

## Responses Received to Revised Money Hill Masterplan Consultation (October 2019)

The responses received during the public consultation on the revised Money Hill masterplan undertaken between 2 October and 16 October 2019 can be viewed below:

Respondent	Comments
<b>Sport England</b>	Have commented previously.
COUNCIL RESPONSE:	Noted
<b>Severn Trent</b>	As the plan does not contain any drainage details our advice would be consistent with our previous response.
COUNCIL RESPONSE:	Noted
<b>Nottinghamshire County Council</b>	At this time, Nottinghamshire County Council does not have any comments to make.
COUNCIL RESPONSE:	Noted
<b>Nick Salt</b>	<p>I've been sent this update but it is not clear what has changed from the original to the revised master plan. I have followed the links provided but can only get to a plan diagram but no narrative. I think it would help everyone you have contacted if you can provide a short summary of what has changed please.</p> <p>As an owner of (<i>redacted</i>) (which is opposite the proposed new junction onto Nottingham Road) we remain extremely concerned about the increased safety risk for the public including school children. The road is already full of traffic since other housing has been introduced which this development will make worse. Please consider people's safety as well as the additional noise and pollution that the new junction will impose on all of us who live close to this location.</p> <p>The access should only be via the bypass road not onto Nottingham Rd.</p> <p>The junction will introduce stopping and starting traffic which brings pollution and the noise of their engines and radios roaring through the night. This will devalue our property as well.</p> <p>Have you consulted with people who live further down into Ashby where new junctions have been put in? The noise from the stopping traffic has devalued these property's and people are living in the back part of their house because of the noise and pollution. Please only use the bypass?</p> <p>We cannot see in the proposals if there is to be a new school, but also leisure facilities. The Hood Park facility is already at teaching capacity (swimming for example).</p> <p>We would expect this huge new development to include these facilities as well as some others such as shops.</p>

COUNCIL RESPONSE:	The issues regarding access from Nottingham Road are considered in response to the comments on the initial Masterplan consultation at Appendix C of the report. The revised Masterplan identifies that there will be a new school within that part of the site that has outline planning permission. A new leisure facility would not be supported by a development of this scale, but the Council will seek improvements to existing facilities where justified. The revised Masterplan identifies an area of mixed uses within that part of the site that has outline planning permission. This may include some shops to meet local needs, but this will be dependent upon the commercial viability of such a proposal.
<b>South Derbyshire District Council</b>	The comments SDDC submitted on 27/08/2019 still stand.
COUNCIL RESPONSE:	Noted
<b>Simon Attwell</b>	<p>I have concerns regarding the proposed Money hill development.</p> <p>Concern about cycle and pedestrian link that is accessed on to Woodcock Way. Already short of parking spaces in area and having this area open will make life difficult for residents. <i>(Comment summarised due to inclusion of personal information in response)</i></p> <p>Also I'm concerned about the road noise that this new development being so close will cause. Ashby is already surrounded by major roads and this will just add to noise and air pollution.</p> <p>The proposed development is too close to existing housing and not only spoils the green areas and is far too condensed.</p> <p>Traffic is a nightmare and these plans don't add any benefit to the quality of life in Ashby. There is a need however, for more housing which I understand.</p>
COUNCIL RESPONSE:	A link through to Woodcock Way for pedestrians and cyclists is important so as to facilitate access to existing parts of Ashby by means other than the car. It is not clear how this link would impact upon parking in the locality. The principle of development has already accepted as part of local plan process. In supporting the allocation of the site the Inspector did not raise any concerns regarding impact of development from traffic.
<b>Environment Agency</b>	<p>Whilst we have no adverse comment to make on the submitted proposed site plan we would like to advise that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any proposed development within Flood Zones 2 and 3 would be subject to the (flooding) Sequential Test and also require submission of an NPPF compliant FRA.</li> <li>• Any proposed development within 8m of a Main River of the Environment Agency (Gilwiskaw Brook) may require a Permit from the Environment Agency.</li> </ul>

COUNCIL RESPONSE:	Noted
<p data-bbox="203 237 427 264"><b>Highways England</b></p>	<p data-bbox="602 237 1440 264"><b>Additional consultation on Moneyhill Masterplan, Ashby de la Zouch</b></p> <p data-bbox="602 309 2013 408">We welcome the opportunity to comment on the revised Moneyhill Masterplan document which has been produced for public consultation as part of the North West Leicestershire Local Plan. We note that this consultation is being held to comply with requirements as set out in the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="602 416 2016 587">Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to the NWLLP, our principal interest is safeguarding the operation of the M1, A42 and sections of the M42, A50 and A453.</p> <p data-bbox="602 632 2016 767">Highways England was previously consulted on a former version of the Moneyhill masterplan and raised comments contained in the letter response dated 30 July 2019. We note that the masterplan has now been slightly revised to add details showing how it is envisaged that the site would be developed. Having reviewed the revised information, we consider this does not affect our previous position.</p> <p data-bbox="602 812 2033 1054">As previously noted, we acknowledge that the Moneyhill site would be in alignment with the Government’s pro-growth agenda, but it would also be important for the Council to ensure that there is sufficient infrastructure capacity to accommodate this growth. This includes adequate capacity on the SRN particularly at A42 J13, which is located adjacent to the site, to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the network. We would expect that the impacts from development growth coming forward are appropriately assessed as part of the development management process, to allow for any potential impacts on the operation of the SRN to be better understood and relevant mitigation to be identified.</p> <p data-bbox="602 1099 1971 1161">We have no further comments to provide at this stage and trust the above is useful in the progression of the North West Leicestershire Local Plan.</p>
COUNCIL RESPONSE:	Noted
<p data-bbox="203 1233 568 1289"><b>Miller Homes Ltd and Redrow Homes Ltd</b></p>	<p data-bbox="602 1233 1308 1260"><b>Re: Consultation on Revised Moneyhill, Ashby de la Zouch</b></p>

I write on behalf of Miller Homes Ltd ('Miller') and Redrow Homes Ltd ('Redrow') further to our letter dated 9 August 2019 (copy enclosed) and in response to the current public consultation on the revised illustrative masterplan prepared in relation to land north of Ashby de la Zouch, known as Moneyhill (Local Plan Ref: H3a and Ec2 (1)).

As previously advised Miller and Redrow jointly control land within the western part of the allocation as illustrated at enclosure 1 to this letter. Neither Miller nor Redrow have been party to any recent discussions regarding either the initial masterplan or the revised illustrative masterplan which is the subject of this consultation.

We wish to make the following points:

**Residential development density**

As set out in our previous representations it is our view that establishing, through the illustrative masterplan, a density cap of 35 dph is overly restrictive.

The revised illustrative masterplan continues to promote the notion of a density cap of 35 dwellings per hectare and we wish to raise again our concerns in doing so. We strongly object to the inclusion of this notation on the illustrative masterplan.

To include such a prescriptive requirement could result in deliverability issues should it be demonstrated that it is unviable to deliver a parcel at no greater than 35 dph.

We consider it critical that the illustrative masterplan allows for flexibility with regards to the density of new residential development and we request that the density cap included in the key is removed from the illustrative masterplan. In this respect it is worth noting that this requirement repeats adopted planning policy and that the Council, through the determination of future planning applications, will have the opportunity to consider the most appropriate density for the given part of the allocation on an application by application basis.

**Employment allocation Ec2 (1)**

	<p>As confirmed in our previous representations we support the minor amendment to Local Plan Allocation Ec2 (1) which now supports the part development of this area for residential uses. We consider that the identification of land in this location for residential uses will provide an attractive gateway to the wider allocation and Ashby de la Zouch.</p> <p>We support the confirmation that this area is suitable for residential (Use Class C3) and business (Use Class B1) development, however, we also consider that the area identified for business use (Use Class B1) is also appropriate for hotel use (Use Class C1) and residential care home use (Use Class C2). We therefore recommend that the revised illustrative masterplan is amended to support Use Class B1, C1 and appropriate C2 uses in this location.</p> <p>We would be pleased to discuss our comments and the timescales for delivering the site with the Council and look forward to working with the Council and Consortium on a revised illustrative masterplan.</p>
<p><b>COUNCIL RESPONSE:</b></p>	<p>The issues regarding density of development are considered in response to the comments on the initial Masterplan consultation at Appendix C of the report. In terms of the area off Smisby Road the adopted Local plan identifies that this area should be for employment uses (Class B1) which, by their nature can be carried out in residential areas without resulting in harm to the amenity of the area. In this respect, therefore, the Masterplan is consistent with the Local Plan. It would be more appropriate for other possible uses to be considered as part of any future planning application rather than through the Masterplan.</p>
<p><b>Ashby de la Zouch Town Council</b></p>	<p>Ashby de la Zouch Town Council's Planning and Transportation Committee have discussed the revised masterplan and welcomed the changes the developers have made to the Masterplan following comments from the Town Council.</p> <p>Separate from this consultation the Town Council requests that the allocation of 15 hectares of employment land near the Mcvities distribution centre is restricted to B1 and B2 uses.</p>
<p><b>COUNCIL RESPONSE:</b></p>	<p>The Town Council's welcoming of the changes is noted.</p> <p>The principal of employment uses falling within Use Classes B1,B2 or B8 on that part of the site adjoining McVities has been established through the local Plan process.</p>

<b>Historic England</b>	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England regarding the above, 02 October 2019.</p> <p>Historic England have no additional further comment to our previous letter of 28 August, providing that the additional area of employment shown to the south of the Masterplan is not on an area of extant ridge and furrow.</p>
<b>COUNCIL RESPONSE:</b>	Noted
<b>The National Forest Company</b>	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the revised Money Hill Masterplan.</p> <p>The amendments made have not addressed the comments raised in our original comments below. We would be grateful if these could still be taken into account in your consideration of the plan.</p>
<b>COUNCIL RESPONSE:</b>	Noted
<b>Natural England</b>	<p>Natural England has previously commented on this proposal and made comments to the authority in our letter dated 12 August 2019</p> <p>The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this amendment although we made no objection to the original proposal.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the original application are unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposal.</p> <p>Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again. Before sending us the amended consultation, please assess whether the changes proposed will materially affect any of the advice we have previously offered. If they are unlikely to do so, please do not re-consult us.</p>
<b>COUNCIL RESPONSE:</b>	Noted