

CHAPTER 4	POLICY NUMBER – S2	POLICY NAME -SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY
------------------	---------------------------	--

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>4.25 - The text says ‘Some development in these settlements will be appropriate. Any further development in such settlements will be restricted to either infilling or PDL which is well related to the settlement concerned’. It is unclear as to which types of settlement this text refers to and the wording included in this paragraph does not appear within the actual policy wording. It is suggested that this wording should be removed or clarified to avoid confusion. For example, one would expect equestrian uses to be acceptable in all rural locations across the district but the wording within this paragraph suggests that it would need to be on PDL or be infill development. If this policy is referring to residential development then it needs to be more precise.</p> <p>4.26 - This paragraph should also make it clear that the provision of additional services in settlements should also be a material consideration.</p>	<p>This paragraph is concerned with Sustainable Villages. Some rewording would provide additional clarity.</p> <p>In the settlement hierarchy all settlements upwards of Sustainable Villages are already regarded as being sustainable and hence potentially suitable for some form of development. Part (3) only applies to Sustainable</p>	<p>At start of paragraph amend to state " Outside of those settlements listed in paragraph 4.22.." . Insert "We term these as Sustainable Villages" after "on a much lesser scale"</p> <p>Reword to state "Any further <u>housing or employment</u> development in such settlements .."</p> <p>Insert the following into policy as (4) "If during the plan period any of the Local Needs Villages gains facilities</p>	8	JJM Planning

Road has sufficient facilities to make it sustainable.	away. As such this does not constitute a sustainable settlement.			
Our client supports the settlement hierarchy as set out in Policy S2. Sustainable Villages can accommodate limited growth; this is supported. We also agree that Packington is a Sustainable Village which can accommodate limited growth. The development of site reference P4 would represent limited growth in Packington.	Noted	No change	65	Stone Planning Services Ltd o/b/o Peveril Homes
Support	Noted	No change	92	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
The hierarchy should be amended for Appleby Magna in view of its proximity to Mercia Park which will create about 3,000 new jobs. To date insufficient weight has been attached to this factor, compared to growth at the Leicestershire International Gateway.	Appleby Magna itself has a limited range of services and facilities. Whilst it is suitable for some development it does not compare to the next level up in the settlement hierarchy (Local Service Centres). The amount of employment growth at Mercia Park does not compare favourably with that at the Gateway, which is identified as growth area in the Strategic Growth Plan.	No change	130	Fisher German o/b/o Richborough
The relative sustainability of Ravenstone is undervalued as the settlement hierarchy fails to acknowledge the proximity to Coalville, the principal town in the district. Parts of the Coalville Urban	Whilst Ravenstone is close to the Coalville Urban Area, it is physically separate from the Coalville Urban Area, whereas Thringstone and the other parts of the Coalville Urban Area are	No change	136	Fisher German o/b/o William Davis Homes

Area, such as Thringstone, are further from services and facilities than Ravenstone. There are also good public transport links to Coalville.	physically indivisible from each other.			
LCC supports the establishment of a settlement hierarchy (Draft Policy S2), and that housing supply will be supported by Local Needs Villages as a strategy for housing growth.	Noted	No change	139	Leicester City Council
The status of Appleby Magna in the settlement hierarchy is supported.	Noted	No change	144	Marrons
Support focussing development in most sustainable settlements and development should be spread across the hierarchy to ensure that smaller settlements do not stagnate. Policy should address what would happen if a new development also proposed a new service which would make a settlement more sustainable.	Allowing for movement between the various parts of the settlement hierarchy would reduce certainty and in effect make the settlement hierarchy potentially meaningless.	No change	147	Gladman Developments Ltd
Support the identification of Coaville as the Principal Town, but question why more development is proposed at Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington which are identified as Key Service Centres in the hierarchy. Object to the lack of any allocation at Measham	<p>Whilst the overall scale of growth across the two Key Service Centres is more than in Coalville, individually the scale of growth is less.</p> <p>Whilst there are no new allocations at Measham, there is provision as land west of High Street has permission for about 450 dwellings.</p>	No change	150	Savills o/b/o David Wilson Homes
We note Long Whatton is identified as a sustainable village within the settlement hierarchy and would agree with this identification; however, we	Part (1) of the policy already refers to development being proportionate to the scale and	No change	161	Mather Jamie

<p>would suggest the wording is changed from “limited amount of growth” to “proportionate amount of growth” to ensure schemes which need to be of a sufficient scale to offer the delivery of affordable housing or other community infrastructure are supported in delivering such benefits to these settlements.</p>	<p>character of the settlement concerned.</p>			
<p>Breedon on the Hill forms part of the Leicestershire International Gateway. This should be reflected by elevating the status of Breedon on the hill or alternatively its unique location and the role it can play in delivering new homes should be recognised. The current approach requires further refinement to ensure sustainable settlements located within an area of strategic regional importance are not unnecessarily restricted when they can make vitally important contributions to meeting housing needs</p>	<p>The Leicestershire International Gateway and is one of a number of growth areas identified in the Strategic Growth Plan and is a broad area encompassing parts of North West Leicestershire and Charnwood. It includes large urban areas such as Coalville, Shepshed and Loughborough as well as Castle Donington and Kegworth. Whilst Breedon on the Hill is included in the Gateway area, it remains a free-standing settlement with a limited range of services and facilities. Significant provision is made for new housing and employment development elsewhere within this area as part of the plan, including the proposed new settlement at Isley Woodhouse and as well as significant growth at larger settlements such as Coalville, Castle Donington and Kegworth.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>172</p>	<p>Fisher German o/b/o Cora</p>

<p>Our client notes and supports the identification of Ashby as a sustainable settlement and consider it to be capable of absorbing additional levels of growth than that already proposed, particularly if there is an increase in housing requirement or a need to ameliorate any housing shortfall due to the application of a more realistic delivery assumption for the Isley Woodhouse new settlement. As demonstrated by the Council's Settlement Study (2021) Ashby also benefits from a range of services and facilities, thus many needs can be met within the settlement. Moreover, Ashby de la Zouch is demonstrably the second most sustainable settlement and could reasonably serve a spatial role above Castle Donington in terms of housing provision</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>174</p>	<p>Fisher German o/b/o Mr R Botham</p>
<p>ODAPC disputes Donisthorpe's categorisation as a sustainable village as the Village Store has closed permanently and been converted into residential accommodation. Oakthorpe – needs improved infrastructure and access to local doctors in Measham.</p>	<p>The loss of the shop in Donisthorpe is noted. However, it would still score well against the settlement methodology such that it would be considered to be a Sustainable Village. Oakthorpe scores similar to other settlements which are identified as Sustainable Villages.</p>	<p>Update settlement study</p>	<p>175</p>	<p>Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe & Acresford Parish Council</p>

<p>Whilst support the assessment of settlements and the use of a hierarchy, it is suggested that Ravenstone should be reconsidered due to its location in close proximity to the Coalville Urban Area. The status of the new settlement at Isley Woodhouse in the hierarchy needs to be clarified.</p>	<p>Whilst Ravenstone is close to the Coalville Urban Area, it is physically separate from the Coalville Urban Area, whereas Thringstone and the other parts of the Coalville Urban Area are physically indivisible from each other.</p> <p>In respect of Isley Woodhouse it is agreed that as the new settlement at Isley Woodhouse does not, as yet, exist, its inclusion in the settlement hierarchy is inappropriate.</p>	<p>Delete Isley Woodhouse from the Settlement Hierarchy</p>	<p>182</p>	<p>Boyer Planning o/b/o Redrow Homes</p>
<p>Do not agree that Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington should both be designated as Key Service Centres. Instead, Castle Donington and the surrounding area should sit between the Principal Town and Key Service Centre in view of its strategic importance in respect of the employment growth that is anticipated.</p>	<p>In considering the status of individual settlements in the settlement hierarchy regard is had to a wide range of services and facilities. Whilst it is the case that Castle Donington and the surrounding area host a significant number of jobs, Ashby de la Zouch has bigger offer in terms of shopping and related services, including a leisure centre., as well as there being a larger population. Therefore, it is considered that they both can be regarded as key Service Centres.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>183</p>	<p>Turley o/b/o Clowes Developments, Redrow Homes Ltd and Wilson Enterprises Ltd</p>
<p>Ashby de la Zouch should be identified as a Main Town to separate it out from Castle Donington. The range and type of services in Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington are</p>	<p>In considering the status of individual settlements in the settlement hierarchy regard is had to a wide range of services and facilities. Whilst it is the case that</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>184</p>	<p>Pegasus Group o/b/o Hallam Land Management</p>

<p>similar, but the number of services in Ashby de la Zouch is much greater so provides more choice. For example, there are 6 convenience stores compared to 3 in Castle Donington, 5 primary schools compared to 3, 2 secondary schools and more dentists, chemists and opticians. In the settlement study, Ashby de la Zouch scores more points than Castle Donington (23 as against 20). Ashby de la Zouch is also home to larger population</p> <p>Furthermore, the range of services and facilities is not that much less than the Coalville Urban Area, which comprises a number of linked settlements which distorts the findings in the settlement hierarchy.</p>	<p>Castle Donington and the surrounding area host a significant number of jobs, Ashby de la Zouch has a bigger offer in terms of shopping and related services, including a leisure centre, as well as there being a larger population. Therefore, it is considered that they both can be regarded as key Service Centres. Whilst it is recognised that Ashby de la Zouch has a good range of services and facilities, the Coalville Urban Area has a much larger population which does function as single settlement.</p>			
<p>Support the status of Measham in the settlement hierarchy, but concerned that the distribution of site allocations do not appropriately reflect the settlement hierarchy.</p>	<p>Support is noted. In terms of the scale of allocations, whilst no new allocations are proposed in Measham, there is provision as land west of High Street has permission for about 450 dwellings.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>187</p>	<p>Define Planning & Design Ltd</p>
<p>We fully support the principle of the Settlement Hierarchy, as set out in proposed policy S2. It is vitally important for the Council to increase the level of housing delivery further down the settlement hierarchy to meet local needs within the villages and rural settlements to assist in the</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>188</p>	<p>C. Green Planning</p>

retention of key services – which may be lost if future development is not directly appropriately – and to attract new services and facilities into the community.				
Support the identification of Measham as a Local Service Centre, but object to the lack of flexibility in Sustainable Villages such as Appleby Magna which would allow for development that could enhance or provide new infrastructure rather than simply maintaining the current infrastructure provision.	Appleby Magna itself has a limited range of services and facilities. Whilst it is suitable for some development it does not compare to the next level up in the settlement hierarchy (Local Service Centres). In order to support the level of services and facilities that would justify a change of status in the hierarchy, it is likely that a amount of growth required would be out of keeping with the existing character of Appleby Magna.	No change	193	Pegasus Group o/b/o Hall Land Management
Support the identification of the Coalville Urban Area as the Principal Town. However, consider that the status of the new settlement at Isley Woodhouse should be reconsidered as there are no services, facilities or infrastructure.	It is agreed that as the new settlement at Isley Woodhouse does not, as yet, exist, that its inclusion in the settlement hierarchy is inappropriate. However, part (2) of the policy is required to explain that it is an exception to the hierarchy policy. Future Local Plans will need to consider where it lies in the settlement hierarchy (or similar).	Delete Isley Woodhouse from the Settlement Hierarchy	195	Marrons o/b/o William Davis
Object. Draft Policy S2 should be modified to allow communities the opportunity to apply the Settlement Hierarchy flexibly, through neighbourhood plans.	The role of the Local Plan is to set out key strategic policies, such as policy S2. If such matters were left to Neighbourhood Plans then there would not necessarily be a	No change	196	Breedon on the Hill Parish Council

	consistent approach across the district.			
Object to the status of Newbold as a Local Needs Housing Village (LNHV). The methodology used does not take account of quality of service. Newbold is the largest of the LNHV and benefits from a primary school which is a key asset in the village which should be given greater weight, there is also a large employment area to the north-east of the village. A contrast is made with Albert Village.	There are limited services in Newbold (primary school, public house, some employment outside the village and informal recreation area). There is a very limited bus service. Albert Village has similar services and facilities, but it benefits from a regular service to Ashby de la Zouch, Swadlincote and Burton upon Trent	No change	206	Pegasus Group o/b/o Taylor Wimpey
The recognition of Ibstock as a sustainable location for additional growth over the plan period is supported.	Noted	No change	211	Pegasus Group o/b/o Davidsons
Welcome the recognition of Ashby-de-la-Zouch as a Key Service Centre and that a significant proportion of development will take place here.	Noted	No change	214	Stantec UK Ltd o/b/o Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Policy S2 states that the strategy of the plan is to direct new development to appropriate locations within the Limits to Development or exceptionally to the proposed new settlement Land South of East Midlands Airport (Isley Woodhouse). It fails, in its wording, to refer to allocations outside of the Limits to Development. It is therefore considered that the policy wording should be amended to include	It is considered that part 1 of the policy should be amended to also include "and other policies of this plan" after "settlement hierarchy below". The supporting text will need to be amended to provide clarification as to which policies are relevant.	Insert "and other policies of this plan" after "settlement hierarchy below". Amend supporting text to refer to policies H2, H3, Ec2 , Ec3 and Ec5	215	Carter Jonas o/b/o Secretary of State for Transport

allocated sites outside of the Limits to Development or the emerging Policy Map should amend the Limits to Development to encompass the allocations.				
Support the status of Whitwick and Donsithorpe in Settlement Hierarchy	Noted	No change	216	Pegasus Group o/b/o Westernrange
Support the identification of Coalville as the Principal Town. Note the status of Blackfordby, but it is not clear why services and facilities in Ashby de la Zouch and Swadlincote do not have a more positive weighting. For example, schools in Ashby de la Zouch. A more robust approach is required	The methodology seeks to take a balanced approach. So, for example, account is taken of accessibility by public transport to higher order centres and hence a greater range of services and facilities, but also takes account of what is available within each settlement. In the case of Blackfordby, there are limited services in the village itself, but it benefits from direct and regular public transport links to both Ashby de la Zouch and Swadlincote.	No change	219	Marrons o/b/o David Wilson Homes
The policy should be changed so that new development only occurs in places which have a wide range of facilities and which offer an attractive and genuine choice of transport options. That should only include the Principal Town and Key Service Centre classifications. Part (2) should be removed until it can be demonstrated that a new settlement can be delivered which is viable and provides the necessary facilities,	The methodology seeks to take a balanced approach to ensure that the plan supports the creation of a sustainable pattern of development as required in the NPPF (paragraph 11). Limiting new development to the top two tiers of the hierarchy would put an unreasonable strain on services and facilities in those settlements. It would also result in the stagnation of other settlements	No change	220	CPRE Leicestershire

including genuine attractive choices of transport. The policy needs to specify what the requirements are for a village to be regarded as a Sustainable Village.	contrary to the NPPF (paragraph 83) which refers to locating housing "where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities". In terms of Sustainable Villages, as set out in the settlement study a range of factors are considered; there is no one service or facility that outweighs others.			
Support the identification of Donington -le-Heath as part of the Coalville Urban Area	Noted	No change	221	Marrons o/b/o Williams Homes
As framed Draft Policy S2 is misleading. It refers to the strategy being to direct new development to locations within the Limits to Development or, exceptionally, to the proposed new settlement. In fact, the emerging Plan also, appropriately, includes other allocations that are and will remain outside Limits to Development and also (Draft Policy Ec4 alongside Draft Policy S4) allows for the prospect of employment development in the Countryside. This should be referred to and reflected in Policy S2, i.e., reflecting that the strategy is to direct development to the Limits of Development, and the new settlement, and allocated sites, and other locations where the relevant criteria are met.	It is considered that part 1 of the policy should be amended to also include "and other policies of this plan" after "settlement hierarchy below". The supporting text will need to be amended to provide clarification as to which policies are relevant.	Insert "and other policies of this plan" after "settlement hierarchy below". Amend supporting text to refer to policies H2, H3, Ec2 , Ec3 and Ec5	225	Planning Prospects Ltd o/b/o St Modwen Logistics
We agree with the Settlement Hierarchy, as set out through Draft	Noted	No change	226	Oxalis Planning and Pegasus

<p>Policy S2, insofar as it identifies that a large amount of growth will take place at the New Settlement of Isley Woodhouse, throughout the Plan Period and beyond. Delivery at Isley Woodhouse presents the opportunity to diversify housing supply options and provide continuity of delivery across the Plan Period.</p>				<p>Group East Midlands o/b/o Harworth Estates and Caesarea</p>
<p>As framed Draft Policy S2 is misleading. It refers to the strategy being to direct new development to locations within the Limits to Development or, exceptionally, to the proposed new settlement. In fact, the emerging Plan also, appropriately, includes other allocations that are and will remain outside Limits to Development and also (Draft Policy Ec4 alongside Draft Policy S4) allows for the prospect of employment development in the Countryside. This should be referred to and reflected in Policy S2, i.e., reflecting that the strategy is to direct development to the Limits of Development, and the new settlement, and allocated sites, and other locations where the relevant criteria are met.</p>	<p>It is considered that part 1 of the policy should be amended to also include "and other policies of this plan" after "settlement hierarchy below". The supporting text will need to be amended to provide clarification as to which policies are relevant.</p>	<p>Insert "and other policies of this plan" after "settlement hierarchy below".</p> <p>Amend supporting text to refer to policies H2, H3, Ec2 , Ec3 and Ec5</p>	<p>229</p>	<p>Planning Prospects Ltd o/b/o P W C Redfern</p>
<p>The proposed settlement hierarchy set out in the draft policy is supported. But this is except for a proposed new settlement (Isley Woodhouse – Land south of East Midlands Airport. Whilst the concept of a new settlement in the</p>	<p>These comments are more appropriately considered as part of the proposed allocation.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>230</p>	<p>East Midlands Airport</p>

district is recognised, the Isley Woodhouse location, that is close to the airport, affected by its activity and potentially compromising its growth, is unsustainable and unsound in planning and local amenity terms.				
The settlement hierarchy fails to consider Kegworth's strategic location in proximity to a range of employment opportunities and access to public transport. Kegworth should be a focus for development and it is a failing of the plan to not direct any growth to it. Kegworth and other established settlements should sit above Isley Woodhouse in the settlement hierarchy which will only become sustainable once services and facilities are provided. As such, Isley Woodhouse should form no part of the hierarchy.	<p>Whilst Kegworth is well placed for employment opportunities and with good public transport, the range of services and facilities is not as great as the higher order settlements. Whilst there are no allocations included in the draft plan for Kegworth, permission is in place for two sites off Derby Road and the Ashby Road which can accommodate xxx dwellings.</p> <p>It is agreed that as the new settlement at Isley Woodhouse does not, as yet exist, that its inclusion in the settlement hierarchy is inappropriate.</p>	No change	232	Stantec UK Ltd o/b/o Caddick land
Draft Policy S2 – Settlement Hierarchy identifies Ibstock as one of three Local Service Centres. Paragraph 4.23 of the proposed policies consultation document sets out that these six settlements form the central part of our settlement hierarchy and will accommodate the vast majority of new development. The recognition of Ibstock as a sustainable location for additional	Noted	No change	235	Pegasus Group o/b/o Davidsons and Westernrange

growth over the plan period is supported.				
The HBF considers that it is important that the spatial distribution of sites follows a logical hierarchy, provides an appropriate development pattern and supports sustainable development within all market areas. The HBF considers that the Council's proposed approach to the distribution of housing should ensure the availability of a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land to deliver the housing requirement.	Noted	No change	237	Home Builders Federation
<p>Policy S2 goes beyond describing the settlement hierarchy in the District; it articulates the Council's spatial strategy. Accordingly, it should be headed 'Spatial Strategy'</p> <p>The Policy or the supporting text to it needs to be clear about how the allocations the Council is proposing to make reflect the spatial strategy that it has resolved to pursue.</p> <p>The distribution of development does not reflect option 7b.</p>	<p>The term 'spatial strategy' is not on that is easily understood. However, it is agreed that the policy does describe the strategy of the plan. Therefore, the policy should be retitled 'The Development Strategy'.</p> <p>Noted. This will be addressed as part of the Regulation 19 plan.</p> <p>This matter is more appropriately addressed in a future report in respect of proposed allocations.</p>	Change policy title to 'The Development Strategy'.	243	Avison Young o/b/o Jelson Homes
Support the settlement hierarchy set out in Draft Policy S2, which is informed by the relative sustainability of villages within NW Leicestershire.	As part the development of the plan, a range of options were considered, including an option of more growth in Sustainable	No change	245	Evolve Planning o/b/o Bloor Homes

<p>However, the restrictive approach of the policy to planned growth means that in time services and facilities in Sustainable Villages will gradually decline. The amount of growth in Sustainable Villages should be increased to support and maintain services and facilities. Further growth will also support the provision of more affordable housing.</p>	<p>Villages. However, it did not perform as well as the proposed approach. The proposed approach plans positively by allocating some development in most Sustainable Villages.</p>			
<p>Support the settlement hierarchy set out in Draft Policy S2, which is informed by the relative sustainability of villages within NW Leicestershire. However, the restrictive approach of the policy to planned growth means that in time services and facilities in Sustainable Villages will gradually decline. The amount of growth in Sustainable Villages should be increased to support and maintain services and facilities. Further growth will also support the provision of more affordable housing. The strategy also fails to take account of other local issues. Appleby Magna has suffered from a number of flood events. Land at Top Street provides an opportunity to help alleviate this problem.</p>	<p>As part the development of the plan, a range of options were considered, including an option of more growth in Sustainable Villages. However, it did not perform as well as the proposed approach. The proposed approach plans positively by allocating some development in most Sustainable Villages.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy is largely concerned with the relative sustainability of individual settlements having regard to access to services and facilities. Issues pertaining to flooding are site specific</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>256</p>	<p>Evolve Planning o/b/o Cameron Homes</p>
<p>Castle Donington and Ashby de la Zouch are both categorised as Key Service Centres. They are, however, clearly and fundamentally different in terms of the services and facilities available, with Ashby de la Zouch</p>	<p>Whilst Ashby de la Zouch does benefit from both more retail and leisure opportunities than Castle Donington, the latter benefits from the significant employment opportunities in and around the</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>277</p>	<p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p>

having a much greater range including a greater retail and leisure offer and the infrastructure can cope, unlike in Castle Donington.	town, as well as a better level of public transport provision. Castle Donington is also within the Leicestershire International Gateway growth area identified in the Strategic Growth Plan for Leicester and Leicestershire.			
We agree, in general terms, with the approach taken to arrive at the settlement hierarchy	Noted	No change	280	Marrons o/b/o Richborough
Swannington – any further development will be restricted to infilling or the use of previously developed land.	Noted	No change	289	Swannington Parish Council
The villages of Diseworth, Long Whatton and Breedon on the Hill are all defined as “Sustainable Villages”. Tonge and Isley Walton are classed as “Hamlets”. Para 4.24 refers to a completely new settlement of Isley Woodhouse. The policy treats all these settlements as independent. There is no mention of what effect the new settlement of Isley Woodhouse will have on the existing settlements. Removing the greenspace agricultural land that separates the settlements will undoubtedly have an effect on the settlements and their inhabitants. This new proposed settlement was a surprise to most people within the area. It was not mentioned in any previous plans or policies. Where did this proposal for a new settlement	The provision of a new settlement will help to relieve pressure on existing settlements such as Diseworth and Long Whatton and enable them to remain as free standing, small scale settlements.	No change	336	Local Resident (Kevin Walker)

originate from and why has there been no public consultation (that we are aware of) regarding it? And yet it now appears in the draught local plan as if it is a done deal and will happen.				
There appears to be no alignment with the Strategic Growth Plan and no context or rationale is provided for the proposed new settlement. It would be helpful if the plan articulated where it is anticipated that the new settlement would sit in the hierarchy once completed. Consideration should be given to whether Ashby de la Zouch should be higher up the settlement hierarchy, possibly as a Principal Town given its greater range of services and facilities than Castle Donington.	Whilst Ashby de la Zouch does benefit from both more retail and leisure opportunities than Castle Donington, the latter benefits from the significant employment opportunities in and around the town, as well as a better level of public transport provision. Identifying Ashby de la Zouch as a Principal Town alongside the Coalville Urban Area would not be appropriate, having regard to the size and range of services and facilities in the latter. The status of Castle Donington in the settlement hierarchy reflects its location within the Leicestershire International Gateway growth area identified in the Strategic Growth Plan for Leicester and Leicestershire.	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council
2. Isley Woodhouse should not be made an exception. It is in the wrong place.	Noted	No change	352	Local Resident (Jeffrey Guy)
From the 2022 consultation we understood that a new settlement option was ruled out at that time. We note that the current consultation advises the Council took the decision in September 2022 to agree Option	The potential of a new settlement was included in the majority of the development strategy options consulted upon in January to March 2022.	No change	357	Historic England

<p>7b as the preferred development strategy and that option includes a new settlement. From the information available in the current consultation documents we understand a new settlement is being proposed and is referred to as Isley Woodhouse. Historic England has concerns about the potential harm of the proposed settlement on the significance of heritage assets contained within the site and nearby as a result of setting impacts. The site would comprise much of the monastic landscape associated with the outstanding St Mary and St Hardulph Priory Church, Breedon on the Hill (GI listed building and associated hill fort scheduled monument) and Langley Priory (GII* listed building). Nearby Conservation Areas and various nearby Listed Buildings would, potentially, also be affected by the proposed settlement. It is unclear from the information available how this settlement option has been taken forward as a preferred option. Nor is it clear how the anticipated level of development could be achieved - is the Council satisfied that the proposal is developable and deliverable?</p>	<p>The concerns regarding the potential impact upon heritage assets is noted but is more appropriately addressed in a future report in respect of proposed allocations.</p>			
<p>Local plan consultation S2 Settlement hierarchies. Some councils with very rural areas are using settlement sharing policies to include smaller</p>	<p>Policy S3 recognises that some small scale development to meet a local need may be appropriate in those settlements which have a</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>381</p>	<p>Local resident (Robert Adey)</p>

<p>with bigger settlement/s to effectively create a team to give a bit of development to these communities to keep all of them improving not at risk of deteriorating as highlighted In Country Landowner reports of rural community problems and their suggestions to improve them .Most of North West Leicestershire is only semi rural with many communities only a short walk away so these rural sharing policies would seem to be easier to implement here. Its the rules but Leicester focussed dominance to decision making compared to much lesser weighting to often much closer but out of district areas frustrates many as it can make cohesion challenging locally.</p>	<p>limited range of services and facilities.</p>			
<p>Support the identification of Woodville as Sustainable Village but object to the lack of any allocations. Are promoting land for housing development which it is not proposed to allocate, partly because sites in Neighbourhood plan areas are sieved out, an approach that is not supported.</p>	<p>The majority of the site being promoted is included within the proposed Limits to development.</p> <p>The issue of the omission of a site will be addressed in a future report in respect of proposed allocations.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>392</p>	<p>CORA</p>
<p>The sentence describing Sustainable villages is incomplete. The hierarchy table is likely to lead to some confusion as villages are mentioned and the boundaries for these is not clear, unlike for example, Parish boundaries.</p>	<p>The description of Sustainable Villages should be amended to include " will take place" at the end of the sentence. The boundaries for the various settlements are defined as the Limits to Development</p>	<p>Amend the wording of Sustainable Villages to include " will take place" at the end of the sentence.</p>	<p>396</p>	<p>Local Resident (Siobhan Dillon)</p>

<p>S2 the sustainability hierarchy imposes a glass ceiling on smaller settlements preventing them from much needed development. The policy creates unsustainable settlements rather than trying to lift them and make them vibrant and sustainable. There needs to be stronger support for rural development. Otherwise the Council's objectives will be unmet.</p>	<p>The proposed approach strikes a balance between supporting some development in the most sustainable rural settlements, whilst ensuring that most development takes place in the most sustainable locations.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>422</p>	<p>CLA</p>
<p>In relation to the proposed settlement hierarchy and for the purpose of clarification, reference to 'Coleorton' should be accompanied by a specific reference to 'Lower Moor Road' as in the currently adopted Local Plan. In addition, a new paragraph (4) should be added stating:- "If during the plan period, any of the Local Housing Needs Villages were to gain facilities to the extent that they would meet the requirements of a Sustainable Village, this would be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications in these settlements".</p>	<p>it is accepted that there may be exceptional circumstances whereby a Local Needs Village could gain a level of services and facilities such that it would accord with a Sustainable Village.</p>	<p>Insert the following in to the policy as (4) If during the plan period any of the Local Needs Villages gains facilities and services to the extent that they would meet the requirements for a Sustainable Village, this will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications in these settlements</p>	<p>554</p>	<p>Local Resident (Thomas Redfearn)</p>
<p>Supports the proposed settlement hierarchy, which is based on the 2022 Settlement Study that is itself underpinned by an entirely appropriate methodology that takes account of the services and facilities that are present within each settlement.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>656</p>	<p>Define Planning & Design Ltd</p>

