

APPENDIX C

CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LAND AT BROOM LEYS FARM COALVILLE (C46)

RESPONSES TO PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: C46	SITE NAME: Land at Broom Leys Farm, Broom Leys Road
----------------	-------------------------	--

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Principal of Development				
Strongly object to 266 houses or development of any kind on Broom Leys Farm.	Noted	No change	10, 85, 93, 98, 325, 326, 328, 406, 439, 460, 461, 463, 464, 468, 472, 484, 516, 517, 518, 601, 614, 618, 619, 627, 650, 655	Mr Roper, Clifford Mason, Marcus Clarke, Lindsey Sawbridge, Keith Andrews, Debs Chambers, Martin & Linda Quilley, Jo Straw, Jamie Bishop, William Crane, Ellie Pacey, Joshua Tallett, Rachel Harrison, Kevin Chambers, Stephen Earnshaw, Megan Hamilton, Grace Hamilton, Helen Hamilton, Garry Hamilton, Stephen Barham, Jake Danvers, B Greasly, Sandra

				Ramp, Darren Ramp, Andrew Lane, J Greasly, Neil Hoult, Linda Hoult
<p>Appreciate that people need somewhere to live and that more housing, including much needed affordable housing is required in the district but this should be delivered in the right places and in line with local need. Broom Leys Farm is not a sequentially preferable location.</p> <p>There has already been significant house building in the local area.</p>	<p>The need for new housing nationally is significant as recognised in national policy.</p> <p>The Broom Leys Farm site is located within the Coalville Urban Area which is defined in the settlement hierarchy as the Principal Town to where “The largest amount of new development will be directed”. The site is well related to services and facilities as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	No change	325, 406, 456, 474, 592	Keith Andrews, Jo Straw, Gavin & Dawn Bennett, Jake Lyon, Stephen Barham
<p>On the site currently are thriving local businesses which are vital to the local community. The farm also holds family events throughout the year which the community love. Removing these would be a detriment to the community.</p>	<p>The site has been put forward for development by the landowner. It will be their responsibility to liaise with any existing business that that may be affected and to ensure that any legal obligations are satisfied.</p>	No change	460, 461, 464, 488	William Crane, Ellis Pacey, Rachel Harrison, Charlotte Dolan
<p>Question why the site at Meadow Lane, that was considered the key site for development, has been swapped for this site. This site has been included because of one councillor without any other sound and legal reason and as such a successful</p>	<p>Whilst it is the case that land at Meadow Lane was proposed by officers, the Local Plan Committee did not accept this recommendation.</p>	No change	614, 618, 619, 650	Peter Kimber, B Greasly, Sandra Ramp, Darren Ramp, J Greasly

challenge of this decision could be made.				
There is no shortage of housing in Coalville. There are hundreds of available properties locally which should not be left empty in favour of building. If people wanted to live here, they would take one of the many empty houses.	The need for new housing nationally is significant as recognised in national policy and the proposed updated standard method. For the housing market to operate effectively there always needs to be a certain amount of vacancy to allow for what is referred to as churn. As at the 2021 Census the vacancy rate was estimated to be 3.5%, compared with a national rate of 5.4%.	No change	473	Katherine Strangeway
The site was a late addition, despite previously being considered unsuitable because of the significant effect upon the Area of Separation. There are viable alternatives elsewhere outside of the Coalville Urban Area, even if this means changing the distribution of development.	Having no development within the Area of Separation would mean very little development in the Coalville Urban Area, contrary to its role as the largest town in the district, with the best range of services and facilities. It is considered that an alternative distribution of development, with less development in the Coalville Urban Area, would not result in a sustainable pattern of development contrary to the NPPF.	No change	116	Strategic Land Group
Support the proposed allocation which is controlled by Barwood development Securities Limited. Confirm that all of	Noted	No change	129	Stantec UK Ltd o/b/o Barwood Development

<p>the Council's draft requirements for the development of the site can be satisfied. Removal of the site from the Area of Separation is consistent with the comments of the Planning Inspector who conducted the Examination of the adopted Local Plan. Have submitted a Vision document which demonstrates that the site is contained and enclosed by buildings and natural features such that development would not result in coalescence of Coalville and Whitwick.</p>				<p>Securities Limited</p>
<p>The site is not controlled by a developer or promoter. There remains uncertainty about whether access can be achieved and allowing for the need for BNG provision and retaining some sense of openness, it is questionable as to whether 266 units could be accommodated on the site.</p>	<p>It is understood that the site is under option to a land promoter (Barwood Land) who are currently preparing detailed plans for this site. The County Highway Authority has advised that a safe and suitable access is achievable. Barwood Land have advised that the assumed amount of development appears to be appropriate.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>243</p>	<p>Avison Young o/b/ Jelsons</p>
<p>Previous Applications</p>				
<p>The site has been the subject of previous planning applications which were rejected by the Council and by the Secretary of State at appeal. Nothing has changed since the previous applications.</p>	<p>A 2009 application for residential development was refused, whilst an application in 2014 was not determined. The Broom Leys Farm site was not included as part of the Stephenson Green development which was</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>406, 456, 488, 592</p>	<p>Jo Straw, Gavin & Dawn Bennett, Charlotte Dolan, Stephen Barham</p>

	refused permission at appeal.			
Brownfield Land				
<p>There is so much land elsewhere in NWL as well as brownfield sites that could be developed before sites in the countryside.</p> <p>Brownfield sites include: the Prince of Wales, land on High Street and the Old Bakehouse sites that should be considered before any other sites.</p> <p>More suitable sites for housing would be where the roads are capable of safely having housing estates next to them, i.e. the dual carriageway where Shaw Lane and Bardon Road are (Old Hall Farm)].</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan included an allowance for sites in Coalville Town Centre to deliver 200 dwellings from previously developed land. In addition, it is proposed to redevelop the former Hermitage Leisure Centre for housing. Other previously developed land is currently being redeveloped for housing, including the former Snibston Discovery park and Workspace 17.</p> <p>Leicestershire County Council as the Highway Authority consider that safe and suitable access is achievable.</p> <p>Shaw Lane is poorly related to services and facilities, with the exception of employment, and is not considered to be a sustainable location for housing development.</p>	No change	294, 407, 558, 627, 655	Peter Kimber, Angela Burr, Elizabeth Barham, Andrew Lane, Linda Hoult

Highways				
Proposed access/traffic lights				
<p>The proposed two sets of traffic lights (one on the bypass and one at the farm entrance) will cause major traffic congestion. It will result in two sets of traffic lights within 500 metres of each other. An additional junction between the existing foot bridge and the traffic lights should not even be considered.</p> <p>The proposed accesses are dangerous and will create a rat run from Stephenson Way and Broom Leys Road.</p> <p>Traffic from the development in that area should be brought out onto the bypass.</p>	<p>The exact nature of any traffic lights or other highway improvements have yet to be agreed although the County Highway Authority has advised that a safe and suitable access is achievable. Further detailed transport modelling will be undertaken to inform the final version of the plan.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>10, 85, 93, 438, 439, 558, 592, 618, 619</p>	<p>Mr Roper, Clifford Mason, Marcus Clarke, Caroline Bishop, Jamie Bishop, Elizabeth Barham, Stephen Barham, Sandra Ramp, Darren Ramp</p>
Increase in traffic				
<p>Broom Leys Road and the A511 are already very busy roads, especially during school drop off/pick up times and at rush hour. The existing junction has a dangerous layout. Increased traffic will be more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists and will also lead to an increase in pollution.</p> <p>The roads surrounding the site are already too busy and the junction just up from the proposed site is a location of many accidents.</p>	<p>The County Highway Authority has advised that a safe and suitable access is achievable. More detailed assessment of both localised and wider impacts will be undertaken as part of further transport modelling work which will inform the final plan.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>10, 85, 93, 294, 326, 328, 403, 406, 439, 459, 460, 463, 464, 466, 468, 472, 473, 476, 484, 488, 516, 517, 518, 543, 558, 592, 601, 618, 619, 627, 655</p>	<p>Mr Roper, Clifford Mason, Marcus Clarke, Peter Kimber, Debs Chambers, Martin & Linda Quilley, Whitwick Parish Council, Jo Straw, Jamie Bishop, Richard Billam, William Crane, Joshua Tallett, Rachel Harrison, Deborah</p>

<p>Increased traffic is contrary to the Council working towards net zero by 2050.</p>				<p>Chambers, Kevin Chambers, Stephen Earnshaw, Katherine Strangeway, Anastasia Davies, Megan Hamilton, Charlotte Dolan, Grace Hamilton, Helen Hamilton, Garry Hamilton, Robert McNamara, Elizabeth Barham, Stephen Barham, Jake Danvers, Sandra Ramp, Darren Ramp, Andrew Lane, Linda Hoult</p>
<p>A511 Growth Corridor</p>				
<p>Plans for the development suggest access from Broom Leys Road or the A511. The new A511 growth corridor, due to commence in 2025, includes the removal of a right turn onto Broom Leys Road (westbound). This means all traffic accessing Forest Rd/London Rd/Long Lane will be required to pass through Coalville. Add 266 new homes</p>	<p>The proposed improvements at the Broom Leys Road junction include prohibiting a right hand turn in to Broom Leys Road from the A511 when heading in a westerly direction. This will necessitate traffic diverting down London Road and then</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>563</p>	<p>Phillip Hopkins</p>

<p>and this problem will become more acute.</p>	<p>on to the southern part of Broom Leys Road. No objection to the principal of development has been received from Leicestershire County Council as the Highways Authority. However, further transport modelling will be undertaken as part of the continuing development of the Local Plan.</p>			
<p>Loss of Greenspace and Farmland</p>				
<p>This is farmland and should not be built on.</p> <p>Broom Leys is a great place to walk and enjoy the open space. Green spaces in urban areas enhance the wellbeing of residents. Depleting greenspace will have an adverse impact on health and wellbeing. This will remove a recreational area for locals, in an area where there is nothing for children and young people.</p> <p>Green spaces are becoming less and less but this particular area is one of character and seen as a landmark in the area.</p> <p>Developing this area would have a detrimental effect on the open landscapes that enrich people's lives. People are currently able to connect</p>	<p>There is one public footpath which crosses the site, but otherwise there is no public access to the site which is privately owned. New development will be required to provide areas of open space. This will be accessible to residents of the new development, but also existing residents so providing increased publicly accessible open space.</p> <p>The existing public footpaths are required to be maintained and improved.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>10, 93, 98, 406, 456, 470, 472, 473, 476, 480, 484, 516, 517, 518, 543, 558, 601</p>	<p>Mr Roper, Marcus Clarke, Lindsey Sawbridge, Jo Straw, Gavin & Dawn Bennett, Lynda Stock, Stephen Earnshaw, Katherine Strangeway, Anastasia Davies, Alison Cooper, Megan Hamilton, Grace Hamilton, Helen Hamilton, Garry Hamilton, Robert McNamara, Elizabeth Barham, Jake Danvers</p>

<p>with the countryside, residents from Whitwick access the area via the public footpaths that cross the area. Residents from Coaville can safely access the area over the footbridge. This connection to the countryside would be lost if it was developed.</p>				
<p>Loss of Area of Separation</p>				
<p>The Area of Separation (AoS), formally Green Wedge, should be increased not depleted.</p> <p>The site forms part of precious 'Eastern Green Wedge' which the Council has previously defended at appeal and at Judicial Review. Designation is, therefore, robust.</p> <p>The area identified in the AoS Study as Area A Unit 14 should be included within Policy En5 (AoS). The land plays an important role in maintaining the physical separation, protects identity and prevents coalescence and serves as the gateway for the public to access the land beyond. The public footpath which runs through the plot is a widely used amenity and gives access to the newly planted National Forest areas and paths that weave through Area A.</p> <p>Previous plans concluded that development of C46 would likely have</p>	<p>In approving the current Local Plan, the Local Plan Inspector did not rule out development within the Area of Separation at some future date in the event of increased development needs.</p> <p>The 2022 Area of Separation study identified the area of land covered by C46 as being of Secondary importance to the Area of Separation as whole. This is partly because of the vegetation along the former mineral railway and the adjacent Coalville Rugby Club.</p> <p>The site was not initially proposed to be included in the draft Local Plan, as proposed at the November 2023 meeting of Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>10, 328, 406, 438, 456, 462, 470, 476, 558, 592, 618, 619, 627, 654, 655</p>	<p>Mr Roper, Martin & Linda Quilley, Whitwick Parish Council, Jo Straw, Caroline Bishop, Gavin & Dawn Bennett, Charles Starbuck, Lynda Stock, Anastasia Davies, Elizabeth Barham, Stephen Barham, Sandra Ramp, Darren Ramp, Andrew Lane, Neil Hoult, Linda Hoult</p>

<p>a significant effect on the open character of this part of the AoS also LPC (15/11/2023) states that the allocation of C46 would be somewhat premature.</p>	<p>Committee. However, the Committee considered that the allocation of land at Meadow Lane was not appropriate and therefore it was necessary to consider alternative provision in order to ensure that sufficient housing land was provided. Since then the housing requirement has increased, making it even more important that sufficient sites are identified.</p>			
<p>This site was proposed as an alternative to that at Meadow Lane (C76) but would deliver less housing (266 dwellings).</p> <p>This site is part of the Area of Separation, to which the site makes an important contribution as recognised in the Area of Separation study. Previous planning applications have been refused or withdrawn. Reference is also made to a legal challenge on land elsewhere in the Area of Separation which demonstrates how highly protected and defended the Area of separation has been. Allocating this site instead of Meadow Lane (C76) is irrational.</p>	<p>Whilst there have been previous refusals of planning permission, in approving the current Local Plan the Local Plan Inspector did not rule out development within the Area of Separation at some future date in the event of increased development needs.</p> <p>The 2022 Area of Separation study identified the area of land covered by C46 as being of Secondary importance to the Area of Separation as whole. This is partly because of the vegetation along the former mineral railway and the</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>182</p>	<p>Boyer Planning o/b/o Redrow Homes</p>

	adjacent Coalville Rugby Club.			
Charnwood Forest/National Forest				
<p>C46 is part of the National Forest and Charnwood Forest.</p> <p>The Charnwood Forest has a unique landscape, everything should be done to manage the character, biodiversity, geodiversity, cultural and industrial heritage of the area.</p>	<p>Neither the Charnwood Forest nor the National Forest are factors which in their own right preclude development. The draft policy requires tree planting in accordance with the National Forest policies. Draft Policy En4 requires new development within the Charnwood Forest to take account of this in the design of new developments.</p>	No changes	406, 407	Jo Straw, Angela Burr
Loss of Wildlife Habitat				
<p>There is a variety of wildlife in the area including badgers, foxes and owls and their habitats need to be protected.</p> <p>Development will cause significant harm to the biodiversity in the local area and result in the loss of diverse habitats.</p> <p>The visual aspect will be lost along with the biodiversity of the area.</p>	<p>The draft policy includes specific requirements to support wildlife and habitats, including securing biodiversity net gain improvements in accordance with national requirements and to retain and enhance existing trees and hedgerows within and on the boundaries of the site.</p>	No change	10, 191, 325: 407, 438, 439, 456, 463, 466, 468, 473, 484, 516, 517, 518, 558, 618, 619	Mr Roper, Tereance Crann, Keith Andrews, Angela Burr, Caroline Bishop, Jamie Bishop, Gavin & Dawn Bennett, Joshua Tallett, Deborah Chambers, Kevin Chambers, Katherine Strangeway, Megan Hamilton, Grace Hamilton, Helen Hamilton, Garry

				, Elizabeth Barham, Sandra Ramp, Darren Ramp
Mining Issues				
<p>The site proforma states that the site is unlikely to be affected by land contamination or landfill. However, it is public knowledge that the site has excessive landfill from the underground workings when the pits were in operation. Unsure why there is no valid concern or acknowledgement of this.</p> <p>Question how safe it is for people to live on this landfill or groundworks to take place when the ground has been undisturbed for so many years?</p> <p>There was a stream that ran into a pond before this was backfilled with waste from the pit. Why hasn't a full investigation and analysis of land contamination not taken place?</p>	<p>The Coal Authority has not identified any issues with this site in its response.</p> <p>The site promoter (Barwood) has advised based on a report obtained from the Coal Authority, that there are no significant potential issues associated with the coal mining legacy.</p>	No change	191, 484, 516, 517, 518	Terence Crann, Megan Hamilton, Grace Hamilton, Helen Hamilton, Garry Hamilton
Flooding and drainage				
<p>The area and site is regularly flooded and the area where the houses are to be built has spent most of the autumn/winter under water. The former railway track also floods during heavy rains.</p> <p>Additional development will cause more flooding on site and to nearby</p>	<p>Proposed draft policy AP7 seeks to direct development to areas at least risk of flooding. The site is located within Flood Zone 1, which is the lowest risk area for flooding. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the Local Plan confirms that the</p>	No change	10, 85, 191, 325, 402, 407, 438, 439, 456, 459, 462, 466, 472, 476, 484, 488, 516, 517, 518, 558, 592, 601, 618, 619	Mr Roper, Clifford Mason, Terence Crann, Keith Andrews, Whitwick Parish Council, Angela Burr, Caroline Bishop, Jamie Bishop, Gavin &

<p>properties, with a risk of flooding along the Grace Dieu Valley</p> <p>There doesn't appear to be any plan to deal with excess water or drainage that will no longer be able to drain, and this will only worsen with the impacts of climate change. What infrastructure will be put into place to stop flooding?</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policy AP7 (Flooding).</p> <p>Experts and MPs warn that a lack of resources and time and weak planning rules mean that developments are given the green light despite warnings about flood risk.</p> <p>Green spaces are being concreted over causing flooding issues where there have never been any before.</p>	<p>site satisfies the Sequential Test. The draft policy includes a requirement for the incorporation Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems in order to manage surface water runoff, for example by holding water on site and releasing it at a rate equivalent to a greenfield site.</p> <p>The land promoter has advised that the issue of surface water flooding will be addressed as part of any detailed plans and that they have contacted the Lead Local Flod Authority to discuss solutions.</p>			<p>Dawn Bennett, Richard Billam, Charles Starbuck, Deborah Chambers, Stephen Earnshaw, Anastasia Davies, Megan Hamilton, Charlotte Dolan, Grace Hamilton, Helen Hamilton, Garry Hamilton, Elizabeth Barham, Stephen Barham, Jake Danvers, Sandra Ramp, Darren Ramp</p>
<p>Suggest creating a space between the development and the existing properties of sufficient size to allow the planting of trees to soak up flood water and provide privacy for both areas. Tree planting would be good there without building houses too.</p>	<p>The exact nature and design of any development has yet to be determined.</p>	No change	85, 326, 466	<p>Clifford Mason, Debs Chambers, Deborah Chambers</p>
<p>This site is located in Flood Zone 1.</p>	Noted		404	<p>The Environment Agency</p>
Pollution				
<p>Air quality in the area is awful, one of the worst areas outside of a city in the</p>	<p>The Broom Leys Road junction was until 2022</p>	<p>That the policy be amended to include an additional</p>	<p>10, 85, 93, 326, 328, 406, 438,</p>	<p>Mr Roper, Clifford Mason,</p>

<p>country. The air quality is already at dangerous levels having been proved by studies at Broom Leys traffic lights.</p> <p>Pollution levels would worsen with increased volumes of traffic in the local area, made worse by the proposed works to widen the A511. Need to consider patients at the hospital and children at the local schools.</p>	<p>included in an Air Quality Management Area. However, this was revoked due to improvements in observed data.</p> <p>The Council's Environmental Protection team still monitor the junction, but do not consider that there are any serious concerns. However, it is suggested that any significant planning application be supported by an Air Quality Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The improvements to the Broom Leys Road/A511 junction are currently planned to start in Spring 2025. Any works will be required to comply with appropriate legislation.</p>	<p>requirement for an Air Quality Impact Assessment to be provided as part of any planning application.</p>	<p>439, 456, 463, 466, 468, 472, 476, 484, 516, 517, 518, 543 618, 619</p>	<p>Marcus Clarke, Debs Chambers, Martin & Linda Quilley, Jo Straw, Caroline Bishop, Jamie Bishop, Gavin & Dawn Bennett, Joshua Tallett, Deborah Chambers, Kevin Chambers, Stephen Earnshaw, Anastasia Davies, Megan Hamilton, Grace Hamilton, Helen Hamilton, Garry Hamilton, Robert McNamara, Sandra Ramp, Darren Ramp</p>
Infrastructure				
<p>The infrastructure cannot cope with an additional 1000 people. Schools and GP practices are already beyond capacity. Public transport is poor. There are limited doctors, dentists, secondary schools, police, fire service and waste collections which are all underfunded (although Council Tax keeps rising).</p>	<p>The draft policy requires the provision of S106 contributions towards the cost of a variety of infrastructure. In accordance with national policy, the nature and scale of any planning obligation required has to be related to the scale and type of development</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>85, 93, 325, 326, 328, 407, 438, 456, 459, 470, 471, 472, 558, 592, 601, 618, 619, 654</p>	<p>Clifford Mason, Marcus Clarke, Keith Andrews, Debs Chambers, Martin & Linda Quilley, Angela Burr, Caroline Bishop, Gavin & Dawn Bennett, Richard Billam,</p>

<p>Infrastructure needs to be built or plans on how costs will be covered drawn up. Services needs to be expanded to cope.</p> <p>Extra homes equal a poorer way of life for existing residents. The only provision for additional infrastructure in the Policy is a 'contribution from the developer'.</p>	<p>proposed. This will mean that for larger pieces of infrastructure, such as new schools, it will be necessary for a number of development to contribute towards such infrastructure.</p>			<p>Lynda Stock, Andrew Millard, Stephen Earnshaw, Elizabeth Barham, Stephen Barham, Jake Danvers, Sandra Ramp, Darren Ramp, Neil Hoult</p>
<p>New footpaths are to be provided but there is a lovely footpath there already.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>326, 466</p>	<p>Debs Chambers, Deborah Chambers</p>
<p>Impact on local residents</p>				
<p>Development will result in adverse impacts on people's health, mental health, wellbeing and happiness. Plans will detract from the quality of life of all current and new residents.</p> <p>Development would not result in any benefits to existing neighbourhoods and residents. Building on the land would have a detrimental effect on the existing houses</p> <p>Development would result in the loss of privacy</p>	<p>The Council is under an obligation to ensure that the future housing needs of the district are met. In doing so, new development will be required to ensure that it minimises impact upon exiting residents as far as possible.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>85, 98, 328, 466, 472, 488</p>	<p>Clifford Mason, Lindsey Sawbridge, Martin & Linda Quilley, Deborah Chambers, Stephen Earnshaw, Charlotte Dolan</p>
<p>Other Issues</p>				
<p>Query why development is not directed to prosperous areas in the back gardens of properties in affluent areas.</p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local plans be prepared with the objective of achieving</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>98</p>	<p>Lindsey Sawbridge</p>

	sustainable development. This includes ensuring that proposed locations of development have access to services and facilities.			
Consultation Process				
There are too many documents to read through making it virtually impossible to know what is really going on. People do not have the time or cannot understand them. Disappointed that the consultation has not been advertised or actively notified to residents who would be directly impacted.	The consultation was advertised via the Council's website, whilst all Parish Councils were made aware of the consultation as were any individuals who had previously asked to be notified of any consultations.	No change	294, 476	Peter Kimber, Anastasia Davies
NWLDC should give due time, consideration and acknowledgement to all residents. Planning Committee will be closely scrutinised.	Noted	No change	407	Angela Burr
Fed up with decisions being made by people who have no connection with, or knowledge of the local area. Suggests that these plans would not be passed if they were within the locality of any of the planning committee members homes.	Noted	No change	472	Stephen Earnshaw
NWLDC should not be a dumping area for Leicester City.	Leicester city has identified that it cannot accommodate all its requirement within its boundaries. In accordance with national policies, the Council is under a legal obligation to co-operate with other local authorities across Leicestershire to ensure that	No change	654, 655	Neil Hoult, Linda Hoult

	<p>this need is met. The increase in housing requirements for the district resulting from this is the second lowest of all Leicestershire authorities.</p>			
<p>Impact on Coalville Rugby Club</p>				
<p>The site adjoins Coalville Rugby Club. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, it is necessary to ensure that the operation of the rugby club does not have unreasonable restrictions placed on its operation. An additional requirement which requires details of measures to protect the operation of the rugby club is suggested.</p>	<p>It is agreed that it would be appropriate to include specific wording in the policy to ensure that any development does not adversely impact the operation of the Rugby Club, in accordance with the Agent of Change principle.</p>	<p>That the following additional requirement be included in the policy for this:</p> <p>Details of measures to protect the operation of Coalville Rugby Football Club from any significant adverse effect arising from the siting of this proposed housing development</p>	<p>143</p>	<p>Sport England</p>