

~~May 2012~~ April 2013

NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY

BROAD LOCATIONS BACKGROUND PAPER - UPDATED



CONTENTS

- 1 Introduction**
- 2 Accessibility Assessment**
- 3 Delivery Assessment**
- 4 Sustainability Appraisal**
- 5 Other Considerations**
- 6 Planning Conclusions**

Appendix

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In outlining the amount of new housing development required in the District until 2031, and distributing this among the six main settlements, the Core Strategy Development Plan Document does not allocate specific sites for housing development. However, it is important to indicate where the Council expects the majority of new housing development to take place during the Plan period in order to reduce the amount of work required in future planning documents, and to provide certainty for local communities, developer and landowners. In addition, it enables planning applications to be determined with the benefit of early input from local communities, stakeholders and developers. Therefore, the Core Strategy identifies a number of Broad Locations across the district where it is expected that most new housing development, together with employment development in some cases, will take place.
- 1.2 This Background Paper outlines the methodology by which these Broad Locations have been identified.
- 1.3 To determine the most appropriate Broad Locations for inclusion in the Core Strategy, a number of potential locations have been assessed under five headings. These are:
- Accessibility Assessment
 - Delivery Assessment
 - Sustainability Appraisal¹
 - Other Considerations
 - Planning Assessment and Conclusions
- 1.4 The first four sections take account of potential positives and negatives of, and constraints to, housing development in the different Broad Locations considered. The fifth, concluding section summarises the outcomes of the preceding four sections. In addition, it provides a balance in planning terms, thereby ensuring that the Broad Locations selected for inclusion in the Core Strategy represent the best areas to locate housing development in the District's main settlements.
- 1.5 In each assessment, Broad Locations are only assessed against one another on a settlement-by-settlement basis. No comparisons are made between potential Broad Locations in different settlements. Each of the main settlements in North West Leicestershire will be expected to accommodate housing growth to meet the housing and employment needs of the local communities. Given that there are no constraints serious enough to prevent housing development in any of these

¹ It should be noted that the sustainability appraisal uses the objectives applied to the Core Strategy Further Consultation Document (2008) and, as such, it is not a sustainability appraisal of this Background Paper but is instead used to assess the potential Broad Locations.

settlements, it is not considered appropriate to compare settlements' potential Broad Locations against one another.

The Six Main Settlements

- 1.6 The amount of housing development proposed and the number of Broad Locations considered in each settlement are set out in the table below. Plans 1-5 on pages 6-10 show each of the Broad Locations considered, on a settlement-by-settlement basis.

Settlement	New homes required from now until 2031	Broad Locations considered
Ashby de la Zouch	605	North
		South East
		West
Castle Donington	970	South West
Coalville	4,030	North East
		South East
		South West
Ilstock	220	North
		North East
		South
		South West
Kegworth	190	None
Measham	440	North East
		South East
		West

- 1.7 Evidence behind the number of new homes required in each settlement is set out in the **Distribution of New Housing Development Background Paper**.

How were the potential Broad Locations identified?

- 1.8 As evident from Plans 1-5, Broad Locations are not given specific, geographic definition. They do not have physical boundaries. Rather, they are taken to be general areas within which housebuilding could reasonably be expected to take place based on the availability of land for such development. The areas are broadly consistent with those prepared for the [Settlement Fringe Assessment](#).
- 1.9 A key aspect in identifying any Broad Location is that there has to be confidence that development in such locations will happen. Therefore, regard has been had to the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), which identifies a large number of potential housing sites across the District.

- 1.10 Broad Locations are expected to accommodate significant amounts of new housing development. In some instances, a SHLAA site may be of such a significant size that all (or most) of the proposed development in a particular settlement could potentially be accommodated on it. However, in other settlements this may not be the case. Therefore, on some occasions, a number of SHLAA sites that abut other SHLAA sites have been considered together within a single potential Broad Location.
- 1.11 Broad Locations for Kegworth were not assessed. It is considered that sufficient land for the small scale of housing development allocated for Kegworth in the Core Strategy can be found within the existing settlement boundary. In reaching this conclusion, account has been taken of existing planning permissions and the level of previously developed land – both in the village and as identified from the SHLAA.

INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 This section of the Background Paper outlines the accessibility of each potential Broad Location to a number of services and facilities. One focus of our strategy is on inclusive and sustainable development and so this accessibility study looks at travel by foot, cycle and public transport. Ease of access to key services and facilities is an important element in considering what makes a location suitable for new housing
- 2.2 As explained in the Introduction to this Background Paper, Broad Locations are, by definition, not precise in their geographical extent. In order to measure access to a potential Broad Location, it was necessary to determine from where to measure. This “measuring point” in each potential Broad Location was identified as being:
- immediately adjacent to the existing urban form, and
 - nearest “as the crow flies” to the centre of the Core Town or Local Centre (as appropriate to the settlement) as defined in the adopted Local Plan.

These measuring points are identified on Plans 1-5, which preceded this section.

- 2.3 The justification for such an approach is that being adjacent to the existing urban form would almost certainly be a prerequisite for any housing development, while Core Town / Local Centres have the most facilities, are most likely to be used by people on a regular basis and tend to represent the “heart” of those settlements that have them. It should be noted that taking the point nearest to the Core Town or Local Centre best reflects the uncertainty regarding the amount of development to be accommodated within a specific Broad Location. If a point more central within the Broad Location (however defined) was taken, this would be unlikely to realistically reflect the centre of all housing development that could take place within that Broad Location. As noted in the Introduction to this Background Paper, Broad Locations are not defined specifically along geographic boundaries – as a result, determining the centre of a Broad Location as a means of measuring distances to facilities is not possible.
- 2.4 Each service / facility was measured as the crow flies from the measuring point. Again, it should be noted that the potential Broad Locations are not defined geographically. It is therefore not possible to measure exact walking routes as these will be dependent on the layout of any housing development, as well as the layout of the existing built up area, taking into account existing topographical or other physical features and how these might determine walking routes. As a result, “as the crow flies” measurements are used, and are used uniformly across the district.
- 2.5 The Planning Conclusions section, which ends this Background Paper, considers existing public footpaths and how these could be used and improved should housing

development take place in these locations. The distances recorded in the remainder of this section must be read with this in mind, but nevertheless it is considered that they represent a good “baseline” position from which to assess each Broad Location in terms of their relative accessibility. The role of this section is primarily to identify issues and constraints to potential housing development.

2.6 If there was more than one of a service or facility within a settlement (for example, there is generally more than one primary school in a settlement), it was the nearest facility to the measuring point that was used. This methodology was used consistently across the Accessibility Assessment, with the exception of Secondary Schools in Coalville. More information on this can be found in the Coalville section, below.

2.7 The assessment as to the relative accessibility of each facility reflects the recommendation in [Manual for Streets](#), which identifies a ‘walkable neighbourhood’ as having a range of facilities within a 10 minute walk (or 800 metres).

Amenity	Method of Assessment and Commentary
Employment Land	The amount of employment land, as identified in the Assessment of Employment Sites (published 2010), within 800 metres of the measuring point was calculated
Core Town / Local Centre	An “as the crow flies” measurement was taken, to the nearest 10m, from the measuring point to the centre of the Core Town / Local Centre as appropriate depending on the settlement
Health Facility	An “as the crow flies” measurement was taken, to the nearest 10m, from the measuring point to the nearest health facility (that is, a doctor’s surgery or hospital; dentists were excluded)
Primary School	An “as the crow flies” measurement was taken, to the nearest 10m, from the measuring point to the nearest primary school
Secondary School	An “as the crow flies” measurement was taken, to the nearest 10m, from the measuring point to the nearest two secondary schools, and an average of the two distances was calculated
Public Transport Hub	<p>A “Public Transport Hub” was defined as being the location where the highest concentration of bus stops and bus routes serving a higher order settlement could be found. The Public Transport Hubs were defined at the following locations in the five main settlements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashby Post Office, 50 Market Street • Castle Donington Bus Station, Delven Lane / High Street • Coalville Memorial Square • Ibstock Between 100 and 109 Melbourne Road • Measham Coral’s Pantry, 47 High Street <p>An “as the crow flies” measurement was taken, to the nearest 10m, from the measuring point to the Public Transport Hub. It should be noted that in some cases – Ashby, Castle Donington and Measham – the Public Transport Hub is within Core Town / Local Centre. It is accepted that this could therefore represent duplication in these cases, either to the advantage or disadvantage of a Broad Location. Where</p>

	this occurs, the issue is considered in the commentary that follows, although the location of the <i>centre</i> of the Core Town / Local Centre and that of the Public Transport Hub were in no cases identical
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The remainder of this section outlines the measurements taken as per the above methodology, with a short summary on a settlement-by-settlement basis.

ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
West Ashby	Core/Local Centre	870 metres
	Health Facility	780 metres
	Leisure Centre	860 metres
	Primary School	550 metres
	Secondary School	1240 metres
	Public Transport Hub	880 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	4.34 hectares within 800 metres	

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
North Ashby	Core/Local Centre	420 metres
	Health Facility	270 metres
	Leisure Centre	280 metres
	Primary School	580 metres
	Secondary School	230 metres
	Public Transport Hub	420 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	7.05 hectares within 800 metres	

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
South East Ashby	Core/Local Centre	730 metres
	Health Facility	870 metres
	Leisure Centre	1000 metres
	Primary School	380 metres
	Secondary School	1190 metres
	Public Transport Hub	720 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	0.76 hectares within 800 metres	

- 2.8.1 There is a significant difference between the North and the other two potential Broad Locations in Ashby. The North is the closest to most of the services listed and the most employment land within 800m of the measuring point.

- 2.8.2 There is little difference between the South East and West potential Broad Locations; although, overall, the South East is marginally closer to the facilities both have two facilities within 800m walking distance. Both are some way distant (relative to the North) from the majority of facilities.
- 2.8.3 Housing development in Ashby will be of such a scale as to require some or most of the amenities listed in the tables above to be provided as part of development within the potential Broad Locations considered
- 2.8.4 Overall, none of the potential Broad Locations can be considered to have poor access to important services. In relative terms, there are some noteworthy distances: both the South East and West are significantly further than the North to a secondary school, while the South East has the least amount of employment land nearby. The West and South East have relatively similar access to services compared to one another.

CASTLE DONINGTON

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
West of Castle Donington	Core/Local Centre	840 metres
	Health Facility	900 metres
	Leisure Centre	800 metres
	Primary School	740 metres
	Secondary School	800 metres
	Public Transport Hub	550 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	0.00 hectares within 800 metres	

- 2.9.1 As there is only one potential Broad Location identified in Castle Donington no comparison regarding the relative accessibility of this location is possible. Overall, the Broad Location is at or within 800 metres of four of the listed amenities (excluding employment provision) namely the Leisure Centre (situated at the Castle Donington Community College), Primary School, Secondary School and Public Transport Hub, while the Core/Local Centre is just beyond the 800 metres.
- 2.9.2 Housing development in Castle Donington will be of such a scale as to require some or most of the amenities listed in the tables above to be provided as part of development within the potential Broad Locations considered
- 2.9.3 Castle Donington has many employment opportunities, in particular East Midlands Airport, East Midlands Distribution Centre and Donington Park Racetrack, but none of these are within 800 metres of the measuring point.

COALVILLE

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
South West Coalville	Core/Local Centre	440 metres
	Health Facility	510 metres
	Leisure Centre	2330 metres
	Primary School	690 metres
	Secondary Schools	2480 metres (average)
	Public Transport Hub	510 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	24.71 hectares within 800 metres	

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
South East Coalville	Core/Local Centre	870 metres
	Health Facility	340 metres
	Leisure Centre	2610 metres
	Primary School	470 metres
	Secondary Schools	2365 metres (average)
	Public Transport Hub	1210 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	2.57 hectares within 800 metres	

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
North East Coalville	Core/Local Centre	920 metres
	Health Facility	380 metres
	Leisure Centre	1140 metres
	Primary School	900 metres
	Secondary Schools	2045 metres (average)
	Public Transport Hub	890 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	38.83 hectares within 800 metres	

2.10.1 In accessibility terms, the North East Broad Location performs better than the South West and South East Coalville Broad Locations assessed, although none perform particularly well in terms of the *Manual for Streets*-recommended 800 metre walking distance. However, the purpose of the Accessibility Assessment is to consider the performances of potential Broad Locations relative to one another. As noted earlier, the *Manual for Streets* recommendation is used to give a benchmark against which to provide these relative accessibility assessments.

2.10.2 This consideration should be balanced against the fact that housing development in Coalville will be of such a scale as to require some or most of the amenities listed in the tables above to be provided as part of development within the potential Broad Locations considered. As a result, the quality of access to existing services is less of

an issue in Coalville than elsewhere in the District, where new housing development is not likely to be of a scale to require the significant provision of new amenities.

- 2.10.3 A unique element of the assessment of the potential Coalville Broad Locations compared to the rest of the district is the method of measuring access to a secondary school. In Coalville it is necessary for pupils to attend two secondary schools as part of their secondary education. These are located in different parts of Coalville. Therefore, to take account of this an average distance to the two secondary schools was measured. It is recognised that this presents an anomalous outcome for the South East Broad Location, as one of the Secondary Schools measured to is adjacent to the Broad Location whilst the other is over 3 kilometres distant. However, since this must be balanced against the fact that pupils must attend both Coalville's Secondary Schools during their school years and so accessibility to both must be taken into account in reaching a conclusion on access to Secondary Schools.
- 2.10.4 Although there are some significant variances between some of the amenities measured to the South West and South East Broad Locations (the Core Centre and Public Transport Hub are notably different), overall, access to services is not dissimilar for these two potential Broad Locations. The South West has four amenities within 800 metres, but is also nearly 3 kilometres distant from Secondary School, while the South East has just two facilities within 800 metres. At 340 metres distant for both, both are nearer to a Health Facility than the North East Coalville Broad Location, which performs better against all other amenities.
- 2.10.5 One anomaly raised in the figures is access to employment land. While both the North East and South West Broad Locations have significant hectares of B128 land within 800 metres of their measuring points, the South East BL has an extremely low amount despite its proximity to sizeable amounts of employment land at Bardon and Ellistown. This is reflective of the fact that the single measuring point used to produce these results is located as near as possible to the Core Shopping Centre. In the case of the South East BL, the measuring point is located to its north-western extent whereas the employment land at Bardon and Ellistown is to the west and south. Given the logical assumption that development on the South East BL – as well as that on the other potential Broad Locations – would have more than one access point to existing highways and walkways, it is not considered that the amount of employment land within 800 metres of the South East BL provides a meaningful reflection of its access to employment.
- 2.10.6 While the North East can be said to have the better access overall, this must be balanced against three issues. Firstly, none of the Broad Locations have good access in terms of the *Manual for Streets* recommendations. Secondly, each would likely be required to provide a range of amenities as part of any housing development. Thirdly, and related to the second point, it may be many years before these facilities are provided such that in the meantime residents will be dependent on existing facilities. Consequently, measuring accessibility to existing amenities does not

necessarily provide a realistic reflection of the access to amenities likely to be enjoyed by future residents in the longer-term.

- 2.10.7 On the basis that each Broad Location assessed would be expected to provide at least some of the amenities on-site, none is considered to have such poor access as to prevent their inclusion in the Core Strategy.

IBSTOCK

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
West of Ibstock	Core/Local Centre	710 metres
	Health Facility	660 metres
	Leisure Centre	570 metres
	Primary School	390 metres
	Secondary School	580 metres
	Public Transport Hub	520 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	0.00 hectares within 800 metres	

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
North of Ibstock	Core/Local Centre	1070 metres
	Health Facility	1250 metres
	Leisure Centre	840 metres
	Primary School	910 metres
	Secondary School	840 metres
	Public Transport Hub	1050 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	1.39 hectares within 800 metres	

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
South West of Ibstock	Core/Local Centre	550 metres
	Health Facility	340 metres
	Leisure Centre	590 metres
	Primary School	420 metres
	Secondary School	590 metres
	Public Transport Hub	380 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	0.00 hectares within 800 metres	

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
North East of Ibstock	Core/Local Centre	710 metres
	Health Facility	960 metres
	Leisure Centre	540 metres
	Primary School	710 metres
	Secondary School	540 metres
	Public Transport Hub	780 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	1.39 hectares within 800 metres	

- 2.11.1 The South and South West potential Broad Locations perform better than the North and North East Broad Locations in accessibility terms, and there is a clear hierarchy in terms of overall access to the amenities considered.
- 2.11.2 It is acknowledged that this is due to Ibstock's Local Centre, where the majority of the village's services are located, being situated in the south and far more proximate to the western Broad Locations than those in the north. However, this does not alter the fact that the western Broad Locations have significantly better access to amenities, with the best performing potential BL (the South West) being less than half the overall distance to amenities than the worst performing Broad Location (the North).
- 2.11.3 The South West and West potential Broad Locations have all amenities within 800m of their measuring points, the North East has all but one within 800m, while the North has none within 800m. The only positive accessibility feature on the North and North East Broad Locations – relative to the western Broad Locations – is that both have some employment within 800m of their measuring point (of 1.39 hectares), while the southern Broad Locations have no employment land within 800m. This is the only employment site within Ibstock.
- 2.11.4 It is considered reasonable to conclude that, relative to the other potential Broad Locations in Ibstock, the North Ibstock potential Broad Location has poor access to amenities. It is further than all other potential Broad Locations from the amenities included in the assessment. Although it does have the best (albeit equal best) access to employment land of the potential Ibstock Broad Locations, this must be considered in the context of the limited amount of employment land in the village as a whole. It must also be balanced against the likelihood that not all new residents of working age in Ibstock will gain employment there, owing to the noted limited amount of employment land within the village.
- 2.11.5 Notwithstanding the above comments regarding the relative accessibility of the North potential Broad Location, and while noting that the South West benefits from closer access to the amenities listed in Accessibility Assessment, none of the Broad Locations assessed have such poor access as to prevent their being considered as Broad Locations in the Core Strategy.

MEASHAM

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
North East Measham	Core/Local Centre	580 metres
	Health Facility	790 metres
	Leisure Centre	870 metres
	Primary School	230 metres
	Secondary School	5,230 metres
	Public Transport Hub	670 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	0.00 hectares within 800 metres	

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
West of Measham	Core/Local Centre	150 metres
	Health Facility	120 metres
	Leisure Centre	180 metres
	Primary School	230 metres
	Secondary School	5,630 metres
	Public Transport Hub	20 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	0.00 hectares within 800 metres	

Potential Broad Location	Amenity	Distance
South East Measham	Core/Local Centre	590 metres
	Health Facility	410 metres
	Leisure Centre	540 metres
	Primary School	430 metres
	Secondary School	6,010 metres
	Public Transport Hub	480 metres
	Employment Provision (B128 land)	
	2.12 hectares within 800 metres	

- 2.12.1 There is a significant difference between the West and the other two potential Broad Locations in Measham. The West Broad Location is significantly closer to most of the services listed than the other two potential Broad Locations assessed, although it has no employment land within 800 metres.
- 2.12.2 There is little difference between the North East and South East potential Broad Locations in that they are both closest to three of the six amenities; the South East does, however, benefit from being within 800 metres of employment provision.
- 2.12.3 Overall, none of the potential Broad Locations can be considered to have poor access to important services. In relative terms, more of the services are located within 800 metres than outside 800 metres.
- 2.12.4 It is clear from the above that the West performs best in terms of accessibility than either of the North East and South East, which are in turn similar to one another.

3.0 DELIVERY ASSESSMENT

INTRODUCTION

- 3.1 This section analyses the potential “deliverability” of dwellings on each potential Broad Location.
- 3.2 As noted, the Broad Locations identified in the Core Strategy will not have specific outlines but will instead be a general geographic location where it is considered the majority of new housing development for the district should take place until the year 2031. However, a key issue to take into account in identifying Broad Locations is the level of certainty that housebuilding can take place in these areas. As noted in the Introduction, potential Broad Locations for assessment have been identified where one or more potential site is included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).
- 3.3 The SHLAA is an assessment of the potential for housing development based on information provided by site promoters. In considering deliverability, the following issues have been taken into account in this section:
- Is the site being promoted, and if so by whom (e.g. landowner, planning or other agent or housebuilder)?
 - Ownership of the site – is there a single landowner or is it in multiple ownership?
- 3.4 In considering the factor of *Promotion*, due weight is given to the type of promoter (i.e. landowner, planning consultancy or agent or housebuilder) in determining the deliverability of a site. Therefore, the involvement of a housebuilder provides a better indication of the likely delivery of a site than if its promotion is through an agent or landowner. Promotion of a site with the landowner’s consent is considered to better indicate a site’s deliverability than if the landowner is not involved.
- 3.5 There are some SHLAA sites which have been identified and promoted to the Council during the period of preparation of the Core Strategy, but which have had limited subsequent promotion. In these cases, account has been taken of this and is reflected in the conclusions regarding deliverability.
- 3.6 One further factor (*Ownership*), together with *Promotion*, form the Broad Locations Delivery Assessment. *Ownership* takes into account the number of landowners involved in the SHLAA site(s) within a potential Broad Location and reflects on the impact this could have for the delivery of housebuilding in the area. A SHLAA site, or Broad Location, in single ownership is likely to be easier to deliver than one in multiple ownership, although where there is evidence of multiple owners working together this could offset these concerns to some extent.

ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH

- 3.7 The following paragraphs examine in detail the *Promotion* and *Ownership* factors across each of the three potential Broad Locations in Ashby.

West Ashby Potential Broad Location

Promotion

- 3.7.1 The predominant SHLAA site within the Ashby West BL is Holywell Spring Farm (SHLAA ref. A3). The promoters of A3 are a town planning consultancy representing the landowner. There is no known housebuilder involvement at this stage². The SHLAA, which has been consulted on with the site promoters, indicates housebuilding would take place during the second five-year period³.
- 3.7.2 Despite uncertainty over the housebuilder involvement and River Mease issue, site A3 performs quite well in terms of *Promotion*.

Ownership

- 3.7.3 The site promoters of A3 indicate it is in single ownership. This has the potential to avoid the problems inherent to sites in multiple ownership (such as ransom strips, restrictive covenants or related), and the BL is therefore considered to score well against the *Ownership* factor.

Summary of Delivery Assessment for West Ashby

- 3.7.4 The West BL, on the basis of its predominant SHLAA site, performs relatively well against the Delivery Assessment. There are no ownership issues. However, as there is no housebuilder involvement at this time, this raises some potential implications for bringing forward development.
- 3.7.5 There is no deliverability issue so significant as to prevent the West Ashby potential BL being identified in the Core Strategy.

North Ashby Potential Broad Location

Promotion

- 3.7.6 The predominant SHLAA site within the Ashby North BL is Money Hill (SHLAA ref. A5). The promoters of A5 are a town planning consultancy representing a consortium of landowners, including some housebuilders. The SHLAA, which has been consulted on

² A planning application has been submitted on site A3.

³ The SHLAA operates on five-year periods, Year One considered to be the first year after the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD. Should the Core Strategy be adopted in Spring 2013 as currently envisaged, Year One will be 2013/14. On this timetable, the second five-year period would be 2018/19 to 2022/23.

with the site promoters, indicates housebuilding would not commence before the second five-year period.

- 3.7.7 The involvement of housebuilders in the promotion of this site is an advantage such that this location is considered to perform well in terms of *Promotion*.

Ownership

- 3.7.8 As noted above, there are multiple landowners within the North Ashby BL. This has the potential to present deliverability obstacles and, while the SHLAA indicates this presents “no unresolvable issues” (the owners are working together in a consortium), it is considered appropriate to form the view that any site in multiple ownership could be subject to some deliverability issues. As a result this location performs moderately against the *Ownership* criterion.

Summary of Delivery Assessment for North Ashby

- 3.7.9 North Ashby performs similarly to West Ashby against the Deliverability Assessment, with the exception of its predominant SHLAA site being in multiple ownership, and this could present deliverability issues. Although the level of housebuilder involvement is not immediately clear, there does not appear to be a major constraint housebuilding in the area.
- 3.7.10 There is no deliverability issue so significant as to prevent the North Ashby potential BL being identified in the Core Strategy.

South East Ashby Potential Broad Location

Promotion

- 3.7.11 The predominant SHLAA site within the Ashby South East BL is Packington Nook (SHLAA ref. A7). The promoters of A7 are a land management company. The level of housebuilder interest is unclear. The SHLAA, which has been consulted on with the site promoters, indicates housebuilding would not commence before the second five-year period.
- 3.7.12 Despite uncertainty over the housebuilder involvement and River Mease issue, site A7 performs quite well in terms of *Promotion*.

Ownership

- 3.7.13 The site promoters of A7 indicate it is in single ownership. This has the potential to avoid the problems inherent to sites in multiple ownership (such as ransom strips, restrictive covenants or related), and is therefore considered to score well against the *Ownership* factor.

Summary of Delivery Assessment for North Ashby

- 3.7.14 The potential South East BL, on the basis of its predominant SHLAA site, performs the best of the three potential Broad Locations against the Deliverability Assessment. There are no ownership issues and, although the level of housebuilder involvement is open to some debate, there does not appear to be a major constraint on housebuilding in the area.
- 3.7.15 There is no deliverability issue so significant as to prevent the North Ashby potential BL being identified in the Core Strategy.

Summary of Ashby Potential Broad Locations Delivery Assessment

- 3.7.16 The above text highlights the important comparison made between the potential Broad Locations in determining their relative merits in terms of deliverability. There is little to choose between the three locations. The North is in multiple ownership, but this is balanced to some extent by the fact that a number of these are housebuilders. Compared to this, the South East and West are in single ownership but do not currently have a housebuilder involved in their promotion. It is clear that in deliverability terms, both the West and South East are equal, and perform better than the North.
- 3.7.17 It should be noted that none of the potential Broad Locations had any deliverability issue so significant as to prevent their being identified in the Core Strategy. Moreover, this is only one element of the assessment of the potential Broad Locations and, while noted above as being a key issue, there are also the important factors of sustainability, accessibility and impact on the environment to consider in reaching a judgement as to the most appropriate Broad Location for Ashby.

CASTLE DONINGTON

- 3.8 Owing to a variety of surrounding land uses and environmental constraints, the only area where housing development of the scale required in the Core Strategy could be located is to the south west of Castle Donington. More details on these issues are provided in the Sustainability Appraisal and Other Considerations sections, but it is important to note the issue here to explain why only a single Broad Location has been assessed.
- 3.8.1 The following paragraphs examine in detail the *Promotion* and *Ownership* factors in respect of this potential Castle Donington Broad Location.

South West Castle Donington Potential Broad Location

Promotion

- 3.8.2 This potential Broad Location contains one site in the SHLAA (South of Park Lane (SHLAA ref. CD4)). The site is promoted by planning consultants on behalf of various

housebuilders. The SHLAA, which has been consulted on with the site promoters, indicates housebuilding would not commence before the second five-year period.

- 3.8.3 The involvement of housebuilders in the promotion of this site is an advantage such that this location is considered to perform well in terms of *Promotion*.

Ownership

- 3.8.4 The site is in multiple ownership, however evidence from the SHLAA suggests that these owners are working together to some extent which overcomes some of these concerns. It is considered appropriate to form the view that any site in multiple ownership could be subject to some deliverability issues such that this location performs moderately against the *Ownership* criterion.

Summary of Delivery Assessment for South West Castle Donington

- 3.8.5 Although it is considered to perform only quite well in terms of *Ownership*, the South West Castle Donington Broad Location scores well against *Promotion*.
- 3.8.6 There is no deliverability issue so significant as to prevent the South West Castle Donington potential BL being identified in the Core Strategy.

COALVILLE

- 3.9 The following paragraphs examine in detail the *Promotion* and *Ownership* factors across each of the three potential Broad Locations in Coalville.

North East Coalville Potential Broad Location

Promotion

- 3.9.1 This Broad Location contains two SHLAA sites (SHLAA refs. C19 and C46). The promotion backgrounds to C19 and C46 are identical: both have been submitted by a planning agent on behalf of two housebuilders. The SHLAA, which has been consulted on with the site promoters, indicates housebuilding would not commence before the second five-year period.
- 3.9.2 The active involvement of housebuilders in the promotion of this site is an advantage such that this location is considered to perform strongly in terms of *Promotion*.

Ownership

- 3.9.3 The site promoters of C19 indicate that the site is in single ownership. It is unclear if this is the case for C46, but there are no indications to the contrary. This has the potential to avoid the problems inherent to sites in multiple ownership (such as ransom strips, restrictive covenants or related), although the Broad Location as a whole is in multiple ownership.

- 3.9.4 However, given that these SHLAA sites both benefit from independent highways access, it will be important to ensure any housing development that takes place in this Broad Location is consistent and not piecemeal. As a result, it is considered to perform well against the *Ownership* factor.

Summary of Delivery Assessment for North East Coalville

- 3.9.5 In deliverability terms, the North East Coalville potential Broad Location performs very well. The predominant SHLAA sites within this potential Broad Location are in single ownership and have a confirmed housebuilder interest. Therefore, should this Broad Location be identified in the Core Strategy as a preferred location, it is a reasonable expectation that housing development would take place in this area during the Plan period.
- 3.9.6 There is no deliverability issue so significant as to prevent the North East Coalville potential BL being identified in the Core Strategy.

South East Coalville Potential Broad Location

Promotion

- 3.9.7 This Broad Location has a single SHLAA site, which in turn is comprised of a number of different landownership interests. All are collectively referred to as Bardon Grange (SHLAA ref. C23).
- 3.9.8 The different components of C23 are being promoted by a number of different landowners, who are promoting their site(s), and housebuilders.
- 3.9.9 The active involvement of housebuilders in the promotion of parts of this site is an advantage. However, the multitude of different landowners and housebuilders involved, and who are not collectively promoting C23 as a single entity, is such that this location is considered to perform moderately in terms of *Promotion*.

Ownership

- 3.9.10 As noted above, there are multiple owners within the South East Broad Location, ranging in size from individuals to large, nationwide organisations. There is evidence that the various promoters are actively working together to bring forward housing development in a comprehensive manner in this location. This move could, potentially, overcome some of the issues discussed under the *Promotion* criterion. Given the general willingness to participate in these discussions, the South East Broad Location is considered to perform moderately against the *Ownership* factor.

Summary of Delivery Assessment for South East Coalville

- 3.9.11 The South East Coalville potential Broad Location performs moderately in deliverability terms. Housebuilder interest is confirmed on large parts of the area,

while the associated landowners and interested parties are working together to promote development. However, it remains the case that there is still multiple ownership such that this potential Broad Location is considered to perform moderately against delivery.

3.9.12 There is no deliverability issue so significant as to prevent the South East Coalville potential BL being identified in the Core Strategy.

South West Coalville Potential Broad Location

Promotion

3.9.13 There are four contiguous SHLAA sites within the South West Coalville Broad Location:

- Owen Street Allotments (SHLAA ref. C29)
- South of Ravenstone Road (C30)
- Land South of Ravenstone Road (C31)
- Standard Hill (C40).

3.9.14 C29 is promoted by an estate agency on behalf of the single landowner. It is understood that the landowner is willing to sell the land. The SHLAA, which has been consulted on with the site promoters, indicates housebuilding would not commence on this Broad Location before the second five-year period.

3.9.15 C30 is promoted by a housebuilder on behalf of a single landowner. The housebuilder indicates there are no known ownership constraints, and refers to a single landowner. The SHLAA, which has been consulted on with the site promoters, indicates housebuilding would not commence on this Broad Location before the second five-year period.

3.9.16 C31 is promoted by a Planning Consultancy on behalf of a housebuilder. It is understood that the housebuilder either owns or has a formal option arrangement on the site. The SHLAA, which has been consulted on with the site promoters, indicates housebuilding would not commence on this Broad Location before the second five-year period.

3.9.17 C40 is identical to C29; it is promoted by an estate agency on behalf of the single landowner. It is understood that the landowner is willing to sell the land. The SHLAA, which has been consulted on with the site promoters, indicates housebuilding would not commence on this Broad Location before the second five-year period.

3.9.18 The involvement of planning consultancies and housebuilders in the promotion of four SHLAA sites means that the South West Coalville potential Broad Location is considered to perform very well in terms of *Promotion*.

Ownership

- 3.9.19 Each of the four SHLAA sites are in single ownership. This has the potential to avoid the problems inherent to sites in multiple ownership (such as ransom strips, restrictive covenants or related). However, given that three of the four SHLAA sites benefit from independent highways access, it will be important to ensure any housing development that takes place in this Broad Location is consistent and not piecemeal. Notwithstanding this issue, the South West potential Broad Location is considered to score well against the *Ownership* factor.

Summary of Delivery Assessment for South West Coalville

- 3.9.20 The South West Coalville potential Broad Location performs well overall in deliverability terms. While there are a number of landowners within the Broad Location, each is promoting their land for housing development either through a planning consultancy or a housebuilder directly.
- 3.9.21 There is no deliverability issue so significant as to prevent the South West Coalville potential BL being identified in the Core Strategy.

Summary of Coalville Potential Broad Locations Delivery Assessment

- 3.9.22 The above text highlights the important comparison made between the potential Broad Locations in determining their relative merits in terms of deliverability. All three Broad Locations perform positively against Promotion and Ownership, to differing extents, while each performs identically against Infrastructure. The inability of the Coalville Broad Locations to deliver any needed local infrastructure or resolve a specific issue is more down to the inexistence of such an issue than the Broad Locations themselves being unable to do so.
- 3.9.23 Each BL has varying degrees of housebuilder interest: both the southern Broad Locations are in multiple ownership (although each SHLAA site has been submitted on behalf of a single landowner) while the North BL consists largely of a single SHLAA site, itself in single ownership with confirmed housebuilder interest.
- 3.9.24 On this basis, there in Deliverability terms, the North East performs better than both southern Broad Locations. It should be noted that none of the potential Broad Locations had any deliverability issue so significant as to prevent their being identified in the Core Strategy. Moreover, this is one element of the assessment of the potential Broad Locations and, while noted above as being a key issue, there are also the important factors of sustainability, accessibility and impact on the environment to consider in reaching a judgement as to the most appropriate Broad Location(s) for Growth for Coalville.

IBSTOCK

- 3.10 The following paragraphs examine in detail the *Promotion* and *Ownership* factors across each of the three potential Broad Locations in Ibstock.

West Ibstock Potential Broad Location

Promotion

- 3.10.1 The predominant SHLAA site within the West Ibstock Broad Location is South of Ashby Road (SHLAA ref. Ib16). The promoters of Ib16 are a planning consultancy acting on behalf of housebuilders with a declared, formal interest in the site. The SHLAA, which has been consulted on with the site promoters, indicates housebuilding would not commence before the second five-year period.
- 3.10.2 The active involvement of housebuilders in the promotion of this site is an advantage such that this location is considered to perform strongly in terms of *Promotion*.

Ownership

- 3.10.3 The site promoters of Ib16 indicate it is in single ownership. This has the potential to avoid the problems inherent to sites in multiple ownership (such as ransom strips, restrictive covenants or related), and the BL is therefore considered to score strongly against the *Ownership* factor.

Summary of Delivery Assessment for West Ibstock

- 3.10.4 In deliverability terms, the West Ibstock potential Broad Location performs very well. The SHLAA site within this potential BL is in single ownership and has a confirmed housebuilder interest. Therefore, should this BL be identified in the Core Strategy as a preferred location, it is a reasonable expectation that housing development would take place in this area during the Plan period.
- 3.10.5 There is no deliverability issue so significant as to prevent the West Ibstock potential BL being identified in the Core Strategy.

South West Ibstock Potential Broad Location

Promotion

- 3.10.6 The predominant SHLAA site within the South West Ibstock Broad Location is Station Road (SHLAA ref. Ib15). The promoters of Ib15 are an estate agency seeking housebuilder interest in the site and acting on behalf of a single landowner. The SHLAA, which has been consulted on with the site promoters, indicates housebuilding would not commence before the third five-year period.

3.10.7 The sole landowner's marketing of the predominant SHLAA site for sale is in this potential Broad Location's favour such that, despite the lack of active housebuilder involvement, this location is considered to perform quite well in terms of *Promotion*.

Ownership

3.10.8 The site promoters of Ib15 indicate it is in single ownership. This has the potential to avoid the problems inherent to sites in multiple ownership (such as ransom strips, restrictive covenants or related), and the Broad Location is therefore considered to score strongly against the *Ownership* factor.

Summary of Delivery Assessment for South West Ibstock

3.10.9 In deliverability terms, the South West Ibstock potential Broad Location performs quite well. The SHLAA site within this potential BL is in single ownership, with a landowner willing to sell, but no housebuilder interest. Despite this, should this BL be identified in the Core Strategy as a preferred location for housing development, it is not unreasonable to assume that housing development could take place in this area later in the Plan period.

3.10.10 There is no deliverability issue so significant as to prevent the West Ibstock potential BL being identified in the Core Strategy.

North Ibstock Potential Broad Location

Promotion

3.10.11 The predominant SHLAA site within the North Ibstock Broad Location is Melbourne Road / Leicester Road (SHLAA ref. Ib18), which was submitted by a planning consultancy on behalf of a housebuilder. There are three other, much smaller SHLAA sites in the area. Leicester Road (Ib8) sits to the east of Ib18, while both Land at Ravenstone Road (Ib6) and Land off Ravenstone Road / Melbourne Road (Ib7) sit within Ib18.

3.10.12 The SHLAA, which has been consulted on with the site promoters, indicates housebuilding would not commence before the second five-year period.

3.10.13 The involvement of housebuilders in the promotion of this site is an advantage such that this location is considered to perform well in terms of *Promotion*.

Ownership

3.10.14 There are a variety of landowners in the potential North Ibstock Broad Location. There is no known formal structure through which the landowners are working together to seek the development of the site, despite Ib18 being submitted by a planning consultancy on behalf of a housebuilder. No reference is made in the submission to the role of Ib8.

3.10.15 While the issue of multiple landowners is not in itself a serious concern, the lack of a confirmed approach by which the landowners are working together, in addition to the submission of a planning application on Ib6 and Ib7, does raise questions over the certainty that can be attached to the delivery of housing development in this potential Broad Location.

3.10.16 As a result, the North Ibstock BL is considered to score poorly against the *Ownership* factor.

Summary of Delivery Assessment for North Ibstock

3.10.17 In deliverability terms, the North Ibstock potential Broad Location performs quite poorly. The SHLAA sites within this potential BL are, individually, in single ownership, but there is no evidence that the landowners are working together in a consortium to secure delivery of housing development. The involvement of a planning consultancy in making SHLAA submissions does indicate some cross-party collaboration, but the extent of this is unknown.

3.10.18 Despite the above, there is no deliverability issue so significant as to prevent the West Ibstock potential BL being identified in the Core Strategy.

North East Ibstock Potential Broad Location

Promotion

3.10.19 The predominant SHLAA site within the North East Ibstock Broad Location is Land Rear of Leicester Road (SHLAA ref. Ib10). The SHLAA site was initially promoted by a house builder but it is understood that the interest has changed and no correspondence has been received from the housebuilder since 2008. The SHLAA, which has been consulted on with the site promoters, indicates housebuilding would not commence before the second five-year period.

3.10.20 While the willingness of the landowner to submit the site for consideration in the SHLAA is a potential positive, the lack of formal housebuilder interest in recent times means that the North East Ibstock Broad Location is considered to perform poorly in terms of *Promotion*.

Ownership

3.10.21 The site promoters of Ib10 indicate it is in single ownership. This has the potential to avoid the problems inherent to sites in multiple ownership (such as ransom strips, restrictive covenants or related), and the BL is therefore considered to score well against the *Ownership* factor.

- 3.10.22 Taking into account the inevitable loss of employment in the village should housebuilding be allowed on Ib10, the North East Ibstock BL performs very poorly in terms of *Infrastructure Provision*.

Summary of Delivery Assessment for North East Ibstock

- 3.10.23 In deliverability terms, the North East Ibstock potential Broad Location performs indifferently. The SHLAA site within this potential Broad Location is in single ownership, but no correspondence has been received to indicate this remains the case since 2008. Despite this, should this Broad Location be identified in the Core Strategy as a preferred location for housing development, it is not unreasonable to assume that housing development could take place in this area later in the Plan period.
- 3.10.24 There is no deliverability issue so significant as to prevent the West Ibstock potential BL being identified in the Core Strategy.

Summary of Ibstock Potential Broad Locations Delivery Assessment

- 3.10.25 The above text highlights the important comparison made between the potential Broad Locations in determining their relative merits in terms of deliverability. The West, South West and North East perform positively against Promotion and Ownership, while the North only performs positively against Promotion.
- 3.10.26 The West and North East benefit from the active involvement of housebuilders, while the role of housebuilders is unclear to the North and entirely absent in the South West. In Ownership terms, the North performs poorly owing to a variety of landowners and there being no known agreed structure within which those landowners are working together. All the other Broad Locations are in single ownership and therefore perform identically to one another.
- 3.10.27 On this basis, there is a clear hierarchy in Deliverability terms, with the West and South West performing better than the North and North East, and the West performing best overall.
- 3.10.28 It should be noted that none of the potential Broad Locations had any deliverability issue so significant as to prevent their being identified in the Core Strategy. Moreover, this is one element of the assessment of the potential Broad Locations and, while noted above as being a key issue, there are also the important factors of sustainability, accessibility and impact on the environment to consider in reaching a judgement as to the most appropriate Broad Location for Growth for Ibstock.

MEASHAM

- 3.11 The following paragraphs examine in detail the *Promotion* and *Ownership* factors across each of the three potential Broad Locations in Measham.

North East Measham Potential Broad Location

Promotion

- 3.11.1 The predominant SHLAA site in this potential Broad Location is Leicester Road/Grassy Lane (SHLAA ref. M11) and is promoted by beneficiaries of a trust. There is no known housebuilder or land agent interest in the site, and therefore (as detailed in the SHLAA) development is not envisaged until the latter part of the plan period. Therefore, it performs moderately in terms of *Promotion*.

Ownership

- 3.11.2 M11 is in multiple ownership, brought together under a trust. This cooperation is a potential positive, in that disposing of the land could be easier than if no cooperation existed, although it is considered that the problems inherent to sites in multiple ownership (such as ransom strips, restrictive covenants or related) remain of concern. Therefore, it is considered to perform quite well in terms of *Ownership*.

Summary for Delivery Assessment for North East Measham

- 3.11.3 In deliverability terms, the North East Measham potential Broad Location performs quite well overall. The SHLAA site has a number of beneficiaries but no known developer interest. Despite this, it is not unreasonable to assume that housing development could take place in this area later in the Plan period.

West Measham Potential Broad Location

Promotion

- 3.11.4 The predominant SHLAA site in this potential Broad Location is Youth Club/Sports Ground/A42 (SHLAA ref. M9). M9 is promoted by planning agents on behalf of multiple landowners. As there is market interest in the site, the SHLAA details that development could commence during the second five year period (starting 2017/18). Therefore, the site scores well in regards to *Promotion*.

Ownership

- 3.11.5 A significant part of the West Measham Broad Location is in single ownership; however, there are smaller, surrounding parcels of the site that fall under various ownerships. As the Broad Location is in multiple ownership, there is the potential for inherent problems such as ransom strips, restrictive covenants or related issues. On the basis that the largest parcel of land is in single ownership, M9 is considered to perform quite well against the *Ownership* factor.

Summary for Delivery Assessment for West of Measham

- 3.11.6 In deliverability terms, the West Measham potential Broad Location performs well. There are a number of landowners, which could cause issues for release of some parts of the site, but the active involvement of a planning agent and housebuilder is beneficial. It is not unreasonable to assume that housing development could take place in this area later in the Plan period.

South East Measham Potential Broad Location

Promotion

- 3.11.7 The predominant SHLAA site in this potential Broad Location is Atherstone Road, Measham (SHLAA ref. M6). The site is currently an operational brickworks and was identified through the 2007 Housing Land Availability Assessment
- 3.11.8 While the willingness of the landowner to submit the site for consideration in the SHLAA is a potential positive, the lack of formal housebuilder interest in recent times means that the North East Ibstock Broad Location is considered to perform poorly in terms of *Promotion*.

Ownership

- 3.11.9 It is unclear as to whether the site is in single or multiple ownership; therefore it scores moderately in terms of *Ownership*.

Summary for Delivery Assessment for South East Measham

- 3.11.10 In deliverability terms, the South East Measham potential Broad Location performs poorly as it has not been promoted by the landowner or brickworks operator, and its development would result in the loss of an important employment use in the village.
- 3.11.11 Although a planning application was submitted on M6, this was in 2001 and there has been no further promotion of the site. In terms of ownership it is not known if there is one or several landowners involved. Furthermore, development would result in a loss of an existing local employment use. Given the lack of developer interest in the site it is not considered that development would take place until later in the Plan period and, given the wider deliverability concerns, there is a question as to whether any certainty could be given to development taking place in the south east of Measham at all.

Summary of Measham Potential Broad Locations Delivery Assessment

- 3.11.12 The above text provides a useful summary of how each potential Broad Location performs against the three Delivery criteria. It is apparent that the South East performs poorly overall such that its inclusion as the Broad Location for Measham would contradict deliverability evidence.

3.11.13 There is little to choose between the other two Broad Locations. The fact that the West performs better in *Ownership* terms than does the North East in *Promotion* terms means that, on balance, the West is the best potential Broad Location for Measham as regards deliverability, but it is clear that both perform well against the overall assessment as set out in this section.

4.0 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

INTRODUCTION

- 4.1 Sustainability Appraisal is a process used to assess how effective the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy (or other plan) will be in delivering development that contributes to greater sustainability locally and globally.
- 4.2 Sustainability Appraisal is a process that takes place during the preparation of the Core Strategy (or other plan). It is, therefore, important to ensure that each of the potential Broad Locations is subject to Sustainability Appraisal as part of the process of deciding on the most appropriate Broad Locations to include in the Core Strategy. This helps to ensure that Sustainability Appraisal is an integral part of the process of preparing the Core Strategy.
- 4.3 The Sustainability Appraisal of the potential Broad Locations was undertaken in-house, whilst a Sustainability Appraisal of the whole Core Strategy has been undertaken by independent consultants.
- 4.4 Each of the potential Broad Locations was assessed against a range of sustainability objectives as identified in the Scoping Report of 2005. In view of the fact that the Sustainability Appraisal is a lengthy and complex piece of work, only a summary of its findings are presented in this section. The complete results are set out in the matrices at Appendix A.
- 4.5 The findings of the Sustainability Appraisal of the potential Broad Locations will be weighed against all of the other assessments undertaken as set out elsewhere in this Background Paper in section 6.

ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH

West Ashby Broad Location

- 4.6 The west Broad Location is judged to have the most negative impacts and the least uncertain impacts, whilst also having the same number of positive impacts as the other two locations.

Positive

- 4.6.1 Of the positive impacts the only one which is unique to the west Broad Location is in relation to impact upon the vitality and viability of the town centre. This is primarily due its scale being such that it is unlikely to be able to accommodate local shops from a commercial viability point of view. However, there is some uncertainty as there is no guarantee that residents would shop in Ashby Town Centre and a direct link to the west to Swadlincote and Burton upon Trent could in itself pull people away from

Ashby. It is considered that whilst being a potentially positive impact the benefits to the town centre as a whole would not be significant.

- 4.6.2 The remaining positive impacts (the provision of quality homes, enhancing and conserving the built environment, and maintaining and enhancing open space) apart from being common with the other locations, are also considered to be uncertain as to some extent any impact will depend upon the actual development which takes place. The impacts are judged to be likely to be fairly minor.

Negative

- 4.6.3 Most of the negative impacts are judged to be common to all 3 Broad Locations considered. Most of these (production of waste, water consumption, pollution and energy use) are not locationally specific although their impact could be significant. However, some particularly in respect of water consumption and energy use could be mitigated to some extent by the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.
- 4.6.4 This location would result in the loss of Greenfield land although there is no reason to think that an appropriate density of development could not be achieved therefore offsetting this impact to some extent. As this location is smaller in extent than the other two areas considered, the loss of Greenfield land would not be as significant in this location.
- 4.6.5 The impact up on the River Mease SAC could be potentially very significant, as it could for the other two locations. However, in accordance with the Habitats Regulations, development could not take place if it were judged to have an adverse impact. Therefore, whilst any impact in theory could be significant, in reality development in this locality would not be able to occur without taking the necessary steps to avoid an adverse impact so minimising the likelihood of a significant impact on this objective.
- 4.6.6 The other common negative impact is in relation to a failure to contribute to diversification of the rural economy. This is as a result of taking land out of agricultural production in to housing use such that there would be no added value to agriculture, forestry or leisure. Once again this impact is considered to be negligible.
- 4.6.7 A negative impact is also recorded in respect of potential impact upon landscape character as recorded in the Landscape Character Assessment – this is common to all three locations assessed. This is because it is only judged to have a moderate potential for mitigating any impact. If it is not possible to mitigate the impact then it is likely that such an impact would be locally significant and would be long term. A mitigation measure identified is to not locate development on the higher ground. Whilst this could mitigate the impact on this objective it would reduce the amount of housing that could be provided in this location to the detriment of the providing quality homes objective.
- 4.6.8 The west Broad Location is judged to be likely to have a negative impact in respect of the reducing the need to travel objective. This is because there are few services and

facilities in the immediate ~~vicinity~~, vicinity. There is an hourly daytime service which passes close to this location and which would provide access to the town centre and ~~currently no public transport serving this locality to provide a direct connection to the town centre~~ where most of the services and facilities are to be found, although access or to the major employment areas on the east side of the town would require a change of bus. There is some employment to the north-east of this location but it does not appear that a direct link could be achieved to improve accessibility to this area. Furthermore, the scale of proposed development may not be able to support the provision of any additional public transport. It is considered therefore, that development in this locality would be likely to result in increased car usage. This impact on this objective is likely to be significant and would also impinge on other objectives which seek to reduce pollution.

- 4.6.9 Finally this location is judged to have a negative impact as it does not contribute towards the provision of employment land, primarily to because its scale is such that it is unlikely to be able to accommodate employment uses as well as housing. The significance of this is likely to be fairly minor as there will be other opportunities to provide employment elsewhere.

Uncertain

- 4.6.10 This Broad Location is only judged to have three uncertain impacts, the lowest of all of the locations in Ashby considered. The impacts in relation to minerals and the cultural, historic and archaeological heritage objective are common to the other locations as well. Uncertainty is recorded in respect of both of these as any impact will largely depend upon the actual development and how it is designed and constructed. Mitigation may result in positive impacts but is considered too uncertain to judge.

- 4.6.11 The remaining uncertain impact is in relation to reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding. This location is according to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment within Zone 1 (i.e. low probability of flooding) and so development would reduce the risk of flooding occurring. However, this objective has twin aims and development here would not reduce the impact of flooding as well, therefore cancelling out to some extent the impact on reducing the risk of flooding. Therefore, the impact is recorded as being uncertain.

North Ashby Broad Location

- 4.6.12 The north Broad Location is judged to have the least negative impacts and the most uncertain impacts. The number of positive impacts is the same as the other two Broad Locations assessed.

Positive

- 4.6.13 Of the positive impacts the only one which is not common to the other locations is in relation to reducing the need to travel. The southern part of this location adjoins the Ashby Town Centre where most services and facilities are located. There are existing

footpath links from this area towards the town centre which could be further enhanced so as to provide opportunities to walk (or cycle) from this location to the town centre, reducing the need to use a car. It would be important to ensure that the design and layout of any development incorporated walking and cycling routes from all parts of the location so as to maximise this potential. This location also benefits from close proximity to established employment areas to the south and the out of town Tesco supermarket. There are no direct links to these areas and it is not clear as to whether any could be achieved. The scale of this location is such that it could support a significant amount of development (albeit that some would have to go beyond the plan period) which would be more likely to be able to support some form of public transport provision. Overall it is considered that the impact on this objective could be significant.

- 4.6.14 The remaining positive impacts (the provision of quality homes, enhancing and conserving the built environment, and maintaining and enhancing open space) apart from being common to the other locations, are also considered to be uncertain as to some extent any impact will depend upon the actual development which takes place. The impacts are judged to be likely to be fairly minor.

Negative

- 4.6.15 Most of the negative impacts are judged to be common to all 3 Broad Locations considered. Most of these (production of waste, water consumption, pollution and energy use) are not locationally specific although their impact could be significant. However, some particularly in respect of water consumption and energy use could be mitigated to some extent by the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.
- 4.6.16 This location would result in the loss of Greenfield land although there is no reason to think that an appropriate density of development could not be achieved therefore offsetting this impact to some extent. The scale of this location is such that the loss of Greenfield land would be significant.
- 4.6.17 The impact up on the River Mease SAC could be potentially very significant, as it could for the other two locations. However, in accordance with the Habitats Regulations, development could not take place if it were judged to have an adverse impact. Therefore, whilst any impact in theory could be significant, in reality development in this locality would not be able to occur without taking the necessary steps to avoid an adverse impact so minimising the likelihood of a significant impact on this objective.
- 4.6.18 The other common negative impact is in relation to a failure to contribute to diversification of the rural economy. This is as a result of taking land out of agricultural production in to housing use such that there would be no added value to agriculture, forestry or leisure. Once again this impact is considered to be negligible.
- 4.6.19 The remaining negative impact relates to the potential impact upon landscape character as recorded in the Landscape Character Assessment. This is because it is

only judged to have a moderate potential for mitigating any impact. If it is not possible to mitigate the impact then it is likely that such an impact would be locally significant and would be long term.

Uncertain

4.6.20 There are four objectives where the impacts are recorded as being uncertain. Two impacts (minerals) and the cultural, historic and archaeological heritage objective are common to the other locations. Uncertainty is recorded in respect of both of these as any impact will largely depend upon the actual development and how it is designed and constructed. Mitigation may result in positive impacts but is considered too uncertain to judge.

4.6.21 The other uncertainties (provision of employment land and impact upon vitality and viability of the town centre) are common with the south-east location. There is uncertainty in respect of employment land because whilst it is considered that the scale of the location could accommodate employment development as well, it is not known at this time as to whether this would happen. There is uncertainty in respect of vitality and viability of the town centre because it is considered that the scale of this location could, potentially, support some local shopping provision which could impact upon the town centre, although the scale of any shopping is likely to be limited so would not be significant. Furthermore this could reduce the need to travel by car, so could be positive on that objective.

4.6.22 The remaining uncertain impact is in relation to reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding. This location is according to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment within Zone 1 (i.e. low probability of flooding) and so development would reduce the risk of flooding occurring. However, this objective has twin aims and development here would not reduce the impact of flooding as well, therefore cancelling out to some extent the impact on reducing the risk of flooding. Therefore, the impact is recorded as being uncertain.

South East Ashby Broad Location

4.6.23 The south-east location is judged to have the second most number of negative impacts but has the same number of positive impacts as the other locations.

Positive

4.6.24 One impact is unique to this location; that which relates to reducing flood risk. There is a history of flooding downstream of Ashby near Packington. The Gilwiskaw Brook which is the source of this flooding runs through this location. The scale of this location is such that it could potentially accommodate flood alleviation measures which would be of benefit downstream of this location. This could be a potentially significant impact.

4.6.25 Three of the positive impacts (the provision of quality homes, enhancing and conserving the built environment, and maintaining and enhancing open space) apart from being common with the other locations, are also considered to be uncertain as to some extent any impact will depend upon the actual development which takes place. The impacts are judged to be likely to be fairly minor.

Negative

4.6.26 Most of the negative impacts are judged to be common to all 3 Broad Locations considered. Most of these (production of waste, water consumption, pollution and energy use) are not locationally specific although their impact could be significant. However, some particularly in respect of water consumption and energy use could be mitigated to some extent by the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.

4.6.27 This location would result in the loss of Greenfield land although there is no reason to think that an appropriate density of development could not be achieved therefore offsetting this impact to some extent. The scale of this location is such that the loss of Greenfield land would be significant.

4.6.28 The impact up on the River Mease SAC could be potentially very significant, as it could for the other two locations. However, in accordance with the Habitats Regulations, development could not take place if it were judged to have an adverse impact. Therefore, whilst any impact in theory could be significant, in reality development in this locality would not be able to occur without taking the necessary steps to avoid an adverse impact so minimising the likelihood of a significant impact on this objective.

4.6.29 The other common negative impact is in relation to a failure to contribute to diversification of the rural economy. This is as a result of taking land out of agricultural production in to housing use such that there would be no added value to agriculture, forestry or leisure. Once again this impact is considered to be negligible.

4.6.30 The remaining negative impact relates to the potential impact upon landscape character and reducing the need to travel. In respect of landscape the Landscape Character Assessment this location is judged to have a low potential for mitigating any impact. For this reason it is considered negative. Such an impact would be significant.

4.6.31 In respect of reducing the need to travel there are few services and facilities in the immediate vicinity (save for a primary school). The location is somewhat distant from employment opportunities which are largely concentrated to the north-east of this location, with no direct public transport connection to these areas. There may be some scope having regard to the scale of this location and its ability to support a significant amount of development, to provide some public transport provision but it is considered that the overall affect is likely to be significant and would also impinge on other objectives which seek to reduce pollution.

Uncertain

- 4.6.32 There are four objectives where the impacts are recorded as being uncertain. Two impacts (minerals) and the cultural, historic and archaeological heritage objective are common with the other locations. Uncertainty is recorded in respect of both of these as any impact will largely depend upon the actual development and how it is designed and constructed. Mitigation may result in positive impacts but is considered too uncertain to judge.
- 4.6.33 The other uncertainties (provision of employment land and impact upon vitality and viability of the town centre) are common with the north location. There is uncertainty in respect of employment land because whilst it is considered that the scale of the location could accommodate employment development as well, it is not known at this time as to whether this would happen. There is uncertainty in respect of vitality and viability of the town centre because it is considered that the scale of this location could, potentially, support some local shopping provision which could impact upon the town centre, although the scale of any shopping is likely to be limited so would not be significant. Furthermore this could reduce the need to travel by car, so could be positive on that objective.

CASTLE DONINGTON

South West Castle Donington Broad Location

- 4.7.1 This location has the potential to score positively in respect of 5 of the sustainability objectives, but the potential negative impacts are slightly greater (6). The impact upon 6 of the objectives is uncertain, whilst there is no relationship to 5 of the objectives.

Positive

- 4.7.2 The positive impacts relate to the provision of quality homes, reducing the need to travel, enhancing and conserving the built environment, enhancing and conserving the landscape character and maintaining and enhancing open space. None of the positive impacts are judged to be fairly certain. However, of these that relating to reducing the need to travel is considered to be potentially significant.

Negative

- 4.7.3 In respect of the negative impacts these are largely ones which reflect the likely impact of development itself rather than the location as they relate to production of waste, water consumption, pollution and energy use which will be common to all new developments irrespective of location. The remaining negative impacts relate to the potential inefficient use of land as the location comprises of Greenfield land, although there is no reason to think that an appropriate density of development could not be achieved therefore offsetting this impact to some extent, and to failure of the location

to contribute to diversification of the rural economy. The impact of the latter is considered to be negligible, whilst the scale of this location is such that the loss of Greenfield land would be significant.

Uncertain

4.7.4 There are six objectives where the impact is judged to be uncertain.

4.7.5 In relation to reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding objective, this location is according to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment within Zone 1 (i.e. low probability of flooding) and so development would reduce the risk of flooding occurring. However, this objective has twin aims and development here would not reduce the impact of flooding as well, therefore cancelling out to some extent the impact on reducing the risk of flooding. Therefore, the impact is recorded as being uncertain.

4.7.6 Uncertainty is recorded in respect of impacts in relation to minerals and the cultural, historic and archaeological heritage objectives as any impact will largely depend upon the actual development and how it is designed and constructed. Mitigation may result in positive impacts but is considered too uncertain to judge.

4.7.7 There is uncertainty in respect of employment land because whilst it is considered that the scale of the location could accommodate employment development as well, it is not known at this time as to whether this would happen. There is uncertainty in respect of vitality and viability of the town centre because it is considered that the scale of this location could, potentially, support some local shopping provision which could impact upon the town centre, although the scale of any shopping is likely to be limited so would not be significant. Furthermore this could reduce the need to travel by car, so could be positive on that objective.

4.7.8 There is an uncertain impact in relation to possible impact upon bio diversity and geo diversity as there are potential local wildlife sites in the vicinity of this Broad Location could be impacted upon. It should be possible to provide mitigation measures such that any impact is minimised, but this would depend upon the actual development that took place.

COALVILLE

South-West Coalville Broad Location

4.8.1 The South-West Broad Location is considered to have the most negative and positive (joint with south-east) impacts, as well as the least uncertain impacts.

Positive

4.8.2 Of the positive impacts, 4 of these (the provision of quality homes, reducing the need to travel, conserving the districts heritage and archaeological assets and maintaining and enhancing open space) are common to the other 2 locations as well. With the

exception of conserving the districts heritage and archaeological assets, none are judged to be fairly certain as they will be dependent upon the design and layout of any actual development itself. With the exception of reducing the need to travel which is considered below, the impacts are judged as being likely to be fairly minor.

4.8.3 This location is well related to the town centre and its services and facilities with parts of this location within 400 metres of the town centre, although those parts towards the south-west corner are more distant. Employment opportunities and facilities such as primary schools are also within reasonable distance. There is the potential for enhancing footpath and cycle links thereby reducing the need to use the car. However, this will be largely dependent upon the actual design and layout of any development. Some form of bus provision would improve accessibility still further, especially for the south-western part of this location, but the scale of development when considering other possible requirements may not be able to support this. For these reasons there is some uncertainty as to whether the impact would be as positive as might appear to be the case. In the event that these measures can be incorporated the impact on this objective could be significant

4.8.4 The other positive impacts relate to impact upon the vitality and viability of the town centre, enhancing and conserving the built environment and landscape character. In respect of the former the positive impacts are twofold – proximity of this location should encourage people to use the shops in the town centre, whilst it is unlikely that scale of location is unlikely to be able to support the provision of new local shops which (if provided) could deter people from using the town centre. However, there is some uncertainty as the actual impact will depend upon the decisions of individuals in terms of their shopping preferences. It is considered that any impact would be fairly minor as on its own it would not affect the overall vitality and viability of the town centre.

4.8.5 In respect of landscape the Landscape Character Assessment suggest that the potential to mitigate any impact is largely moderate, although the north-eastern part which adjoins the existing built area of Coalville has a high potential to achieve mitigation. However, the actual design and layout of any development would ultimately determine the impact. Subject to appropriate mitigation the potential positive impact upon this objective is quite significant.

Negative

4.8.6 In respect of the negative impacts, 5 of these are common to all locations. These 5 impacts are largely ones which reflect the likely impact of development itself rather than the location, as they relate to production of waste, water consumption, pollution and energy use which will be common to all new developments irrespective of location. However, some, particularly in respect of water consumption and energy use could be mitigated to some extent by the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures. This location would result in the loss of Greenfield land although there is no reason to think that an appropriate density of development could not be achieved therefore offsetting this impact to some extent. As this location is smaller than the

other two areas considered, the loss of Greenfield land would not be as significant in this location.

- 4.8.7 In respect of impact upon pollution, all the locations will impact to some extent of the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) at Broom Leys Road/Stephenson Way junction. This is because the AQMA relates to traffic. All these locations will generate traffic, some of which will pass through this junction thereby having a negative effect on the reducing the impact of pollution objective. The impact from development at this location is likely be less significant than either of the other locations by virtue of its distance from the junction and the availability of alternative road routes which would enable traffic to avoid this junction.
- 4.8.8 The remaining negative impacts relate protection and enhancement of the districts bio diversity and geo diversity and providing an adequate supply of employment land. In respect of the latter this is primarily because its scale is such that it is unlikely to be able to accommodate employment uses as well as housing. The significance of this is likely to be fairly minor as there will be other opportunities to provide employment elsewhere.
- 4.8.9 In respect of bio diversity and geo diversity a Local Nature Reserve (Snibston Grange) lies towards the centre of this location. Unless appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated in to any development the impact on this objective could be significant.

Uncertain

- 4.8.10 There are two uncertain impacts. The first is in relation to sustainable use of minerals. This is recorded as uncertain as any impact will largely depend upon the actual development and how it is designed and constructed. Mitigation may result in positive impacts but is considered too uncertain to judge. This is common to all three locations.
- 4.8.11 The remaining uncertain impact is in relation to reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding. This location is according to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment within Zone 1 (i.e. low probability of flooding) and so development would reduce the risk of flooding occurring. However, this objective has twin aims and development here would not reduce the impact of flooding as well, therefore cancelling out to some extent the impact on reducing the risk of flooding. Therefore, the impact is recorded as being uncertain.

North Coalville Broad Location

- 4.8.12 This location is recorded as having the lowest number of negative and positive impacts, as well as the highest number of uncertain impacts.

Positive

- 4.8.13 Of the 5 positive impacts recorded 4 (the provision of quality homes, reducing the need to travel, conserving the districts heritage and archaeological assets and maintaining and enhancing open space) are common to the other 2 locations as well. The impact upon conserving the districts heritage and archaeological assets and reducing the need to travel, are judged to be fairly certain. However, there is less certainty in respect of the other two objectives as any impact will be dependent upon the design and layout of any actual development itself. With the exception of reducing the need to travel which is considered below, the impacts are judged as being likely to be fairly minor.
- 4.8.14 This location lies at the heart of the Coalville urban area and so benefits from being well related to a wide range of services and facilities by means other than the car. There are existing bus routes which pass close to this location whilst the scale of location could probably support the provision of additional bus services. There are existing footpaths which cross this location which provide links in to the wider urban area. These could potentially be enhanced to provide cycle links as well. The scale of this location is such that it is likely that it could support the provision of additional services and facilities so reducing the need to travel even more. Because of its central location the impact is considered to be fairly certain and the impact is also likely to be significant.
- 4.8.15 The remaining positive impacts relate to impact upon landscape character. The Landscape Character Assessment suggests that the potential for mitigation is moderate to high and for this reason the impact is positive. Providing the necessary mitigation measures are incorporated the impact is likely to be significant.

Negative

- 4.8.16 All of the recorded negative impacts are common to the other locations in Coalville. These 5 impacts are largely ones which reflect the likely impact of development itself rather than the location, as they relate to production of waste, water consumption, pollution and energy use which will be common to all new developments irrespective of location. However, some, particularly in respect of water consumption and energy use could be mitigated to some extent by the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures. This location would result in the loss of Greenfield land although there is no reason to think that an appropriate density of development could not be achieved therefore offsetting this impact to some extent. The loss of Greenfield land could be significant in view of the scale of this location. However, the incorporation of open spaces and other measures to preserve some sense of separation would help to lessen this impact to some extent.
- 4.8.17 In respect of impact upon pollution, all the locations will impact to some extent of the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) at Broom Leys Road/Stephenson Way junction. This is because the AQMA relates to traffic. All these locations will generate traffic, some of which will pass through this junction thereby having a negative effect

on the reducing the impact of pollution objective. However, the impact from development at this location would be the most significant by virtue of its close proximity to this junction meaning a significant amount of traffic will have to go through the junction.

Uncertain

4.8.18 There are is one uncertain impact which is common with the other locations in relation to sustainable use of minerals. This is recorded as uncertain as any impact will largely depend upon the actual development and how it is designed and constructed. Mitigation may result in positive impacts but is considered too uncertain to judge.

4.8.19 The remaining uncertain impacts are common with the south-east location and relate to protection and enhance of bio diversity and geo diversity, provision of employment land and impact upon vitality and viability of the town centre. There is uncertainty in respect of employment land because whilst it is considered that the scale of the location could accommodate employment development as well, it is not known at this time as to whether this would happen. There is uncertainty in respect of vitality and viability of the town centre because it is considered that the scale of this location could, potentially, support some local shopping provision which could impact upon the town centre, although the scale of any shopping is likely to be limited so would not be significant. Furthermore this could reduce the need to travel by car, so could be positive on that objective.

4.8.20 In respect of bio diversity and geo diversity there is some concern that the former railway which crosses this location and which carries on northwards beyond the edge of this location could provide a corridor along which people will walk or cycle. This is a concern as to the north is a SSSI and so more people using this route could potentially have an impact. However, it is considered that it should be possible to mitigate against any potential impact and would also be offset by the potential to create new areas of bio diversity as part of any development.

South East Coalville Broad Location

4.8.21 This location is recorded as having the joint most number of positive impacts and the highest number of negative impacts, the latter jointly with the north location.

Positive

4.8.22 Of the positive impacts, 4 of these (the provision of quality homes, reducing the need to travel, conserving the districts heritage and archaeological assets and maintaining and enhancing open space) are common to the other 2 locations as well. With the exception of conserving the districts heritage and archaeological assets, none are judged to be fairly certain as they will be dependent upon the design and layout of any actual development itself. With the exception of reducing the need to travel which is considered below, the impacts are judged as being likely to be fairly minor.

- 4.8.23 This location is well related to the large employment area at Bardon. Parts of this location are within 400 metres of so and there are some limited footpath links to the town centre, generally speaking most of the location is further away. However, the scale of this location is such that it could support (and indeed need) the provision of arrange of local services and facilities within the location itself. This would reduce the need to travel great distances which would be further helped through the provision of arrange of cycling and walking routes across the location. The scale of this location is likely to be able to support the provision of bus services, not just to Coalville town centre but also possibly further afield as well. There is some uncertainty regarding this impact as it will be partly dependent upon the design and layout of any development. However, subject to such measures the positive impact could be significant.
- 4.8.24 The remaining positive impacts relate to reducing the risk of flooding and conserving and enhancing the district built environment and protection and enhancement of bio diversity and geo diversity. In respect of bio diversity there are some potential Local Wildlife Sites in the vicinity of the location. Development could impact on these so some form of mitigation will be required. This would include National Forest planting areas. This will partly depend upon the design and layout of any subsequent development so there is some uncertainty attached to this. The impact is not considered likely to be significant.
- 4.8.25 In respect of conserving and enhancing the built environment is largely judged as being positive as there is no Conservation Area in Coalville and few listed buildings. Therefore, there are few features which could be affected by new development in this location.
- 4.8.26 In respect of flooding part of this location is located within zone 3. However, the scale of the location is such that it could accommodate mitigation measures which would not only reduce flooding in this location but also downstream. However, this would depend upon the layout and design of any development. Subject to such mitigation being incorporated the impact could be quite significant.

Negative

- 4.8.27 In respect of the negative impacts, 5 of these are common to all locations. These 5 impacts are largely ones which reflect the likely impact of development itself rather than the location, as they relate to production of waste, water consumption, pollution and energy use which will be common to all new developments irrespective of location. However, some, particularly in respect of water consumption and energy use could be mitigated to some extent by the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures. This location would result in the loss of Greenfield land although there is no reason to think that an appropriate density of development could not be achieved therefore offsetting this impact to some extent. The loss of Greenfield land could be significant in view of the scale of this location. However, the incorporation of open spaces and other measures to preserve as part of development would help to lessen this impact to some extent, and should be achievable in view of the scale of this location.

4.8.28 In respect of impact upon pollution, all the locations will impact to some extent of the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) at Broom Leys Road/Stephenson Way junction. This is because the AQMA relates to traffic. All these locations will generate traffic, some of which will pass through this junction thereby having a negative effect on the reducing the impact of pollution objective. The impact from development at this location would be quite significant by virtue of the fact that some traffic emanating from this location and going westwards will go through this junction. The significance of this impact is likely to be less than for the north but greater than for the south-west locations, but could still be significant.

4.8.29 The remaining negative impact relates to landscape character. The Landscape Character Assessment suggests that the potential to achieve mitigation is moderate on the northern part of this location but low in respect of the southern part which is largely identified as a sensitive landscape. For this reason it is considered that the impact could be significant.

Uncertain

4.8.30 There are is one uncertain impact which is common with the other locations in relation to sustainable use of minerals. This is recorded as uncertain as any impact will largely depend upon the actual development and how it is designed and constructed. Mitigation may result in positive impacts but is considered too uncertain to judge.

4.8.31 Two of the remaining uncertain impacts are common with the north location and relate to the provision of employment land and impact upon vitality and viability of the town centre. There is uncertainty in respect of employment land because whilst it is considered that the scale of the location could accommodate employment development as well, it is not known at this time as to whether this would happen. There is uncertainty in respect of vitality and viability of the town centre because it is considered that the scale of this location could, potentially, support some local shopping provision which could impact upon the town centre, although the scale of any shopping is likely to be limited so would not be significant. Furthermore this could reduce the need to travel by car, so could be positive on that objective.

4.8.32 The remaining uncertain impact is in relation to reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding. This location is according to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment within Zone 1 (i.e. low probability of flooding) and so development would reduce the risk of flooding occurring. However, this objective has twin aims and development here would not reduce the impact of flooding as well, therefore cancelling out to some extent the impact on reducing the risk of flooding. Therefore, the impact is recorded as being uncertain.

IBSTOCK

North Ibstock Broad Location

4.9.1 The north is judged to have the most negative impacts and the least positive impacts.

Positive

4.9.2 Of the positive impacts, all 4 of these (the provision of quality homes, the vitality and viability of the town centre, conserving the districts heritage and archaeological assets and maintaining and enhancing open space) are common to the all the other locations assessed in Ibstock. With the exception of conserving the districts heritage and archaeological assets and vitality and viability of the town centre, none are judged to be fairly certain. In respect of provision of quality homes and open space this is because the exact impact will depend upon the design and layout of any actual development itself. None of the impacts are likely to be that significant.

Negative

4.9.3 Most of the negative impacts are judged to be common to all 4 Broad Locations considered. Of these the production of waste, water consumption, pollution and energy use objectives are not locationally specific although their impact could be significant. However, in respect of water consumption and energy use the impact could be mitigated to some extent by the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.

4.9.4 The other common negative impacts relate to the provision of employment land and a failure to contribute to diversification of the rural economy. In respect of the former this is primarily because its scale is such that it is unlikely to be able to accommodate employment uses as well as housing. The significance of this is likely to be fairly minor as there will be other opportunities to provide employment elsewhere. In respect of the rural economy this is as a result of taking land out of agricultural production in to housing use such that there would not be added value to agriculture, forestry or leisure. Once again this impact is considered to be negligible.

4.9.5 The remaining negative impacts associated with this location relate to impact upon landscape character, reducing the need to travel by car and efficient use of land. In respect of landscape character, to the north of this location is a valley such that this location is visible when viewed from the north. The Landscape Character Assessment suggests that along the northern edge of this location the potential for achieving mitigation is low. In other parts of the location, particularly those parts closest to the existing urban edge, the potential to achieve mitigation is moderate. The potential impact on this objective is significant.

4.9.6 This location would result in the loss of Greenfield land although there is no reason to think that an appropriate density of development could not be achieved therefore

offsetting this impact to some extent. Notwithstanding this, as this is quite a large area the potential impact on this objective is significant.

- 4.9.7 The final negative impact is in relation to reducing the need to travel. It is judged as being a potential negative impact because large parts of this location, particularly to the west, will not be directly served by existing bus services and there is little scope to divert the existing service. Furthermore, the scale of this location is unlikely to support the provision of new services. In respect of walking and cycling this location is over 800 metres away from the principal services and facilities, although the Co – Op supermarket is closer than the town centre to this location. In addition, the nature of the existing development to the south means that there are limited opportunities to link in to these areas. Even if such linkages could be provided the nature of this existing development is such that it does not itself provide very direct routes to the town centre. All of these factors are more likely to result in people using cars to access services and facilities. The potential impact on this objective is considered to be significant.

Uncertain

- 4.9.8 Of the 4 uncertain impacts one is common to all locations; reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding. This location is according to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment within Zone 1 (i.e. low probability of flooding) and so development would reduce the risk of flooding occurring. However, this objective has twin aims and development here would not reduce the impact of flooding as well, therefore cancelling out to some extent the impact on reducing the risk of flooding. Therefore, the impact is recorded as being uncertain.
- 4.9.9 In relation to sustainable use of mineral, this is recorded as uncertain as any impact will largely depend upon the actual development and how it is designed and constructed. Mitigation may result in positive impacts but is considered too uncertain to judge. This impact is common with the west and south-west locations as well.
- 4.9.10 There is an uncertain impact in relation to possible impact upon biodiversity and geo diversity as Kelham Bridge Nature Reserve lies to the north. It should be possible to provide mitigation measures such that any impact is minimised, but this would depend upon the actual development that took place. If adequate mitigation could not be achieved it is considered that in view of the distance to the nature reserve that any impact would not be significant.
- 4.9.11 The final uncertainty is in relation to impact upon the character and distinctiveness of the built environment. This is because of the concerns outlined above regarding the fact that there are few opportunities to integrate development at this location in to the existing development to the south. Therefore, development here would be somewhat 'isolated'. It may be possible to overcome these concerns to some extent, but it would depend upon the design and layout of any actual development.

West Ibstock Broad Location

4.9.12 The west is judged to have the second most number of positive impacts and the joint least number of negative impacts.

Positive

4.9.13 Of the positive impacts, 4 of these (the provision of quality homes, the vitality and viability of the town centre, conserving the districts heritage and archaeological assets and maintaining and enhancing open space) are common to the all the other locations assessed in Ibstock. With the exception of conserving the districts heritage and archaeological assets and vitality and viability of the town centre, none are judged to be fairly certain. In respect of provision of quality homes and open space this is because the exact impact will depend upon the design and layout of any actual development itself. None of the impacts are likely to be that significant.

4.9.14 The remaining impacts relate to impact upon the character and distinctiveness of the built environment, landscape character and bio diversity. The Landscape Character Assessments suggests that development in this location could be mitigated, so providing such mitigation is included it is likely that this will be a significant positive impact. This also links in to the issue of bio diversity as the provision of tree planting required because of the location within the National Forest will not only help mitigate any potential impact upon the landscape, but would also contribute towards creating additional bio diversity. It is likely that this could be a significant positive impact.

4.9.15 In respect of any impact on the character and distinctiveness of the built environment objective, the actual impact will depend upon the design and layout of actual development. However, it is likely that new development could be designed so that it integrates and connects with existing development to the east. The significance of this impact is likely to be minor.

Negative

4.9.16 Most of the negative impacts are judged to be common to all 4 Broad Locations considered. Of these the production of waste, water consumption, pollution and energy use objectives are not locationally specific although their impact could be significant. However, in respect of water consumption and energy use the impact could be mitigated to some extent by the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.

4.9.17 The other common negative impacts relate to the provision of employment land and a failure to contribute to diversification of the rural economy. In respect of the former this is primarily because its scale is such that it is unlikely to be able to accommodate employment uses as well as housing. The significance of this is likely to be fairly minor as there will be other opportunities to provide employment elsewhere. In respect of the rural economy, this is as a result of taking land out of agricultural production in to

housing use such that there would not be added value to agriculture, forestry or leisure. Once again this impact is considered to be negligible.

- 4.9.18 This location would result in the loss of Greenfield land although there is no reason to think that an appropriate density of development could not be achieved therefore offsetting this impact to some extent. Notwithstanding this, as this is quite a large area the potential impact on this objective is significant.

Uncertain

- 4.9.19 Of the 3 uncertain impacts one is common to all locations; reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding. This location is according to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment within Zone 1 (i.e. low probability of flooding) and so development would reduce the risk of flooding occurring. However, this objective has twin aims and development here would not reduce the impact of flooding as well, therefore cancelling out to some extent the impact on reducing the risk of flooding. Therefore, the impact is recorded as being uncertain.

- 4.9.20 In relation to sustainable use of mineral, this is recorded as uncertain as any impact will largely depend upon the actual development and how it is designed and constructed. Mitigation may result in positive impacts but is considered too uncertain to judge. This impact is common with the west and south-west locations as well.

- 4.9.21 The remaining uncertainty relates to reducing the need to travel. This location is not served by any bus services, but the adjoining development to the east is. Providing the necessary footpath connections are included as part of new development this should allow future residents to be able to access these services relatively easily. It is not clear as to whether it would be possible to extend this service to serve this location as well, although proximity to this location may mean this is not required. If the footpath (and cycleway) links in to the existing development can be achieved then the nature of the existing built up area provides fairly direct routes to facilities such as schools and the town centre. The uncertainty relates to the fact that ultimately the impact will depend to a large extent to the design and layout of any development. If done in the right way, then future residents should have alternatives to using the car. Such an impact could be quite significant but it is difficult to be certain at this time.

South West Ibstock Broad Location

- 4.9.22 The south-west location is judged as having the second most positive and negative impacts.

Positive

- 4.9.23 Of the positive impacts, 4 of these (the provision of quality homes, the vitality and viability of the town centre, conserving the districts heritage and archaeological assets and maintaining and enhancing open space) are common to all the other locations assessed in Ibstock. With the exception of conserving the districts heritage and

archaeological assets and vitality and viability of the town centre, none are judged to be fairly certain. In respect of provision of quality homes and open space this is because the exact impact will depend upon the design and layout of any actual development itself. None of the impacts are likely to be that significant.

4.9.24 The remaining impacts relate to impact upon the character and distinctiveness of the built environment and bio diversity. The provision of tree planting required because of the location within the National Forest will contribute towards creating additional bio diversity. It is likely that this could be a significant positive impact.

4.9.25 In respect of any impact on the character and distinctiveness of the built environment objective, the actual impact will depend upon the design and layout of actual development. However, it is likely that new development could be designed so that it integrates visually in with existing development. The significance of this impact is likely to be minor.

Negative

4.9.26 Most of the negative impacts are judged to be common to all 4 Broad Locations considered. Of these the production of waste, water consumption, pollution and energy use objectives are not locationally specific although their impact could be significant. However, in respect of water consumption and energy use the impact could be mitigated to some extent by the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.

4.9.27 The other common negative impacts relate to the provision of employment land and a failure to contribute to diversification of the rural economy. In respect of the former this is primarily because its scale is such that it is unlikely to be able to accommodate employment uses as well as housing. The significance of this is likely to be fairly minor as there will be other opportunities to provide employment elsewhere. In respect of the rural economy, this is as a result of taking land out of agricultural production in to housing use such that there would not be added value to agriculture, forestry or leisure. Once again this impact is considered to be negligible.

4.9.28 This location would result in the loss of Greenfield land although there is no reason to think that an appropriate density of development could not be achieved therefore offsetting this impact to some extent. Notwithstanding this, as this is quite a large area the potential impact on this objective is significant.

4.9.29 The remaining negative impact relates to impact upon Landscape Character. The Landscape Character Assessment suggests that the appearance of a rising settlement edge, when viewed from the south, would be difficult to mitigate. This impact could therefore be significant.

Uncertain

- 4.9.30 Of the 4 uncertain impacts one is common to all locations; reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding. This location is according to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment within Zone 1 (i.e. low probability of flooding) and so development would reduce the risk of flooding occurring. However, this objective has twin aims and development here would not reduce the impact of flooding as well, therefore cancelling out to some extent the impact on reducing the risk of flooding. Therefore, the impact is recorded as being uncertain.
- 4.9.31 In relation to sustainable use of mineral, this is recorded as uncertain as any impact will largely depend upon the actual development and how it is designed and constructed. Mitigation may result in positive impacts but is considered too uncertain to judge. This impact is common with the west and south-west locations as well.
- 4.9.32 The remaining uncertainty relates to reducing the need to travel. An existing bus service passes along Station Road and so could serve this location to some extent. However, it is unlikely that development would be of a scale which would support diverting the service so it would be necessary as part of development to ensure that it is designed to enable future residents to gain easy access to Station Road. The location has reasonably direct access to the town centre, primary school and secondary school via the existing built up area which offers various routes. However, recreation facilities and the Co – Op supermarket are further away. Subject to ensuring good footpath and cycle way links to station Road then future residents should have attractive alternatives to using the car. Such an impact could be quite significant but it is difficult to be certain at this time.

North-East Ibstock Broad Location

- 4.9.33 This location has the most positive and least (joint) negative impacts.

Positive

- 4.9.34 Of the positive impacts, 4 of these (the provision of quality homes, the vitality and viability of the town centre, conserving the districts heritage and archaeological assets and maintaining and enhancing open space) are common to all the other locations assessed in Ibstock. With the exception of conserving the districts heritage and archaeological assets and vitality and viability of the town centre, none are judged to be fairly certain. In respect of provision of quality homes and open space this is because the exact impact will depend upon the design and layout of any actual development itself. None of the impacts are likely to be that significant.
- 4.9.35 This is the only location in Ibstock which includes an element of previously developed land so that it has a positive impact in respect of efficient use of land. However, the location is small so the impact on this objective will not be that significant overall. The fact that this location includes some previously developed land is also positive in respect of impact on Landscape Character. This location was not

assessed as part of the Landscape Assessment but it is generally comprised of unattractive land which is also not open to public views. This is judged as being a significant impact.

4.9.36 The provision of tree planting required because of the location within the National Forest will contribute towards creating additional bio diversity. It is likely that this could be a significant positive impact.

4.9.37 This is the only location in Ibstock which is recorded as having a positive impact in respect of the rural economy. This again relates to the fact that it is partly previously developed land, which is also not farmed. Therefore, unlike the other locations there would not be a loss of agricultural land. However, the scale of this location is quite small so the overall impact will not be significant.

Negative

4.9.38 Most of the negative impacts are judged to be common to all 4 Broad Locations considered. Of these the production of waste, water consumption, pollution and energy use objectives are not locationally specific although their impact could be significant. However, in respect of water consumption and energy use the impact could be mitigated to some extent by the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.

4.9.39 The other common negative impact relates to the provision of employment land. This is primarily because its scale is such that it is unlikely to be able to accommodate employment uses as well as housing. The significance of this is likely to be fairly minor as there will be other opportunities to provide employment elsewhere.

4.9.40 This is the only location which is judged to have a potential negative impact in respect of minerals. This is because this location adjoins the active Ibstock Brickworks. New housing development in this location could result in future residents seeking restrictions on the existing use, either production of bricks or in terms of extraction of minerals which are known to exist to the east of the brickworks. If this were to happen this could be a quite significant impact.

4.9.41 The final negative impact relates to impact upon the character and distinctiveness of the built environment. This is because of the fact that this location lies behind existing development fronting on to Leicester Road. It may be possible to achieve a pedestrian link through to Leicester Road but even this would still result in a development which is somewhat isolated and turns its back on the rest of Ibstock. As such it would not be integrated into the wider settlement and would therefore not enhance the character of the built environment. It is considered that this would be a potentially quite significant impact.

Uncertain

4.9.42 Of the 2 uncertain impacts one is common to all locations; reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding. This location is according to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment within Zone 1 (i.e. low probability of flooding) and so development would reduce the risk of flooding occurring. However, this objective has twin aims and development here would not reduce the impact of flooding as well, therefore cancelling out to some extent the impact on reducing the risk of flooding. Therefore, the impact is recorded as being uncertain.

4.9.43 In respect of reducing the need to travel, this location lies behind existing development fronting on to Leicester Road. Whilst an existing bus service passes along Leicester Road which would potentially serve this location, there would need to be a pedestrian link through the existing development fronting Leicester Road to ensure that future residents had easy access to this service. It is not clear whether this is achievable. Recreation facilities are close by, whilst the Co-Op supermarket is a little further on, but would depend upon the ability to create a link to Leicester Road as outlined above. If this could not be achieved then this location would be somewhat isolated and integrated in to the wider settlement and could result in increased car usage. However, it is not clear at this time.

MEASHAM

West Measham Broad Location

4.10.1 The west has the second fewest number of both positive and negative impacts, but also the most number of uncertain impacts.

Positive

4.10.2 Of the 4 positive impacts 3 are common to all of the locations assessed in Measham. These relate to the provision of quality homes, the vitality and viability of the town centre, and maintaining and enhancing open space. The first and last of these are considered to be uncertain as to some extent any impact will depend upon the actual development which takes place. The impacts are judged to be likely to be fairly minor.

4.10.3 In respect of vitality and viability of the town centre it is considered that this impact is certain, unlike the other two locations. This is partly because of the location's proximity to the town centre which directly adjoins it. In addition, this location will be important in helping to achieve the restoration of the Ashby Canal, which includes the possibility of a wharf type development on the very eastern edge of this location close to the town centre. Such a wharf would help attract additional people to Measham, some of whom would use the shops and other services, as well as residents. This would be a significant positive impact.

4.10.4 The other positive impact relates to conserving the built environment. To some extent this also will depend upon the design and layout of any subsequent development. Once again the impact on this objective is likely to be minor.

Negative

4.10.5 Four of the seven negative impacts in this location are common to all 3 Broad Locations considered. Most of these (production of waste, water consumption and pollution) as well as that related to energy use are not locationally specific although their impact could be significant. However, some particularly in respect of water consumption and energy use could be mitigated to some extent by the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.

4.10.6 The other impact common to all 3 Broad Locations relates to the impact up on the River Mease SAC. This could be potentially very significant,. However, in accordance with the Habitats Regulations, development could not take place if it were judged to have an adverse impact. Therefore, whilst any impact in theory could be significant, in reality development in this locality would not be able to occur without taking the necessary steps to avoid an adverse impact so minimising the likelihood of a significant impact on this objective.

4.10.7 This location would result in the loss of Greenfield land although there is no reason to think that an appropriate density of development could not be achieved therefore offsetting this impact to some extent. In addition, that part closest to the High Street would involve the use of some previously developed land; therefore, notwithstanding the extent of this location the impact upon this objective is not likely to be significant.

4.10.8 In respect of Landscape Character although this location is well contained by existing development, the Landscape Character Assessment suggests that mitigation would be difficult to achieve, primarily due to the topography. This impact is judged to be potentially significant.

Uncertain

4.10.9 This location has the most number of uncertain impacts. In respect of the provision of employment land this is because whilst it is unlikely that it would be unable to accommodate significant employment uses as well as housing, there is some potential for employment as associated with the development of wharf at the eastern edge of this location.

4.10.10 In respect of the rural economy, development in this location would result in taking land out of agricultural production in to housing use such that there would not be added value to agriculture, forestry or leisure. However, the restoration of the Ashby Canal which passes through this location would offset this to some extent.

4.10.11 In relation to reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding objective, this location is according to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment within Zone 1 (i.e. low probability

of flooding) and so development would reduce the risk of flooding occurring. However, this objective has twin aims and development here would not reduce the impact of flooding as well, therefore cancelling out to some extent the impact on reducing the risk of flooding. Therefore, the impact is recorded as being uncertain.

4.10.12 Uncertainty is recorded in respect of impacts in relation to minerals and the cultural, historic and archaeological heritage objectives as any impact will largely depend upon the actual development and how it is designed and constructed. Mitigation may result in positive impacts but is considered too uncertain to judge.

4.10.13 The final uncertain impact relates to reducing the need to travel. This location is close to the town centre and all the various services and facilities available there, including bus services. The provision of proper footpath and cycleway links from any subsequent development should make a positive contribution to this objective. However, it is unlikely that a bus service could be secured to go through this location which negates to some extent these possible positive impacts.

South East Measham Broad Location

4.10.14 The south-east is judged to have the most positive impacts.

Positive

4.10.15 Of the 8 positive impacts 3 are common to all of the locations assessed in Measham. These relate to the provision of quality homes, the vitality and viability of the town centre, and maintaining and enhancing open space. The first and last of these are considered to be uncertain as to some extent any impact will depend upon the actual development which takes place. The impacts are judged to be likely to be fairly minor. In respect of vitality and viability this impact is uncertain as a reflection of the locations relative distance from the town centre which could deter people from using the centre as much as might be expected.

4.10.16 This location comprises of both Greenfield and previously developed land. The loss of Greenfield land is likely to be offset by the fact that it should be possible to achieve a reasonable density of development, so that overall this will be a positive and significant impact.

4.10.17 The other positive impacts relate to the cultural, historic and archaeological heritage objective; landscape; built environment character and energy use. The first two are judged as being certain and quite significant. In respect of both energy use and built environment these are less certain and will partly depend upon any subsequent development and how it is designed and laid out in. In respect of energy use any subsequent development would need to require less energy than the current brickworks to show a positive impact on this objective.

Negative

- 4.10.18 Four of the seven negative impacts in this location are common to all 3 Broad Locations considered. Most of these (production of waste, water consumption and pollution) are not locationally specific although their impact could be significant. However, some particularly in respect of water consumption and energy use could be mitigated to some extent by the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.
- 4.10.19 The other impact common to all 3 Broad Locations relates to the impact up on the River Mease SAC. This could be potentially very significant,. However, in accordance with the Habitats Regulations, development could not take place if it were judged to have an adverse impact. Therefore, whilst any impact in theory could be significant, in reality development in this locality would not be able to occur without taking the necessary steps to avoid an adverse impact so minimising the likelihood of a significant impact on this objective.
- 4.10.20 In respect of the rural economy, this is judged as being a negative impact as a result of taking land out of agricultural production in to housing use such that there would not be added value to agriculture, forestry or leisure although the impact is considered to be negligible.
- 4.10.21 Development in this location would involve the cessation of brick manufacturing which currently takes place. It could also result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves and would represent a significant impact.
- 4.10.22 The remaining negative impact relates to reducing the need to travel by car as this location is somewhat distant from the main services and facilities, including employment opportunities at the Westminster Industrial Estate. There are no bus services which serve this locality and it is not clear as to whether any new service could be supported. It is likely, therefore, that residents would need to use their car and would represent a potentially significant impact.

Uncertain

- 4.10.23 There are two uncertain impacts; provision of employment land and reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding objective. In respect of the latter, this location is according to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment within Zone 1 (i.e. low probability of flooding) and so development would reduce the risk of flooding occurring. However, this objective has twin aims and development here would not reduce the impact of flooding as well, therefore cancelling out to some extent the impact on reducing the risk of flooding. Therefore, the impact is recorded as being uncertain.
- 4.10.24 In respect of employment land it is not clear as to whether new employment uses could be accommodated as well as housing. However, development here would result in the loss of the existing brickworks and its associated employment. If this were to happen without the provision of additional employment land then this would be a negative impact. However, at this time the impact is uncertain.

North East Measham Broad Location

4.10.25 This location is judged to have the most negative impacts and (jointly) the least positive.

Positive

4.10.26 Of the 4 positive impacts 3 are common to all of the locations assessed in Measham. These relate to the provision of quality homes, the vitality and viability of the town centre, and maintaining and enhancing open space. The first and last of these are considered to be uncertain as to some extent any impact will depend upon the actual development which takes place. The impacts are judged to be likely to be fairly minor. In respect of vitality and viability this impact is uncertain as a reflection of the locations relative distance from the town centre which could deter people from using the centre as much as might be expected.

4.10.27 The other positive impact relates to the cultural, historic and archaeological heritage objective and is judged as being certain and quite significant.

Negative

4.10.28 Four of the eleven negative impacts in this location are common to all 3 Broad Locations considered. Most of these (production of waste, water consumption and pollution) as well as that related to energy use are not locationally specific although their impact could be significant. However, some particularly in respect of water consumption and energy use could be mitigated to some extent by the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.

4.10.29 The other impact common to all 3 Broad Locations relates to the impact up on the River Mease SAC. This could be potentially very significant,. However, in accordance with the Habitats Regulations, development could not take place if it were judged to have an adverse impact. Therefore, whilst any impact in theory could be significant, in reality development in this locality would not be able to occur without taking the necessary steps to avoid an adverse impact so minimising the likelihood of a significant impact on this objective.

4.10.30 In respect of the rural economy, this is judged as being a negative impact as a result of taking land out of agricultural production in to housing use such that there would not be added value to agriculture, forestry or leisure although the impact is considered to be negligible.

4.10.31 This location would result in the loss of Greenfield land although there is no reason to think that an appropriate density of development could not be achieved therefore offsetting this impact to some extent.

4.10.32 This location is judged to have a negative impact as it does not contribute towards the provision of employment land, primarily to because its scale is such that it is

unlikely to be able to accommodate employment uses as well as housing. The significance of this is likely to be fairly minor as there will be other opportunities to provide employment elsewhere.

4.10.33 The remaining negative impacts relate to reducing the need to travel by car; landscape character and built environment. In respect of reducing the need to travel by car this location is somewhat distant from the main services and facilities, including employment opportunities at the Westminster Industrial Estate. There are no bus services which serve this locality and it is not clear as to whether any new service could be supported. It is likely, therefore, that residents would need to use their car and would represent a potentially significant impact.

4.10.34 In terms of landscape character the Landscape Character Assessment suggests that the character of the land could be altered significantly if developed although it would appear that mitigation may be possible. For this reason this impact is regarded as being not certain, but with potential for being negative.

4.10.35 In respect of impact on the built environment objective, it is considered that this location relates quite poorly to the existing urban form and as a result of development fronting Leicester Road and High Street would make it difficult to integrate this location in to the wider settlement and would represent a significant impact.

Uncertain

4.10.36 There are two uncertain impacts: sustainable use of minerals and reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding. In respect of the latter this location is according to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment within Zone 1 (i.e. low probability of flooding) and so development would reduce the risk of flooding occurring. However, this objective has twin aims and development here would not reduce the impact of flooding as well, therefore cancelling out to some extent the impact on reducing the risk of flooding. Therefore, the impact is recorded as being uncertain.

4.10.37 Uncertainty is recorded in respect of impacts in relation to minerals objective as any impact will largely depend upon the actual development and how it is designed and constructed. Mitigation may result in positive impacts but is considered too uncertain to judge.

5.0 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 The Sustainability Appraisal section of this Background Paper reflects the Sustainability Objectives as set out original SA of the 2008 Core Strategy Consultation document. Some factors, which do require consideration when determining the best Directions for Growth in the district, are not explicitly mentioned in the SA. This section sets out these constraints without providing conclusions as to the impacts of these on the potential for development. This analysis can be found in the Planning Conclusions section of this Background Paper.

5.2 The additional constraints are:

- East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone
- Agricultural Land Quality

A Geographic Information System layer was provided to the Council by Natural England during 2012, and this has been used in cross-reference with the potential Broad Locations
- Contaminated Land / Landfill

A Geographic Information System layer was provided to the Council by Leicestershire County Council, and this has been used in cross-reference with the potential Broad Locations
- Potential highways impact (as identified by the Highways Agency)
- Any other issue not covered elsewhere in this Background Paper

5.3 This section provides a short commentary on these additional factors that could have an impact on the appropriateness of an area for accommodating housing growth, highlighting where appropriate what effect this has on the relative merits of each Broad Location.

ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH

Factor	West Ashby	North Ashby	South East Ashby
East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone	No part of the potential Broad Locations is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport	No part of the potential Broad Locations is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport	No part of the potential Broad Locations is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport
Agricultural Land Quality	A mixture of Grade 2 and Grade 3	A mixture of Grade 3 and Grade 4	A mixture of Grade 2 and Grade 3
Contaminated Land / Landfill Issues	There are no known contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL	Some contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL, but these form a small minority of the general area	There are no known contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL
Potential highways impact as identified by the Highways Agency	No major issues identified	No major issues identified	No major issues identified
Other issue not identified elsewhere	None known	None known	None known

5.4.1 There is very little to choose between the Broad Locations in respect of the above constraints. It is clear from the summary table that no single issue significantly affects any Broad Location. In fact, there is very little to differentiate between the Broad Locations against any of the criteria, with the West and South East facing identical issues.

5.4.2 The North is slightly different on two issues. Firstly, the best quality agricultural land that could potentially be lost if housing development takes place within the BL is Grade 3. This is still amongst the best and most versatile agricultural land quality, but is clearly of a lower quality than the Grade 2 agricultural land that could potentially be lost if housing development takes place on either the West or South East BLs. The second issue in the North is the presence of two historic landfill uses. These are, relative to the Broad Location itself, small (about 2.75 hectares in total), and near to Cliftonthorpe, and therefore do not provide a meaningful obstacle to housing development on the entirety of the site. Given their location – some way to the north

– it is also considered unlikely these would present an obstacle to housing development in the near future as housebuilding would commence at the southernmost part of the BL. However, the existence of these issues must be taken into account when reaching a conclusion as to the most appropriate direction for housing growth in Ashby.

5.4.3 Each of the potential Broad Locations received the same comments from the Highways Agency. Subject to the potential need for some advanced signage warning motorists on the A42 of congestion at junction 12 to use junction 13 instead, the Highways Agency consider the level of housebuilding proposed for Ashby can be accommodated within the existing highways network with no remedial work required. There is no difference between the three potential Broad Locations on this issue.

5.4.4 The East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone does not extend into Ashby and therefore has no effect on development in the settlement.

CASTLE DONINGTON

Factor	South West Castle Donington
East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone	Part of the potential BL is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport
Agricultural Land Quality	A mixture of Grade 2 and Grade 3
Contaminated Land / Landfill Issues	There are no known contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL
Potential highways impact as identified by the Highways Agency	No major issues identified
Other issue not identified elsewhere	Absence of other available land in the area around the village

5.5.1 As there is only one Broad Location assessed in Castle Donington, it is not possible to draw comparisons.

5.5.2 One issue is the lack of other available sites at Castle Donington to accommodate the amount of development required in the village. The SHLAA does not provide an indication that many other sites exist, and certainly not to the scale required in the Core Strategy, while unavoidable constraints also present a significant problem in considering other potential Broad Locations. Surrounding land uses (East Midlands Airport; employment land, and other nearby villages), the presence of the active floodplain and a lack of SHLAA sites make land adjoining Castle Donington at a premium.

- 5.5.3 As the table details, there are no issues regarding contaminated land, highways or other issues. There would be a loss of Grade 2 agricultural land which is the classed as the most versatile, flexible, productive and efficient land which can best deliver future crops for food and non-food uses such as biomass, fibres and pharmaceuticals. As noted already, constraints on housing development must be considered in the context of the lack of alternative sites elsewhere in Castle Donington.
- 5.5.4 In terms of highways, while there are no significant issues identified, there would be a requirement for a western by-pass and some improvements at the A50 Sawley Junction. The bypass was discussed in more detail in the Delivery section.
- 5.5.5 The southern extent of the site falls within the East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone which will prevent housing development on that part of the SHLAA site. However, it is important to note two factors in relation to this. Firstly, the Broad Location is of a size that will not require all the land to meet the housing needs of Castle Donington, such that the presence of the Public Safety Zone in part of the site is not overly significant in context. Secondly, and as noted already, constraints on housing development must be considered in the context of the lack of alternative sites elsewhere in Castle Donington.
- 5.5.6 It will be important for the Planning Assessment to reflect on how the factors affecting land availability impact on the identification of potential Broad Locations in Castle Donington in planning terms, but there is no issue outlined above considered likely to prevent housebuilding in the south west of Castle Donington.

COALVILLE

Factor	South West Coalville	South East Coalville	North East Coalville
East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone	No part of the potential BL is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport	No part of the potential BL is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport	No part of the potential BL is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport
Agricultural Land Quality	A mixture of Grade 2, Grade 3 and Urban Land	Vast majority of BL Grade 3 (remainder Urban Land)	Vast majority of BL Grade 3 (remainder Urban Land)
Contaminated Land / Landfill Issues	Some contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL, but these form a small minority of the general area	There are no known contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL	There are no known contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL
Potential highways impact as identified by the Highways Agency	No major issues identified	No major issues identified	No major issues identified
Other issue not identified elsewhere	None known	None known	Significant local opposition to any housing development within the BL

- 5.6.1 The primary differentiating feature between the potential Coalville Broad Locations is the significant opposition from local communities to housing development within the North East Broad Location. This is because the current Local Plan identifies this locality as a part of a Green Wedge.
- 5.6.2 Other than this issue, there is little to choose between the Broad Locations in respect of the above constraints. Two other matters provide separation between the potential BLs – Contaminated Land / Landfill and Agricultural Land Quality. The South West BL has 0.18 hectares of contaminated land or landfill on its outermost extent. Given the scale, and position, of this use in respect of the wider area accounted for in the Broad Location, it is considered highly unlikely that this will present an obstacle to the delivery of housing development in the area.
- 5.6.3 In respect of Agricultural Land Quality, the South West Coalville BL has some Grade 2 in the vicinity. This is to the far west of the BL's extent, and the loss of some of the

best and most versatile agricultural land is an important consideration. However, both of the North East and South East also have some of the best and most versatile agricultural land due to their being almost entirely Grade 3. Given that these three Broad Locations are being assessed against one another, it is appropriate to reflect on the impact of housing development on the BLs relative to one another. As a result, although each BL has some of the best and most versatile agricultural land within it, the North East and South East BLs perform better than the South West BL on the basis that the latter has Grade 2 and the others Grade 3.

- 5.6.4 Each of the potential Broad Locations received the same comments from the Highways Agency. There is no indication that housing development cannot be accommodated within the Coalville Broad Locations on the basis of the expected impact on the highways network. The Highways Agency have advised that they have identified schemes to cater for potential housing growth in these Broad Locations. It is therefore considered that no BL should be excluded from consideration on the basis of its impact on the highways network.
- 5.6.5 The East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone does not extend into Coalville and therefore has no effect on development in the settlement.

IBSTOCK

Factor	West Ibstock	North Ibstock	South West Ibstock	North East Ibstock
East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone	No part of the potential BL is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport	No part of the potential BL is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport	No part of the potential BL is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport	No part of the potential BL is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport
Agricultural Land Quality	Entirely Grade 3	A mixture of Grade 2 and Grade 3	A mixture of Grade 2 and Grade 3	Entirely Grade 3
Contaminated Land / Landfill Issues	There are no known contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL	There are no known contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL	There are no known contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL	Significant contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL
Potential highways impact as identified by the Highways Agency	No major issues identified	No major issues identified	No major issues identified	No major issues identified
Other issue not identified elsewhere	Within an existing Area of Separation policy designation	None known	None known	None known

- 5.7.1 There is little to choose between the Broad Locations in respect of the above constraints. Aside from the significant amount of Contaminated Land / Landfill Use present at North East Ibstock, which has already been considered as part of the Delivery Assessment, no major issues arise which can be used to differentiate between Ibstock's potential BLs.
- 5.7.2 The West is within an Area of Separation designated under Local Plan policy E21 that seeks to prevent the coalescence of the west of Ibstock with Heather. Policy E21 is a local designation that will be subject to review as part of the Local Plan. The outcome of this review process, given that it has yet to begin, is uncertain.
- 5.7.3 Agricultural land quality is another area where the BLs perform slightly differently. Given that these four Broad Locations are being assessed against one another, it is appropriate to reflect on the impact of housing development on the BLs relative to one another. As a result, although each BL has some of the best and most versatile

agricultural land within it, the West and North East BLs perform better than the South West and North BL on the basis that the latter pair have Grade 2 and the others only Grade 3. Given that all the potential Ibstock BLs have the best quality agricultural land, it is not appropriate to exclude from consideration a BL on the basis of its agricultural land grade as this would summarily exclude all the potential BLs in Ibstock.

- 5.7.4 In respect of highways, the impact arising from the scale of development proposed in Ibstock is considered by the Highways Agency likely to be addressed by highways schemes elsewhere. The Highways Agency has stated that the highways schemes required as a result of housing development in Coalville will address the impact of the scale of housing development proposed in Ibstock. As a result of this, it is considered that the scale of housing development proposed in Ibstock will not be constrained by the impact on the highways network.
- 5.7.5 The East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone does not extend into Ibstock and therefore has no effect on development in the settlement.

MEASHAM

Factor	North East Measham	West Measham	South East Measham
East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone	No part of the potential DfG is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport	No part of the potential DfG is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport	No part of the potential DfG is affected by the Public Safety Zone at East Midlands Airport
Agricultural Land Quality	A mixture of Grade 3 and Grade 4	Predominantly Grade 3 with a small section of Grade 4	Grade 3
Contaminated Land / Landfill Issues	There are no known contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL	There are no known contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL	Significant contaminated land or landfill uses in the BL
Potential highways impact as identified by the Highways Agency	No major issues identified	No major issues identified	No major issues identified
Other issue not identified elsewhere	None known	Development in this area could help to facilitate the re-opening of the Ashby Canal	None known

- 5.8.1 There is very little to choose between the Broad Locations in respect of the above table. It is clear from the summary table that no single issue significantly affects any Broad Location, with the exception of the existing contaminated land issue on the South East which has already been identified in the Delivery section of this Background Paper. So much so, there is very little to differentiate between the Broad Locations against any of the criteria.
- 5.8.2 The South East is slightly different on two issues. Firstly, the best quality agricultural land that could potentially be lost if housing development takes place within the Broad Location is Grade 3, which is amongst the best and most versatile agricultural land quality. Both of the other BLs have Grade 3 land, although this is something of a moot point since there is a brickworks site which already dominates the land extent in the South East Measham BL. The second issue in the South East is the presence of contaminated land, also related to the brickworks use.

- 5.8.3 Notwithstanding the above, the existence of these issues must be taken into account when reaching a conclusion as to the most appropriate direction for housing growth in Measham.
- 5.8.4 Each of the potential Broad Locations received the same comments from the Highways Agency who consider that traffic generated from new development proposed for Measham can be accommodated within the existing highways network with no remedial work required. There is no difference between the three potential Broad Locations on this issue.
- 5.8.5 The East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone does not extend into Measham and therefore has no effect on development in the settlement.
- 5.8.6 An issue not identified elsewhere in this Background Paper is the potential for the reopening of the Ashby Canal. The West Broad Location, owing to its geographic location, is uniquely positioned to contribute to the regeneration of the Canal. Neither the North East nor the South East can offer this particular positive. No other such considerations exist in Measham.

6.0 PLANNING CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

- 6.1 The previous sections of this Background Paper have provided an assessment of the potential for housing development in potential Broad Locations having regard to four broad themes:
- Accessibility
 - Sustainability
 - Delivery
 - Other Considerations
- 6.2 None of these on their own can be used alone to determine, from a planning point of view, the most appropriate Broad Locations for the district's housing needs, and therefore no section drew overall conclusions as to the suitability of one Broad Locations compared to any other Broad Location.
- 6.3 A brief summary of the function of each section is set out below:
- The Accessibility Assessment outlined the relative distance of the assessed Broad Locations from a range of key facilities and services on a settlement-by-settlement basis. Some conclusions were drawn as to which of the Broad Locations could be said to have the best or poorest access. None of the potential Broad Locations was so poorly related to those services as to be summarily excluded from consideration.
 - The Sustainability Appraisal considered the positive and negative impacts, in sustainability terms, of new housing being located within the potential Broad Locations. It also considered the level of certainty that could be applied to those positive or negative impacts. Some conclusions were outlined as to which potential Broad Location performed best in sustainability terms on a settlement-by-settlement basis.
 - The Delivery Assessment reflected on the extent to which a potential Broad Location could be relied upon to deliver housing development within the Plan period (i.e. up to 2031). Some conclusions as to which Broad Location(s) performed best on a settlement-by-settlement basis were outlined. None of the potential Broad Locations were to be excluded from consideration on the basis of deliverability.
 - Finally, any other issue or constraint that had not been identified in the previous three sections was assessed as to its potential impact on housing development in the Other Considerations section. Owing to the varied nature of the "other" considerations, this section only identified the constraints,

rather than drawing a conclusion as to which Broad Location performed best. In common with the Accessibility Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and Delivery Assessment, no issue noted in the Other Considerations section was considered so significant as to prevent a Broad Location's inclusion in the Core Strategy.

- 6.4 In none of these sections is there a judgement of the planning merits of the potential Broad Locations, as each section focuses on a specific theme and where conclusions are provided these are also made in terms of the theme of that section. As a result, it is necessary to bring these considerations together to weigh up the planning merits of each potential Broad Location, and thereby determine the most appropriate Broad Locations for inclusion within the Core Strategy.
- 6.5 In terms of structure, this section summarises each of the above themes, including the outcomes, on a settlement-by-settlement basis. Each settlement is taken in turn, and these summaries are reflected upon in a final Planning Assessment that outlines the planning merits of each potential Broad Location. A conclusion is then made as to which Broad Location is to be included in the Core Strategy.
- 6.6 A focus on the positive impacts of housing development is made in line with paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (see below). Where negative impacts of housing development are highlighted, these are noted, but strong weight is given to the positives.
- 6.7 The relationship between the Broad Location selection work and the National Planning Policy Framework is provided below.

THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (MARCH 2012)

- 6.8 The **National Planning Policy Framework** (NPPF) must be taken into account in the preparation of local plans. The Core Strategy is a document that forms part of the Local Plan for the district. The NPPF identifies sustainable development as the "golden thread" running through plan-making. Regard has therefore been had to the NPPF in preparing this Background Paper, and the following paragraphs are of particular relevance in identifying Broad Locations for housing development:

"8. ...to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. The planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions."

"10. Plans...need to take local circumstances into account, so that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas."

"14. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be

seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.

For **plan-making** this means that:

- local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;
- Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:
 - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
 - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”

6.9 The following is a summary of paragraph 17, with the most relevant elements to this piece of evidence and North West Leicestershire.

“17. Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. These 12 principles are that planning should:

- be genuinely plan-led...be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives;
- proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs...;
- seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants...;
- take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas...;
- support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk...and encourage the reuse of existing resources, including conversion of existing buildings, and encourage the use of renewable resources...;
- contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework;
- encourage the effective use of land by reusing land...; promote mixed use developments, and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas...;
- conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance...;
- actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable; and

- take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.”

6.10 These paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework are reflected in the planning assessments that have been undertaken. This is to ensure compliance with the NPPF.

PLANNING CONCLUSIONS

Ashby de la Zouch

6.11.1 Three Directions of Growth were assessed in Ashby: West, North and South East. Ashby is required to accommodate in the region of 600 dwellings for the remainder of the Plan period.

Accessibility Assessment Summary

6.11.2 Overall, the North has the best access to services, with little to choose between the West and South East Broad Locations. The North has all services within the preferred 800 metre maximum walking distance, while the West and South East had only two services within 800m. The North also had the most employment land within 800m.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary

6.11.3 All three potential Broad Locations were judged to perform similarly in terms of likely impacts (positive, negative and uncertain).

6.11.4 All 3 potential Broad Locations have the same number of positive impacts, of which 3 out of the 4 are common to all locations. The west does not have any significant positive impacts that are common with the other locations. However, the north has one (reducing the need to travel) as does the south-east (reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding).

6.11.5 In respect of negative impacts, the west has the most number of negative impacts (10). However, there were 8 impacts which were common to all Broad Locations. One of these (landscape character) was judged to be significant for all three Broad Locations. In addition, a further impact (efficient use of land) was judged to be significant in respect of both the north and the south-east whilst reducing the need to travel was judged to be significant in respect of both the west and south-east. Therefore, the south-east has the most number of significant negative impacts, whilst the north and west have two each.

6.11.6 On balance having regard to the fact that there are a number of impacts common to all locations and to the significance of other impacts, from a Sustainability Appraisal

point of view the north location performs marginally better than either of the other two locations.

6.11.7 The Sustainability Appraisal considered the issue of the River Mease Special Area of Conservation and concluded that, while in theory impact from housing development could be significant, housing development would not be able to occur without taking the necessary steps to avoid any adverse impact arising.

6.11.8 The Sustainability Appraisal noted that the uncertain impacts are dependent on the nature of housing development in the area such that there is no reason the impacts should be assumed to be either positive or negative.

Delivery Assessment Summary

6.11.9 The South East performed marginally better overall, primarily due to its potential for resolving an infrastructure issue (that of alleviating flooding in Packington). The West and North performed similarly in delivery terms, although the involvement of housebuilders on the North is a unique positive amongst the Ashby Broad Locations.

Other Considerations

6.11.10 The North Broad Location performed slightly better than the West and South East Broad Locations. The North has two unique differences relative to the West and South. Firstly, the North has no Grade 2 agricultural land, while a not insignificant amount of Grade 2 is present in the West and South East. Secondly, there is evidence that some historic landfill may exist in the North but the location and size of these does not present serious obstacles to development in the Broad Location itself.

Planning Assessment and Conclusions

6.11.11 The Core Strategy requires that 1,400 dwellings are to be accommodated within Ashby during the Plan period, of which 356 have already been built and a further 438 have planning permission or are under construction. This leaves a residual requirement of around 600 dwellings. Both the North and South East Broad locations could accommodate this amount of development, and could accommodate more if required (evidence in the SHLAA indicates up to 1,600 dwellings could be accommodated in the North and 1,100 in the South East). However, the West Broad Location includes a single SHLAA site with a capacity of 500 dwellings. Identification of the West Broad Location in the Core Strategy would mean that there would be a need to make up for a shortfall of 100 dwellings elsewhere in Ashby.

6.11.12 Notwithstanding the above, it is considered feasible that this shortfall could potentially be met from SHLAA sites within Ashby.

6.11.13 The impact up on the River Mease SAC could be potentially very significant. However, in accordance with the Habitats Regulations, development could not take

place if it were judged to have an adverse impact. Therefore, whilst any impact in theory could be significant, in reality development in any of the potential Ashby Broad Locations would not be able to occur without taking the necessary steps to avoid an adverse impact.

6.11.14 It is clear from the above section summaries that the North, on balance, performs better than both the West and South East. In all sections, with the exception of Delivery, the North is identified as being the most likely to bring more positive impacts to Ashby or can be considered the Broad Location better suited to accommodate housing development in Ashby.

6.11.15 A key benefit of this locality, as highlighted in the Sustainability Appraisal and reflected in the Accessibility Assessment, is the reduced need to travel for new and existing residents that would likely arise from housebuilding in that particular locality. This is due to its proximity to the facilities in Ashby town centre.

6.11.16 This reflects a key principle of the NPPF, that of “actively manag[ing] patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable”. A logical phasing of development starting in that area closest to the town centre and radiating northwards would reinforce this approach. The physical proximity to Ashby’s facilities is supplemented by existing walking routes from this location, particularly to Market Street via North Street.

6.11.17 Whilst that development which took place in the north of this BL would be further from the town centre than the southern parts of this location, the routes referred to above could be enhanced and extended as part of future development so as to provide convenient and attractive routes to the town centre (and possibly existing employment areas as well) from all parts of the location.

6.11.18 This specific benefit could not be secured as readily on the other potential Broad Locations owing to the lower quality access to services and walking routes, in relative terms, to the South East and West BLs.

6.11.19 The Sustainability Appraisal also notes that there is evidence that housing development to the south east of Ashby could result in the resolution to a local flooding problem. Downstream of the South East Ashby Broad Location there have, in recent years, been a number of instances of flooding which has affected parts of the village of Packington. It is considered that careful masterplanning on this location could incorporate the provision of flood alleviation measures; this is substantiated by the Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. This is primarily because it has the potential to deliver benefits in terms of reducing flood risk. These benefits will go beyond this location but, whilst potentially significant, they are primarily of ‘local’ significance whereas the potential opportunity to reduce the need to travel offered by the North is of more than local benefit.

6.11.20 As already noted, the one factor where the North does not perform the best is in relation to Delivery, where the South East and West perform equal best. However, the North Broad Location is unique in having housebuilder interest which indicates a degree of confidence that housing will be delivered in this locality up to 2031 (and potentially beyond). In this respect, the deliverability issues raised in respect of the North Broad Location is of limited concern.

6.11.21 The main issue for comparison between the Broad Locations in terms of “Other Considerations” is that of agricultural land Grade. The South East and East Broad Locations contain higher quality agricultural land than the North. The NPPF advises at paragraph 17 that: “Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework”. The identification of the North as the preferred Broad Location would be consistent with this advice.

6.11.22 In balancing the issues raised above, it is clear that the North Broad Location is the best Broad Location for growth in planning terms. Identifying the North as the Broad Location for housing development in Ashby will positively meet the housing need for Ashby and, by taking account of the circumstances of the town in reaching this conclusion, will best reflect the principles of sustainable development outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework.

CASTLE DONINGTON

6.12.1 Only one Broad Location was assessed for inclusion in the Core Strategy to accommodate the development required at Castle Donington. As such, direct comparison between the South West potential Broad Location and other areas of land is not possible. Notwithstanding this, the planning merits of the site must be assessed such that the site is not simply identified in the Core Strategy because it has no competitors.

Accessibility Assessment Summary

6.12.2 Out of the six amenities considered are 800 metres or less distant from the measuring point. The scale of development proposed is such that some of the amenities considered in the Accessibility Assessment may be required on-site, making the distances from these amenities not necessarily reflective of the reality. However, accessibility in general is good on the South West Castle Donington BL.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary

6.12.3 The Sustainability Appraisal highlighted no serious problems on the Castle Donington Broad Location. Positive and negative impacts were roughly in balance in number and significance; *reducing the need to travel* was considered a significant positive, while the loss of greenfield land is to such an extent that *efficient use of land* is considered a significant negative. No issue raised was so significant as to prevent housing development on the South West Castle Donington Broad Location.

Delivery Assessment Summary

- 6.12.4 The main issue to consider is that of land ownership – there are multiple owners on the site and this could present delivery issues. However, given that the potential BL performs well against *Promotion* and *Infrastructure Provision*, there is no reason to assume that this would prevent insurmountable delivery problems. The twin involvement of a planning consultancy and a housebuilder combines to ensure that the South West potential BL performs well in deliverability terms.

Other Considerations

- 6.12.5 Two unique issues affect Castle Donington generally and the South West BL specifically. The East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone extends into part of the Broad Location and this would likely have an impact on the location of housing development there. However, this is not considered to be an insurmountable obstacle to housing development in this location.
- 6.12.6 Secondly, there is a lack of other available land around Castle Donington. Owing to a variety of surrounding land uses and environmental constraints, in addition to a lack of SHLAA sites, the only area where housing development of the scale required in the Core Strategy could be located is to the south west of the village.

Planning Assessment and Conclusions

- 6.12.7 It is clear from the above that there is no fundamental reason why housing development should not take place on the South West Castle Donington Broad Location. In accepting this point, and the fact that its identification will ensure the dwelling needs of the village until 2031 are met, it is also true that this BL can also deliver additional benefits, including a western bypass.
- 6.12.8 On the basis of the above, it is considered that identifying the South West Castle Donington Broad Location in the Core Strategy will represent positive planning as required by the NPPF through meeting the housing and infrastructure needs of the village.

COALVILLE

Accessibility Assessment Summary

- 6.13.1 In accessibility terms, the North East Broad Location performed better than the South West and South East Coalville Broad Locations assessed; although none performed particularly well such that the Accessibility Assessment in Coalville was very much a relative one. This consideration should be balanced against the fact that housing development in Coalville will be of such a scale as to require some or most of the amenities included in the assessment to be provided on the sites where housebuilding takes place in the town.

6.13.2 On the basis that each Broad Location assessed would be expected to provide at least some of the amenities on-site, none was considered to have such poor access as to prevent their inclusion in the Core Strategy.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary

6.13.3 The North East was considered to, on balance, marginally perform the best overall in sustainability appraisal terms, with the South West and South East performing similarly to one another. The North East's better performance is countered to some degree by its likely negative impact on the *Pollution* criterion and by the higher level of uncertainty (in relative terms) to the other BLs in Coalville. The North East also had the fewest number of positive and negative impacts.

6.13.4 The South West and South East had the most number of positive impacts, of which four were common to all BLs assessed. All of the potential BLs also had two other positive impacts which were judged as being significant – the South West and North East in respect of *reducing the need to travel* and *landscape character*, and the South East in respect of *reducing the need to travel* and *reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding*.

6.13.5 The South West had the most number of negative impacts, of which five are common to all BLs assessed. Of these common impacts, one is judged to be significant for all locations (*efficient use of land*). The South West has one other significant negative impact (*biodiversity*), the North East one (*pollution*) and the South East two further significant negative impacts (*landscape character* and *pollution*).

Delivery Assessment Summary

6.13.6 All the Coalville BLs performed well against Delivery factors, although a hierarchy was apparent. The North East performed strongly against both the *Ownership* and *Promotion* criteria while the South West and South East performed “well” or “quite well” against these same criteria.

Other Considerations

6.13.7 There were only two “other” issues on which the potential BLs differed. All the BLs had some of the best and most versatile agricultural land grade – Grade 2 and/or 3 – mixed with the Urban Grade. Only the South West had any Grade 2 agricultural land.

6.13.8 The second issue, and one of significant importance, was the level of local opposition raised to potential housing development within the North East BL. This is because the current local plan identifies this locality as a part of a Green Wedge. No such opposition was raised to development in either the South East or South West BLs.

Planning Assessment and Conclusions

- 6.13.10 The Core Strategy requires that 4,950 dwellings are to be accommodated within Coalville during the Plan period, of which 698 have already been built and a further 220 have planning permission or are under construction. This leaves a residual requirement of 4,030 dwellings. Alone, none of the Broad Locations considered in Coalville can accommodate this scale of housing development. The South East can deliver 2,820 dwellings during the Plan period, the North East 1,800 and the South West 800. On this basis, it is apparent that only if the South East Coalville Broad Location is identified for housing development can the residual requirement of 4,030 dwellings for Coalville be met. The first question, therefore, is the extent to which the South East Broad Location is an appropriate location for new housing development in planning terms.
- 6.13.11 None of the assessments set out in the preceding sections of this Background Paper highlighted any serious concerns with identifying the South East Coalville for housing development in the Core Strategy. Although it did not perform the best, relative to the other BLs assessed, in any of those assessments a large part of this was due to the difficulties inherent in delivering housing development on a scale such as that for the South East of Coalville. In none of the assessments was the South East BL regarded as performing poorly. It is considered likely that the scale of housing development proposed on the South East Coalville Broad Location is such that wider benefits, such as inward investment and the regeneration of Coalville and its town centre, could be realised beyond the scope of this Background Paper.
- 6.13.12 Therefore, in order to meet the housing requirement for Coalville, it is considered appropriate to identify South East Coalville as a Broad Location for housing development in the Core Strategy.
- 6.13.13 Including the South East Coalville Broad Location in the Core Strategy still leaves a shortfall of approximately 1,200 dwellings. There is a requirement, therefore, to directly compare and contrast the planning merits of the North East Coalville potential Broad Location with the South West Coalville potential Broad Locations. As noted above, the North East can accommodate approximately 1,800 dwellings and the South West approximately 800. Notwithstanding the above, it is considered feasible that, if the South West Broad Location was chosen, the shortfall that would result could potentially be met from SHLAA sites within Coalville.
- 6.13.14 Taken as a whole, against Delivery factors, Accessibility factors and Sustainability Appraisal objectives, the North East performs *marginally* better than the South West, while it performs extremely poorly against the “Other” factors, and in particular the level of public opposition raised to housing development in the area.
- 6.13.15 In Delivery terms, no insurmountable concerns were raised. In Accessibility terms, while the South West performed worse than the North East, the performance of the BLs was, in relative terms, difficult to differentiate owing to their scale and the inevitable requirement that some or most of the amenities discussed in the

Accessibility Assessment would be required on-site. In respect of Deliverability, the South West had four contiguous SHLAA sites, each in single ownership and promoted either by a planning consultancy or housebuilder and none of which had known ownership issues. The Sustainability Appraisal's findings indicate that the South West's main failings related to the high number of negative impacts, of which one was judged to be significant. Its main strengths related to the highest positives amongst the assessed BLs, of which two were judged significant, and the lowest level of uncertainty.

6.13.16 Therefore, while the North East did perform better than the South West on three of the assessments in this Background Paper, it was very marginal. Turning to the fourth section ("Other Considerations"), while the South West does have some Grade 2 agricultural land, all the BLs assessed had Grade 3 agricultural land within their extents. The fact that all the Broad Locations assessed in Coalville have some of the best and most versatile agricultural land reduces the significance of agricultural land quality as a determining factor.

6.13.17 On the above basis, there is little to choose between the South West and North East potential BLs. The primary difference lies in the level of public opposition raised to housing development taking place within the North East BL. The level of this opposition, in the context of localism, is considered to be such that it diminishes the benefits of the North East Broad Location to the extent that it should not be identified in the Core Strategy.

IBSTOCK

Accessibility Assessment Summary

6.14.1 The West and South West performed better overall than the North and North East. Both the West and South West have all amenities within 800 metres of their measuring points, the North East has all but one within 800 metres, and the North has none within 800 metres. The limited amount of employment land in Ibstock – 1.39 hectares⁴ – is within 800 metres of the two northern Broad Locations. The North alone was considered to have poor access to amenities, when considered relative to the other BLs in Ibstock.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary

6.14.2 The four Broad Locations considered in Ibstock performed quite differently, relative to one another, with the significance of the impacts being particularly important.

6.14.3 The North East had the highest number of positive impacts, of which 4 were common to all the BLs. The North did not have any other positive impacts. In the

⁴ It should be noted that the Brickworks site, which is within the North East Broad Location, has not been included in these figures. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, the brickworks, as a non-B1, B2 or B8 use was not included in the 2010 Assessment of Employment Sites. Secondly, since this use would be lost if housing development took place in the North East Broad Location, access to it would not be relevant since it would no longer exist.

other BLs, the West had two significant positive impacts (*landscape character* and *biodiversity*), the South West one (*biodiversity*) and the North East two (*landscape character* and *biodiversity*).

6.14.4 The North had the most negative impacts, of which 6 are common to all the BLs considered. Of the remaining impacts, the North had three significant negative impacts (*landscape, reducing the need to travel* and *efficient use of land*), the West one (*efficient use of land*), the South West two (*landscape* and *efficient use of land*) and the North East two (*minerals* and *built environment*).

6.14.5 In sustainability appraisal terms, the West was considered to perform the best with little to choose between the South West and North East. The North was judged to perform the worst of the four potential BLs for Ibstock.

6.14.6 The Sustainability Appraisal noted that the uncertain impacts are dependent on the nature of housing development in the area such that there is no reason the impacts should be assumed to be either positive or negative.

Delivery Assessment Summary

6.14.7 In respect of deliverability, the West and South West performing better than the North and North East, and the West performing best overall. Lack of housebuilder interest counted against the South West.

Other Considerations

6.14.8 In terms of other issues, there is little to differentiate the potential Broad Locations in Ibstock. Firstly, the West is within an Area of Separation designated under Local Plan policy E21 that seeks to prevent the coalescence of the west of Ibstock with Heather. Policy E21 is a local designation that will be subject to review as part of the Local Plan. The outcome of this review process, given that it has yet to begin, is uncertain.

6.14.9 The second difference between the BLs was in terms of Agricultural Land Grades. The North and South West have, in relative terms, the poorest quality agricultural land in consisting entirely of Grade 3, while the West and North East have some higher quality Grade 2 land.

Planning Assessment and Conclusions

6.14.10 The Core Strategy requires that 550 dwellings are to be accommodated within Ibstock during the Plan period, of which 75 have already been built and a further 187 have planning permission or are under construction. This leaves a residual requirement of 290 dwellings. Of the Broad Locations considered in Ibstock, only the North can accommodate this scale of housing development, and this is an important consideration in determining the most appropriate Broad Locations in the District generally and Ibstock specifically.

- 6.14.11 As noted, the West Broad Location is subject to an existing Local Plan designation (Area of Separation), which is to be reviewed as part of the Local Plan. To exclude a potential Broad Location on this basis could result in housing development taking place in a less appropriate location. It is therefore considered that excluding the West Broad Location solely on the basis of such a local designation is inappropriate at this time.
- 6.14.12 It is clear from the four assessments that neither the North nor the North East perform well overall. While the North does not perform poorly enough to be excluded from consideration, development in the North East would result in the closure of a viable brickworks. On this basis, and set against a generally poor performance in overall terms, the North East is not considered an appropriate location for housing development and is therefore excluded.
- 6.14.13 The North potential BL is large enough to accommodate Ibstock's required amount of new development on its own. As noted earlier in this section, the purpose of identifying Broad Locations for housing development in a Core Strategy is to provide some certainty to communities and the development industry as to where the required new dwellings will be expected to be located until the end of the Plan period. By identifying Broad Locations which cannot by themselves accommodate all the housebuilding required, this "certainty" is reduced. It is therefore appropriate to balance the issue of certainty against the generally poor performance of the North potential BL in the four assessments of this Background Paper. It should again be noted that the North performed notably worse than the West and South West potential BLs, such that the primary factor in favour of the North is its ability to accommodate the necessary growth in Ibstock.
- 6.14.14 In order to reflect this, it is important to reflect on the reasons behind the North's poor performance, and the extent to which these could be considered as carrying less weight in planning terms than the certainty provided by the North's size.
- 6.14.15 In accessibility terms, the North performed worse than the other three potential Broad Locations, and was considered to have poor access to existing amenities. This was also true in the Sustainability Appraisal, which concluded the North was the least sustainable of the four BLs assessed for housing development. The Delivery assessment concluded that the North's performance was indifferent relative to the other Ibstock BLs, and also noted it was the only BL to perform poorly in respect of *Ownership*. As regards other considerations, there was little to choose between the Broad Locations although it was noted that the North, in having only Grade 3 agricultural land, performed better in relative terms than both the West and North East (and the same as the South West, which also consists entirely of Grade 3).
- 6.14.16 On the basis of this brief summary, the North's overall performance cannot be considered favourably. It performs poorly in terms of accessibility and sustainability, and indifferently against deliverability and other considerations. There is no specific feature of the North Broad Location which is considered of sufficient benefit to

outweigh these negatives, and as a result it is considered that the North Broad Location should not be included in the Core Strategy.

6.14.17 In light of the above, and considering the fact that both the West and South West tend to outperform the two northern BLs in the four section assessments, and often in significant terms, means that it is most appropriate to compare the West with the South West to determine the best Broad Location for Ibstock.

6.14.18 Considering Delivery issues, based on the SHLAA, the South West BL can accommodate approximately 135 dwellings, while the West can accommodate approximately 285 dwellings. The figure for the West is considered unrealistically high, although more recent information suggests 220 dwellings is a more realistic figure. The South West could, therefore, meet less than half the residual requirement for Ibstock while the West could accommodate 75% of that requirement.

6.14.19 Regarding a direct comparison between the West and the South West, it is helpful to consider how each performed in the four sections. In terms of the Sustainability Appraisal and Delivery Assessment, the West outperformed the South West. The South West, by contrast, performed only marginally better in terms of accessibility and “other” considerations.

6.14.20 The Sustainability Appraisal noted that the difference between the two BLs as being *landscape character*, which was judged to be a negative against the South West and a positive against the West. This is particularly important in considering the effect housing development could have in the West, which, as noted under Other Considerations, is within an Area of Separation policy designation. The Settlement Fringe Assessment concluded that appropriate screening and planting could reinforce the area between the west of Ibstock and Heather, such that the impact of housing development in this location could be considered of positive benefit in landscape character terms.

6.14.21 Given that the Council would be in a position to require housing development to follow the recommendations of the Settlement Fringe Assessment, and thus reinforce the existing separation between Ibstock and Heather, it is considered that identifying the West as the Broad Location for Ibstock would be beneficial in planning terms.

6.14.22 Also different between the West and South West is the presence of higher quality agricultural land in the former than the latter. All the land within these potential Broad Locations – and, indeed, the already-excluded North and North East – is considered to be the best and most versatile agricultural land (that is, Grades 2 and/or 3). As a result, selecting the South West over the West on this issue alone would represent a “best worst” approach that would not be entirely compatible with the positive planning required by paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

6.14.23 The issue of deliverability is also important to consider in more detail. It was noted earlier in this Background Paper that, since the Plan period runs until the year 2031, housebuilder involvement at this early stage is not necessarily crucial to an area's identification as a Broad Location. However, given that this assessment has concluded a direct comparison between the South and South West must be conducted to determine the most appropriate Broad Location for Ibstock, and in deliverability terms the West outperforms the South West on this issue only, the active housebuilder involvement in the West is considered a positive in the context of Ibstock.

6.14.24 The marginal outperformance of the West by the South West in terms of accessibility is based on the fact that most amenities are nearer to the measuring point of the latter than the former. However, since all amenities are within 800 metres of the measuring points of both the West and South West, it is not considered that this is a significant factor in favour of the South West.

6.14.25 From the above, it is apparent that the West overall performs better than the South West. One factor in favour of the West is the positive benefits that can be brought to Ibstock in landscape character terms through housebuilding to the immediate west of the village. Secondly, its size is such as to provide a strong level of certainty as to where the majority of Ibstock's residual residential requirements will be met during the Plan period. Given that it also performs better in Deliverability terms, and none of the negatives (relative to the South West) are considered to outweigh the positives that would result from housebuilding in this area, West Ibstock is considered the best Broad Location for housing development in Ibstock.

MEASHAM

Accessibility Assessment Summary

6.15.1 The West performs the best overall, with five of the six amenities within 800 metres. While the South East also has five within 800 metres, in addition to being the only BL in Measham with access to employment land, the overall distances are much further. The North East has four amenities within 800 metres, such that all of the Measham BLs can be considered to have good access to amenities. Notwithstanding this fact, the West's five nearest amenities are all within 230 metres of the measuring point with the result that its performance is, in relative terms, far better than either the North East or South East.

6.15.2 Measham does not have a Secondary School. As a result, all of the BLs are over five kilometres distant from their nearest Secondary School – in relative terms, this is not considered to be a significant issue.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary

6.15.3 On balance, the South East performed the best overall. A number of impacts – both positive and negative – were common to all potential Broad Locations such that the analysis considered significance of the impacts as much as the number of them. The South East’s positive performance in respect of the significant impacts of *efficient use of land, cultural, historic and archaeological heritage and landscape* is the primary reason for its better performance.

6.15.4 As regards the other two potential Broad Locations, both had the same number of positive impacts but the North East had the highest number of negative impacts by some way, of which two were judged significant (*reducing the need to travel and built environment*).

6.15.5 The Sustainability Appraisal considered the issue of the River Mease Special Area of Conservation and concluded that, while in theory impact from housing development could be significant, housing development would not be able to occur without taking the necessary steps to avoid any adverse impact arising.

Delivery Assessment Summary

6.15.6 The South East performed the worst in delivery terms, with its best score being “moderate” in terms of *ownership*. The West performed slightly better than the North East, but there is little to choose between the two BLs as they both perform well overall.

Other Considerations

6.15.7 The major issue not considered elsewhere in Measham is the potential for the re-opening of the Ashby Canal that could be delivered in the vicinity of the West Broad Location. No other serious constraints or issues were raised in this part of the Background Paper.

Planning Assessment and Conclusions

6.15.8 The Core Strategy requires that 550 dwellings are to be accommodated within Measham during the Plan period, of which 58 have already been built and a further 51 have planning permission or are under construction. This leaves a residual requirement at least 440 dwellings. Alone, any of the Broad Locations considered in Measham can accommodate this scale of housing development.

6.15.9 The impact up on the River Mease SAC could be potentially very significant. However, in accordance with the Habitats Regulations, development could not take place if it were judged to have an adverse impact. Therefore, whilst any impact in theory could be significant, in reality development in any of the potential Measham Broad Locations would not be able to occur without taking the necessary steps to avoid an adverse impact.

- 6.15.10 On the South East potential Broad Location, there is no known input from the landowner or a housebuilder, and the loss of the brickworks would have a serious impact on the village. As a result of these negative issues, and the absence of many significant positive factors to weigh against these, identification of the South East BL is not considered to represent positive planning as required by the NPPF. As such, is excluded from consideration in the Core Strategy.
- 6.15.11 It is therefore appropriate to consider which of the North East and West is best placed to deliver the housing growth and associated investment that will benefit Measham most.
- 6.15.12 In terms of Accessibility, the West performed best in relative terms but both the West and North East had good access to amenities. As regards the Sustainability Appraisal, the West performed better than the North East in terms of the significance of the negative impacts on the latter Broad Location. Both had the same number of positive impacts, however. Although the West was, on balance, identified as the better BL, both the North East and West were judged to perform well in terms of deliverability. A significant “other” consideration was the ability of housebuilding in the West Broad Location to deliver the reopening of the Ashby Canal. This presents a significant opportunity for inward investment into the village as part of a long-sought regeneration project. There is no such opportunity in the North East, as the Ashby Canal is located within the West Broad Location.
- 6.15.13 In respect of the two remaining Broad Locations in Measham, the West was judged to perform better in relative terms to the North East on accessibility, deliverability and sustainability grounds. On this basis, in addition to the very significant regeneration and investment benefits to Measham and the wider area that would accompany the reopening of the Ashby Canal, it is considered that the best Broad Location, in planning terms, is the West Measham Broad Location.