

MEETING OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2024

ADDITIONAL PAPERS

CONTENTS

Item		Pages
3	PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION	
	Question from Mr J Perry	3 - 12
	Question from Mr P Philips	
	Question from Mrs G Armston	
	Question from Mr C Taylor	
	Question from Mr H Baker	
5	LOCAL PLAN- PROPOSED HOUSING ALLOCATIONS - ISLEY WOODHOUSE AND COALVILLE URBAN AREA	
	Local Plan- proposed housing allocations - Isley Woodhouse and Coalville Urban Area Local Plan Committee Report	13 - 16
	Appendix A title page	
	Appendix A C18 C73 C76	
	Appendix A C19a C19b	
	Appendix A C88 C89	
	Appendix A C90 C91	
	Appendix B	
	Appendix C	
	Appendix D	
	Appendix E	
	Appendix F	
	Appendix G	
	Appendix H	
	Appendix I	
	Appendix J	
	Appendix K	
	Appendix L	
	Appendix M	
	Appendix N	
	Appendix O	
	Appendix P	
	Appendix Q	
	Appendix R	
	Appendix S	
	Appendix T	
	Appendix U title page	
	Appendix U	
	Appendix V title page	
	Appendix V	
	Update sheet	

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – MONDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2024

QUESTIONS AND ANSWER SESSION

Question from Mr J Perry

'If the Broad Location, C 47/C 81 etc, remains in the Local Plan I am assuming considerations re: access issues (roads) have already been resolved. Based on the anticipated number of houses to be built there may be in excess of 1,000 additional vehicles on those roads. This would render the use of Church Lane as the sole exit impractical & unrealistic.

In my assessment, to satisfy adequate access requirements, the construction of a major road through C48 will be required. This road would then have to cross Church Lane into any planned development.

My question : - If this is the case will that road be contained within the proposed development C 47/ C 81.'

Response from the Chair of the LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE

'The County Highway Authority in their response to the draft Local Plan advised that access to this site should be considered in conjunction with site C48 off Thornborough Road. The site promoter is currently looking at this, but the exact details have yet to be determined but it would suggest that there would be some possible form of connection between the two sites across Church Lane.'

This page is intentionally left blank

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – MONDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2024

QUESTIONS AND ANSWER SESSION

Question from Mr P Philips

Proposed inclusion in Local Plan of West Whitwick Valley C47/C77/C78/C81/C86 for housing development.

‘Officers and Members will now be well aware of a growing feeling among the community that public consultation was inadequate in the case of West Whitwick Valley being included for housing development in the proposed local plan. This is evidenced by the fact that the majority of those most effected by this inclusion had no knowledge of either the proposal or the consultation until after the consultation closing date. It is noted that in the past consultations have been sent to individual households for far less significant development proposals. In the interest of fairness, transparency and reasonableness, all of which the Council is clearly signed up to delivering, is it agreed that a second public consultation is appropriate in this case, ensuring those most effected are properly and clearly notified?’

Response from the Chair of the LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE

‘In preparing a Local Plan there is no requirement unlike with planning applications, to consult with individual households in the vicinity of any proposed development site. The approach to the consultation was consistent with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement.

The decision to consult on the draft Local Plan was made at the Council’s Local Plan Committee on 17 January 2024. This is a public meeting which was also streamed live. The report to the 17 January meeting specifically noted that the contents of the draft plan would be consulted upon for a six-week period, which subsequently took place between 5 February 2024 and 17 March 2024

Information about the consultation, including what was proposed, was on the Council’s website, together with details of the consultation period and how to respond, as well as where public drop-in sessions were taking place. One such drop-in sessions was for the wider Coalville area at the New Life Church in Margaret Street Coalville on 12 February 2024. In addition, messages were also put out via social media and the local press. The Council also consulted directly with all Parish Councils.

As can be seen from Table 1 of item 5, the number of responses to the proposed West of Whitwick Broad location was only bettered by that in respect of the proposed new settlement. This would suggest, therefore, that people were aware of the draft plan.’

This page is intentionally left blank

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – MONDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2024

QUESTIONS AND ANSWER SESSION

Question from Mrs G Armston

'I refer to the West Whitwick proposal to build 500 houses from New Swannington to Talbot Lane and a further 300 houses on Thornborough Road.

In order for the for the broad location to be included in the local plan, the Limits of Development will have to be moved. Will this be limited to the edge of the proposed development ie C81/47?'

Response from the Chair of the LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE

'As part of the draft plan we did publish proposed changes to the Limits to Development. In respect of the West of Whitwick Broad Location, the proposal was to include all of the site, but no other change was proposed. A review of the Limits to Development, including considering any consultation responses received, will be the subject of a report to a future meeting of the Local Plan Committee.'

This page is intentionally left blank

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – MONDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2024

QUESTIONS AND ANSWER SESSION

Question from Mr C Taylor

‘Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Liz Truss, has stated “I am delighted to be appointed as Environmental Secretary. I look forward to tackling the important issues facing our rural communities including championing British food, protecting people from flooding and improving the environment.” Considering these priorities, how does the council justify the proposed development on the West Whitwick Valley, given its impact on agricultural land, flood risk and local biodiversity?’

Response from the Chair

‘The Local Plan has to seek to reconcile a number of competing demands. This includes reconciling the need for new development with the need to protect the Best and Most Versatile agricultural land whilst also ensuring that new development does not exacerbate flooding and making provision for biodiversity net gain.

The government has made it clear that Local Plans must address the need for new housing, with a national target of 1.5 million new homes being required over the next five years. A failure to make sufficient provision will almost certainly result in the plan being considered as not sound at Examination.

In terms of agricultural land quality, information from Natural England suggests that most of the site is grade 4 land (poor quality), with the remainder being grade 3 (good to moderate).

The land to the west of Whitwick is located within Flood Zone 1, which is the lowest risk area for flooding. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the Local Plan confirms that the site satisfies the Sequential Test as required by national policy. Furthermore, neither the Environment Agency nor the Lead Local Flood Authority (Leicestershire County Council) have raised an objection.

Any new development will be required to deliver biodiversity net gain equivalent to at least 10% as required by the Environment Act 2021.’

This page is intentionally left blank

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – MONDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2024

QUESTIONS AND ANSWER SESSION

Question from Mr H Baker

'I have attended the last 3 meetings and heard a number of valid reasons why 500 houses should not be built on the West Whitwick site. They included:

- Underground Streams
- Flood risk;
- Lack of infrastructure and
- Almost impossible access

No one has mentioned the Thringstone fault. This is a very unstable fault which runs in the earth's surface between Talbot Lane and School Lane, New Swannington, where the ground is very wet. Exactly where it is proposed that the houses will be built.

I have spent some time looking up information about faults in the earth's surface and understand that if an active fault exists, it has the potential for the surface to rupture and a structure for human habitation should not be built over a fault line. I also found a relatively recent example of a house which had been built on Thringstone fault and was crumbling badly. The fact that the house was for sale at a knockdown price made the headlines of Leicester Mercury, via Leicestershire Live.

An advantage of a fault line is that the soil on the surface is very fertile and is easy and cost effective to farm.

There is a Health and Safety risk for people buying houses built on a fault line, the cost of house insurance will be high and difficult to find. Particularly if there is also a risk of flooding. Mortgages, in order to purchase the houses are also likely to be either expensive or difficult to obtain.

I would therefore conclude that if houses are built on this site, they are unlikely to be affordable and would contribute to the number of houses currently standing empty within North West Leicestershire.

Do councillor's agree that there are a number of sites available where the land is less fertile, where house building is likely to be more affordable, and be a would safer alternative for residents, than West Whitwick?'

Response from the Chair of the LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE

'The article in Leicester Mercury acknowledges that the cause of the subsidence in the instance referred to is not known.

There is no evidence that has been presented to suggest that the Thringstone fault would preclude development. A map on the Northern Mine Research Society website would suggest that the fault does not run anywhere near the site.

[Geology of the Leicestershire Coalfield - Northern Mine Research Society](#)

In any event, the National planning Policy Framework states that "Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner". Therefore, it will be the responsibility of the developer/promoter to satisfy themselves that there is not likely to be a land stability issue.'

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE

16 DECEMBER 2024

UPDATE SHEET

UPDATED NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER CHANGES TO THE PLANNING SYTEM

A revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other guidance were published on 12 December 2024. The consultation on these were the subject of a report to this Committee on 26 September 2024 ([Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and Other Changes to the Planning System .pdf](#))

The revised NPPF largely confirms the changes proposed in the consultation.

The changes include “*new immediate mandatory housing targets for councils to ramp up housebuilding and deliver growth across the country putting more money in working people’s pockets*”.

The report to this Committee on 26 September 2024 noted that as a result of proposed changes to the standard method used to calculate housing requirements to be addressed in Local Plans, that the starting point for assessing future needs was proposed to increase from 357 dwellings each year to 621 dwellings each year. As a result of some changes to the standard method, the government has confirmed that the starting figure for North West Leicestershire is 595 dwellings each year. To this must be added any unmet need from elsewhere in the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area. The revised standard method still results in unmet need from Leicester City. How this is distributed across Leicestershire will be the subject of further work with all of the Leicestershire authorities. However, it is considered likely to be close to the figure that is currently being planned for (686 dwellings) and so not change is proposed at this time.

The draft NPPF had also increased the emphasis upon addressing the needs for large scale warehousing. This is included in the final version.

ITEMS 5 AND 6 – APPENDICES

To assist members, the table below identifies the various appendices referred to in items 5 and 6 and the matter to which they relate. The page numbers refer to the paper copies of the Appendices which are in a separate book for ease of cross referencing.

Site	Appendix	Pages
ITEM 5 - LOCAL PLAN – PROPOSED HOUSING ALLOCATIONS – ISLEY WOODHOUSE AND COALVILLE URBAN AREA		
List and maps of additional sites put forward for consideration	A	37 to 45
Representations to IW1 - Isley Woodhouse	B	47 to 103
Representations to C46 - Broom Leys Farm, Coalville	C	105 to 122
Representations to C48 - South of Church Lane, New Swannington	D	123 to 148
Representations to C50 - Jack's Ices, Standard Hill, Coalville	E	149 to 152
Representations to C61 - Church View, Hugglescote	F	153 to 155
Representations to C74 - Lily Bank, Thringstone	G	157 to 163

Representations to C83 - 186, 188 and 190 London Road, Coalville	H	165 to 168
Representations to R17 - Coalville Lane / Ravenstone Road, Coalville	I	171 to 175
Representations to Broad Location - West Whitwick	J	177 to 209
Representations to C92 - Former Hermitage Leisure Centre, Whitwick	K	211 to 216
Representations to Coalville Town Centre	L	217 to 219
Representations to C18 – Land off Thornborough Road Coalville	M	221 to 223
Representations to C19a – Land off Torrington Avenue/Hall Lane, Whitwick	N	225 to 228
Representations to C19b – Land off Stephenson Way, Coalville	O	231 to 235
Representations to C73 – Land off Kirton Road, Coalville	P	237 to 240
Representations to C76 – Land off Meadow Lane, Coalville	Q	243 to 245
C90 – Land south of The Green/Richmond Road Donington le Heath	R	247 to 248
Representations to C91 – Land south of Ashburton Road, Hugglescote	S	249 to 250
Representations to Remaining SHELAA sites – Coalville Urban Area	T	251 to 252
Area of Separation – sub parcels of land	U	253 to 255
Area of separation – proposed allocations for housing	V	257 to 259
ITEM 6 - LOCAL PLAN- PROPOSED EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS: CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION		
Representations to general need employment sites	A	275 to 315
Representations to potential locations for strategic distribution	B	317 to 383
New potential employment sites put forward in response to consultation	C	385 to 386
Proposed revised site boundary for employment site at Midland Road, Ellistown and additional site put forward at Wood Road	D	387 to 388
Strategic warehousing locations for purposes of transport modelling	E	389 to 392

ITEM 5 - LOCAL PLAN – PROPOSED HOUSING ALLOCATIONS – ISLEY WOODHOUSE AND COALVILLE URBAN AREA

Site IW1 – Isley Woodhouse

Representations attributed to Cllr Ray Sutton (405) in Item 5 Appendix B (representations to Policy IW1) should additionally be attributed to

- Cllr Carol Sewell (NWLDC Daleacre Hill Ward)
- Cllr Andrew Priestley Kegworth Parish Council Chair
- Cllr John McLelland (Hemington and Lockington Parish Council Chair)
- Cllr Leonora Cope (Castle Donington Parish Council Chair)
- Cllr Mark Rogers (Castle Donington Parish Council Planning Chair)
- Cllr Nick Rushton (NWLDC Valley inc Long Whatton, Diseworth, Belton)

- Cllr David Bamford (Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council Chair)

Site C90 - Land south of The Green/Richmond Road Donington le Heath

Correspondence has been received from the owner of an adjoining property which notes that the proposed allocation includes land in their ownership. Following correspondence with the site promoter it is accepted that there is a drafting error in respect of the boundary of C90 to Richmond Road as shown at Appendix A. This will be corrected.

The correspondence from the owner of the adjoining property also refers to the existence of springs on the site. This matter has been brought to the attention of the site promoter.

Site C91 – land south of Ashburton Road, Hugglescote

The promoter of the site considers that the site assessment for this site is not entirely accurate as the Council’s pre-applications response notes that *“The HIA asserts that the level of harm would be less than substantial, “at the lowest end of the scale.” Whilst the Council’s Conservation Officer would agree that the level of harm would be towards the low end of the less than substantial scale, they would not agree that it is “at the lowest.”*

The pre-application advice dated 25 October 2024 concludes that

“In summary, the pre-application submission would fail to accord with Policy D1 of the adopted Local Plan and Policies G3, ENV 2 and ENV 5 of the made Hugglescote and Donington Le Heath Neighbourhood Plan. It is also considered that conflict would arise in relation to demonstrating compliance with Policy He1 of the adopted Local Plan and Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) with the loss of agricultural land also weighing against the proposed development.

Whilst accepting that the scheme seeks to provide 100% affordable housing, it is my view that any weight to be attributed to this would not outweigh the fundamental conflicts with the above policies”.

ITEM 6 - LOCAL PLAN- PROPOSED EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS: CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

Representations attributed to Cllr Ray Sutton (405) in Item 6 Appendix B (representations to Policy EMP90) should additionally be attributed to

- Cllr Carol Sewell (NWLDC Daleacre Hill Ward)
- Cllr Andrew Priestley Kegworth Parish Council Chair
- Cllr John McLelland (Hemington and Lockington Parish Council Chair)
- Cllr Leonora Cope (Castle Donington Parish Council Chair)
- Cllr Mark Rogers (Castle Donington Parish Council Planning Chair)
- Cllr Nick Rushton (NWLDC Valley inc Long Whatton, Diseworth, Belton)
- Cllr David Bamford (Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council Chair)

This page is intentionally left blank