

MINUTES of a meeting of the LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE held in the Forest Room, Stenson House, London Road, Coalville, LE67 3FN on WEDNESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2025

Present: Councillor J G Simmons (Chair)

Councillors M Ball, P Lees, D Bigby, S Lambeth, J Legrys, P Moulton, C A Sewell, L Windram and M B Wyatt

In Attendance: Councillor A Barker

Officers: Mr I Nelson, Ms J Althorpe, Mr J Arnold, Ms A Gibson, Ms E Trilk, Mrs C Hammond and Mr B Dooley

## **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor R Morris.

## **2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

All councillors declared they had been lobbied without influence in respect of Site A27 (land south of Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch) which was included in item 6, New Local Plan – Consideration of the Consultation Responses to Proposed Housing and Employment Allocations.

Councillor P Lees declared that he had been lobbied on item 7, New Local Plan – Outcomes from the Call for General Needs Employment Sites 2025, with relation to site EMP66 in Measham. He was advised that he could speak as ward member, but he would need to leave the meeting prior to any discussion or voting on this item.

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

There were five public questions received.

### **Question from Ms A Kingaby**

'The SHELAA entry for Site A27 is out of date and cannot be relied on as decision-level evidence, there is also no plan-level Habitats Regulations Assessment/Appropriate Assessment for the River Mease published with a guaranteed nutrient solution - therefore, will you confirm that A27 will not be advanced to Regulation 19 at this meeting unless officers can point to the exact document and page in tonight's public papers that show, in plain terms, all of the following:

1. River Mease test passed: the legally required Habitats Assessment for the plan concludes no harm to the Mease and the phosphate fix is secured and workable (not just promised or dependent on an unbuilt third-party scheme).
2. Biodiversity: proof of at least 10% Biodiversity Net Gain and a map that legally fixes continuous wildlife corridors, minimum buffer strips next to hedges/woodland/ditch, and a low-light "dark corridor" plan.
3. Road safety and traffic: a Stage-1 road-safety audit and sightline drawings for the Rushey Close/Bishop Hall Road access, and traffic modelling that includes Money Hill/Burton Road (impacts assessed together).
4. Drainage certainty: a Severn Trent letter confirming foul capacity, plus a surface-water/SuDS plan showing how runoff is treated, stored and routed in storms, and any legal consent needed to alter the boundary ditch.

Chair's initials

5. Legal right of access: documents proving the developer has the legal right to use the through-estate road, and whether that route is adopted or secured with the highway authority (S38/S278).

If any one of these is missing from the public papers, will you defer A27 to a later meeting and require a full public report before any Reg-19 decision?’

### **Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee**

‘The site assessment work will be reviewed and updated to inform the Regulation 19 plan.

A Habitat Regulation Assessment of the plan is not required at this stage, but it will be undertaken for the Regulation 19 plan. There is a nutrient solution which Severn Trent are pursuing which involves pumping out of the River Mease catchment. This is scheduled to be done by the end of March 2027. Severn Trent have reconfirmed this recently.

As part of the Local Plan it will be necessary to demonstrate that there is a scheme in place to address the phosphate issue. However, the securing of any measures is a requirement of the planning application stage, either through conditions or via a legal agreement (Section 106 Agreement).

The requirement for how biodiversity net gain requirements will be addressed are matters for a planning application stage.

In terms of highway design, the County Councils Highway Design Guide advises that road safety audits are required for development of 150 dwellings or the layout contains features not covered by the Leicestershire Highway Design Guidance. This site is below this threshold and the County Highway Authority did not raise any concerns when consulted upon the draft plan.

In terms of drainage Severn Trent Water did not object to the proposed allocation. The exact details of how foul water will be addressed is a matter to be addressed as part of any subsequent planning application.

In response to this question, the site promoter (Richborough) has advised that they “retain all necessary rights to acquire the land required to deliver the connections to Rushey Close for access purposes. Richborough’s client (owner of the A27 allocation) is the same landowner who sold the land to Bellway that comprised the adjacent application boundary (14/00578/OUTM) – Richborough were also the applicant for that outline application.” As outlined in response to question 3, the County Highway Authority has not objected to the proposed allocation.’

### **Supplementary question asked:**

In response to a supplementary question, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager explained that, as Severn Trent were still committed to the scheme that involved pumping water out of the catchment area, any development would not be allowed to happen at the present time until the scheme was in place. However, as the Local Plan was looking ahead to 2042, this was due to happen in the early part of the plan period.

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager then noted that nutrient neutrality would be a part of a planning application rather than an allocation.

It was added that transport modelling work covering the District and the areas in the Plan was ongoing and would inform future decisions made by the Council with regards to Regulation 19. Also, estate fees were not a matter for which the Council would be responsible, as they were legal matters between homeowners and developers.

Chair’s initials

### **Question from Mr J Peck**

Mr J Peck was not in attendance, so his question was not asked.

### **Question from Mr C Taylor**

'You have justified WWV remaining in the plan because Meadow Lane and Measham have been removed and suggest that the plan will fail if you remove any more sites, despite planning for more than your quota to be built. You have built houses and employment sites allocated to other areas. Have you asked other areas to co-operate and build part of NWLDC's quota?'

### **Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee**

'It would only be possible to ask other authorities to help meet the Council's housing requirement if it was able to demonstrate that the need for North West Leicestershire cannot be accommodated within the district. This is not the case. Therefore, the other Leicestershire authorities would decline to take any additional development in the absence of demonstrable evidence.'

In response to a supplementary question, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager explained that local people would benefit from building houses within the district by ensuring that the housing needs of existing and future residents were met.

### **Question from Ms G Baker**

'Number 1 of your 11 Plan Objectives is to 'Enable the Health and Wellbeing of the District's Population'. The Ivanhoe Way was established to provide people with access to the countryside and crosses through many parts of the proposed West Whitwick Broad Location. It runs from Swannington, through West Whitwick Valley, Grace Dieu woods and onto Osgathorpe and the well-used Worthington Trail. We have suggested that this particularly attractive part of our countryside should form an area of separation between Coalville, West Whitwick and Thringstone. This is in order to protect their village communities and identity, which together with access to the countryside, would enable the health and wellbeing of residents.

How many other sites, currently within your strategy plan, also form such an integral part of the Ivanhoe Way?'

### **Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee**

'No other sites that are proposed for housing or employment in the Local Plan lie on the route of the Ivanhoe Way. Any future development will be required to retain and enhance any public footpaths which cross the site.'

In response to a supplementary question related to Policy EN5, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager explained that there was currently an area of separation in East Coalville in the adopted Local Plan, and that an area of separation between Whitwick and Thringstone was also recognised.

It was added that, while a proposal had been put forward to devote part of East Coalville to housing development, there was no reason why the rest of the area should not be maintained as an area of separation. Areas surrounded by development, however, were not regarded as countryside.

### **Question from Mr M Elton**

Chair's initials

‘Your Plan Objective number 8 states that you will conserve and enhance our heritage. Drone footage over C77, prior to the fields being cut, identified a double-edged circle. Following discussions with a specialist, we have been advised that this is the probable site of a GIN mine. These were the 1<sup>st</sup> mechanical mines which were introduced within North West Leicestershire in the 17<sup>th</sup> century where shallow coal seams were common. This area has a very deep compression with water constantly sleeping through which suggests this could have Subsidence issues. A similar Heritage site exists and is open to the public at Hough Windmill in Swannington.’

Mr M Elton confirmed that the site in the question was incorrect, and that his question was in relation to Site C47.

It was agreed that a response to his amended question would be provided outside of the meeting.

#### **4 MINUTES**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2025.

It was moved by Councillor M Ball, seconded by Councillor J Legrys and

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2025 be approved and signed by the Chair as an accurate record of proceedings.

#### **5 NEW LOCAL PLAN – CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICIES**

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager presented the report, who, with the Principal Planning Policy Officer, summarised each of the policies for consideration. Reference was also made to the additional papers that were circulated before the meeting.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer introduced the report by detailing the factors that had influenced the proposed policy changes. It was also noted that some changes may not be required depending on the results of the National Development Management Policies (NDMPs) consultation.

Each chapter was then discussed in turn, and it was agreed that questions would be dealt with at the conclusion of each chapter, with the exception of those asked for clarification.

##### Chapter 5 – Creating Attractive Places

During discussion councillors expressed concern over the proposed changes to Policy AP4 (Reducing Carbon Emissions). It was highlighted that the current policy had the potential to raise funds for the Council’s Zero Carbon ambitions.

It was noted by the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager that developers were becoming increasingly aware of carbon emissions and were therefore becoming more effective at addressing related issues.

The Legal Advisor then informed the Committee of the measures that had been put forward to Parliament relating to the policy which would come into effect on 7 October 2025. It was then proposed by members that any decision which related to this policy should be deferred.

Chair’s initials

## Chapter 6 – Housing

Councillors expressed their support for Policy H8 (Housing in Multiple Occupation in Kegworth), and it was questioned why this was not a universal policy.

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager responded that evidence had not been presented that other areas were experiencing issues similar to Kegworth, and that the implementation of a policy that applied across the District could undermine the focus on Kegworth and result in having no policy in place at all.

## Chapter 7 – The Economy

A discussion was had regarding several existing empty sites that were not being used for development, and it was noted by members that local residents were anxious about the use of new sites when there were already sites available. Councillors questioned whether the need to ask developers for new sites could be reduced by using available empty sites.

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager responded that the goal of the New Local Plan was to ensure that sufficient new land was provided up to 2042.

## Chapter 9 – Infrastructure and Facilities

Councillors expressed their support for this policy.

## Chapter 10 - Environment

Councillors expressed their support for this policy that would work alongside the Council's Zero Carbon ambitions.

Councillor D Bigby moved to defer any decision on Policy AP4 (Reducing Carbon Emissions) pending further investigation into the feasibility of a carbon offset fund. It was seconded by Councillor P Moulton.

RESOLVED THAT:

Policy AP4 (Reducing Carbon Emissions), as amended in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, subject to the findings of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, be deferred.

The remaining recommendations detailed within the report were moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor M Ball and

RESOLVED THAT:

- 1) Policy AP2 (Amenity), as amended in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.
- 2) Policy AP3 (Renewable Energy), as amended in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.
- 3) Policy AP5 (Health and Wellbeing, as amended in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.
- 4) Policy AP6 (Health Impact Assessments), as drafted in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.

Chair's initials

- 5) Policy AP8 (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems), as amended in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.
- 6) Policy AP9 (Water Efficiency), as amended in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed subject to the findings of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.
- 7) The principle of Policy H2 (Housing Commitments), with the wording to be drafted in full in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.
- 8) Policy H8 (Houses for Multiple Occupation in Kegworth), as amended in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.
- 9) The principle of Policy EC2 (Employment Commitments), with the wording to be drafted in full in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.
- 10) Policy IF1 (Development and Infrastructure), as amended in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.
- 11) Policy IF3 (Green and Blue Infrastructure), as amended in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.
- 12) Policy IF5 (Transport Infrastructure and New Development), as amended in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.
- 13) Policy EN1 (Nature Conservation/Biodiversity Net Gain), as amended in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.
- 14) Policy EN3 (The National Forest), as amended in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.
- 15) Policy EN5 (Area of Separation), as amended in Appendix F for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed.

## **6 NEW LOCAL PLAN – CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PROPOSED HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS**

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager presented the report.

During discussion, the issues raised by residents in relation to Site A27 (land south of Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch) as detailed in the additional papers, were acknowledged. However, Members were not opposed to keeping the site in the Regulation 19 consultation of the Local Plan.

In response to a question relating to Site K12 (land south of Ashby Road, Kegworth), the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager confirmed that they were still awaiting legal advice.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor M Ball and

**RESOLVED THAT:**

- 1) The responses at Appendix A of the report be noted.

No changes be made to the proposed housing and employment allocations as detailed within the report.

Chair's initials

## **7 NEW LOCAL PLAN – OUTCOMES FROM THE CALL FOR SITES FOR GENERAL EMPLOYMENT SITES 2025**

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager presented the report.

Following his declaration of interest, Councillor P Lees, as ward member for Measham North, addressed the meeting and praised the employment allocations for being fair and reasonable. The lack of opposition to the allocations was also highlighted. He then left the meeting and did not take part in any discussions or voting on the item.

Councillor J Legrys moved the recommendations in the report.

They were seconded by Councillor M Ball and

**RESOLVED THAT:**

- 1) Subject to there being no opportunity to include the site in a Regulation 18 stage consultation and the outcome of further work including transport modelling, viability assessment and infrastructure requirements, the land east of Carnival Way, Castle Donington (EMP63 (part)) in Appendix A be proposed to be allocated in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.

Subject to there being no opportunity to include the site in a Regulation 18 stage consultation and the outcome of further work including transport modelling, viability assessment and infrastructure requirements, the former site of Measham Colliery, Measham (EMP66) in Appendix A be proposed to be allocated in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.

Councillor P Lees left the meeting at 7:37pm

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 7.38 pm

Chair's signature