

APPENDIX B

CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO ISLEY WOODHOUSE IW1)

RESPONSES TO PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

EMPLOYMENT	SITE NUMBER: IW1	SITE NAME: Isley Woodhouse
-------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
GENERAL		
1 –Overarching matters		
Everyone to be given the chance to vote in a local referendum to determine whether this development goes ahead or not.	Planning decisions are made by elected Members, informed by the professional advice of officers. The Local Plan needs to be agreed by Full Council before it is submitted for examination. Planning applications (for large scale proposal such as this) are decided by Planning Committee. Those opposed to development can contribute to both processes.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Stephen Pember (89);</i>		
It has been said that a planning application was anticipated by the end of the year in relation to the Isley Walton/housing land. Despite protestations that “nothing was decided,” national developers would not make such an investment without the assurance the developments would go ahead. This is evidence of a “done deal” in principle, accepting details would still have to be worked out.	The Council has expressed its preference, at this stage, that IW1 is part of the strategy for the new Local Plan. This will only become a confirmed proposal if/when the Local Plan Inspector supports it in the Inspector’s Report at the end of the Examination process. In respect of any forthcoming planning application, the NPPF provides clear guidance the weight to be given to emerging plans (paragraph 48).	No change
<i>Respondents: Richard Brackenbury (117);</i>		
Object to the naming of the settlement which was done without local consultation.	The settlement’s name was chosen by the site promoters, not the council.	No change.

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>Isley Walton has a separate identify and the name 'Isley' should not be shared.</p>		
<p><i>Respondents: Angus Shields (2); Protect Diseworth (115); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Cllr Ray Sutton (405);</i></p>		
<p>Isley Woodhouse will provide no strategic benefit to either the locality or the region and is derived from the science of convenience only. It is not beneficial for, or needed by, existing local communities. It is to the benefit of landowners only.</p>	<p>IWI will make a significant contribution to the new housing and new employment land needed over forthcoming years. The council has considered and compared all the potential sites in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) and concluded that IW1 is suitable proposal. The council's decision making has been informed by a Sustainability Appraisal which considered alternative strategies including options without a new settlement.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Sarah-Jane Varley (67); Stephen Pember (89); Stuart Dudley (102); Protect Diseworth (115); Miriam Wallace (265); Garry Needham (285); Pauline Needham (292); Cllr Ray Sutton (405);</i></p>		
<p>What evidence is there to demonstrate all other options and locations have been fully researched and considered, and what evidence demonstrates that opinions have been sought as to how many people would consider relocating there and what businesses have been asked to comment?</p>	<p>The council has considered and compared all the potential sites in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) and concluded that IW1 is suitable proposal. The council's decision making has been informed by a Sustainability Appraisal which considered alternative strategies including options without a new settlement. The Government provides each local planning authority with a housing requirement figure which is the minimum figure the Local Plan should plan for. The need for additional employment land is based on evidence commissioned by the Council.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Karen Jepson (106); Andrew Allman (114);</i></p>		

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>Who would this development be serving and where would they work? There is a huge ongoing housing estate in Castle Donington - is there really a need for more? Many homes remain unsold.</p>	<p>The Government provides each local planning authority with a housing requirement figure which is the minimum figure the Local Plan should plan for. Taking into account sites which already have planning permission, more housing land needs to be included in the Local Plan if the Government's figure is to be met. The Local Plan looks ahead to 2042 and the sites it identifies are not all needed now but will be needed in the future. Failure to make sufficient provision for housing will be likely to result in the plan not being 'sound' and hence leave the Council vulnerable to planning applications across the district, with little means to resist.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Jennifer Onyon (358); Carly Snee (626); Marie Brierley (638);</i></p>		
<p>Both the EMP90 and IW1 developments are driven by the Freeport Designation. Is NWLDC support for both of these developments being pushed on to you by Central Government, Leicestershire County Council and the City Council? Without the Freeport designation, would you still be supporting the inclusion of these development proposals (IW1 and EMP90) in the Draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>The area centred on the northern parts of A42 and M1 was identified as a location for growth, called the Leicestershire International Gateway in the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan (2018) which predates the Freeport designation. The suggested approach for the Local Plan to take for the Freeport land is outlined in the accompanying report on this agenda 'Local Plan - Proposed Employment Allocations: Consideration of Responses to Consultation'.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Michael Doyle (138); Louis Della-Porta (249); Janet Allard (271); Mervyn Johnson (284); Karen Oliff (593);</i></p>		
<p>Where is the joined-up thinking of the three counties of Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire? Why does NW Leicestershire (and particularly Diseworth) appear to be bearing the brunt of this?</p>	<p>IW1 is within a growth area in the Strategic Growth Plan (2018) which provides a strategic framework for the local plans being prepared in the Leicester and Leicestershire area.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
	At the present time there are no formal arrangements for planning at the sub-regional level.	
<i>Respondents: Beverley Aust (257); Karen Oliff (593);</i>		
Proposals for these developments conflict starkly with other laudable objectives and policies in the adopted and draft LP which promote well-being, caring for the countryside, flooding, pollution, air quality, climate change, sustainability, employment, heritage and more.	Achievement of the plan's objectives should be considered in the context of the plan as a whole rather than individual proposals. The plan seeks to strike a balance between the different objectives. In addition to the ones mentioned, the plan also has an objective about delivering sufficient new homes, including through the identification of sites for development. A role of the new Local Plan is to positively identify sites to meet future development needs in a sustainable way which best sustains the local environment. By positively identifying development sites, the council will be better placed to resist unsuitable, unplanned development elsewhere.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Duncan Ross (44); Stuart Dudley (102); Richard Brackenbury (117); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Cllr Carol Sewell (128); Michael Doyle (138); Long Whatton & Diseworth Flooding Working Group (199); Peter Onyon (203); Erica Morris (246); Louis Della-Porta (249); Janet Allard (271); Shirley Briggs (539); Karen Oliff (593);</i>		
The size of the new settlement is too large. The proposed new town doesn't need to be this big or destructive. A smaller new town (say 1,500 houses) alongside developments at Ashby and Castle Donington (currently being built) as well as sensitive additions to sustainable villages should provide the required number of houses. Make the settlement smaller so that we can have more houses, more economic activity but without	Where a large number of new homes is needed, as is the case in North West Leicestershire, the NPPF supports a new settlement approach (paragraph 74). At the scale proposed, IW1 can continue to deliver the new homes which will be needed beyond the timeframe of this Local Plan (i.e. post 2042). In principle, planning on a larger scale can also deliver more infrastructure such as schools and will improve the development's overall viability to provide the necessary	No change.

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>desecrating such a huge amount of countryside. A much smaller scheme, only taking a third of the land and keeping development as far away from listed buildings would go some way to mitigate the impact.</p>	<p>infrastructure. Further Local Plan viability work is planned.</p>	
<p><i>Respondents: Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Duncan Ferguson (148); Angela Bamford (194); Patricia Jackson (227); Louis Della-Porta (249); Tim Wagstaff (429);</i></p>		
<p>The proposal contravenes the National Planning Policy Framework, the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, the Climate Change Act 2008, and the Local Development Plan. IW1 is not compliant with the NPPF including its three dimensions of sustainable development. IW1 does not reflect the Government's stance to build in the right places. If [the Freeport and] Isley Woodhouse are sanctioned, NWLDC will have failed against statutory duties on environmental protection, carbon net zero targets [ref: Reg 18 3.5 NPPF environmental objective] and statutory duties to safeguard their constituent's quality of life. [ref: Reg 18 3.5 NPPF social objective].</p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework directs, amongst other things, that Local Plans should be prepared with the intention of meeting development needs in full. This requires a balanced approach, weighing up the social, environmental and economic impacts of the Local Plan as a whole. The Sustainability Appraisal provides a mechanism for doing this balancing exercise. The Council is not aware that the emerging Local Plan contravenes the other legislation mentioned in this representation and to date none of the statutory agencies have identified such a conflict.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Joanna Wragg (54); Richard Brackenbury (117); Long Whatton & Diseworth Flooding Working Group (199); Louis Della-Porta (249); Janet Moorhouse (329); Jim Snee (376); Morwenna Mitchell (377);</i></p>		
<p>A village is classed as having between 500 and 2,500 inhabitants. The plan of building 4500 houses, despite the timescale, would result in an area that is significantly bigger than a 'village'.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Joanna Wragg (54); Peter Onyon (203);</i></p>		

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>If NWLDC follow the diktat of the Strategic Growth Plan and the Leicestershire International Gateway then Diseworth and the other rural villages around EMA will become marooned in a sea of concrete, congestion and pollution.</p>	<p>The Strategic Growth Plan (SGP) provides an overarching framework for the Local Plan but it is not binding (statutory). The council has considered alternative approaches (see the Sustainability Appraisal) and has concluded that IW1 can be successfully delivered. A study has been commissioned to assess whether some form of countryside gap should be designated in the plan to better secure separation between IW1 and Diseworth.</p>	<p>No change but note the forthcoming separation study.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Jim Snee (376);</i></p>		
<p>This new proposed settlement was not mentioned in any previous plans or policies. Where did this proposal originate from and why has there been no public consultation regarding it?</p>	<p>The Strategic Growth Plan (2018) did identify the broader area as a location for growth. The Local Plan consultation was the first main opportunity for those affected to comment on the proposed new settlement. There will be at least one further stage of consultation on the Local Plan. Objectors can also participate in the Examination in Public in front of an independent Planning Inspector which will follow.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Kevin Walker (336);</i></p>		
<p>Government policy re housing (numbers) is completely wrong.</p> <p>These homes are not needed.</p> <p>The number of homes cannot be justified.</p> <p>IW1 is a kneejerk reaction to the Government's housing figures.</p>	<p>The Government provides each local planning authority with a housing requirement figure which is the minimum figure the Local Plan should plan for. Local Plans should expect to meet development needs in full (see NPPF paragraph 35). Failure to make sufficient provision for housing will be likely to result in the plan not being 'sound' and hence leave the Council vulnerable to planning applications across the district, with little means to resist.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<i>Respondents: Peter Forster (3); Marie Slevin (68); Hazel Fitzgibbon (87); John Aust (255); Sean Gascoigne (261); Garry Needham (285); Bill Cunningham (301); Neil Curling (309);</i>		
<p>The fact that this local plan is being produced now, at the same time as the proposed developments being suggested as part of an Inland Freeport are unlikely to be coincidental. There is some collusion occurring somewhere to try and combine all at one time with a view that each development will contribute to the road infrastructure, as the developments in isolation are unlikely to want to spend the sums of money required to bring the road capacity up to something that might be fit for purpose.</p>	<p>Work on preparing a new Local Plan initially began in 2018. It is inevitable that when preparing a Local Plan that sites will be actively promoted for development as landowners/ developers seek to get their sites allocated. Indeed, it is a crucial way to show which sites are 'available' (NPPF paragraph 68).</p> <p>The point about collusion is not accepted however it is agreed that an advantage of considering sites collectively through the Local Plan is that the cumulative infrastructure requirements can be assessed and addressed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<i>Respondents: Duncan Ross (44); Stephen Smith (305); Sally Price (310);</i>		
<p>The juxtaposition of the two "proposals" is oppressive, akin to the behaviour of an autocratic state. There is a potential breach of ECHR in this conduct.</p> <p>They are promoted only by landowner/ owners and developer/developers who have no real knowledge or interest in the locality. How are NWLDC proposing to ensure the accuracy and independence of the proposed assessment, given this is being prepared by the applicant and supported by specialists funded by the applicant?</p>	<p>The Local Plan and Development Consent Order processes both have consultation stages and public hearings in which those opposed to development can participate. In both cases, the final decision on the acceptability or otherwise of the proposal is made by independent planning inspectors.</p> <p>If future development needs are to be met, it is essential that there are landowners willing to put land forward and developers willing to develop it.</p> <p>The Council is engaging its own consultants to provide specialist advice independent of the site promoters.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<i>Respondents: Richard Brackenbury (117); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127);</i>		

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
Policy IW1 is a wish list without substantive evidence that its ambitions can be achieved.	Policy IW1 makes clear that a more detailed comprehensive masterplan is needed to bring the development forward. The Council is continuing to develop its own evidence base for the Local Plan including in respect of infrastructure requirements.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Richard Brackenbury (117);</i>		
2 – Location		
The building of this settlement is not compatible with the stated aim in the Strategic Growth Plan of reducing the amount of development in a rural area.	The Strategic Growth Plan identifies the area centred on the northern parts of A42 and M1 as a location for growth called the Leicestershire International Gateway.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Alison Evans (57); Robert Evans (73); Stuart Dudley (102); Protect Diseworth (115); Cllr Ray Sutton (405);</i>		
An urban scale town, by its size, nature and location, will change the historic rural landscape and heritage of the site to one of urban/industrial conurbation, protecting neither villages nor rural areas and which will be in direct conflict with those policies designed to protect ‘sustainable’ villages.	IW1 is being proposed as a stand-alone settlement. It will not, in any form, be an extension to Diseworth. There will be localised impacts and an underpinning aim of Policy IW1’s approach is that these should be minimised and mitigated for where possible. A study has been commissioned to assess whether some form of countryside gap should be designated in the plan to better secure separation between IW1 and Diseworth.	No change but note the forthcoming separation study.
<i>Respondents: Duncan Ross (44); Jo Coultas (55); Alison Evans (57); Richard Smith (101); Karen Jepson (106); Protect Diseworth (115); Cllr Ray Sutton (405);</i>		
Re co-location of housing and employment. The settlement will be a dormitory town with high levels of commuting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the ultimate target is 4.7k homes, there will also have to be a high 	Co-locating housing and employment provides people with a choice to live closer to where they work and vice versa. The NPPF indicates that a realistic approach should be taken to this matter. New	No change.

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>number of industrial buildings on site to achieve the objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The idea that only workers for the [proposed] Freeport [EMP90] will live in Isley Woodhouse is not born out by empirical data. • Given the need to absorb the 'overspill' from Leicester City, any argument claiming reduction in commuting activity compounds the fantasy. • The Freeport should not be used as a reason for more housing here. 	<p>settlements should have "sufficient access to services and employment opportunities within the development itself (without expecting an unrealistic level of self-containment)" (paragraph 74b, emphasis added).</p>	
<p><i>Respondents: Jo Coultas (55); Stephen Pember (89); Protect Diseworth (115); Richard Brackenbury (117); Alastair Hutchinson (222); John Aust (255); Sean Gascoigne (261); Garry Needham (285); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); David Hawtin (307); Patricia Guy (308); Alison Millward (343); Guy Jeffrey (352); Thomas Onyon (356); Cllr Ray Sutton (405);</i></p>		
<p>It is not clear that the location and its development is genuinely sustainable. It is remote from existing settlements and within an area that is presently rural. Whilst there are ambitions for public transport access, the location is remote from the public transport infrastructure. The location is anticipated to be car dependent, it is some distance from the Strategic Road Network, and using part of the local road network (A453) that is already an important access to EMA for its passengers and cargo operations</p> <p>Such a large development should be attached to an existing town/city environment where there are road links and public transport to support it and established infrastructure/services. Development must</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan is planning for substantial amounts of housing elsewhere, notably at Coalville, Ashby and Castle Donington with smaller amounts to villages in the district.</p> <p>Where housing requirements are high, the NPPF advocates planning for new settlements and urban extensions as a reasonable approach (paragraph 74). The adopted Local Plan includes urban extensions at Coalville and Ashby and there is now an opportunity to plan for a stand-alone settlement which will be able to deliver significant levels of housing over an extended period. In contrast to urban extensions, new settlements will inevitably be in more rural locations. The NPPF specifies that there should be "a genuine choice of</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>stay in built up towns and cities and not in countryside e.g Castle Donington, Kegworth, Ashby, Coalville, Shepshed and Melbourne</p>	<p>transport modes” (paragraph 74) and this is reflected in criteria (2)(e), (g) and (h) of Policy IW1.</p> <p>Forthcoming transport modelling will identify the road improvements needed, including any to A453, to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the Local Plan’s proposals.</p>	
<p><i>Respondents: Lesley Hextall (9); East Midlands Airport (230); Mervyn Johnson (284); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Tony Wilson (351); J. Smith (373); Chris Duggan (427); Laura Kristiansen (598);</i></p>		
<p>The location is too close to Diseworth and also to Castle Donington.</p>	<p>A study has been commissioned to assess whether some form of countryside gap should be designated in the plan to better secure separation between IW1 and Diseworth.</p>	<p>No change but note the forthcoming separation study.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Diane Wilby (60); Alan Clark (105); Karen Jepson (106); Christine Agar (152); David Bamford (170); Angela Bamford (194); Rachel Smith (224); Patricia Jackson (227); Charlotte Christodoulou (242); Charlotte Agar (264); Jeremy Hunt (269); Alan Wade (274); Richard Smithies (276); Stephen Smith (305); Jacqueline Quinton (312); Guy Jeffrey (352); Jamie Smith (369); Carla Smith (370); J. Smith (373); Lucy Agar (375); Susan Fenny (387); Nigel Lane (629); Thomas Lane (630); Marie Brierley (638); Karen Franklin (639);</i></p>		
<p>Why so much housing in one place? It is a simplistic approach which does not address the needs of nearby villages or consider the local aesthetic. Such a large development would be out of place in the local area, especially the historic villages of Diseworth, Wilson, Tonge, Breedon-on-the-Hill, Isley Walton, Worthington and Belton. Growth needs to be spread more equitably.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan is planning for substantial amounts of housing elsewhere, notably at Coalville, Ashby and Castle Donington with smaller amounts to villages in the district. The covering report includes a table showing how much new housing is being directed to the different tiers within the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Faced with high housing numbers, the Council has also had to explore the scope for new settlement/s, as recommended in the NPPF (paragraph 74).</p> <p>There will be localised impacts and an underpinning aim of Policy IW1’s approach is</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
	that these should be minimised and mitigated for where possible.	
<p><i>Respondents: Ian Ward (34); Duncan Ross (44); Judith Bilington (103); Craig Jones (104); Richard Brackenbury (117); Michael Doyle (138); Duncan Ferguson (148); Laura Dudley (155); Erika Wood (210); Andy Foxall (217); Louis Della-Porta (249); Joanne Hunt (253); John Aust (255); Janet Allard (271); Garry Needham (285); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Jacqueline Quinton (312); Peter Miller (314); Elizabeth Jarrom (315); William Jarrom (316); Kath Taylor (323); Ron Taylor (324); Annabel McCrorie (383); Nigel Lane (629); Karen Franklin (639); (and others)</i></p>		
<p>There are far more appropriate parcels of land available, nearby, that would not have the same adverse impact on a village like Diseworth.</p> <p>Use brownfield sites instead e.g. run down buildings and warehouses and bring abandoned properties into use.</p>	<p>The Council has considered all the potential, available sites from the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment including brownfield sites, the availability of which is very limited in the district. The outcomes of this detailed assessment are published on the council's website. This comprehensive approach points to IW1 being needed in addition to a considerable number of sites elsewhere in the district.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Joanna Wragg (54); Stuart Dudley (102); Chris Peat (123); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Kay Armitage (149); Janet Hutchinson (154); David Bamford (170); Angela Bamford (194); Joanne Hunt (253); Charles Brompton (272); Garry Needham (285); Pauline Needham (292); Kevin Walker (336); Alison Millward (343); Tony Wilson (351); Jim Snee (376); Susan Fenny (387); Glenn Robinson (423); Nicola Clarke (424); Kathleen Pigott (581); Karen Oliff (593); Aimee Ridler (625); Carly Snee (626); Robert Ridler (636);</i></p>		
<p>IW1 is in the wrong place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why place such a huge development so far north in the county where there is no demand? Especially taking into consideration all the housing developments in progress in close proximity to this location. • Countryside counteracts the effects of airport and transport pollution • There is no infrastructure 	<p>The Leicestershire International Gateway is a growth location in the Strategic Growth Plan (2018).</p> <p>A key purpose of the Local Plan is to identify in advance the sites needed for new housing for the next 15+ years. Substantial amounts of housing are proposed elsewhere, notably at Coalville, Ashby and Castle Donington with smaller amounts to villages in the district.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will serve the needs of Nottingham, Derby, Loughborough, Leicester or Ashby de la Zouch • It is opposite the airport and the racetrack • Location is based on where landowners are willing to sell land 	<p>The council has commissioned an initial noise impact study and criterion 3(f) of Policy IW1 requires a noise strategy to be prepared.</p> <p>Policy IW1 identifies key infrastructure to be planned for as part of the new settlement (see criteria (1)(e)-(g), 2(d)(e)(h) and 3(b)). IW1 is a component of the Local Plan's strategy to meet the housing requirements set by the Government.</p> <p>As outlined, significant amounts of development are proposed in other locations in the district. However, the planning system has no control over who purchases the homes that are built.</p>	
<p><i>Respondents: Lesley Hextall (9); Hazel Fitzgibbon (87); Richard Smith (101); Stuart Dudley (102); Laura Dudley (155); Peter Onyon (203); Jamie Agar (209); Louis Della-Porta (249); John Aust (255); Sean Gascoigne (261); Alan Wade (274); Pauline Needham (292); Jacqui Donaghy (299); Annette Della-Porta (302); Stephen Smith (305); Emma Haycraft (306); Clement Croft (317); Lois Croft (318); Janet Moorhouse (329); Jim Snee (376); Helen Warren (503);</i></p>		
<p>Leicester city can't achieve its housing requirements and NWL is being pressured to build on prime agricultural land to meet the county's targets. It is a 25-mile commute to Leicester and there will be thousands more cars on the M1 (and surrounding rural roads) as people commute.</p> <p>IW1 is not a good location to meet Leicester City's unmet needs. The purpose of the Government's standard method is to target the development of brownfield land in those cities.</p> <p>Has the council challenged the City Council's claims that it cannot meet its own needs?</p>	<p>The response to Leicester City's unmet housing need is discussed in this Housing Distribution paper. The increase in this council's housing requirement is principally driven by an objective to achieve a better balance between homes (i.e workforce) and jobs (see page 24) rather than meeting unmet need from Leicester City.</p> <p>Leicester City has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the other Leicestershire authorities that it cannot meet its full housing requirement within its boundaries. The</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
	authorities have signed a Statement of Common Ground to that effect.	
<i>Respondents: Alison Evans (57); Robert Evans (73); Erica Morris (246); Louis Della-Porta (249); Garry Needham (285); Pauline Needham (292); Annette Della-Porta (302); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Neil Curling (309); Jim Snee (376); David Fenny (388);</i>		
IW1 places thousands of extra families in an area that already has full employment. Surely the housing would be better placed nearer to local jobs.	As outlined, significant amounts of development are proposed in other locations in the district. Also the Housing Distribution paper identifies that the need for additional workforce is an upwards pressure on the overall housing requirement.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Alastair Hutchinson (222); Susan Fenny (387);</i>		
Diseworth has endured massive developments over recent decades. The fact is that the northwest of the county, around EMA and J24, M1 has already been developed to its maximum sustainable capacity, arguably even beyond. NWLDC must develop policies that prevent over-development in any one part of the District and which provide equal opportunity and quality of life for all within the NWLDC area.	The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan identifies the area centred on the northern parts of A42 and M1 as a location for growth. In addition, the draft Local Plan is planning for substantial amounts of housing elsewhere, notably at Coalville, Ashby and Castle Donington with smaller amounts to villages in the district. The covering report includes a table showing how much new housing is being directed to the different tiers within the settlement hierarchy.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Nick Hollick (38); Richard Brackenbury (117); Christine Agar (152); Angela Bamford (194); Garry Needham (285); J. Smith (373); Jim Snee (376);</i>		
There should only be small scale development in Diseworth.	The proposed Limits to Development in the draft Local Plan reflect Diseworth's status as Sustainable Village suitable for limited growth.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Nick Hollick (38); Stuart Dudley (102); Richard Brackenbury (117); Louis Della-Porta (249);</i>		

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
3 – Phasing		
<p>Policy IW1(b)-(g) will not be achieved if only 1,900 homes are to be built by 2040. Also, the principles in Section 2 of the policy will not be met within the duration of the new Local Plan – if at all.</p>	<p>The comprehensive masterplan (section 3 of the policy) will provide the overall framework for the whole settlement. This will apply throughout the development of the settlement, including for phases post 2042. Section 4 requires planning applications to adhere to the masterplan.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<i>Respondents: Protect Diseworth (115); Cllr Ray Sutton (405);</i>		
<p>IW1 is unlikely to deliver 1,900 homes by 2040:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning a new settlement is more complex and time consuming than sustainable urban extensions such as Money Hill, South East Coalville (timescales for the latter are set out). • Bedford Local Plan Inspector disagreed with that council’s assumed build out rates • For the IW1 site, there are significant matters to resolve including flood risk, heritage, ecology, proximity of the airport and Donington circuit • There are parallels with the two strategic Development Areas in the adopted Harborough Local Plan where first occupation is unlikely to be before 2026 and 2028 respectively. • There is no proposed trajectory IW1. Until there is, additional sites could be needed. • A new settlement is heavily reliant on new infrastructure and there is 	<p>This matter is considered in the covering report.</p>	<p>The revised assumption is that some 1,950 dwellings will be built by 2042 (the plan end date).</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>currently limited evidence quantifying what is needed, costs and delivery timescales</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead-in times will be long. • Major new housing developments in Leicestershire have generally failed to meet anticipated delivery rates and/or required significant public funding for necessary infrastructure. The Parish Councils are not convinced that the proposed new settlement will deliver 1,900 dwellings in the period up to 2040. <p>Respondents' assessments of the number of homes which could be delivered by 2040 are variously a) circa 145-160 dwellings/year; b) none; c) up to 300; d) up to 500;</p>		
<p><i>Respondents: Richborough (130); William Davis Homes (136); Strategic Land Group (116); David Wilson Homes (150); Cora (172); Mr R Botham (174); Bloor Homes (187); Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council (189); Breedon on the Hill Parish Council (196); Jelson Homes (243);</i></p>		
<p>Based on the promoters' experience elsewhere, 1,900 dwellings is an underestimate. Housing delivery on IW1 could be closer to 250 per annum after 3-4 years on site. This would mean the Council would not need to allocate additional sites as Isley Woodhouse could supply a further 525 new homes above that anticipated. However, the west of Castle Donington allocation (CD10) could reduce the build out rate at Isley Woodhouse as both sites will be competing within the same market.</p>	<p>This matter is considered in the covering report.</p>	<p>The revised assumption is that some 1,950 dwellings will be built by 2042 (the plan end date).</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Harworth & Caesarea (226);</i></p>		

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>It would be preferable that the 4,500 homes are expedited on this land to increase the allocation from 1,900 and reduce the allocation elsewhere.</p>	<p>This matter is considered in the covering report.</p>	<p>The revised assumption is that some 1,950 dwellings will be built by 2042 (the plan end date).</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Castle Donington Parish Council (277);</i></p>		
<p>4 – Justification for this development</p>		
<p>The proposed 'new settlement' does not have sufficient evidence to prove it is deliverable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has not been demonstrated that site issues (including flooding and environmental factors) have been addressed • It is unclear whether all the landowners are supportive and whether landowner agreements are in place <p>The costs of providing the necessary transport and infrastructure to support the proposed new settlement have increased significantly over recent years while there are ongoing economic changes impacting on housing market performance. The viability of the new settlement is declining, with cost inflation now outpacing house price inflation. The Parish Council is concerned that the new settlement will not be able to viably provide the level of transport and infrastructure improvements required to make it sustainable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is further work to do, including in relation to transport modelling, infrastructure delivery and viability testing. That understood, the supporting evidence is considered to be sufficiently advanced (proportionate to the stage the plan is at) for the new settlement to be included in the next stage of plan preparation. No fundamental barriers to delivery have been identified. • As far as the Council is aware the landowners are supportive and are working in collaboration with the site promoters 	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: David Wilson Homes (150); Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council (189); Breedon on the Hill Parish Council (196);</i></p>		
<p>It is unclear from the information available how this settlement option has been taken</p>	<p>As outlined, the Council has considered all the potential, available sites from the</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>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 in the manner that it anticipates?</p>	<p>Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and tested alternative strategies, with and without a new settlement, through the Sustainability Appraisal. There is further work to do, including in relation to transport modelling and infrastructure delivery. That understood, the supporting evidence is considered to be sufficiently advanced (proportionate to the stage the plan is at) for the new settlement to be included in the next stage of plan preparation. No fundamental barriers to delivery have been identified.</p>	
<p><i>Respondents: Historic England (357);</i></p>		
<p>If the new settlement does not get built, the major impact on housing numbers will impact the whole of the District, with other sustainable settlements having to take up the slack. Putting eggs in one basket is a risk and the Inspector will draw the same conclusion and want a robust plan B.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed development strategy includes significant levels of development elsewhere in the district in addition to the new settlement. This approach helps to mitigate risk and maintain the overall supply of new housing year on year. The housing requirement figure also includes an additional margin to compensate for unexpected circumstances (e.g. delays).</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Kevin Morrell (435);</i></p>		
<p>The whole basis for building the town is based on assertions and statistics which, at best, are highly questionable.</p>	<p>The Government provides each local planning authority with a housing requirement figure which is the minimum figure the Local Plan should plan for. Local Plans should expect to meet development needs in full (see NPPF paragraph 35). The Council has considered all the potential, available sites from the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and tested alternative strategies</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
	to meet the housing figure, with and without a new settlement, through the Sustainability Appraisal. The outcome of the work so far is that IW1 is needed and justifiable.	
<i>Respondents: Richard Brackenbury (117);</i>		
6- Support		
Support and agree with the draft allocation of the Isley Woodhouse New Settlement [detailed reasons set out].	Support welcomed.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Harworth & Caesarea (226);</i>		
Castle Donington Parish Council supports the concept of a new settlement to take as much of the housing allocation as possible in order to reduce the burden on Castle Donington and other areas.	Support welcomed.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Castle Donington Parish Council (277);</i>		
7 – Masterplan		
Expand section (4) of Policy IW1 to include a policy/policies that apply draconian sanctions to the developers in the event of non-compliance and/or non-performance.	The measures that the planning system has to regulate development include a) ensuring compliance with conditions and b) if necessary, enforcement action. Criterion 4 of Policy IW1 also confirms that “the Council will only approve planning applications that adhere to the comprehensive masterplan ... and the bespoke design code”.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Protect Diseworth (115); Cllr Ray Sutton (405);</i>		
In recognition that a new settlement will come forward in phases over the lifetime of the Plan (and in all likelihood its successor(s)), consider whether a separate	The merits of such an approach could be considered further but this should not affect an ‘in principle’ decision to include IW1 in the Local Plan at this stage.	No change

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>Supplementary Development Plan (SDP) document is required, providing a strategic framework that sets out the overall vision and strategic masterplan for the International Gateway (IG) area. Within the framework provided by any such SDP, the new Local Plan and its successor(s) could then bring forward allocations and policies that deliver their own respective elements of the overall International Gateway Transport Strategy. This would provide a robust platform:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for the identification of the overall service and infrastructure needs of the IG area; • for seeking to deliver the required infrastructure in 'one go' wherever possible; and • for maximising opportunities for securing developer contributions and ensuring their most effective use in combination with any available public funding streams. 		
<p><i>Respondents: Leicestershire County Council (341);</i></p>		
<p>8 – Cumulative impacts</p>		
<p>Plan should recognise that this site would form a significant element of further development in the International Gateway Area (or immediately adjoining), including EMP90, CD10 and the wider Freeport, thus it cannot be considered in isolation.</p>	<p>It is agreed that this site cannot be viewed in isolation and requires a strategic approach. In this respect, the forthcoming transport modelling work will quantify the combined traffic impacts of the Local Plan proposals and Ratcliffe Power Station on the local and strategic highway network and, as a second stage, consider what measures are needed to address the impacts.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<i>Respondents: Leicestershire CC (as Local Highways Authority) (341);</i>		
The cumulative effect on Diseworth of EMP90 and IW1 (including loss of wildlife habitat and rural landscape, air quality, light, noise, flooding, mental and physical health, traffic and more) must be viewed holistically. NWLDC must develop policies and strategies that properly address issues of cumulative environmental impacts.	The 'whole plan' Sustainability Assessment will provide a combined analysis of the social, environmental and economic impacts of the Local Plan's policies and allocations.	
<i>Respondents: Sarah-Jane Varley (67); Protect Diseworth (115); Michael Doyle (138); Christine Agar (152); Angela Bamford (194); Long Whatton & Diseworth Flood Working Group (199); Erika Wood (210); Andy Foxall (217); Louis Della-Porta (249); Beverley Aust (257); Janet Allard (271); Pauline Needham (292); Stephen MacIver (330); Guy Jeffrey (352); David Fenny (388); Cllr Ray Sutton (405); Karen Oliff (593);</i>		
9 – Employment land		
The proposed industrial build element of the settlement is not compliant with Local Plan Policy Ec2(2).	The role of the new Local Plan is to positively identify sites to meet future development needs. That is the exercise which is being undertaken and will inevitably mean identifying sites for development which would not be permitted under the terms of the adopted Local Plan. The requirements of the adopted plan, in this case Policy Ec2, will be superseded by the new plan once it is adopted.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Protect Diseworth (115); Cllr Ray Sutton (405);</i>		
The area of land to the north of the A453 has been highlighted for industrial usage to act as a barrier for the development to lessen sound/noise pollution affecting the new settlement. This land in effect is the centre of "Isley Walton" as it now stands. How are the current residents taken into consideration, when this stage of the development would see a large proportion of properties being	Including an element of employment land will improve the overall sustainability of the new settlement (see NPPF paragraph 74b). The precise location of the employment area is not decided at this stage but it is agreed that this must be at sufficient distance from the houses in Isley Walton so as not to have a detrimental effect.	No change.

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>absorbed into this area? Noise pollution being used as an excuse to industrialise this area.</p>		
<p><i>Respondents: Jo Coultas (55);</i></p>		
<p>10 – Site capacity</p>		
<p>The site capacity is below that stated in Policy IW1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHELAA uses a gross to net development ratio of 50% in accordance with the Joint SHELAA Methodology (2019). This ratio does not take into account the need to provide employment floorspace, shops, schools and community facilities necessary to make the development sustainable. To accommodate 4,500 dwellings at the density suggested in the SHELAA, the site would need to be developed almost entirely for housing. • Additional and will need to be kept free from housing because of the proximity of Donington circuit and the airport. • The western boundary of the site is in Flood Zone 2 diminishing the available land further. 	<p>At this point, with the information available, the capacity figure is considered to provide a reasonable basis to plan for. The overall number of homes could change as the proposals become more detailed and evidence studies more specific. The promoters' recent public consultation suggested a figure of 4,250 homes.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: MSV (181);</i></p>		
<p>11 – Affordable Housing</p>		
<p>Young people/local workers won't be able to afford the homes.</p>	<p>Criterion 2(h) addresses this point directly and further explanation is given in paragraphs 4.113-4.114. Subject to viability</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>Will IW1 have social housing? More of the housing needs to be able to be afforded by those who are working in nearby warehousing jobs. It is not clear that the development would be attractive to local workers.</p>	<p>testing, the percentage of affordable housing for IW1 may be higher than elsewhere in the district.</p>	
<p><i>Respondents: Peter Forster (3); Alison Evans (57); Robert Evans (73); Richard Smith (101); East Midlands Airport (230); Noel McGough (287); Katrina Paling (288); David Hawtin (307); Sally Price (310); S. Smith (372); Carly Snee (626);</i></p>		
<p>12 – Economic impacts</p>		
<p>Local tourism trade will be adversely affected.</p>	<p>The council is not aware of evidence that the building of new homes would adversely affect local tourism. Indeed, the new residents of IW1 may boost custom for local tourism events and destinations.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Lesley Hextall (9);</i></p>		
<p>HIGHWAYS</p>		
<p>1 – Access/road layout</p>		
<p>There appears to be a major roundabout proposed at the top of the hill between the existing A453 and Melbourne Road close to The Rookery which will overlook Grade 2 listed buildings. The obvious place to put a relief road would be either at Castle Donington traffic lights or at DHL roundabout and cutting straight across to Moor Lane, this would go roughly through the middle of the development and would take traffic away from Isley Walton.</p>	<p>The precise locations of the access points and the overall road layout and improvements is not yet decided. Much will depend on the outcome of the forthcoming transport modelling. It is agreed that the planning of these matters will need to take full account of nearby listed buildings and other heritage assets, amongst other factors.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondent: Angus Shields (2);</i></p>		

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
2 – Highways capacity		
<p>Given the size and proximity to our network of the Isley Woodhouse allocations, this development (in particular) is likely to have a material traffic impact on the SRN. Junctions of interest include M1 J23a/ A453 Finger Farm roundabout, M1 J24, A50 J1, and A42 J14. It is likely that infrastructure improvements will be required at some/all of these junctions.</p>	<p>Noted. The forthcoming transport modelling work will quantify the combined traffic impacts of the Local Plan proposals and Ratcliffe Power Station on the local and strategic highway network and, as a second stage, consider what measures are needed to address the impacts.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<i>Respondents: National Highways (112)</i>		
<p>Transport modelling should assess the combined impact of IW1, EMP90 and CD10 on the local and strategic road network, identify impacts and mitigations.</p>	<p>Agreed. The forthcoming transport modelling work will quantify the combined traffic impacts of the Local Plan proposals and Ratcliffe Power Station on the local and strategic highway network and, as a second stage, consider what measures are needed to address the impacts.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<i>Respondents: Protect Diseworth (115); Cllr Ray Sutton (405);</i>		
<p>Local road and SRN systems are already constrained including with traffic going to the airport, Donington Park (including during Download) and Diseworth itself. IW1 will add significant addition traffic movements making congestion worse, including during construction, including HGV movements to the industrial element of the development. This must be addressed.</p> <p>Any issues on M1, A453 and A42 already cause major problems to local communities with drivers striving to find alternative routes</p>	<p>Noted. The forthcoming transport modelling work will quantify the combined traffic impacts of the Local Plan proposals and Ratcliffe Power Station on the local and strategic highway network and, as a second stage, consider what measures are needed to address the impacts.</p>	

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>and using country lanes and villages as cut throughs.</p> <p>The shortest route to Derby is via Swarkstone Bridge which is Grade I listed and a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</p> <p>A453 serves as an access road for freight as well as for those working on the airport site.</p>		
<p><i>Respondents: Duncan Ross (44); Emma Ward (53); Joanna Wragg (54); Jo Coultas (55); Alison Evans (57); Diane Wilby (60); Audrey Brooks (64); Sadie Dunmore (66); Sarah-Jane Varley (67); Marie Slevin (68); Susan Hurley (69); Robert Evans (73); John Hurley (88); Stephen Pember (89); Richard Smith (101); Stuart Dudley (102); Craig Jones (104); Alan Clark (105); Alicia Smithies (109); Paul Jepson (110); Susan Smith (111); Andrew Allman (114); Protect Diseworth (115); Richard Brackenbury (117); Chris Peat (123); Susan Ward (125); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Delia Platts (137); Adrienne Chester (145); Duncan Ferguson (148); Christine Agar (152); Isobel Smithies (164); Charlotte Jones (169); Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council (189); Angela Bamford (194); Breedon on the Hill Parish Council (196); Lesley Allman (198); Peter Onyon (203); Alastair Hutchinson (222); Patricia Jackson (227); Anne Howell (240); Christopher Howell (241); John Aust (255); Beverley Aust (257); Sandie Moores (259); Charlotte Springthorpe (260); Sean Gascoigne (261); Charlotte Agar (264); Meryl Tait (273); Alan Wade (274); Richard Smithies (276); Garry Needham (285); Noel McGough (287); Katrina Paling (288); Pauline Needham (292); DHL (293); Caroline Reffin (300); Bill Cunningham (301); Jane Cunningham (303); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Emma Haycraft (306); David Hawtin (307); Patricia Guy (308); Jacqueline Quinton (312); Nichola Miller (313); Elizabeth Jarrom (315); William Jarrom (316); Travis Croft (319); Sarah Gascoigne (321); Kath Taylor (323); Ron Taylor (324); Janet Moorhouse (329); Stephen Maclver (330); Dawn Maclver (331); Sue Orme (332); Sylvia Slevin (339); Bill Slevin (342); Alison Millward (343); Tony Wilson (351); Amy Dunmore (349); Vanessa Johnson (354); Jennifer Onyon (358); Ron Mearns (361); Jamie Smith (369); Carla Smith (370); Nicky Miller (374); Lucy Agar (375); Jim Snee (376); Morwenna Mitchell (377); Annabel McCrorie (383); Jacqueline Butterworth (384); Paul Butterworth (385); Susan Fenny (387); David Fenny (388); Cllr Ray Sutton (405); East Midlands Airport (230); Glenn Robinson (423); Nicola Clarke (424); Bruce Scott (482); Helen Warren (503); Karen Oliff (593); Laura Kristiansen (598); Aimee Ridler (625); Carly Snee (626); Nigel Lane (629); Thomas Lane (630); Robert Ridler (636); Hannah Robinson (653);</i></p>		
<p>County Highways have no money to fund the improvements necessary.</p>	<p>Once the necessary road improvements have been identified, the next stage will be to confirm funding sources. Developer funding will be essential. This exercise will be done as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will accompany the Local Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Alison Evans (57); Robert Evans (73); Karen Franklin (639);</i></p>		

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
It is essential that the transport assessment takes into account the impact of the additional development traffic on the operation of Donington circuit, particularly on race days.	Noted. The transport modelling will have to be based on reasonable and justifiable assumptions.	No change.
<i>Respondents: MSV (181);</i>		
Accepting that work on the evidence base is on-going, it is the Local Highway Authority's view that, unless the Strategic Road Network issues can be addressed, it has very significant doubts that the Plan being proposed through this consultation will be effective, i.e. deliverable over the Plan period, and thus 'sound'. In this context, the close and proactive involvement and support of National Highways will be essential.	Noted. It is agreed that National Highways is a key stakeholder as the draft plan approaches its latter stages of preparation.	No change
<i>Respondents: Leicestershire County Council (341);</i>		
Development will affect access to existing sites (e.g. the airport).	The planning of highways upgrades etc must ensure that access to existing development, including the airport, is maintained. It could be necessary to change access arrangements in a more detailed way e.g. changes to the configuration or location of a junction.	No change.
<i>Respondents: East Midlands Airport (230);</i>		
Will the A453 be turned into a dual carriageway from Donington Services to Castle Donington traffic lights?	The necessity for the dualling of this stretch will be a matter for the forthcoming transport modelling. It is feasible that this type of upgrade could be required.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Angus Shields (2);</i>		
It may be that workers for the airport and local industry use A453/M1/A42 to reach the site from Birmingham, Nottingham, Derby etc therefore causing extra traffic	Agreed. The transport modelling will need to incorporate realistic assumptions about the origins and destinations of the additional traffic that these developments will generate.	No change.

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
	Some of these journeys will start/end outside the district.	
<i>Respondents: Lesley Hextall (9);</i>		
It is requested that any transport impacts within South Derbyshire associated with the development of this site, in terms of highway capacity, safety and local amenity, be identified and satisfactorily mitigated, including in respect of any heavy goods vehicle movements.	Noted. The forthcoming transport modelling work will consider movements in/out of the district.	No change.
<i>Respondents: South Derbyshire DC (545);</i>		
3 – Road safety		
There will be increased traffic using the villages (including Diseworth, Breedon, Melbourne, Stanton by Bridge, Kings Newton, Swarkstone, Long Whatton) as a rat run when local major roads are blocked, busy or closed and during construction of IW1. Our roads are not designed to accommodate such a volume of traffic. It will be particularly hazardous for school children. The school is located on a blind bend and already has issues with traffic and parking.	IW1 will result in an increased number of journeys on local roads. The forthcoming transport modelling will help to quantify the increase and identify the measures needed in response. Sustainable transport options will be an important way to bear down on the number of car trips (see Policy IW1 criteria 2(e) and (h)). Improved bus services in particular will be important.	
<i>Respondents: Nick Hollick (38); Sadie Dunmore (66); Sarah-Jane Varley (67); Robert Evans (73); Stephen Pember (89); Richard Smith (101); Stuart Dudley (102); Susan Smith (111); Andrew Allman (114); Richard Brackenbury (117); Chris Peat (123); Delia Platts (137); Adrienne Chester (145); Isobel Smithies (164); Anne Howell (240); Christopher Howell (241); Charlotte Christodoulou (242); Erica Morris (246); Sean Gascoigne (261); Charles Brompton (272); Meryl Tait (273); Richard Smithies (276); Pauline Needham (292); Caroline Reffin (300); Annette Della-Porta (302); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Elizabeth Jarrom (315); William Jarrom (316); Sarah Gascoigne (321); Kath Taylor (323); Ron Taylor (324); Janet Moorhouse (329); Stephen Maclver (330); Dawn Maclver (331); Vanessa Johnson (354); Thomas Onyon (356); Sally Simpson (371); Jim Snee (376); Kevin Ward (380); David Fenny (388); Nigel Lane (629); Thomas Lane (630); Karen Franklin (639);</i>		
The local road network, in particular A453, is already/close to being dangerous.	It is agreed that there will be some increase in journeys on local roads. The forthcoming	No change.

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>More traffic and larger vehicles will create more danger for existing road users such as cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>This settlement will increase traffic along the Green in Diseworth making it even more hazardous for residents cycling or walking along the road between Long Whatton and Diseworth. This route is already used as a rat run for workers heading for the Airport. There will also be an increased risk of traffic collision at Long Whatton school.</p>	<p>transport modelling will help to quantify the increase and identify the measures needed in response.</p> <p>All proposals will be subject to a road safety audit at detailed design stage which will consider all types of road user.</p>	
<p><i>Respondents: Nick Hollick (38); Joanna Wragg (54); Protect Diseworth (115); Jennifer Onyon (358); Paul Butterworth (385); Cllr Ray Sutton (405); Julie Doyle (416); Nicola Clarke (424); Hannah Robinson (653);</i></p>		
<p>The only parking for Isley Walton Church is on the A453 which is a very busy road 24/7, what will be done to safe guard people wanting to go to the Church when the roads get even more busy</p>	<p>For pedestrians, a key consideration will be to identify where the 'desire lines' are for people crossing roads. In turn, the type of pedestrian crossing will need to suit the location, the level of use and the types of user (e.g. pedestrians, cyclists, horse-riders).</p> <p>All proposals will be subject to a road safety audit at detailed design stage.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Angus Shields (2);</i></p>		
<p>4 – Sustainable transport</p>		
<p>Public transport links are insufficient to support such a development.</p> <p>The only bus service through Diseworth and Long Whatton was withdrawn last year.</p> <p>There is not a bus stop between Melbourne and the airport.</p>	<p>It is agreed that improved public transport with realistic walking and cycling options are essential to improve the overall sustainability of the new settlement. This is emphasised in Policy IW1 criteria 2(e) and (h)). Ensuring there are additional bus stops in the best locations is one way to make bus travel a more realistic option.</p> <p>[Note: The Skylink Nottingham service serves Diseworth and Long Whatton]</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<i>Respondents: Lesley Hextall (9); Hazel Fitzgibbon (87); Andrew Allman (114); Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council (189); Breedon on the Hill Parish Council (196); Janet Moorhouse (329); Alison Millward (343); Tony Wilson (351); Nicola Clarke (424); Laura Kristiansen (598);</i>		
<p>The proposed new town is very poorly situated with respect to the railway network. There will be a need for fast and frequent bus services connecting to East Midlands Parkway station. There are also separate proposals to extend the Nottingham Express Transit tram system beyond its present terminus at Clifton South via the Ratcliffe Power Station redevelopment site and East Midlands Parkway station to East Midlands Airport. If this is built, it should also serve the Isley Woodhouse new town. The plan should make appropriate reference to and suitable provision for this scheme.</p>	<p>Whilst not binding at this stage, the Baseline Infrastructure Capacity Report observes that there should be at least one bus service providing access from the new settlement to a railway station – likely to be Long Eaton, East Midlands Parkway or Loughborough (page 63). It is agreed that connecting to the Nottingham tram network at East Midlands Parkway would significantly upgrade sustainable transport links in the Leicestershire International Gateway Area. Currently proposals for the tram extension are not confirmed. If and when they are, a more specific requirement for bus connections to it can be pursued.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<i>Respondents: Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council (189); Antony Kay (510);</i>		
<p>Promises of footpaths, cycle ways won't materialise as it's built on a hill and so everyone will drive everywhere. Sceptical this will be achieved.</p>	<p>Some residents will be happy to walk or cycle. Others will walk or cycle for some journeys but not all. Yet more may want to use an electric bike or take the bus. The key point is that, by providing a range of sustainable transport options, residents will be given a genuine choice (see Policy IW1 2(e)).</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<i>Respondents: Jacqui Donaghy (299); Bill Cunningham (301); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Rod Dawson (417);</i>		
<p>1. The Leicestershire Local Access Forum (LLFA) has lodged three requests for Definitive Map Modification Orders (DMMOs) for what we claim are existing rights of way. It is to be seen if the County Council make the orders and if the routes are contested</p>	<p>1 – Noted. 2 – Noted. IW1 also brings the opportunity to make these routes more accessible and to extend the network of walking (and cycling) routes in the area. Proposed changes to Policy IW1 above in response to Natural</p>	<p>See proposed changes in response to Natural England (223).</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>the LLFA will wish to see the outcome tested by the inspectorate.</p> <p>2. The LLAF identifies that IW1 will potentially impact on existing public rights of way. The LLFA does not wish to see Rights of Way subsumed into the streets as such but would suggest they should remain green corridors through any development.</p>	<p>England's comments emphasise access to natural green space.</p>	
<p><i>Respondents: Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192);</i></p>		
<p>LOCAL SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE</p>		
<p>1 – Infrastructure</p>		
<p>Welcome that the requirement for a comprehensive masterplan and phasing plans to identify all necessary on-site and off-site highway improvements.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: National Highways (112)</i></p>		
<p>An Outline or Hybrid application will be necessary for the whole site rather than incremental full applications to ensure that highways infrastructure is delivered and coordinated in a timely way. We would welcome this inclusion in policy.</p>	<p>Agreed and this could be added to the supporting text. The requirements for a comprehensive masterplan and phasing plans (sections 3 and 4 of Policy IW1) will also help to ensure a comprehensive approach to the planning of the whole settlement.</p>	<p>Add to the supporting text: at the outset, an Outline or Hybrid application will be necessary for the whole site rather than incremental full applications to ensure a comprehensive and coordinated approach to the development.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: National Highways (112)</i></p>		
<p>Infrastructure and services modelling should assess the combined impact of IW1, EMP90 and CD10 and identify impacts and mitigations.</p>	<p>This will be done through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will accompany the Local Plan. Infrastructure and service providers are centrally involved in the preparation of the IDP and this helps ensure that the overall impacts (beyond individual sites) are considered. A first stage Baseline</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
	Infrastructure Capacity Report has already been prepared.	
<i>Respondents: Protect Diseworth (115); Guy Jeffrey (352); Cllr Ray Sutton (405);</i>		
<p>Draft policy wording would need to include reference to the need for S106 financial contributions to deal with wider cumulative/cross-boundary issues, unlike the draft policies for other site allocations.</p> <p>it is requested that developer contributions be sought toward sustaining the long term financial viability of existing bus service 9, which passes the proposed site and connects East Midlands Gateway to Ashby, Swadlincote and Burton.</p>	<p>Agreed. Criterion 3(b) should include reference to funding arrangements.</p> <p>The request for funding towards bus service 9 is noted. While this is a more detailed matter for a later stage, effective bus services will be a key means to bear down on the number of car journeys and improve the overall sustainability of the new settlement.</p>	<p>Amend criterion 3(b) as follows: “The identification of essential infrastructure, including all necessary on-site and off-site highway improvements, funding arrangements and its delivery in a coordinated and timely way.”</p>
<i>Respondents: Leicestershire CC (as Local Highways Authority) (341); South Derbyshire DC (545);</i>		
<p>Noting the scale of the proposed new settlement, it is recommended that paragraph 3(b) of the supporting text be amended to make reference to the need to identify appropriate infrastructure to support the waste management needs of the new settlement and any impacts it is likely to have on existing waste management infrastructure within the County.</p>	<p>It is considered that the wording of criterion 3(b) encompasses all relevant types of infrastructure and a specific reference to waste related infrastructure is not needed. The Baseline Infrastructure Capacity Report makes the following observations with respect to waste infrastructure “LCC’s Minerals and Waste Local Plan states that there is sufficient capacity to enable targets for the recycling of local authority collected waste to be met. Similarly, sufficient capacity has been identified to enable targets for commercial and industrial waste to be met. Through our discussions with LCC, it is understood that further new sites are unlikely to be required to meet demand arising from new development within the plan period, with</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
	LCC's strategic approach being focused on improving existing facilities" (page 46).	
<i>Respondents: Leicestershire CC (as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority) (341);</i>		
<p>The existing infrastructure cannot cope. There are not enough local amenities at present. Schools, doctors, dentists, midwifery services etc are all over capacity. Where is the funding? Pressure will increase on these vital services.</p> <p>This will be a large development with few facilities. Residents will have to travel for most requirements.</p> <p>The new settlement should have sufficient access to services and employment opportunities within the development itself, and at the same time as the houses are built, without reliance on the facilities within existing communities which are already over-stretched.</p>	<p>The infrastructure implications of IW1 will be identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will accompany the Local Plan. The Baseline Infrastructure Capacity Report sets out the current position in both a 'by settlement' and 'by infrastructure type' way. The Capacity Report also lists the main types of funding sources (pages13-14): developer funding, Government funding and direct funding by infrastructure providers.</p>	No change.
<i>Respondents: Diane Wilby (60); Marie Slevin (68); Robert Evans (73); Richard Smith (101); Karen Jepson (106); Alicia Smithies (109); Paul Jepson (110); Andrew Allman (114); Christine Agar (152); Isobel Smithies (164); Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council (189); Breedon on the Hill Parish Council (196); Lesley Allman (198); Jamie Agar (209); Patricia Jackson (227); John Aust (255); Beverley Aust (257); Charlotte Agar (264); Jeremy Hunt (269); Samantha Wade (275); Castle Donington Parish Council (277); Garry Needham (285); Pauline Needham (292); Jacqui Donaghy (299); Caroline Reffin (300); Bill Cunningham (301); Neil Curling (309); Elizabeth Jarrom (315); William Jarrom (316); Travis Croft (319); Ann Hawtin (327); Alison Millward (343); Tony Wilson (351); Vanessa Johnson (354); Ron Mearns (361); Sally Simpson (371); S. Smith (372); J. Smith (373); Susan Fenny (387); David Fenny (388); Nicola Clarke (424); Karen Oliff (593); Carly Snee (626); Hannah Robinson (653);</i>		
Other housing developments (e.g. at Castle Donington) make promises to build new schools, surgeries and fail to deliver.	The infrastructure implications of IW1 will be identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will accompany the Local Plan.	No change.

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>Facilities will be negotiated down and infrastructure compromised.</p> <p>Scepticism that the infrastructure will be delivered.</p>	<p>Without going into the detail of any particular site, infrastructure which is developer funded (either in whole or in part) is secured at planning application stage through legal agreements and/or conditions. Sometimes the arrangement is that the funding will go to an infrastructure provider (e.g the Local Education Authority) to provide the service or facility (e.g a new school). On occasions the provider decides it can provide the service in an alternative way from what was originally intended (e.g. there is sufficient spare capacity in an existing school). This can be acceptable provided the terms of any legal agreement/s are still met.</p>	
<p><i>Respondents: Joanne Hunt (253); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Vanessa Johnson (354); Carly Snee (626);</i></p>		
<p>The current infrastructure including power, heating, lighting, water and drainage would require a total upgrade through the area which would cause massive destruction for years before starting any housing development.</p>	<p>Annex A of the Baseline Infrastructure Capacity Report contains an initial infrastructure long list and this includes indicative phasing. This will be refined as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is progressed. Infrastructure delivery will be timed to take place alongside development; it is not necessary (or feasible) for all the infrastructure to be in place before house building starts.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Angus Shields (2); Lesley Hextall (9); Emma Ward (53); Glenn Robinson (423);</i></p>		
<p>To include the provision of schools and commerce as a 'bonus' within the proposed development does not show that consideration has been made of the number of child places not taken up in other areas (e.g. Castle Donington)</p>	<p>The school place requirements of IW1 will be identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will accompany the Local Plan. The Baseline Infrastructure Capacity Report sets out the current position which has been informed by discussions with the Education Authority.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<i>Respondents: Karen Jepson (106); Stephen Smith (305);</i>		
<p>NWLDC should prove how it will plan and enforce a coherent strategy rather than simply permit the development, take the council tax and then sit back and allow public services and infrastructure to decay even further in this area.</p>	<p>The infrastructure implications of IW1 will be identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will accompany the Local Plan. The Baseline Infrastructure Capacity Report sets out the current position. Infrastructure which is developer funded (either in whole or in part) is secured at planning application stage through legal agreements and/or conditions. The legal agreement is binding on all parties who sign it, including the council.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<i>Respondents: Richard Brackenbury (117);</i>		
ENVIRONMENTAL		
1 – Overarching environmental issues		
<p>Concern about IW1's impact on the environment. No amount of measures to mitigate the environmental impact will make any difference.</p>	<p>Mitigation of the right type can profoundly improve the overall environmental impacts of new development. This can include, but is not limited to, comprehensive landscaping (Policy IW1 criterion 3(c)), biodiversity net gain (criterion 3(g)) and carbon reduction (criterion 2(b)).</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<i>Respondents: Jeremy Hunt (269); Pauline Needham (292); Jane Cunningham (303); Rod Dawson (417);</i>		
<p>In what way is an entire new town a more efficient use of resources over the strategic and careful targeting of housing in areas where it is most needed and where infrastructure exists and can simply be upgraded?</p>	<p>The Council has considered all the potential, available sites from the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment. This comprehensive approach points to IW1 being needed in addition to a considerable number of sites elsewhere in the district.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<i>Respondents: Stuart Dudley (102);</i>		

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
2 – Landscape and topography		
<p>Once gone, too much beautiful countryside will be lost forever. Development will result in the loss of fields, trees and extensive lengths of ancient hedgerows. Beautiful views will be lost. The intrinsic character of the local countryside will be lost. It will result in urban sprawl.</p>	<p>The Council has considered all the potential, available sites from the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment. This comprehensive approach points to IW1 being needed in addition to a considerable number of sites elsewhere in the district. Key considerations are whether impacts can be mitigated to an acceptable level and/or whether the negative impacts on landscape character etc. are outweighed by the overall benefits of the development. At this stage, the council considers that the latter is the case.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Peter Forster (3); Lesley Hextall (9); Duncan Ross (44); Sadie Dunmore (66); Sarah-Jane Varley (67); Marie Slevin (68); Susan Hurley (69); Robert Evans (73); John Hurley (88); Stephen Pember (89); Craig Jones (104); Gary Woods (113); Andrew Allman (114); Protect Diseworth (115); Richard Brackenbury (117); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Cllr Carol Sewell (128); Adrienne Chester (145); Janet Hutchinson (154); Joshua Smithies (156); Isobel Smithies (164); Lesley Allman (198); Erika Wood (210); Andy Foxall (217); Alastair Hutchinson (222); Rachel Smith (224); Anne Howell (240); Christopher Howell (241); Louis Della-Porta (249); Joanne Hunt (253); Charlotte Springthorpe (260); Sean Gascoigne (261); Charlotte Agar (264); Elinor Hunt (270); Janet Allard (271); Meryl Tait (273); Richard Smithies (276); Noel McGough (287); Katrina Paling (288); Bill Cunningham (301); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Stephen Smith (305); Emma Haycraft (306); David Hawtin (307); Patricia Guy (308); Nichola Miller (313); Peter Miller (314); Elizabeth Jarrom (315); William Jarrom (316); Travis Croft (319); Tracy Croft (320); Sarah Gascoigne (321); Kath Taylor (323); Ron Taylor (324); Janet Moorhouse (329); Stephen MacIver (330); Dawn MacIver (331); Annelise Hunt (333); Kevin Walker (336); Martin Cooper (344); Amy Dunmore (349); Tony Wilson (351); Jennifer Onyon (358); Jamie Smith (369); Carla Smith (370); Nicky Miller (374); Jim Snee (376); Annabel McCrorie (383); Jacqueline Butterworth (384); Paul Butterworth (385); Mr Wykes (401); Cllr Ray Sutton (405); Glenn Robinson (423); Nicola Clarke (424); Chris Duggan (427); Tim Wagstaff (429); Bruce Scott (482); Shirley Briggs (539); Karen Oliff (593); Laura Kristiansen (598); Carly Snee (626); Nigel Lane (629); Thomas Lane (630); Marie Brierley (638); Karen Franklin (639); Hannah Robinson (653);</i></p>		
<p>Development and the removal of natural vegetation will impact on the stability of slopes and increase water runoff from the site, which in turn will enhance the erosion of any exposed soil.</p>	<p>The council does not have evidence that land stability is a current or potential issue in this location.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<i>Respondents: Joanna Wragg (54);</i>		
<p>Work commissioned by the LW&DPC identifies the role of this land a) maintaining Diseworth's nucleated form and identity as a rural settlement; and b) forms a backdrop to views from the north and east of Diseworth with PROW through the parcel affording long views out into the landscape and add to the setting of Diseworth within this rural landscape. Landscape and visual sensitivities are assessed as medium for housing and employment development.</p> <p>It is requested that effective landscape screening be provided and that built development be designed to mitigate any impact on the rural character of South Derbyshire to the west.</p>	<p>It is recognised that IW1 will have a landscape impact and that mitigation will be required. The exact nature of the mitigation measures which will be necessary will be determined at a later stage. The Council's Landscape Study provides some initial guidance (see pages 61-62).</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<i>Respondent: Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council (189); South Derbyshire DC (545)</i>		
2 – Townscape/separate identity of villages		
<p>Diseworth will lose its essential character, rural nature and setting, and its conservation village status when it adjoins such a large housing development.</p> <p>With EMP90, the village will be sandwiched between massive developments which will totally destroy the rural nature of Diseworth.</p> <p>The local character of this area is rural small villages separated by farmed countryside, linked to larger market towns. This area's character will be lost entirely.</p>	<p>The Local Plan recognises the separation between Diseworth and the proposed new settlement (IW1) to the west through the Limits to Development but a more specific planning protection may also be merited. A study has been commissioned to assess whether some form of countryside gap should be designated in the plan to better secure separation between IW1 and Diseworth.</p>	<p>No change but note the forthcoming separation study.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p><i>Respondents: Kathleen Robertson (27); Alison Evans (57); Audrey Brooks (64); Sadie Dunmore (66); Sarah-Jane Varley (67); Marie Slevin (68); Susan Hurley (69); Robert Evans (73); John Hurley (88); Richard Smith (101); Craig Jones (104); Susan Smith (111); Gary Woods (113); Andrew Allman (114); Richard Brackenbury (117); Chris Peat (123); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Cllr Carol Sewell (128); Delia Platts (137); Michael Doyle (138); Adrienne Chester (145); Duncan Ferguson (148); Kay Armitage (149); Laura Dudley (155); Charlotte Jones (169); Angela Bamford (194); Lesley Allman (198); Erika Wood (210); Andy Foxall (217); Rachel Smith (224); Charlotte Christodoulou (242); John Aust (255); Beverley Aust (257); Sandie Moores (259); Charlotte Springthorpe (260); Sean Gascoigne (261); Miriam Wallace (265); Samantha Wade (275); Mervyn Johnson (284); Garry Needham (285); Katrina Paling (288); Pauline Needham (292); Jacqui Donaghy (299); Jane Cunningham (303); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Stephen Smith (305); Emma Haycraft (306); Jacqueline Quinton (312); Nichola Miller (313); Peter Miller (314); Elizabeth Jarrom (315); William Jarrom (316); Clement Croft (317); Sarah Gascoigne (321); Kath Taylor (323); Ron Taylor (324); Ann Hawtin (327); Janet Moorhouse (329); Dawn MacIver (331); Sue Orme (332); Kevin Walker (336); Bill Slevin (342); Amy Dunmore (349); Vanessa Johnson (354); Ron Mearns (361); Jamie Smith (369); Carla Smith (370); J. Smith (373); Nicky Miller (374); Morwenna Mitchell (377); Jacqueline Butterworth (384); Susan Fenny (387); David David (432); Helen Warren (503); Patricia Hening (524); Shirley Briggs (539); Karl Pigott (580); Carly Snee (626); Nigel Lane (629); Thomas Lane (630); Karen Franklin (639);</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The farmland of the proposed settlement forms a natural buffer between the built environment at the top of the Hill i.e. Airport and Race Track and small neighbouring villages below. This countryside should be protected. • Castle Donington, Isley Woodhouse and Diseworth will all become one entity • It will transform Wilson from being rural to predominantly urban. There will be continuous urban /industrial/ infrastructure from Wilson to the M1 and beyond. • There will be no separation from Diseworth. The cumulative development with overwhelm Diseworth. • A greater area of separation between Diseworth and IW1 is essential. • Can Isley Walton be screened from the development, from Glebe cottages to the White House on A453 and along the 	<p>The A453 acts as a boundary between the large scale development to the north and the open countryside to the south. IW1 would constitute a significant encroachment into this countryside and it will reduce the extent of separation between adjacent villages (Diseworth, Tonge and Isley Walton) and the development to the north.</p> <p>Whilst a study has been commissioned into a potential countryside gap between IW1 and Diseworth, the principle of maintaining the separate identify of settlements is one which could be incorporated into Policy IW1.</p>	<p>Add a criterion to IW1 as follows: A comprehensive masterplan...should provide for..</p> <p>3(x) both the physical and perceived separation between the new settlement and the villages of Isley Walton, Diseworth and Tonge through measures to include the careful siting of development and effective landscaping.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>Melbourne Road to Church View with a 30m width of tree planting on top of a bund? This would help us keep the identity of our village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will Isley Walton be shielded from this development- being sited on Walton Hill and all views would be destroyed. • Isley Walton will be swamped. • Local villages will be blighted and will lose their tranquillity. 		
<p><i>Respondents: Angus Shields (2); Lesley Hextall (9); Duncan Ross (44); Robert Evans (73); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Christine Agar (152); Janet Hutchinson (154); David Bamford (170); Alastair Hutchinson (222); Erica Morris (246); Louis Della-Porta (249); Charlotte Agar (264); Charles Brompton (272); Caroline Reffin (300); Jane Cunningham (303); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Kevin Walker (336); Martin Cooper (344); Mr Wykes (401); Rod Dawson (417); Ian Robertson (430);</i></p>		
<p>The proposed new settlement would bring large-scale development even closer to Tonge with very significant impacts on the character of the settlement. The emerging Breedon on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan identifies a provisional Area of Separation between Tonge and the proposed new settlement. The Area of Separation can only apply within the Neighbourhood Area, so the new Local Plan provides the opportunity to extend the Area of Separation beyond the parish boundary.</p>	<p>The provisional Area of Separation was not supported by the Neighbourhood Plan Examiner. The new criterion recommended above deals with the principle of maintaining the distinct identity of existing villages.</p>	<p>See proposed new criterion above.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Breedon on the Hill Parish Council (196);</i></p>		
<p>3 - Ecology</p>		
<p>Wildlife and habitats (including soils which also act as a sink for pollutants) will be lost forever. The Government is promoting ecological gain, not loss.</p>	<p>The broad hierarchy set out in the NPPF is that significant harm to biodiversity should be avoided where possible, then adequately mitigated and, as a last resort, compensated for. If none of these sequential steps can be</p>	<p>See the proposed changes below in response to Natural England's comments.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
	<p>achieved, planning permission should be refused (paragraph 186). A comprehensive mitigation package will be required for the development to go ahead. Natural England has not made an 'in principle' objection to the development of this site which is primarily arable land.</p>	
<p><i>Respondents: Angus Shields (2); Lesley Hextall (9); Duncan Ross(44); Joanna Wragg (54); Jo Coultas (55); Alison Evans (57); Diane Wilby (60); Sadie Dunmore (66); Sarah-Jane Varley (67); Robert Evans (73); John Hurley (88); Stephen Pember (89); Richard Smith (101); Craig Jones (104); Susan Smith (111); Protect Diseworth (115); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Cllr Carol Sewell (128); Kay Armitage (149); Laura Dudley (155); Joshua Smithies (156); Isobel Smithies (164); Charlotte Jones (169); Lesley Allman (198); Jamie Agar (209); Patricia Jackson (227); Anne Howell (240); Christopher Howell (241); Louis Della-Porta (249); Joanne Hunt (253); Sandie Moores (259); Sean Gascoigne (261); Charlotte Agar (264); Miriam Wallace (265); Elinor Hunt (270); Janet Allard (271); Mervyn Johnson (284); Garry Needham (285); Pauline Needham (292); Bill Cunningham (301); Annette Della-Porta (302); Jane Cunningham (303); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Emma Haycraft (306); David Hawtin (307); Patricia Guy (308); Neil Curling (309); Nichola Miller (313); Peter Miller (314); Elizabeth Jarrom (315); William Jarrom (316); Clement Croft (317); Travis Croft (319); Tracy Croft (320); Sarah Gascoigne (321); Janet Moorhouse (329); Stephen Maclver (330); Dawn Maclver (331); Sue Orme (332); Annelise Hunt (333); Sylvia Slevin (339); Bill Slevin (342); Martin Cooper (344); Amy Dunmore (349); Tony Wilson (351); Guy Jeffrey (352); Thomas Onyon (356); Sally Simpson (371); Nicky Miller (374); Lucy Agar (375); Morwenna Mitchell (377); Kevin Ward (380); Paul Butterworth (385); Susan Fenny (387); Cllr Ray Sutton (405); Rod Dawson (417); Glenn Robinson (423); Nicola Clarke (424); Haydon Warren (426); Tim Wagstaff (429); Helen Warren (503); Shirley Briggs (539); Karen Oliff (593); Carly Snee (626); Marie Brierley (638); Karen Franklin (639); Hannah Robinson (653);</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Green Infrastructure (GI) should be coordinated throughout the large developments proposed in the north of the district (Isley Woodhouse, the developments at Castle Donington and Kegworth, East Midlands Freeport). • Also Biodiversity Net Gain sites to provide connected habitats for the maximum benefit for nature recovery and access for people to nature. • Consideration should be given to extending GI links across local 	<p>It is agreed that the policy could be more specific and testing with respect to green infrastructure requirements, biodiversity net gain, the approach to landscaping and climate change. A suite of amendments is proposed in response.</p>	<p>Amend criterion 1(g) as follows: 1(g) Formal and informal open space to include children's play areas, sport pitches, natural green space, recreation routes and cycling and walking links that supplement and enhance the existing rights of way network.</p> <p>Amend criterion 2(b) as follows: 2(b) Striving for carbon neutrality, and adapting to climate change, including by incorporating measures to minimise energy consumption whilst maximising the benefits</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>authority boundaries to link with other large developments that are proposed, including those falling within the focus of the East Midlands Development Company.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This proposal should follow a landscape led approach to ensure that the development fits in with the surrounding countryside and existing green & blue Infrastructure (GBI) and can provide biodiversity net gain. • It should be an exemplar of sustainable, green development, incorporating connected natural areas and GBI throughout the site providing accessible, high quality green space for both future residents and for nature recovery. • This should include strategic-scale accessible natural green space (such as a country park) as recommended in the council's Green & Blue Infrastructure Study. • The proposal should incorporate integrated water management and adaptation to climate change including nature-based solutions such as green roofs, street trees and wetlands. • Wider connections to sites within neighbouring local authorities should be considered including connection to Trent Gateway project. 		<p>from on-site renewable energy generation and energy efficient buildings.</p> <p>Amend criterion 3(c) as follows: 3(c) A comprehensive landscaping strategy that which is demonstrably landscape-led and which retains, enhances and capitalises on existing landscape features, reflects its landscape context and is informed by the Council's Landscape Sensitivity Study (2020).</p> <p>Amend criterion 3(d) as follows: 3(d) The achievement of national biodiversity net gain requirements as a minimum. A comprehensive approach to strategic Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Net Gain, providing connected habitats that bring maximum benefit for nature recovery and for residents' access to nature and natural green space and creating links to a wider GI network beyond the village where possible.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Natural England (223);</i></p>		

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>How can the developers / promoters of this site claim they can enhance the biodiversity by developing so much countryside/agricultural land and losing hedgerows? They will have to make massive use of off-site BNG credits which just passes the buck - it doesn't enhance this area's biodiversity better at all.</p> <p>IW1 cannot be designed in a way which will achieve 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	<p>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is a national requirement designed to deliver a genuine uplift in biodiversity by creating or enhancing habitats in association with development. Much of this site comprises arable land which, in strict biodiversity terms, is not that diverse and BNG requirements could achieve a genuine improvement. Measures could include enhancing existing features, creating additional habitat areas and creating links to reduce the fragmentation of the local ecological network. BNG metrics are used to quantify the gains. However, it is considered that the policy could be strengthened further.</p>	<p>See the proposed changes above in response to Natural England's comments.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Duncan Ross (44); Joanna Wragg (54); Jo Coultas (55); Stuart Dudley (102); Karen Jepson (106); Alicia Smithies (109); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Christine Agar (152); Charlotte Jones (169); Sean Gascoigne (261); Richard Smithies (276); Noel McGough (287); Katrina Paling (288); Jacqui Donaghy (299); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Stephen Smith (305); Patricia Guy (308); Jamie Smith (369); Carla Smith (370); Jim Snee (376); David Fenny (388); Tim Wagstaff (429);</i></p>		
<p>4 - Heritage</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not clear how the significance of named assets at Breedon on the Hill and Langley Priory have been considered, or the significance derived from their setting. There is the potential for the allocation to result in high levels of harm to significance of the heritage assets. Nearby Conservation Areas and various Listed Buildings would, potentially, also be affected by the proposed settlement. Again, it is not clear how any harm has been considered in NPPF terms, or how 	<p>Historic England's comment that this proposal does not show a positive approach to the historic environment merits further work.</p> <p>It is understood that the site promoters are undertaking work to assess and understand the potential impact on heritage issues. The Council will keep the matter under review. The requirements of Policy IW1 with respect to heritage should can be strengthened through the rewording of criterion 3(e).</p>	<p>Amend criterion 3(e) as follows: 3(e) The conservation and enhancement of heritage assets both on site and within the vicinity of the site. A Heritage Assessment which will identify the heritage assets both on and beyond the site which may be impacted, their significance, including the significance derived from setting, and provide a thorough analysis of the impact of development on this significance.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>Criteria 3e of the site policy could be achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would any proposed mitigation measures identified in the Landscape Sensitivity Study be harmful to the significance of heritage assets or significance derived from setting? • the Plan does not show a positive approach to the historic environment in respect of this site allocation. 		
<i>Respondents: Historic England (357);</i>		
<p>Concerned about the effect that the new Isley Woodhouse new town would have on the settings (views to and from / setting) of all the local heritage buildings. This includes Langley priory, Breedon hill fort and church, Donington Hall and the villages of Isley Walton, Diseworth, Tong and Belton themselves. The current residential area of Isley Walton includes many substantial period dwellings including listed buildings and a church, and other large houses with individual character.</p> <p>Diseworth will lose its conservation status.</p> <p>Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it</p>	<p>It is agreed that further work on the heritage impacts of the proposal is needed. See proposed approach outlined in response to Historic England above.</p>	<p>See the proposed changes above in response to Historic England's (357) comments.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>possesses. Section 72 contains similar requirements with respect to buildings or land in a conservation area. In this context 'preserving' means doing no harm.</p> <p>The Barnwell Manor and Forge Field cases illustrate the need to demonstrably give "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving heritage assets and to refer expressly to the advice of the NPPF in cases where there is harm to heritage assets has been identified.</p>		
<p><i>Respondents: Lesley Hextall (9); Duncan Ross (44); Joanna Wragg (54); John Hurley (88); Richard Smith (101); Stuart Dudley (102); Craig Jones (104); Karen Jepson (106); Paul Jepson (110); Gary Woods (113); Richard Brackenbury (117); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Christine Agar (152); Janet Hutchinson (154); Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council (189); Breedon on the Hill Parish Council (196); Erica Morris (246); Louis Della-Porta (249); Sean Gascoigne (261); Richard Smithies (276); Pauline Needham (292); Jacqui Donaghy (299); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Emma Haycraft (306); Patricia Guy (308); Nichola Miller (313); Tony Wilson (351); Thomas Onyon (356); Nicky Miller (374); Lucy Agar (375); Morwenna Mitchell (377); Mr Wykes (401); Glenn Robinson (423); Tim Wagstaff (429);</i></p>		
<p>5 – Flooding and drainage</p>		
<p>The land allocated for IW1 (and EMP90) covers large areas of the water catchment that flows into Diseworth Brook – which too often floods within the village. Replacing the extensive woodland and farmland catchment area with hardstanding and building will bring a significantly heightened and additional flood risk to Diseworth and Long Whatton causing home owners further flooding issues. Mitigating flooding factors is a work in progress that has involved EMA and LCC and a group of volunteers from within the village. Release of the water from the Airport Retaining Ponds is not done during periods</p>	<p>The NPPF makes clear that granting planning permission should not lead to increased flood risk elsewhere (paragraph 173).</p> <p>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. LCC does not have an 'in principle' objection to IW1. Importantly its position is that the</p>	<p>Add a criterion to IW1 as follows:</p> <p>2(x) Incorporating appropriate measures to manage surface water run-off from the site by sustainable means, ensuring i) discharge rates meet LLFA requirements; ii) existing properties are not exposed to increased flood risk; and (iii) the safe operation of East Midlands Airport is not inadvertently affected</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>where flooding would occur. The development proposed would have a huge negative effect on the work already achieved.</p> <p>EMP90 and IW1 will result in over 200 Ha of land adjacent to Diseworth, representing two thirds of the natural rainwater runoff catchment area into Diseworth Brook, being concreted over. As Diseworth Brook runs through the heart of the village and is a fast flow reacting brook, the risk of increased frequency and scale of flooding in the village is unavoidably increased. The sheer scale of contributory flood risk from these developments will be such that mitigation will not be economically viable. If these developments go ahead, then NWLDC will have relinquished its duty of care and knowingly condemned Diseworth and downstream Long Whatton to certainly of material flooding and increased damage to property.</p> <p>The roads would become totally flooded in Isley Walton and Tongue, recently this area has become almost impassable in times of prolonged rain.</p> <p>The fields by Moor Lane flood as does the Melbourne Road at Church View, this will only be made much worse by any development.</p> <p>Flooding will happen in the wider area e.g. Wilson</p>	<p>discharge rate should not exceed 80% of the pre-development discharge rate for any sub-catchment of the site.</p> <p>Similarly, the Environment Agency has not objected to the proposal.</p> <p>Policy IW1 is currently silent on the matter of surface water drainage. In view of the extent of local concern, this should be rectified.</p>	

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p><i>Respondents: Angus Shields (2); Peter Forster (3); Lesley Hextall (9); Ian Ward (34); Nick Hollick (38); Duncan Ross (44); Emma Ward (53); Joanna Wragg (54); Alison Evans (57); Diane Wilby (60); Audrey Brooks (64); Sadie Dunmore (66); Susan Hurley (69); Robert Evans (73); John Hurley (88); Stephen Pember (89); Richard Smith (101); Stuart Dudley (102); Judith Bilington (103); Craig Jones (104); Alan Clark (105); Karen Jepson (106); Alicia Smithies (109); Paul Jepson (110); Susan Smith (111); Gary Woods (113); Andrew Allman (114); Protect Diseworth (115); Richard Brackenbury (117); Chris Peat (123); Susan Ward (125); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Cllr Carol Sewell (128); Delia Platts (137); Michael Doyle (138); Adrienne Chester (145); Duncan Ferguson (148); Kay Armitage (149); Christine Agar (152); Laura Dudley (155); Joshua Smithies (156); Isobel Smithies (164); Charlotte Jones (169); Angela Bamford (194); Lesley Allman (198); Long Whatton & Diseworth Flood Working Group (199); Jamie Agar (209); Erika Wood (210); Andy Foxall (217); Rachel Smith (224); Patricia Jackson (227); Anne Howell (240); Christopher Howell (241); Charlotte Christodoulou (242); Erica Morris (246); Louis Della-Porta (249); Joanne Hunt (253); Sandie Moores (259); Charlotte Springthorpe (260); Sean Gascoigne (261); Charlotte Agar (264); Janet Allard (271); Charles Brompton (272); Meryl Tait (273); Alan Wade (274); Samantha Wade (275); Richard Smithies (276); Garry Needham (285); Noel McGough (287); Katrina Paling (288); Pauline Needham (292); Jacqui Donaghy (299); Caroline Reffin (300); Bill Cunningham (301); Annette Della-Porta (302); Jane Cunningham (303); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Stephen Smith (305); Emma Haycraft (306); Patricia Guy (308); Neil Curling (309); Sally Price (310); Nichola Miller (313); Peter Miller (314); Elizabeth Jarrom (315); William Jarrom (316); Clement Croft (317); Lois Croft (318); Travis Croft (319); Tracy Croft (320); Sarah Gascoigne (321); Kath Taylor (323); Ron Taylor (324); Ann Hawtin (327); Janet Moorhouse (329); Stephen MacIver (330); Dawn MacIver (331); Sue Orme (332); Sylvia Slevin (339); Amy Dunmore (349); Tony Wilson (351); Vanessa Johnson (354); Jamie Smith (369); Carla Smith (370); Sally Simpson (371); J. Smith (373); Nicky Miller (374); Lucy Agar (375); Jim Snee (376); Kevin Ward (380); Annabel McCrorie (383); Jacqueline Butterworth (384); Paul Butterworth (385); Susan Fenny (387); David Fenny (388); Cllr Ray Sutton (405); Julie Doyle (416); Rod Dawson (417); Glenn Robinson (423); Haydon Warren (426); Chris Duggan (427); David David (432); Bruce Scott (482); Helen Warren (503); Sheila Dakin (545); Karl Pigott (580); Kathleen Pigott (581); Karen Oliff (593); Laura Kristiansen (598); Aimee Ridler (625); Carly Snee (626); Nigel Lane (629); Thomas Lane (630); Robert Ridler (636); Marie Brierley (638); Karen Franklin (639); Hannah Robinson (653);</i></p>		
<p>The discharge rate should not exceed 80% of the pre-development discharge rate for any sub-catchment of the site. The requirements of East Midlands Airport will need to be considered relating to bodies of open water within proximity to the airport site.</p>	<p>See proposed change above.</p>	<p>See above for proposed additional criterion dealing with surface water drainage.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Leicestershire CC (as Lead Local Flood Authority) (341);</i></p>		
<p>Development will result in chemicals and pollution bleeding into the soil killing living organisms.</p>	<p>There are engineering solutions to control and manage surface water run off (e.g. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems) including removal of pollutants.</p>	<p>See above for proposed additional criterion dealing with surface water drainage.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>Additional water flow in Diseworth Brook will be harmful to water-borne wildlife. Water quality is already affected by industrial pollution and the proposals could make it worse.</p>		
<p><i>Respondents: Nick Hollick (38); Stephen Pember (89); Sean Gascoigne (261); Emma Haycraft (306); Sarah Gascoigne (321); Nicola Clarke (424);</i></p>		
<p>The western most edge of the site currently lies within Flood Zone 3. It is anticipated the extent of Flood Zone 3 will increase to a small extent once NaFRA2 [National Flood Risk Assessment 2] goes live [expected Spring 2025]. There is also a small amount of land lying within Flood Zone 3 on the eastern edge of the site. There are ordinary watercourses within the site boundary. The rest of site is Flood Zone 1.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Environment Agency (404);</i></p>		
<p>IW1 will require massive and costly flood mitigation measures which may be unaffordable.</p>	<p>The costs of installing sufficient surface water drainage will be the developers' responsibility. More generally the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will identify funding sources for the infrastructure required. In many cases, this will be developer funding but it could include some public sector funding. Infrastructure requirements will be reflected in the Local Plan as appropriate. Whilst the full infrastructure costs are currently unconfirmed, there is no evidence at this point that they are unaffordable and would make the development undeliverable.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Tony Wilson (351); Jim Snee (376);</i></p>		

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>New building proposals should include both attenuation of runoff from new roofs and hardstanding, and new areas of flood storage to intercept surface water in order to alleviate flood risk in Breedon, Long Whatton and Diseworth villages.</p> <p>Water quality is also important, and the District Council will be aware of multiple criminal charges being brought against East Midlands Airport Ltd by the Environment Agency for pollution entering the river system.</p>	<p>Noted. Policy IW1 is currently silent on the matter of surface water drainage and this should be rectified.</p>	<p>See above for proposed additional criterion dealing with surface water drainage.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council (189); Breedon on the Hill Parish Council (196);</i></p>		
<p>6 – Impacts on residents</p>		
<p>Air quality and noise pollution is already poor because of increased traffic, increased flights and increased housing and warehousing in the area. The potential of thousands of homes is going to have a massive negative impact on noise, air and light pollution (Diseworth is in a dip) including from the increased volume of traffic coming through Diseworth and Long Whatton. This will have a negative impact on the health and well being and quality of life of existing residents. The surrounding area will be affected as well. Construction over an extended timeframe will worsen air quality from equipment emissions and increased traffic</p> <p>Isley Walton is regularly exposed to road traffic noise above 55 dB and aircraft noise above 65dB. This is above the EU's</p>	<p>Traffic: Forthcoming transport modelling will help identify the routes that IW1 traffic will take including the propensity (if any) for vehicles to route through Diseworth and Long Whatton and which will help to address what mitigation is required</p> <p>Air quality: The High Street/Bondgate area in Castle Donington is an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) for Nitrogen Dioxide. The 2023 Air Quality Annual Status Report shows that NO₂ standards were met in the AQMA in 2022. The traffic modelling will identify how flows through Castle Donington could change which, in turn, would signal if NO₂ levels within the AQMA could worsen.</p> <p>Residents' comments more particularly relate to worsening air quality with Diseworth itself.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>threshold of 55 decibels (dB) for daily exposure and 50 dB for night exposure.</p> <p>Air quality here at Isley Walton has deteriorated significantly since DHL Cargo West was built and additional aircraft departing and arriving and in winter when aircraft de-icer is used. The smell from the airport holding ponds directly adjacent to the proposed development is absolutely disgusting. There are days when we cannot venture outside/have doors or windows open as the air stings our eyes and noses.</p>	<p>Draft Policy EN6 requires an air quality assessment to be prepared for development where air quality could be significantly affected.</p> <p>Noise and lighting: As a predominantly residential development, IW1 is not expected to generate an unacceptable level of noise or lighting nuisance for existing residents. Care should be taken with the siting of development, especially the employment and commercial aspects to ensure this is the case.</p>	
<p><i>Respondents: Joanna Wragg (54); Alison Evans (57); Audrey Brooks (64); Sadie Dunmore (66); Sarah-Jane Varley (67); Marie Slevin (68); Robert Evans (73); John Hurley (88); Richard Smith (101); Stuart Dudley (102); Judith Bilington (103); Alan Clark (105); Karen Jepson (106); Alicia Smithies (109); Susan Smith (111); Gary Woods (113); Andrew Allman (114); Chris Peat (123); Susan Ward (125); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Delia Platts (137); Michael Doyle (138); Duncan Ferguson (148); Kay Armitage (149); Christine Agar (152); Laura Dudley (155); Joshua Smithies (156); Isobel Smithies (164); Lesley Allman (198); Jamie Agar (209); Erika Wood (210); Andy Foxall (217); Alastair Hutchinson (222); Anne Howell (240); Christopher Howell (241); Charlotte Christodoulou (242); Erica Morris (246); Beverley Aust (257); Sandie Moores (259); Sean Gascoigne (261); Jeremy Hunt (269); Janet Allard (271); Charles Brompton (272); Meryl Tait (273); Alan Wade (274); Samantha Wade (275); Richard Smithies (276); Noel McGough (287); Katrina Paling (288); Pauline Needham (292); Bill Cunningham (301); Annette Della-Porta (302); Jane Cunningham (303); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Stephen Smith (305); Emma Haycraft (306); Patricia Guy (308); Neil Curling (309); Nichola Miller (313); Peter Miller (314); Elizabeth Jarrom (315); William Jarrom (316); Clement Croft (317); Lois Croft (318); Travis Croft (319); Sarah Gascoigne (321); Kath Taylor (323); Ron Taylor (324); Stephen MacIver (330); Dawn MacIver (331); Annelise Hunt (333); Bill Slevin (342); Vanessa Johnson (354); Jennifer Onyon (358); Ron Mearns (361); Jamie Smith (369); Carla Smith (370); Sally Simpson (371); Nicky Miller (374); Lucy Agar (375); Jim Snee (376); Morwenna Mitchell (377); Kevin Ward (380); Annabel McCrorie (383); Jacqueline Butterworth (384); Susan Fenny (387); Mr Wykes (401); Nicola Clarke (424); Haydon Warren (426); Chris Duggan (427); Helen Warren (503); Karl Pigott (580); Karen Oliff (593); Carly Snee (626); Nigel Lane (629); Thomas Lane (630); Karen Franklin (639);</i></p>		
<p>The new residents will be adversely impacted by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> poor air quality, including from the noise/dust linked to the quarry at 	<p>In view of the proximity of the airport and Donington Race Circuit, the council has commissioned an initial noise impact study to help quantify the potential impacts and to identify any mitigation measures required. Its</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>Breedon and the quarry lorries using local roads to reach A42.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise from the Download festival and race days at Donington Park <p>With respect to noise and air pollution, NWLDC and the applicant should demonstrate why the proposed site, which is already known to be unsuitable, has been selected for development. Specifically, why this location has been chosen over other potential alternatives.</p>	<p>findings may need to be reflected in Policy IW1 in due course. Currently criterion 3(f) of Policy IW1 requires a noise strategy to be prepared. Draft Policy EN6 requires an air quality assessment to be prepared for development where air quality could be significantly affected. Faced with high housing numbers, the Council has also had to explore the scope for new settlement/s, as recommended in the NPPF (paragraph 74). The Council has considered all the potential, available sites from the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment. This comprehensive approach points to IW1 being needed in addition to a considerable number of sites elsewhere in the district.</p>	
<p><i>Respondents: Lesley Hextall (9); Duncan Ross (44); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Marie Brierley (638);</i></p>		
<p>There will be a reduction in local green amenity space and attractive walking routes which are essential for residents' wellbeing.</p> <p>To make properties attractive they need more space around them and woodland areas for children to play and adults to walk.</p>	<p>There is a network of public rights of way which cross the site. It is important that the design of any development takes these into account. There is also an opportunity to make these routes more accessible and to extend the network of walking (and cycling) routes in the area. Proposed changes to Policy IW1 above in response to Natural England's comments address these points.</p>	<p>See amendments in response to Natural England's (223) comments above.</p>
<p><i>Respondents: Alison Evans (57); Robert Evans (73); Stuart Dudley (102); Karen Jepson (106); Susan Smith (111); Michael Doyle (138); Erica Morris (246); John Aust (255); Bill Cunningham (301); Annette Della-Porta (302); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Sarah Gascoigne (321); Janet Moorhouse (329); Sue Orme (332); Bill Slevin (342); Amy Dunmore (349); Guy Jeffrey (352); Morwenna Mitchell (377); Mr Wykes (401); Bruce Scott (482); Helen Warren (503); Karen Oliff (593);</i></p>		
<p>It will exacerbate existing parking problems resulting from the airport.</p>	<p>In addition to providing sufficient parking for residents and businesses in the new settlement, there may need to be restrictions</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
	or other measures to prevent long stay parking by airport users.	
<i>Respondents: Beverley Aust (257); Jane Cunningham (303); Vanessa Johnson (354); Karen Oliff (593);</i>		
Littering and fly tipping will increase.	Dropping litter is an offence by virtue of the Environmental Protection Act (1990). Littering is not under the control of the Planning system and the potential for littering is not, of itself, a planning reason to resist development.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Duncan Ross (44); Sadie Dunmore (66); Sarah-Jane Varley (67); Marie Slevin (68); Alicia Smithies (109); Susan Smith (111); Gary Woods (113); Charlotte Christodoulou (242); Richard Smithies (276); Jane Cunningham (303); Stephen Smith (305); Peter Miller (314); Sylvia Slevin (339); Jennifer Onyon (358); Nicola Clarke (424); Karen Oliff (593);</i>		
Antisocial behaviour and crime levels will inevitably increase with the construction of 4,500 houses.	These are matters which are not under the control of the planning system. There is no evidence that residents, workers and visitors to IW1 will be any more likely to commit crime or anti-social behaviour than anyone else.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Alicia Smithies (109); Duncan Ferguson (148);</i>		
The current local residents of Isley Walton would suffer massively in terms of well-being and would be exposed to extreme stress if any building work was to commence.	There will be some unavoidable disturbance for local residents during construction but appropriate conditions would be attached to any planning permission, such as hours of operation, to minimise disruption. Responsible developers, such as those who participate in the Considerate Constructors Scheme, have an interest in keeping disturbance as low as possible.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Glenn Robinson (423);</i>		
7 – Agricultural Land		
Productive agricultural land will be lost forever. We need food security. The loss is not justified.	The NPPF states that “Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of	

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>The proposed new settlement lies in an area of Grade 3 agricultural land and close to Grade 2 land. Consequently, the site is likely to be Grade 3a land- the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>	<p>poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The availability of agricultural land used for food production should be considered, alongside the other policies in this Framework, when deciding what sites are most appropriate for development” (footnote 62). 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</p>	
<p><i>Respondents: Angus Shields (2); Lesley Hextall (9); Nick Hollick (38); Duncan Ross(44); Joanna Wragg (54); Jo Coultas (55); Alison Evans (57); Diane Wilby (60); Audrey Brooks (64); Sadie Dunmore (66); Sarah-Jane Varley (67); Marie Slevin (68); Susan Hurley (69); Robert Evans (73); Hazel Fitzgibbon (87); John Hurley (88); Richard Smith (101); Stuart Dudley (102); Craig Jones (104); Alan Clark (105); Karen Jepson (106); Paul Jepson (110); Susan Smith (111); Gary Woods (113); Andrew Allman (114); Protect Diseworth (115); Richard Brackenbury (117); Chris Peat (123); Susan Ward (125); Angela Shephard (126); Paul Shephard (127); Delia Platts (137); Michael Doyle (138); Adrienne Chester (145); Duncan Ferguson (148); Kay Armitage (149); Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council (189); Angela Bamford (194); Breedon on the Hill Parish Council (196); Lesley Allman (198); Peter Onyon (203); Erika Wood (210); Andy Foxall (217); Rachel Smith (224); Patricia Jackson (227); Beverley Aust (257); Charlotte Springthorpe (260); Sean Gascoigne (261); Janet Allard (271); Meryl Tait (273); Alan Wade (274); Samantha Wade (275); Mervyn Johnson (284); Garry Needham (285); Noel McGough (287); Katrina Paling (288); Pauline Needham (292); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Stephen Smith (305); Emma Haycraft (306); David Hawtin (307); Patricia Guy (308); Nichola Miller (313); Peter Miller (314); Elizabeth Jarrom (315); William Jarrom (316); Sarah Gascoigne (321); Kath Taylor (323); Ron Taylor (324); Janet Moorhouse (329); Dawn MacIver (331); Sue Orme (332); Martin Cooper (344); Tony Wilson (351); Guy Jeffrey (352); Jennifer Onyon (358); Jamie Smith (369); Carla Smith (370); Nicky Miller (374); Kevin Ward (380); Annabel McCrorie (383); Jacqueline Butterworth (384); Mr Wykes (401); Cllr Ray Sutton (405); Rod Dawson (417); Glenn Robinson (423); Shirley Briggs (539); Karl Pigott (580); Karen Oliff (593); Carly Snee (626); Nigel Lane (629); Thomas Lane (630); Karen Franklin (639); Hannah Robinson (653);</i></p>		
<p>8 – Carbon emissions</p>		
<p>Concern about the reference to carbon neutrality in IW1(2)(b). Is carbon neutrality being conflated with net-zero? Striving to achieve net-zero has the capacity to deliver greater benefits across the lifetime of the development than carbon neutrality. The ability to deliver on-site renewables may be,</p>	<p>It is agreed that net-zero is a better term. The draft renewable energy and reducing carbon emissions policies refer to net zero, energy efficiency and renewable energy generation and the Council has a Zero Carbon Roadmap and Action Plan.</p>	<p>Remove the reference to carbon neutrality from the draft policy wording of IW1 and replace with ‘striving for net-zero’.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
to some extent, constrained by the site's proximity to the airport.		
<i>Respondents: Harworth & Caesarea (226);</i>		
<p>The proposal is contrary to carbon neutral and climate change objectives. For example soil is a sequester of carbon.</p> <p>The farmland around Diseworth helps to cleanse our atmosphere and replacing these green fields with housing and warehouses would be devastating and irreversible for climate change. Further, the proposed developments would bring a significant increase in pollution, in particular exhaust fumes, noise and light and no amount of offsetting would counteract this.</p>	<p>Criterion 2(b) of Policy IW1 underlines that minimising carbon emissions is a key objective for the new settlement.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<i>Respondents: Joanna Wragg (54); Jo Coultas (55); Susan Ward (125); Michael Doyle (138); Joshua Smithies (156); Erika Wood (210); Andy Foxall (217); Louis Della-Porta (249); Beverley Aust (257); Sean Gascoigne (261); Elinor Hunt (270); Janet Allard (271); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Patricia Guy (308); Annelise Hunt (333); Tony Wilson (351); Guy Jeffrey (352); Annabel McCrorie (383); David Fenny (388); Marie Brierley (638);</i>		
<p>Every property should have solar panels and an EV charging point</p>	<p>Within the current framework provided by the Government, the council is not able to require solar panels on every new home. This may change.</p> <p>EV charging points are dealt with through the Building Regulations regime.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<i>Respondents: Ian Ward (34); John Aust (255); Janet Moorhouse (329);</i>		
<p>4.111 recognises "journeys by car will be a significant component of all transport movements...". It is impossible to reconcile such a statement with NWLDC's declaration of a climate emergency. .</p>	<p>The need to address issues relating to climate change has to be a balanced against the need for new housing. Improved public transport with realistic walking and cycling options are essential to improve the overall sustainability of the new settlement and to</p>	<p>No change.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
	moderate carbon emissions. This is emphasised in Policy IW1 criteria 2(e) and (h).	
<i>Respondents: Richard Brackenbury (117);</i>		
9 – Adjacent uses		
<p>Houses would be too close to the airport (including DHL) and Donington circuit. They would be located no more than 300m south of the runway threshold and safety zone, giving rise to health and safety concerns, and Donington Park motor circuit. The siting of industrial buildings will not be a sufficient shield from the noise. Glare from the airport lighting will also be an issue.</p> <p>Mitigation of noise from the adjoining racetrack shows how the proposal is riddled with thinking based on hope and expectation rather than substance.</p>	<p>In view of the proximity of the airport and Donington Race Circuit, the council has commissioned an initial noise impact study to help quantify the potential impacts. Its findings may need to be reflect in Policy IW1 in due course. Currently criterion 3(f) of Policy IW1 requires a noise strategy to be prepared.</p> <p>East Midlands Airport (230) has not objected to IW1 on health and safety grounds.</p>	No change
<i>Respondents: Judith Bilington (103); Paul Jepson (110); Protect Diseworth (115); Richard Brackenbury (117); Cllr Carol Sewell (128); Delia Platts (137); Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council (189); Angela Bamford (194); Breedon on the Hill Parish Council (196); Charlotte Agar (264); Alan Wade (274); Richard Smithies (276); Mervyn Johnson (284); Garry Needham (285); Pauline Needham (292); Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Peter Miller (314); Elizabeth Jarrom (315); William Jarrom (316); Stephen MacIver (330); Alison Millward (343); Tony Wilson (351); Jamie Smith (369); Carla Smith (370); J. Smith (373); Lucy Agar (375); Jim Snee (376); Susan Fenny (387); Cllr Ray Sutton (405); Nigel Lane (629);</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan refers to a noise assessment which raises the prospect of potential restrictions/regulations that may affect the utilisation of the airport as a cargo hub (e.g. impacting scheduling, efficiency, and overall costs). 	<p>In view of the proximity of the airport and Donington Race Circuit, the council has commissioned an initial noise impact study to help quantify the potential impacts. Its findings may need to be reflect in Policy IW1 in due course.</p>	No change.

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the airport or its operators should not be penalised or operations constrained in future to satisfy the needs of this new development • The Agent of Change principle puts the onus is on the developer/local council to implement measures that prevent any negative impacts on operations at EMA. • The developer or local council would need to fund and implement soundproofing and any other viable mitigation strategies to prevent future residents becoming aggravated or disturbed. Investment in infrastructure that addresses any potential conflicts may be warranted. 	<p>In accordance with the Agent of Change principle (NPPF paragraph 193), measures will need to be included as part of new development to ensure that there are no negative impacts upon the operation of either the airport or the racetrack.</p>	
<i>Respondents: Logistics UK; UPS (218);</i>		
<p>Object to the new settlement at Isley Walton given its proximity to Donington Park motor racing circuit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be the promoters' responsibility to ensure adequate mitigation to address issues emanating from the motor racing circuit and airport (24 hr operation). • Policy IW1 requires a comprehensive masterplan including a strategy to address the noise from the airport and circuit, including mitigation measures for the amenity of residents. This is likely to require a significant buffer between the circuit and any residential development, 	<p>In view of the proximity of the airport and Donington Race Circuit, the council has commissioned an initial noise impact study to help quantify the potential impacts. Its findings may need to be reflect in Policy IW1 in due course.</p> <p>In accordance with the Agent of Change principle (NPPF paragraph 193), measures will need to be included as part of new development to ensure that there are no negative impacts upon the operation of either the airport or the racetrack.</p>	<p>Amend criterion 3(f) as follows: 3(f) A full noise assessment and linked strategy to address the noise from East Midlands Airport and Donington Park Racing circuit, including amenity measures to protect the amenity of residents.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>reducing the development achievable on site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement for a noise assessment (paragraph 4.116) is not stated in Policy IW1. 	<p>Reference to a noise assessment (to quantify the issue) in addition to a noise strategy can be added to the policy.</p>	
<i>Respondents: MSV Group (181);</i>		
<p>The site is immediately to the south of the airport and wraps around one of the airport's surface water reservoirs. The proposed allocation is for some 4,500 new homes (including homes suited to the elderly, sheltered, extra-care facilities and nursing/care homes) and includes open amenity space, public space, and sport facilities.</p> <p>Such noise sensitive uses are incompatible with a location immediately adjacent to a 24-hour international airport, including the 24-hour DHL hub operation, long-stay car parks and wider airport activity.</p> <p>The proposal could conflict with national aviation policy 'to reduce the number of people significantly affected by aircraft noise, particularly at night', national planning policy and the EMA Noise Action Plan to reduce the local population affected by night noise.</p> <p>Around 50% of the freight at EMA arrives before 07:00 making noise disturbance an inevitability at such a location.</p> <p>A detailed noise assessment must be carried out with the airport as soon as possible. To do such an assessment as part of an application would be too late.</p>	<p>In view of the proximity of the airport and Donington Race Circuit, the council has commissioned an initial noise impact study to help quantify the potential impacts. Its findings may need to be reflect in Policy IW1 in due course.</p> <p>In accordance with the Agent of Change principle (NPPF paragraph 193), measures will need to be included as part of new development to ensure that there are no negative impacts upon the operation of either the airport or the racetrack.</p>	<p>See change above in response to MSV Group (181).</p>
<i>Respondents: East Midlands Airport (230); DHL (293);</i>		

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
<p>Existing business operations of the airport must be taken into account and protected. Any new development will be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed to ensure that all permitted activities are able to occur. The best means of achieving this, however, would be to plan development in locations where the operation of the airport would not be affected.</p> <p>Future growth at the airport has the potential to further impact on any new development near the airport. EMA has the capability and the capacity to grow to handle up to 10 million passengers a year and around 1 million tonnes of cargo over the period to 2040. This is a substantial increase, and any noise assessments need to factor in this growth projection. The proposed mitigations outlined in the proposals (4.116) are simply not adequate for the current operations let alone factoring in growth at the airport,</p>	<p>In accordance with the Agent of Change principle (NPPF paragraph 193), measures will need to be included as part of new development to ensure that there are no negative impacts upon the operation of the airport and its resident businesses.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p><i>Respondents: DHL (293);</i></p>		
<p>Concerns that IW1 could compromise the operations at Breedon and Cloud Hill quarries. Any masterplan or subsequent application(s) should have regard to Breedon and Cloud Hill quarries as part of any baseline assessment. Policy IW1/supporting text should specify that the new settlement will be designed in a way as to ensure that it would not prejudice the continued operation of the quarries or that there would be impacts</p>	<p>Noted. This matter should be referenced in the supporting text as suggested.</p>	<p>Add the following sentence to the end of paragraph 4.116: The planning of the new settlement will also need to take into consideration the existing operations at Breedon and Cloud Hill quarries.</p>

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION
to amenity arising from inappropriate design and layout.		
<i>Respondents: Leicestershire CC (as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority) (341);</i>		
Spectators visiting the race track will put off by the difficulty of getting there	The forthcoming transport modelling work will quantify the combined traffic impacts of the Local Plan proposals on the local and strategic highway network and, as a second stage, consider what measures are needed to ensure an operational road network including for those visiting Donington Race Circuit.	
<i>Respondents: Marie Brierley (638);</i>		
10 - Design		
IW1 will fail on quality of life for residents as well as aesthetics. No new housing is of high quality design.	The council's design and amenity ambitions for the new settlement are clearly expressed in Policy IW1 in particular in sections 2 and 3 of the policy.	No change.
<i>Respondents: Kathryn Hutchinson (304); Jim Snee (376);</i>		
Parking provision must be sufficient.	Noted.	No change.
<i>Respondents: John Aust (255);</i>		