



Scan the code above or visit [www.nwleics.gov.uk/meetings](http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/meetings) for a full copy of the agenda.

Meeting	<b>LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE</b>
Time/Day/Date	6.00 pm on Wednesday, 24 September 2025
Location	Forest Room, Stenson House, London Road, Coalville, LE67 3FN
Officer to contact	Democratic Services 01530 454512

### AGENDA

Item		Pages
<b>1</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</b>	
	Under the Code of Conduct members are reminded that in declaring interests you should make clear the nature of that interest and whether it is a disclosable pecuniary interest, registerable interest or other interest.	
<b>3</b>	<b>PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION</b>	
	To receive questions from members of the public under rule no.10 of the Council Procedure Rules.	
<b>4</b>	<b>MINUTES</b>	
	To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2025	<b>3 - 10</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>NEW LOCAL PLAN – CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICIES</b>	
	The report of the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager.	<b>11 - 214</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>NEW LOCAL PLAN – CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PROPOSED HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS</b>	
	The report of the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager.	<b>215 - 244</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>NEW LOCAL PLAN – OUTCOMES FROM THE CALL FOR SITES FOR GENERAL EMPLOYMENT SITES 2025</b>	
	The report of the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager.	<b>245 - 258</b>

Circulation:

Councillor J G Simmons (Chair)  
Councillor P Lees  
Councillor M Ball (Deputy Chair)  
Councillor D Bigby  
Councillor S Lambeth  
Councillor J Legrys  
Councillor R L Morris  
Councillor P Moulton  
Councillor C A Sewell  
Councillor L Windram  
Councillor M B Wyatt

MINUTES of a meeting of the LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE held in the Forest Room, Stenson House, London Road, Coalville, LE67 3FN on WEDNESDAY, 30 JULY 2025

Present: Councillor J G Simmons (Chair)

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

Officers: Mr I Nelson, Mr C Elston, Mrs C Hammond, Mr J Arnold and Ms B Leonard

## **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors S Lambeth and R Morris.

## **2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

In accordance with the Code of Conduct, Members declared the following interests:

Councillor K Merrie declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 6 and received legal advice to leave the room during the discussion and vote for recommendations 2 and 3.

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

There were no questions received.

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

'C77 is owned by World Habitat formally known as East Midlands Housing so it is likely that any building is going to be social or affordable housing. Therefore it will be public money, funded by government grants, which will be used to build on this site. This steep valley has an underground stream, surface coal seams and underground gas. We have been advised by an ex- developer that this site will be extremely expensive to develop. Do the Local Plan Committee, therefore feel that this would be a good use of public money to develop this site?'

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

'A decision as to whether or not it is appropriate to undertake development at site C77 having regard to costs alone is for East Midlands Housing as the prospective developer to determine, it is not for the Council to judge if it represents a good use of public money. The Local Plan is concerned with determining, from a planning perspective, whether it is appropriate for sites to be developed. In this instance it is considered that site C77 is appropriate.'

In response to a supplementary question, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager informed that questioner that the Council was not aware of a survey that took place on the C77 site but would seek more information.

**Question from Mr C Taylor**

'Full council voted 35 to 1 for the petition to remove WWV from the plan being referred to LPC, because WWV site doesn't meet any of the plan objectives, isn't in line with proposed planning reforms and fails to treat WWV fairly in terms of creating an area of separation. Councillor Legrys proposed that no more sites should be removed which were recommended by Officers. Does this mean that no sites will be removed from the plan until the appeal stage, whether or not they are viable?'

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

'The decision as to whether any site should be excluded (or included) in the final Local Plan will, in the first instance, be for members of the Local Plan Committee to decide having regard to evidence, including, not limited to, the ongoing transport modelling and the viability assessment. The final decision as to the content of the Local Plan will rest with a meeting of the full Council.'

In response to a supplementary question, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager explained that the West Whitwick valley remained in the Local Plan because Officers considered it acceptable but ultimately the acceptability of sites was a decision for the Committee and Council to make.

**Question from Mr G Baker**

'I understand that HS2 safeguarding has now been lifted, a planning application for more than 4 ½ thousand properties at Isley Walton and 300 properties at Broomleys have been submitted and that part of the proposed Twycross new development will extend onto an area of NWLDC. You have also stated that you will continue to plan for 686 properties to be built within the district per year, while the impact of Local Government restructuring on requirements is unclear. From your report it appears that you have already decided that the proposal to build on Packington Nook has also been removed. Basic arithmetic would suggest that further sites will be removed. I am concerned that sites will be taken out of the plan based upon political influence rather than the viability of the site and impact upon the community. Could you explain to me please criteria for withdrawing sites from the New Local Plan?'

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

'The site at Packington Nook was identified as a reserve site in the event that the safeguarding for HS2 was not removed as it affected sites that already had planning permission. As the safeguarding has now been removed it follows that a reserve site is no longer required.'

In response to a supplementary question, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager explained that the master plan for the West Whitwick site was to ensure that the different parts of that site area would join up logically and the development of any area within the site would consider everything in the wider site, subject to consultation with the wider community.

#### 4 MINUTES

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2025.

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

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2025 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

#### 5 LOCAL PLAN – ADDITIONAL PROPOSED HOUSING ALLOCATIONS: CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Before the presentation of item 5, the Chair of the Local Plan Committee explained the structure of the presentations and discussions to the Committee.

The report was presented by the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager and the Principal Planning Policy Officer.

##### Sections 1 – 3

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager explained to the Committee that the actual number of dwellings required may change based on updated government modelling. If the number decreases, some sites may be removed; if it increases, new sites may need to be added. Unmet housing needs from Leicester City and possibly Oadby and Wigston would also influence final numbers.

It was appreciated by a member of the Committee, that the HS2 safeguarded had been removed. In response to their enquiry about the Norton Juxta Twycross development, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager explained that the majority of this proposal was located within Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council area. Decisions made for this site relied on the Borough Council, who were less advanced in their Local Plan process which could mean potential delays in this Council's Plan. Updates would be provided to the Committee.

It was requested by a member that the Committee have further discussions about proposals that involved Norton Juxta Twycross, Appleby and employment at Junction 11.

Officers were congratulated for their 'meticulous' responses to the public consultation process.

##### Section 4

A member of the Committee raised concerns, on behalf of residents of Rushey Close, about an allocated site South of Burton Road. It was reported that these residents were not officially informed during the consultation of this site. It was explained that the consultation process involved Parish and Town Councils being notified with the expectation to help disseminate information; and those signed up to the consultation database, or had previously made representations, were contacted. It was added that writing to every resident was not feasible due to cost

and time constraints. Officers were unsure why residents of this site were unaware as other sites across the district were notified. Any comments received would be reviewed thoroughly and if changes to the plan was warranted, recommendations would be made accordingly.

### Section 5

A discussion followed. The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Managers informed Members, that whilst the Council were unable to compel developers to work together, there was some reassurance that 3 of the developers had met. Upcoming transport modelling evidence may require sensible planning and encourage collaboration between developers, but it was up to them to do so.

Members were updated on an active petition in relation to Torrington Avenue (recommendation 2). Actions taken, because of the petition, depended on the number of signatures.

In response to a question, it was explained that a parcel of undeveloped land would be preserved by a legal agreement, but future changes could not be ruled out.

Concerns were raised about the West Whitwick land. It was explained that If the land was included in the Regulation 19 plan, objections could still be submitted; and that viability assessment and/or other evidence could lead to changes, which included the removal or replacement of sites.

### Section 6

A discussion followed. The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager proposed to include supportive wording in the Plan to protect existing homes from site designs with potential negative impacts, in response to a Member's request.

It was explained to the Committee that a ditch running parallel to Park Lane (CD9) had resulted in the lead Local Flood Authority raising concerns in respect of site access. Officers were to follow this up to understand how this might affect the proposed widening of Park Lane, though the issue was expected to be manageable.

### Section 7

A discussion followed. The suitability of site K12 in Kegworth was questioned due to noise and safety concerns. The Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that pending a detailed noise assessment and mitigation plan, the site could be considered potentially acceptable. Officers were also awaiting legal advice due to the site's proximity to the Kegworth air crash site. The site would be withdrawn and replaced elsewhere if deemed unsuitable following these measures.

In response to concerns raised by a member regarding Housing Allocation Strategy (7b) the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager explained that Strategy Option 7b was the option the Committee felt most comfortable with; out of several options. Changes made to distributions were necessary due to constraints including site availability and highway advice; and to ensure housing

targets were met. Option 7b was a guiding framework and not set in stone. It was recognised that the distribution was not ideal, but many settlements lacked available sites. Members also recognised that while the strategy wasn't perfect, it reflected practical constraints and dynamically evolved evidence.

A recorded vote being requested, the voting was detailed below.

The motion was put to vote and CARRIED. Recorded votes to follow.

RESOLVED THAT:

**SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER WORK INCLUDING TRANSPORT MODELLING, VIABILITY ASSESSMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS, THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE AGREES THAT:**

- 1. LAND OFF THORNBOROUGH ROAD (C18) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 105 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.**
- 2. LAND OFF HALL LANE AND TORRINGTON AVENUE (C19A); LAND OFF STEPHENSON WAY (C19B) AND BROOM LEYS FARM (C46) ARE ALLOCATED AS A SINGLE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT AREA IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN, TO PROVIDE AROUND 1,200 DWELLINGS IN TOTAL.**
- 3. LAND SOUTH OF THE GREEN, DONINGTON LE HEATH (C90) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 62 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.**
- 4. LAND ADJACENT TO 194 BURTON ROAD, ASHBY-DE-LA-ZOUCH (A31) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 30 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.**
- 5. LAND SOUTH OF PARK LANE, CASTLE DONINGTON (CD9) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 35 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.**
- 6. LAND REAR OF 111A HIGH STREET, IBSTOCK (IB20) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 46 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.**
- 7. LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 140 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN, SUBJECT TO CONFIRMATION THAT THE SITE IS ACCEPTABLY LOCATED IN RELATION TO THE EAST MIDLANDS AIRPORT PUBLIC SAFETY ZONE.**
- 8. LAND OFF LEICESTER ROAD/ASHBY ROAD, MEASHAM (M11) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 300 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN, UNLESS FURTHER WORK ON SURFACE WATER FLOODING DEMONSTRATES A LOWER CAPACITY IS MORE APPROPRIATE.**
- 9. LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 150 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.**
- 10. LAND AT MEASHAM ROAD, APPLEBY MAGNA (AP1) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 37 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.**
- 11. LAND WEST OF REDBURROW LANE, PACKINGTON (P7) IS DEFERRED FOR CONSIDERATION AT A FUTURE MEETING OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE.**

12. LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 50 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.

13. FURTHER TO THE GOVERNMENT'S LIFTING OF THE HS2 SAFEGUARDING ROUTE, LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCHE (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7) BE NO LONGER PROPOSED AS A RESERVE ALLOCATION SITE.

14. LAND AT SPRING LANE AND REAR OF 55 NORMANTON ROAD (P5 AND P8) IS DEFERRED FOR CONSIDERATION AT A FUTURE MEETING OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE.

**SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER WORK INCLUDING TRANSPORT MODELLING, VIABILITY ASSESSMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS, THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE AGREES THAT: 1. LAND OFF THORNBOROUGH ROAD (C18) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 105 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN. 2. LAND OFF HALL LANE AND TORRINGTON AVENUE (C19A); LAND OFF STEPHENSON WAY (C19B) AND BROOM LEYS FARM (C46) ARE ALLOCATED AS A SINGLE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT AREA IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN, TO PROVIDE AROUND 1,200 DWELLINGS IN TOTAL. 3. LAND SOUTH OF THE GREEN, DONINGTON LE HEATH (C90) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 62 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN. 4. LAND ADJACENT TO 194 BURTON ROAD, ASHBY-DE-LA-ZOUCHE (A31) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 30 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN. 5. LAND SOUTH OF PARK LANE, CASTLE DONINGTON (CD9) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 35 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN. 6. LAND REAR OF 111A HIGH STREET, IBSTOCK (IB20) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 46 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN (Motion)**

Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Paul Lees	Against
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Peter Moulton	For
Councillor Carol Sewell	For
Councillor Lee Windram	Against
Councillor Michael Wyatt	Against
Councillor Anthony Barker	For
Councillor Keith Merrie MBE	For
<b>Carried</b>	

## **6 LOCAL PLAN – ADDITIONAL PROPOSED EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS: CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer.

A discussion followed. The Principal Planning Officer explained to the Committee that the transport modelling being undertaken to support the Local Plan would consider relevant proposals in neighbouring authorities that relate to areas with allocated land in the Plan.

A member asked whether protection nearby to a particular site already in development could be put in place to maintain woodlands and the 'unique' village of Battram. The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager agreed to look further into this and return to the Committee with any further actions.



A recorded vote being requested, the voting was detailed below.

The motion was put to vote and CARRIED. Recorded votes to follow

RESOLVED THAT:

**THAT LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE:**

**(1) AGREES NOT TO INCLUDE LAND EAST OF MIDLAND ROAD ELLISTOWN (EMP24 ORIGINAL AREA AND EMP24 REDUCED AREA) AS AN ALLOCATION IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.**

**(2) SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER WORK INCLUDING TRANSPORT MODELLING, VIABILITY ASSESSMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS, AGREES THAT LAND BETWEEN ELLISTOWN TERRACE ROAD AND WOOD ROAD, ELLISTOWN (EMP98) IN APPENDIX D BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.**

**(3) AGREES THE POLICIES MAP EXTRACT FOR MONEY HILL IN APPENDIX E FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGULATION**

**THAT LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE: (1) AGREES NOT TO INCLUDE LAND EAST OF MIDLAND ROAD ELLISTOWN (EMP24 ORIGINAL AREA AND EMP24 REDUCED AREA) AS AN ALLOCATION IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN. (2) SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER WORK INCLUDING TRANSPORT MODELLING, VIABILITY ASSESSMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS, AGREES THAT LAND BETWEEN ELLISTOWN TERRACE ROAD AND WOOD ROAD, ELLISTOWN (EMP98) IN APPENDIX D BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN. (3) AGREES THE POLICIES MAP EXTRACT FOR MONEY HILL IN APPENDIX E FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGULATION (Motion)**

Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Paul Lees	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Peter Moulton	For
Councillor Carol Sewell	For
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Anthony Barker	For
Councillor Keith Merrie MBE	Conflict Of Interests
<b>Carried</b>	

#### **Departure of Councillor**

Councillor K Merrie left the meeting at 8.08pm.

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.30 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

## NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – WEDNESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2025



Title of Report	NEW LOCAL PLAN – CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICIES	
Presented by	Ian Nelson Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager	
Background Papers	<p>Report to Local Plan Committee 18 October 2023 <a href="#">Draft Local Plan – Policies</a></p> <p><a href="#">Draft North West Leicestershire Local Plan 2020 - 2040 Proposed Policies for Consultation (January 2024)</a></p> <p>Report to Local Plan Committee 22 May 2024 <a href="#">Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation</a></p> <p>Report to Local Plan Committee 14 August 2024 <a href="#">New Local Plan – Strategy Policies: Consultation Responses</a></p> <p>Report to Local Plan Committee 11 June 2025 <a href="#">New Local Plan – Consideration of responses to policies</a></p> <p><a href="#">Draft Sustainability Appraisal of Policies (May 2025)</a></p> <p><a href="#">National Planning Policy Framework</a></p> <p><a href="#">Local Development Scheme (February 2025)</a></p>	Public Report: Yes
Financial Implications	The cost of the Local Plan Review is met through existing budgets which are monitored on an ongoing basis.	

	<b>Signed off by the Section 151 Officer:</b> Yes
<b>Legal Implications</b>	The Local Plan must be based on robust and up to date evidence.
	<b>Signed off by the Monitoring Officer:</b> Yes
<b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b>	No staffing implications are associated with the specific content of this report. Links with the Council's Priorities are set out at the end of the report.
	<b>Signed off by the Head of Paid Service:</b> Yes
<b>Purpose of Report</b>	To consider the comments made in respect of a number of the development management-style policies from the draft Regulation 18 Plan (2024), and to agree changes for incorporation into the Regulation 19 pre-submission version of the Plan.
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p><b>THAT THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. NOTES THE COMMENTS RECEIVED IN RESPECT OF THE POLICIES.</b></li> <li><b>2. AGREES POLICY AP2 (AMENITY) AS AMENDED IN APPENDIX F FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.</b></li> <li><b>3. AGREES POLICY AP3 (RENEWABLE ENERGY) 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.</b></li> <li><b>4. AGREES 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.</b></li> <li><b>5. AGREES POLICY AP5 (HEALTH AND WELLBEING) AS AMENDED IN APPENDIX F FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.</b></li> <li><b>6. AGREES POLICY AP6 (HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS) AS DRAFTED IN APPENDIX F FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.</b></li> </ol>

	<p>7. AGREES POLICY AP8 (SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS) AS AMENDED IN APPENDIX F FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.</p> <p>8. AGREES POLICY AP9 (WATER EFFICIENCY) 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.</p> <p>9. AGREES TO THE PRINCIPLE OF POLICY H2 (HOUSING COMMITMENTS) WITH THE WORDING TO BE DRAFTED IN FULL IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.</p> <p>10. AGREES POLICY H8 (HOUSES FOR MULTIPLE OCCUPATION IN KEGWORTH) AS AMENDED IN APPENDIX F FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.</p> <p>11. AGREES TO THE PRINCIPLE OF POLICY EC2 (EMPLOYMENT COMMITMENTS) WITH THE WORDING TO BE DRAFTED IN FULL IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.</p> <p>12. AGREES POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE) AS AMENDED IN APPENDIX F FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.</p> <p>13. AGREES POLICY IF3 (GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE) AS AMENDED IN APPENDIX F FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN</p> <p>14. AGREES POLICY IF5 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT) AS AMENDED IN APPENDIX F FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN</p> <p>15. AGREES POLICY EN1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN) AS AMENDED IN APPENDIX F FOR INCLUSION IN</p>
--	---

	<p><b>THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.</b></p> <p><b>16. AGREES POLICY EN3 (THE NATIONAL FOREST) AS AMENDED IN APPENDIX F FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.</b></p> <p><b>17. AGREES POLICY EN5 (AREA OF SEPARATION) AS AMENDED IN APPENDIX F FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.</b></p>
--	---

## 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 At its meeting on [18 October 2023](#), Local Plan Committee agreed a set of draft Local Plan policies for 'Regulation 18' consultation. The public consultation, which also included proposed site allocations and changes to the Limits to Development, ran between 5 February and 17 March 2024. Over the subsequent months the Committee has considered a series of reports dealing with the responses received.

- **22 May 2024.** Overview of the number of responses and the types of respondents.
- **14 August 2024.** Consideration of the representations to Strategy Policies S1-S5 and the Plan's Objectives.
- **16 December 2024.** Consideration of the representations relating to the proposed new settlement at Isley Woodhouse, housing allocations in the Coalville Urban Area and employment site allocations.
- **29 January 2025.** Consideration of the representations to the Limits to Development.
- **11 March 2025.** Consideration of the representations to the proposed housing allocations in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages
- **11 June 2025.** Consideration of the representations to selected policies from the Housing, Economy, Town and Local Centres, Infrastructure and Facilities and Environment chapters of the draft Local Plan.
- **30 July 2025.** Consideration of representations to the 2025 Additional Sites consultation.

1.2 This report complements the June report and is concerned with a further batch of 16 development management-style policies which have not been reported previously. The policies included in this report and the number of responses each received are listed below. This includes Policy En3 National Forest which was deferred from consideration at the June meeting.

1.3 At its meeting on [18 October 2023](#), Local Plan Committee agreed a set of draft Local Plan policies for 'Regulation 18' consultation. The public consultation, which also included proposed site allocations and changes to the Limits to Development, ran between 5 February and 17 March 2024. Over the subsequent months the Committee has considered a series of reports dealing with the responses received.

- **22 May 2024.** Overview of the number of responses and the types of respondents.
- **14 August 2024.** Consideration of the representations to Strategy Policies S1-S5 and the Plan's Objectives.
- **16 December 2024.** Consideration of the representations relating to the proposed new settlement at Isley Woodhouse, housing allocations in the Coalville Urban Area and employment site allocations.
- **29 January 2025.** Consideration of the representations to the Limits to Development.
- **11 March 2025.** Consideration of the representations to the proposed housing allocations in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages
- **11 June 2025.** Consideration of the representations to selected policies from the Housing, Economy, Town and Local Centres, Infrastructure and Facilities and Environment chapters of the draft Local Plan.
- **30 July 2025.** Consideration of representations to the 2025 Additional Sites consultation.

1.4 This report complements the June report and is concerned with a further batch of 16 development management-style policies which have not been reported previously. The policies included in this report and the number of responses each received are listed below. This includes Policy En3 National Forest which was deferred from consideration at the June meeting.

**Table 1 – Policies included in this report**

<b>Chapter 5 - Creating Attractive Places</b>	
Policy AP2 - Amenity	22
Policy AP3 – Renewable Energy	21
Policy AP4 – Reducing Carbon Emissions	38
Policy AP5 – Health and Wellbeing	23
Policy AP6 – Health Impact Assessments	10
Policy AP8 – Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems	14
Policy AP9 – Water Efficiency	18
<b>Chapter 6 - Housing</b>	
Policy H2 – Housing Commitments	21
Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation in Kegworth	24
<b>Chapter 7 - The Economy</b>	
Policy Ec2 – Employment Commitments	8

<b>Chapter 9 - Infrastructure and Facilities</b>	
Policy IF1 – Development and Infrastructure	33
Policy IF3 - Green and Blue infrastructure	12
Policy IF5 – Transport Infrastructure and New Development	26
<b>Chapter 10 - Environment</b>	
Policy En1 – Nature Conservation/Biodiversity Net Gain	29
Policy En3 – National Forest	14
Policy En5 – Area of Separation	11

- 1.5 The purpose of this report is to consider the representations received and to recommend changes to the policies in response. In addition, the policies have been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) by the Council's consultants, although this is currently in draft and will be subject to change. The [draft SA findings](#) are broadly supportive of the proposed policies with mitigation measures and other potential improvements put forward in some cases (but not all). These suggestions are considered under the relevant section of this report.
- 1.6 The policies were originally written in the context of the September 2023 version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF has been updated twice since then, most recently in December 2024. Officers have considered the implications of these changes in making their recommendations on individual policies.
- 1.7 More widely, the Government has now announced that its consultation on new national development management policies is delayed until later in the year. To recap, these national policies would cover planning considerations that regularly apply in decision-making with the aim of simplifying and regularising the approach to common planning matters. It would remove the need to cover such issues in Local Plans. For the time being, and to minimise risk, it is recommended that the new local plan continue to include its suite of development management policies. If and when the new national policies are confirmed, officers will advise on any implications for these local policies.
- 1.8 It should also be noted that all of the policies in the plan will need to be subject to a Viability Assessment. This could result in the need for further changes to the policies when the plan is taken to Council for agreement of the Regulation 19 plan.
- 1.9 For completeness, listed below are the remaining policies which will be reported to future meetings of the Committee.

**Table 2 – Policies which will be reported to future meetings**

Policy AP1 – Design of New Development
Policy AP7 – Flood Risk
Policy H1 – Housing Strategy
Policy H3 – Housing Provision – New Allocations
Policy H4 – Housing Types and Mix



Policy H5 – Affordable Housing
Policy H9 – Provision for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
Policy Ec1 – Economic Strategy
Policy Ec3 – New Employment Allocations
Policy IF4 – Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities

## 2 STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

2.1 Like the June report, this report is structured by Local Plan chapter. Each section highlights the key issues raised in connection with the relevant policies from a chapter of the plan. Any recommendations from the SA report are also addressed. For each section there is a linked appendix which summarises and groups together the various representations by policy and chapter and provides officers' comments in response.

- **Section 3** deals with **Creating Attractive Places Policies AP2, AP3, AP4, AP5, AP6, AP8 and AP9**. Linked **Appendix A** provides a summary of the representations received for each of these policies and officers' assessment of the issues raised.
- **Section 4** deals with **Housing Policies H2 and H8**. The linked appendix is **Appendix B**.
- **Section 5** deals with **Economy Policy Ec2**. The linked appendix is **Appendix C**.
- **Section 6** deals with **Infrastructure and Facilities Policies IF1, IF3 and IF5**. The linked appendix is **Appendix D**.
- **Section 7** deals with **Environment Policies En1, En3 and En5**. The linked appendix is **Appendix E**.
- **Section 8** outlines the next steps.

2.2 **Appendix F** contains revised versions of the policies as a result of this consideration.

## 3 CREATING ATTRACTIVE PLACES (CHAPTER 5)

### Policy AP2 – Amenity

- 3.1 Due to the delay of the government's National Development Management Policies (NDMP) consultation (see paragraph 1.7), officers have decided to proceed with this policy. Depending on the NDMP's content and progress, Policy AP2 may not be required as the Local Plan advances.
- 3.2 Except for the removal of the reference to a Supplementary Planning Document, the policy in the 2024 consultation was identical to Policy D2 (Amenity) in the adopted Local Plan. There were 22 responses, predominantly from landowners/developers/agents (11) as well as statutory consultees (five), local residents (three) and parish/town councils (three).
- 3.3 A summary of the comments, alongside officers' response and suggested changes are set out at **Appendix A**. An amended policy is at **Appendix F**. Changes have

been made to parts (1) and (2) of the policy. Changes to part (1) have been made to increase clarity, robustness and consistency (both with the National Planning Policy Framework and within the policy itself). Part (2) has been rewritten so that it is more consistent with the 'agent of change' principle in the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3.4 No changes to the policy are required as a result of the Sustainability Appraisal.

### **Policy AP3 – Renewable Energy**

- 3.5 There is support for the policy from a range of sectors and there is support for renewable energy generation in general and representations from the CPRE Leicestershire, Protect Diseworth and several residents support solar panels being a mandatory requirement on new buildings.
- 3.6 Part (1)(a) and (b) of the policy set targets, in megawatts, for solar and wind energy generation during the plan period. The figures in the draft policy were to 2040 and as such have been recalculated to 2042.
- 3.7 As the policy requirements should apply to all new development it is proposed to delete the word 'housing' from Part (2) of the policy.
- 3.8 Historic England consider that Part 3(b) should also include the need to ensure there is no unacceptable harm to the significance of heritage assets or their setting. However, when assessing development proposals, the local plan will be considered as a whole, and draft Policy En7 (Conservation and Enhancement of the Historic Environment) sufficiently sets out the requirements in relation to heritage assets and their setting.
- 3.9 The Environment Agency consider that Part 3(b) should include a criterion to ensure appropriate measures are in place to protect the local environment and National Highways note that there are highway safety implications that need to be considered in relation to the siting of both wind turbines and solar farms. As such, it is proposed that additional criteria be added to the policy in relation to biodiversity, ecology and wildlife and highway safety.
- 3.10 East Midlands Airport (EMA) supports the policy approach but request that the local plan recognises and refers to the importance of, and the need for, renewable energy installations to have no detrimental effects on aviation safety and aircraft operations at or in the vicinity of EMA. Whilst the draft policy does include (in Part (4)(c)) a criterion relating to air traffic safety and radar and communications this is only in the context of wind turbines. It is proposed that the wording be amended and moved to Part (2)(d) of the policy to ensure aviation safety is assessed as part of wind and solar energy proposals.
- 3.11 A developer representation notes that Part (2) of the policy should have regard to the need to consider proposals on a site-by-site basis to consider viability, feasibility and local context. This policy is one to be tested through the forthcoming whole plan viability assessment which will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan.

- 3.12 Natural England supports Part (5) of the policy which seeks to avoid the use of the best and most versatile agricultural land. CPRE Leicestershire considers that the policy could go further and seek to also avoid development on Grade 3b agricultural land. As solar farm developments are temporary, fully reversible and the land can be maintained in agricultural use and as such the quality of agricultural land should not be compromised no changes are proposed to Part (5) of the policy.
- 3.13 In regard to the Sustainability Appraisal the policy scores a minor positive against SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively) the SA details that the policy could be enhanced/strengthened by ensuring the solar energy infrastructure 'must' avoid the best/most versatile agricultural land, as developing on this land can reduce available areas for food production.
- 3.14 The Committee is asked to agree the revised policy wording subject to the findings of the whole plan viability study.

#### **Policy AP4 – Reducing Carbon Emissions**

- 3.15 There is limited support for the policy as drafted. A large majority of the development industry consider the policy to be unnecessary as it duplicates and goes beyond national requirements and planned changes to Building Regulations. Developers consider that nationally applied standards provide clarity and consistency.
- 3.16 To provide consistency with national standards several developers suggest making reference in the policy for development proposals to meet the latest 'national' standards. It is proposed that Part (1)(b) of the policy include reference to the latest 'national' standards.
- 3.17 In terms of Part (1) of the policy respondents note these are not requirements set out in the NPPF and consider that the requirement for 'all' development to demonstrate measures to minimise energy consumption and follow the energy hierarchy is excessive and would be a significant burden and have cost implications for applicants. It is not proposed that the policy wording be amended at this stage but to rather await the outcome of the forthcoming whole plan viability assessment which will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan.
- 3.18 Part (2) of the policy sets out the requirement for contributions to a carbon offset fund where renewable energy generation equivalent to consumption is not possible on site. The development industry has raised several concerns with this requirement including a lack of detail, a lack of transparency in relation to the financial contribution required and little flexibility or consideration of viability.
- 3.19 At this stage it is considered that the council is not in a position to be able to commit to setting up a carbon offset fund. This is due to available resources, expertise and the need to submit the local plan. Officers have had informal conversations with AECOM who undertook the Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study (2021) who advise that setting up a carbon offset fund would not currently be viable for a district of our size. It is proposed that Part (2) of the policy be deleted.

- 3.20 In light of the above changes, it is proposed that Part (1)(c) of the policy becomes Part (2) as this criterion specifically sets out the requirements for major development.
- 3.21 In addition to the changes proposed to the policy and awaiting the viability assessment there are a number of nationally significant changes that are expected which may have implications for this policy.
- 3.22 The Future Homes Standard (FHS) is expected to be published this autumn, and the Government has confirmed (in June 2025) that the FHS will include changes to Building Regulations to require new homes to include solar panels. The Government are also expected to consult on the National Development Management Policies (NDMP) in autumn 2025. In addition, a recent (25 July 2025) Court of Appeal judgement on the Written Ministerial Statement (December 2023) confirmed that LPAs can set energy efficiency standards above national regulations, provided they are justified by local circumstances, backed by evidence, have a clear rationale and are supported by viability evidence. It is unclear whether the Government intends to appeal the decision.
- 3.23 The changes expected to be introduced by the FHS highlights the Government's intentions to include more energy efficient measures in new developments. It is possible that energy efficiency requirements may be included in the NDMP. In view of the current uncertainty at the national level we have kept changes to this policy to a minimum but intend to keep the policy under review.
- 3.24 No changes are required to be made to the policy having regard to the outcome from the SA.
- 3.25 The committee is asked to agree the revised policy wording subject to the findings of the whole plan viability study.

#### **Policy AP5 – Health and Wellbeing**

- 3.26 There is support for the policy from Sport England, Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland ICB, CPRE Leicestershire, The Home Builders Federation as well as from Leicester City Council and several developers.
- 3.27 Several responses refer to the need for this policy to list the infrastructure requirements that would support health and wellbeing. It is the intention that this policy will complement other policies in the Local Plan including draft Policy IF1 which sets out the infrastructure requirements for developments, as such the infrastructure requirements do not need to be repeated in this policy.
- 3.28 In regard to Part (1) of the draft policy Leicestershire County Council (LCC) consider that the policy could be expanded to include reference to mental health. This suggested change is supported, and it is proposed that Part (1) of the policy include reference to development maintaining and improving the physical and mental health and wellbeing of our residents.

- 3.29 LCC also consider that Part (1) of the policy should be amended to replace 'encouraging healthy lifestyles' with 'enable healthier choices'. This is due to emerging public health evidence that suggests the word 'lifestyles' implies individual choices and behaviours are solely responsible for health outcomes which overlooks the influence of social economic and environmental factors on health. It is proposed that Part (1) of the policy is amended to reflect this suggested change.
- 3.30 A representor queries the wording of Part (2)(g) of the policy in relation to 'controlling the location of and access to take away uses'. It is considered that the wording could be amended to better reflect the intention of the draft policy. It is proposed that the word 'controlling' be replaced with 'managing' in terms of the location of and access to takeaway uses.
- 3.31 No changes are required to be made to the policy having regard to the outcome from the SA.

### **Policy AP6 – Health Impact Assessments**

- 3.32 The Regulation 18 Local Plan (2024) did not include a draft policy relating to Health Impact Assessments (HIA) as work was ongoing with other Leicestershire authorities and the Public Health Team at Leicestershire County Council to formulate a common approach to HIA policy across the county.
- 3.33 The consultation responses from the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland ICB, Leicestershire County Council, Ashby de la Zouch Town Council and a number of developers supported the inclusion of a HIA policy in the Local Plan.
- 3.34 There was some objection to a HIA policy on the grounds it would duplicate information already submitted as part of major planning applications and would add a further layer of bureaucracy resulting in time and cost implications for the applicant and the council. Several developers also note that there is no adopted standardised format for HIAs in England and as local plans should consider wider health issues a HIA should not be necessary.
- 3.35 Since the Regulation 18 consultation Public Health Leicestershire have developed a HIA template for Leicestershire that can be referenced in local plans. It is considered that a HIA policy will enable development proposals to demonstrate their impact on health and wellbeing and provide a mechanism for any positive impacts to be secured and any negative implications to be mitigated.
- 3.36 A draft policy has been prepared that sets out the thresholds and location of development that would be required to undertake a HIA Screening Statement which will be used to determine whether a Health Impact Assessment is required.
- 3.37 The draft policy requires all residential proposals of 50 or more dwellings; all major non-residential developments and development located in an identified Area of Concern in the Leicestershire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (latest edition) to undertake a HIA Screening Statement.

- 3.38 The threshold of 50 or more dwellings is considered reasonable and manageable and not too onerous for the small/medium developers. Supporting text will be drafted to provide the context and set out in more detail the requirements of the policy.
- 3.39 As there was not a policy drafted in the Regulation 18 Local Plan (January 2024) this policy has not yet been subject to SA. This policy (along with others not yet assessed) will be assessed when the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan is prepared.

### **Policy AP7 – Flood Risk**

- 3.40 An update to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) has been commissioned and as such the draft Flood Risk Policy will be considered at a future meeting of this committee.
- 3.41 Since the draft Flood Risk Policy was published the NPPF has been revised and now contains comprehensive guidance on flood risk and the application of the sequential and exceptions tests. As such, consultants undertaking the SFRA update have been asked to provide advice on whether the new Local Plan needs to include a detailed policy on Flood Risk or whether the policy should direct applicants to the requirements of the NPPF or any successor document.
- 3.42 The SFRA update should be completed in Autumn 2025 and may have implications for policies Ap8 (Sustainable Drainage Systems) and Ap9 (Water Efficiency).

### **Policy AP8 – Sustainable Drainage Systems**

- 3.43 There is support for the policy from Natural England as well as from some developers. There is a detailed response from Diseworth Flood Working Group specifically relating to the impact of surface water run-off in Diseworth.
- 3.44 A large majority of the responses refer to changes to the NPPF that have been made since the policy was drafted and that the policy wording and supporting text need amending in light of these changes.
- 3.45 One of the changes in the revised NPPF (para.182) is that SuDS, proportionate to the scale and nature of the proposal, should be incorporated by any application that could affect drainage on or around a site. As such it is proposed that reference to SuDS being required as part of major development proposals in Part (1) of the policy be deleted and the wording be amended to reflect the revised requirements of the NPPF.
- 3.46 Given changes to the NPPF it is also proposed that Part (1)(a) and (b) of the policy be deleted.
- 3.47 Parts (2) and (3) of the draft policy are very similar. It is proposed that these two parts of the policy be deleted as the NPPF (para. 182) requires SuDS to provide multifunctional benefits wherever possible, through facilitating improvements in water quality and biodiversity, as well as benefits for amenity. As this requirement is set out

in the NPPF it does not need to be repeated in local policy.

- 3.48 As a result of the above changes Part (4) of the policy will become Part (2). There are some wording changes proposed to this part of the policy, whilst Parts (2)(a) and (b) reflect requirements in the NPPF for SuDS as part of major development schemes Part (c) includes additional wording as suggested by Leicestershire County Council in relation to the maintenance of all on-site drainage elements not adopted by a third party.
- 3.49 In addition to the changes proposed to the policy wording the supporting text also needs updating to reflect changes to the NPPF and for clarity.
- 3.50 No changes are required to be made to the policy having regard to the outcome from the SA.

### **Policy AP9 – Water Efficiency**

- 3.51 There is support for the draft policy from the Environment Agency (EA), Ashby de la Zouch Town Council as well as some developers.
- 3.52 Several developers consider that water efficiency is best dealt with through Building Regulations and that there is insufficient evidence, including an absence of engagement with key stakeholders, to demonstrate a local need for more stringent requirements.
- 3.53 The EA has identified North West Leicestershire as being within a 'seriously water stressed' area. The EA water stressed areas classifications are one of the primary sources of evidence which support a tighter water efficiency standard. As such it is considered appropriate to seek to meet the optional tighter water efficiency standard. For clarity purposes there are some suggested wording changes to Part (1) of the draft policy.
- 3.54 In terms of Part (2) a number of respondents suggest the requirement for WAT01 should only apply to major developments or developments over a certain threshold, as currently worded the policy would apply to smaller non-residential developments that would not easily or financially be able to meet the requirements.
- 3.55 It is acknowledged that Part (2) of the policy could be burdensome for smaller developments, as such it is proposed that Part (2) be amended to refer to major non-residential development. In addition, a new Part (3) is proposed to be added to the draft policy that sets out requirements for all other development proposals captured by the planning process.
- 3.56 Several representations from the development industry note that there is no evidence that the impact of the policy on viability has been tested. This policy is one to be tested through the forthcoming whole plan viability assessment which will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan. The committee is asked to agree the revised policy wording subject to the findings of the whole plan viability study.

- 3.57 No changes are required to be made to the policy having regard to the outcome from the SA.

## **4 HOUSING (CHAPTER 6)**

### **Policy H2 – Housing Commitments**

- 4.1 The 2024 consultation did not present a drafted policy; instead, it suggested that Policy H2 (set to be drafted at Regulation 19) would list housing commitments and outline considerations for renewing lapsed planning permissions. Policy H1 of the adopted Local Plan supports such renewals, which is why a similar policy is proposed for the new Local Plan.
- 4.2 The responses received (totaling 21) were predominantly from landowners/developers/agents (13) with further comments provided from local residents (four) and members/parish/town councils (four).
- 4.3 The responses were mixed and broadly fell into the following themes:
- Support in principle;
  - The policy is unnecessary as committed developments will form part of the Local Plan housing trajectory;
  - Specific sites that should be referenced in the policy; and
  - Committed developments in Kegworth should be revisited in the Local Plan so that they deliver specific benefits.
- 4.4 Officers' responses to the above can be found in **Appendix B**. Officers recommend proceeding with Policy H2, on the basis that it would provide clarity for decision makers (particularly in scenarios where a permission has lapsed and/or a new application is submitted). Policy H2 will be drafted at Regulation 19 stage, with the most up-to-date information available at the time.
- 4.5 As there was no drafted policy, Policy H2 has not yet been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal; this will be done at the Regulation 19 stage.

### **Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation in Kegworth**

- 4.6 Most of the responses received were from residents providing general support for this policy, although some concerns were raised about specifics of the policy and the accuracy of data used to inform the evidence base. Two responses specifically objected to the inclusion of this policy. The responses are summarised as part of **Appendix B**. Also, for information, as this policy is focused on Kegworth, all those who previously made representations on the Article 4 process or declared HMOs (House in Multiple Occupation) properties were consulted, in addition to those on the Local Plan database.
- 4.7 Whilst the Council recognises that HMOs play an important role in providing a form of rented and more affordable accommodation, a high concentration of HMOs has the potential to create harmful impacts, for example, imbalanced communities and



adverse impacts on amenity. Evidence shows there to be a comparatively high number of HMOs in Kegworth with noticeable concentrations at a local neighbourhood/street level. Therefore, a local plan policy, focusing on Kegworth, seeking to manage the impact of HMOs is considered to be justified.

- 4.8 Part (a) of the policy seeks to resist development that leads to a harmful concentration of HMOs or development in a location where there is already a concentration of HMOs. Although a 'harmful concentration' is not defined in either national legislation or guidance, the application of a threshold is widespread amongst local authorities. Several responses either objected to the use of a threshold or suggested that it should be applied village-wide. However, for the purposes of this policy, it was considered that using a 10% threshold at a local level represented a reasonable and balanced approach. This has been established following a review of the number and spatial distribution of HMOs in Kegworth and best practice in other local authorities. This approach seeks to manage the impact of HMOs at the immediate neighbourhood level and is a manageable distance for assessing the impact of new or extended HMOs. Therefore, officers do not propose any changes to the threshold or radius level, although amendments to the wording of this criterion are proposed for clarity and renamed as criteria a) and b).
- 4.9 Part (b) of the policy seeks to ensure a residential property does not become sandwiched between two houses occupied by HMOs. No specific objections were received to this element of the policy. The only proposed policy wording changes are to provide clarity and rename the criterion as c).
- 4.10 Officers have estimated the number of HMOs using the following resources:
- Planning Register providing details of HMOs with planning permission or certificate of lawfulness
  - HMO Mandatory Licensing register providing details of HMOs occupied by five or more persons forming two or more household sharing or lacking basic amenities.
  - Council Tax records identifying properties which are occupied by full-time students only
  - HMO declarations providing details of existing HMOs 'declared' throughout the process of making the Article 4 Direction.
- 4.11 Officers consider a comprehensive record of HMOs has been provided based on the data that is available. However, it is possible that not all HMO properties have been identified, for example, those smaller HMOs with less than five residents and not subject to Mandatory Licensing. The Housing Act 2004 provides powers for local authorities to introduce a scheme of Additional Licensing to license those HMOs not covered by Mandatory Licensing and this would facilitate the recording of all HMOs. Whilst the Council does not operate such a scheme, its Environmental Health Team is undertaking work to assess if additional licensing is justified. However, this work is still ongoing, and the outcome is uncertain, although the benefits of an Additional Licensing scheme when applying this policy are acknowledged. Therefore, officers will continue to liaise with the Environmental Health Team and should there be a

change in circumstances with policy implications, this will be addressed in a future report.

- 4.12 In addition, only the specific addresses of HMOs sourced from the planning register and the licensing register can be made publicly available. Whereas, within the context of the Data Protection Act 2018, the specific address of HMOs identified through the 'declaration' process cannot, although this information can be used to identify the number of HMOs in a street. This will have an impact on what data is available to specific parties (Local Planning Authority, the applicant and consultees) using the policy when an application is submitted.
- 4.13 Although these issues are not unique to this District, when considering whether the threshold has been exceeded or if a residential dwelling would be sandwiched between two HMOs, officers and applicants will rely on this data to make an assessment. Therefore, it is considered beneficial to investigate further the HMO data available and its use in identifying the number, location or specific address of a HMO, within the context of the Data Protection Act 2018. It is also intended to prepare a dataset of HMO properties, and this will be updated on a regular basis to ensure current HMO numbers/location are available to help determine planning applications.
- 4.14 Part (c) of the policy seeks the provision of one off-street parking space per HMO occupant, subject to highway safety and amenity considerations. This proposes a higher level of provision than the requirements for those HMOs accommodating up to six residents, as set out in the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG). There was general support for this approach, and the local highway authority did not raise any comment. Of the limited objections received, specific reference was made to other factors contributing to on-street parking levels, the availability of bus services and the fact that HMO occupants are less likely to generate cars. However, given HMOs typically accommodate a higher number of adult residents than standard dwellings there is the potential for all HMO occupants to have a car. Therefore, no change is proposed to the parking requirement although this criterion is to be renamed as d).
- 4.15 Some further minor changes are proposed to the policy so that it specifically refers to new build HMOs and the conversion of properties and with respect to the 'numbering' of the remaining criteria. All policy wording changes are detailed in **Appendix F**. The supporting text will also be updated to provide advice on suitable data sources to be used to assess the suitability of a proposal.
- 4.16 No changes are required to be made to the policy having regard to the outcome of the SA.

## **5 THE ECONOMY (CHAPTER 7)**

### **Policy Ec2 – Employment Commitments**

- 5.1 The consultation document explained that the full wording of this policy will be included in the next version of the Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage). The policy will

list key sites with planning permission for employment development and it will outline the likely response/requirements if an application to renew a permission comes forward. The adopted Local Plan contains an equivalent policy (Policy Ec1 – Employment provision: permissions).

- 5.2 Waiting to write the policy until Regulation 19 stage means the list of sites will be as up to date as possible. The policy will be subject to Sustainability Appraisal at this point.
- 5.3 Despite the consultation document not including proposed policy wording, there were eight representations to this policy. The representations raise quite diverse matters, notably:
- planning control over development in the countryside should be maintained;
  - commitments (including planning permissions) should be robustly assessed if the Plan is to rely upon them;
  - concern that wording for this policy was not included in the consultation document;
  - the plan's approach to the Freeport needs to be clarified; and
  - planning is a barrier to growth of the rural economy.
- 5.4 The representations and officers' comments in response are included in **Appendix C**. No changes are proposed in response to these comments.

## **6 INFRASTRUCTURE AND FACILITIES (CHAPTER 9)**

### **Policy IF1 – Development and Infrastructure**

- 6.1 There were 33 representations in respect of this policy and officers' comments in response are included in **Appendix D**. Of the responses 15 were from landowners/developers, two from Parish Councils, three from local authorities and four from local residents.
- 6.2 Some landowners/developers sought changes to make clear that any contributions are subject to negotiation and are related to the scale of development. These matters are already addressed in national requirements and so it is not necessary for the policy to also include such references.
- 6.3 Responses from residents were concerned with lack of local services and facilities at the present time. Whilst these concerns are understood, any policy requirements must be justified by evidence, in this case this will be provided by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
- 6.4 Some minor changes to the policy wording are proposed for clarity and to ensure that the policy provides a suitable basis for seeking contributions.
- 6.5 In respect of the outcome from the Sustainability Appraisal no changes are required as the policy generally scores positively.

### **Policy IF3 – Green and Blue Infrastructure**

- 6.6 The 12 representations and officers' comments in response are included in **Appendix D**. Six of the representations support the policy.
- 6.7 Two housebuilders want to add the qualifying phrases 'where possible' or 'where necessary' to Part (1) of the policy but officers consider that the current wording, which already includes the words 'where appropriate' is sufficient. A change to Part (1) to require existing green infrastructure to be retained **and enhanced** where possible is supported.
- 6.8 **Appendix D** also includes suggested changes to the policy's supporting text as follows:
- Insert the NPPF definition of 'Green Infrastructure'
  - Add commentary about [Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles & Standards](#)
  - Add more explanation about how green infrastructure can support better health, contribute to Biodiversity Net Gain and act as a form of natural flood management.
- 6.9 The outcome of the SA does not require any further changes to the policy.

### **Policy IF5 – Transport Infrastructure and New Development**

- 6.10 There may be elements of this policy that are covered by the aforementioned National Development Management Policies; officers will make a further assessment of the policy when the NDMP is published for consultation.
- 6.11 There were 22 responses, predominantly from landowners/developers/ agents (11) as well as statutory consultees (five), local residents (three) and parish/town councils (three).
- 6.12 The comments received can be summarised as follows:
- General support (from a mix of landowners/developers/agents, statutory consultees and town council);
  - General comments about the principle of/the aims of the policy; and
  - Specific comments relating to the wording of parts (2), (3), (4) and (5).
- 6.13 A summary of the comments, alongside officers' responses and suggested changes, is set out at **Appendix D**. The amended policy is at **Appendix F**. Officers have proposed changes to the wording of parts (2) to (5) for the purposes of clarity, conciseness and consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 6.14 When the transport modelling work is more advanced, officers will consider whether the policy should reference specific highways improvement schemes to which

development should contribute. This is done in Policy IF4 of the adopted Local Plan and provides a policy hook for securing developer contributions towards schemes such as the A511.

- 6.15 No changes to the policy are required as a result of the Sustainability Appraisal.

## **7 ENVIRONMENT (CHAPTER 10)**

### **Policy En1 – Nature Conservation and Biodiversity Net Gain**

- 7.1 There were 29 responses to this policy and officers' comments in response are included in **Appendix E**. Of these, 12 were from landowners/developers, three from Parish Councils, one from a local authority, two from government agencies, six from local residents and one from a local interest group.
- 7.2 Changes are proposed for clarity, but also to avoid repeating matters that are already addressed in legislation.
- 7.3 No changes to the policy are required as a result of the Sustainability Appraisal.

### **Policy En3 – National Forest**

- 7.4 This Policy was considered at the 11 June 2025 meeting of this committee. At that meeting Members considered that the policy should be deferred to a future meeting to allow officers and the National Forest Company (NFC) time to discuss and agree policy wording specifically in relation to the Heart of the National Forest.
- 7.5 Officers have since met with the NFC and have agreed amendments to the policy wording (see **Appendix F**).
- 7.6 It is proposed that reference to the Heart of the National Forest be removed from Part (1) of the draft policy and that a new section be added to the policy (Part 4) that requires development within the Heart of the National Forest to demonstrate the measures taken to comply with the Heart of the National Forest Vision.
- 7.7 Other minor changes have also been made to the policy following suggestions from the NFC. Most notably the inclusion of criteria (2)(b) and (c) which are requirements of the National Forest Policy (En3) of the adopted Local Plan
- 7.8 As confirmed in the 11 June 2025 Local Plan Committee Report, no changes to the policy are required as a result of the Sustainability Appraisal.

### **Policy En5 – Area of Separation**

- 7.9 There were 11 responses to this policy. Officers' comments in response are included in **Appendix F**. There were three responses from landowners/developers which raised specific objections to the principal of the policy and/or how it was defined. Comments from residents on the other hand were supportive of the approach.

- 7.10 There were two responses to the consultation on behalf of developers which questioned the basis for the policy. The Council's consultant who undertook the assessment of the existing Area of Separation provided a response to the various comments. These are included as part of **Appendix F**.
- 7.11 The draft policies the subject of this report were consulted upon in February/March 2024.
- 7.12 The meeting of this Committee on 16 December 2024 agreed to the allocation for housing of three sites that are currently included in the Area of Separation (land off Thornborough Road (C18), land at Torrington Avenue Whitwick (C19A) and land off Stephenson Way (C19B). This was in addition to an earlier decision to allocate land at Broom Leys Farm (C46) for housing. These decisions were necessary in order to ensure the provision of sufficient land for housing in the Coalville Urban Area consistent with the agreed development strategy.
- 7.13 In agreeing the allocation of these sites, it was also agreed that the remaining land in the Area of Separation should be retained as such an amendment to the wording of the policy is proposed in order to make it more positively worded.

## 8 NEXT STEPS

- 8.1 The consultation responses to the remaining policies (Table 2 above) will be brought to future meetings of the Committee over the coming months. The timetable in the [Local Development Scheme](#) requires the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan to be considered by Council in April 2026, consulted on in May-June 2026 and submitted for Examination in August 2026. This timetable would meet the Government's deadline of December 2026 for plans to be submitted and examined under the current Local Plans system.

Policies and other considerations, as appropriate	
Council Priorities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning and regeneration</li> <li>- Communities and housing</li> <li>- Clean, green and Zero Carbon</li> </ul>
Policy Considerations:	The Local Plan is required to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and other government guidance and requirements.
Safeguarding:	None discernible.
Equalities/Diversity:	An Equalities Impact Assessment of the Local Plan review will be undertaken as part of the Sustainability Appraisal.
Customer Impact:	No issues identified

Economic and Social Impact:	The decision itself will have no specific impact. The new Local Plan as a whole will aim to deliver positive economic and social impacts and these will be recorded through the Sustainability Appraisal.
Environment, Climate Change and zero carbon:	The decision, of itself, will have no specific impact. The new Local Plan as a whole will aim to deliver positive environmental and climate change impacts and these will be recorded through the Sustainability Appraisal.
Consultation/Community/Tenant Engagement:	The Regulation 18 Local Plan has been subject to consultation. Further consultation will be undertaken at Regulation 19 stage.
Risks:	<p>A risk assessment for the Local Plan Review has been prepared and is kept up to date. As far as possible control measures have been put in place to minimise risks, including regular Project Board meetings where risk is reviewed.</p> <p>The report highlights the potential risks associated with the issues considered as part of the report.</p>
Officer Contact	<p>Ian Nelson  Planning Policy Team Manager  01530 454677  <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p>

This page is intentionally left blank



CHAPTER: 5	POLICY NUMBER: AP2	POLICY NAME: Amenity		
MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
<p><b>(1) New development should be designed to minimise its impact on the amenity and quiet enjoyment of both future residents and existing residents in the vicinity of the development. Development proposals will be supported where: (a) They do not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of existing residents through the loss of privacy, excessive overshadowing and overbearing impact. (b) They do not generate a level of activity, noise, vibration, pollution or unpleasant odour emission, which cannot be mitigated to an appropriate standard and so, would have an adverse impact on amenity and living conditions.</b></p>				
<p>[Part 1 would be far more robust if it specified when development would <b>not</b> be supported. The term “<i>significant adverse effect</i>” is too high a bar and is difficult to define. “<b>Detrimental</b>” is a better term and is used elsewhere in the document.]</p> <p>Part 1 should be rewritten as follows:  <i>(1) ... Development proposals will <b>not</b> be supported where:</i>  <i>(a) They <b>are detrimental to</b> the living conditions of existing residents through the loss of privacy, excessive overshadowing and overbearing impact, or</i>  <i>(b) They <del>do not</del> generate a level of activity, noise, vibration, pollution or unpleasant odour emission...</i>”]</p>	<p>The suggested change to the wording is not ‘<i>positively prepared</i>’ (as required by the NPPF) and is unlikely to be accepted by the Local Plan Inspector. However, officers think the policy could be made more robust and less ambiguous by replacing ‘<i>supported</i>’ with ‘<i>permitted</i>’.</p> <p>Whilst the use of ‘<i>significant adverse effect</i>’ in (1)(a) was deemed appropriate for the adopted Local Plan, replacing it with ‘<i>unacceptable</i>’ is more in keeping with the terms in NPPF (2024) paragraphs 187 and 198. For consistency, ‘<i>unacceptable</i>’ should also be added to (1)(b).</p> <p>On reflection, it is also recommended that ‘<i>pollution</i>’ is</p>	<p><b>Change part 1) to read “Development proposals will be <u>permitted</u> where...”</b></p> <p><b>Change part 1(a) to read “They do not have <u>an unacceptable impact</u> on the living conditions...”</b></p> <p><b>Change part 1(b) to read: “They do not generate <u>an unacceptable level of activity, noise, vibration, light</u> or unpleasant odour emission which cannot be mitigated to an appropriate standard.”</b></p>	92	Ashby Town Council

	deleted from 1(b) and 'light' is added. Pollution (air, land and water quality) is dealt with in Policy En6 (plans should avoid unnecessary duplication).	Add supporting text to aid in the interpretation of 'unacceptable'.		
<b>(2) Development which is sensitive to noise or unpleasant odour emissions will not be permitted where it would adversely affect future occupants.</b>				
[It is unclear how a development can be “ <i>sensitive</i> ” to noise or unpleasant odour emissions. Is the policy intended to protect future occupants from an existing source of noise or odour or is it intended that sources of noise or odour are not built close to existing or potential new homes? If the former, then we would suggest substituting “ <i>subject</i> ” for “ <i>sensitive</i> ”. If the latter, then it needs more extensive rewriting]	It is agreed that this part of the policy could be clearer and reference to mitigation is required in line with the NPPF. The intention of (2) is to address the ‘agent of change’ principle at NPPF paragraph 200, meaning proposed development needs to account for the existing environment and provide suitable mitigation in order to be acceptable. The term significant adverse effect is taken from NPPF paragraph 200.	<b>Rewrite part (2): “Development proposals which are likely to experience significant adverse effects from noise, vibration, light or odour levels in its vicinity will only be permitted where suitable mitigation can be provided that would reduce the effects to an appropriate level.”</b>	92	Ashby Town Council
[Part 2 of the policy does not allow for appropriate mitigation in accordance with NPPF §191a and NPPF §180e. It 2 should be redrafted to include reference to mitigation, similar to Part 1 of the policy]	We have broadened the policy to include vibration and light impacts so it is consistent with (1)(b). We also propose changing ‘ <i>will not be</i> ’ to ‘ <i>will only be</i> ’ to make the wording more positive.		183	Turley (Clowes, Redrow, Wilson Estates)
The use of “it” in part (2) detracts from the clarity and understanding of this part of the policy. It might be better worded to read, “Development which is sensitive to noise or unpleasant odour emissions will not be permitted where	We suggest changing to ‘in its vicinity’; this wording is used in the NPPF and is sufficiently clear and concise.		225; 229;	Planning Prospects (St Modwen); Planning Prospects (P, W, C & R Redfern)

<p><b>the existing or expected presence of noise or odour</b> would adversely affect future occupants.”</p>				
<p><b>(2) Proposals for external lighting schemes should be designed to minimise potential pollution from glare or light spillage. The intensity of lighting should be necessary to achieve its purpose, and the benefits of the lighting scheme must be shown to outweigh any adverse effects</b></p>				
<p>[Please consider using lighting that matches natural patterns: blue light is dominant from dawn to midday, while red-orange light should be used at night. Blue LED light at night can negatively affect health and nature; LEDs now offer a range of colours to suit these needs.]</p>	<p>The Planning Practice Guidance says the following on this topic: <i>“White light, with more blue content or with ultraviolet content, is generally more disruptive to wildlife than, say, yellow/orange light. Similarly, for humans, light intrusion by white/blue light is more disruptive to sleep. Use of modern white light sources that filter out blue or ultraviolet light may mitigate these effects, as well as offering superior directional control. However, whiter light aids people’s vision and ability to perceive colour; it also facilitates CCTV use.”</i> The type/nature/suitability of lighting will vary for each development proposal. The Local Plan cannot account for every eventuality, so the wording of (3) is considered appropriate for how the decision maker should react to development proposals in general terms.</p>	<p>No change to the policy.</p> <p><b>Add some more supporting text on lighting at Regulation 19 stage.</b></p>	<p>396</p>	<p>Siobhan Dillon</p>

# APPENDIX A – POLICY AP2 (AMENITY)

General comments				
[General Support]	Noted	No change	45; 175; 185; 186; 188; 214; 232;	LLR Integrated Care Board; Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe & Acresford Parish Council; Pegasus Group (Clowes Developments); Pegasus Group (Wilson Bowden Developments); C. Green Planning (Cadwallader Family); Stantec UK (Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land); Stantec UK (Caddick Land);
Any future policy should support the demonstration and provision of mitigation measures where necessary and appropriate to address any potential amenity impacts	Noted, changes are proposed to part (2) of the policy (see above).	See proposed amendment to part (2) above.	211; 235;	Pegasus Group (Davidsons); Pegasus Group (Davidsons & Westernrange)

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP2 (AMENITY)

Any developments should not have an adverse impact on the lives of those already in the parishes. There are sadly examples where past and proposed developments have violated that principle and Ashby Woulds Town Council is keen that the principle must be upheld going forward.	Development cannot avoid <i>all</i> adverse impacts. The key issue for decision making is the scale of the adverse impact, whether mitigation is required and if so, whether mitigation can reduce the adverse impact to an acceptable level. The policy is drafted to guide decision makers on how to respond to these issues.	No change  <b>As proposed above, add supporting text at Regulation 19 stage to aid in the interpretation of what constitutes an ‘unacceptable’ impact.</b>	180	Ashby Woulds Town Council
[The policy should recommend that developments are well connected by sustainable transport as appropriate].	This issue is dealt with in Policy IF5; plans should avoid unnecessary duplication.	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council (planning)
[Can vibrancy of place and connectivity be considered in this section? It might be helpful to include reference to the TCPA guidance ‘20 Minute neighbourhoods: creating healthier, active, prosperous communities’, as it recommends planning principles for healthy neighbourhoods—such as streets, space access to community facilities and vibrancy of amenities—to enable new development to be integrated into the existing businesses as per 5.9]	Officers consider these matters are better dealt with in the design policy / design guide.	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council (planning)
Minerals and waste safeguarding are important considerations on this issue. Extant minerals and waste operations and infrastructure should also not be prejudiced by non-waste and non-mineral development in proximity.	Noted; this issue would be covered by the redrafted part (2) (see above).	See Part (2) above.	341	Leicestershire County Council (planning)

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP2 (AMENITY)

The policy is seen as forming an integral part of overall design policy and should be incorporated within a broader Policy AP1	Officers have no concerns with AP2 being a distinct policy.	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council (landowner)
Nowhere does it say that all policies must be read in conjunction with each other for example AP2 on noise should apply to all policies.	Applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan (as a whole), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This will be made clearer when the Local Plan has been drafted as a single document (the Regulation 19 Plan) rather than three separate consultation documents.	No change	527	Julia Howard
Investment from the companies developing land around and in Kegworth would be welcome. Playgrounds, sports facilities, pedestrian crossings and a larger school would all help.	Comments are noted, but this is not the purpose of Policy AP2. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will identify the infrastructure required from proposed development sites.	No change	585	J Lewis
<b>Application of the policy to specific sites</b>				
[Maintaining nighttime goods flights is vital for UK business growth. East Midlands Airport supports exports, international trade, local jobs, and economic development. We oppose housing plans at Isley Woodhouse and ask that a balanced approach is applied; weighing the need for housing against the economic importance of the airport. Appropriate mitigation for	Noted; part (2) has been amended to better reflect the agent of change principle	See Part (2) above.	218	UPS

# APPENDIX A – POLICY AP2 (AMENITY)

businesses and residents is required. If the development proceeds, the Agent of Change principle must be applied.]				
[The NPPF states that new developments should avoid locations where they may be affected by existing issues like noise. The proposed site at Isley Walton (Woodhouse) could be affected by activity at East Midlands Airport, potentially compromising the growth of an existing important national and regional asset/the nationally significant night-time air cargo operation.]	Noted; part (2) has been amended to better reflect the agent of change principle	See Part (2) above.	230	East Midlands Airport
[Proximity to the airport and racetrack means new developments may expose residents to unacceptable noise and light levels, as highlighted in sections 5.8, 5.9, and 5.48(F), potentially harming residential amenity and public safety.]			350	Teresa Walker
If you consider the impact of the Freeport on the small village of Diseworth. The specifics in 5.8 of the documentation, 'noise, light and the quality of life of...existing residents' it's not clear how this will apply.	These impacts would need to be dealt with in detail as part of a planning application. If the impacts cannot be adequately mitigated, then an application would be contrary to Policy AP2 and could be refused on that basis.	No change	651	Amanda Hack

# APPENDIX A – POLICY AP3 (RENEWABLE ENERGY)

CHAPTER: 5	POLICY NUMBER: AP3	POLICY NAME: RENEWABLE ENERGY
------------	--------------------	-------------------------------

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<b>(1) The Council will support renewable energy proposals that contribute towards achieving the following renewable energy generation targets by 2040:</b> <b>(a) 50.62 MW of energy generated by solar energy generation.</b> <b>(b) 47.8 MW of energy generated by wind generation.</b>				
<p>The policy should be aligned with NPPF paras 160-163. The target for renewable energy generation should be regarded as a minimum level of delivery over the plan period notwithstanding the need to upgrade strategic infrastructure and grid connections. As it's a strategic policy, the local plan should define those areas where the generation of renewable energy is acceptable in planning terms and not rely on delivery through Neighbourhood Plans (other than for the identification of additional local opportunities) nor should local opinion determine or constrain the ability to deliver otherwise acceptable renewable energy developments.</p>	<p>Noted. The draft Policy supports the delivery of renewable energy and sets targets for both solar energy generation and wind energy generation for plan period. The plan period now goes to 2042 and as such the targets will need amending.</p> <p>The Policies Map identifies areas potentially suitable for small and medium/large scale wind energy generation.</p>	<p>Part (1) of the policy be amended to read:</p> <p>The Council will support renewable energy proposals that contribute towards achieving the following renewable energy generation targets by 2042:</p> <p><b>550.762</b> MW of energy generated by solar energy generation.</p> <p><b>52.647.8</b> MW of energy generated by wind generation.</p>	341	Leicestershire County Council
<b>(2) Proposals for renewable energy generation as part of new housing developments should be proportionate to the scale of the proposed development and appropriate to their setting.</b>				
<p>Query the use of the term "<b>proportionate</b>" in para 2 of the</p>	<p>Noted. However, the current wording is considered</p>	<p>No change.</p>	92	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council



## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP3 (RENEWABLE ENERGY)

	proposed policy. A development with a larger renewable energy generation capacity than is needed for that development alone could be considered disproportionate despite its obvious beneficial contribution to renewable energy generation. Maybe this could be overcome by substituting “ <b>at least sufficient for</b> ” instead of “ <b>proportionate to</b> ”.	appropriate. The provision of more than enough energy from renewable sources on a development would need to be managed on a site-by-site basis by the developer.			
	The Renewable and Local Carbon Energy Study (2021) identifies the main opportunities for NWLDC going forward will be wind and solar energy and heat pumps but this should include the need to review sites on a site-by-site basis, having regard to viability, feasibility and local context. Part (2) of the Draft Policy should have regard to the need to review sites on a site-by-site basis to consider viability, feasibility and local context.	Part (2) of the policy refers to renewable energy generation as part of new developments being proportionate. In terms of viability, this policy is one to be tested through the forthcoming whole plan viability assessment which will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan.	No change.	214	Stantec UK Ltd obo Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
	We support the Council’s approach to the delivery of renewable energy through Draft Policy AP3. It is important to ensure that the delivery of renewable energy projects is proportionate to developments, particularly when these are proposed as part of new housing developments.	Noted. The requirement set out in Part (2) of the draft policy should apply to all developments and not just housing. As such the word housing needs to be deleted from the requirement.	Delete the word housing from Part (2) of the draft policy. The revised wording to read: (3) Proposals for renewable energy generation as part of new <b>housing</b>	226	Oxalis Planning and Pegasus Group East Midlands obo Harworth Estates and Caesarea

# APPENDIX A – POLICY AP3 (RENEWABLE ENERGY)

		developments should be proportionate to the scale of the proposed development and appropriate to their setting.		
<b>(3)(a) There is no unacceptable impact on residential amenity as result of the development alone or in conjunction with any permitted and existing renewable energy schemes in terms of noise, shadow flicker, vibration, topple distance, glint and glare and visual dominance</b>				
Policy Cc1 of the Adopted Local Plan refers to the cumulative effect that would result from other existing renewable energy schemes and the impact on economic, social and environmental benefits for the communities closest to the proposal. This should be included in Draft Policy Ap3.	In terms of the cumulative effect that would result from renewable energy schemes, this requirement is included in Part (3)(a) of the draft policy albeit the criterion is worded differently. Part (3)(a) refers to there being no unacceptable impact of the development alone <u>or</u> in conjunction with any permitted and existing renewable energy schemes. The adopted Local Plan (Policy Cc1) refers to the economic, social and environmental benefits for the communities closest to the proposal. The adopted Local Plan was drafted in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) which made specific reference (para. 93) to the economic, social and	No change.	527	Julia Howard

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP3 (RENEWABLE ENERGY)

	environmental dimensions of sustainable development in the context of planning playing a key role in providing resilience to the impacts of climate change and supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy. The wording in the NPPF has since changed but as the elements of sustainable development are set out in national policy, it is not necessary for them to be repeated in Local Plan Policy.			
<b>(3)(b) There is no unacceptable impact on the landscape character taking account of the special qualities set out within the individual National Character Areas</b>				
Part 3(b) refers to the need to ensure there is no unacceptable impact on landscape character with reference to National Character Areas. This should be extended to incorporate the need to ensure there is no unacceptable harm to the significance of heritage assets or their setting or include this as a separate criterion.	Noted. When assessing proposals, the Local Plan will be considered as a whole, and it is considered that draft Policy En7 (Conservation and Enhancement of the Historic Environment) sufficiently sets out the requirements in relation to heritage assets and their setting.	As a result of changes to part (3)(b) of the policy (set out below) draft criteria (3)(b) will become (3)(c) – there are no proposed changes to the wording of this criterion.	357	Historic England
Welcome bullet point (b) regarding the protection of landscape character but consider there should be an additional point stating that there should be no unacceptable impact on biodiversity, wildlife or nature conservation designations. The policy should	Noted. Planning Practice Guidance does suggest there is evidence of risk of collision between moving wind turbine blades and birds and/or bats. Whilst these are generally a relatively low risk, in some	Revise criteria (b) to read: (b) There is no unacceptable impact on <b>biodiversity, ecology or wildlife.</b> <del>the landscape character</del>	223, 404	Natural England, The Environment Agency

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP3 (RENEWABLE ENERGY)

<p>ensure that appropriate measures are in place to protect the local environment. Para 5.19 of the supporting text recognises that the provision and benefit of medium and large-scale renewable energy schemes needs to be balanced against the environmental impacts. However, this requirement is not included within the Draft Policy. Strongly recommend that an additional bullet point, (d) is added under section (3) to include this requirement.</p>	<p>situations, such as in close proximity to important habitats used by birds or bats, the risk is greater and the impacts on birds and bats should therefore be assessed. As such it is considered appropriate to include additional policy wording to there is no unacceptable impact on wildlife, biodiversity or ecology.</p>	<p><del>taking account of the special qualities set out within the individual National Character Areas;</del></p>		
<p><b>(4) In addition to the above considerations, proposals for wind energy developments will be supported where:</b>  <b>(b) It can be demonstrated that the proposal has support from the local community;</b></p>				
<p>Adopted LP Policy Cc1 part 2 (b) requires support from the local community for one or more wind turbines, <u>or</u> it is set out within an area defined as being suitable for wind energy development within an adopted Neighbourhood Plan (NP). The draft policy has the need for support of the local community as a separate item in the list of requirements. Currently, if a site is identified as suitable for a wind turbine in a NP, then it is automatically deemed to have the support of the Local Community, whereas the draft policy requires a site to have the proven support of the local community even if it has been included as a</p>	<p>The draft policy requirements were written in the context of the September 2023 NPPF. The NPPF was revised in December 2023 and again in December 2024. As such national guidance has changed. It is proposed that the policy wording be retained but that additional detail is added to the supporting text to set out that if a site is identified as being suitable for wind energy generation in a NP then it is deemed to have the support of the local community.</p>	<p>No change to the policy wording but propose that the supporting text is amended.</p>	<p>92</p>	<p>Ashby de la Zouch Town Council</p>

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP3 (RENEWABLE ENERGY)

<p>suitable site in a NP. NPs go to referendum before they are accepted and so have the support of the community.</p>				
<b>ADDITIONAL CRITERIA PROPOSED</b>				
<p>It might be appropriate add a criterion to cover accessibility to a site for construction (including for 'abnormal loads' as necessary) and future maintenance and replacement/upgrading ('re-powering') purposes, especially in respect of sites for wind turbines. Where existing/life-expired renewable energy infrastructure (mainly that of wind turbines) is proposed to be replaced by new generation/more powerful infrastructure, which may be of a significantly larger scale, there should not be an automatic assumption that this will be acceptable in transport-terms, at least in terms of transportation to/from the site.</p>	<p>It would be for the applicant to evaluate as part of an assessment of any potential site. The Highways Authority would be consulted as part of any planning application and if access to the site was an issue, this would be raised during this process.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>
<b>SOLAR PANELS ON EXISTING BUILDINGS/NEW BUILDINGS</b>				
<p>If not in Policy AP3, then elsewhere in the Draft Local Plan, NWLDC should publish a policy that mandates that all new buildings must support roof mounted solar panels unless specific exemption is granted. Solar panels must be on the roofs of buildings. There is no need to lose agricultural land (especially on best and most</p>	<p>Solar panels are not required on new homes through current building regulations. In June 2025 the Government confirmed that new build homes will have solar panels by default through proposed changes in the Future Homes Standard (FHS). The</p>		<p>103, 115, 220, 285, 376, 401, 503</p>	<p>Judith Billington, Protect Diseworth, CPRE Leicestershire, Garry Needham, Jim Snee, Mr Wykes, Helen Warren</p>

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP3 (RENEWABLE ENERGY)

	<p>versatile) to solar panels. If necessary, Section 106 agreements should be used to secure this and/or requesting a statutory change in Central Government policy. It is cheaper to fit at building stage rather than retro fitting later.</p>	<p>FHS is expected to be published in Autumn this year.</p> <p>Part (5) of the policy states that proposals for solar energy development should avoid using the best and most versatile agricultural land where possible. Solar farm developments are generally temporary and fully reversible and allow for the land to be maintained in agricultural use during operation and as such should not compromise the agricultural resource.</p>			
46	<p>New version of SAP11 due in 2025 and also BREEAM towards achieving net zero carbon emissions.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>285</p>	<p>Garry Needham</p>
	<p>The Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study states the new target for solar can be achieved from roof tops. Roof tops do not appear in AP3 and should be amended to include the inclusion of roof tops. The policy only refers to housing.</p>	<p>Noted. The Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study does identify roof-mounted and building-integrated solar energy generation would offer additional resource it does also identify some of the constraints associated with solar panels on industrial buildings. The draft policy (Part (3)) refers to planning applications for renewable energy and this would include applications for roof mounted solar panels.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>527</p>	<p>Julia Howard</p>

# APPENDIX A – POLICY AP3 (RENEWABLE ENERGY)

AREAS IDENTIFIED AS POTENTIALLY SUITABLE FOR WIND TURBINES				
The areas Identified as potentially suitable for small scale or medium/large scale turbines defined on the Policies Map are misleading and largely irrelevant. The areas identified as potentially suitable have only been subject to detailed assessments in respect of wind speed and proximity to residential properties. No assessment has been undertaken in respect important factors such as landscape character or potential impacts upon heritage assets or their settings. NWLDC should undertake a sensitivity study to inform Policy AP3.	As detailed on the policies maps the areas identified as potentially suitable for wind energy generation have only been the subject of detailed assessments in respect of wind speed and proximity to residential properties. Detailed assessments in respect of factors such as landscape character or potential impacts upon heritage assets or their settings would need to be undertaken on a site-by-site basis.	No change.	196	Breedon on the Hill Parish Council
We welcome the text relating to heritage assets that is included on the Maps showing areas potentially suitable for small scale or medium/large wind energy.	Noted.	No change.	357	Historic England
Wind power should have sites excluded that should be archaeological protected or deemed to be local wildlife sites.	The areas identified as potentially suitable for wind energy generation have only been the subject of detailed assessments in respect of wind speed and proximity to residential properties. Detailed assessments in respect of factors such as landscape character or potential impacts upon heritage assets or their settings would need to be	No change.	527	Julia Howard

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP3 (RENEWABLE ENERGY)

	undertaken on a site-by-site basis.			
<b>LANDSCAPE IMPACTS</b>				
Agree with the policy with some caveats. It is important to recognise the impact of solar and wind on landscape character and their potential cumulative adverse impact in particular locations. As such, there should be stronger design requirements for solar and wind infrastructure to ensure they are integrated into the surrounding landscape with minimal impact.	Noted. Part (3)(b) of the draft policy seeks to ensure that there is no adverse impact on landscape character. When determining planning applications, the Local Plan should be considered as a whole. Draft Policy S4 (Countryside) Part (2)(a) requires development to respect the appearance and character of the landscape, including its historic character.	No change.	220	CPRE Leicestershire
<b>AGRICULTURAL LAND</b>				
Support paragraph 5 of the policy with respect to the best and most versatile agricultural land. However, suggest that good productive agricultural land; 3b grade land, should also be avoided where possible. If not, then food security is likely to become much more of an issue in the near future.	Policies need to balance renewable energy goals with the preservation of agricultural land. The policy wording is considered appropriate given the temporary and fully reversible nature of solar farm developments. Generally solar farm developments allow for the land to be maintained in agricultural use and as such should not compromise the agricultural resource.		220	CPRE Leicestershire
We welcome the inclusion in point 5 of this policy of the protection of Best	Noted.	No change.	223	Natural England



## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP3 (RENEWABLE ENERGY)

and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land.				
<b>IMPACT ON EAST MIDLANDS AIRPORT</b>				
The strategic policy approach to renewable energy is supported. The Local Plan policy should recognise and refer to the importance of, and the need for renewable energy installations to have no detrimental effects on aviation safety and aircraft operations at or in the vicinity of EMA. This includes both solar PV arrays and wind turbine developments. This policy should also be consistent with the Local Plan policy in relation to Aerodrome Safeguarding (Policy Ec9).	The Policy currently (Part (4)(c)) refers to proposals needing to consider all impacts on air traffic safety and radar and communications in the context of proposals for wind energy developments. As aviation safety is a consideration for both wind and solar energy developments it is proposed that Part (4)(c) be moved to become Part (3)(d).	Criterion (4)(c) be moved and amended to read: <del>(3)(d) All impacts. The potential impacts on air traffic and aircraft operations radar and communications at or in the vicinity of East Midlands Airport have been assessed, consulted upon and addressed.</del>	230	East Midlands Airport
<b>HIGHWAY SAFETY</b>				
National Highways is supportive of renewable energy production proposals in principle; however, wind turbines should not be located on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) where motorists need to pay particular attention, such as the immediate vicinity of connections, sharp bends, and crossings for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders as set out in DfT Circular 01/2022 paragraph 65-67. Wind turbines should be sited at a set distance from the SRN to mitigate risks to the safety of road users arising from structural or mechanical	Noted and agree that reference to highway safety is included in the draft policy to ensure this is considered as part of proposals.	Add new criterion (d) to Part (2) of the draft policy to read: <b>(2)(d) There is no adverse impact on highway safety.</b>	112	National Highways

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP3 (RENEWABLE ENERGY)

<p>failure. Paragraph 70 of the DfT circular details that solar farms and wind turbines have the potential to create glint and glare which can be a distraction for drivers. Where these developments would be visible from the SRN, National Highways should be consulted.</p>				
<b>OTHER COMMENTS</b>				
<p>There is an enormous local concentration of knowledge on all types of renewable energy in the area.</p>	Noted.	No change.	103	Judith Billington
<p>Welcome policies to support renewable energy including wind energy. Aggregate Industries have committed to Net Zero and are looking at opportunities to improve our environmental credentials.</p>	Noted.	No change.	107	Aggregate Industries Ltd
<p>The Plan appears to have a thorough strategic consideration of climate change, both mitigation and adaptation. Welcome and support the policy. It is encouraging to see targets for wind and solar generation and that a mapping exercise has been completed to identify areas potentially suitable for small and large-scale wind turbines. The support of onshore wind developments, providing they meet conditions, is also a positive feature of the draft Plan.</p>	Noted.	No change.	353	Derbyshire County Council

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP3 (RENEWABLE ENERGY)

Renewable energy technologies use input energies and convert them to electrical energy. Examples include solar panels and wind turbines. Heat pumps need electricity to work and so are not a renewable energy technology; they are a low carbon technology. Confusing these ideas does not give confidence in the overall plan.	Noted. The draft policy itself does not refer to heat pumps. However, Paragraph 5.11 of the supporting text identifies heat pumps as a form of renewable energy and whilst they can be if the electricity used to power them is from a renewable source it is considered that the paragraph be amended to avoid confusion.	Amend the supporting text to remove reference to heat pumps as a form of renewable energy.	396	Siobhan Dillon
--	--	--	-----	----------------

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

<b>CHAPTER: 5</b>	<b>POLICY NUMBER: Ap4</b>	<b>POLICY NAME: REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS</b>
-------------------	---------------------------	---

<b>MAIN ISSUES RAISED</b>	<b>COUNCIL RESPONSE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>RESPONDENTS ID</b>	<b>RESPONDENTS NAME</b>
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
SEGRO supports the draft wording of Policy AP4. Given the rapidly changing technologies and approaches to sustainable design, it is important to ensure that the policy wording is not too inflexible or could conflict with, or pre-empt, Government legislation and building regulations in the future.	Noted.	No change.	290	Delta Planning obo SEGRO
The policy rightly highlights the role of the planning system in supporting the transition to a low-carbon future. The use of the Energy Hierarchy is a positive way to encourage developers to take a holistic view to design low energy buildings. DCC also supports and welcomes: •“pollution and climate change” referenced as an important consideration for health and wellbeing •The process of updating the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in the light of climate change •A presumption for SuDS as part of new development unless inappropriate (Draft Policy AP8)	Noted.	No change.	353	Derbyshire Country Council

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

<p>•The consideration of the impact of climate change on water availability Climate change referenced as relevant to green and blue infrastructure and open space (Draft Policy IF3)</p>				
<p><b>(1) Development is required to contribute to the Council's aim for a carbon neutral district by 2050. To achieve this, all new development will be required to demonstrate how the following requirements are satisfied</b></p>				
<p>Ap4 (1) - the requirement for ALL development to demonstrate measures to minimise energy consumption and follow the energy hierarchy is excessive and a significant burden and cost on applicants (and the LPA). These requirements are not contained in the NPPF and should be dealt with at Building Regulation stage.</p>	<p>It is not proposed that the policy wording be amended at this stage but to rather await the outcome of the forthcoming whole plan viability assessment which will inform the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Some minor wording changes to Part (1) are proposed.</p>	<p>Part (1) be amended to read: Development is required to contribute to the Council's aim for a carbon neutral district by 2050. To achieve this, all new development will be required to demonstrate <b>that how the following requirements are satisfied:</b></p>	8	JJM Planning
<p><b>(1)(a) Achieve energy efficiency targets in line with the latest standards at the time a planning application is determined, as set by national policies (including any transitional arrangements)</b></p>				
<p>Recommend Part (1)(a) be reworded to reference 'achieving energy efficiency targets in line with the latest national standards' or include reference to The Future Homes Standard and Building Regulations as the appropriate standards of development for 'energy efficiency targets at the time'.</p>	<p>Noted. It is proposed that a new Part 1(a) be added to the policy to refer to renewable energy generation.</p> <p>As a result of the above change the current Part 1(a) will be come Part 1(b). It is considered that adding reference to national standards would provide clarity</p>	<p>Part (1)(a) be added to read: <b>(1)(a) On-site renewable energy generation is maximised as much as possible;</b></p> <p>Part 1(b) be amended to read:</p>	183, 214	<p>Turley obo Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Redrow Homes, Stantec UK Ltd obo Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey</p>

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

	on the standards being referred to, text is proposed to be added to Part 1(b).	Achieve energy efficiency targets in line with the latest <b>national</b> standards at the time a planning application is determined, <b>will be achieved</b> as set by national policies (including any transitional arrangements); and		Strategic Land Ltd and Wilson Enterprises Ltd
<b>(1)(b) Demonstrate that measures have been taken to minimise energy consumption by following the steps in the energy hierarchy;</b>				
There should be flexibility in the policy to consider site specific constraints and feasibility and viability implications.	It is not proposed that the policy wording be amended at this stage but to rather await the outcome of the forthcoming whole plan viability assessment which will inform the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.	No change.	183, 214	Turley obo Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Redrow Homes Ltd and Wilson Enterprises Ltd, Stantec UK Ltd obo Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
<b>(1)(c) Major developments will be required to demonstrate that measures have been taken to reduce lifecycle carbon emissions and maximise opportunities for the reuse of materials.</b>				
Recommend that detailed applications are supported by a Whole Life Cycle Assessment which includes consideration of the upfront embodied carbon of new development and measure to reduce embodied carbon	It is not proposed that the policy wording be amended at this stage but to rather await the outcome of the forthcoming whole plan viability assessment	Part (1)(c) becomes Part (2) of the policy. No wording changes are proposed to this part of the policy.	183	Turley obo Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Redrow Homes

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

<p>emissions. Recommend Part (1)(c) be reworded to read:  <i>Major development will need to demonstrate that measures have been taken to reduce lifecycle carbon emissions and maximise opportunities for the reuse of materials. Detailed major applications should include a Whole Life Cycle Assessment to demonstrate how upfront carbon has been considered and reduced where feasible and viable.</i></p>	<p>which will inform the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</p> <p>However, as criteria (1)(c) refers to the requirements of major developments it is considered that this criterion should be separated as Part (1) of the policy refers to the requirements for all development.</p>			<p>Ltd and Wilson Enterprises Ltd</p>
<p>Strongly support a requirement for Whole Life Cycle carbon assessments on medium sized and large development schemes. A checklist may be appropriate for small schemes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>92</p>	<p>Ashby de la Zouch Town Council</p>
<p>Strongly support the inclusion of this section. Recognise the rationale for not repeating in the Local Plan issues covered by separate regulation. Welcome the order of the Energy hierarchy. Note the proposed removing of the requirement for a Whole Life Cycle carbon assessment but strongly suggest that this decision is kept under review while further work is undertaken with the aim of the need for such an assessment being required in the future.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>404</p>	<p>The Environment Agency</p>
<p>Unfortunate that the requirement to conduct Whole Life Cycle (WLC) carbon assessments has been removed, but</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>353</p>	<p>Derbyshire County Council</p>

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

the reasoning for this is understood. It is encouraging that the plan still references the use of WLC as a useful tool.				
The plan to consider WLC assessments of future developments, is a step forward, however the plan then introduces the words 'not...economically viable' with reference to a district fund. The opportunity for new homes and industrial units to consider net zero during the development would be more effective.	Noted.	No change.	651	Amanda Hack
<b>(2) Renewable energy generation should be maximised as much as possible on-site. Where the use of on-site renewables to match the total energy consumption of the development/site is demonstrated not to be technically feasible or economically viable, a financial contribution will be required to the council's carbon offset fund to enable residual carbon emissions to be offset by other local initiatives.</b>				
Query the meaning of 'maximised' as much as possible and how it will be measured. The policy is imprecise and open to interpretation that will result in a lot of schemes needing to provide energy consumption figures or financial information. It could also compromise elements of design - covering available roof space with Solar PV, precluding the provision of roof lights, dormer windows etc which would otherwise be part of the design aesthetic of the development. The wording should refer to 'maximise generation where this is feasible and viable, in line with national policy requirements'.	<p>The Policy is seeking to ensure that renewable energy generation is utilised as much as possible on a proposed development site.</p> <p>Reducing the carbon impact of development and the design of development is a balance. The Draft NWL Good Design Guide was published for consultation on 23 July 2025. The draft Design Guide builds on the adopted Good Design SPD and includes sections on energy and resource efficiency and sets out</p>	No change.	8, 183	JJM Planning, Turley obo Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Redrow Homes Ltd and Wilson Enterprises Ltd



## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

	how these elements can be integrated into the design of developments.			
Recommend Part (2) be reworded to read: Renewable energy generation should be maximised as much as possible on site, <i>where feasible and viable in line with national standards</i> . Where the energy consumption of the site cannot be met by the use of on-site renewables, a financial contribution will be required to the Council's carbon offset fund.	Noted. At this stage it is considered that the council is not in a position to be able to commit to setting up a carbon offset fund. This is due to available resources, expertise and the need to get the Local Plan submitted. Officers have had informal conversations with AECOM who undertook the Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study (2021) who advise that setting up a carbon offset fund would not currently be viable for a district of our size.	The current Part (2) of the policy be deleted.	183	Turley obo Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Redrow Homes Ltd and Wilson Enterprises Ltd
Strongly support the policy particularly a council run carbon offset fund, provided (as proposed) it is not available to developers to avoid their statutory carbon reduction requirements under the new building regulations, and the fund is used to boost local carbon reduction schemes which otherwise could not be funded.			92	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
In terms of a potential carbon offset fund it is noted that a viability assessment has not yet been completed and will be part of the next stages of work. There is a lack of detail about the Council's carbon offset fund. Support measures that can help carbon reductions in line with the Government's 2023 Written Ministerial Statement.			183	Turley obo Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Redrow Homes Ltd and Wilson Enterprises Ltd

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

50	Jelson has no objection to Part (a) of the Policy. The remainder of Policy AP4 is not consistent with national policy, is not justified and is not demonstrably effective. Therefore, the Policy is not sound and, in the light of the fact that Part (a) adds nothing over Building Regulations, it should be deleted.			243	Avison Young obo Jelson Homes
	DCC welcomes the reference to a carbon offset fund as a last resort where low carbon construction cannot be met.			353	Derbyshire Country Council
	If it is not economically viable to provide renewables onsite, it is unlikely that it will be economically viable to contribute to the Council's Offset Fund. there needs to be transparency in relation to the financial contribution required to the Council's Carbon Offset Fund and specific local initiatives need to be identified within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This would be a particular disincentive to businesses as outline applications for industrial and warehousing units will not necessarily be on a pre-let basis and therefore the occupier will not be known. The total energy consumption will depend on occupier requirements. In this respect, the policy wording in its current form would not be consistent with national policy.			185, 186, 187, 656	Pegasus Group obo Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Pegasus Group obo Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd, Define Planning and Design Ltd obo Bloor Homes Ltd, Define Planning and Design Ltd obo Rosconn Strategic Land

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

<p>Policy AP4 could be burdensome, particularly for industry with high operational energy requirements and no prospect of meeting those on site. Developers need a relative level of certainty regarding the financial commitments from the outset of delivering a scheme. Policy should provide additional flexibility that would require developments to meet the requirements as far as possible in the confines of a viable development; requiring viability assessments to demonstrate that if the Council sees fit. Given that the Council are seeking contributions towards their own offsetting scheme, this needs to be in place in quickly with sufficient capacity to support the scale of growth required in the plan period. NWLDC should ensure that the offsetting scheme is specific and measurable and that it supports a tariff / credit-based approach that is CIL compliant.</p>	<p>It is not proposed that the policy wording be amended at this stage but to rather await the outcome of the forthcoming whole plan viability assessment which will inform the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</p> <p>At this stage it is considered that the council is not in a position to be able to commit to setting up a carbon offset fund. This is due to available resources, expertise and the need to get the Local Plan submitted. Officers have had informal conversations with AECOM who undertook the Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study (2021) who advise that setting up a carbon offset fund would not currently be viable for a district of our size.</p>	<p>The current Part (2) of the policy be deleted.</p>	<p>187, 225, 226, 229, 656</p>	<p>Define Planning and Design Ltd obo Bloor Homes Ltd, Planning Prospects Ltd obo St Modwen Logistics, Oxalis Planning and Pegasus Group obo Harworth Estates and Caesarea, Planning Prospects Ltd obo P, W, C &amp; R Redfern, Define Planning and Design Ltd obo Rosconn Strategic Land</p>
<p>The WMS of 13th December 2023 informed councils that the government expects examiners to reject local plans where local energy efficiency standards go beyond current national policy provisions. This same rational should apply to requiring sites to match their total energy consumption on site or pay financial contributions. This would go way beyond the national requirements</p>	<p>There has been a recent (25 July 2025) Court of Appeal judgement on the Written Ministerial Statement (December 2023) which confirmed that LPAs can set energy efficiency standards above national regulations, provided they are justified by local circumstances, backed by evidence, have a clear rationale</p>	<p>The current Part (2) of the policy be deleted.</p>	<p>193, 211, 216, 235</p>	<p>Pegasus Group obo Hallam Land Management, Pegasus Group obo Davidsons Developments Limited, Pegasus Group obo Westernrange</p>

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

and has the potential to undermine viability and delivery and compete with the provision of other forms of infrastructure. A site-by-site approach to energy generation also has the potential to undermine economies of scale in the provision of sustainable sources of energy and conflict the efficient use of land.	and are supported by viability evidence. It is unclear whether the Government intends to appeal the decision. It is not proposed that the policy wording be amended at this stage but to rather await the outcome of the forthcoming whole plan viability assessment which will inform the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.			Limited, Pegasus Group obo Davidsons Developments Limits and Westernrange Limited
The policy should allow for credit to be given where a development can demonstrate its energy, beyond what is generated onsite, is sourced from a provider offering a supply from renewable sources.	Noted.	No change.	225, 229	Planning Prospects Ltd obo St Modwen Logistics, Planning Prospects Ltd obo P, W, C & R Redfern
<b>OTHER COMMENTS</b>				
<b>CROSS REFERENCE TO OTHER LOCAL PLAN POLICIES</b>				
There should be a cross reference to policy AP8 to encourage sustainable drainage and water sensitive design to manage water on site as part of climate change adaptation.	Noted, as part of the Regulation 19 Local Plan consideration will be given to how to show linkages between policies.	No change.	223	Natural England
Policy AP4 would benefit to having an additional criteria and/or cross-reference(s) to relevant policies elsewhere in the draft Plan with respect to promoting sustainable travel as a key	Noted, as part of the Regulation 19 Local Plan consideration will be given to how to show linkages between policies.	No change.	341	Leicestershire County Council

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

component in reducing carbon emissions.				
<b>NATIONAL REQUIREMENTS</b>				
<p>Draft Policy AP4 is unnecessary, it duplicates and goes beyond national requirements and planned building regulations. The December 2023 Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) states that ‘a further change to energy efficiency building regulations is planned for 2025 meaning that homes built to that standard will be net zero ready and should need no significant work to ensure that they have zero carbon emissions as the grid continues to decarbonise. Nationally applied standards provide clarity and consistency for developers.</p> <p>The WMS further details that ‘the Government does not expect plan-makers to set local energy efficiency standards for buildings that go beyond current or planned buildings regulations’. The WMS also informed councils that the government expects examiners to reject local plans where local energy efficiency standards go beyond current national policy provisions. Building Regulations and the emerging Future Homes Standard offer the most appropriate mechanisms to deliver low carbon and energy efficient developments.</p>	<p>The Future Homes Standard (FHS) is expected to be published this autumn, and the Government has confirmed (in June 2025) that the FHS will include changes to Building Regulations to require new homes to include solar panels. The Government are also expected to consult on the National Development Management Policies (NDMP) in autumn 2025. In addition, a recent (25 July 2025) Court of Appeal judgement on the Written Ministerial Statement (December 2023) confirmed that LPAs can set energy efficiency standards above national regulations, provided they are justified by local circumstances, backed by evidence, have a clear rationale and are supported by viability evidence. It is unclear whether the Government intends to appeal the decision.</p> <p>The changes expected to be introduced by the FHS highlights the Government’s intentions to include more energy efficient measures in new developments.</p>	<p>As set out above Part 1(b) will be amended to read:  <del>Achieve</del> <b>Energy</b> efficiency targets in line with the latest <b>national</b> standards at the time a planning application is determined, <b>will be achieved as set by national policies</b> (including any transitional arrangements); and</p>	<p>8, 147, 150, 161, 183, 184, 187, 193, 211, 216, 235, 237, 656</p>	<p>JJM Planning, Gladman Developments Ltd, Savills obo David Wilson Homes (East Midlands), Mather Jamie obo The Trustees of Lord Crawshaw 1997 Discretionary Settlement (the Whatton Estate, Turley obo Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Redrow Homes Ltd and Wilson Enterprises Ltd, Pegasus Group obo Hallam Land Management, Define Planning and Design Ltd obo Bloor Homes Ltd, Pegasus Group obo Hallam Land Management,</p>

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

<p>It would be appropriate to make to the reference latest 'national' standards or the 2025 Future Homes Standard and the Building Regulations as the appropriate standards for development.</p> <p>Essential that Draft Policy AP4 is fully evidenced, justified, and included in viability considerations.</p>	<p>It is possible that energy efficiency requirements may be included in the NDMP. In view of the current uncertainty at the national level we have kept changes to this policy to a minimum but intend to keep the policy under review.</p> <p>As above, it proposed that Part (1)(a) include reference to the latest national standards.</p>			<p>Pegasus Group obo Davidsons Developments Limited, Pegasus Group obo Westernrange Limited, Pegasus Group obo Davidsons Limits and Westernrange Limited, Home Builders Federation, Define Planning and Design Ltd obo Rosconn Strategic Land</p>
<p>The policy needs to be clear that all development should meet minimum statutory requirements. It also fails to include reference to the provisions of NPPF para 164.</p>	<p>Noted, it is not necessary for Local Plan policy to repeat the NPPF. However, it is considered that the supporting text could be amended and make reference to the requirements in the NPPF.</p>	<p>The supporting text be amended as detailed.</p>	341	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>
<p>The Government is to introduce a set of National Development Management Policies, which is likely to include further guidance on the energy performance of development and provide a consistent approach.</p>	<p>Noted. It has been reported that the Government have delayed consultation on the National Development Management Policies (NDMP). It is now anticipated that consultation on</p>	<p>No change.</p>	183	<p>Turley obo Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Redrow Homes Ltd and Wilson Enterprises Ltd</p>

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

	the NDMP will take place in autumn 2025.			
<b>SOLAR PANELS ON NEW BUILDS</b>				
NWLDC should strengthen the policy to make it compulsory and mandate the use of solar roof panels on all new builds. If necessary, it should prevail upon Central Government to mandate the policy.	The Future Homes Standard (FHS) is expected to be published this autumn, and the Government has confirmed (in June 2025) that the FHS will include changes to Building Regulations to require new homes to include solar panels. As such, it would be a functional requirement of the Building Regulations.	No change.	115, 175, 255, 352, 487	Protect Diseworth, Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe and Acresford Parish Council, Johnathan Aust, Jeffrey Guy, Mary Lorimer
Whilst there are several references to energy saving techniques electric vehicle charging points seem to have been overlooked.	In England, Part S of the Building Regulations (Infrastructure for charging electric vehicles) requires new and significantly renovated buildings with parking to have EV charge points and cable routes. There is no need to repeat this requirement in the Local Plan.	No change.	175, 255	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe and Acresford Parish Council, Johnathan Aust
Note that the FHS and FBS consultation includes requirements for the provision of Solar PV on new development from 2025.	The Future Homes Standard (FHS) is expected to be published this autumn, and the Government has confirmed (in June 2025) that the FHS will include changes to Building	No change.	183	Turley obo Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Redrow Homes Ltd and Wilson Enterprises Ltd

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

	Regulations to require new homes to include solar panels.			
<b>WIND TURBINES/WIND FARMS</b>				
Unaware of any large-scale housing developer who can deliver carbon neutral dwellings at scale. Therefore, external energy sources will be required, and the use of renewable energy sources should be made mandatory. As all non-residential sites across North-West Leicestershire appear “potentially suitable for small scale wind energy” (Local Plan – “Map showing areas potentially suitable for small scale wind energy”), perhaps a policy of incorporating wind farms into the development should be considered: perhaps replacing the proposed warehousing fronting onto the A453, with a wind farm.	<p>Noted. The Future Homes Standard (FHS) is expected to be published this autumn, and the Government has confirmed (in June 2025) that the FHS will include changes to Building Regulations to require new homes to include solar panels.</p> <p>Whilst it appears that large areas of the district are identified as potentially suitable for wind energy, these areas have only been the subject of detailed assessments in respect of wind speed and proximity to residential properties. Detailed assessments in respect of factors such as landscape character or potential impacts upon heritage assets or their settings would need to be undertaken on a site-by-site basis.</p>	No change.	352	Jeffrey Guy
<b>ENERGY EFFICIENCY</b>				
Paragraph 5.33: The first bullet point states that “The use of high energy efficiency lighting and mechanical	Noted. It is considered that the supporting text could include	The supporting text be amended as detailed.	139	Leicester City Council



## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

ventilation with heat recovery should also be considered.” It is preferable to avoid installing mechanical ventilation systems as they increase energy consumption and carbon emissions during the summer. This runs counter to purpose of the “Energy Reduction” section of the Energy Hierarchy. Heat recovery should be utilised wherever mechanical ventilation are installed but it should be made clear that the use of mechanical ventilation systems should only be acceptable where less energy intensive options have been considered beforehand and found not to be appropriate.	information regarding the use of mechanical ventilation systems.			
<b>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b>				
Para. 5.26 states that greenhouse gas emissions will need to be reduced but there will be huge additional demands as regards traffic and this will just add to the emissions of greenhouse gases, as well as causing increased congestion.	There is a national intention to move towards the use of electric vehicles, this, coupled with on-site measures such as solar panels seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	No change.	350	Teresa Walker
<b>REGULATED/UNREGULATED ENERGY</b>				
Unclear if the policy relates to regulated or unregulated energy. Policy requirements should only relate to regulated energy and carbon emissions. Developers do not have control over unregulated energy and carbon emissions. Utilising the Local Energy Efficiency Standards Update (WMS) as support the policy should make it clear	Noted, it is considered that wording could be added to the supporting text that sets out that developments can only address regulated energy and carbon emissions.	The supporting text be amended as detailed.	183	Turley obo Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Redrow Homes Ltd and Wilson Enterprises Ltd

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

<p>that any requirements which go beyond national standards should only relate to regulated energy and that the requirements of the policy are subject to feasibility and viability. At this stage the embodied carbon of new development is not considered as part of the Building Regulations, however, as part of the FHS and FBS consultation the Government has requested information on embodied carbon, and it is likely that embodied carbon will be included in the future.</p>				
<p><b>OTHER COMMENTS</b></p>				
<p>Concerned about the level of detail that is required at the various stages of the application process (outline, reserved matters or full). An outline application would not provide the same level of detail as a reserved matters or full application.</p>	<p>Noted. It is considered that some additional supporting text that sets the requirements would help clarify this matter.</p>	<p>The supporting text be amended as detailed.</p>	<p>147</p>	<p>Gladman Developments Ltd</p>
<p>The proposed policy requirements to seek evidence that proposals have sought to minimise energy consumption and maximise renewable energy generation are appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>187</p>	<p>Define Planning and Design Ltd obo Bloor Homes Ltd</p>
<p>In response to the 2022 consultation the CPRE stated that a strategic policy should be set out at the front of the plan to address Climate Change and meet net-Zero targets. Although the importance of Climate Change as a</p>	<p>It is not a requirement to have an overarching policy. As part of the Regulation 19 Local Plan consideration will be given to how to show linkages between policies.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>220</p>	<p>CPRE Leicestershire</p>

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

<p>cross-cutting issue is acknowledged, the document does not sufficiently recognise that Climate Change mitigation should be a key strategic priority for the plan and addressed through a Strategic Climate Change Policy. Concerned that without such a focus climate change considerations will not feature strongly enough in the decisions about the location, design and delivery of new developments. Perhaps more will be clearer when the Design Policy is set out in the Plan. See South Worcestershire Development Plan Review: Regulation 19 Publication Document, November 2022.</p>				
<p>Recommend the Plan include positive policy wording to address climate change mitigation and adaptation which recognises that biodiversity loss and climate change are interlinked. Climate Change policies should include policy guidance on “Nature-Based Solutions” which can play an important role in aiding climate change adaptation. This approach creates better linked habitat networks which will build up resilience to climate change at a landscape scale. The policy should also recognise the important role of Green Infrastructure in climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p>	<p>Noted. It is considered that the supporting text could be amended to include reference to the role green infrastructure plays in climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p>	<p>The supporting text be amended as detailed.</p>	<p>223</p>	<p>Natural England</p>

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP4 (REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS)

<p>SEGRO recognises that real estate is a significant contributor to carbon emissions through the construction and operation of buildings. SEGRO has made it its priority to eliminate as far as possible the carbon emissions from the construction of new buildings and the operation of existing buildings to ensure that any residual carbon is offset or absorbed meaningfully and effectively.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>290</p>	<p>Delta Planning obo SEGRO</p>
<p>Our schools have a focus on the climate agenda from both the teaching and learning perspective as well as new schools designed to be low carbon. Schools need to be energy efficient to support the climate agenda and minimise revenue costs so more of their budget can focus on teaching and learning.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>
<p>Will a provision be put in place to restrict the sourcing of materials from within a set local distance. Such as bricks from Ibstock brick (Ibstock site) or Forterra (Desford site). This will reduce carbon footprint.</p>	<p>This is beyond the scope of planning.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>414</p>	<p>Emily Massey</p>
<p>Provision for active travel - Failed at Grange Road site with no direct cycle access to Coalville town centre.</p>	<p>Noted. This is not within the scope of this policy.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>487</p>	<p>Mary Lorimer</p>

# APPENDIX A – POLICY AP5 (HEALTH AND WELLBEING)

CHAPTER: 5		POLICY NUMBER: AP5	POLICY NAME: HEALTH AND WELLBEING		
MAIN ISSUES RAISED		COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Support					
Support the policy and welcome the consideration of health and wellbeing in the Local Plan and it's joining up with the Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the NWL Community Health and Wellbeing Plan. Agree that careful planning can positively contribute to a range of health benefits.		Noted.	No change.	45	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland ICB
Welcome the inclusion of the Policy but suggest it could be strengthened. Policy appears to put onus on the Council without giving it extra powers to require developers to contribute. In addition to listing what the Council will support, developer requirements should be identified to ensure the health and wellbeing of communities, including contributions towards the creation of safe walking and cycling infrastructure.		Development proposals will be assessed against the Local Plan as a whole. Draft Policy IF1 sets out the type of infrastructure required to support new developments, as such they do not need to be repeated in this policy.	No change.	92	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
Good to see a strong section on Health and Wellbeing. As this is a cross-cutting issue that is relevant to many of the topic areas in the Local Plan consideration could also be given to adding extra reference to Health and Wellbeing throughout the plan. This		Noted, as part of the Regulation 19 Local Plan consideration will be given to how to show linkages between policies.	No change.	139	Leicester City Council

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP5 (HEALTH AND WELLBEING)

would give the issue greater emphasis and ensure this critical issue is central to the aims of the Local Plan.				
<p>Policy is supported. Being active should be an intrinsic part of everyone's daily life and the design of where we live and work plays a vital role in this. Good design should contribute to making better places and create environments that make the active choice the easy choice for people and communities.</p> <p>The Active Design Guidance (2023) seeks to help planners, designers and those involved in delivering and managing our places to create and maintain active environments. The principles set out in the Guidance are aimed at contributing towards the Governments desire for the planning system to promote healthy communities through good urban design.</p>	<p>Noted. Policy AP5 will complement other policies in the Local Plan including those which address the design of new development.</p> <p>The Draft NWL Good Design Guide was published for consultation on 23 July 2025. The draft Design Guide builds on the adopted Good Design SPD and includes elements on health and wellbeing and sets out how the design of developments can contribute to health and well-being.</p>	No change.	143	Sport England
Supports the provision of an overarching health and wellbeing policy. The proposed policy is informed through the utilisation of relevant evidence to support a specific overarching policy for healthy lifestyles that will ensure that policies meet the health and wellbeing needs of the	Noted.	No change.	185, 186	Pegasus Group (Clowes Developments Ltd), Pegasus Group (Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd)

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP5 (HEALTH AND WELLBEING)

district's population over the plan period.				
Support this policy and note the Council's support for the delivery of a safe walking and cycling network. The ability to walk and cycle often and effectively is a major consideration in the new locations of development and in their design and layout. Safe and attractive links to schools would help young people appreciate the freedom and other benefits of a less car-dependent lifestyle.	<p>Noted. This approach will also be supported by other policies in the Local Plan, including IF5: Transport Infrastructure.</p> <p>The Draft NWL Good Design Guide was published for consultation on 23 July 2025. The draft Design Guide builds on the adopted Good Design SPD and includes elements on health and wellbeing and sets out how the design of developments can contribute to health and well-being.</p>	No change.	220	CPRE Leicestershire
Welcome this policy however suggest that it could also include the importance of contact with nature. See comments under AP5 (2)(d).	See response under AP5 (2)(d).	No change.	223	Natural England
Support this policy which promotes high quality accessible and inclusive environments. It is consistent with paragraph 96 and 97 of the NPPF and in particular paragraph 96c). The delivery of housing in the right locations with access to jobs and services, along with leisure and recreation space is vitally important.	Noted. When assessing proposals, the Council will give consideration to how schemes can positively contribute to the health and wellbeing of our communities. This approach will be supported by this policy and	No change.	232	Stantec Uk Ltd (Caddick Land)

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP5 (HEALTH AND WELLBEING)

The Council should prioritise Land south of Ashby Road, Kegworth, given its highly sustainable location and access to considerable employment opportunities along with local services and facilities.	other policies in the Local Plan.			
From a Public Health perspective draft policy AP5 is supported. The draft policy identifies the importance of wider determinants including housing design and access to employment on health outcomes.	Noted.	No change.	341	Leicestershire County Council
Welcome this policy, particularly paragraph 5.46: Pollution and Climate Change.	Noted.	No change.	404	The Environment Agency
<b>AP5 (1) Development that maintains and improves the health and wellbeing of our residents, encouraging healthy lifestyles by tackling the causes of ill health and inequalities will be supported. Health considerations will be embedded in decision making and the Council will support the creation of a high quality, accessible and inclusive environment.</b>				
The policy should be expanded to reflect mental health, in e.g. in respect of social isolation.	Agree the policy should be amended to refer to both the physical and mental health and wellbeing of residents.	Amend Part (1) of the policy to read: “Development that maintains and improves the <b>physical and mental</b> health and wellbeing of our residents...”	341	Leicestershire County Council
Would it be possible to change the word ‘lifestyles’ and instead of ‘encouraging healthy lifestyles’ the wording becomes ‘enable healthier choices’ and in 5.46 bullet point	Noted and agree the suggested amendments.	Amend Part (1) of the policy to read: “... <del>encouraging healthy lifestyles</del> <b>enables healthier choices</b> by	341	Leicestershire County Council



## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP5 (HEALTH AND WELLBEING)

<p>'healthy lifestyles' becomes 'healthier choices'.</p> <p>There is an emerging public health evidence base to suggest the word 'lifestyles' is a problematic word because it implies their individual choices and behaviours solely responsible for health outcomes this perspective overlooks the influence of social economic and environmental factors on health. Public Health would advocate for more inclusive language such as 'health choices' or 'health practices' which would emphasise the broader context in which individual choices are made.</p>		<p>tackling the causes of ill health and inequalities will be supported."</p> <p>The supporting text will also be amended to reflect the revised wording.</p>		
<p>The local plan has a key role in helping to create healthy places. The local plan should require health impact assessments for large scale developments, i.e., developments which are greater than 700 homes where a new primary school would be required and will form an important part of the new community.</p>	<p>Draft Policy AP6 Health Impact Assessments sets out the requirements and thresholds for when a Health Impact Assessment would be required.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>
<p>Comments from a LCC Landowner Perspective:</p> <p>The policy aspires to meet the guidance given in NPPF at section 8. It would give greater clarity if it referred</p>	<p>Noted. The policy states that health considerations will be embedded in decision making and it sets out a range of criteria that development must meet to be supported.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP5 (HEALTH AND WELLBEING)

specifically to development being required to meet those standards.				
<b>AP5 (2) To achieve this, the Council will: (a) Ensure homes are high quality, good homes and allow people to live healthy lives within them and remain in their homes for longer</b>				
Support criteria (a) to (g) of Part (2) of the draft policy.	Noted.	No change.	115	Protect Diseworth
<b>AP5 (2) To achieve this, the Council will: (c) Support the delivery of a safe walking and cycling network to increase access to active travel, considering active design within development and connections with the wider community, services and employment opportunities.</b>				
The inland waterway network can play a role in supporting the aims of Policy AP5 and play a valuable role in encouraging people to be more active, (for example, canoeing, walking and cycling along towpaths, sustainable travel). The health and wellbeing of communities is an important consideration, and new development should consider ways opportunities to pursue healthier and more active lifestyles can be maximised. Waterways provide a free to use resources and support the aims of 2(c) and (d). This positive role should be referenced within the policy or its supporting text.	<p>This is a strategic policy that explicitly states the councils support for the health and wellbeing of the district. The specific elements that contribute to our health and wellbeing are dealt with by other policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>It would be more appropriate to add additional supporting text to the Ashby Canal Policy to reference the potential health and wellbeing benefits of the restoration of the Ashby Canal.</p>	No change to policy AP5 but additional supporting text added to Policy IF7 (Ashby Canal) to reference the potential health and wellbeing benefits of the restoration of the Ashby Canal	132	Canal and River Trust
Ensure that no public rights of way are removed due to the development of an area i.e. New Swannington proposed development.	Generally, the retention of public rights of way is preferable. Other Policies in the Local Plan (such as Policy IF1 Development and	No change.	289	Swannington Parish Council

# APPENDIX A – POLICY AP5 (HEALTH AND WELLBEING)

	Infrastructure) support the provision of public footpaths as part of new developments.			
<b>AP5 (2) To achieve this, the Council will: (d) Promote and increase access to, and the protection and improvement of, green and blue spaces, sports facilities and play and recreation opportunities.</b>				
Welcome the inclusion of blue and green infrastructure but could be expanded to explain further the health benefit of good access to high quality green space. Green and blue spaces provide opportunities for more active and healthy lifestyles and therefore have a positive impact on preventing health issues. GI can supply other health benefits through helping address some of the environmental causes of poor health, such as poor air quality (by filtering particulates) and reducing urban summer temperatures by cooling air. The representation includes a list of the elements that GI should seek to achieve. Consider incorporating or cross-referencing these health aspects with Policy IF3 – Green and Blue Infrastructure.	Agree that the incorporation of Green Infrastructure (GI) within development is an important objective, but it is considered that the issue is adequately addressed in other draft policies of the Local Plan.  Additional commentary about Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles & Standards to be added to the supporting text for Policy IF3.	No change.	223	Natural England
There is a requisite for new development to provide and increase access to/to protect and improve green and blue spaces. Green spaces are essential.	Agree that the incorporation of Green Infrastructure (GI) within development is an important objective, but it is considered that the issue is adequately addressed by	No change.	350	Teresa Walker

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP5 (HEALTH AND WELLBEING)

	other policies in the Local Plan.			
<b>AP5 (2) To achieve this, the Council will: e) Maintain and improve accessibility to healthcare, social care, education and community facilities and wider support services.</b>				
To improve accessibility to healthcare, engagement with the ICB is recommended, to inform further refinement of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan as part of the Local Plan review process.	Noted and information/advice from the ICB will feed into an update of the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which is currently being undertaken.	No change.	245, 256	Evolve Planning (Bloor Homes), Evolve Planning (Cameron Homes)
We support the point regarding quality of life can be improved through better access to education and skills.	Noted.	No change.	341	Leicestershire County Council
<b>AP5 (2) To achieve this, the Council will: (f) Prevent negative impacts on residential amenity and wider public safety from noise, ground instability, ground and water contamination, vibration and air quality.</b>				
Particularly welcome this section of the policy.	Noted.	No change.	404	The Environment Agency
<b>AP5 (2) To achieve this, the Council will: (g) Support healthy eating and promote healthy food choices, through opportunities for sustainable food development, such as allotments and community growing places, and controlling the location of, and access to, take away uses.</b>				
This section refers to controlling the location of and access to take away uses. What does this mean? This should refer to a specific policy that provides details on what is and is not acceptable.	In assessing planning applications, the Local Plan needs to be read as whole. Draft Policy Tc2 (Hot Food Takeaway Uses) sets out the policy consideration for determining applications for hot food takeaways. However, agree that the wording of the policy could be	Amend Part (d) to read "Support healthy eating and promote healthy food choices, through opportunities for sustainable food development, such as allotments and community growing places, and controlling <b>managing</b> the	8	JJM Planning

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP5 (HEALTH AND WELLBEING)

	amended to better reflect the intention of the draft policy.	location of, and access to, take away uses”.		
<b>Other comments on Criteria</b>				
Suggest a further criterion (h) is added to AP5 (2) – ensure that rural communities, countryside and the environment are protected from over-development.	Noted. BNG is dealt with in national policy and guidance, in addition to the requirements of draft Policy En1.	No change.	115	Protect Diseworth
<b>General Comments</b>				
It is considered that the proposals at Land at Money Hill accord with all of the measures listed in this policy. As such, broadly supportive of the principle of this policy.	Noted. When assessing proposals, the Council will give consideration to how the scheme can positively contribute to the health and wellbeing of our communities. This approach will be supported by this policy and other policies in the Local Plan.	No change.	214	Stantec (Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land)
Our clients are proactive in creating developments that support resident's health and wellbeing and is an important part of designing a successful development. The Council should consider whether there is a need for a specific health and well-being policy or whether this is a matter already picked up as part of the design and sustainable transport policies.	The inclusion of a specific policy explicitly embeds health and wellbeing within the Local Plan and subsequent decision making. It is considered to represent a balanced approach which ensures that health and wellbeing issues are addressed but without adding significant burdens.	No change.	235	Pegasus Group (Davidsons & Westernrange)

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP5 (HEALTH AND WELLBEING)

<p>Generally, support plans that set out how the Council will achieve health and wellbeing improvements. In its plan preparation the Council should consider health impacts with regard to the level and location of development.</p> <p>Collectively policies should ensure health benefits and limit any negative impacts. Therefore, any development in accordance with the plan should already be contributing positively to the overall healthy objective of that area.</p>	<p>The inclusion of specific policy explicitly embeds health and wellbeing within the Local Plan and subsequent decision making. It is considered to represent a balanced approach which ensures that health and wellbeing issues are addressed but without adding significant burdens.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>237</p>	<p>Home Builders Federation</p>
<p>Recognise the need for development to maintain and improve the health and wellbeing of residents. Health and wellbeing is an important consideration in the creation of high quality, accessible and inclusive communities.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>245, 256</p>	<p>Evolve Planning (Bloor Homes), Evolve Planning (Cameron Homes)</p>
<p>In general terms, a Health and Wellbeing policy is supported from a strategic transport perspective. In terms of the proposed wording, it is suggested that it would be beneficial to explicitly reference provision of walking and cycling infrastructure designed where appropriate to LTN 1/20 as part of new development, both in terms of on-site and off-site provision.</p>	<p>The supporting text to draft Policy IF5 (Transport Infrastructure and New Development) identifies that we are in the process of preparing a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). Para. 1.3.2 of LTN 1/20 notes that the guidance should be applied when identifying the infrastructure required to create good quality cycle networks when preparing a</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP5 (HEALTH AND WELLBEING)

	LCWIP or other local network plan for cycling. As this is a requirement of the LCWIP it is not necessary for this to be duplicated in the Local Plan.			
Improvements in biodiversity and maintaining the rural character of our region is vital for our wellbeing and mental health.	Agree that the incorporation of Green Infrastructure (GI) within development is an important objective. Part (d) of the Policy seeks to promote and increase access to green and blue spaces.	No change.	350	Teresa Walker
Will the building of development be restricted at the weekends and will developers be required to clean roads and keep the dust down during construction?	For some types of development, a Construction Management Plan (CMP) is required as a condition of planning permission. A CMP outlines how a construction project will be managed (including hours of operation), minimising its impact on the environment and surrounding community. Other issues can be managed and enforced through the use of conditions attached to any planning permission granted, for example, require the wheel washing of construction vehicles.	No change.	414	Emily Massey

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP5 (HEALTH AND WELLBEING)

<p>This policy seeks to address Objective 1 of the Local Plan. The supporting text identifies the particular issues faced. The text also acknowledges that health and wellbeing improvements requires more that improving access to medical treatment and services.</p> <p>However, the solutions suggested do not refer to the provision of local facilities, as part of this. If green space is being lost in a community, then the plan should address investment in leisure and recreational facilities as part of new infrastructure provided. Proposed development in Castle Donington is going to reduce the opportunities for walking and cycling therefore the plan should include investment in the provision of leisure facilities such as a leisure centre in order to provide an opportunity for the community to participate in an active lifestyle. Removal of greenspaces will have a long-term impact on the mental and physical health of the community at a cost to the public purse much more then considering investment in facilities that support health and wellbeing from the outset.</p>	<p>This is a strategic policy that explicitly states the councils support for the health and wellbeing of the district. The specific elements that contribute to our health and wellbeing are dealt with by other policies in the Local Plan including (but not limited to), Development and Infrastructure (Policy IF1, Community Facilities (IF2), Green and Blue Infrastructure (IF3) and Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities (IF4).</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>419</p>	<p>Clare Taylor</p>
--	---	-------------------	------------	---------------------



# APPENDIX A – POLICY AP6 (HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS)

CHAPTER: 5	POLICY NUMBER: AP6	POLICY NAME: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS
------------	--------------------	--

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<b>SUPPORT FOR POLICY</b>				
Support the development of Health Impact Assessment criteria and will support Public Health (Leicestershire) when required.	Noted.	A draft policy has been prepared.	45	LLR ICB
Although this policy has not yet been written the principle is strongly supported.	Noted.	A draft policy has been prepared.	92	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
The approach is agreed, and Public Health will continue to work closely NWLDC on the HIA approach to achieve a streamlined straightforward process. A screening tool has been developed to provide clarity over when and how HIAs would be used, and it would be objectively applied to reduce bureaucracy.	Public Health Leicestershire have developed a HIA template for Leicestershire that can be referenced in local plans. It is considered that a HIA policy will enable development proposals to demonstrate their impact on health and wellbeing and provide a mechanism for any positive impacts to be secured and any negative implications to be mitigated.  A draft policy has been prepared that sets out the thresholds and location of development identifying	A draft policy has been prepared.	341	Leicestershire County Council
Agree the need to include a policy relating to Health Impact Assessments (HIA). The policy must be clear on which development proposals an initial Health Impact Screening Statement will be required. The policy must be clear on local triggers for a HIA. Support further consideration being given to this policy and reserve the right to provide further comment at the next stage of the Local Plan process.			245, 256	Evolve Planning obo Bloor Homes, Evolve Planning obo Cameron Homes
Consider that trigger 2 would be the most suitable as it would ensure localised			214	Stantec UK Ltd obo Bloor

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP6 (HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS)

standards for all applications of a particular size across the District, providing certainty for developers. The identification of a numerical threshold, such as the number of dwellings, would provide consistency.	<p>when a HIA Screening Statement will be required and subsequently used to determine whether a Health Impact Assessment is required.</p> <p>The draft policy requires all residential proposals of 50 or more dwellings; all major non-residential developments and development located in an identified Area of Concern in the Leicestershire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (latest edition) to undertake a HIA Screening Statement.</p> <p>The threshold of 50 or more dwellings is considered reasonable and manageable and not too onerous for the small/medium developers.</p> <p>Supporting text will be drafted to provide the context and set out in more detail the requirements of the policy.</p>			Homes East Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
---	--	--	--	--

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP6 (HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS)

<b>HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS ALREADY IN THE PPG</b>				
There is no adopted standardised HIA in England which enables local authorities to decide what the process will look like or when it should be required. Health Impact Assessments (HIA) are covered within the PPG which identifies them as a 'useful tool to use where there are expected to be significant impacts', but it also outlines that the Local Plan should consider wider health issues in an area and ensure that policies respond to these. As such Local Plans should already have considered the impact of development on the health and well-being of their communities and set out policies to address any concerns. Consequently, where a development is in line with policies in the local plan a HIA should not be necessary.	It is considered that a HIA policy will enable development proposals to demonstrate their impact on health and wellbeing and provide a mechanism for any positive impacts to be secured and any negative implications to be mitigated. The thresholds applied and the HIA process have been prepared taking into account local circumstances and in collaboration with Public Health Leicestershire.	A draft policy has been prepared.	147, 214, 237	Gladman Developments Ltd, Stantec UK Ltd obo Bloor Homes East Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land, Homes Builders Federation
<b>EVIDENCE FOR INDIVIDUAL SCHEMES</b>				
The requirement for HIA for development proposals that meet a particular numerical threshold without any specific evidence that an individual scheme is likely to have a significant impact upon the health and wellbeing of the local population is not justified by reference to the PPG. Only if a significant adverse impact on health and wellbeing is identified should a HIA be required, which sets out measures to substantially mitigate the impact.	A draft policy has been prepared that sets out the thresholds and location of development identifying when a HIA Screening Statement will be required and subsequently used to determine whether a Health Impact Assessment is required.	A draft policy has been prepared.	237	Homes Builders Federation

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP6 (HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS)

<b>OBJECTS TO POLICY</b>				
Such a policy is unnecessary and objects to the principle of the inclusion of a draft policy, and any requirement at planning application stage for a Health Impact Assessment (HIA). The formulation and end result of HIAs is effectively the collation and duplication of information already submitted as part of any major planning application (i.e. Air Quality Assessment, BREEAM Pre-Assessment, Energy/Sustainability Report, Flood Risk Assessment, Noise Assessment, Transport Assessment etc.). This draft policy would lead to a further layer of bureaucracy providing no additional benefit and resulting in unnecessary time and cost implications for the applicant and the Council to assess information which is already readily available elsewhere via the technical information submitted in support of a planning application. SEGRO therefore considers such a policy unnecessary and should not be included in the Draft Local Plan.	<p>Noted. It is considered that a HIA policy will enable development proposals to demonstrate their impact on health and wellbeing and provide a mechanism for any positive impacts to be secured and any negative implications to be mitigated.</p> <p>A draft policy has been prepared that sets out the thresholds and location of development identifying when a HIA Screening Statement will be required and subsequently used to determine whether a Health Impact Assessment is required.</p>	A draft policy has been prepared.	290	Delta Planning obo SEGRO
<b>HIAs AND OLDER PERSONS HOUSING</b>				
In terms of older person's housing the policy should recognise the health benefits that delivering older people's housing can bring to individuals as well as help reduce the demands exerted on Health and Social Services and other care facilities. The 'Healthier and Happier' Report details the fiscal and wellbeing benefits of building more homes for later living. These include fiscal savings to the NHS and social care services	Noted. It is considered that a HIA policy will enable development proposals to demonstrate their impact on health and wellbeing and provide a mechanism for any positive impacts to be secured and any negative implications to be mitigated. This could	A draft policy has been prepared.	553	The Planning Bureau obo McCarthy Stone

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP6 (HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS)

<p>as well as increased happiness and life satisfaction of residents. Specifically designed housing for older people offers significant opportunities to enable residents to be as independent as possible in a safe and warm environment. Recommendation: For the plan to be in line with national policy and effective the following wording should be added the policy area to recognise the health benefits of older persons housing. <i>Specialist Housing for older people has a number of health benefits and proposals for such schemes will not be required to submit a Health Impact Assessment.</i></p>	<p>identify the health benefits of providing older people's housing.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

# APPENDIX A – POLICY AP8 (SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS)

CHAPTER: 5	POLICY NUMBER: AP8	POLICY NAME: SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS
------------	--------------------	---

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<b>(1) All major development proposals will include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water run-off unless it can be clearly demonstrated that: (a) SuDS are not technically, operationally or financially deliverable or viable and that surface water drainage issues from the development can be mitigated in an alternative way;</b>				
This policy is essential. Concerned that part 1 includes financial and viability loopholes which could allow developers to avoid inclusion of a SUDS scheme where it is technically feasible and necessary. Remove the words “financially deliverable or viable”. If SUDS is needed and it is not financially deliverable or viable then planning permission should be refused.	The NPPF has been revised since the draft policy was published. The NPPF now requires any application that could affect drainage on or around a site to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, that are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal. As such it is considered that Part (1) of the draft policy is re-worded and that Parts (1)(a) and (1)(b) are deleted.	Part (1) of the policy be reworded to read “ <del>All major development proposals will include</del> <b>Development proposals that could affect drainage on or around a site should incorporate</b> Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water run-off <b>consistent with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, or its successor.</b>  Delete Parts (1)(a) and (1)(b) of the policy	92	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
Supports the provision of SuDS in appropriate locations, where it is viable. The policy aligns with NPPF para. 175.	Noted. The NPPF has been revised since the draft policy was published. The NPPF now	See response above to representation 92.	185, 186	Marie Stacey obo Clowes, Marie Stacey

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP8 (SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS)

	requires any application that could affect drainage on or around a site to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, that are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal. As such it is considered that Part (1) of the draft policy is re-worded and that Parts (1)(a) and (1)(b) are deleted.			obo Wilson Bowden
The District's proposed approach to prioritising SUDs is noted. The flexibility built into the draft policy wording to take account of viability or site-specific environmental issues is welcomed and should form part of the final wording for this policy.	Noted. The NPPF has been revised since the draft policy was published. The NPPF now requires any application that could affect drainage on or around a site to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, that are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal. As such it is considered that Part (1) of the draft policy is re-worded and that Parts (1)(a) and (1)(b) are deleted.	See response above to representation 92.	214	Stantec obo Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Part (1) Should the word major be removed and read ALL development. Replacing permeable land with concrete means water will go elsewhere with the possible risk of flooding. Relevant particularly to current proposal on St Georges Hill, Swannington.	Noted. The NPPF has been revised since the draft policy was published. The NPPF now requires any application that could affect drainage on or around a site to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, that are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal. As such it is considered that Part	See response above to representation 92.	289	Swannington Parish Council

# APPENDIX A – POLICY AP8 (SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS)

	(1) of the draft policy is re-worded and that Parts (1)(a) and (1)(b) are deleted.			
The policy needs to be wary of Developers subdividing a plot into separate “phases”, each with its own separate planning application, to circumnavigate the need for ponds and soakaways.	Noted. The provision of SuDS is usually secured through planning conditions which ensure the initial implementation of SuDS, and S106 agreements are used to secure their long-term management and maintenance.	No change.	175	Oakthorpe, Doninsthorpe and Acresford Parish Council
The Policy should set out a clear definition of major development.	Noted, as the NPPF has been revised since the draft policy was published, the changes the Part (1) of the policy detailed above include the proposed deletion of the word ‘major’.	See response above to representation 92.	175	Oakthorpe, Doninsthorpe and Acresford Parish Council
This policy is highly problematic as we know the developers backed up by Freeport and Dept of Levelling up sanction, can override local planners concerns or objections. This policy states if not financially deliverable surface water can be mitigated in an alternative way. This could allow a reduced level of mitigation. If that were to occur residents in Diseworth could face far greater flood risk due to these developments. We demand the policy is tightened up to “surface water drainage issues from the development MUST be mitigated in an alternative way”.	Noted, the NPPF has been revised since the draft policy was published and as such it is proposed that Part (1)(a) be deleted.	See response above to representation 92.	199	Louis Della-Porter obo Long Whatton & Diseworth Flood Working Group (FWG)



## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP8 (SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS)

Paragraph 5.71 suggests that minor development is not required to use SuDS. All development must consider flood risk and water quality, and as such, SuDs should always be considered for development of any size. Suggest removing the word 'major' as it is relevant for all development including minor.	Noted, as the NPPF has been revised since the draft policy was published, the changes the Part (1) of the policy detailed above include the proposed deletion of the word 'major'.	See response above to representation 92.	341	Leicestershire County Council
Part 1a - The statement relating to not being financially deliverable makes SuDS sound more optional than it is. SuDS in the form of attenuation must be implemented in order to comply with Policy AP7. The wording should ensure that it is clear that cost constraints do not impact on the ability to meeting Policy AP7 and to provide adequate treatment to the run-off. It is unclear what NWLDC considers to be SuDS and this falls below the standards set by national policy and draft policy AP7. SuDS attenuation in the form of below ground tanks and treatment though mechanical means should still be implemented at a minimum.	Noted, the NPPF has been revised since the draft policy was published and as such it is proposed that Part (1)(a) be deleted.	See response above to representation 92.	341	Leicestershire County Council
<b>(2) All schemes with the inclusion on SuDS should demonstrate that they have considered all four areas of good SuDS design; quantity, quality, amenity and biodiversity.</b>				
Part 2 - Consider removing the words "with the inclusion of SuDS" in line with our recommendations against Part 1a.	Noted, the NPPF has been revised since the draft policy was published and as such it is proposed that Part (2) of the draft policy be deleted.	Delete Part (2) of the draft policy.	341	Leicestershire County Council

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP8 (SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS)

<b>(3) Where appropriate, every effort should be made to link SuDS into wider initiatives to enhance green infrastructure, improve water quality and benefit wildlife and biodiversity.</b>				
Natural England welcomes this policy. Agree that a multi-functional approach to SuDS should be encouraged and take opportunities to incorporate features that enhance and maintain biodiversity as part of a coherent green and blue infrastructure approach. GI has many benefits including contributing to sustainable drainage at local and catchment scales. Guidance on sustainable drainage systems, including the design criteria, can be found in the CIRIA SuDS Manual (2015) C753.	Noted, the NPPF has been revised since the draft policy was published and as such it is proposed that Part (3) be deleted. The NPPF (para. 182) requires SuDS to provide multifunctional benefits wherever possible, through facilitating improvements in water quality and biodiversity. As this requirement is set out in the NPPF it does not need to be repeated in local policy	No change.	223	Natural England
<b>(4) Arrangements must be put in place for the management and maintenance of the SuDS over the whole period during which they are needed.</b>				
Suggest that reference should be made to the need to ensure that such schemes are safe. RoSPA says, “SuDS can, if not well designed, present a significant risk to the children, residents and general public that will interact with them.”	There are National standards for sustainable drainage systems (July 2025) which require public safety measures to be included.  SuDS and safety regulations in the UK, particularly England, are governed by the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (2025), the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, and the Construction (Design and Management)	No change.	92	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP8 (SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS)

	Regulations 2015 (CDM Regulations). These regulations establish a framework for the safe design, construction, and long-term management of SuDS.			
Based on recent experience, we strongly recommend that arrangements for the management and maintenance of the SUDS over the whole period are needed and should be contained in a S106 Agreement. The absence of proper management and/or maintenance can have serious repercussions for properties located in flood zones 2 and 3.	Noted. The provision of SuDS is usually secured through planning conditions which ensure the initial implementation of SuDS, and S106 agreements are used to secure their long-term management and maintenance.	No change.	213	Osgathorpe Parish Council
Would developers be legally bound to deliver safe flood risk mitigation, principally through SuDS, throughout the full life of their respective developments?	The provision of SuDS is usually secured through planning conditions which ensure the initial implementation of SuDS, and S106 agreements are used to secure their long-term management and maintenance.	No change.	199	Louis Della-Porter obo Long Whatton & Diseworth Flood Working Group (FWG)
Part 4 - Maintenance should include all drainage on-site that is not adopted by the third party (i.e. highway drainage or water company adopted drainage). This will also include existing drainage retained on-site such as ditches. Consider rewording to something along the lines of: <i>Arrangements must be put in place for the management and maintenance of</i>	Agree that the wording of the draft policy could be amended to reflect the suggested wording.	Additional criterion (c) to be added to part (2) of the draft policy: <b>“Ensure arrangements are put in place for the management and maintenance of the proposed surface water drainage system over the whole period</b>	341	Leicestershire County Council

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP8 (SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS)

<i>the proposed surface water drainage system and any retained existing surface water drainage features over the whole period during which they are needed.</i>		<b>during which they are needed”.</b>		
<b>COMMENTS ON SUPPORTING PARAGRAPHS</b>				
Paragraph 5.69 states “Leicestershire County Council is the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and is the lead organisation for providing advice and guidance on surface water runoff and run off rates”. This should be strengthened to include the need to seek pre-application advice from the LLFA.	Noted and agree that the supporting text should be strengthened to include the need for applicants to seek pre-application advice from the LLFA.	The supporting text will be amended to reflect the need for applicants to seek pre-application advice from the LLFA.	341	Leicestershire County Council
It appears that the report has not been updated to reference that latest version of NPPF (December 2023). All references throughout the report should be updated. For example, paragraphs 5.70 and 5.71 reference NPPF paragraph 167 however the correct paragraph is now paragraph 175.	Noted.	The supporting text will be updated to reflect the revisions to the NPPF.	341	Leicestershire County Council
Paragraph 5.74 is out of date. It is currently unclear if and when Schedule 3 will be implemented.	Noted.	The supporting text will be updated.	341	Leicestershire County Council

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP8 (SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS)

<b>OTHER COMMENTS</b>				
<b>OVERLOADED DRAINAGE SYSTEMS</b>				
Drainage systems are under massive pressure and cannot cope. There are impacts from surface water from “small” developments not installing ponds/soakaways but relying instead on the already overloaded sewage system. Local streams are polluted by run off from an overloaded water treatment plant - or other sewage related problem. Any new development should consider sustainable drainage, as appropriate, such that an already overburdened sewage system is not further compromised.	The NPPF makes clear that granting planning permission should not lead to increased flood risk elsewhere (paragraph 170). The inclusion of SuDS solutions will control and manage surface water run-off. Utilities companies have a statutory duty to provide water and sewage to all new developments. It is their responsibility to ensure that there is sufficient capacity in the system to accommodate new development, even if this involves having to undertake improvements to existing infrastructure. If there are capacity constraints, this may impact the timing of development rather than the principle of development.	No change.	175, 180, 565	Oakthorpe, Doninsthorpe and Acresford Parish Council, Ashby Woulds Town Council, Mark Payne
<b>IMPACT ON DISEWORTH</b>				
Diseworth suffers from repeated flooding due to land run-off from a large catchment area plus discharges from East Midland Airport holding ponds. This is already well documented with LCC Flood Management team. Any proposed development in the catchment area (not just the village	Noted. The NPPF makes clear that granting planning permission should not lead to increased flood risk elsewhere (paragraph 170). The inclusion of SuDS solutions will control and manage surface water run-off.	No change.	336	Kevin Walker

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP8 (SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS)

boundary) should help eliminate this risk by design.				
<p>Comments relate to the potential impact of the proposed development of land around Isley Walton [IW1] and south of the A453 [EMP90]. Long Whatton &amp; Diseworth Flood Working Group (FWG) is a volunteer group of residents who work reduce the risk of flooding to homes in Diseworth. The two proposed developments either side of Diseworth are of such a large scale, and in terms of surface water management, precisely in the wrong location. Mitigation will reduce the risk, but would it be guaranteed to be reliable and cost effective over the long-term?</p> <p>We demand NWLDC planners commission independent baselines audits to ensure impacts are not underestimated. As a minimum, all water runoffs should be measured over a full yearly cycle both on site and directly in Diseworth. The granular detail specific to Diseworth needs to be accurately measured and evidenced over a full weather cycle. To comply with [Reg 18 5.61], the Local Plan should clearly set out a policy framework to assess, model and manage the cumulative effects of multiple large-scale developments as a</p>	<p>The NPPF makes clear that granting planning permission should not lead to increased flood risk elsewhere (paragraph 170). Managing the risk of flooding from surface water is the responsibility of Lead Local Flood Authorities. LCC (in its role as the LLFA) prepared the Diseworth and Long Whatton Catchment Study and subsequently the Long Whatton and Diseworth Flood Risk Mitigation and Resilience Study in response to flooding in Diseworth and Long Whatton. Additional criteria has been agreed to be added to Policy IW1 in relation to surface water run-off.</p>	No change.	199	Louis Della-Porter obo Long Whatton & Diseworth Flood Working Group (FWG)

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP8 (SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS)

whole for the small sensitive locale of Diseworth. We call for a single system level water catchment evaluation, in principle as defined by SCIMAP, from which any single or separate planning application has to be impact assessed against.				
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>				
Comment relates to how CD10 will adhere to Policy AP8.	Noted.	No change.	183	Philip Ivory
The provision of SuDS is noted as a requirement within the proposed Local Plan allocation for Clowes' employment site at Land West at Hilltop Farm, Castle Donington through the proposed employment allocation site EMP89.	Noted.	No change.	185	Marie Stacey obo Clowes
As a part of the allocation requirements for Money Hill, SuDS will be delivered onsite within the wider scheme.	Noted	No change	214	Stantec obo Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP9 (WATER EFFICIENCY)

CHAPTER: 5	POLICY NUMBER: AP9	POLICY NAME: WATER EFFICIENCY
------------	--------------------	-------------------------------

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<b>Support Policy</b>				
Support.	Noted.	No change.	92	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
We welcome the inclusion of this section and are particularly supportive of the wording throughout. Fully support the strong and prescriptive nature of the Draft Policy.	Noted.	No change.	404	Environment Agency
Supports the Council's intention to strive for higher water efficiency standards given that the area is classified as one under serious water stress, and note that the development industry already works to high standards in this regard, including the newly introduced Environmental Improvement Plan. In that regard, the requirement for new residential developments to meet the optional water efficiency standard of 110 l/p/d is justified.	Noted.	No change.	187, 656	Sam Perkins Define Planning and Design obo Bloor Homes Ltd, Sam Parkins (Define Planning and Design) obo Rosconn Strategic Land



# APPENDIX A – POLICY AP9 (WATER EFFICIENCY)

<b>(1) All proposals for new residential development are required to achieve the national optional water efficiency standard of a maximum of 110 litres of water per person per day, this will be secured by a planning condition.</b>				
There is also no evidence that the impact on viability has been tested. The policy's impact on viability will need to be tested and confirmed in order that it does not hinder the development of housing.	This policy is one to be tested through the forthcoming whole-plan viability assessment which will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan. It is proposed that this policy is agreed at this stage subject to the findings of the whole-plan viability study.	No change.	147, 184, 193, 211, 216, 235	Gladman Developments, Clare Clarke Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management, Alan Siviter Pegasus Group obo Hallam Land Management, Clare Clarke Pegasus Group obo Davidsons Developments Limited, Harry Clayton Pegasus Group obo Westernrange Limited, Clare Clarke Pegasus Group obo Davidsons Developments Limited and Westernrange Limited

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP9 (WATER EFFICIENCY)

<p>Building Regulations (Part G) require all new dwellings to achieve a 125 litres per day per person. The draft policy goes beyond the current national requirements and is therefore not supported. Water efficiency is most appropriately dealt with through Building Regulations. There is insufficient evidence provided to demonstrate a local need for a lower requirement.</p>	<p>The Housing: optional technical standards guidance sets out how planning authorities can gather evidence to set optional requirements. One of the primary sources of evidence to support a tighter water efficiency standard for new dwellings is the Environment Agency water stressed areas 2021 classification. This identifies areas of serious water stress. NWL is identified as being within an area classed as 'seriously water stressed'. As such it is considered appropriate to seek to meet the optional tighter water efficiency standard. The Environment Agency are supportive of the policy and there has not been any objection to the policy from relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Some minor wording changes are proposed to Part (1) of the policy for clarity.</p>	<p>Amend Part (1) of the draft policy to read:  <del>All proposals for new residential development are required to achieve the</del> <b>As part of proposals for residential development applicants will be required to submit evidence to demonstrate that the</b> national optional water efficiency standard of a maximum of 110 litres of water per person per day <b>can be met</b>. This will be secured by a planning condition.</p>	<p>184, 193, 211, 216, 235</p>	<p>Clare Clarke Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management, Alan Siviter Pegasus Group obo Hallam Land Management, Clare Clarke Pegasus Group obo Davidsons Developments Limited, Harry Clayton Pegasus Group obo Westernrange Limited, Clare Clarke Pegasus Group obo Davidsons Developments Limited and Westernrange Limited</p>
<p>The evidence provided is for the wider Severn Trent Water area and does not appear to be supported by consultation with key stakeholders such as Severn Trent Water or the Environment Agency. A clear local need should be established through interaction not solely with the Environment Agency but with local water</p>			<p>147, 184, 193, 211, 216, 235, 237</p>	<p>Gladman Development, Clare Clarke Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management, Alan Siviter Pegasus Group</p>

# APPENDIX A – POLICY AP9 (WATER EFFICIENCY)

and sewerage companies and catchment partnership. The Council's evidence does not demonstrate a clear local need in line with the requirements of the PPG.				obo Hallam Land Management, Clare Clarke Pegasus Group obo Davidsons Developments Limited, Harry Clayton Pegasus Group obo Westernrange Limited, Clare Clarke Pegasus Group obo Davidsons Developments Limited and Westernrange Limited, Home Builders Federation
It is noted and welcomed that NWLDC are not seeking to impose water efficiency standards over and above the national requirements. However, it is considered that some form of flexibility should be included within the policy wording to ensure that new residential developments are not restricted or limited on accounts of water efficiency where viability or site-specific constraints impact the ability to achieve this.	This policy requires residential development to demonstrate that the national optional tighter water efficiency standard of 110 litres of water per person be met. This policy is one to be tested through the forthcoming whole-plan viability assessment which will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan. It is proposed that this policy is agreed at this stage subject to the findings of the whole-plan viability study.	No change.	214	Scarlett Lambeth Stantec obo Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP9 (WATER EFFICIENCY)

<p>We are pleased to see that the optional standard of 110l/p/d for residential development has been recognised as being required for new residential dwellings in the district since the area has been classed as 'seriously water stressed'.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>404</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>
<p><b>(2) All proposals for new non-residential buildings are required to demonstrate that BREEAM excellent credits for WAT 01 are being targeted and this will be secured by a planning condition. An assessment of the building's water efficiency performance should be carried out by a BREEAM approved assessor using the BREEAM Wat 01 calculator, or equivalent best practice standard, and should be submitted as part of a planning application.</b></p>				
<p>The proposed requirement to achieve BREEAM Excellent for the Water 01 (WAT01) would result in a number of small-scale applications having to undertake an assessment of water efficiency which would be over the top. The wording of the current application would catch applications such as equestrian uses, extensions to sports pavilions, small rural offices etc. The policy should only be applied over a specific threshold to ensure that it does not apply for smaller outbuildings that would not be able to achieve such a standard or should be a standard planning condition which wouldn't result in a significant burden on applicants and the LPA.</p>	<p>Noted and it is acknowledged that Part (2) of the policy could be burdensome for smaller developments. As such it is proposed that Part (2) of the draft policy be amended to refer to major non-residential development and a new Part (3) be added to the draft policy that sets out requirements for other development proposals captured by the planning process.</p>	<p>Amend Part (2) to read:  <del>(2) All Major non-residential proposals for new non-residential buildings are</del> <b>involving the extension, replacement or creation of new non-residential floorspace or a combination thereof will be</b> required to demonstrate that BREEAM excellent credits for WAT 01...</p> <p>Add a new Part (3) to the policy to read:  <b>(4) For all other development proposals captured by the planning process</b></p>	<p>8, 187, 656</p>	<p>James Mattley,          Sam Perkins          Define Planning and Design obo          Bloor Homes Ltd, Sam Parkins (Define Planning and Design) obo Rosconn Strategic Land</p>

# APPENDIX A – POLICY AP9 (WATER EFFICIENCY)

		<b>including, change of use, conversions, extensions and refurbishments, applicants will need to demonstrate that measures have been incorporated to achieve the highest level of water efficiency possible.</b>		
Generally, support the provision of BREEAM excellent standards for Water Efficiency credits in alignment with WAT 01.	Noted.	No change.	185, 186	Marie Stacey Pegasus Group obo Clowes Developments (UK) Limited, Marie Stacey Pegasus Group obo Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd
It should be noted that at outline application stage for industrial and warehousing units, the units will not necessarily be pre-let and therefore the occupier will not be known. There will be instances where proposals will need to be flexible to react to the market, which	The draft Policy does not specify the stage of the planning application process where an assessment is required, this does allow some flexibility. It could, for example, be a condition of an outline	No change.	185, 186	Marie Stacey Pegasus Group obo Clowes Developments (UK) Limited, Marie Stacey Pegasus Group

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP9 (WATER EFFICIENCY)

<p>will all have a bearing on the final specification of sanitaryware components and the calculations for the BREEAM WAT 01 calculator, or equivalent best practice standard. The assessment cannot therefore be submitted as part of a planning application and therefore should be required prior to occupation rather submitted as part of a planning application. The draft policy wording, in particular criterion (2), should be updated to take this into consideration.</p>	<p>permission that requires an BREEAM WAT01 assessment to be undertaken at a later stage of the application process.</p>			<p>obo Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd</p>
<p>Consider including BREEAM WAT02 to this requirement as this provides a credit for the installation of water butts which can reduce the amount of rainfall entering the surface water drainage system and potentially reducing flooding risk.</p>	<p>BREEAM WAT 01 is concerned with water consumption and encourages the reduction of water consumption by ensuring efficient design and specifying water efficient equipment. BREEAM WAT02 is concerned with water monitoring and encourages the effective management and monitoring of water consumption by providing clear data on water use. Policy AP9 addresses water efficiency and as such WAT 01 is considered the most appropriate measure</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>
<p>Is the use of BREEAM Wat 01 Calculator approved assessors providing another opportunity for</p>	<p>Noted and it is acknowledged that Part (2) of the policy could be burdensome for smaller developments. As detailed</p>	<p>See proposed wording changes above to Part (2) and the proposed</p>	<p>396</p>	<p>Siobhan Dillon</p>

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP9 (WATER EFFICIENCY)

scams/bribes/squeezing the small developers?	above it is proposed that Part (2) of the draft policy be amended to refer to major non-residential development and a new Part (3) be added to the draft policy that sets out requirements for other development proposals captured by the planning process.	new Part (3) of the draft policy.		
Pleased to see that water efficiency in non-residential development will be required to demonstrate that Excellent BREEAM credits for WAT 01 are being targeted.	Noted.	No change.	404	Environment Agency
<b>COMMENTS ON SUPPORTING PARAGRAPHS</b>				
5.79 – Looking at the report, it seems a huge amount of the country is within the high water stressed category. This seems a ‘broad brush’ categorisation. Does Severn Trent provide a clearer understanding about how NWLDC is water stressed? Is this due to infrastructure failure, too much development or rainfall issues? Should we be looking to understand the true reasons for the high water stress? Or even if the category is appropriate to NWLDC.	The Environment Agency (EA) establishes areas of serious water stress. This designation is made based on the EA’s assessment of current and future water usage, including climate change scenarios. The Environment Agency provides recommendations, and the Secretary of State ultimately makes the final decision on which areas are classified as experiencing serious water stress. The classification is particularly relevant for water companies who produce water resource management plans.	No change.	396	Siobhan Dillon

## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP9 (WATER EFFICIENCY)

<p>The supporting commentary could be strengthened to illustrate benefits beyond the individual household level, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water efficiency measures will contribute to a reduction in the per customer carbon footprint of the water industry which are incurred through the abstraction, treatment, and conveyance of clean and wastewater.</li> <li>Water efficiency measures will help ensure sustainable management of existing water network infrastructure by relieving capacity stresses.</li> </ul> <p>Also, consideration should be given for any future version of the report to state that water efficiency measures are required to reduce the associated impact of a growing population accessing an already stressed resource.</p>	<p>Noted and agree that the supporting text could identify the benefits of water efficiency measures.</p>	<p>The supporting text will be amended to include reference to the benefits of water efficiency measures.</p>	<p>404</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>
<p><b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b></p>				
<p>It is considered that the measures relating to water efficiency could be included within a wider Climate Change policy.</p>	<p>The Local Plan includes policies concerned with mitigating the impacts of climate change, these include draft Policy AP3 (renewable energy), AP4 (reducing carbon emissions) as well as AP7, AP8 and AP9. These would be applied when determining planning applications and as such it is considered that climate change is adequately address in the</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>



## APPENDIX A – POLICY AP9 (WATER EFFICIENCY)

	draft Local Plan. A separate policy on water efficiency is considered the appropriate approach.			
Draft Policy AP9 is unnecessary because it duplicates national requirements.	Policy AP9 is considered necessary as it sets the local requirements for water efficiency.	No change.	161	Jenny Adams Mather Jamie obo The Trustees of Lord Crawshaw 1997 Discretionary Settlement (the Whatton Estate)

This page is intentionally left blank

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H2 (HOUSING COMMITMENTS)

### RESPONSES TO PROPOSED POLICIES

CHAPTER: 6	POLICY NUMBER: H2	POLICY NAME: HOUSING COMMITMENTS		
MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
<b>Principle of policy</b>				
Support in principle	Noted	No change	92; 183	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council; Turley (Clowes Developments Redrow Homes & Wilson Estates)
[Support in principle but reserve the right to comment at Regulation 19 stage]	Noted	No change	182; 232	Boyer Planning (Redrow Homes); Stantec UK (Bloor Homes and Taylor Wimpey)
[It is not necessary to have a policy setting out commitments, these sites should be shown in the housing trajectory. As commitments they do not need a policy to make provision for their development as they already have planning permission.]	Yes, committed sites will be shown/accounted for in the housing trajectory at Regulation 19. Policy H2 is proposed to provide clarity / support for the renewal of any lapsed planning permissions.	No change	184; 193; 211; 216; 235	Pegasus Group (Hallam Land Management); Pegasus Group (Davidsons); Pegasus Group (Westernrange); Pegasus Group (Davidsons & Westernrange)
<b>Sites to be referenced in policy</b>				
[Appendix A makes reference to Money Hill and its status as under construction / Local Plan allocation. The recognition of the Site as an ongoing allocation is welcomed].	Noted	No change	214	Stantec UK (Bloor Homes and Taylor Wimpey)

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H2 (HOUSING COMMITMENTS)

[Any commitments prior to 1st April 2020 should be excluded from the table as they fall outside of the plan period and only cause confusion.]	The policy would include commitments that are expected to contribute towards the Council's housing land supply during the plan period. It would not include completed or under construction sites.	No change	232; 392	Stantec UK (Caddick Land); Cora
Should Appendix A include Swannington Neighbourhood Plan allocation of 12 houses?	Appendix A showed housing commitments as at 1 April 2023. This site was granted outline permission for 14 dwellings in April 2025. The list of commitments will be updated as part of the Regulation 19 plan.	No change	289	Swannington Parish Council
As the plan emerges the deliverability of existing commitments should be tested to ensure that they continue to represent a viable option for inclusion within overall numbers. Further it is noted that the Money Hill housing numbers are included within both commitments and allocations. To provide clarity Table 2 should be adjusted to ensure there is no opportunity for double counting.	This deliverability of commitments is assessed annually as part of the Council's five year housing land supply assessment, in line with the definitions of 'deliverable' and 'developable' in the <a href="#">NPPE</a> . There has been no double counting for Money Hill.	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council (landowner)

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H2 (HOUSING COMMITMENTS)

Existing commitments				
[Request for housing commitments in Kegworth to become a sustainable and integrated part of Kegworth by providing homes suited to older people (e.g. bungalows); providing sports pitches, allotments, cycling and walking links and play areas; a mix of housing including affordable housing and provision for first time buyers]	<p>‘Commitments’ are sites with planning permission or sites with a resolution (from members of the Planning Committee) to grant planning permission.</p> <p>The two commitments in Kegworth already have planning permission and Section 106 agreements requiring financial contributions to offsite facilities and the provision of onsite sports pitches.</p> <p>Both have reserved matters approval (detailed design), although an alternative full application is pending for one of the sites and the other reserved matters approval was not made by a housebuilder so could be the subject of a new planning application in due course. New planning applications need to be subject to updated assessments and be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</p>	At Regulation 19, confirm in Policy H2 that if a new planning application is required, it will be determined in accordance with the policies in the new Local Plan, will need to be accompanied by updated planning assessments and will take account any relevant material considerations at the time the application is determined.	128	Carol Sewell
[Specific reviews should be carried out of the two committed Kegworth sites before they are implemented, including measures to connect the new developments with the rest of Kegworth for better social cohesion, health, and commercial viability; provision of public open space and sports facilities, in particular full-size pitches and team facilities; new noise and air quality assessments to reflect the growth that has taken place since permission was granted; and a review of supermarket floor space in Kegworth per head of population]			134	Kegworth Parish Council
[The existing commitments in Kegworth would benefit from having additional services nearer than the ‘town’ centre]			364; 365; 379; 382	Paul Sewell; Sophie Sewell; Fern Sewell; Kirstyn Sewell

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H2 (HOUSING COMMITMENTS)

<p>[The Computer Centre Site should be allocated for retail and leisure. The site itself should have a mix of housing, especially to cater for older people as the provision in Kegworth is poor, with new estates recently building no bungalows. I would like to see the original plan of sports pitches, a pavilion and allotments maintained in any new plans.</p>	<p>This issue was addressed at the <a href="#">11 June 2025 Local Plan Committee</a>, in relation to Policy Ec5 (Existing Employment Areas). <a href="#">Appendix B</a> of the report (pages 10-12) responded to these comments in detail. with policy reps in June – see pages 10-12 in the appendix to the June report. Appendix B</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>382</p>	<p>Kirstyn Sewell</p>
<p><b>Other</b></p>				
<p>[The committed supply includes sites currently held up due to nutrient neutrality issues. These sites may prove slow to come forward, however, to boost delivery early in the plan period the inclusion of a 10% uplift is sensible to provide flexibility of supply. It is vital to ensure there is a supply of deliverable sites to meet needs early on in the plan period. This means identifying sites outside of the River Mease catchment, in locations such as Kegworth]</p>	<p>Noted, this is not an issue for this policy, but the Regulation 19 plan will be accompanied by a housing trajectory and needs to demonstrate a five year housing land supply.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>232</p>	<p>Stantec UK (Caddick Land)</p>

**APPENDIX B – POLICY H2 (HOUSING COMMITMENTS)**

[More housing of different types and in different places is needed to give people choice, help the economy, and make homes affordable. If councils keep blocking rural developments, housing issues won't be solved or updated to meet 21 <sup>st</sup> century needs like climate change.]	These comments are more relevant to Policy S1 and H1. Similar comments were made in respect of Policy S1 and were addressed at the <a href="#">14 August 2024 Local Plan Committee (Appendix B)</a> and Policy H1 (Housing Strategy) will be presented to a future date of this committee.	No change	422	CLA
[Detailed comments relating to housing requirement and distribution]			656	Define Planning & Design (Rosconn Strategic Land)

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

### RESPONSES TO PROPOSED POLICIES

<b>CHAPTER: 6</b>	<b>POLICY NUMBBER: H8</b>	<b>POLICY NAME: HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH</b>
-------------------	---------------------------	---

<b>MAIN ISSUES RAISED</b>	<b>COUNCIL RESPONSE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>RESPONDENT ID</b>	<b>RESPONDENT NAME</b>
<b>General Comments</b>				
Kegworth is a popular location for rental properties given its proximity to East Midlands Airport, Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station, East Midlands Gateway, Sutton Bonington Campus, major road networks and availability of comparatively cheaper property.	Noted.	No change	5, 594, 613	Lesley Pendleton, Vicky Saunders, John Saunders
Policy is not directly relevant to Ashby de la Zouch.	Noted	No change	92	Ashby Ze la Zouch Town Council
Support for the policy.	Noted.	No change	134, 162, 263, 364, 365, 379, 382, 594, 606, 612	Kegworth Parish Council, David and Hilary Jones, John Sisson, Paul Sewell, Sophie Sewell, Fern Sewell, Kirstyn Sewell, Vicky Saunders, David Hayes, Anthony Pearson
Support. The impact of HMOs on communities cannot be underestimated.	Noted.	No change	651	Amanda Hack



## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

Support for the policy which seeks to protect Kegworth from a high number of student HMOs.	The policy seeks to manage all new HMO development (student and non-student).	No change	128	Councillor Carol Sewell
The policy is welcomed but would like to stress that by and large, the students are good citizens.		No change	475	David Manley
Broadly agree with the policy which seeks to prevent the loss of housing to HMOs in Kegworth.	Noted	No change	232	Stantec (Caddick Group)
No comment	Noted	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council
Small and large HMOs create the same issues. So why are they being treated differently?	The draft local plan policy applies to both small and large HMOs.	No change.	613	John Saunders
Discriminates against students, landlords, and village.	Evidence shows there to a high number of HMOS in Kegworth with areas of notable concentrations. The policy seeks to manage the impact of HMOs on the surrounding area and supports a balanced community.	No change	5	Lesley Pendleton
Other homes are put above HMOs with no justification. The policy should be removed from the Local Plan.		No change	526	Haydn Stanney
Offices should consider whether other villages have high numbers of HMOs and face similar issues to Kegworth.	Looking at comparable licencing data, as of July 2025 the District has 89 registered HMOs. 68 of these are in Kegworth. The remaining 21 are split	No change	5	Lesley Pendleton

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

	<p>between the following settlements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Castle Donington (2)</li> <li>• Ashby De La Zouch (1)</li> <li>• Measham (1)</li> <li>• Coalville (12)</li> <li>• Hugglescote (1)</li> <li>• Ellistown (4)</li> </ul> <p>Officers are not aware of concerns or evidence of issues being faced elsewhere in the District.</p>			
<b>Housing Supply</b>				
Question the impact of HMOs on the availability of other house types, as these are available for sale and many new homes are being built	<p>Whilst HMOs play an important role in providing affordable and accessible housing for many groups a proportionately high number of HMOs may result in imbalanced communities, with a lack of house types available for other groups.</p> <p>As detailed in the <a href="#">HMO Background paper</a>, evidence shows there to be a high number and concentrations of HMOs in Kegworth.</p>	No change	5	Lesley Pendleton
An overprovision of HMOs impacts/restricts the availability of other types of housing stock, including	A proportionately high number of HMOs may result in imbalanced communities.	No change	119, 168, 232, 475, 565, 594, 606, 613	Geoff Sewell, James McKay, Stantec

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

properties suitable for young people, first time buyers and families (for sale and for rent in the village).  Policy would provide a balance between HMOs and other types of residential properties.	The policy seeks to prevent an overconcentration of HMOs, supporting a mix of housing types and balanced community.			(Caddick Group), David Manely, Mark Payne, Vicky Saunders, David Hayes, John Saunders
Extensions to HMOs impact on the type of housing stock i.e. homes become too large and unsuitable for families.	The policy criteria apply to the extension of HMOs.	No change	594	Vicky Saunders
Concentration of HMOs will adversely impact on pricing of properties to the detriment of those seeking home ownership.	Resisting an overconcentration of HMOs will support a mix and balance of house types.	No change	232, 606	Stantec (Caddick Group), David Hayes
New housing allocations are needed in Kegworth to meet future housing needs.	The draft Local Plan proposes housing allocations in Kegworth	No change	232	Stantec (Caddick Group)
<b>Highways and Parking</b>				
Parking demand for HMOs is no greater than a family home as both could create a demand for 3-4 parking spaces.	HMOs typically accommodate a higher number of adult residents than standard dwellings. Although car ownership patterns can vary there is the potential for all HMO occupants to have a car, increasing the pressure for parking.	No change	5	Lesley Pendleton
Bus services are available to the Sutton Bonnington and Nottingham campus	Alternatives to private car use are available for residents	No change	5	Lesley Pendleton

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

and the airport. Students can cycle and aircrew generally don't have cars.	and the policy seeks the provision of cycle storage.			
Bus services are available to the airport. Aircrew generally do not have cars.	HMOs typically accommodate a higher number of adult residents than standard dwellings. Although car ownership patterns can vary there is the potential for all HMO occupants to have a car, increasing the pressure for parking. Furthermore, in light of the currently high number of HMOs, cumulative impacts on parking pressure is also a concern.	No change	5	Lesley Pendleton
Parking restrictions in the Market Place and on other roads in the centre of the village have exacerbated parking problems.	Parking problems can be associated with a range of issues outside of the planning system, including, but not limited to, parking restrictions, fly parking and overall higher car ownership. However, given the nature of a HMO use and the potential level of parking demand such properties can create, the policy seeks an adequate level of parking for this use.	No change	5	Lesley Pendleton
Sutton Bonington College charges for parking but provide a free bus from Kegworth, with the village becoming the 'park' location for a 'park and ride' type scheme.		No change	168	James McKay
Question some of the advice provided by the local highway authority as HMOs are being allowed with no or limited parking leading to on-street parking.	Previous versions of the Leicestershire Design Guide did not have specific parking guidance for HMOs.	No change	119, 612, 613	Geoff Sewell, Anthony Pearson, John Saunders

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

	<p>However, an updated <a href="#">Leicestershire Highway Design Guide</a> (December 2024) includes minimum parking standards for HMOs. For HMOs with up to 6 residents, between 3 -6 spaces are required. For larger HMOs 1 space per resident is required.</p> <p>Whilst the proposed local plan policy is not dissimilar to these recently adopted standards, it seeks the provision of one off-street parking space per occupant, for all HMOs.</p>			
Where would cars park if a terraced house is used as an HMO.	<p>The subdivision of properties not located in large plots, have more limited opportunity to provide on-site parking. However, an HMO use could create a comparatively higher demand for parking and increase parking stress on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Therefore, the policy seeks to address this issue and supports HMOs that provide one off-street parking space per occupant.</p>	No change	168	James McKay

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

Applications should be refused if they cannot show how all occupants will park.	The proposed policy supports HMO development that would provide appropriate off-street parking, of one space per occupant.	No change	168	James McKay
<p>Parking and highway capacity and safety problems associated with inadequate parking for HMOs include cars parked for days, high levels of on-street parking, double parking, pavement parking, inaccessible roads, blocking junctions/corners/pavements.</p> <p>Issues are impacting congestion, on homeowners' ability to park, pedestrian safety, accidents and preventing access by refuse and emergency vehicles.</p> <p>Station Road, Pritchard Drive, New Street, Side Ley, Sutton Road and Thomas Road are specifically identified as experiencing these issues.</p>	<p>Insufficient on-site parking for HMOs could potentially result in highway safety issues and harm to the character of the local area.</p> <p>Therefore, the policy seeks the provision of appropriate off-street parking, of one space per occupant.</p>	No change	119, 162, 239, 364, 365, 379, 382, 594, 613, 647	Geoff Sewell, David and Hilary Jones, Nigel Taylor, Paul Sewell, Sophie Sewell, Fern Sewell, Kirstyn Sewell, Vicky Saunders, John Saunders, Diane Powell
<p>Para 6.85 should be amended to read:</p> <p><i>“High levels of on-street parking <b>does</b> result in congestion and difficulty in vehicles passing, as well as pavement parking obstructing pedestrians”</i></p> <p>i.e. replace ‘could’ with ‘does’</p>	<p>The supporting text seeks to recognise that there are instances when high levels of on-street parking will adversely impact on highway safety.</p> <p>Therefore, the policy seeks the provision of appropriate off-street parking of one</p>	No change	606	David Hayes

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

	space per occupant, reducing the necessity for cars to park on the street.			
Suggest the Council engage with the university. The university could ease parking problems by proving free parking for their students and retain the free bus service.	Noted and the Council supports a multifaceted approach to the issues raised.	No change.	168	James McKay
Employment development in the area will exacerbate the highway and parking issues.	All new development will be expected to be satisfactory in highway terms and provide adequate parking.	No change	162	David and Hilary Jones
Land earmarked for development could be used as a car park, to take cars off the road and improve amenity.	Allocated land has been identified to deliver development. Its use as a car park to serve other development is not a deliverable option.	No change	239	Nigel Taylor
<b>Impact on amenity and community</b>				
It is not reasonable to indicate the tenanted properties are more poorly maintained/greater impact on area. Many owner-occupied properties are in need of maintenance/have overgrown gardens.	There is the potential for absentee landlords to neglect property management.	No change	5	Lesley Pendleton
During my time as the Parish Council Clerk, very few HMO related complaints were received. Complaints received related mainly to parking and refuse. The few anti-social behaviour	Over a number of years, issues have been reported to the District Council relating to the increasing number and concentration of HMOs within	No change	5	Lesley Pendleton

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

<p>complaints were swiftly dealt with the University Student Liaison Officer.</p>	<p>the village. Responses to this consultation indicate these concerns are on-going. Evidence shows there to be a high concentration of HMOs in Kegworth.</p> <p>It is generally recognised that a high concentration of HMOs can cause harm to amenity (<a href="#">Evidence Gathering – Housing in Multiple Occupation and possible planning responses</a>).</p>			
<p>The District Council has provided no evidence to shows that HMOs impact on local amenities. The 2020 Council report on the subject of the Article 4 Direction admits they found no link between HMOs and amenity issues.</p>	<p>It is difficult to find specific demonstrable evidence to link amenity type issues directly to HMOs. For example, a higher level of on-street parking is observed in some locations although it is acknowledged this can be caused by other factors as well.</p> <p>However, since the Article 4 process commenced, more data has been gathered on the number and concentration of HMOs in Kegworth. In 2020, officers estimated 174 HMOs and this estimation increased to 262 in 2024. A mapping exercise</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>536</p>	<p>Haydon Stanney</p>



## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

	<p>undertaken shows there to be areas with notable concentrations and responses to this consultation also indicate on-going concerns.</p> <p>It is also generally recognised that a high concentration of HMOs can cause harm on amenity, (<a href="#">Evidence Gathering – Housing in Multiple Occupation and possible planning responses</a>).</p>			
An imbalance, and clustering, of HMO and non-HMO properties could negatively impact on amenity and the sense of community, with the presence of a more transitory population. The village needs a balanced community, including families, and not an over concentration of a transient residential population.	<p>An over concentration of HMOs can potentially undermine community balance, due to the loss of residents with a long-term stake in the community and an increase in the transient population. It is also recognised that there is potential for negative impacts on amenity, such as noise and disturbance.</p> <p>The policy seeks to protect amenity and manage the concentration of HMOs.</p>		119, 168, 475 612, 594	Geoff Sewell, James McKay, David Manley Anthony Pearson, Vicky Saunders
Every other property is being bought for the HMO rental market, destroying the village character and other impacts detailed in the draft Local Plan.		No change	647	Diane Powell

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

<b>Local Services and Infrastructure</b>				
Students and HMO tenants support the day-to-day local services and businesses, providing economic benefit.	Noted. Occupants will contribute to local spending power but this needs to be balanced against the potential adverse impacts of having an overconcentration of HMOs.	No change	5	Lesley Pendleton
Too many HMOs lead to insufficient use of local facilities such as buses and shops, making them less sustainable.	Occupants will contribute to local spending and support local services, although this could be limited to term time in respect of students.	No change	119	Geoff Sewell
Infrastructure has not been improved in the area and the number of HMOs compounds this issue.	Noted. The Community Infrastructure Levy is a levy that local authorities can choose to charge on new development to help pay for supporting infrastructure. However the Council does not currently operate such a levy.	No change	565	Mark Payne
<b>Data sources and application of the policy</b>				
The estimate of HMOs in Kegworth at 14.0% is an underestimate. Paragraph 6.4 should refer to 'at least 14%' to reflect the incompleteness of the data.	HMOs numbers have been estimated using a number of sources, including licenced properties, planning permissions, certificate of lawful development, Council Tax records of student only properties, as well as those	Officers to investigate further possible sources of HMO data and its use in the application of policy, within the context of the Data Protection Act.	128, 134, 606	Councillor Carol Sewell, Kegworth Parish Council, David Hayes

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

	<p>HMOs that have been ‘declared’.</p> <p>Whilst these sources are considered to represent a reliable method to identify the number and locations of an HMO in an area, it is acknowledged that this process may not identify every HMO, e.g. properties that do not require a licence or those in existence prior to the Article 4 coming into effect.</p>	Update supporting text to provide clarification on the use and availability of data.		
<p>An Additional Licensing Scheme (as adopted by other areas such as Leicester City Council) would improve the accuracy of HMO data and help inform the planning process and ensure the policy is effective and fair. The District Council should introduce Additional Licensing as a matter of urgency, prior to the adopted of the Local Plan. The policy will be subject to challenge without Additional Licensing.</p>	<p>The Council has implemented an HMO licensing scheme for Mandatory Licensing. This is generally required for a HMO occupied by five or more people in two or more household, where these are sharing an amenity regardless of the number of stories.</p> <p>Housing legislation also allows local authorities to introduce a scheme of Additional Licensing for those HMOs not covered by a mandatory licence. This would facilitate the recording</p>		128, 134, 168, 606	Councillor Carol Sewell, Kegworth Parish Council, James McKay , David Hayes

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

	of all HMOs. The Council's Environmental Health Protection Team is currently undertaking work to assess if further licencing is required/justified in the District although the outcome of this work is not yet known.			
The policy can only be applied if we have a definitive list of all HMOs in the village. Many HMOs are not registered including properties on Shepherds Walk, Thomas Road, Kirby Drive and Sutton Road.	HMOs numbers have been estimated using a number of sources. Whilst these sources are considered to represent a reliable method to identify the number and locations of an HMO in an area, it is acknowledged that this process may not identify every HMO, e.g. properties that do not require a licence or those in existence prior to the Article 4 coming into effect. Data is also only up to date at a certain point of time.		594	Vicky Saunders
Who is monitoring and mapping the HMOs? I can see from the appendix in the HMO background paper that many are not listed.			613	John Saunders
<b>H8 (a) The number of HMOS do not represent 10% or more of all dwellings within 100m radius from the centre of the building to which the application relates or the proposes does not result in the 10% threshold being exceeded.</b>				
A 10% rule within a 100m radius is desired but at present this would result in a number of properties on Derby Road being decanted.	The policy can only apply to new development and cannot be applied in retrospect to existing and lawful HMOs.	No change	475	David Manley
Kegworth is a small village and a HMO will impact wherever it is located. The	A 100m radius is considered indicative of an immediate	No change	565, 647	Mark Payne, Diane Powell

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

<p>threshold should be applied to the village as a whole rather than at a local street level.</p>	<p>neighbourhood level and is a manageable distance for assessing the impact of new/extended HMOs.</p> <p>Assessing at a village scale would cover too large an area to determine if there is an over-concentration of HMOs in the immediate locality of the application site. The policy is considered to provide a more balanced approach allowing consideration to be given to the local context.</p>			
<p>A threshold applied at street level will have the opposite of the desired effect and the spread of HMOs is proliferating. The Draft Plan states that HMO already make up 14.6% of the properties in Kegworth.</p>	<p>Kegworth has a comparatively high proportion of HMOs and evidence shows there are areas within the village that experience of higher concentration of this use. The policy seeks to manage the impact of HMOs at the immediate neighbourhood level. Applying a threshold at the village scale would cover too large an area to determine if there is an over-concentration of HMOs in the locality of a proposal.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>647</p>	<p>Dianne Powell</p>

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

Data (Census, Council and University data) shows that students make up around 77% of HMO and 20.6% of the population of Kegworth. The threshold limit is therefore unnecessary, and a 10% figure is arbitrary and not reflective of the situation faced by Kegworth.	Kegworth has a comparatively high proportion of HMOs and evidence shows there are areas within the village that experience of higher concentration of HMOs. Although a 'harmful concentration' is not defined in either national legislation or guidance, the application of a threshold is widespread amongst local authorities. Using a 10% threshold at a local level is considered to represent a reasonable and balanced approach, and having regard to the number and distribution of HMOs in Kegworth.	No change	526	Haydn Stanney
<b>H8 (b) It does not result in a residential dwelling being sandwiched between two HMOs along the same side of the street.</b>				
This is welcomed	Noted	No change	475	David Manley
<b>H8 (c) The development is able to provide suitable off-street parking of one space per occupant that does not cause detriment to highway safety or the amenity of the area, either individually or cumulatively</b>				
Support this requirement	Noted	No change	119, 134, 364, 365, 379, 382, 594, 606	Geoff Sewell, Kegworth Parish Council, Paul Sewell, Sophie Sewell, Fern Sewell, Kirstyn Sewell, Vicky Saunders, David Hayes

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

Support this requirement but car parking issues are determined by other non-HMO factors	<p>Noted. Parking problems can be as result of other factors including parking restrictions fly parking, car ownerships levels.</p> <p>The policy identifies the parking requirements for a HMO use.</p>	No change	475	David Manley
Wish to see a similar policy for self-contained apartments in Kegworth, either as a separate policy or as an amendment to the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide	<p>HMOs typically accommodate a higher number of adult residents than standard dwellings, including apartments, justifying a 'HMO' parking standard.</p> <p>Question whether there would be any justification for a similar approach to be applied to self-contained apartments.</p>	No change	134, 606	Kegworth Parish Council, David Hayes
Object to this requirement. People in the HMO are far more likely to work/study in the same place i.e. university or airport. Therefore, they have less of a need for multiple cars, not more. There are students in the district that do not own cars	<p>Alternatives to private car use are available for residents and the policy seeks the provision of cycle storage.</p> <p>HMOs typically accommodate a higher number of adult residents than standard dwellings. Although car ownership patterns can vary there is the potential for all HMO occupants to have a</p>	No change	526	Haydn Stanney

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

	car, increasing the pressure for parking. Furthermore, in light of the currently high number of HMOs, cumulative impacts on parking pressure is also a concern.			
<b>Monitoring</b>				
A regular review of HMOs is necessary.	Officers will continue to monitor planning permissions and refusals for HMOs. This will inform the evidence base and the effectiveness of the policy in achieving its objectives.	No change	128	Councillor Carol Sewell
HMO number will continue to increase. Given current HMO numbers are an underestimate and the Article 4 direction has not slowed down the growth in HMOs, an annual review of the policy and its effectiveness is needed. This must be passed on sound data and openness.	<p>The Article 4 Direction means that in Kegworth, planning permission is needed to change the use from a dwelling house to a small HMO. The draft Local Plan policy seeks to support the planning process when a permission is sought for a new HMO.</p> <p>Officers will continue to monitor planning permissions and refusals for HMOs. This will inform the evidence base and the effectiveness of the policy in achieving its objectives.</p>	No change.	134, 606	Kegworth Parish Council, David Hayes



## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

<p>HMO properties need to be regulated and monitored following the planning approval. For example, where are cars associated with these properties parked (usually on streets of pavements)</p>	<p>Officers will continue to monitor planning permissions and refusals for HMOs. This will help inform the effectiveness of the policy in achieving its objectives.</p> <p>However, it is not within the scope of planning, nor are there planning mechanisms available, to monitor where people park their cars. The draft policy can however seek to ensure appropriate parking provision for a HMO use.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>613</p>	<p>John Saunders</p>
<p>Who looks into those properties that have not be declared as HMOs.</p>	<p>Landlords of existing HMOs, in operation pre-February 2021, are able to declare these to the Council. This process is voluntary and is not a statutory requirement. However, should the Council receive a complaint that a HMO is an unlawful use this will be investigated by officers and any planning breach of condition will be dealt with in accordance with the Councils' <a href="#">Local Enforcement Plan (Planning) 2024</a></p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>613</p>	<p>John Saunders</p>
<p>Who checks the occupancy levels of HMOs to ensure that the system is not being abused?</p>	<p>Planning permissions granted are not monitored on site as a matter of course. Should the</p>	<p>No change</p>		

## APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

	Council receive a complaint that a property is not operating to the terms of the planning permission, this will be investigated and dealt with in accordance with the <a href="#">Councils' Local Enforcement Plan (Planning) 2024</a> .			
<b>Other comments</b>				
The presence of an Article 4 Direction makes it impractical to apply for planning permission every time a new tenant moves in.	The planning use is linked to the property. Planning permission will not be required for each change of tenant if the property remains as a HMO use.	No change	5	Lesley Pendleton
Student properties are exempt from Council Tax, reducing the Parish Council's precept. Assume the District Council is able to claim for exempt Council Tax properties, which could be used to address the shortfall in the Parish Council precept.	This is not a planning matter. However, Government compensates local authorities for the loss of Council Tax income.	No change	5	Lesley Pendleton
Student properties are exempt from Council Tax, reducing the Parish Council's precept. Although students receive the benefits of having a Parish Council which has to be paid for by the dwindling non-student population		No change	119, 594, 613	Geoff Sewell, Vicky Saunders, John Saunders

# APPENDIX B – POLICY H8 (HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) IN KEGWORTH)

Suggest a separate policy clause/measure to require planning permission be sought to continue as a HMO when an existing HMO is sold.	The planning use as a HMO is linked to the property. A new permission is not needed if only ownership changes.	No change	134, 606	Kegworth Parish Council, David Hayes
The proposed pedestrian crossing on Sideley (finance provided by the new housing estate via a legal agreement) has not come to fruition as the traffic count did not support it. Suggest that the traffic count does not reflect the circumstances.	This is a separate matter and not an issue that can be addressed by a policy that seeks to manage the HMOs in Kegworth.	No change	162	David and Hilary Jones

This page is intentionally left blank

# APPENDIX C – POLICY Ec2 (EMPLOYMENT COMMITMENTS)

CHAPTER: 7	POLICY NUMBER: Ec2	POLICY NAME: EMPLOYMENT COMMITMENTS
------------	--------------------	-------------------------------------

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
The policy should NOT be changed (Ec1 and 2) with regards to development in the countryside.	<p>Policy Ec2, when drafted, will be concerned with sites which currently have planning permission for employment development. The policy's purpose is to explain the likely response/requirements for an application to renew the planning permission on one of these sites.</p> <p>The policy does not have a specific role with respect to development in the countryside. That is dealt with by other policies in the draft plan, most notably Policy S4.</p>	No change.	103 401	Judith Bilington; Mr Wykes
It will be important to ensure that any commitments are fully and robustly assessed before they are relied upon in the Plan. The same level of scrutiny should be applied to all such sites, and a realistic approach taken. If a site is unlikely to deliver employment it should not be allocated for that use.	Policy Ec2, when drafted, will be concerned with sites which currently have planning permission for employment development. These sites will not necessarily be allocated in the Local Plan.	No change.	225 229	St Modwen Logistics; P,W,C&R Redfern
I fail to understand Ec1 and Ec2. Ec1 and Ec2 will be included in the next plan, which one? This feels	Policy Ec2 will be included in the next draft of this local plan and it will subject to full public	No change.	255	John Aust

## APPENDIX C – POLICY Ec2 (EMPLOYMENT COMMITMENTS)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
underhanded and some kind of subterfuge.	consultation at that point. The policy deals with sites which have planning permission. For this reason, it makes sense to defer writing the policy until the next stage so the list of sites it includes will be as up to date as possible.			
Policy Ec2 (amongst others) is to be included in the next version of the Local Plan. As this will be the Publication version (Regulation19) will consultees have opportunity to comment on or suggest changes to the Policy wording without the need to 'object' or find it 'unsound' as such.	The Regulation 19 (pre-submission) stage is the formal consultation stage. Responses will need to be expressed in terms of 'support' or 'objection' for a policy/site allocation and, in the latter case, identify which of the NPPF 'Tests of Soundness' are failed by the policy/site in question.	No change.	404	Environment Agency
It is presumed that the actual Local Plan will clarify how the Freeport sites will be considered, i.e. will they be treated as part of the baseline/existing commitments that the Local Plan will need to work alongside/be accommodated on top of?	This is correct. The next, pre-submission version of the Local Plan will confirm the plan's approach to the Freeport.	No change.	341	LCC
Nationally the rural economy is 18% less productive than urban areas and the inability to secure planning is a major barrier. This could reduce inequality around the area, replace	[The respondent linked this comment to Policy Ec2 although it relates to more diverse matters. It is answered here for ease].	No change.	422	CLA Midlands

## APPENDIX C – POLICY Ec2 (EMPLOYMENT COMMITMENTS)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
lost farm incomes from subsidies and provide well-paid employment opportunities. Easy significant gains (e.g. increased Business Rates, renewable development) by allowing well-designed sustainable rural development. Too much development is being refused or not coming forward due to the costs and risks involved in a planning application.	<p>There is a balance to be struck between enabling sustainable rural development and maintaining the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Draft Policy S4 deals with development in the countryside and it specifically allows for the expansion of rural enterprises (criterion (i)) and for development related to agriculture and forestry (criteria (a) and (b)). In addition, Policy Ec12 provides a positive framework for the visitor economy which is particularly focused in the more rural parts of the district.</p> <p>The Council considers that these policies in combination accord with the NPPF's section on supporting a prosperous rural economy (paragraphs 88-89). Importantly, having an up-to-date Local Plan is a key way to provide more certainty for all those using the planning system.</p>			

This page is intentionally left blank



# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

CHAPTER 4	POLICY NUMBER – IF1	POLICY NAME – DEVLOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
-----------	---------------------	---

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Policy needs to make clear the threshold where such infrastructure provision would be required.	The thresholds will vary depending upon the type of infrastructure required.	No change	8	James Mattley
Maps provided showing the details and locations of National Grids Assets.	Noted	No change	62	Avison Young o/b/o National Grid Electricity Transmission
Support	Noted	No change	92, 175	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council, Oakthorpe, Donsithorpe and Acresford Parish Council
The policy should include reference to other means of securing developer contributions other than S106 Agreements	It is agreed that it would be helpful to include reference to S278 agreements as well.	In part (3) add in the following text at the end: <b>“or Section 278 Legal Agreements for highways infrastructure”</b>  Include reference in supporting text to Section 278 agreements.	112	National Highways
The supporting text should include refence to the need to support public	Noted	No change	139	Leicester City Council

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
transport provision between Leicester City and North West Leicestershire.				
Broadly welcome the policy but note that the supporting evidence base in respect of playing pitches and other recreation facilities needs to be updated. Part (2)(b) should include reference to sport and leisure facilities under community facilities.	<p>Work to update the evidence base is well underway and will be used to inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Part (d) of the policy already includes reference to open spaces, sport and recreation facilities. Therefore, there is no need to also include reference under 2(b).</p>	No change	143	Sport England
Development can only be required to mitigate its own impact. It is important to understand the existing issues in respect of infrastructure provision and to ensure that any contributions would mitigate any impacts.	<p>The supporting text already makes clear that “the nature and scale of any planning obligation required has to be related to the scale and type of development proposed”.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the different type of infrastructure which are required to support development.</p>	No change	147	Gladman Developments
Object to the wording of part 1 of the policy as it states, “development <u>will</u> [be supported by ...]”. Development should only be required to mitigate its	It is accepted that development can only be required to address the impacts arising from the development itself. The policy	No change	150	Savills on behalf of David Wilson Homes (East Midlands)

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
own impact and cannot be used to address existing deficiencies.	specifically states, “and make contributions as appropriate to,..”. The word appropriate provides the necessary assurance that only those requests which arise directly from the impact of a development will be considered acceptable.			
Supportive of the proposed policy but note that it will be necessary to ensure that sites are deliverable from a viability perspective.	The need to ensure that sites are viable is accepted. A viability assessment of the plan will be undertaken to inform the Regulation 19 version.	No change	182	Boyer Planning o/b/o Redrow Homes East Midlands
No comments to make at this stage but reserve the right to comment on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan when available.	Noted	No change	183	Turley o/b/o Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Redrow Homes Ltd and Wilson
Support the provision of a strategic policy. Requests should be clearly identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and considered as part of any viability evidence to support the plan. Some elements of growth may require strategic infrastructure which together with a delivery mechanism should be outlined in the plan. Other non-strategic infrastructure may require a different approach.	Noted. Work on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is ongoing and will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan.	No change	185	Pegasus Group o/b/o Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd

## APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Support the provision of a strategic policy. Requests should be clearly identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and considered as part of any viability evidence to support the plan. Some elements of growth may require strategic infrastructure which together with a delivery mechanism should be outlined in the plan. Other non-strategic infrastructure may require a different approach.	Noted. Work on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is ongoing and will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan.	No change	186	Pegasus Group o/b/o Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd
<p>The proposed approach is appropriate and that it is important to identify any infrastructure requirements as early as possible and to ensure that they are viable.</p> <p>It noted that the Government intends to introduce a new Infrastructure Levy that may offer an opportunity to deliver the infrastructure required to support new development in a more efficient manner.</p>	Noted. Work on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and a Viability Assessment is ongoing and will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan.	No change	187	Define Planning & Design Ltd o/b/o Bloor Homes Ltd
To maintain the current levels and to accommodate future additional demand created by population growth as the result of new dwellings and other development additional policing resourcing should be taken into consideration.	Development can only be required to address the demonstrable impacts arising from the development itself. Subject to this being the case, contributions towards the provision of additional facilities to support the work of the police can	In part 2(b) add in reference to <b>'community safety'</b>	205	Leicestershire Police

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	be considered appropriate. To do this it is considered that the policy should be made to include reference to community safety.			
Welcome parts 4 and 5 of the draft policy but consider that the policy should allow for some negotiation to be had between the Council and developers on individual sites. This will enable regard to be had to a sites context and any site specific infrastructure provision.	Paragraph 10 of the Planning Obligations Planning Practice Guidance makes clear that all planning obligations are negotiable. Therefore, it is not necessary for the policy to specifically refer to negotiation.	No change	214	Stantec Uk Ltd o/b/o Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Have concerns regarding the use of transport modelling to support the Local Plan which represents “predict and provide” rather than “determine and provide”. Consider that the Viability Assessment is too late in the process.	The transport modelling is necessary to understand the potential impacts arising from new development. This will include factoring in the potential contribution from sustainable transport modes such as walking, cycling and public transport. The Viability Assessment can only be undertaken when the infrastructure implications arising from new development are clear and these can only be determined when the proposed sites have been agreed.	No change	220	CPRE Leicestershire
Part 5 of Draft Policy IF5 includes “and / or” after part (b), but not after part (a). This should be changed so “and /	This is IF5 – make sure picked up	No change	229	Planning Prospects Limited o/b/o

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
or” is also included after part (a). Public transport services may well be part of any solution and require a financial contribution, but this will not be so in every case, so it must be made clear that these are alternatives to be considered individually or in combination.				P,W,C & R Redfern
This policy wording should be revised to include major economic and employment assets in the district including EMA, along with developments that are within the EMAGIC site, that is one of the tax Sites that are part of the East Midlands Freeport.	This is general policy which will apply to all potential developments. It is not clear as to what this referring.  Clarification has been sought but no response has been received.	No change	230	East Midlands Airport
Agree with large parts of this draft Policy IF1 however any infrastructure requirements secured by way of a Section 106 agreement must meet the CIL (Regulation 122) tests. The following wording should be added to part 2) of draft Policy IH1:“Subject to conformity with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 the type of infrastructure required to support new development includes, but is not limited to”.	Meeting the CIL test is a legal requirement which does not need to be expressly included in the policy.	No change	232	Stantec IK Ltd o/b/o Caddick Land

## APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
No specific comments on this draft policy at this stage but wish to reserve the right to review and comment on the second part of the 'Infrastructure and Delivery Plan' once it is available.	Noted	No change	234	Turley o/b/o IM Properties
Note that development can only be required to mitigate its own impact. The Infrastructure Development Plan must show the existing and known deficiencies in the current infrastructure, before reaching any conclusion on the cumulative effects of new development, and any contribution that is needed from new development to mitigate any impacts. The policy wording should include the opportunity for negotiation around policy requirements for site specific reasons, to reflect any viability challenges identified in the Plan Viability Assessment and for any sites whose circumstances fall outside the parameters of the typologies tested.	<p>Work on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and a Viability Assessment is ongoing and will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan.</p> <p>The IDP will have regard to existing provision together with the outcome of consultation with the various services providers.</p> <p>Paragraph 10 of the Planning Obligations Planning Practice Guidance makes clear that all planning obligations are negotiable. Therefore, it is not necessary for the policy to specifically refer to negotiation.</p>	No change	237	Home Builders Federation
It is noted that Part 1 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been prepared, but as the Local Plan makes further progress, each of the allocations will be subject to a more detailed assessment in Part 2 of the IDP. We would welcome the opportunity to review this document in	Noted and agreed that cross boundary discussions in respect of the merging plans for both North West Leicestershire and Hinckley & Bosworth will continue.	No change	238	Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>due course and wish to continue working with officers of your Council and Leicestershire County Council to explore the most effective delivery mechanisms for cross-boundary strategic transport schemes required to manage and mitigate the combined impacts of growth.</p> <p>HBBC would like to reserve further comment regarding the 'soundness' of the plan until the pre-submission consultation stage, when any remaining evidence base documents and the policies contained within the Plan have been fully drafted.</p>				
<p>Policy IF1 is not consistent with the provisions of paragraph 57 of the NPPF. The wording needs to be adjusted so that it is made clear in paragraph (1) that the delivery of infrastructure, or contributions towards the delivery of infrastructure, will be sought where it is necessary to do so to make the development acceptable in planning terms and where the infrastructure / contributions sought are directly related to and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development.</p>	<p>As set out in the supporting text to the policy, the need to ensure that any contributions are directly related to and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to any proposed development is a requirement of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations. There is no need for the policy to expressly state this as well.</p>	No change	243	Avison Young o/b/o Jelson Homes



# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>Bloor Homes notes the types of infrastructure listed in draft Policy IF1 to support new development. The infrastructure should be set out in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Where new development generates a demand for new or improved infrastructure, Bloor Homes recognises that a reliable mechanism such as a planning obligation is necessary.</p> <p>Any infrastructure should be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p>	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery plan is being prepared and will support the Regulation 19 plan.</p> <p>Noted. This is a requirement of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations.</p>	No change	245	Evolve Planning o/b/o Bloor Homes
<p>Cameron Homes notes the types of infrastructure listed in draft Policy IF1 to support new development. The infrastructure should be set out in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Where new development generates a demand for new or improved infrastructure, Cameron Homes recognises that a reliable mechanism such as a planning obligation is necessary.</p> <p>Any infrastructure should be necessary to make the development</p>	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery plan is being prepared and will support the Regulation 19 plan.</p>	No change	256	Evolve Planning o/b/o Cameron Homes

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.	Noted. This is a requirement of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations.			
<p>The County Council is engaged with NWLDC on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan development process and welcome the opportunity to input meaningfully from an early stage.</p> <p>From a highways perspective the policy would benefit from reference to measures that address the cumulative and cross boundary impacts.</p> <p>It is important that schools and home shave access to high quality broadband to support learning.</p> <p>The plan makes reference to Superfast broadband whereas government targets refer to ultrafast, gigabit capable fibre.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The transport modelling being undertaken to support the plan will consider cumulative and cross boundary impacts. However, it is considered that an amendment part (1) of the policy would be appropriate.</p> <p>Noted. The National Planning Policy Framework refers to “full fibre broadband connections” which should be used instead in order to ensure consistency</p>	<p>Amend part (1) to state:</p> <p>“... in order to mitigate its impact, <b>individually and cumulatively with other development, upon</b> the environment and communities”</p> <p>That part(e) be amended to state: <b>“The provision of full fibre broadband connection”</b></p>	341	Leicestershire County Council
Concerns raised regarding flooding on Duck Lane Appleby Magna due Victorian age drains. New development will make this worse.	If a service or facility is already at capacity, development can only be required to address the demonstrable impacts arising from the development itself. It is for infrastructure providers to	No change	440	Natalie Pettitt

## APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>There are capacity issues at local hospitals and doctors. It is very difficult to get appointments if you work.</p> <p>The catchment for secondary schools keeps changing which results in siblings going to different schools and friendship groups being broken up.</p> <p>Appleby is the forgotten village, and to our health, child's education and environment the more houses you put into the village the more damaging it will be for everyone.</p>	<p>address any existing deficiency in provision.</p> <p>The catchments for schools are identified by the County Education authority. Having a Local Plan in place will make it easier for them to plan for future requirements, rather than dealing with ad hoc speculative proposals.</p>			
<p>If you're going to keep allowing housing developments you need to make developers build amenities to accommodate them. Doctors surgeries, schools and other childcare settings, substantial green zones for children to play, conservation, infrastructure for vehicles and goods lorries as we live in a national forest zone and already have a high density of through traffic from local businesses. Build on external areas such as Hugglescote massive development which has been allowed without any substantial infrastructure being built to accommodate it.</p>	<p>Consistent with the Community Infrastructure Level Regulations 2010 New development can only be required to address the impact arising from the development itself and must be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. Policy IF1 seeks to ensure that such provision is made as part of new development.</p>	No change	469	Kyle Warner

## APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>It is considered unnecessary to keep land for a new school at Ibstock [part of the proposed development off Leicester Road Ibstock] since currently neither St Denys infant school, nor the junior school are full and neither are projected to be at capacity in the next 6 years. Consequently, an additional mainstream school would not benefit the community.</p> <p>However, there is a need for additional capacity in specialist school provision.</p>	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will identify the specific requirements for new education provision based on consultation with the education authority.</p>	No change	495	Ibstock Junior School
<p>The primary school in Ibstock is not even full! So it doesn't make sense at all and the traffic is bad enough as it is, why anyone would want to make it worse I really don't know.</p>	<p>The Education Authority has previously indicated that the primary school was full. The situation pertaining at the time that any planning applications for additional housing development are being considered will determine whether any contributions are required towards schools in the locality.</p>	No change	496	Eeden Varney
<p>There is a lack of clarity on what additional services will be explicitly committed to with the new houses. Please can the actual new surgeries and schools and core utilities to support the additional housing be listed and audited for completion?</p>	<p>The initial <a href="#">Infrastructure Delivery Plan</a> identifies which sites will contribute towards the provision of different types of infrastructure. This is being updated.</p>	No change	621	James Norton

## APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>The proposed approach is considered to be appropriate. It is important that the infrastructure delivery requirements are identified as quickly as possible and that they consider how infrastructure delivery should be funded. That should then be taken account of in a comprehensive Viability Assessment that considers the cumulative costs of the plan's policy requirements. RSL also note that the Government intends to introduce a new Infrastructure Levy (CIL) that may offer an opportunity to deliver the infrastructure required to support new development in a more efficient manner.</p>	<p>The initial <a href="#">Infrastructure Delivery Plan</a> identifies which sites will contribute towards the provision of different types of infrastructure. This is being updated. A Viability Assessment will also be undertaken.</p> <p>The potential for a new CIL is noted and its development will be monitored and if necessary introduced at a later date.</p>	No change	656	Define Planning & Design Ltd o/b/o Rosconn Strategic Land

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

CHAPTER: 9	POLICY NUMBER: IF3	POLICY NAME: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE
------------	--------------------	-----------------------------------

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<b>Support</b>				
Support	Support welcomed.  Although, not linked to these representations, it is suggested that the Plan's supporting text be updated to include the NPPF's definition of green infrastructure.	Replace the Landscape Institute's definition of green infrastructure at paragraph 9.17 of the supporting text with the definition in the NPPF Glossary.	45 92 185 186 245 256	Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Integrated Care Board; Ashby Town Council; Clowes Developments; Wilson Bowden Developments; Bloor Homes; Cameron Homes
<b>IF3 Part (1)</b>				
Reword Part (1) as follows: "...and enhances the existing network of multi-functional spaces and natural features throughout the district <u>where possible</u> ."	The starting sentence of Part (1) states that the Council expects major development to deliver new green infrastructure 'where appropriate'. In these circumstances, the further caveat suggested in this representation is not considered necessary.	No change.	214	Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Policy IF3 is not justified and will not be effective. The first sentence should be amended to read: "The Council will expect all major development, where	The NPPF confirms the cross-cutting importance of green infrastructure to deliver wide-ranging benefits. It identifies its	No change.	243	Jelson Homes

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<i>necessary and</i> appropriate, to contribute towards the delivery of new green infrastructure which connects to and enhances the existing network of multi-functional spaces and natural features throughout the district”.	role in climate change, health and well-being, ecology and air quality. In these circumstances, the policy expectation that GI <b>will</b> be provided is reasonable. The inclusion of the phrase ‘where appropriate’ would deal with situations where this is not feasible and adding ‘necessary’ as an additional qualification is not needed.			
Recommend adding reference to Natural England’s <a href="#">Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles &amp; Standards</a> in the policy wording and supporting text. These standards can provide the output measures so that developers have certainty over what green infrastructure is needed on site. They can be included as site specific and area-based requirements in site allocation policies.	Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework helps support the delivery of high-quality GI. The Framework is made up of a number of components including the 15 <a href="#">Principles</a> (January 2023) which help describe the attributes and functions of good quality GI and its wide-ranging benefits and the <a href="#">Standards</a> (January 2023) which provide more specific information about good GI and how to plan, deliver and maintain it. The Standards include criteria/ attributes relating to quantity, size, proximity, capacity, quality, accessibility, type and process (planning and management of green infrastructure) and are designed to be used consistently as guidelines.	Add commentary about Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles & Standards to the supporting text for Policy IF3.	223	Natural England

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	<p>The GI Framework and its Standards are described as 'voluntary'.</p> <p>Overall, the GI Framework is a very useful source of information and best practice guidance. The Standards do include measures which relate to a whole area (e.g. accessible greenspace standards) where the achievement of these standards is not wholly in the gift of the planning system. They may also prove to be some overlap with the requirements in the forthcoming Local Plan Policy IF4 – Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities. For these reasons, it is recommended that Natural England's GI Framework is referenced in the supporting text and not in the policy itself.</p>			
<p>Natural England made comments on Policy AP5 – Health and Wellbeing. You may want to incorporate or cross-reference these health aspects within this GI policy.</p>	<p>Agreed. The health and wellbeing benefits of GI, which are also acknowledged in the NPPF (paragraph 96c), could be expanded upon in the supporting text for Policy IF3.</p>	<p>Add to the supporting text (paragraph 9.19) that GI can have a positive impact by providing opportunities for more active and healthy lives and can help to address some of the environmental causes of poor health e.g. by</p>	223	Natural England



## APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
		reducing urban summer temperatures by cooling the air.		
The supporting text acknowledges that blue infrastructure falls within the definition of green infrastructure but it is disappointing that it is not explicitly mentioned in Policy IF3. This would enable the following important benefit which can be facilitated by the planning regime to be included in the policy: “Opportunities for weir removal and de-culverting should be sought where possible to improve the network of blue infrastructure”.	The Green Infrastructure Study, which the policy refers to, includes a range of measures to improve the district’s GI, including as an example restoring the condition of rivers in Measham. Overall, the measures suggested in this representation is considered too specific for inclusion in the policy itself. Although not directly linked to this comment, it would be worth the policy referring to any future update to the GI Study, in case the study is reviewed during the lifespan of the plan.	Amend Part (1) to read: “.... identified in the Green Infrastructure Study <b>(or its successor)</b> .”	404	Environment Agency
<b>IF3 Part (2)</b>				
Amend Part (2) to encourage/secure improvements to existing green infrastructure. “.... Existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows should be retained <u>and enhanced</u> wherever possible.”	Part (1) refers to enhancing the existing GI network. Amending Part (2) as proposed would be consistent with the intent of the policy.	Amend Part (2) to read: “Proposals that cause loss or harm to the green infrastructure network, including its function and amenity value, will not be permitted unless the need for and benefits of the development outweigh any adverse impacts. Existing trees,	146	National Forest Company

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
		woodlands and hedgerows should be retained <b>and enhanced</b> wherever possible.”		
<b>Other matters</b>				
To help GI standards to be delivered, local authorities should set GI targets. These should include delivery levels over time. For instance, the % of people having good quality publicly accessible greenspaces within 15 minutes’ walk from home by 2030.	Noted. This will be a matter for the Local Plan Monitoring Framework which will be included in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan. Regarding GI specifically, the draft Local Plan notes that planning policies act on new development and have limited influence over the current use of land. The example of a target in Natural England’s representation would not be an appropriate monitoring measure for a Local Plan policy.	No change.	223	Natural England
The plan does not appear to have adopted a strategic approach to GI. Neighbouring authorities in Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire have taken a more strategic approach, based on the <a href="#">Greater Nottinghamshire Blue-Green Infrastructure Strategy</a> . The Erewash Local Plan Review contains Strategic Policy 5: Green Infrastructure which designates a number of strategic green infrastructure corridors one of	At this point there is not an equivalent to the Greater Nottinghamshire study in Leicester and Leicestershire. The <a href="#">Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study for Leicester and Leicestershire (2017)</a> is the most recent assessment of strategic-scale GI opportunities. This was prepared to support the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth	No change.	341	LCC

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
which (the Trent Strategic Green Infrastructure Corridor) forms part of the shared County/LPA boundary. Considering the challenges relating to climate change/flood risk/ local nature recovery experienced in the River Trent/River Soar corridor, this appears shortsighted.	Plan and focuses on six likely locations for strategic scale development. In the absence of a current, comprehensive Leicester and Leicestershire-scale GI study, the new Local Plan can rely on the <a href="#">NWL Green and Blue Infrastructure Study (2022)</a> which is referenced in Policy IF3 to provide a sufficiently strategic approach (NPPF paragraph 188).			
We recommend that the supporting text identifies that Green Infrastructure can be used to deliver BNG. "Open space can be used for Sustainable Drainage Schemes (SUDS) to manage surface water. Open spaces can also be used for Natural Flood Management (NFM) schemes to hold back flood water from natural watercourses, to reduce downstream flooding. NFM schemes can also be used for biodiversity benefits such as new wetland areas". Please consider specifically naming these two types of flood risk management for open spaces.	Agreed.	Amend paragraph 9.19 as follows: "..... Green infrastructure provides opportunities for increased physical activity, but also helps create a sense of place, and-provides habitats for wildlife <b>and can help deliver Biodiversity Net Gain</b> . It also tends to be multi-functional. <del>and so</del> <b>It</b> can act as defences against flooding <b>including as Natural Flood Management (NFM) by holding back flood water to reduce downstream flooding</b>	404	Environment Agency

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
		<i>which in turn can have biodiversity benefits by creating new wetland areas. Green infrastructure can also</i> alleviate some of the effects of climate change such as increased temperatures by providing cooling opportunities and absorb air pollution.”		

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

CHAPTER: 9	POLICY NUMBER: IF5	POLICY NAME: TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT
------------	--------------------	---

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
<b>Principle of policy</b>				
[The policy] is supported to reduce the amount of personal travel and to encourage active travel (pedestrian and cycle links).	Noted	No change	45	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board
Support	Noted	No change	92	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
[Supports a general policy for transport infrastructure in new development. Such a policy encourages sustainable transport infrastructure]	Noted	No change	185; 186	Pegasus Group (Clowes Developments); Pegasus Group (Wilson Bowden Developments)
[Supports the draft policy and supports the provision of active travel through the provision for walking and cycling to be an integral part of the design process for major new housing development]	Noted	No change	245; 246	Evolve Planning (Bloor Homes);
It is recognised within the supporting text to the policy that the settlement hierarchy (Draft Policy S2) and the site allocations seek to reduce the need to travel by locating development in the Districts most	Noted	No change	214	Stantec UK (Bloor Homes & Taylor Wimpey)

**APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)**

sustainable locations. This approach is supported.				
--	--	--	--	--

## APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

General comments				
[Natural England supports sustainable transport; there is a link to climate change policy. There is a strong link to green infrastructure, We also note the link to Green Infrastructure, cycle and pedestrian routes could incorporate verges or boundaries of natural habitat and street trees to connect to other habitats and green spaces.]	The adopted Local Plan (IF4) requires 'linkages to key Green Infrastructure'. This has not been included in IF5 because a new policy on Green Infrastructure (IF3) is proposed. There is the opportunity to provide further clarity on what we mean by 'well-designed' pedestrian and cycle links in part (3)(a), incorporating reference to green infrastructure.	<b>Update the supporting text at Regulation 19 stage, to cross reference Policy IF3 and to provide more detail to what is meant by well-designed in part (3)(a), using the wording provided by Natural England.</b>	223	Natural England
[The Local Plan must recognise that, due to the spatial spread of the district, the private car will remain a preferred choice for many residents; appropriate infrastructure improvements and provisions should form part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Transport infrastructure provision needs to be informed by a robust evidence base in close collaboration with the County Council as highways authority.]	Noted, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is pending and will incorporate transport considerations once the transport modelling work is complete.	No change	185; 186	Pegasus Group (Clowes Developments); Pegasus Group (Wilson Bowden Developments)
[To ensure new development is supported by the required infrastructure, it is critical that the Council identifies infrastructure requirements/funding and engage with the highways authority as early as possible]	Noted	No change	187; 656	Define Planning & Design (Bloor Homes); Define Planning & Design (Rosconn Strategic Land)

## APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

[Paragraph 9.33 - Reserve the right to provide further comments once the relevant evidence (the North West Leicestershire Good Design SPD and the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide) is available to view]	Noted; the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide was adopted in December 2024. The Good Design is out to consultation until 17 September 2025.	No change	214	Stantec UK (Bloor Homes & Taylor Wimpey)
[Comments about the access proposals/sustainable transport measures for Money Hill]	Noted	No change	214	Stantec UK (Bloor Homes & Taylor Wimpey)
See comments on IF1	Noted – see IF1	See IF1	220	CPRE Leicestershire
[The final policy will be influenced by ongoing and planned Local Plan transport assessment work. A more bespoke approach may be required to address cumulative and cross-boundary transport impacts, likely in the form of area transport strategies. The International Gateway and areas such as Coalville and Ashby are expected to need these strategies.]	Noted – the transport modelling is expected later in the autumn. This is likely to identify specific transport improvements that are required as a result of the proposed allocations. We will review whether the policy needs to make reference to specific transport strategies / highways improvement schemes (as adopted Local Plan IF4 does currently) at that time.	<b>Consider if the policy needs to make reference to specific transport strategies / highways improvement schemes once the transport modelling is completed.</b>	341	Leicestershire County Council



## APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

<p>[The transport strategy will influence future housing locations and therefore school place requirements. Good transport networks near schools are required to provide staff, pupils, and families with various travel options. School travel plans should guarantee safe access, supported by good transport links. The County Council will need to understand how infrastructure—including schools, libraries, and healthcare—will be delivered alongside new development to ensure sustainable growth.]</p>	<p>Comments noted but no changes to Policy IF5 are proposed unless LCC can demonstrate otherwise.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>
<p>[Paragraph 5.26 notes the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, yet increased development will lead to more traffic, emissions and congestion. While it is proposed that more people might live within cycling distance of their jobs, they are more likely to drive in from other urban centres where they have established connections. Re IF5 paragraph 9.31, the impact upon the highway network is an important consideration when determining planning applications]</p>	<p>It is correct that where people choose to live and work cannot be controlled. However, the planning system can provide the <i>opportunities</i> for people to live in proximity to employment opportunities and to access sustainable transport modes; this is what the Local Plan aims to do.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>350</p>	<p>Teresa Walker</p>
<p>[Suggest paragraph 9.34 is strengthened as follows: “we <del>may</del> <b>will</b> require new public transport routes within the development site or a contribution towards the enhancement of existing services”]</p>	<p>Agreed; this would be consistent with the wording at part (3) of the policy.</p>	<p><b>At Regulation 19 stage, change the supporting text as suggested.</b></p>	<p>353</p>	<p>Derbyshire County Council</p>

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

[The roads are already congested, so what measures will address this? Will speed limits be reduced to 30mph and enforced, and will police presence increase with population growth? Public transport is non-existent so will this be improved?]	These comments relate to proposed housing allocation lb18. These are detailed issues that would be addressed through the planning application submission. Draft Policy IF5 seeks to address the issues of traffic increase, highway safety and public transport connection which are referenced in this comment.	No change	414	Emily Massey
The increased traffic would destroy the local environment increase pollution and detrimental to local wildlife.	Impact upon wildlife and air quality are planning considerations; they are dealt with in Policies En1 and En6.	No change	580	Karl Piggot
The traffic would be greatly increased. This would create a lot of air pollution which in turn would affect the residents and also the local wildlife.			581	Kathleen Piggot
IF5(2) New development that is likely to generate significant amounts of movement on the local highway network will require a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement to assess and mitigate any negative transport impacts.				
[Amend part 2 to include reference to the strategic road network]	Noted. This wording could be added, or to simplify the policy and avoid confusion, 'local highway network' could be deleted.	Amend part 2 to read “ <b><i>New development that is likely to generate significant amounts of movement on the local highway network will require a Transport Assessment...</i></b> ”	112	National Highways

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

In the case of section (2) of IF5, the wording should be expanded as follows: "(2) New development that is likely to generate significant amounts of movement on the local highway <b>and public transport networks</b> will require a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement to assess and mitigate any negative transport impacts."	This is not considered to be necessary in light of the above changes	No change		Network Rail
[Part 2 which references 'any negative transport impacts' is inconsistent with the NPPF which states that any significant impacts from development on the transport network or on highway safety should be "cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree". We would therefore encourage officers to revisit this wording in order to comply with NPPF §114.	This part of the policy should be amended to avoid inconsistencies with the NPPF. It also reads that only negative impacts need to be assessed which is not the case	<b>Amend this part of the policy to say "...to assess the impacts of development and, where necessary, provide appropriate mitigation."</b>	183; 204	Turley (Clowes Developments, Redrow, Wilson Estates); Mather Jamie (Paul Fovargue)
<p><b>IF5(3) Having regard to its scale, type and location, new development will be required to maximise accessibility by sustainable modes of transport by: (a) Providing well-designed pedestrian and cycle links within the development; (b) Where necessary, providing for a bus link within the development; and (c) Taking opportunities to link to existing footpaths, cycleways and bus routes in the wider area.</b></p> <p><b>IF5(4) The district's strategic cycling and walking routes, as identified in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, will be safeguarded. Any development proposals which would impact these routes will be expected to accommodate them within the development.</b></p>				
[Part 3b should be amended as follows: Where <del>necessary</del>	Agreed that a bus link will not always be required and appropriate is a better term.	<b>Replace 'necessary' with</b>	234	Turley (IM Properties)

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

<b>appropriate</b> , providing for a bus link within the development.]		<b>‘appropriate in part (3)(b).</b>		
--	--	-------------------------------------	--	--

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

<p>[Welcome the focus on promoting sustainable travel and for new developments to be accessed by well-designed pedestrian and cycle links and a bus link, where necessary. This includes the preparation of the Local and Walking Cycling Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) for the district which will help to provide appropriate infrastructure for supporting mode shift.]</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>112</p>	<p>National Highways</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [Improvements to existing cycling and walking routes are required as they are more intensively used due to new developments and increased tourism.</li> <li>• All new developments should include social paths and provide connections to current trails.</li> <li>• The poor surfacing on the Measham to Donisthorpe trail has led to repeated complaints and accidents. A short section was resurfaced section around 4-5 years ago but no further improvements have been made. The trail is unsuitable for cyclists, walkers, and wheelchair users.]</li> </ul>	<p>These comments are noted and officers agree with the points made in the first two bullet points.</p> <p>Whilst the Measham to Donisthorpe route is not identified as a priority route in the Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, these comments have been passed on to the Council's health and wellbeing team who are keeping a working log of where improvements to infrastructure are needed and will add these comments to that log.</p>	<p>No change to the policy itself</p>	<p>175</p>	<p>Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe and Acresford Parish Council.</p>
<p>[Section 3 should state that development will maximise accessibility via sustainable modes including green infrastructure such as EV charge points for residents who</p>	<p>New development must provide electric vehicle charging points in accordance with Part S of the Building Regulations. The need for any additional 'green</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

have no choice but to use private vehicles, to support the transition to electric vehicles and enable the infrastructure to be in place]	infrastructure' would need to be defined (it is too broad a term) and justified as part of the Regulation 19 consultation			
We support the principle of including safeguarding provisions within the draft policy, albeit in practice this may need to be widened out to include other forms of transport infrastructure (i.e. not just the LCWIP corridors), subject to the outcomes of the ongoing/planned transport evidence.	This part of the policy could be broadened with some minor amendments.	Amend part (4) to read " <b><i>The district's strategic cycling and walking routes, including those as identified in the...</i></b> "	341	Leicestershire County Council
<b>IF5(5) Development that Development that has a demonstrable transport impact will be required to financially contribute towards: (a) Public transport services; (b) Any sustainable transport measures necessary to make the development acceptable; and/or (c) Any offsite highways improvements necessary to mitigate the impact of development.</b>				
[The policy should be expanded to include Section 278 agreements as a form of mitigation. Section 278 is an alternative to S106 and allows the developer to control the delivery and timing of the highway scheme]	Noted	<b>Delete 'financially' from the opening sentence.</b>  <b>At Regulation 19 stage, add text on S106 and S278 agreements.</b>	112	National Highways
[Part (5) should be amended; 'demonstrable' has a negative connotations whereas a term such as 'noticeable' or 'perceptible' would achieve the same result without being unnecessarily negative.]	Officers think that demonstrable is an appropriate term.	No change	147	Gladman Developments
[The development must mitigate its own impact and not be utilised to	Noted	No change	147	Gladman Developments

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

address existing deficiencies present in the authority]				
Part 5 of Draft Policy IF5 includes “and / or” after part (b), but not after part (a). This should be changed so “and / or” is also included after part (a). Public transport services may well be part of any solution and require a financial contribution, but this will not be so in every case, so it must be made clear that these are alternatives to be considered individually or in combination	Noted	<b>Add “and/or” at the end of part (a).</b>	225	Planning Prospects (St Modwen Logistics)
[Part 5c should be amended as follows: <i>Any offsite highways improvements necessary to mitigate the impact of the development to an acceptable level.</i> ]	‘Necessary to mitigate’ is considered an appropriate qualifier.	No change	234	Turley (IM Properties)
[Part (5) is not consistent with the NPPF and in order to be sound should be amended as follows: <i>Development that has a demonstrable adverse impact on highway safety or the operation of the highway network will be required to mitigate its effects to ensure that its residual impacts on highway safety are not unacceptable and its impacts on the road network will not be severe. Such mitigation should focus on measure required to minimise vehicle trips, increasing movement by active and shared travel,</i>	Noted	No change	243	Avison Young (Jelson Homes)

# APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

<i>and only after such measures have been explored, the delivery of off-site highway infrastructure.</i>				
[Adequate funding to mitigate impacts to railway safety and operations including level crossings and railway stations should be provided by developers and we feel that the wording should be expanded to reflect these potential impacts. In view of this we would ask that the draft wording in section (5)(a) should reflect this so that it is captured in the local plan.	There are currently no passenger rail services or stations in the district – Policy IF6 deals with the potential Leicester To Burton Rail Line. Freight rail does operate through the district and there are some level crossings. Any developer contributions would need to be fully justified in accordance with the legal tests in the CIL Regulations. It may be more appropriate for impacts upon rail safety and operation to be assessed in Transport Assessments rather than add this requirement to a policy that seeks to provide sustainable transport / highways improvements measures.	<b>Add supporting text to at Regulation 19 stage to confirm that Transport Assessments should, where appropriate, take into account impacts upon railway safety and operation.</b>	244	Network Rail
We note that Paragraph 9.34 (Public Transport) only seems to relate to bus services and we would ask that this paragraph is expanded to include rail, particularly in relation to the enhancement of existing services so that this is captured in the local plan.	There is no passenger rail in the district. Policy IF6 deals with the potential Leicester to Burton Rail Line.	No change	244	Network Rail



# APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

CHAPTER 10	POLICY NUMBER – EN1	POLICY NAME – NATURE CONSERVATION/BIO DIVERSITY NET GAIN
------------	---------------------	--

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Support	Noted	No change	92	Ashy de la Zouch Town Council
In general terms we support the principles enshrined in this Section but note that both IW1 and EMP90, if allowed, will fall woefully short of any capability of showing a biodiversity net gain of 10%. Rather, they will produce a massive degradation of biodiversity in the area - which no amount of mitigation will be able to restore. In net zero and biodiversity terms it makes no strategic sense to destroy something in one location and attempt to mitigate it in another, the primary casualty will still suffer death by a thousand cuts. A far more sound policy would be to protect first and to mitigate second. We therefore call on NWLDC to adopt a policy of utilising brownfield sites as a first priority and to only even consider greenfield desecration once all brownfield potential has been exhausted.	<p>As set out in the <a href="#">Planning Practice Guidance</a>, the objective of net gain “is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value <u>relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat</u> [underlining added]”. There is no evidence at this stage to suggest that it will not be possible for this requirement to be addressed onsite at either IW1 (Isley Woodhouse) or EMP 90 (land south of East Midlands Airport).</p> <p>The amount of brownfield land in North West Leicestershire and which does not already benefit from planning permission, is limited and largely comprises of small areas/ The Local plan allocates the site of the former Hermitage Leisure Centre in Whitwick for housing, and also includes an allowance for</p>	No change	115	Protect Diseworth

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	redevelopment of sites around Coalville Town Centre			
It is suggested that part 1(a) should refer to “the time a planning application is submitted” rather than when it is determined. Part 1(d) is confusing as it is not clear as to whether it relates to only part (c ) (i) to (v) or just to biodiversity requirements.	The current legislation built in an allowance for sites already in the process of being determined such that the provisions would not apply. It is possible that any future changes would do likewise. However, if it did not the current proposed wording of part(a) could result in delays to both the determination and delivery of development. Therefore, it is agreed that a change is required.	<i>That part (a) be amended to state “Ensuring that development provides a net gain in biodiversity consistent with any national policy prevailing at the time that a planning application is <del>determined</del> <u>submitted</u>”</i>	147	Gladman Developments
The policy is supported as it accords with the National Planning Policy Framework. Should the Council seek a requirement higher than the national standards, these would need to be justified and tested.	Noted. It is not proposed to seek higher requirements than those required nationally.	No change	150	Savills o/b/o David Wilson Homes East Midlands
Policy EN1 is in alignment with national policy on biodiversity net gain and is therefore supported.	Noted	No change	161	Mather Jamie o/b/o The Trustees of Lord Crawshaw 1997 Discretionary Settlement
The Parish Council supports nature conservation/biodiversity.	Noted	No change	175	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe and

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
				Acresford Parish Council
Support the need to provide biodiversity net gain in accordance with national requirements. However, requirement (d) is considered to go beyond the national requirements. Furthermore, on site provision may not be the most beneficial in terms of biodiversity net gain. Requirement (e) duplicates national requirements and should be deleted	<p>National policy allows for any BNG provision to be on-site, offsite or delivered via statutory biodiversity credits. Part (d) of the proposed policy is intended to make clear that the Council's preference is for provision to be made on site wherever possible. It is accepted that this may always be possible or even preferable, but it is considered that it is appropriate for the policy to make this clear. It is considered that the policy would benefit from some rewording. In addition, it is suggested that it be renumbered to become part (c).</p> <p>In respect of part (e) The Environment Act 2021 requires the submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan. As such, therefore, this part of the proposed policy would duplicate national requirements and so it would be appropriate to delete it.</p>	<p>That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c):</p> <p><b>"Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable"</b></p> <p>That part (c) be renumbered as part (d) and that part (e) be deleted.</p>	184	Pegasus Group o/b/o Hallam Land Management
Clowes are supportive of the need to address net losses to biodiversity	Noted	No change	185	Pegasus Group o/b/o Clowes

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
through the provision of enhancement to deliver an overall net gain.				Developments Ltd
Wilson Bowden is supportive of the need to address net losses to biodiversity through the provision of enhancement to deliver an overall net gain.	Noted	No change	186	Pegasus Group o/b/o Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd
Support the need to provide biodiversity net gain in accordance with national requirements. However, requirement (d) is considered to go beyond the national requirements. Furthermore, on site provision may not be the most beneficial in terms of biodiversity net gain. Requirement (e) duplicates national requirements and should be deleted	<p>National policy allows for any BNG provision to be on-site, offsite or delivered via statutory biodiversity credits. Part (d) of the proposed policy is intended to make clear that the Council's preference is for provision to be made on site wherever possible. It is accepted that this may always be possible or even preferable, but it is considered that it is appropriate for the policy to make this clear. It is considered that the policy would benefit from some rewording. In addition, it is suggested that this be renumbered to become part (c).</p> <p>In respect of part (e) The Environment Act 2021 requires the submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan. As such, therefore, this part of the proposed policy</p>	<p>That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c):</p> <p><b>"Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable"</b></p> <p>That part (c) be renumbered as part (d) and that part (e) be deleted.</p>	193	Pegasus Group o/b/o Hallam Land Management

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	would duplicate national requirements and so it would be appropriate to delete it.			
Policy EN1 is in alignment with national policy on biodiversity net gain and is therefore supported.	Noted	No change	204	Mather Jamie o/b/o Paul Fovargue
<p>The policy should make reference to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain in accordance with national policy.</p> <p>The plan does not provide guidance in respect of where any of-site provision should be accommodated. The requirement for any off-site provision to be located close to a development site should be removed.</p>	<p>Part (a) of the policy requires that development deliver biodiversity net gain that is consistent with national policy. This provides flexibility in the event that national policy requirements increase or decrease.</p> <p>It is proposed that part (d) which refers to offsite provision be deleted.</p>	<p>That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c):</p> <p><b>“Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable”</b></p> <p>That part (c) be renumbered as part (d) and that part (e) be deleted.</p>	214	Stantec UK Ltd o/b/o Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Support the need to provide biodiversity net gain in accordance with national requirements. However, requirement (d) is considered to go beyond the national requirements. Furthermore, on site provision may not be the most beneficial in terms of biodiversity net gain. Requirement (e) duplicates national requirements and should be deleted	<p>National policy allows for any BNG provision to be on-site, offsite or delivered via statutory biodiversity credits. Part (d) of the proposed policy is intended to make clear that the Council's preference is for provision to be made on site wherever possible. It is accepted that this may always be possible or even preferable, but it is considered that it is appropriate for the policy to make this clear. It is considered that the policy would benefit from some rewording. In addition, it is suggested that this be renumbered to become part (c).</p> <p>In respect of part (e) The Environment Act 2021 requires the submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan. As such, therefore, this part of the proposed policy would duplicate national requirements and so it would be appropriate to delete it.</p>	<p>That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c):</p> <p><b>“Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable”</b></p> <p>That part (c) be renumbered as part (d) and that part (e) be deleted.</p>	216	Pegasus Group o/b/o Westernrange
<p>10.29 the wording should be updated to reflect the introduction of mandatory net gain on 12th February 2024.</p> <p>10.30 the metric will be known as the Statutory Biodiversity Metric.</p>	The supporting text to the policy will be updated.	That the supporting text be amended to take account of changes since the draft plan was published.	223	Natural England

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>10.32 We are pleased to note the joined up across different policies that enhancing biodiversity has many benefits including health &amp; wellbeing, creating attractive places and climate change mitigation.</p> <p>An explanation of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) for Leicestershire &amp; Rutland as it develops should be provided.</p> <p>Statutory guidance on alignment between Local Plans and LNRS is anticipated as part of the Governments work on planning reform. LNRS will guide BNG off site units where they can be most effective for ecological connectivity.</p> <p>As well as this policy there should be a clear strategy for BNG delivery within allocated sites for development.</p>				
<p>This policy is supported but it should recognise the need for the biodiversity net gain projects to not compromise the aviation safety and aerodrome safeguarding requirements of EMA. A cross reference to the EMA aerodrome safeguarding policy (Ec9) could usefully be added.</p>	<p>Part (1) of policy Ec9 (East Midlands Airport: Safeguarding) already seeks to ensure that new development does not affect the operational integrity of the airport. However, it is agreed that it would be helpful to include a refence in the supporting text to policy En1 cross refer to policy Ec9.</p>	<p>That the supporting text to policy En1 include reference to the need for biodiversity net gain projects to not compromise the aviation safety and aerodrome safeguarding requirements in accordance with Ec9 (East Midlands Airport: Safeguarding)</p>	230	East Midlands Airport

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
We agree that it is important to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the district, but ensuring development provides a net gain in biodiversity consistent with national policy at the time a planning application is determined. Caddick's proposals for land south of Ashby Road, Kegworth would achieve a biodiversity net gain of over 20% which is considerably higher than the statutory minimum and this is one of the many benefits that favour the Site's allocation.	Noted	No change	232	Stantec UK Ltd o/b/o Caddick Land
Support the need to provide biodiversity net gain in accordance with national requirements. However, requirement (d) is considered to go beyond the national requirements. Furthermore, on site provision may not be the most beneficial in terms of biodiversity net gain. Requirement (e) duplicates national requirements and should be deleted	National policy allows for any BNG provision to be on-site, offsite or delivered via statutory biodiversity credits. Part (d) of the proposed policy is intended to make clear that the Council's preference is for provision to be made on site wherever possible. It is accepted that this may always be possible or even preferable, but it is considered that it is appropriate for the policy to make this clear. It is considered that the policy would benefit from some rewording. In addition, it is suggested that tis be renumbered to become part (c).	That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c):  <b>"Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable"</b>  That part (c) be renumbered as part (d) and that part (e) be deleted.	235	Pegasus Group o/b/o Davidsons & Westernrange



# APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	In respect of part (e) The Environment Act 2021 requires the submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan. As such, therefore, this part of the proposed policy would duplicate national requirements and so it would be appropriate to delete it.			
Bloor Homes supports the emerging Policy in principle. However, the policy should recognise there may be some circumstances where local provision is not possible and national biodiversity credits cannot be ruled out in some circumstances.	National policy allows for any BNG provision to be on-site, offsite or delivered via statutory biodiversity credits. Part (d) of the proposed policy is intended to make clear that the Council's preference is for provision to made on site wherever possible. It is accepted that this may always be possible or even preferable, but it is considered that it is appropriate for the policy to make this clear. It is considered that the policy would benefit from some rewording. In addition, it is suggested that tis be renumbered to become part (c).	That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c):  <b>"Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable"</b>  That part (c) be renumbered as part (d)	245	Evolve Planning o/b/o Bloor Homes
Bloor Homes supports the emerging Policy in principle. However, the policy should recognise there may be some circumstances where local provision is not possible and national biodiversity	National policy allows for any BNG provision to be on-site, offsite or delivered via statutory biodiversity credits. Part (d) of the proposed policy is intended to	That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c):	256	Evolve Planning o/b/o Cameron Homes

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
credits cannot be ruled out in some circumstances.	make clear that the Council's preference is for provision to be made on site wherever possible. It is accepted that this may always be possible or even preferable, but it is considered that it is appropriate for the policy to make this clear. It is considered that the policy would benefit from some rewording. In addition, it is suggested that this be renumbered to become part (c).	<b>"Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable"</b>  That part (c) be renumbered as part (d)		
In respect of part (e) it is not clear as to how a requirement for developments to have a management plan will this be monitored.	The Environment Act 2021 requires the submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan. As such, therefore, this part of the proposed policy would duplicate national requirements and so it would be appropriate to delete it.	That part (e) be deleted	289	Swannington Parish Council
This is a key policy in demonstrating NWLDC's approach to environmental conservation and mitigating and adapting to climate change. Biodiversity provides good education opportunities and an understanding of how it can contribute to a child's local community.	Noted	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council
In 10.28, it is emphasised that there is a need to boost the levels of bio	As set out in the <a href="#">Planning Practice Guidance</a> , the objective	No change	350	Teresa Walker

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
diversity and yet the proposals for development are highly likely to diminish these levels of biodiversity.	of net gain “is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value <u>relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat</u> [underlining added]”. There is no evidence at this stage to suggest that it will not be possible for this requirement to be addressed onsite at either IW1 (Isley Woodhouse) or EMP 90 (land south of East Midlands Airport).			
There can be no question that if either IW1 or EMP90 are developed, neither can be built sustainably or be designed to achieve a net biodiversity gain of 10%, whatever mitigations might be employed. Further development, on top of what has gone before, will completely destroy the entire ecology, ethos and character of the area, as well as create a mighty mess of urban and industrial sprawl where no-one would voluntarily choose to live or work.	As set out in the <a href="#">Planning Practice Guidance</a> , the objective of net gain “is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value <u>relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat</u> [underlining added]”. There is no evidence at this stage to suggest that it will not be possible for this requirement to be addressed onsite at either IW1 (Isley Woodhouse) or EMP 90 (land south of East Midlands Airport).	No change	376	Jim Snee
Welcome this section and have the following comments to make: Para 10.29. January 2024 should be changed to February 2024 in order to reflect the mandatory go-live date.	Noted. The supporting text at 10.29 and 10.30 will be updated accordingly.	No change	404	The Environment Agency

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>Para. 10.30. We recommend that the last sentence is amended to read: "...habitats will need to be secured, <b>managed</b> and <b>monitored</b> for at least 30 years".</p> <p>Para 10.31. We recommend the wording is amended to state the preference for and therefore encouragement for on-site gains.</p>	Noted. Supporting text to be amended.			
Rural development, both housing and commercial, must be permitted. So that rural individuals can live, work and invest in the environment. From planting hedges or installing renewables there must be a sustainable local population and economy. Otherwise the Council will not achieve their environmental objectives.	Noted	No change	422	Country Land and Business Association
10.32 notes the importance of "health and well being", the need to create "attractive places" and to respond to "climate change". Covering the land with buildings and infrastructure does not allow for any of these. Green spaces are important, small though they may be in the universal scheme of things, to peoples mental and physical health, and to the well-being of the natural habitats around us.	The Local Plan has to seek a balance between meeting the future housing and employment needs, whilst also protecting and seeking improvements to the environment. Policy En1 will ensure that new development helps to improve biodiversity across the district consistent with national legislation.	No change	539	Shirley Briggs

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
The policies don't consider the local wellbeing of the residents or wildlife only the businesses who want to make money out of developing the area. If you carry on like this we won't have any rural environments left.	The Local Plan has to seek a balance between meeting the future housing and employment needs, whilst also protecting and seeking improvements to the environment. Policy En1 will ensure that new development helps to improve biodiversity across the district consistent with national legislation.	No change	580	Karl Pigott
The environment would be very much affected. With lots more traffic. This would also affect the wildlife, and mental and physical health of the residents who can at the moment walk in the country lanes to see the birds and wild life, farm animals etc.	The Local Plan has to seek a balance between meeting the future housing and employment needs, whilst also protecting and seeking improvements to the environment. Policy En1 will ensure that new development helps to improve biodiversity across the district consistent with national legislation.	No change	581	Kathleen Pigott

## APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

Increasing development will have an impact on biodiversity, loss of habitats and scheme to compensate for loss will not be as good as the lost environment.	The Local Plan has to seek a balance between meeting the future housing and employment needs, whilst also protecting and seeking improvements to the environment. Policy En1 will ensure that new development helps to improve biodiversity across the district consistent with national legislation.	No change	597	Sue Bull
---	---	-----------	-----	----------

CHAPTER: 10	POLICY NUMBER: En3	POLICY NAME: THE NATIONAL FOREST
-------------	--------------------	----------------------------------

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<b>(1) In the National Forest, as defined on the Policies Map, we will support development that: (a) Provides opportunities for diversification of the economy, especially in relation to the woodland economy and tourism, including visitor accommodation which accords with Policy Ec12 and reflects the National Forest Company's Sustainable Tourism Accommodation Design Guide.</b>				
Hoped the policy would be more supportive of tourism accommodation in the Forest than elsewhere in the District, particularly where the Sustainable Tourism Accommodation Guide has been taken into account.	Policy En3 does support tourism accommodation in the National Forest which accords with the National Forest Company's Sustainable Tourism Accommodation Guide.	No change.	146	National Forest Company
<b>(3) Where planting and landscaping cannot be accommodated within or close to the development site or where the only potential area of planting or landscaping is small or is isolated with limited connectivity to other habitats, a commuted sum may be agreed.</b>				
The removal of "in exceptional circumstances" from Clause 3, is completely unacceptable. There needs to be early additional consultation with this council and the other wards directly impacted by the National Forest Company vision for The Heart of the Forest. Cannot support the watered-down clause 3 as it leaves the door open for trees that should be planted in or close to our ward being planted miles away, this will not support the local area's development. ODAPC object to this – no exception, <i>trees not more houses!</i>	NWLDC have worked with the National Forest Company (NFC) on the drafting of the National Forest Policy and supporting text. It was during this joint working that the removal of 'in exceptional circumstances' was agreed. Monitoring of sites undertaken by the NFC demonstrates that where the requirement is for a small area of planting and landscaping, this is often not provided or is provided but the quality and connectivity is such that it does not contribute to National Forest cover. As	No change.	175	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe & Acresford Parish Council (ODAPC)

	such, the NFC may wish to request a financial contribution in these circumstances, which is not considered 'exceptional' therefore the reference to 'exceptional' has been omitted.			
<b>SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL POLICY CRITERIA</b>				
<b>En3 - Policy wording</b> We would encourage the following criterion to be included in the Policy relating to development in the Heart of the National Forest. <b>Suggested additional criterion:</b> <u>Within the Heart of the National Forest development should support the delivery of the Heart of the National Forest Vision. The following types of development will be supported:</u> <u>A) Tourism and leisure attractions</u> <u>B) Visitor accommodation where it complies with the Sustainable Tourism Accommodation Design Guide.</u> <u>C) Proposals associated with the woodland, environmental and green economy and education or research in those sectors.</u> <u>D) Enhancements to the footpath and cycleway network.</u> <u>E) Small scale renewable energy installations.</u> <u>F) Volunteer facilities.</u> <u>Development in the Heart of the National Forest should strengthen linkages to nearby urban areas and</u>	The National Forest Company was in the process of updating The Heart of the National Forest Vision Document at the time the draft Local Plan document was being prepared. As the Vision document has now been published the Policy should include reference to The Heart of the National Forest Vision.  Officers have recently (July 2025) met with the National Forest Company and revised wording for Policy En3 has been agreed. It was also considered that an illustrative map, included as an appendix in the Local Plan, showing the broad location of the Heart of the National Forest would be useful.  Additional supporting text will be added to provide additional detail about the Heart of the National Forest and the associated Vision document.	Policy amended to include the following additional criteria (4):  <b>Within the Heart of the National Forest development should demonstrate support for the delivery of the Heart of the National Forest Vision by:</b> <b>Strengthening linkages to nearby urban areas and leisure and tourism attractions.</b> <b>Being exemplars of sustainable design and construction and Seeking to promote the use of non-motorised modes of travel.</b> <b>The District Council will support the National Forest Company and others</b>	146	National Forest Company



<p><u>leisure and tourism attractions. Development will be exemplars of sustainable design and construction and seek to promote the use of non-motorised modes of travel. The District Council will support the National Forest Company and others in the delivery of the Heart of the National Forest Vision. Development in the Heart of the National Forest should demonstrate compliance with the Vision.</u></p>		<p><b>in the delivery of the Heart of the National Forest Vision. Development in the Heart of the National Forest should demonstrate compliance with the Vision.</b></p> <p>Additional supporting text will be added to include additional detail about the Heart of the National Forest Vision Document.</p> <p>Parts (1), (2) and (3) of the policy amended as follows: Part (1)(b) of the policy include reference to <b>educational</b> opportunities. Part (2) to include 2 new criteria: <b>(b) ensure the siting and scale of the proposed development is appropriately related to its setting within the Forest; and (c) respect the character and appearance of the National Forest.</b></p>		
---	--	---	--	--

## APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

		Part (3) revised to make the policy wording clearer. Provide an illustrative map showing the broad location of the Heart of the National Forest to be included as an appendix in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.		
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS ON POLICY En3</b>				
Support the aims behind the policy and have no overriding issues with the policy and requirements. Would recommend a change to the policy wording to make it clearer that residential development is accepted in the National Forest. The policy currently appears to not directly support residential development within the National Forest. This is especially critical as some of the key locations for housing delivery fall within the National Forest. Similar terminology could be used to that within Draft Policy En4 which identifies there are some developments which would be given priority but does not rule out other development as long as it meets the policies criteria.	The policy supports 'development' and the supporting text sets out the requirements for woodland planting and landscaping as part of new developments, including residential developments. The site allocation policies for sites that fall within the National Forest include provision for tree planting and landscaping in accordance with draft Policy En3. Whilst residential development is not clearly stated in the policy it is inferred that residential development will be supported in the National Forest, providing it accords with the policies in the Local Plan.	No change.	147	Gladman Developments
Disappointing that the Draft Policy is not as specific about the Heart of the National Forest as the Adopted Plan.	A new criterion (4) to be added to the policy that refers to the	See changes above in response to the National	175, 180	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe & Acresford Parish

## APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

<p>The draft Policy does not specifically refer to tree planting within that area – unlike the clear definition within sections 4 and 5 of the Adopted Local Plan Policy.</p> <p>The removal of clauses 4 and 5 is completely unacceptable. Early consultation should take place with those wards directly impacted by the National Forest Company vision for The Heart of the Forest, and its impact on the new Local Plan.</p>	<p>Heart of the National Forest Vision.</p> <p>The requirement for tree planting within the National Forest (including within the Heart of the National Forest) is set out in Part (2)(a).</p>	<p>Forest Company's comment.</p>		<p>Council (ODAPC), Ashby Woulds Town Council</p>
<b>COMMENTS ON SUPPORTING TEXT</b>				
<p>Para. 10.46 The reference to carbon sinks is dated and may not be true. Instead, reference could be made to government policy to increase tree planting such as the Environment Act which sets out the policy to increase woodland and tree canopy cover in England to 16.5% of land area.</p>	<p>Noted and agree the suggested amendments to the supporting text.</p>	<p>Supporting text to be updated as suggested.</p>	<p>146</p>	<p>National Forest Company</p>
<p>Para. 10.49: Request the second sentence referring to the thresholds in the Guide is omitted as the National Forest planting thresholds are in the process of being updated. It's unlikely that the thresholds for residential and commercial/industrial development would change, but there should be further clarity the types of developments which require National</p>	<p>Noted and the supporting text will be updated. The council will await updated information on revised guidance on National Forest planting thresholds.</p>	<p>Amend the supporting text to reflect the most up to date information from the National Forest Company at the time of drafting the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>146</p>	<p>National Forest Company</p>

## APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

Forest planting [changes to the Guide will be communicated to NWLDC].				
<p>We would request that the section of 10.49 from 'other appropriate habitats...' is amended as detailed below to more accurately reflect what is sought from National Forest woodland planting and landscaping.</p> <p>Third sentence to start with: <u>National Forest woodland planting and landscaping</u></p> <p>Add additional text onto the end of paragraph 10.49: <u>other appropriate habitats such as wood pasture, parkland and ponds where they form part of a connected green infrastructure network. Public access should be included in areas of green infrastructure and footpath/cycleway connections to adjoining woodlands and public rights of way should be incorporated.</u></p>	Noted and agree the suggested amendments.	Supporting text updated to reflect the changes suggested.	146	National Forest Company
<p>The Heart of the Forest Vision is due to be launched in April 2024, and would suggest the following text to be added to the end of paragraph 10.52: <u>The Vision identifies three investment priorities and six investment zones which will support more diverse and thriving wildlife; improve wellbeing; will be accessible for everyone; encourage</u></p>	Noted and agree the amendments suggested to the supporting text.	Supporting text updated to reflect the changes suggested.	146	National Forest Company

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

<u>more people to visit and stay for longer; create greener jobs, support sustainable modes of travel and renewable energy and increase participation and volunteering opportunities.</u>				
Suggested additional paragraph in supporting text: <u>Development will be expected to incorporate the required National Forest planting in addition to compliance with Biodiversity Net Gain requirements set out in Policy En1 – Nature Conservation / Biodiversity Net Gain (Strategic Policy). The strategic significance multiplier in the metric will apply to woodland habitats and tree planting within the National Forest.</u>	Noted and agree that the additional wording could be added to the supporting text.	Supporting text updated to reflect the changes suggested.	146	National Forest Company
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>				
Policy En3 is supported to offer a range of leisure opportunities for communities and visitors	Noted.	No change.	45	Leicester Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board
Support	Noted.	No change.	92	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
Appropriate green infrastructure and energy development should be supported in the National Forest and Charnwood Forest Regional Park. A	Noted. Any proposals that require planning permission will need to be consistent with the proposed policy. Whether this is	No change.	107	Kirsten Cunningham Bardon Aggregates

## APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

balanced approach to conservation and green infrastructures can be met that provides long term aims of protecting, enhancing the landscape and biodiversity.	the case or not will depend upon the specific proposal and circumstances.			
We support draft policy En3 and the proposals at Corkscrew Lane have been designed with the National Forest designation in mind.	Noted.	No change.	204	Tom Collins
The proposals at Money Hill will provide tree planting throughout the site and landscaping in accordance with Draft Policy En3.	Noted.	No change.	214	Scarlett Lambeth Stantec obo Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Welcome policy.	Noted.	No change.	223	Natural England
Bloor Homes supports draft Policy En3. Land South of Heather presents an opportunity for the creation of tree planting as part of a landscape led approach development and the delivery of new recreational facilities to support the local community.	Noted.	No change.	245	Neil Cox obo Bloor Homes
There are no concerns with this policy and appears to reflect the current state of thinking in the Heart of the Forest area.	Noted.	No change.	341	Leicestershire County Council
National Forest tourism policies should continue to apply to the Fishing Lakes	Swannington is within the National Forest and as such	No change.	569	Phil Ellis

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

site off Spring Lane, Swannington - these units should not become for residential occupation to help meet housing targets.	provision (1)(a) of the policy, relating to the woodland economy and tourism, would apply.			
Being in the heart of the National Forest development should be kept as an absolute minimum.	The Local Plan is required to allocate development sites for housing and employment uses in the district to meet future needs. Policy En3 requires new development within the National Forest to contribute towards the creation of the forest.	No change.	597	Sue Bull

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E5 (AREA OF SEPARATION)

CHAPTER 10	POLICY NUMBER – EN5	POLICY NAME – AREA OF SEPARATION
------------	---------------------	----------------------------------

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
This policy, as it stands, is not directly relevant to Ashby. However, we would advocate including a paragraph to make it clear that this policy does not prevent other Areas of Separation being designated in Neighbourhood Plans if there is sufficient evidence to justify them.	Noted and agreed.	That the supporting text note that Areas of Separation could be designated through Neighbourhood Plans where justified.	92	Ashby De la Zouch Town Council
The policy wording is not considered to be as permissive as it needs to be, particularly in the context where insufficient housing is being provided in the Coalville Urban Area. Alternative wording is suggested which would support development which “ <i>clearly maintains the separation between the built-up areas of these settlements</i> ”.	The current wording for policy En5 is the same as that used in the adopted Local Plan and which was approved by the then Local Plan Inspector. However, it is considered that the wording of the part (2) of the policy could make more positive.	That part (2) be amended to state:  “Development will <del>not</del> <b>only</b> be permitted which, either individually or cumulatively, would <b>not</b> demonstrably adversely affect or diminish the present open and undeveloped character of the area”.	150	Savills o/b/o David Wilson Homes East Midlands
The Planning Inspector who examined the adopted Local Plan recognised that there may be a need to review the boundaries of the Area of Separation in the light of increased development needs. As such this scenario has	Since the consultation was undertaken, and in view of the significant need for additional housing, the extent of the Area of Separation has been reduced in	That the extent of the Area of Separation be amended to reflect the previous decisions in respect of proposed housing allocations	195	Marrons o/b/o William Davis Homes



# APPENDIX E- POLICY E5 (AREA OF SEPARATION)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>come to pass, particularly in view of the primacy of the Coalville Urban Area in the spatial strategy. The designation is restrictive and need to be justified by evidence.</p> <p>It is noted that the 2022 study reassessed the boundaries of the Area of separation, but it is considered that the study is not robust. In particular, the NPPF does not, as suggested, provide a precedent for the Area of Separation.</p> <p>Concerns are also expressed regarding the methodology used such that it does not provide a substantial basis to conclude that it is appropriate to limit development given the sustainable location in the Coalville Urban Area, the most sustainable location in the district.</p>	<p>order to accommodate some housing development.</p> <p>The Council's consultant who undertook the Area of Separation study has provided a response to the detailed comments. These are attached to this appendix.</p>	<p>within the current Area of Separation.</p>		
<p>Natural England suggests that opportunities should be taken to enhance the biodiversity value of Areas of Separation and the potential to make connections with the wider Green Infrastructure network. There may also be opportunities for Biodiversity Net Gain off-setting sites within these areas.</p>	<p>Noted. This can be addressed through references in the supporting text.</p>	<p>That the supporting text notes the potential for biodiversity net gain opportunities within the Area of Separation.</p>	223	Natural England

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E5 (AREA OF SEPARATION)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>The approach taken by the Council in respect of the Area of Separation is flawed. Whilst the Inspector who considered the adopted Local Plan supported the Area of Separation, that was in the context of spatial strategy being promoted and with the development requirements at that time. The evidence presented by the Council in support of the Area of Separation is not considered to be robust, particularly as it does not assess whether the release of land in the Area of Separation would still meet the central objective of policy En5. A detailed critique of the approach is presented.</p> <p>Coalville and Whitwick have already merged, they are indistinguishable from each other (particularly, and importantly, in the immediately vicinity of the AoS), and they function as a single urban area. It is not necessary to keep the land open and doing so is forcing much needed development to less sustainable .</p>	<p>Since the consultation was undertaken, and in view of the significant need for additional housing, the extent of the Area of Separation has been reduced in order to accommodate some housing development.</p> <p>The Council's consultant who undertook the Area of Separation study has provided a response to the detailed comments. These are attached to this appendix.</p>	<p>That the extent of the Area of Separation be amended to reflect the previous decisions in respect of proposed housing allocations within the current Area of Separation.</p>	243	Avison Young o/b/o Jelson Homes
<p>It is not clear as to why the Swannington Incline, Hough Hill, and Snibston 3 are not included in the Area of Separation</p>	<p>The Coalville-Whitwick Area of Separation covers those parts that are within the built-up area and which cannot be regarded as countryside. The three areas referred to however can be</p>	<p>No change</p>	289	Swannington Parish Council

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E5 (AREA OF SEPARATION)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	regarded as countryside and are protected as such.			
No comments	Noted	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council
<p>The Area of Separation (Formally Green Wedge) should be increased not depleted. In particular land adjoining the roundabout of the A511/Hermitage Road which has previously had permission for housing development should be included. The land plays an important role in maintaining physical separation, protects identity and prevents coalescence and serves as the gateway for the public to access the land beyond. The public foot path which runs through the plot is a widely used amenity and gives access the newly planted National Forest areas and paths that weave through Area A.</p> <p>Broom Leys Farm should not lose its designation of AoS or be built upon. Developing this area would have a detrimental effect on the open landscapes that enrich people's lives. In addition, development would without doubt compromise the air quality further. We do need new housing within the district, including much needed</p>	<p>The parcel of land adjoining Hermitage Road (parcel 14), together with adjoining land to the rear of properties on Hermitage Road, is proposed to be excluded from the area of development in order to maintain a buffer between new development and existing dwellings.</p> <p>The Area of Separation study (2022) identifies this parcel as being of secondary importance. In the 2023 study the site is identified as being within Priority A (forms coherent extension with suitable access, can be adequately mitigated and is available and promoted).</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>	<p>406</p>	<p>Jo Straw</p>

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E5 (AREA OF SEPARATION)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
genuinely affordable housing. This should be delivered in the right places and in line with local need. Depleting the Area of Separation is not the right place for housing development nor is it a sequentially preferable location.	In view of the need to identify sufficient land to meet the housing requirements and the conclusions of the 2023 study, it is considered appropriate to no longer include this area within the Area of Separation.			
This policy re. Coalville & Whitwick is to be welcomed (although I doubt it is strong enough for residents of those areas) but where is a similar policy directive for the Northern Parishes? The statements in relation to both Housing development (already allocated & proposed) and Industrial/Commercial expansion will effectively create an enormous urban conurbation around J23 of 3/5 miles with a large busy Airport at its centre.	The Coalville-Whitwick Area of Separation is unique in that it is surrounded by built development. The separation of settlements in other instances is identified as an issue for consideration under policy S4 (Countryside).	No change	475	David Manley
If land to South of Church Lane, Whitwick is developed, the remaining buffer up to the Incline should be designated as an area of separation between Whitwick and Swannington.	The land in question can be more properly considered as part of the countryside between Whitwick and Swannington.	No change	569	Phil Ellis
Proposed housing at C46 [Broom Leys Road] violates the statement "there is a presumption against development that would result in the physical coalescence of Coalville and Whitwick and the loss of the separate identity of	The 2022 Area of Separation study identified the area of land covered by C46 as being of Secondary importance to the Area of Separation as whole. This is partly because of the	No change	618	Sandra Ramp

# APPENDIX E- POLICY E5 (AREA OF SEPARATION)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>the two settlements." The earlier version of the Local Plan excluded land at C46.</p> <p>The area of separation is extremely important to this area and there is a large opposition to building on it.</p>	<p>vegetation along the former mineral railway and the adjacent Coalville Rugby Club. In view of the significant need for land for more housing, and in view of the evidence outlined above, it is considered appropriate to allocate this part of the Area of Separation for future housing development.</p>			

This page is intentionally left blank

### **Draft Policy AP2 – Amenity**

- (1) New development should be designed to minimise its impact on the amenity and living conditions of both future residents and existing residents in its vicinity. Development proposals will be permitted where:
  - (a) They do not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of existing residents through the loss of privacy, excessive overshadowing and overbearing impact.
  - (b) They do not generate an unacceptable level of activity, noise, vibration, light or unpleasant odour emission, which cannot be mitigated to an appropriate standard.
- (2) Development proposals which are likely to experience significant adverse effects from noise, vibration, light or odour levels in the vicinity will only be permitted where suitable mitigation can be provided that would reduce the effects to an appropriate level.
- (3) Proposals for external lighting schemes should be designed to minimise potential pollution from glare or light spillage. The intensity of lighting should be necessary to achieve its purpose, and the benefits of the lighting scheme must be shown to outweigh any adverse effects.

### **Draft Policy AP3 – Renewable Energy (Strategic Policy)**

- (1) The Council will support renewable energy proposals that contribute towards achieving the following renewable energy generation targets by 2042:
  - (a) 55.7 MW of energy generated by solar energy generation.
  - (b) 52.6 MW of energy generated by wind generation.
- (2) Proposals for renewable energy generation as part of new developments should be proportionate to the scale of the proposed development and appropriate to their setting.
- (3) Planning applications for renewable energy including any new grid connection lines and any ancillary infrastructure and buildings associated with the development will be supported where:
  - (a) There is no unacceptable impact on residential amenity as result of the development alone or in conjunction with any permitted and existing renewable energy schemes in terms of noise, shadow flicker, vibration, topple distance, glint and glare and visual dominance; and
  - (b) There is no unacceptable impact on biodiversity, ecology or wildlife; and
  - (c) There is no unacceptable impact on landscape character taking account of the special qualities set out within the individual National Character Areas; and
  - (d) The potential impacts on ~~air-traffic~~ aviation safety and aircraft operations ~~radar and~~ communications at or in the vicinity of East Midlands Airport have been addressed; and
  - (e) There is no adverse impact on highway safety; and
  - (f) Proposals are accompanied by details to demonstrate how future maintenance will be undertaken and how the site will be decommissioned to ensure the restoration of the site following cessation, such details will be secured by means of condition and/or Section 106 legal agreement; and
- (4) In addition to the above considerations, proposals for wind energy developments will be supported where:
  - (a) The site and scale of development proposed corresponds with the 'Areas Identified as potentially suitable for small scale or medium/large scale turbines' as defined on the Policies Map or is set out within an area defined as being suitable for wind energy development within a made Neighbourhood Plan; and
  - (b) It can be demonstrated that the proposal has support from the local community; and
  - ~~(c)~~
- (5) Proposals for solar energy developments including both mounted and standalone ground mounted installations and extensions and repowering of solar extensions, should avoid using the best and most versatile agricultural land where possible.



- (1) Development is required to contribute to the Council's aim for a carbon neutral district by 2050. To achieve this, all new development will be required to demonstrate that :
  - (a) On-site renewable energy generation is maximised as much as possible;
  - (b) Energy efficiency targets in line with the latest national standards at the time a planning application is determined, will be achieved ~~as set by national policies~~ (including any transitional arrangements); and
  - (c) That measures have been taken to minimise energy consumption by following the steps in the energy hierarchy.
- ~~(2) Renewable energy generation should be maximised as much as possible on-site. Where the use of on-site renewables to match the total energy consumption of the development/site is demonstrated not to be technically feasible or economically viable, a financial contribution will be required to the council's carbon offset fund to enable residual carbon emissions to be offset by other local initiatives.~~

#### **Draft Policy AP5 – Health and Wellbeing (Strategic Policy)**

- (1) Development that maintains and improves the physical and mental health and wellbeing of our residents, enables healthier choices by tackling the causes of ill health and inequalities will be supported. Health considerations

will be embedded in decision making and the Council will support the creation of a high quality, accessible and inclusive environment.

(2) To achieve this, the Council will:

- (a) Ensure homes are high quality, good homes and allow people to live healthy lives within them and remain in their homes for longer.
- (b) Facilitate the creation of healthy and resilient communities with opportunities for social interaction, and where people feel safe.
- (c) Support the delivery of a safe walking and cycling network to increase access to active travel, considering active design within development and connections with the wider community, services and employment opportunities.
- (d) Promote and increase access to, and the protection and improvement of, green and blue spaces, sports facilities and play and recreation opportunities.
- (e) Maintain and improve accessibility to healthcare, social care, education and community facilities and wider support services.
- (f) Prevent negative impacts on residential amenity and wider public safety from noise, ground instability, ground and water contamination, vibration and air quality.
- (g) Support healthy eating and promote healthy food choices, through opportunities for sustainable food development, such as allotments and community growing places, and managing the location of, and access to, take away uses.

#### **Draft Policy AP6 - Health Impact Assessments**

(1) A Health Impact Assessment (HIA) Screening Statement must be undertaken for the following types of development:

- (a) all residential proposals of 50 or more dwellings; or
- (b) all major non-residential development; and
- (c) development located in an identified Area of Concern in the Leicestershire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (latest edition)

(2) Applicants should use the HIA Screening Tool prepared by Public Health (Leicestershire) and contained within the HIA template and guidance for North West Leicestershire ([Health Impact Assessments | Leicestershire County Council Professional Services](#))

#### **Draft Policy AP8 – Sustainable Drainage Systems**

- (1) Development proposals that could affect drainage on or around a site should incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water run-off consistent with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, or its successor. :

- (2) Sustainable Drainage Systems provided as part of major development proposals should: (a) take account of advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority; and (b) have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards; and (c) Ensure arrangements are put in place for the management and maintenance of the proposed surface water drainage system and any retained existing surface water drainage features over the whole period during which they are needed.

#### **Draft Policy AP9 – Water Efficiency**

- (1) As part of proposals for residential development applicants will be required to submit evidence to demonstrate that the national optional water efficiency standard of a maximum of 110 litres of water per person per day can be met, this will be secured by a planning condition.
- (2) Major non-residential proposals involving the extension, replacement or creation of new non-residential floorspace or a combination thereof will be required to demonstrate that BREEAM excellent credits for WAT 01 are being targeted and this will be secured by a planning condition. An

assessment of the building's water efficiency performance should be carried out by a BREEAM approved assessor using the BREEAM Wat 01 calculator, or equivalent best practice standard, and should be submitted as part of a planning application.

- (3) For all other development proposals captured by the planning process including, change of use, conversions, extensions and refurbishments, applicants will need to demonstrate that measures have been incorporated to achieve the highest level of water efficiency possible.

#### **Draft Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation in Kegworth**

- (1) Within the Parish of Kegworth we will support proposals for new (new-build or conversion) Houses in Multiple Occupation, extensions to Houses in Multiple Occupation or the increase in the occupancy of Houses in Multiple Occupation where:
  - (a) The existing number of Houses in Multiple Occupation do not represent 10% or more of all dwellings within 100m radius from the centre of the building to which the application relates, or
  - (b) the proposed development would not result in 10% or more of all dwellings within 100m radius from the centre of building to which the

- application relates being occupied as Houses in Multiple Occupation ; and
- (c) It would not result in a residential property (C3 use) being sandwiched between two Houses in Multiple Occupation along the same side of the street; and
  - (d) The development is able to provide suitable off-street parking of one space per occupant that does not cause detriment to highway safety or the amenity of the area, either individually or cumulatively; and
  - (e) The House in Multiple Occupation would not significantly harm residential amenity and the social and physical character of the area, in particular through increased activity, noise or disturbance; and
  - (f) Sufficient provision is made available on site for refuse storage facilities and cycle storage facilities; and
  - (g) The overall size of the property is suitable for multiple occupation with adequate living space and standards for future occupants (i.e., garden/amenity space, internal space, noise, outlook, light and privacy).

## **Draft Policy IF1 – Development and Infrastructure (Strategic Policy)**

### **Infrastructure requirements**

- (1) Development will be supported by, and make contributions as appropriate to, the provision of new physical, social and green infrastructure in order to mitigate its impact individually and cumulatively with other development upon the environment and communities.
- (2) The type of infrastructure required to support new development includes, but is not limited to:
  - (a) Affordable housing; and

- (b) Community facilities including education, health, local shops, cultural facilities; and community safety and
- (c) Transport including highways, footpaths and cycleways, public transport and associated facilities; and
- (d) Green infrastructure including open space, sport and recreation, National Forest planting (either new provision or enhancement of existing sites) and provision of or improvements to sites of nature conservation value; and
- (e) The provision of full fibre broadband connection and
- (f) Utilities and waste; and
- (g) Flood prevention and sustainable drainage.

### **Securing provision**

- (3) Contributions may be secured by means of planning obligations and/or a Community Infrastructure Levy charge, in the event that the Council brings a Charging schedule into effect or Section 278 Legal Agreements for highways infrastructure.
- (4) The infrastructure secured (on or off-site) will be provided either as part of the development or through a financial contribution to the appropriate service provider and may include the long-term management and maintenance of the infrastructure.
- (5) In negotiating the provision of infrastructure the Council will have due regard to viability issues and where appropriate will require that the applicant provide viability information to the Council which will then be subject to independent verification.
- (6) Any request to seek amendments to an existing a Section 106 legal agreement which would result in a lesser provision of infrastructure, will only be considered where a fully transparent open book viability assessment has proven that full mitigation cannot be afforded, allowing only for the minimum level of developer profit and landowner receipt necessary for the development to proceed.
- (7) The Council will work closely with infrastructure providers to ensure inclusion of infrastructure schemes within their programmes, plans and strategies, and delivery of specific infrastructure requirements in conjunction with individual development schemes and the expected timing of development coming forward. The Council will also work with partners and other stakeholders to secure public funding towards infrastructure, where possible.

### **Draft Policy IF3 – Green Infrastructure (Strategic Policy)**

- (1) The Council will expect all major development, where appropriate, to contribute towards the delivery of new green infrastructure which connects to and enhances the existing network of multi-functional spaces and natural features throughout the district. In making provision, regard should be had to the priorities for green infrastructure identified in the Green Infrastructure Study (or its successor). Such provision will be proportionate to the scale of the development and the site's context.
- (2) Proposals that cause loss or harm to the green infrastructure network, including its function and amenity value, will not be permitted unless the need for and benefits of the development outweigh any adverse impacts. Existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows should be retained and enhanced wherever possible.



- (3) Where adverse impacts on green infrastructure network are unavoidable, development will only be permitted if suitable mitigation measures for the network are provided.

#### **Draft Policy IF5: Transport Infrastructure and New Development**

- (1) All development must provide safe and suitable access for vehicles, pedestrians and where relevant, cyclists.
- (2) New development that is likely to generate significant amounts of movement will require a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement and Travel Plan, as appropriate, to assess the impacts of the development and, where necessary, provide suitable mitigation.
- (3) Having regard to its scale, type and location, new development will be required to maximise accessibility by sustainable modes of transport by:
  - (a) Providing well-designed pedestrian and cycle links within the development;
  - (b) Where appropriate, providing for a bus link within the development; and
  - (c) Taking opportunities to link to existing footpaths, cycleways and bus routes in the wider area.

- (4) The district's cycling and walking routes, including those identified in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, will be safeguarded. Any development sites which incorporate these routes will be expected to accommodate them within the development.
- (5) Development that has a demonstrable transport impact will be required to contribute towards:
  - (a) Public transport services; and/or
  - (b) Any sustainable transport measures necessary to make the development acceptable; and/or
  - (c) Any offsite highways improvements necessary to mitigate the impact of the development.

#### **Draft Policy En1 – Nature Conservation/Biodiversity Net Gain (Strategic Policy)**

- (1) The Council will seek to conserve and enhance the biodiversity of the district by:
  - (a) Ensuring that development provides a net gain in biodiversity consistent with any national policy prevailing at the time that a planning application is submitted.
  - (b) Requiring that development follows the mitigation hierarchy of avoid, minimise, restore and offset.
  - (c) Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable
  - (d) Requiring that development avoids an adverse impact on the nature conservation value of the following hierarchy of sites, with the weight afforded to their protection reflecting their position in the hierarchy (greatest weight first) along with any legislative and national policy requirements:
    - (i) Special Areas of Conservation (SAC);
    - (ii) Irreplaceable habitats (defined as Ancient woodlands; Mature plantation or secondary woodland; Species-rich

ancient hedgerows; Aged or veteran trees; Species-rich neutral grassland; Acid grassland and heath grassland; Dry and wet heathland; Bogs and Sphagnum pools and Rock outcrops);

- (iii) National designations (Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and National Nature Reserves);
- (iv) Local and Regionally Important Geodiversity Sites (RIGS) and candidate Regionally Important Geodiversity Sites (cRIGS);
- (v) Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs), Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) and candidate Local Wildlife Sites (cLWSs) which meet the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland LWS criteria;
- (vi) Local and National Biodiversity Action Plan-related (BAP) priority habitats.

### **Draft Policy En3 – National Forest (Strategic Policy)**

The District Council will support the National Forest Company and its partners to realise the economic, social and environmental potential of the National Forest by:

- (1) Supporting development within the National Forest, as defined on the Policies Map, that:
  - (a) Provides opportunities for diversification of the economy, especially in relation to the woodland economy and tourism, including visitor accommodation which accords with Policy Ec12 and reflects the National Forest Company's Sustainable Tourism Accommodation Design Guide.
  - (b) Contributes to the range of leisure and educational opportunities for local communities and visitors;
  - (c) Enhances the National Forest's role as a natural carbon sink;
  - (d) Increases woodland cover; and
  - (e) Ensures the character of the National Forest is enhanced through incorporating a National Forest identity;
- (2) Requiring new development within the National Forest to:
  - (a) contribute towards the creation of the forest by providing tree planting and landscaping in accordance with the most up to date National Forest Company's Guide for Developers and Planners; and
  - (b) ensure the siting and scale of the proposed development is appropriately related to its setting within the Forest; and
  - (c) respect the character and appearance of the National Forest.
- (3) Requiring that a commuted sum be provided towards the provision of tree planting within the National Forest where planting and landscaping cannot be accommodated within or close to the development site or where the only potential area of planting or landscaping is small or is isolated with limited connectivity to other habitats.
- (4) Within the Heart of the National Forest development should **demonstrate support for the delivery of the Heart of the National Forest Vision by:**
  - **strengthening linkages to nearby urban areas and leisure and tourism attractions.**
  - **being exemplars of sustainable design and construction and**
  - **Seeking to promote the use of non-motorised modes of travel.**

The District Council will support the National Forest Company and others in the delivery of the Heart of the National Forest Vision. Development in the Heart of the National Forest should demonstrate compliance with the Vision.

- (1) Land between Coalville and Whitwick, as identified on the Policies Map, is designated as an Area of Separation where only agricultural, forestry, nature conservation, leisure and sport and recreation uses will be allowed. Any other proposed uses will need to demonstrate why they cannot be accommodated elsewhere within the district.
- (2) Development will only be permitted which, either individually or cumulatively, would not demonstrably adversely affect or diminish the present open and undeveloped character of the area.

This page is intentionally left blank

## NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – WEDNESDAY 24 SEPTEMBER  
2025

<b>Title of Report</b>	<b>NEW LOCAL PLAN – CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSULTATION RESPOSNES TO PROPOSED HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS</b>	
<b>Presented by</b>	Ian Nelson  Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Background Papers</b>	<p><a href="#"><u>Draft North West Leicestershire Local Plan 2024-2042 – Additional Proposed Housing and Employment Allocations for Consultation (March 2025)</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Report to Local Plan Committee – 11 March 2025 (Proposed Housing Allocations in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages)</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Report to Local Plan Committee – 16 December 2024 (Proposed Housing Allocations – Isley Woodhouse and Coalville Urban Area)</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>National Planning Policy Framework (publishing.service.gov.uk)</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (2021)</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Coalville Housing Sites Assessment</u></a></p>	<b>Public Report:</b> Yes

	<a href="#">Ashby de la Zouch Housing Sites Assessment</a>	
<b>Financial Implications</b>	None discernible.	
	<b>Signed off by the Section 151 Officer: Yes</b>	
<b>Legal Implications</b>	The Local Plan must be based on robust and up to date evidence.	
	<b>Signed off by the Monitoring Officer: Yes</b>	
<b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b>	No staffing implications associated with the specific content of this report.	
	<b>Signed off by the Head of Paid Service: Yes</b>	
<b>Purpose of Report</b>	To consider the responses to the Regulation 18 consultation undertaken earlier this year and which relate to sites which were not the subject of consultation.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p><b>THAT THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE:</b></p> <p>(I) <b>NOTES THE RESPONSES AT APPENDIX A OF THE REPORT;</b></p> <p>(II) <b>AGREES THAT NO CHANGES BE MADE IN RESPECT OF THE PROPOSED HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS REFERRED TO IN THE REPORT</b></p>	

## 1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The meeting of this Committee on 30 July 2025, considered a report in respect of responses to the consultation on the additional housing and employment sites which were consulted upon earlier this year.
- 1.2 The report noted that a number of comments had been received in respect of sites which had previously been consulted upon, but which were not part of the latest consultation. In addition, a number of responses received were promoting other sites.
- 1.3 Notwithstanding the fact that the consultation document had made it clear that views were not being sought in respect of sites not included in the consultation, in the interest of openness and clarity this report presents the additional comments received.



## **2 SUMMARY OF RESPONSES**

- 2.1 As set out in the report to this Committee on 30 July 2025, the following additional representations were received.

### Local Residents

- Five objected to the proposed allocation at South of Church Lane, New Swannington (C48).
- Four objected to the proposed allocation at Land at Broom Leys Farm, Coalville (C46).
- Two objected to the proposed broad allocation on land west of Whitwick.
- 17 objected to the proposed allocation at Land south of Burton Road Ashby de la Zouch (A27).
- In general terms, four objected to more development across the district, two objected to more development in Ashby de la Zouch, one objected to more development in the Coalville Urban Area and one objected to all new development in the flood plain/catchment of the Gilwiskaw Brook.
- Four sent an email that did not include a response/attachment.

### Landowners/Developers/Agents

- 12 respondents commented on / sought to promote a site or sites outside the scope of this consultation (see Appendix P)
- Six respondents provided comments on general matters such as housing requirements and the Local Plan period
- Two supported the deletion of Land at Old End and 40 Measham Road, Appleby Magna Ap15/Ap17 as a housing allocation

### Parish/Town Councils

- Two provided comments on proposed housing sites outside the scope of this consultation. This includes Ashby Town Council who raised a number of queries on behalf of local residents in respect of site A27.

- 2.2 The responses are summarised and responded to at Appendix A of this report.
- 2.3 The representations tend to fall into two categories: those which raise concerns about proposed allocations and those which promote alternative sites. In respect of the former these are largely from residents, whilst the latter are largely from landowners/developers.
- 2.4 In terms of the representations to proposed sites, in most cases these are from people who made comments to the February-March 2024 consultation on the draft Local Plan. The comments made in response to the latest consultation undertaken earlier this year tend to either repeat their previous comments or are similar to those made by others. It is considered that the issues raised are not such as to warrant either not allocating the proposed sites or make any changes to the proposed policies for these sites.
- 2.5 In the case of land South of Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch (A27), the representations are from individuals who have not previously commented. It should be appreciated that the current stage of local plan preparation (i.e. Regulation 18) is an ongoing process which continues right up to the point at which the Council agrees

the 'final' plan which it wishes to take forward to Examination (referred to as a Regulation 19 plan). It is, therefore, appropriate to consider the comments made in respect of this site.

- 2.6 Amongst the comments made is that there has been insufficient notice and engagement with local residents in respect of this site. The potential development of this site has been in the public domain since 2018 when it was first included in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). It was also included in subsequent updates, most recently in 2021 when the SHELAA was also the subject of a report to this Committee at its meeting on [26 May 2021](#).
- 2.7 The [2021 SHELAA](#), together with previous [iterations](#), have always been available on the Council's website.
- 2.8 This site was included as part of the draft Local Plan consulted upon in February and March 2024. This had been agreed by the Local Plan Committee at its meeting on [17 January 2024](#), although it was also recommended to be included in an earlier report on [15 November 2023](#) but the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the report for reasons not related to this site.
- 2.9 It has also been suggested that the Council has failed to consult adequately and that the consultation has not followed the approach set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Officers are of the view that this is not the case for the reasons outlined below:
- 2.10 Section 7 of the SCI sets out how the Council will consult on the Local Plan. For the Regulation 18 stage (the current stage of Local Plan preparation) it states (paragraph 7.4): "Notify and invite comments from the specific and general consultation bodies as well as residents or other persons with an interest in the district. To meet these requirements the specific and general bodies along with residents and business will be informed, by letter or e-mail during this stage of plan preparation"
- 2.11 In terms of the first sentence of paragraph 7.4 the specific consultation bodies are defined in Regulations and are listed at Appendix B of the SCI. General consultation bodies cover a wide range of organisations, including parish and town councils and interest groups. These are listed at Appendix C of the SCI.
- 2.12 In respect of "residents or other persons with an interest in the district" as set out in the SCI (paragraph 5.5) the Council maintains "a database of individuals, community groups and stakeholder groups, who wish to be informed of the production of development plan documents and plan making". The [New Local Plan](#) page on the Council's website includes an invitation for those who wish to be kept informed of progress on the Local Plan to provide contact details to the Council.
- 2.13 Turning to the second sentence of paragraph 7.4 of the SCI, the reference to "residents and business" refers to those who have asked to be notified of progress on the Local Plan.
- 2.14 Having regard to the above and for the reasons set out in Appendix A, officers are of the view that the issues raised are not such as to change the recommendation to this Committee of 11 March 2025 that this site be proposed to be allocated for around 60 dwellings as part of the Regulation 19 Plan.

Policies and other considerations, as appropriate	
Council Priorities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning and regeneration</li> <li>- Communities and housing</li> <li>- Clean, green and Zero Carbon</li> </ul>
Policy Considerations:	The Local Plan is required to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and other government guidance and requirements.
Safeguarding:	None discernible.
Equalities/Diversity:	An Equalities Impact Assessment of the Local Plan review will be undertaken as part of the Sustainability Appraisal.
Customer Impact:	No issues identified
Economic and Social Impact:	The decision itself will have no specific impact. The new Local Plan as a whole will aim to deliver positive economic and social impacts and these will be recorded through the Sustainability Appraisal.
Environment, Climate Change and zero carbon:	The decision, of itself, will have no specific impact. The new Local Plan as a whole will aim to deliver positive environmental and climate change impacts and these will be recorded through the Sustainability Appraisal.
Consultation/Community/Tenant Engagement:	The Regulation 18 Local Plan has been subject to consultation. Further consultation will be undertaken at Regulation 19 stage.
Risks:	<p>A risk assessment for the Local Plan Review has been prepared and is kept up to date. As far as possible control measures have been put in place to minimise risks, including regular Project Board meetings where risk is reviewed.</p> <p>The report highlights the potential risks associated with the issues considered as part of the report.</p>
Officer Contact	<p>Ian Nelson  Planning Policy Team Manager  01530 454677  <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p>

This page is intentionally left blank

## RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS (MARCH 2025)

### OTHER COMMENTS RECEIVED

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
<b>General – Local Plan Strategy</b>				
[It is important to ensure effective sustainable transport connectivity and accessibility to Leicester for residents of NWL as the city provides the key source of employment and a wide range of services, educational, health facilities and retail and leisure opportunities. Any adverse transport impacts identified on the city's network will require mitigation measures to support this new growth, based on robust transport modelling findings. The focus of the sustainable transport interventions needs to be based on a bus-based strategy, to help manage the city's urban congestion.]	In the event of there being a demonstrable impact from development in North West Leicestershire upon transport provision in Leicester City, then this would need to be addressed as part of any planning application and secured via Planning Obligation.	No change	48	Leicester City Council
<b>Plan Period</b>				
The anticipated adoption date would now leave less than 15 years from adoption and this is before any potential delays/the plan period should be extended to 2043.	Based on the Local Development Scheme adoption would leave marginally less than a 15-year plan period. However, in view of the cut-off date for submission of plans by December 2026, there is insufficient time to allocate additional sites and to also update the evidence base. Furthermore, there are many examples of where plans have been	No change	72; 91	Pegasus Group (Davidsons & Westernrange); Pegasus Group (Davidsons)

	allowed to be adopted with less than 15-years.			
<b>Housing Need</b>				
[We note that the Plan does not mention that the NWL housing requirement would contribute towards Leicester's unmet need. We would like to see a reference within the plan to continued commitment to meeting our unmet need through partnership to address the L&L cross boundary matters.]	This is something which can be addressed in the supporting text.	That the supporting text include reference to an ongoing commitment to joint working with other Leicester and Leicestershire authorities.	48	Leicester City Council
It will be important, ahead of the Submission of the Local Plan, that the current Statement of Common Ground, between the Leicester and Leicestershire planning authorities is updated to reflect the current position on housing needs (both the new standard method and the implications of the transitional arrangements) and to consider the unmet needs post 2036. The need to balance housing and employment growth will also need to be considered as before.	As reported to the 30 July 2025 LPC, "the issue of housing requirements across Leicester and Leicestershire is the subject of ongoing work with the other Leicestershire authorities." This work will inform an updated Statement of Common Ground in due course.	No change	72; 91	Pegasus Group (Davidsons & Westernrange); Pegasus Group (Davidsons)
[The housing requirement of 686dpa is not positively prepared as it does not consider the most recent local housing need figures]			255; 289; 290	William Davis; Fisher German (Mr Botham); Fisher German (Richborough Estates)

[A housing buffer of between 15-20% should be applied to the housing requirement]	The plan already includes a buffer of 10% to ensure that in the event of sites either being build out at a slower rate than anticipated or not coming forward at all, that the overall requirement will be met by the end of the plan period. It is considered that there is no justification to increase this further.	No change	91; 111; 150	Pegasus Group (Davidsons); Define Planning & Design (Bloor Homes); Leicestershire County Council (landowner)
The distribution strategy with regards to the Sustainable Villages (5%) is too low. More growth is needed in the villages to support facilities and services.	Officers justified a revised distribution strategy at the 11 March 2025 Local Plan Committee. No further comment is necessary at this stage.	No change	387	Stone Planning Services (Peveril Homes)

## PROPOSED HOUSING ALLOCATIONS

<b>General – Site Allocations</b>				
[General objection to the locations of proposed housing and employment allocations (with reference to the Freeport, Isley Woodhouse and the northern part of the district). Development of these sites would have significant environmental impacts. There have already been decades of change affecting the area; the Local Plan should not be allocating any greenfield sites. The answer is to build up or down rather than out]	The overall scale of housing development that the plan must provide for has been established through the Statement of Common Ground with the other Leicestershire authorities consistent with national policy. The proposed development strategy in the plan seeks to balance homes and jobs in proximity to each other. The need for new infrastructure is recognised and will be addressed as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No change	9	Michael Goy
[Concerned that employment land allocations are based upon unreliable forecasts and modelling. The pressure for strategic warehousing is not sustainable]	The new Local Plan is planning for a 15+ year time horizon. Employment land forecasts are based on expert analysis and offer a sufficiently robust evidence base for the new Local Plan. Current findings indicate future demand for strategic warehouses; further work to confirm the scale of development needed is ongoing and will inform the next iteration of the Local Plan.	No change	12	Siobhan Dillon
[Concerned about the loss of agricultural land and the impact upon food security]	The NPPF advises that if developing agricultural land is necessary, lower-quality land should be chosen over higher-quality land. The use of land for food production should be considered with other policies when	No change	12	Siobhan Dillon



	selecting development sites. This means that the development of agricultural land is not of itself a reason to resist development. It is a factor to weigh in the planning balance.			
[Objects to the proposals to build houses on the flood plain / catchment of the Gilwiskaw Brook]	At 30 July Local Plan Committee, officers confirmed that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is being updated in line with the requirements of the 2024 NPPF. To be deemed sound, the Local Plan needs to be consistent with national policy, including NPPF paragraph 170: <i>“Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.”</i>	No change	349	Rebekah Harrison-Page
[The poor percentage of rental and low-cost housing needs addressing, as does the fact that the supporting infrastructure such as roads, health centres etc often never materialises (e.g. the additional parking promised for Hugglescote Surgery)]	The Regulation 19 version of the plan will include policies regarding the need for new housing development to also make provision for affordable housing, subject to not making development unviable as required by national policy. The need for new infrastructure is recognised and will be addressed as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No change	416	Kay Adams

<b>Housing Allocations</b>				
<b>Principal Town</b>				
<p>[Objects to additional housing developments in Coalville, given existing road congestion, long waits for medical appointments, and the loss of green space.]</p>	<p>The need for new housing nationally is significant as recognised in national policy.</p> <p>The Broom Leys Farm site is located within the Coalville Urban Area which is defined in the settlement hierarchy as the Principal Town to where “The largest amount of new development will be directed”. The site is well related to services and facilities as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The County Highway Authority has advised that a safe and suitable access is achievable.</p> <p>The draft policy requires the provision of S106 contributions towards the cost of a variety of infrastructure.</p>	No change	228	Lisa Hooper
<b>Land at Broom Leys Farm, Broom Leys Road, Coalville (C46)</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient school, medical, and dental facilities for new housing developments</li> <li>• Loss of countryside and the increased flood risk</li> </ul>	<p>These comments were also made in relation to C18, C19a, C19b and so were reported to the 30 July 2025 Local Plan Committee.</p>	No change	28	Zoe Williams

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heavy traffic and unsafe roads near Stephenson's Way throughout the day</li> </ul>				
[Objects to the number of houses planned for Torrington Avenue, Hall Lane, Broomleys Farm, Off Stephenson's Way and Thornborough Road from a traffic, road safety and flooding perspective]			55	Paul Rowe
[Resubmission of comments originally submitted in 2024]	Comments were reported and responded to as part of the 16 December 2024 Local Plan Committee.	No change	412	Jamie Bishop
<b><i>South of Church Lane, New Swannington (C48)</i></b>				
[Object to allocation of this site]	The same comments were made in relation to C18 and/or C19a/C19b and so were reported to the 30 July 2025 Local Plan Committee.	No change	213; 214; 239; 240; 245;	Matt Bennett; Michael Angrave; Alwyn Hill; Brienne Bennett; Jayne Angrave;
<b><i>Land at Lily Bank, Thringstone (C74)</i></b>				
[The site should be allocated for 84 dwellings]	The Planning Committee of 16 December 2024 agreed to allocate this site for 64 dwellings as per the previous submissions. At this stage as no significant evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that a greater amount of development would be acceptable in planning or highway terms, it is considered	No change	136	Andrew Large Surveyors

	prudent to continue to assume a capacity of 64 dwellings.			
<b>Broad Location West Whitwick (C47, C77, C78, C86, C81)</b>				
[Objects to the proposed allocation of this site]	The same comments were made in relation to C18 and so were reported to the 30 July 2025 Local Plan Committee	No change	404; 406	Jay Rocks; Claire Caulfield
<b>Housing Allocations</b>				
<b>New settlement - Isley Woodhouse (IW1)</b>				
[Agrees with the proposed housing figure of 4,250 (reduced from 4,500) as this aligns with the planning application]	Noted	No change	78	Oxalis (Harworth Estates & Caesarea]
[Considers the 1,950 homes anticipated at IW1 up to 2042 to be an underestimation. Confident that the delivery rate could be closer to 250dpa after 3-4 years on site / a further 525 homes could be delivered up to 2042, meaning the Council would need to allocate additional sites. The allocation of land to the west of Castle Donington for residential development could have the potential to reduce the build out rate at Isley Woodhouse, as both sites will be competing within the same market]	This issue was addressed in reports to Local Plan Committee on 17 January 2024 and on 16 December 2024. Notwithstanding the fact that a planning application for the new settlement has been submitted, there is still significant uncertainty, particularly in respect of transport related issues which mean an assumed start date before 2032/33 would be risk to the plan.	No change	78	Oxalis (Harworth Estates & Caesarea]

[The delivery assumptions for IW1 are overly optimistic and not supported by sufficient evidence]			255, 289, 290	William Davis; Fisher German (Mr Botham); Fisher German (Richborough Estates)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [Continues to object to the proposed new settlement (IW1).</li> <li>• It should be made clear that the 1,950 dwellings is not a reduction in site capacity, but what can be built by 2042.</li> <li>• Disappointed by lack of progress on area of separation between Diseworth and IW1]</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The Regulation 19 Plan will be accompanied by a housing trajectory which will provide further clarity on the number of homes IW1 will be allocated for and when they are expected to be constructed.</p> <p>Work has been commissioned to consider the issue of separation between Isley Woodhouse and Diseworth</p>	No change	101	Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council
<b>Housing Allocations</b>				
<b>Key Service Centres</b>				
[General objection to more development in Ashby]	The strategy for allocating housing sites in Ashby and the reasons for allocating/not allocating sites have been reported to several previous Local Plan Committees.	No change	409; 418;	Hayley Essen; Jane Plackett
<b><i>Land north of Moira Road, Ashby de la Zouch (A25) &amp; Land south of Moira Road, Ashby de la Zouch (A26)</i></b>				
[The sites should be allocated for housing in the Local Plan]	Officers responded to these representations as part of the 11 March 2025 Local Plan Committee	No change	289	Fisher German (Mr Botham)

<b>South of Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch (A27)</b>				
Lack of sufficient notice and engagement to local residents. The council has known about this development since at least 2017, but residents not made aware.	This site was included as part of the draft Local Plan consulted upon in February and March 2024. Prior to that it was identified in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) since 2018. The SHELAA has been available since then on the Council's website.	No change	34,35, 41,71,75,76,77,86,94,152	Roger Baker, Demi Middleton, Eve Bird, Oliver Ison, Reuben Hall-McNair, Janet Ruffoni, Paul Cruise, David and Elizabeth Sanderson, James Peck, Abigail Kingaby
Contrary to previously agreed development boundaries which were in place to stop urban sprawl and protect wildlife and green spaces.	The Council is required to allocate sufficient sites to meet the future requirements of the district. The plan seeks to strike a balance between identifying sufficient land to meet future housing needs whilst also protecting the vast majority of land as countryside.	No change	34,71	Roger Baker, Oliver Ison
Impact and disruption to existing residents during construction of any development. This will be in terms of traffic, but also noise and dust. This will impact those with health issues such as asthma.	Any proposed development will be required to comply with other policies of the plan which seek to ensure that the amenity of existing residents is protected during the construction phase of any development.	No change	34,37,71, 75,77,152,266, 383	Roger Baker, Nicola Briggs, Oliver Ison, Reuben Hall-McNair, Paul Cruise, Abigail Kingaby, Laura Tucker, Darren Thompson

Additional traffic impact upon existing residents of Rushey Close. Issues already when buses and lorries use Bishops Hall Road, for example having to mount kerbs. Also results in congestion on local roads. Rushey Road is not fit for purpose and could not cope with the additional traffic; Burton Road would be a more suitable point of access. There would be a loss of spaces for parking where new road will go through and an increase in noise.	Leicestershire County Council as the highway authority has not raised an objection to the proposal.	No change	34,37,41,67,71, 75, 76, 77,85,86, 94, 152,266, 383, 384	Roger Baker, Nicola Briggs, Eve Bird
Outside of previously agreed Limits to Development which have been moved to accommodate new development but without communicating to local residents.	The plan seeks to strike a balance between identifying sufficient land to meet future housing needs whilst also protecting the vast majority of land as countryside. The draft Local plan was subject to public consultation between 5 February and 17 March 2024. The responses to that consultation were considered by the Local Plan Committee of 11 March 2025.	No change	35,37,71, 94, 152, 384	Demi Middleton, Nicola Briggs, Oliver Ison, James Peck, Abigal Kingaby, Sahel Najib
Site lies within National Forest and borders a Birch tree plantation and hedgerows used by nesting birds.	The sites' location within the National Forest does not preclude development. Instead, it will be necessary to ensure that any development reflects its National Forest setting and that it	No change	35,71,94	Demi Middleton, Oliver Ison, James Peck

	includes tree planting consistent with the requirements of the policies of the Local Plan.			
Located within Special Area of conservation for River Mease.	Whilst the site is located within the catchment for the River Mease Special Area of Conservation, this does not preclude development subject to satisfying the requirements of policy En2.	No change	35,71,152	Demi Middleton, Oliver Ison, Abigail Kingaby
Impact upon local amenities such as doctors, dentists and schools.	Policy IF1 ((Development and Infrastructure) requires that new development contribute towards the provision of new infrastructure to mitigate its impact upon local communities. In accordance with national policy, the nature and scale of any such provision must be related to the scale of development proposed. This means that for larger pieces of infrastructure, such as new school, it will be necessary for a number of developments to contribute towards such infrastructure. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is in the process of being prepared which will identify the specific infrastructure requirements arising from individual sites.	No change	37, 41,67,71,86, 152,383	Nicola Briggs, Eve Bird, Patrick Marston, Oliver Ison, David and Elizabeth Sanderson, Abigal Kingaby, Darren Thompson



Site is designated as greenbelt land which provides an ecological and recreation resource for Ashby community.	There is no Green Belt within the district. In the adopted Local Plan, the site is identified as countryside. As required under national legislation, any new development will be required to include provision for Biodiversity Net Gain as part of any future development to offset the impact upon the local ecology. Whilst a public footpath crosses the site, the majority of the site is not publicly accessible. As required in the draft policy any future development will be required to retain and enhance this footpath.	No change	67,86,266, 383	Patrick Marston, David and Elizabeth Sanderson, Laura Tucker, Darren Thompson
Development would set precedent.	Each individual proposal must be considered on its own specific merits.	No change	67	Patrick Marston
Loss of open countryside and views over fields.	The protection of areas of countryside must be balanced against the need to address the future housing requirements through the allocation of land for development. In landscape terms a Landscape Sensitivity Assessment identifies that the site is part of wider landscape that is judged to be of medium-low sensitivity. Other areas around Ashby de la Zouch are judged to be of higher sensitivity.	No change	71,76, 86,	Oliver Ison, Janet Ruffoni, David and Elizabeth Sanderson

Impact upon local wildlife and pollution run off from construction work.	The draft policy includes specific requirements to support wildlife and habitats, including securing biodiversity net gain improvements in accordance with national requirements and to retain existing trees and hedgerows within and on the boundaries of the site. There are no ecological designations, such as Sites of special Scientific Interest, which apply to the site. Any development will be subject to a range of planning conditions to ensure that any impact from construction activity is minimised as far as possible and consistent with other legal requirements.	No change	71,75,77, 86, 94,152	Oliver Ison, Reuben Hall-McNair, Paul Cruise, David and Elizabeth Sanderson, James Peck, Abigail Kingaby,
Loss of privacy for existing residents.	All policies in the plan must be taken together when considering planning applications. Draft policy AP2 (Amenity) requires that new development be designed to ensure that its impact on existing residents in the vicinity of the proposed development is acceptable.	No change	71,152, 383	Oliver Ison, Abigail Kingaby, Darren Thompson
Potential increase in crime during the construction phase and afterwards as there will be more people around.	These are matters which are not under the control of the planning system. There is no evidence that residents, workers and visitors to this site will be any more likely to commit crime or	No change	71	Oliver Ison

	anti-social behaviour than anyone else.			
Decrease in the value of homes.	The impact upon the price of existing properties is not a material planning consideration.	No change	71,85, 152, 383	Oliver Ison, Daniel Evans, Abigail Kingaby, Darren Thompson
Assessment of sites is misleading in respect of distance to services and facilities as it uses straight line measurements which will result in shorter distances.	The site assessment methodology uses a consistent approach when assessing individual sites thus ensuring that no site is at an advantage to any other site.	No change	71, 152	Oliver Ison, Abigail Kingaby,
Impact upon local footpaths which are used by local residents.	As per the draft policy any future development will be required to retain and enhance this footpath.	No change	75	Reuben Hall-McNair
Residents were misled when purchasing their homes as they were advised that the site was Greenbelt, protected farmland and that no new development would be allowed.	There is no Green Belt within the district. The Council is not responsible for any advice provided by the developer or any other parties. There is no record of the Council having provided such advice.	No change	94	James Peck,
Ashby has already taken a significant amount of new housing development in recent years. This has put pressure on local infrastructure and resulted in the loss of areas of countryside.	Ashby de la Zouch is identified in the settlement hierarchy as a Key Service Centre (together with Castle Donington), which is the second level in the hierarchy. It is also the second largest	No change	94	James Peck

	<p>settlement in the district in population terms behind the Coalville Urban Area and also has an extensive range of services and facilities. It is, therefore, appropriate that a significant amount of new housing is directed to Ashby de la Zouch.</p> <p>Policy IF1 ((Development and Infrastructure) requires that new development contribute towards the provision of new infrastructure to mitigate its impact upon local communities.</p> <p>This site, together, with a smaller site to the north of Burton Road, are the only new allocations over and above those included in the adopted Local Plan.</p>			
Impact upon residents as additional groundworks required which could have been undertaken when Rushey Close was built.	At the time that Rushey Close was being built there was no need to make provision for future development as the housing needs at that point in time had been addressed. It would not have been reasonable for the Council to require a developer to undertake additional works, the need for which was not sufficiently clear or justified.	No change	152	Abigail Kingaby

Additional light pollution will impact wildlife, but also local residents.	All policies in the plan must be taken together when considering planning applications. Draft policy AP2 (Amenity) includes specific provision to ensure that lighting schemes are designed to minimise light pollution.	No change	152	Abigail Kingaby
Impact upon ability to run a business from home due to the loss of views.	It is a long-established principle in English Law that there is no right to a view from a property.	No change	152	Abigail Kingaby
Proposed development appears to be excessive.	The Council is required to allocate sufficient sites to meet the future requirements of the district.	No change	383	Darren Thompson
<b>Housing allocations</b>				
<b>Local Service Centres</b>				
<b><i>Land off Leicester Road, Ibstock (lb18)</i></b>				
[Wants to be kept in the loop regarding planning applications on this land]	The Council's Statement of Community Involvement states: <i>"Neighbour notification by letter is the principal method of consultation on most planning applications. For most planning applications, letters are sent to all owners/occupiers of properties that immediately adjoin the boundary of the application site. In addition, the Council will notify more widely where an application is likely to have a wider impact."</i>	No change	396	Carol Metcalf

<b>Land at Station Road, Ibstock (lb23)</b>				
[An increased housing buffer should be added to the housing requirement; this site should be allocated to meet the increased requirement.]	See comments in relation to the housing buffer above. This site has been assessed in detail and is not considered necessary to meet the Council's housing needs up to 2042.	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (landowner)
<b>Land north of Bosworth Road, Measham (M18)</b>				
Welcomes the Council's intention to allocate more housing in Measham but urge the Council to reconsider the proposed allocations – M18 is a more suitable and deliverable allocation.	The proposed allocation of additional sites in Measham was justified as part of the 11 March Local Plan Committee. The suitability of M18 was considered as part of this process and it was concluded that the site is not needed to meet the Council's housing needs up to 2042.	No change	111	Define Planning & Design (Bloor Homes)
<b>Housing Allocations</b>				
<b>Sustainable Villages</b>				
<b>East and West of Measham Road, Appleby Magna (Ap13a, Ap13b &amp; Ap13c)</b>				
[This site should be allocated in the Local Plan for 70 to 85 dwellings]	Officers responded to these representations as part of the 11 March 2025 Local Plan Committee	No change	290	Fisher German (Richborough Estates)
<b>Main Street/Tongue Lane, Breedon on the Hill (Br5)</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions why a site in Appleby Magna was chosen over Breedon on the Hill</li> <li>Appleby Magna scored lower (8) in the Council's Settlement Study compared to Breedon on the Hill (10).</li> </ul>	Housing allocations are proposed across several of the District's Sustainable Villages, with officers having undertaken a comprehensive assessment of sites.	No change	79	Cora

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Br5 should be considered instead of Appleby Magna.</li> </ul>	<p>However no Local Plan allocation is proposed in Breedon on the Hill given its recently adopted Neighbourhood Plan which includes a housing allocation. Permission has also now been granted for the development of this site. There is no requirement for the Council to allocate additional sites in Breedon on the Hill to meets its housing needs up to 2042.</p>			
<b><i>Newton Road, Heather (H1)</i></b>				
[An increased housing buffer should be added to the housing requirement; this site should be allocated to meet the increased requirement.]	See comments in relation to the housing buffer above. This site has been assessed in detail and is not required to meet the Council's housing needs up to 2042.	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (landowner)
<b><i>Land off Ashby Road, Moira (Mo8)</i></b>				
[Strongly supports the allocation of the site for 70 dwellings]	Local Plan Committee on 11 March 2025 agreed the proposed allocation of land off Ashby Road, Moira (Mo8) for around 49 dwellings for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan. The detailed site assessment noted that development of the front part of the site would be acceptable whilst the rear part of the site would be out of character, at a	No change	137	Metacre Limited

	significant depth compared to the current built form and would represent an encroachment into the countryside. The detailed site assessment concluded that development should be restricted to the frontage part only of the site.			
<b><i>Land at School Lane, Oakthorpe (Oa5)</i></b>				
[The site could be expanded to include additional land in the same ownership and deliver more housing – a site plan accompanies the representations]	Land ownership is noted. The proposed allocation of Oa5 is for around 47 dwellings and includes land to the south to facilitate the provision of open space. This scale of development is appropriate considering the District's future housing requirement and the scale and character of Oakthorpe.	No change	136	Andrew Large Surveyors
<b><i>Land south of Normanton Road, Packington (P4)</i></b>				
[The entry for P4 in Table 5 should be changed from eight to nine dwellings to reflect the current planning application for nine dwellings on this site.]	<p>Table 5 identifies 'eight' as the change in the capacity of allocation P4, which has been reduced from 18 to around 10 dwellings.</p> <p>The current planning application for nine dwellings has not yet been determined.</p>	No change	387	Stone Planning Services (Peveril Homes)



<b>Land off Ibstock Road, Ravenstone (R18)</b>				
<p>[This site should be allocated as it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the control of a housebuilder with local expertise.</li> <li>• Well-located, unconstrained, and visually contained.</li> <li>• Offers good access to local services and infrastructure.</li> <li>• More sustainable than some preferred allocations (e.g., Thringstone).</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed allocation of an additional site in Ravenstone was justified as part of the 11 March Local Plan Committee. The suitability of R18 was considered as part of this process and it was concluded that the site is not needed to meet the Council's housing needs up to 2042.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>255</p>	<p>William Davis</p>

<b>Employment Allocations</b>				
<b><i>Land north of Derby Road Kegworth (EMP73 part)</i></b>				
We welcome the suggestion in the consultation document that the land proposed to be allocated north of Remembrance Way could be suitable for strategic warehousing. However, we also believe that the land north of Derby Road could similarly help to deliver for strategic needs.	Noted. Local Plan Committee on 16 December 2024 provisionally agreed Land north of Derby Road (EMP73 part) as a general needs employment site for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan. A study which will quantify the future need for strategic warehousing in Leicester and Leicestershire is underway. This study, once finalised, will inform the selection of sites for inclusion in the Local Plan.	Officers will bear this information in mind when considering the implications of the forthcoming strategic warehousing study for site allocations in the emerging Local Plan.	69	Curzon Coaker Trust and CHC Children's Settlement
<b><i>West of Hilltop, Castle Donington (EMP89)</i></b>				
The parish council is minded to accept the change for EMP89 if there is not a proven need for offices.	Noted. For context, this comment relates to the decision, made following the Regulation 18 public consultation (2024), to omit offices as one of the potential uses at EMP89.	No change.	336	Castle Donington PC

Other				
'No comment'	Noted	No change	100; 145; 278; 309	Breedon on the Hill Parish Council; Charnwood Borough Council; Breaston Parish Council; Canal & River Trust
Did not attach response / wrote response in subject box	Officers unable to respond	No change	341; 482; 484; 485	Taz Edwards; John Sadler; Maggie Daulby; Maureen Smart

This page is intentionally left blank

## NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – WEDNESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2025



<b>Title of Report</b>	<b>NEW LOCAL PLAN – OUTCOMES FROM THE CALL FOR GENERAL NEEDS EMPLOYMENT SITES 2025</b>	
<b>Presented by</b>	Ian Nelson Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager	
<b>Background Papers</b>	<a href="#">Need for Employment Land Update Note (July 2024)</a>  <a href="#">Additional Proposed Housing and Employment Allocations (March 2025)</a>  Local Plan Committee Report 30 July 2025: <a href="#">Additional Proposed Employment Allocations: Consideration of Responses to Consultation</a>  <a href="#">Site Assessments</a>  <a href="#">Sustainability Appraisal of Sites</a>  <a href="#">National Planning Policy Framework</a>  <a href="#">Local Development Scheme (February 2025)</a>	<b>Public Report:</b> Yes
<b>Financial Implications</b>	The cost of the Local Plan Review is met through existing budgets which are monitored on an ongoing basis.	
	<b>Signed off by the Section 151 Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Legal Implications</b>	The Local Plan must be based on robust and up to date evidence.	
	<b>Signed off by the Monitoring Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b>	No staffing implications are associated with the specific content of this report. Links with the Council's Priorities are set out at the end of the report.	

	<b>Signed off by the Head of Paid Service: Yes</b>
<b>Purpose of Report</b>	To consider additional general needs employment sites for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p><b>THAT THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>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, AGREES 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.</b></li> <li><b>2. 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, AGREES 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.</b></li> </ol>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Committee has made considerable progress identifying general needs<sup>1</sup> employment sites for inclusion in the new Local Plan.
- 1.2 On [16 December 2024](#) Local Plan Committee considered the representations to the proposed employment site allocations in the 2024 Regulation 18 consultation. The Committee agreed, subject to the outcomes of further transport, infrastructure and viability assessment, six general needs employment sites and locations to go forward to the Regulation 19 version of the plan. The six sites are:
- EMP89 West of Hilltop, Castle Donington
  - EMP73(part) North of Derby Road, Kegworth
  - EMP60 Burton Road, Oakthorpe
  - IW1 Isley Woodhouse
  - A5 Money Hill
  - EMP90 Land south of East Midlands Airport (subject to the Development Consent Order decision, the site could provide up to 20% general needs

<sup>1</sup> General needs' employment land is land for offices, industry and smaller scale warehousing (units up to 9,000sqm). Warehouse units of 9,000+ sqm are categorised as 'strategic warehousing'.

floorspace)

- 1.3 At its meeting on [30 July 2025](#), the Committee agreed EMP98 Land between Ellistown Terrace Road and Wood Road, Ellistown/Battram for inclusion in the Regulation 19 plan.
- 1.4 The combined supply from these sites, plus vacant land within established industrial estates, is insufficient to meet the employment needs evidenced in the [Need for Employment Land Update Note \(July 2024\)](#). The residual requirements, i.e. the shortfall, are shown below.

**Table 1 – Residual requirements (2025-42)**

	Offices	Industry/smaller warehousing
Residual requirements	39,319sqm (c 13.1ha)	At least 31,972sqm (c 11ha)

## 2 CALL FOR SITES 2025

- 2.1 The [2025 Additional Sites Consultation](#) document anticipated there could be a shortfall of between 12 and 19ha of employment land and included a Call for Sites for general needs employment and also for potential lorry parking locations. The employment sites which were submitted in response to the call are listed in Table 2 below. The first three are new sites which have not been assessed previously. The remaining four are sites or parts of sites which have been submitted previously. In some cases, updated information was supplied.

**Table 2 – 2025 Call for Employment Sites submissions**

Ref	Site	Status	Proposed use	Ha
EMP99	Land north of rail line, Hemington	New site	Employment	6.8
EMP100	Land at Fields Farm, Measham	New site	Employment	5.7
EMP101	Land north of Wood Road, Ellistown/Battram	New site	Employment	11
EMP63 (part)	Carnival Way (Option 1), Castle Donington	Part of a previously submitted site	Employment	1.8
EMP63	Carnival Way (Option 2), Castle Donington	Previously submitted site	Employment	8.7
EMP90 (part)	MAG site, south of East Midlands Airport	Part of a previously submitted site	Employment	41.28
EMP66	Ex-Measham Mine site, Measham	Previously submitted site	Employment	3.6

## 3 ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

- 3.1 Officers have assessed the new employment sites and reviewed any additional information supplied with the resubmissions. For the new sites (EMP99, EMP100, EMP101), detailed site assessments have been prepared, incorporating the outcomes of the Sustainability Appraisal. For EMP63, EMP90 and EMP66, the existing assessments have been updated. The assessment process for each site is explained in Table 3.

**Table 3 – Assessment process**

Ref	Site	Status	Assessment process
EMP99	Land north of rail line, Hemington	New site	New site assessment, including SA.
EMP100	Land at Fields Farm, Measham	New site	New site assessment, including SA.
EMP101	Land north of Wood Road, Ellistown/ Battram	New site	New site assessment, including SA.
EMP63 (part)	Carnival Way (Option 1), Castle Donington	Part of a previously submitted site	This is a considerably smaller site than EMP63. EMP63 assessment and SA have been updated
EMP63	Carnival Way (Option 2), Castle Donington	Previously submitted site	EMP63 assessment has been updated
EMP90 (part)	MAG site, south of East Midlands Airport	Part of a previously submitted site	EMP90 assessment has been factually updated to recognise that there is a current planning application on the northern half of EMP90 (24/00727/OUTM). The site will be assessed and addressed at a detailed level through this application.
EMP66	Ex-Measham Mine site, Measham	Previously submitted site	Updated assessment and SA.

3.2 Sites have been assessed following the same format and using the same criteria as for all the other candidate sites. As a result, there are two sites which officers consider are appropriate for allocation.

- EMP63(part) - Carnival Way, Castle Donington (Option 1)
- EMP66 - Ex-Measham Mine site, Sweptstone Road, Measham

**EMP63(part) – Carnival Way, Castle Donington (Option 1)**

3.3 As part of the 2025 'Call for Sites' the promoters of the Carnival Way site submitted two options for development of the site. Option 2 (8.7ha) was a resubmission of a site which has been assessed previously, and Option 1 relates to a smaller area (1.8ha) located to the southwest of the larger site.

3.4 In terms of the larger site, this was previously assessed and not proposed for allocation due to a dismissed appeal decision on the site for employment development. The Inspector found that development would undermine the physical and perceived separation and open and undeveloped character between Castle Donington and Hemington.

3.5 The Option 1 site is significantly smaller than the larger site. It is promoted for around 6,750sqm of floorspace for Class E(g)(iii) use (light industry), B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution) use. It comprises the field immediately to the east



of Carnival Way and to the south of an existing area used for storage (of cars). The proposed smaller site would not result in development extending any further eastward than the storage area to the north of the site.

- 3.6 Officers have undertaken a detailed site assessment of the smaller site (Option1), and it has also been subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The smaller site scores better in the SA than the larger site for SA12 (biodiversity and geodiversity), this is due to the reduced site area not containing any ecological features. The remaining SA scores are unchanged.
- 3.7 In addition, updated information has been sought from the Highways Authority, Ecology and Heritage Teams at Leicestershire County Council who advise that there are no objections to development of the smaller site.
- 3.8 It is considered that the sensitive design of units and the inclusion of landscape buffers and screening would potentially overcome the Inspector's observations regarding the perceived separation between Castle Donington and Hemington. As the development would not physically extend further eastwards than existing development the physical separation between the two settlements would not be affected. As such, the smaller site is proposed for allocation for employment use.

#### **EMP66 – Ex Measham Mine site, Sweptstone Road, Measham**

- 3.9 This site was previously assessed as part of the site assessment process that supported the Regulation 18 Local Plan (2024). At that time the site was not recommended for allocation given it is a candidate Local Wildlife Site and also having regard to its rural location.
- 3.10 The site was re-submitted as part of the Call for Sites 2025. The submission included additional and updated information including a Preliminary Ecology Appraisal, Transport Technical Note and Vision Document.
- 3.11 The site is being promoted for general needs employment land, specifically small units, 'start-up' and 'grow-on' space. The site promoters have advised that the design of the units would be in keeping with its rural location utilising a natural colour scheme and timber cladding, the inclusion of renewable energy generation and green infrastructure elements, landscaping and tree planting. The site would also provide a link onto the existing Public Right of Way network.
- 3.12 Officers have updated the detailed site assessment in light of the additional information submitted by the site promoters. In addition, revised comments have been sought from the Highways Authority, the Ecology Team and the Planning, Historic & Natural Environment Team at Leicestershire County Council. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has also been updated.

#### **Highways**

- 3.13 In terms of access to the site the Highways Authority has no objections subject to mitigation measures. This would include the potential localised widening of

Sweepstone Road to accommodate HGV movements. The impacts of HGV movements through the Gallows Lane/Sweepstone Road junction would need to be examined.

- 3.14 The Highways Authority notes that the site is in a poor location in terms of sustainable transport options. The site promoters consider that the footpath on the southern side of Sweepstone Road could be uncovered to provide a pedestrian route towards Measham. The Highway Authority advises whilst this may be possible the footpath would need to meet the required standard of construction and meet the existing footway towards Measham. They note that access for cyclists would be difficult along Sweepstone Road because of its restricted width and the relatively high vehicle speeds.
- 3.15 Although access to the site by a range of sustainable means of transport may not be possible, the NPPF (para. 89) states, in terms of supporting a prosperous rural economy, that sites to meet local business needs in rural areas “may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable”.

### **Landscape**

- 3.16 The Landscape Sensitivity Study for the site concludes that its overall landscape sensitivity to new employment development is low as the landscape lends itself to employment development due to its industrial past. In terms of visual sensitivity, the Study notes that there are higher susceptibility receptors including the farm to the northwest and residential property to the east of the site, although views are restricted by intervening vegetation. Overall visual sensitivity is medium-low to change arising from new employment development. The Study identifies opportunities for development to retain and enhance boundary vegetation and to improve accessibility to the public right of way adjacent to the site.

### **Ecology**

- 3.17 The site is currently identified as a candidate Local Wildlife Site (cLWS). It was identified as such in 2007 due to the presence of early successional community and mixed grassland on the post-industrial site (former colliery tip).
- 3.18 The site promoters have submitted a Preliminary Ecology Appraisal of the site. LCC Ecology has assessed the appraisal against the Local Wildlife Site (LWS) criteria and note that the promoter’s survey completed in 2025 did not find the same level of interest compared to the 2007 survey. This may partly be due to the natural site maturation as the previous survey identified ‘early successional habitats’, partly due to the existing management of grassland on site and partly due to the level of survey recently completed.
- 3.19 LCC Ecology note that one of the recommendations in the 2025 appraisal is for further botanical survey work to be completed and it may be that this records

additional species which would indicate that the site retains its LWS value, but they conclude at face value the recent survey suggests that the ecological value of the site may have declined.

### **Previously Developed Land**

- 3.20 The site is former mineral workings with areas of hardstanding on the part of the site closest to Swepstone Road. Mineral extraction sites are usually subject to restoration and aftercare conditions. The NPPF definition of Previously Development Land (PDL) excludes minerals sites where restoration has been required through the development management process. There has been some uncertainty as to whether the site was subject to restoration conditions and as such whether it is greenfield or PDL.
- 3.21 As part of the Call for Sites (2025) the site promoters submitted an assessment that concludes the site accords with the definition of PDL in the NPPF. In light of this assessment officers sought additional advice from the LCC as the Minerals Planning Authority. This revealed that LCC agreed to the retention of the hardstanding on the site and that the site was signed out of the post-colliery aftercare agreement in December 2002. This means that the site constitutes PDL as per the definition in the NPPF.

### **Revised SA Assessment**

- 3.22 Considering the PDL status of the site, the revised Sustainability Appraisal (SA) score has changed from a significant negative to a significant positive in regard to SA14 (Land-use efficiency). The rest of the SA scoring is unchanged.

### **Summary**

- 3.23 It is considered that the sensitive design of buildings, using natural colour schemes and materials such as timber cladding as well as smaller footprint buildings, lower roof heights, and the provision of green infrastructure, landscape buffers, planting and screening could mitigate any adverse impact of development on its countryside setting. As such, it is proposed that the site be allocated for employment use.
- 3.24 Maps of both sites and draft Policy wording are included in Appendix A.

## **4 NEXT STEPS**

- 4.1 If the Committee agrees with the recommendations, the residual requirement for industrial/smaller warehousing would reduce as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4 – Revised residual requirement**

		<b>Offices (sqm)</b>	<b>Industrial/smaller warehousing (sqm)</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Residual requirement (Table 1)</b>	39,319sqm	At least 31,972sqm
B	EMP63(part) - Carnival Way (Option 1)	0	6,754sqm
C	EMP66 Ex-Measham Mine site	0	10,033sqm

<b>D</b>	<b>Additional supply (B+C)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16,787sqm</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>Revised residual requirement (D-A)</b>	<b>39,319sqm (c13.1ha)</b>	<b>At least 15,185sqm (c 5.2ha)</b>

- 4.2 Officers will consider whether and how this gap can be bridged and will report back to the Committee.
- 4.3 The shortfall in office floorspace is considerable. The report to the [16 December 2024](#) Local Plan Committee contained the following commentary on this matter which is still considered to be valid.

*“3.22 [There is] a considerable shortfall in the provision for new office space. Employment forecasts in the [Need for Employment Land Update Note \(July 2024\)](#) show that the number of people in office-based jobs will increase which, on the face of it, translates into a need for new office premises. Crucially, however, a market demand for new stock is not evident. Linked to this, speculative office development is currently not viable. Increased home and hybrid working since the pandemic will have had a bearing but the lack of demand in the district was evident before this. There were successful developments in the 2000s-2010s (for example the Ivanhoe Business Park in Ashby) but relatively little since then. As an illustration, the planning permission for three new office buildings at the E M Point site near Castle Donington (18/02227/FULM) looks unlikely to be built out and a revised application for office, research, light industry, general industry and warehousing uses is currently under consideration (22/01116/FULM) [Now approved]. The applicants for the redevelopment of 3,638sqm of good quality offices for a Lidl food store at Ashby (23/01153/FULM) were able to demonstrate a lack of market demand. Further, developers are not promoting realistic office sites through the Local Plan process (see paragraph 37 of the [Employment Topic Paper](#)).*

*3.23 There is some risk in not planning for the full requirement but as outlined, it is considered that there are compelling signs that the forecasts are out of step with actual demand. With a view to flexibility, it may be necessary for the plan to outline an approach if office demand does return during the lifetime of the plan”.*

- 4.4 The recommendations ask the Committee to agree these sites for inclusion in the Regulation 19 Plan without a commitment to include them in an ‘informal’ Regulation 18 consultation beforehand. Whilst this is not ideal, the Government’s December 2026 submission deadline for Local Plans to be examined under the current system means this is recommended. Officers consider that the imperative of meeting the deadline substantially outweighs the more limited risk of not exposing these two sites to informal public consultation first. If, however, it proves essential to undertake an additional Regulation 18 consultation for other reasons, these sites could be included at that stage.

<b>Policies and other considerations, as appropriate</b>	
Council Priorities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning and regeneration</li> <li>- Communities and housing</li> <li>- Clean, green and Zero Carbon</li> </ul>
Policy Considerations:	The Local Plan is required to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and other government guidance and requirements.
Safeguarding:	None discernible.
Equalities/Diversity:	An Equalities Impact Assessment of the Local Plan review will be undertaken as part of the Sustainability Appraisal.
Customer Impact:	No issues identified
Economic and Social Impact:	The decision itself will have no specific impact. The new Local Plan will aim to deliver positive economic and social impacts and these will be recorded through the Sustainability Appraisal.
Environment, Climate Change and Zero Carbon:	The decision, of itself, will have no specific impact. The new Local Plan will aim to deliver positive environmental and climate change impacts and these will be recorded through the Sustainability Appraisal.
Consultation/Community/Tenant Engagement:	The Regulation 18 Local Plan has been subject to consultation. Further consultation will be undertaken at Regulation 19 stage.
Risks:	<p>A risk assessment for the Local Plan Review has been prepared and is kept up to date. As far as possible control measures have been put in place to minimise risks, including regular Project Board meetings where risk is reviewed.</p> <p>The report highlights the potential risks associated with the issues considered as part of the report.</p>
Officer Contact:	Ian Nelson Planning Policy Team Manager 01530 454677 <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a>

This page is intentionally left blank

**Draft Policy XX - Land to the east of Carnival Way, Castle Donington (EMP63 part)**

- (1) Land to the east of Carnival Way, Castle Donington (EMP63 part), as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for:
  - (a) Around 6,750sqm of industry/smaller scale warehousing (Use Classes E(g)(iii)/B2/B8) to include small scale industrial units suitable for start-up businesses in accordance with draft Policy Ec6 (Start-up Workspace)
- (2) Development will be subject to the following requirements:
  - (a) Provision of a safe and suitable access from Carnival Way, delivery of off-site improvements needed to mitigate the highway impacts of development, and (iii) a sufficient package of sustainable transport measures, all of which must meet the requirements of the relevant highways authorities;
  - (b) Retention and enhancement of natural landscape buffers;
  - (c) A comprehensive landscaping scheme to help mitigate the visual impacts of development;
  - (d) The scheme helps create a softened, less abrupt edge to the built-up area of Castle Donington;
  - (e) The scheme is designed in a way to maintain the actual and perceived separation between the settlements of Castle Donington and Hemington;
  - (f) Potential impacts on the residential amenity of properties close to the site on Carnival Way, Glover Road, Blyth Court and Upton Close are addressed through the scheme's design;
  - (g) Provision of a Mineral Assessment for sand and gravel; and
  - (h) Commitment to prepare and implement an Employment and Skills Plan in accordance with draft Policy Ec7 (Local Employment Opportunities).

**EMP63 (part) - Carnival Way, Castle Donington**

The map shows a large red-outlined area labeled **EMP63 (part)** located on the right side of the map. To the left of this area, there is a residential area with streets including Victoria Street, Blyth Court, Upton Close, Glover Road, and Station Road. Various buildings are shown, including a Factory, a Play Area, and several houses with numbered plots. A large area is labeled **EMP63 (part)** in the center-right. A path (um) is shown on the right side, and a scale bar indicates 1:1250 mapping. The map also shows a large area labeled **EMP63 (part)** in the center-right.

Reproduction from Ordnance 1:1250 mapping with permission of the Controller of HMSO  
Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to  
prosecution or civil proceedings Licence No: 100019329

Reproduction from Ordnance 1:1250 mapping with permission of the Controller of HMSO  
Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to  
prosecution or civil proceedings Licence No: 100019329



**Draft Policy XX – Ex Measham Mine Site, Measham (EMP66)**

- (1) The site of the former Measham Mine, Measham (EMP66), as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for:
  - (a) Around 14400sqm of industry/smaller scale warehousing (Use Classes E(g)(iii)/B2/B8) to include small scale industrial units suitable for start-up businesses in accordance with draft Policy Ec6 (Start-up Workspace)
- (2) Development will be subject to the following requirements:
  - (a) Provision of a safe and suitable access from Swebstone Road, delivery of off-site improvements needed to mitigate the highway impacts of development, and (iii) a sufficient package of sustainable transport measures, including the reinstatement of the footpath to the south of Swebstone Road, all of which must meet the requirements of the relevant highways authorities;
  - (b) The design and density of the scheme should reflect and respect its countryside setting. Buildings should be of a scale, form and general design that complements the site's rural location;
  - (c) Provision of a pedestrian connection from Swebstone Road through the site to Public Right of Way P89/1;
  - (d) Demonstration through further ecological surveys that the site no longer meets the criteria for a Local Wildlife Site;
  - (e) Retention and enhancement of natural landscape buffers;
  - (f) A comprehensive landscaping scheme to help mitigate the visual impacts of development;
  - (g) Provision of a Minerals Assessment for at or near surface coal; and
  - (h) Commitment to prepare and implement an Employment and Skills Plan in accordance with draft Policy Ec7 (Local Employment Opportunities).

# EMP66 - Ex-Measham Mine Site

