

## **SUMMARY OF RESPONSES BY QUESTION**

### **Question 1 - Should we have a target of 8,000 or 10,200 new homes?**

Majority of responses support the figure of 8,000 although some would prefer to see this reduced further.

There was also support for the target of 10,200 as the RSS figures are the most robust evidence base. A reduction to 8,000 new dwellings would not be in conformity with the RSS, there is no evidence to support a figure lower than that in the RSS, especially in light of the latest legal challenge to the Government's proposed revocation of RSS. Reflecting past build rates is not considered pro-active planning for growth.

Some suggestions for a higher figure of 12,240 (10,200 plus a 20% allowance), to provide choice and competition. Reference made to the plan period which needs amending as it should not be restricted to coincide with the RSS.

Some concerns regarding the impact on the Leicester & Leicestershire HMA if NWLDC uses lower figures than those in the RSS. Any housing targets should not be set until the housing requirements study has been completed.

### **Question 2 - Do you support our proposal to not build on the Green Wedge?**

Majority of responses to this question support the proposal not to build on the Green Wedge. Opinion is that the Green Wedge provides separation between and identity to the surrounding settlements, as well as natural environment and public amenity value. Reference to the community engagement exercise conducted by the County Council which has revealed widespread and strong support for its existing Green Wedges.

Some concern that designation as Area of Separation may allow for development after 2026.

Some responses considered this to be a premature question in view of the fact that the housing figures have not yet been finalised and the proposal not to build on the Green Wedge is not based on any robust and credible evidence rather it is based on a reduced housing provision at Coalville which is not in general conformity with the Regional Plan. Furthermore, development of one large location (Bardon Grange) for new housing is a risky strategy whilst the Green Wedge is a sustainable location for development.

Acknowledged that avoiding development on the Green Wedge would mean more development across other settlements in the District.

Development at Broom Leys Farm could be considered without affecting the larger area of Green Wedge, as could the area between Green Lane and Hall Lane. Retaining the Green Wedge is not practical when the Council has less than 2 years housing land supply.

### **Question 3 - How should we distribute the remaining 35 homes per annum across the rest of the district [outside of Coalville]:**

- a) **equally distribute to each of the settlements listed ?[Ashby, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham] or**
- b) **Distribute to each of the settlements listed in some other way? or**
- c) **Distribute to the various other villages across the District? or**
- d) **A combination of b) and c)?**

Some support for each of the options. More support for options (a) and (d). There was also significant support for an 'other' unspecified option.

Some support for development in villages and that this should not be limited to 35 per annum depending on the local area and need and should include social housing as this would keep local services going. Others noted that it would not be appropriate to distribute housing equally amongst the settlements listed without undertaking an assessment in relation to capacity and local need.

Development should be located to support jobs.

Any options should ensure that infrastructure is provided for as part of new development and that due consideration is given to the impact of development on the historic market towns of Ashby and Castle Donington.

Directing a large proportion of new housing to Coalville relies on the market sustaining levels of demand and potentially limits the range of housing for people in the rest of the District. Support for more development in Ashby due to its popularity and that Ibstock could support a Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE).

Some considered that the River Mease should not be given excessive weight as a solution will be found within the next 20 years and funded through additional development in the catchment. However, others suggested that reducing the housing figures for Ashby would not help fund a solution for the River Mease issue.

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

The majority of the responses support the approach not to allocate land for strategic distribution as there is enough warehousing in the District already. Specific opposition to the site at J24 as it would increase traffic congestion and the site is too remote.

There was some support for allocating a site at J24 as it would attract higher quality employers into the area and provide jobs for the new dwellings and there are good road and rail links, potential to reduce road traffic congestion and deliver environmental benefits. Furthermore, the PACEC study includes a specific recommendation to make provision for strategic distribution in North West Leicestershire and it is also backed up by other evidence.

Some considered that a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) would act as a driver for regeneration and a major catalyst for economic growth, attracting inward investment, supporting existing business and providing a sustainable alternative for existing freight distribution. A high quality, nationally significant facility for the district would see an increase in the areas economy and in turn raise the profile of the District as a destination for business growth and investment.

Also suggested that rail freight could be provided at Ashby, whilst other employment sites also promoted at Donington Park Race Track and land off Beveridge Lane Bardon.