

**MEETING OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY, 28 JANUARY 2026**

**ADDITIONAL PAPERS**

## CONTENTS

Item		Pages
3	<b>PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION</b>	
	Question from Mr Roy Todd	3 - 14
	Question from Mr Carl Sutton	
	Question from Mr Noel Suthesh	
	Question from Mr Michael Elton	
	Question from Ms Gayle Baker	
	Question from Mr Chris Taylor	
5	<b>NEW LOCAL PLAN - DISEWORTH AND ISLEY WOODHOUSE AREA OF SEPARATION</b>	
	Update Report	15 - 24
	Correspondence with Mr Brackenbury	
	Letter from Pegasus Group	
	Letter from Mather Jamie	

## **Local Plan Committee – Wednesday, 28 January 2026**

### **PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM MR ROY TODD**

With reference to the Council's own records, can the Committee identify the specific recorded rationale relied upon when progressing Site EMP97 for not undertaking Regulation 18 consultation, in circumstances where:

- technical engagement on EMP97 has been ongoing since at least early 2024, including sustained engagement with the site promoters and Leicestershire County Council Highways;
- that engagement included an acknowledged in-principle highways objection relating to access arrangements, the operational function of the Kegworth Bypass, and site topography, as evidenced in contemporaneous internal records received by way of Environmental Information Regulations requests, including correspondence dated 8 August 2024;
- internal correspondence disclosed under the Environmental Information Regulations confirms that, as at 14 November 2025, just five days prior to the Local Plan Committee decision of 19 November 2025, officers regarded the site as "at risk" because the primary access arrangements lie outside the site red line and beyond the promoter's control;
- Environmental Information Regulation disclosures show that no engagement had taken place at allocation stage with either the Civil Aviation Authority or East Midlands Airport / Manchester Airport Group, despite the site's proximity to the airport's runway approach and Public Safety Zone; yet
- the site was not subject to Regulation 18 consultation, and Members themselves recorded on 19 November 2025 that it "did not get full scrutiny from local residents";

and, in those circumstances, how the Committee reconciles a prolonged period of promoter-engaged technical work on EMP97 with the purpose of Regulation 18 and the Council's own Statement of Community Involvement, both of which are intended to secure early and meaningful public engagement and a robust evidence base before options are effectively fixed?

## RESPONSE FROM THE CHAIR OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE

- It is established practice for officers to discuss the technical aspects of potential site allocations (of all types) with expert agencies, such as the local highways authority, before making recommendations to the Committee. This may also include asking for information and clarifications from the site promoters.
- The fact that LCC Highways has concerns about the access to this site was clearly stated in the 19 November 2025 Local Plan Committee report (paragraph 4.12). Appendix B of the same report identified that more detailed assessment may reveal a technical solution which LCC could support.
- In respect of the airport, the greatest proportion of the site lies outside the airport Public Safety Zone. Officers' view is that the site can be developed without encroaching on the PSZ.
- If these, or any other technical matters, cannot be addressed to the satisfaction of professional officers, the advice to the Committee to allocate the site may be changed.
- The 19 November 2025 Local Plan Committee report gave reasons both for and against Regulation 18 consultation at this stage and, on balance, recommended against it. This advice and the decision the Committee made does not contravene the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.
- It is relevant to highlight that a site allocation policy will be included in the Regulation 19 version of the plan which will include requirements to address the impacts of development such as landscaping, design quality and sustainable transport improvements.

## **Local Plan Committee – Wednesday, 28 January 2026**

### **PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM MR CARL SUTTON**

Environmental Information Regulations disclosures show that on 18 June 2025, Ian Nelson, then Planning Policy Manager at North West Leicestershire District Council, specifically asked Manchester Airport Group, the owner and operator of East Midlands Airport and a statutory consultee, whether it had any concerns regarding the proposed residential allocation of Site K12.

This was followed by a further email on 15 July 2025, in which Mr Nelson stated:

“I was just wondering if you were able to advise on this issue as we are in the process of finalising a report to our Local Plan Committee.”

On 24 July 2025, Manchester Airport Group responded directly to that request and provided site-specific statutory consultee advice, concluding unequivocally:

“For reasons of aircraft noise exposure and disturbance, and residential amenity, it would be inappropriate to allocate this site for residential development.”

Given that Manchester Airport Group, as the statutory airport operator, provided site-specific advice stating that Site K12 is inappropriate for residential allocation on aircraft noise and residential amenity grounds, and that this advice was specifically requested by officers prior to the Local Plan Committee report being produced, can the Committee confirm how this conclusion was presented to Members when Site K12 was considered, and whether the Committee is satisfied to progress the allocation to Regulation 19 in light of that advice?

## RESPONSE FROM THE CHAIR OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE

- Whilst Manchester Air Group (MAG) responded to the March 2025 Regulation 18 consultation (alongside Prologis UK), they did not comment on site K12 as part of their response.
- As a direct result of residents' Regulation 18 comments, Ian Nelson wrote to MAG on 18 June 2025 to establish their views on site K12 and airport safety. At the same time, officers were seeking legal advice on the issue, with the intention of reporting this to 30 July 2025 Local Plan Committee.
- A response from MAG was received on 24 July 2025; after the publication of the 30 July LPC reports. The email trail between MAG and Ian Nelson confirmed that MAG's concerns with the site were about noise rather than safety. At this point in time, officers had requested, but not yet received, legal advice about site K12 and airport safety.
- Whilst MAG's concerns about noise were not reported to LPC, the issue of noise and the suitability of site K12 was raised by Cllr Sutton and referenced in the update report to 30 July LPC, where officers concluded that "excluding this site on the basis of noise without a more detailed assessment, as required in the policy, would be premature." After considering the issue of noise, officers did not propose any changes to the original recommendation that site K12 should be allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan "subject to confirmation that the site is acceptably located in relation to the EMA Public Safety Zone."
- The update report was finalised by Ian Nelson as Planning Policy Team Manager on 30 July and it is reasonable to assume that his email exchange with MAG (24 July), although not explicitly referred to, would not have changed the conclusions set out in the update report.
- It should be noted that there are still several stages before the site can be formally allocated in an adopted Local Plan. MAG can make formal comments at Regulation 19 stage; the Council can change the Plan after the Regulation 19 consultation and the Planning Inspectorate can explore the soundness of allocating site K12 during the Local Plan examination. Furthermore, a site allocation does not equate to a planning permission and any future planning application would need to demonstrate that the proposed development is acceptable in noise terms.

## **Local Plan Committee – Wednesday, 28 January 2026**

### **PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM MR NOEL SUTHESH**

At the Local Plan Committee meeting on 19 November 2025, Members were advised that progressing Site EMP97 was necessary to avoid undermining the Local Plan.

However, EIR material shows that, just five days earlier, officers were recording internally that EMP97 itself was “at risk” because its primary access depends on land outside the site red line and beyond the promoter’s control.

Can the Committee confirm whether Members were explicitly informed, at the point of decision, that officers were simultaneously assessing EMP97 as carrying a site-specific deliverability risk, as opposed to a general procedural or plan-level risk?

If that distinction was not made clear, how were Members able to make a fully informed, evidence-based decision to rely on EMP97 as a strategically critical allocation?

#### **RESPONSE FROM THE CHAIR OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE**

- The fact that LCC Highways has concerns about the access to this site was clearly stated in the 19 November 2025 Local Plan Committee report (paragraph 4.12). Appendix B of the same report confirmed that more detailed assessment may reveal a technical solution which LCC could support.
- If this, or any other technical matters, cannot be addressed to officers’ professional satisfaction before the Committee’s consideration of the Regulation 19 Plan, the advice to the Committee to allocate the site may be changed.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Local Plan Committee – Wednesday, 28 January 2026**

### **PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM MR MICHAEL ELTON**

Following the last round of consultation for additional sites put forward for development, you decided to remove 3 of them from the plan. One of those sites Ap15/17 because you stated that it was undeliverable. Could you outline for me please why the site is undeliverable?

#### **RESPONSE FROM THE CHAIR OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE**

- Land at Old End, Appleby Magna (Ap15) and 40 Measham Road, Appley Magna (Ap17) was proposed as a single housing allocation. However, the sites are in different ownership and have been submitted to the Council independently. No evidence has been presented to the Council which gives certainty that the site would be delivered as a comprehensive development.
- It was not considered appropriate to allocate Ap15 and Ap17 as independent sites in light of each site's potential capacity when viewed individually.
- Ap15 has a capacity of less than 10 dwellings and falls below the identified necessary site threshold for a site to be considered as a potential allocation.
- It is uncertain whether 10 or more dwellings could be delivered at Ap17, following a reduction in and amendment to the site area, potential flood risk constraints and the need for development to take into account the surrounding character of the area.
- Whilst the sites are not proceeding as allocations, at 11 March 2025 Local Plan Committee it was agreed that these sites would be included in the Limits to Development for Appleby Magna in the next version of the Plan (Regulation 19).

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Local Plan Committee – Wednesday, 28 January 2026**

### **PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM MS GAYLE BAKER**

The majority of sites included within your plan, will be part of large scale housing estates proposed by major promoters and building companies such as David Wilson homes and Gladman's. These developments have a much greater negative impact upon the area, community identity, heritage and wildlife, infrastructure flooding etc. There are relatively few smaller developments across the district. Hugglescote and Ashby are now unrecognisable and often grid locked, this has had a huge negative impact upon those communities. You now plan to treat Whitwick and Diseworth in the same way.

What evidence do you have that concentrating large scale developments in 2 unfortunate areas, for the period of your plan, will deliver the best outcomes for residents of NWLDC?

#### **RESPONSE FROM THE CHAIR OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE**

- The Local Plan needs to allocate a sufficient supply and mix of sites in order to meet its housing requirement up to 2042.
- In order to be deemed sound by an independent Planning Inspector, the Council's strategy to meet housing needs must be justified, taking into account reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence.
- Sites have been identified in accordance with an agreed distribution strategy, which includes a new settlement but also delivers housing in line with an agreed settlement hierarchy (approved for the Regulation 19 plan at 14 August 2024 Local Plan Committee). Sites have been assessed in accordance with a specified methodology and have undergone sustainability appraisal.
- The identification of sites is underpinned by a wide range of evidence. Some of that evidence, such as transport modelling, an infrastructure delivery plan, sustainability appraisal and a viability assessment is ongoing and will be completed by the time the Regulation 19 version goes out to consultation.
- All the Council's Local Plan evidence will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, alongside the Regulation 19 version of the plan and will be examined by an independent Planning Inspector against the tests of soundness.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Local Plan Committee – Wednesday, 28 January 2026

### PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

#### QUESTION FROM MR CHRIS TAYLOR

At the last meeting, it was acknowledged that the decisions surrounding site selection for the Local Plan are becoming increasingly difficult. Given this, why did the Committee choose to remove Site C76 (Meadow Lane, Coalville)—the very site that Planning Officers and independent consultants ranked first in the hierarchy for housing development in the area? To date, we have not seen any technical or environmental evidence that justifies the removal of this top-ranked site. By rejecting the most viable and sustainable option without a published evidence base, are you not making the final decision to produce a 'sound' and defensible Plan significantly more difficult for this Council?

#### RESPONSE FROM THE CHAIR OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE

- Officers proposed to allocate site C76 and presented it, as part of a report on Proposed Housing and Employment Allocations, to the Local Plan Committee on 15 November 2023.
- Members at that meeting resolved not to allocate the site “*because of the impact on the Coalville Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest, destroying this part of the Charnwood Forest, the loss of mature trees, the impact on local roads, particularly the junction of Meadow Lane and Leicester Road but also the increased risk to children going to and from Castle Rock School.*”
- Planning policies need to identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account of their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. Officers have undertaken a site assessment exercise which involves weighing up the potential benefits and adverse impacts of developing sites.
- In carrying out the site assessment work underpinning the proposed site allocations, officers have never ranked sites nor have they referred to site C76 as its top-ranked site in the Coalville Urban Area.
- As confirmed at 11 March 2025 Local Plan Committee ([Local Plan Proposed Housing Allocations](#) report) planning policy officers consider that they have identified a range of suitable sites to broadly accord with the Council’s agreed distribution strategy (see Table 7 of that report) and meet the Council’s housing need up to 2042.

This page is intentionally left blank

## LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE - 28 JANUARY 2026

### UPDATE

#### **Item 5: New Local Plan – Diseworth and Isley Woodhouse Area of Separation**

Further to the publication of the above report, officers received correspondence from the following parties:

- Richard Brackenbury (on behalf of Protect Diseworth)
- Steve Lewis-Roberts, Pegasus Group (on behalf of Harworth Estates Investments Limited and Caesarea Planning Services Limited)
- Georgina Doyle, Mather Jamie (on behalf of Fred Sherwood and Sons (Transport) Ltd and Messrs Sherwood)

Copies of the correspondence received are appended to this update report.

#### ***Richard Brackenbury (on behalf of Protect Diseworth)***

##### *Summary*

- Mr Brackenbury emailed officers on 20 January 2026 to state it was his understanding that, although the Area of Separation (AoS) was not explicitly identified as comprising parcels A to I, that was the intention of Local Plan Committee on 19 November 2025 when resolving that an AoS should be designated.
- Mr Brackenbury forwarded two emails that he had sent to Ian Nelson, then the Planning Policy Team Manager (on 25 November 2025 and 8 December 2025, the latter following a phone conversation with Mr Nelson). It is Mr Brackenbury's understanding from that phone call that Mr Nelson also agreed that members had intended to designate parcels A to I.
- Mr Brackenbury thinks that the Local Plan Committee are being asked to take a further decision on the extent of the AoS; something with which he disagrees as he feels this decision has already been taken.

##### *Officer Response*

- The reasons underpinning the recommendation before members at this (28 January 2026) committee are clearly set out at paragraphs 1.3 to 1.6 of the committee report.

#### ***Pegasus Group (on behalf of Harworth Estates Investments Limited and Caesarea Planning Services Limited)***

##### *Summary*

- Pegasus Group emailed a letter to officers on 20 January 2026. Their letter was sent on behalf of the promoters of the Isley Woodhouse proposed allocation.
- Their clients object to the inclusion of parcels H and I in the proposed Area of Separation. These parcels fall within the site boundary of Isley Woodhouse.
- Their clients' view the designation of parcels H and I in the AoS as "*unnecessary and will remove all flexibility in these parcels which could potentially frustrate the delivery*

*of the site. The designation of these parcels is premature and better considered once the development is permitted in full.”*

**Officer Response**

- The implications of designating parcels H and I are addressed in the committee report at paragraph 1.8.
- It should also be noted as well as setting out the uses that would be acceptable in the AoS, draft Policy En5 also includes an element of flexibility: *“Any other proposed uses will need to demonstrate why they cannot be accommodated elsewhere within the district.”* The draft ('Regulation 19') wording for Policy En5 was agreed at Local Plan Committee on 24 September 2025.
- There will be the opportunity for Pegasus' clients to object to the proposed AoS boundary as part of the Regulation 19 consultation.

***Mather Jamie (on behalf of Fred Sherwood and Sons (Transport) Ltd and Messrs Sherwood)***

- Mather Jamie emailed a letter to officers on 26 January. Their clients have interest in land to the west of Diseworth and wish to object to the principle of the proposed AoS between Diseworth and Isley Woodhouse.
- Mather Jamie agree with the officer report to the 19 November 2025 Local Plan Committee, which did *not* recommend an AoS in this location.

**Officer Response**

- Members have already resolved to designate an AoS; this report is seeking clarity on the extent of the AoS, so that it can be included in the Regulation 19 Plan.
- There will be the opportunity for Mather Jamie's clients to object to the principle of the AoS as part of the Regulation 19 consultation.

***Officer recommendation***

No change to the officer recommendation on page 15 of reports pack.

**EXTERNAL: Local Plan Committee 26 January 2026 - Diseworth area of separation – Item**

**From** richardbrackenbury@tiscali.co.uk <richardbrackenbury@tiscali.co.uk>

**Sent:** 20 January 2026 12:43

**To** JOANNE ALTHORPE <JOANNE.ALTHORPE@nwleicestershire.gov.uk>

**Cc** CLLR R MORRIS <RAY.MORRIS@nwleicestershire.gov.uk>; CHRIS ELSTON

<CHRIS.ELSTON@NWLeicestershire.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]

CLLR N RUSHTON <NICHOLAS.RUSHTON@NWLeicestershire.gov.uk>

1 attachment (16 KB)

RE: Local Plan Committee !9 November;

Dear Ms Althorpe,

I attach a copy of a self-explanatory email to Ian Nelson concerning the above issue.

We agreed that, although the committee did not specifically identify areas "A-I" from the map, that was the intention. We also agreed that when the matter was put back before the committee for confirmation to avoid doubt in the future.

However, I do not read the agenda item in that way with the committee being asked to take a further decision, a decision that in practice has it has already taken.

Please can you confirm as a matter of urgency that you have both seen the email attached and that the committee will be apprised of its contents. Bearing in mind that urgency, I have raised a question with "Democratic services" dealing with the point, a question I can withdraw subject to hearing from you.

Regards

Richard Brackenbury  
On behalf of Protect Diseworth

Protect Diseworth is a trading name of Wings Communities Limited which is a company limited by guarantee registered in England with registered number 14243540 and whose registered office is at 27 Old Gloucester Street, London, United Kingdom, WC1N 3AX  
This message is intended solely for the addressee and may contain confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please send it back to us, and immediately and permanently delete it. Do not use, copy or disclose the information contained in this message or in any attachment.

Wings Communities Limited does not accept responsibility for any loss arising from unauthorised access to, or interference with, any Internet communications by any third party, or from the transmission of any viruses.

[www.protectdiseworth.com](http://www.protectdiseworth.com)

**RE: Local Plan Committee !9 November**

**From** richardbrackenbury@tiscali.co.uk <richardbrackenbury@tiscali.co.uk>

**Sent:** 8 December 2025 12:08

**To** 'IAN NELSON' <IAN.NELSON@NWLeicestershire.gov.uk>

**Cc** CHRIS ELSTON <CHRIS.ELSTON@NWLeicestershire.gov.uk>;

[REDACTED]

Ian,

Thank you for your call back just now. I did not expect to hear but guess it would make sense to confirm our discussion!

I think you and I both agreed that the intention was to specify that all the areas identified in the report should together constitute the Area of Separation. Certainly, I had been explicit in asking for that in the letter to the committee members in response to your original recommendation. However, we also both agreed, particularly given all the other surrounding factors, that it would be better to confirm matters. On that basis, the committee will be asked to confirm in the New Year.

For the rest, I understand you retire at the end of this week and so wish you the very best in this new phase of your life.

Kind regards  
Richard

**From:** richardbrackenbury@tiscali.co.uk <richardbrackenbury@tiscali.co.uk>

**Sent:** 25 November 2025 11:25

**To:** 'IAN NELSON' <IAN.NELSON@NWLeicestershire.gov.uk>

**Cc:** 'CHRIS ELSTON' <CHRIS.ELSTON@NWLeicestershire.gov.uk>;  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Local Plan Committee !9 November

Ian,

Referring to the committee's agreement to accept the motion to propose the area of separation for Diseworth,

I thought I should just check on the detail. I think it was implicit (if not explicit – waiting to see the recording) that the area would be for all of the individual "plots" identified in the LVIA report but please confirm.

Regards

Richard Brackenbury  
On behalf of Protect Diseworth

Protect Diseworth is a trading name of Wings Communities Limited which is a company limited by guarantee registered in England with registered number 14243540 and whose registered office is at 27 Old Gloucester Street, London, United Kingdom, WC1N 3AX  
This message is intended solely for the addressee and may contain confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please send it back to us, and immediately and permanently delete it. Do not use, copy or disclose the information contained in this message or in any attachment.

Wings Communities Limited does not accept responsibility for any loss arising from unauthorised access to, or interference with, any Internet communications by any third party, or from the transmission of any viruses.

[www.protectdiseworth.com](http://www.protectdiseworth.com)

This page is intentionally left blank

P18-1419LO04v2

20 January 2026

Joanne Althorpe – Principal Planning Policy Officer  
North West Leicestershire District Council  
By Email Only

Dear Jo,

**North West Leicestershire District Council Local Plan Committee, 28<sup>th</sup> January 2026**  
**Diseworth and Isley Woodhouse Area of Separation**

I write on behalf of my clients Harworth Estates Investments Limited and Caesarea Planning Services Limited regarding the upcoming meeting of the Local Plan Committee at North West Leicestershire District Council, scheduled for Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> January 2026 at 6pm. Harworth and Caesarea are the joint applicants on the pending application 25/00865/OUTM for the Isley Woodhouse site.

Item 5 on the Agenda for this meeting is entitled '*New Local Plan: Diseworth and Isley Woodhouse Area of Separation*'. Members are due to confirm the extent of the proposed Diseworth and Isley Woodhouse Area of Separation. The options presented to the committee are Parcel B only (as previously recommended by NWLDC's Officers), or Parcels A to I, per Appendix A of the report.

The applicants wish to note that, should the Local Plan Committee proceed to confirm the Area of Separation covering Parcels A to I, this would be inconsistent with the proposed allocation for Isley Woodhouse (IW1). This is because Parcels H and I as shown in Appendix A of the report intrude into the site area of proposed allocation IW1 and would be inconsistent with the planning application site boundary and the Masterplan that accompanies the planning application. The consideration of the application is at an early stage and is supported by an Illustrative Masterplan which may need to be adjusted and refined to respond to consultee comments. Designating part of the allocation as an Area of Separation is unnecessary and will remove all flexibility in these parcels which could potentially frustrate the delivery of the site. The designation of these parcels is premature and better considered once the development is permitted in full.

For these reasons the applicants object to the inclusion of Parcels H and I in the Diseworth and Isley Woodhouse Area of Separation.

4 The Courtyard, Church Street, Lockington, Derbyshire, DE74 2SL  
T 01509 670806 E [EastMidlands@pegasusgroup.co.uk](mailto:EastMidlands@pegasusgroup.co.uk)

Offices throughout the UK.

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.  
Registered Office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RQ

1

**Expertly Done.**

21

PLANNING | DESIGN | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | ECONOMICS  
TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE | BUILDING SURVEYING | BIODIVERSITY



Please ensure that this objection is reported to the Local Plan Committee on the 28<sup>th</sup> January, to ensure that our representations are properly considered before a decision is made.

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Yours sincerely,



**Steve Lewis-Roberts**  
Executive Director  
[Steve.Lewis-Roberts@Pegasusgroup.co.uk](mailto:Steve.Lewis-Roberts@Pegasusgroup.co.uk)



Joanne Althorpe – Principal Planning Policy Officer Northwest Leicestershire District Council by Email Only

22<sup>nd</sup> January 2026

Dear Joanne,

**Re: Northwest Leicestershire District Council Local Plan Committee, 28th January 2026 Diseworth and Isley Woodhouse Area of Separation**

I write on behalf of my clients Fred Sherwood and Sons (Transport) Ltd and Messrs Sherwood regarding Item 5 of the agenda at the upcoming meeting of the Local Plan Committee at Northwest Leicestershire District Council, scheduled for Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> January 2026 at 6pm. Item 5 is a report by the Principal Planning Officer regarding a proposed Diseworth and Isley Woodhouse Area of Separation. Our client objects to the inclusion of An Area of Local Separation to Diseworth and would like their concerns to be shared with the Committee ahead of its meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup>.

This letter is written in relation to our client's interest in land to the west of Diseworth.

At the Meeting Members will be presented with 2 options to the extent of the Area of Separation at Diseworth. Members are due to confirm the preferred option that will be taken forward as part of the Local Plan process.

The options presented to the committee are Parcel B only, or Parcels A to I, per Appendix A of the report.

NWLDC had previously agreed to explore the most appropriate means for maintaining the separation of Diseworth and the new settlement at Isley Woodhouse, whether that be through creating some form of area of separation, gap, buffer zone, or similar designation, or by appropriate application of existing policy.

The Landscape Partnership was commissioned by NWLDC to undertake an independent study of the land that provides both physical and perceived separation between Diseworth and Isley Woodhouse and which therefore safeguards Diseworth's character and appearance.

Officers presented the study to the Local Plan Committee on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2025 recommending that Officers are of the view that the designation of an Area of Separation was not justified between Diseworth and the New settlement Isley Woodhouse. Whilst accepting that the new settlement will change the character between the two settlements to some degree, it was recommended that a countryside designation remains appropriate. This position is supported by my client.

My client does not support the designation of an Area of Local Separation between Diseworth and Isley Woodhouse. Such a designation is not supported by robust evidence, and there is no justification for the extent of land proposed. The land in question already lies outside defined settlement limits and is therefore subject to countryside policy, which restricts development accordingly. Adopted Policy S3 (Countryside) specifically states that development will only be supported where: "it does not undermine, either individually or cumulatively with existing or proposed development, the physical and perceived separation and open undeveloped character". This requirement is mirrored in emerging policy S4 of the New Local Plan that is in preparation.



As such, no greater level of protection would be achieved through the introduction of a bespoke Area of Separation designation, beyond that already provided by adopted and proposed policy.

This position is reinforced by the conclusions of the independent study undertaken by The Landscape Partnership, which does not support the need for an Area of Local Separation between Diseworth and Isley Woodhouse and indeed highlights that any designation could be counter productive and duplicate existing policy.

For the reasons set out above, my client objects to any Area of Local Separation designation, supports the original officer recommendation that a countryside designation is appropriate and considers that the identification of a wider Area of Local Separation is neither justified nor necessary as presented on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2025.

Please ensure that this objection is reported to the Local Plan Committee on the 28th of January, to ensure that our representations are carefully considered before a decision is made.

If you would like to discuss this representation, please can in touch.

Yours sincerely

**GEORGINA DOYLE** BSc MSc MRTPI  
Planning Manager  
E-mail: [georgina.doyle@matherjamie.co.uk](mailto:georgina.doyle@matherjamie.co.uk)  
Tel: 01509 233433