land adjoining the northern boundary of the Bull &amp; Swan car park in Diseworth appears to be largely scrubland associated with existing properties on Grimes Gate. Even if it were developed, the inclusion of this small parcel of land within the Limits to Development would not have the effect of extending the built-up area of the village into the open countryside.</p>	<p>The Diseworth Draft Limits to Development should be extended at the eastern edge of Diseworth to the rear of properties on Grimes Gate and Clements Gate to include a small area of land which adjoins the northern boundary of the Bull &amp; Swan car park. Please see the amended plan 4 within Appendix A.</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		defensible mature hedge along their eastern boundary. This parcel of land is well-related to the structure and pattern of development within the settlement rather than forming part of the surrounding countryside.		
Thomas Taylor Planning Ltd		In this respect, Newton Burgoland should be included within the list of settlements with a LtD boundary drawn around it. The village benefits from a primary school, general stores, an outreach post office (Tues/Weds), a Pub/Restaurant and a Church as well as employment opportunities in nearby farming enterprises. These facilities support a range of nearby settlements and recognition with a LtD line would provide an opportunity to further sustain these services and facilities.	Few services exist within Newton Burgoland. Residents are relatively isolated from shops, significant employment opportunities, medical services and cultural/recreational facilities. The bus service through the village is less than hourly and does not extend into the evening or Sundays, the last bus, on the current timetable, being at 17:56. Consequently, the accessibility to a range of local services for residents of any proposed new housing would be limited.	No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development.
Thomas Taylor Planning Ltd	Heather	The LtD should be extended at the western side of Heather to include the land and buildings known as "Dawson's Yard". Heather is considered to be a sustainable settlement and there have been a number of residential developments permitted there in recent years. Dawson's Yard represents an extensive range of buildings on the edge of the settlement which are clearly not part of the surrounding, undeveloped countryside. Although on	Dawson's Yard is clearly detached from the principal built-up area of Heather and should be excluded from within the boundary.	No revisions to the proposed limits to development

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		<p>the edge of the settlement, they are well-related to it and the pattern of development that extends along Sweystone Road.</p>		
Thomas W Redfern	Packington	<p>The proposed limits to development in Packington do not fully take into account the areas of development potential.</p> <p>The open paddock land at the rear of 53 Normanton Road, Packington has been excluded from the proposed limits to development notwithstanding that the planning permission (14/00109/OUT) recently granted for 4 dwellings on the land will be issued when the S. 106 Agreement has been executed (see submitted application plan ref. 4955/1). The limits should at least be reinstated to include the application site as in the currently adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan and further extended to include the paddock land between this site and the chicken farm to the north-east, edged in blue on the submitted application plan as land which has potential for and is available for development.</p>	<p>Planning permission for the erection of up to four dwellings on land at rear Of 53 Normanton Road, Packington is to be permitted subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement (14/00109/OUT).</p>	<p>Revise Packington Draft Limits to Development include land at rear of 53 Normanton Road. Please see the amended plan 5 within Appendix A.</p>
Willesley Residents	Ashby de la Zouch	<p>If it is necessary to change the limits to development for Ashby to accommodate additional development then this should be on the north side of the town between the existing</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development.</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		<p>development and the A511 Ashby Bypass. Development in this area would be more sustainable and have better access to the main road network. The undeveloped land to the South side of Ashby between the A42 and the Leicester to Burton mineral railway line , and in particular the land between the railway line and Willesley Lane has a high landscape and amenity value and is an important gateway into the National Forest Open Access areas.</p>		
<p>Ibstock Parish Council</p>	<p>Ibstock</p>	<p>Following the recent draft limits to development for Ibstock, the Parish council were very happy at the tight boundary that has been proposed on this document.</p> <p>As a Parish we have been subject to a huge increase in housing over the past couple of years, and this has lead to our services being pushed to its limits.</p> <p>The roads cannot cope, especially at peak times, often large queues, and large volumes of traffic. Parking is a major problem, alone with the other stretched services like schools, doctors etc.</p> <p>Our only observation is the allotment gardens on Station Road, we would like</p>	<p>The inclusion of any site within the Limits to Development does not automatically mean that proposed development would be approved. It will also be necessary to consider other matters such as the impact upon the highway network, impact upon the amenity of adjoining properties and the wider area as well as the impact upon infrastructure.</p> <p>Generally, peripheral playing fields, environmental space, allotments and community gardens should not be included within the boundary.</p>	<p>Revise Ibstock Draft Limits to Development to exclude the allotments on Station Road. Please see the revised amended plan 6 within Appendix A.</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		to see them excluded from the plan, as being allotments, they should not be under consideration for development?		
Kegworth Parish Council	Kegworth	<p>There is very little land left within the limits to development for Kegworth to grow. The Parish Council is mindful of the fact that Kegworth is a “restrained village” due to the flight path of the East Midlands Airport and the possibility of flooding from the River Soar. However, Councillors did wonder whether it would be possible to include the area of land along Derby Road and towards J24 of the M1 within the limits to development, an area about which there is at present a planning application pending from the land owner. The Parish Council is concerned that there is very little land in and around Kegworth that could be used for sport and recreation purposes and, within this planning application numbered 14/00541 for 150 houses, there is the provision for sports and recreational areas which would be laid out by the applicant and be able to be used by residents of Kegworth. For this application to be challenged because it is not within the limits to development would not be helpful.</p>	<p>The Planning application has not been included as the draft Limits to Development as it is yet to be determined. If the application is approved then this will be taken into consideration as part of the Limits to Development as part of the final plan.</p>	<p>No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development. At this time but that the Limits to Development will be adjusted in the event of planning permission being granted for the development referred to.</p>



**Ashby de la Zouch**

Respondent	Packington Nook Residents Association
Which draft Town Centre Boundary does your response relate to?	Ashby de la Zouch
Is the method used to define the draft town centre boundary correct?	Yes
Are the draft town centre boundaries drawn in accordance with the methodology	Yes
Are there any area of the town centre boundary that should be changed?	No
Council's Response	Support for methodology and draft boundary noted. No further comments to make.

Respondent	Chris Smith
Which draft Town Centre Boundary does your response relate to?	Ashby de la Zouch
Is the method used to define the draft town centre boundary correct?	Yes. The document does not define the method used nor does it detail main town centre type uses. Therefore the defined town centre maybe considered reasonable but it is not possible to assess whether the method has been used. The implications of different boundaries have not been made clear and it is not possible to make an informed decision.
Are the draft town centre boundaries drawn in accordance with the methodology	No. It is not clear why the Health Centre has been included but the Leisure Centre has been excluded.
Are there any areas of the town centre boundary that should be changed?	Yes. The document seems to be defining the existing position and not also assessing where retail development should be considered in the future. This would depend on expectation of need over the Local Plan period and this issue has not been addressed in the consultation documents.
Council's response	<p>Further information on methodology and main town centre uses was provided as a 'Frequently Asked Questions' leaflet accompanying the consultation. However for clarification a more detailed overview of the methodology used in the work so far has been provided within the main report.</p> <p>Further work is to be undertaken to assist in the preparation of our retail strategy as part of the Local Plan, this will include policy formulation to accompany the town centre review, and there will be further opportunity to make representation on the suggested</p>

	<p>approach as part of the Local Plan consultation.</p> <p>The revised town centre boundaries are based on existing uses within Ashby de la Zouch and how they are dispersed throughout the centre. Further work will include the assessment of whether there is a need for additional/future retail floorspace (comparison and convenience) in the district and its town and village centres.</p> <p>The library is within the currently defined town centre boundary and the leisure centre is not. The library is read within the context of North Street and is within close proximity to the main area where retail uses are located within Ashby including the 'mews/courtyard' style development that join onto Market Street. However the Leisure Centre is somewhat more detached from this area with less strong links to Market Street. It is therefore not suggested it be included within the town centre boundary.</p>
--	--

Respondent	Ashby Civic Society
Which draft Town Centre Boundary does your response relate to?	Ashby de la Zouch
Is the method used to define the draft town centre boundary correct?	Not answered
Are the draft town centre boundaries drawn in accordance with the methodology	Yes
Are there any area of the town centre boundary that should be changed?	<p>Yes. The retail development of North Street is ok.</p> <p>However the Town Centre boundary is too constrained particularly in light of the planned 35% growth of the town. This will lead to high rents and loss of vitality. Agree that South Street should be protected as residential areas around town hall. Area around Union Passage and Rushton Yard need to be reviewed further.</p>
Council's Response	<p>The revised town centre boundaries are based on existing uses within Ashby de la Zouch and how they are dispersed throughout the centre. A Retail Capacity Study has been commissioned which will include an assessment of whether there is a need for additional/future retail floorspace (comparison and convenience) in the district and its town and village centres.</p> <p>This will assist in the preparation of our retail strategy as part of the local plan, including the formulation of policies to accompany the town centre review, and there will be a further opportunity to make representation on the suggested approach.</p> <p>Additional work has been carried out with reference to role of South Street within the town centre. The southern side is residential however a number of properties on the north side of</p>

	South Street are in main town centre use. In addition there are a number of pedestrian links from South Street, in the form courtyard/mew style development comprising main town centres uses, to Market Street. Similar characteristics can be found between Market Street and North Street. It is therefore suggested that the proposed town centre boundary be amended to include the northern side of South Street, please see the amended plan 2A within Appendix B. There will be further opportunity to make representation on the suggested amendments as part of future Local Plan consultation.
--	---

Respondent	David Bigby
Which draft Town Centre Boundary does your response relate to?	Ashby de la Zouch
Is the method used to define the draft town centre boundary correct?	Yes
Are the draft town centre boundaries drawn in accordance with the methodology	Yes
Are there any area of the town centre boundary that should be changed?	No
Council's Response	Support for methodology and draft boundary noted. No further comments to make.

Respondent	Ashby Town Team
Which draft Town Centre Boundary does your response relate to?	Ashby de la Zouch
Is the method used to define the draft town centre boundary correct?	<p>Concerned raised that the methodology is only based on what is existing and not necessarily what we would like to see developed. Town centre boundaries are therefore drawn too tightly. If they had been drawn too tightly previously some recent and successful developments may never have been permitted.</p> <p>There is a natural gravitation of retail to the bottom end of Market Street, influenced by the greater footfall in this part of town and availability of parking and car accessibility in this area.</p> <p>Retail success depends on access by car. Therefore consideration, in the first instance should be given to what should happen to car parking and congestion and then building a strategy for planning control around that. Should not focus on where buildings are now and not ignore transport.</p>
Are the draft town centre boundaries drawn in	Not answered

accordance with the methodology	
Are there any areas of the town centre boundary that should be changed?	One of Ashby's features is the large number of 'jitties' leading to North and South Street which have been used to form a number of Mews type development. Encouragement should be given for more of this style of development in the future. The natural limit of these is in South Street and North Street. Therefore propose that the boundary line be drawn to include and run along South Street and along Lower Church Street.
Councils Response	<p>The revised town centre boundaries are based on existing uses within Ashby de la Zouch and how they are dispersed throughout the centre. Further work will include the assessment of whether there is a need for additional/future retail floorspace (comparison and convenience) in the district and its town and village centres. Comments reference parking and congestion issues are noted however at this stage in the process the boundaries have been suggested based on the NPPF definition of what is a town centre.</p> <p>Further work is also to be undertaken to assist in the preparation of our retail strategy to be included within the Local Plan including policy formulation to accompany the town centre review, and there will be further opportunity to make representation on the suggested approach.</p> <p>Additional work has been carried with reference to role of South Street within the town centre. The southern side is residential however a number of properties on the north side of South Street are in main town centre use. In addition there are a number of pedestrian links from South Street, in the form of courtyard/mew style development comprising main town centres uses, to Market Street. Similar characteristics can be found between Market Street and North Street. It is therefore suggested that the proposed town centre boundary be amended to include the northern side of South Street as well as the western side of Lower Church Street, please see the amended boundary within Appendix B Plan 2A. There will be further opportunity to make representation on the suggested amendments as part of future Local Plan consultation.</p>

### Castle Donington

Respondent	Castle Donington Parish Council
Which draft Town Centre Boundary does your response relate to?	Castle Donington
Is the method used to define the draft town centre boundary correct?	No. It is considered to be slightly flawed as it has missed properties that are currently in business use.
Are the draft town centre boundaries drawn in accordance with the	No

methodology	
Are there any areas of the town centre boundary that should be changed?	Yes. The proposed Town Centre boundary is not acceptable in that it has been reduced too much. It should be as the boundary defined in the current adopted Local Plan 2002 and be extended to include a parcel of land know as the 'Dalby Parcel' off Bondgate (owned by the Parish Council) as well as the Delven Lane, bus station area, library building, vets practice, bowls club and nursing home.
Councils Response	<p>Castle Donington is a local centre that displays positive signs of vitality and viability. The majority of its retail and town centre uses are dispersed along the length of Market Street and Borough Street. It is considered that it is this area that displays the characteristics of a town centre, as defined in the NPPF, and the proposed boundary has been drawn in order to reflect this. The existing boundary has been contracted to exclude areas predominantly characterised by residential properties, which is not defined as a main town centre use within the NPPF. This suggested boundary will give focus to the centre and with policy support could discourage loss of town centre uses in this location.</p> <p>Survey work identified a number of uses located outside of the town centre, including those identified in the above representation. However these sites are quite separate from the area where the majority of retail and town centres uses are located, as well as not being adjacent to these uses. They are also located in areas mainly residential in character and not considered to be viewed within the context of the village centre, where the shops and other town centre uses are located. It is therefore not suggested that the boundary be amended to include theses areas as they are not considered to be located in an area that displays the characteristics of a town or village centre, as defined in the NPPF.</p>

### Coalville

Respondent	Coalville Town Team
Which draft Town Centre Boundary does your response relate to?	Coalville Town Centre
Is the method used to define the draft town centre boundary correct?	Not answered
Are the draft town centre boundaries drawn in accordance with the methodology	Not answered
Are there any areas of the town centre boundary that should be changed?	Suggest that the primary shopping area be extended to include Hotel Street.
Council's response	The NPPF defines the 'primary shopping area' where retail development is concentrated i.e. those frontages that include a

	<p>high proportion of retail uses and those adjacent uses which are adjoining and closely related that provide greater opportunities for a diversity of other main town centres uses such as restaurants, businesses etc.</p> <p>There is a run of vacant properties on the northern side of Hotel Street with the majority of the previous uses having been non-retail. Vacancy levels on the southern side of Hotel Street are low with a good proportion of the units being occupied by independent retailers.</p> <p>Although Hotel Street is adjacent to the primary shopping area there is a physical separation due to the presence of the rail line. Footfall is also observed as being lower in this area. It is therefore not suggested that it form part of the primary shopping area in light of its physical relationship with the shopping area of Coalville.</p>
--	---

Respondent	Ravenstone with Snibston Parish Council
Which draft Town Centre Boundary does your response relate to?	Coalville
Is the method used to define the draft town centre boundary correct?	Yes
Are the draft town centre boundaries drawn in accordance with the methodology	Yes
Are there any area of the town centre boundary that should be changed?	Not answered.
Council's Response	Support for methodology and draft boundary noted. No further comments to make.

Respondent	Bob and Joy White
Which draft Town Centre Boundary does your response relate to?	Coalville
Is the method used to define the draft town centre boundary correct?	Yes
Are the draft town centre boundaries drawn in accordance with the methodology	Yes
Are there any area of the town centre boundary that should be changed?	Not Answered
Council's Response	Support for methodology and draft boundary noted. No further comments to make.

## **Ibstock**

Respondent	Ibstock Parish Council
Which draft Town Centre Boundary does your response relate to?	Ibstock
Is the method used to define the draft town centre boundary correct?	Not Answered
Are the draft town centre boundaries drawn in accordance with the methodology	Not Answered
Are there any area of the town centre boundary that should be changed?	Would support the inclusion of the whole of the High Street to be within the boundary. Cannot see why the Post Office would be cut off from the town centre. The proposed boundary excludes the doctor's surgery, chemist, church and high street services. The Parish Council is working hard to keep the High Street thriving and we feel this small adjustment would help us secure the buildings and protect the character of our High Street.
Council's Response	<p>Ibstock is a small local centre, with low vacancy rates, with its retail and other town uses dispersed along the length of the High Street. They are generally laid out as a number of small groupings with residential uses in between. The existing boundary has been contracted in a couple of locations to exclude a number of residential properties. This will give focus to the centre and with policy support could discourage further dispersal or loss of town centre uses in this location.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed town centre comprises the area that is predominately occupied by town centre uses. It is not suggested that the whole of High Street be included within the boundary. It is noted that this results in a number of town centre uses being excluded, however the southern part of High Street is predominantly residential and therefore not considered to display the characteristics of a town or village centre, as defined in the NPPF.</p>

## **Measham**

Respondent	Measham Parish Council
Which draft Town Centre Boundary does your response relate to?	Measham
Is the method used to define the draft town centre boundary correct?	Yes
Are the draft town centre boundaries drawn in accordance with the	No. There should be a separate area around the Co-op, Library, Leisure Centre, the Museum and the car parks on Peggs Close.

methodology	
Are there any areas of the town centre boundary that should be changed?	Yes. There should be a separate area around the Co-op, Library, Leisure Centre, the Museum and the car parks on Peggs Close.
Council's Response	<p>Measham is a local centre with its retail and other town centre uses dispersed along the length of the High Street. There are also a number of residential uses along the High Street which contribute to the low key retail character of parts of this centre. The existing boundary has been contracted in a couple of locations to exclude a number of residential properties. This will give focus to the centre and with policy support could discourage further dispersal or loss of town centre uses in this location.</p> <p>It was observed that there are a number of town centre uses that would be located outside of this proposed boundary, a number of which have been raised in the above representation. However these are generally within predominantly residential or industrial areas, separate from the area where retail uses are located, and do not display the characteristics of a town centre as defined by the NPPF. Therefore it is not suggested that the boundary be revised to include these premises.</p>

### **Kegworth**

Respondent	Kegworth Parish Council
Which draft Town Centre Boundary does your response relate to?	Kegworth
Is the method used to define the draft town centre boundary correct?	
Are the draft town centre boundaries drawn in accordance with the methodology	
Are there any areas of the town centre boundary that should be changed?	<p>Yes. The proposed town boundary is too small. The boundary should be retained as the existing and even then it would not include some of the existing retail uses, including those uses adjacent on The Dragwell, Derby Road and High Street. Designation and suggested policy is too restrictive for Kegworth. Retail businesses should be encouraged and the proposed designation would exclude existing businesses. Suitable premises may not be found in such a small designated area but maybe suitable elsewhere in the village, and therefore permission may not be granted.</p> <p>Kegworth has lost numerous pubs and retail units and too small a defined area would harm the sustainability of Kegworth. There is the chance that permission could be refused purely on the grounds that it is not within the defined centre whereas in a village a mix of</p>

	<p>residential, retail, pubic houses and businesses work well together and define its character.</p> <p>A number of corrections were suggested, advising that Chapel Street be amended to read Church Gate and a number of the properties uses were clarified:  42 High Street – Hotel  22 High Street – Business  29 Derby Road – Business  58 Derby Road – Business  Cornerstone off Market Place, front building financial and professional and rear businesses (not defined at present).</p>
<p>Council's Response</p>	<p>Kegworth is a local centre with its retail and other town centre uses mainly concentrated around Church Gate and Market Place. The revised town centre boundary, at this stage in the process, is based on the NPPF definition of what a town centre is and on its existing uses and how they are dispersed throughout the centre. Therefore the existing boundary has been contracted exclude those areas where the town centre type uses are more dispersed/isolated from others and where residential uses are more predominant.</p> <p>A Retail Capacity Study has been commissioned which will include the assessment of whether there is a need for additional/future retail floor space (comparison or convenience) in the district and its town and village centres. This will be used to inform our Retail Strategy as part of the Local Plan.</p> <p>If a boundary is made too wide it could result in main town centre uses becoming dispersed across the village as well as the loss of a focus to the village, which at present is situated around the Church Gate and the Market Place. It could also result in the increase in the number of vacant units in this area as town centre uses become more spread out across the village.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised that making the centre too small could exclude main town centre uses outside of this definition. However this is not necessarily the case, as application of the sequential test would enable the development of appropriate edge of centre sites where town centre sites are not available.</p> <p>The suggested corrections have been made; these can be viewed within Appendix B Map 6a.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is suggested that the proposed town centre boundary be slightly increased to now include the properties at Nos 2 – 6 Derby Road, Nos 1-3 Derby Road, Nos 2- 10 High Street and Nos 1-9 High Street. A number of these units are within town centre uses and given their siting and relationship with Church Gate, it is considered that they should form part of the 'village centre'</p>