

**APPENDIX D**

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SOUTH OF CHURCH LANE, NEW SWANNINGTON  
(C48)**

## RESPONSES TO PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

<b>HOUSING</b>	<b>SITE NUMBER: C48</b>	<b>SITE NAME: South of Church Lane, New Swannington</b>
----------------	-------------------------	---

<b>MAIN ISSUES RAISED</b>	<b>COUNCIL RESPONSE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>RESPONDENTS ID</b>	<b>RESPONDENTS NAME</b>
<b>Principal of Development</b>				
Strongly object to development on the site. No benefit to local residents and will result in the loss of open spaces and greenfields.	The Council is required to allocate sufficient sites to meet the future requirements of the district. The proposed policy for this site seeks to ensure that it is designed and developed in a way that is sympathetic to its surroundings.	No change	63, 71, 75, 81, 86, 97, 98, 267, 297, 298, 340, 360, 393, 395, 398, 400, 403, 507, 514, 520, 544, 600, 609, 610, 628, 633, 640, 642, 644, 649, 654, 655	Neil Riley, Johanna Telford, Mr & Mrs Hopkins, Neil Jefferies, Claire Caulfield, Shirley Brotherhood, Lindsey Sawbridge, Iva Knapcikova, John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Michael & Anita Fletcher, Doreen Pepper, Daniel Wagstaff, Duncan White, Richard Derbyshire, Christine Jorgens, Susan Conti, Stephanie Barker, Karen Harrup, Ellie Leeland, Michael Owens, Matthew

				Tredwell, John Perry, Gail Perry, Sandra McNally, Penny Bass, Felix Bass, Stuart Flude, Taylor J Flude, Christopher Nedza, Neil Hoult, Linda Hoult
Acknowledge that land needs to be allocated for development to meet national and local requirements. However, development should be in the form of pockets of housing rather than sites such as this.  However, this is not the best location, it contradicts Government environmental policy.	The need for new housing nationally is significant as recognised in national policy. If the requirement is to be successfully addressed, then it is necessary to allocate a number of larger sites such as this. However, the draft plan also identifies a number of smaller sites. In all cases it is necessary to be able to demonstrate that what is proposed will be delivered.	No change	81, 254, 514, 654	Neil Jefferies, Stephen Caulfield, Karen Harrup, Neil Hoult
Allocation of C48 does not take into account the provisions of paragraph 74 of the NPPF which identifies factors to be taken into account when considering the allocation of sites for housing development.	Paragraph 74 of the NPPF is concerned with “new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns”. The NPPF does not clarify as to what constitutes significant. Amongst the factors to be considered in identifying sites is reference to sites being of a “size and location [that] will	No change	355	Joanne Lunn

	<p>support a sustainable community with access to services and employment opportunities within the development itself ..... or in larger towns to which there is good access". In this instance the site is located in the Principal Town in the district where there is a good range of services and facilities available, including public transport which passes directly along Thornborough Road.</p>			
<p>There has already been so many houses built in the local area. The number of new homes planned for the area is not proportionate, not in line with local need and will result in mass over development of housing and overcrowding in the local area.</p> <p>There are plenty of properties already available on the market, but people cannot afford them.</p> <p>Coalville should be made fit for purpose before any commitment is made for housing schemes.</p>	<p>As at the 2021 census the Coalville Urban Area was home to 33% of the population, the largest settlement in the district, with a very good range of services and facilities. It is appropriate therefore, that the largest amount of development is directed there.</p> <p>The Council is working with landowners and developers to regenerate the town centre.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>97, 254, 267, 278, 297, 298, 403, 406, 409, 504, 544, 536, 591, 649, 654</p>	<p>Shirley Brotherhood, Stephen Caulfield, Iva Knapcikova, R Hoult, John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Susan Conti, Jo Straw, Andrew Palmer, Jay Rocks, Michael Owens, Brenda Harper, Jessica Curtis, Christopher Nedza, Neil Hoult</p>

Query why development is not directed to prosperous areas in the back gardens of properties in affluent areas.	The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local plans be prepared with the objective of achieving sustainable development. This includes ensuring that proposed locations of development have access to services and facilities.		98	Lindsey Sawbridge
There are areas that could be developed in villages with better services and access to the main road network.	The NPPF seeks to direct development to locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. By their nature, villages do not offer this as they have fewer service and facilities, including less public transport.	No change	254	Stephen Caulfield
Support the proposed allocation which provides an ideal opportunity to continue growth in Coalville and develop a high quality, sustainable residential scheme that could make an important contribution to meeting housing needs as well as helping to ensure the viability of local services and facilities within Coalville. No major comments in respect of the policy requirements.	Noted	No change	147	Gladman Developments Ltd
<b>Impact on Residents</b>				
Adverse impacts on the quality of life, wellbeing and mental health of existing	The Local Plan has to ensure that sufficient housing	No change	86, 98, 254	Claire Caulfield, Lindsey

<p>residents. Development would bring no benefit to existing residents.</p>	<p>provision is made to meet the future needs of the district. However, these have to be balanced against the impact of development on existing communities. The issues listed are largely matters which will depend upon the design of a development. Draft Policy AP2 addresses the potential impact of all new development on the amenity of existing residents and would be applied to any subsequent planning application for development on the site.</p>			<p>Sawbridge, Stephen Caulfield</p>
<p>Development will impact property prices, existing properties will be devalued.</p>	<p>The impact upon the price of existing properties is not a material planning consideration.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>75, 286, 395, 536, 615</p>	<p>Mr &amp; Mrs Hopkins, Chris Jobburn, Duncan White, Brenda Harper, Amy Collis</p>
<p><b>Changes to Settlement Boundaries</b></p>				
<p>Once the boundaries for development are altered there is the risk they will be removed completely until all the countryside has been developed.</p> <p>Inappropriate to move the Limits to Development and include this site before any assessment has been made to ensure suitability, sustainability and achievability.</p>	<p>The plan seeks to strike a balance between identifying sufficient land to meet future housing needs, whilst also protecting the vast majority of land as countryside</p> <p>The suitability of the site has been assessed through an independent Sustainability Appraisal which considered a</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>297, 355, 649</p>	<p>John Fleming, Joanne Lunn, Christopher Nedza</p>

	wide range of factors. In addition, officers have assessed the site in terms of its deliverability. All of this information was published as part of the consultation.			
<b>Previous Application</b>				
<p>Previous application (16/01407/OUTM) was refused on the site on various grounds, including: it is outside the Limits to Development and within countryside, it would not represent sustainable development and was not in conformity with the NPPF.</p> <p>Nothing has changed to warrant further applications. Local residents still oppose development in this location.</p> <p>The huge amount of local objection to the previous application should be taken into account against this proposal].</p>	<p>The previous planning application which was refused in the context of the adopted Local Plan which allocated sufficient land elsewhere for the period up to 2031. The new plan will go to 2042 and needs to identify new sites to accommodate the housing requirement which are now significantly higher than in the adopted Local Plan.</p>	No change	63, 81, 262, 297, 298, 355, 403, 544, 615, 631, 649	Neil Riley, Neil Jefferies, CH Kyriakou, John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Joanne Lunn, Susan Conti, Michael Owens, Amy Collis, Stuart Jobburn, Christopher Nedza
<b>Brownfield Land</b>				
<p>Brownfield sites should be considered first before carving up the countryside.</p> <p>Redeveloping brownfield sites is more sustainable. There is the Prince of Wales, the land on High Street and the Old Bakehouse sites that should be considered before any other sites.</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</p>	No change	81, 297, 298, 407, 649, 655	Neil Jefferies, John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Angela Burr, Christopher Nedza, Linda Hoult

<p>Efforts should focus on brownfield redevelopment, urban infill and sustainable housing initiatives.</p> <p>By repurposing existing urban areas and promoting smart growth policies housing needs can be met without sacrificing precious green spaces.</p>	<p>being redeveloped for housing, including the former Snibston Discovery park and Workspace 17. The amount of new housing that needs to be provided for is such that it is necessary to allocate greenfield sites for development.</p>			
<b>Visual Impact</b>				
<p>Development would impact the visual nature of the Parish, irrevocably alter the landscape and diminish the scenic value and rural aspect that makes the area unique. It would also impact upon residential amenity a result of overshadowing.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Settlement Fringe Assessment (March 2010) - as no more recent assessment is available. Sites west of Coalville (inc. C48) had the highest score for landscape and visual quality and as such would be the least suitable place for development of all the fringes around Coalville</p>	<p>A Landscape Sensitivity Study of 2022 was available on the Council's website at the time of the consultation. This identifies the site as being medium in respect of landscape sensitivity and medium-high in respect of visual sensitivity, similar to most other sites that have been put forward for development in the Coalville Urban Area. The Sustainability Appraisal assesses the site as having a significant negative score, as do the vast majority of sites around the Coalville Urban Area.</p> <p>The relationship between any proposed development and existing properties will be assessed as part of a planning application.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>71, 75, 81, 267, 278, 286, 289, 297, 355, 393, 395, 398, 399, 536, 615, 628, 631, 633, 649</p>	<p>Johanna Telford, Mr &amp; Mrs Hopkins, Neil Jefferies, Iva Knapcikova, R Hoult: Chris Jobburn, Swannington Parish Council, John Fleming, Daniel Wagstaff, Joanne Lunn, Duncan White, Richard Derbyshire, Alexandra Derbyshire, Brenda Harper, Amy Collis, Sandra McNally, Stuart Jobburn, Penny Bass, Christopher Nedza</p>



<b>Loss of Agricultural Land</b>				
<p>Object in principle to the loss of agricultural land. The land is actively farmed. Farming land should be retained for producing food for current and future generations.</p> <p>Much needed agricultural land should be safeguarded. The Government talks about the importance of food security and therefore development would be against Government guidelines.</p>	<p>Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land is defined as Classes 1,2 and 3a. Natural England's Provisional Agricultural Land Classification map record the site as being Grade 3. It is not clear, therefore, whether or not BMV would be affected. Generally speaking, 20 or more hectares is generally considered to be significant, the term used in the NPPF. This is more than the proposed site. Therefore, if the site was to be assumed as all being Grade 3a (and it might not), the loss would not be significant. The NPPF advises that it is necessary to consider the loss of agricultural land against other policy considerations. In this instance the loss of agricultural land has to be weighed against the need for new housing.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>63, 81, 86, 340, 355, 398, 399, 513, 569, 591, 402, 633, 640</p>	<p>Neil Riley, Neil Jefferies, Claire Caulfield, Michael &amp; Anita Fletcher, Joanne Lunn, Richard Derbyshire, Alexandra Derbyshire, Kirsty Marriott, Phil Ellis, Jessica Curtis, Whitwick Parish Council, Penny Bass, Felix Bass</p>
<b>Loss of Greenspace</b>				
<p>Object to the loss of greenspace which are essential for maintaining the natural beauty of the area and for residents' enjoyment, positive mental health and the well-being of</p>	<p>The plan has to strike a balance between meeting future development needs and protecting key environmental features. The</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>71, 75, 81, 86, 98, 254, 267, 286, 297, 298, 360, 398, 399, 403, 406, 513,</p>	<p>Johanna Telford, Mr &amp; Mrs Hopkins, Neil Jefferies, Claire Caulfield,</p>

<p>communities. Their loss will be detrimental to the environment and their preservation must be prioritised for the benefit of all</p> <p>Contradicts the current demands to 'protect our planet'.</p> <p>Mature trees and hedgerows will be lost. There are Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) on site and natural water springs.</p>	<p>land in question is not subject to any statutory designations. Whilst there is some public access via public footpaths, the majority of the land is not publicly accessible. Any development will need to incorporate appropriate provision of greenspaces. This will benefit not only residents of the new development, but also residents from nearby areas.</p> <p>Any trees protected under a Tree Preservation Order would remain protected in accordance with the appropriate legislation.</p>		<p>520, 563, 595, 600, 609, 610, 611, 633, 649, 654</p>	<p>Lindsey Sawbridge, Stephen Caulfield, Iva Knapcikova, Chris Jobburn, John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Doreen Pepper, Richard Derbyshire, Alexandra Derbyshire, Susan Conti, Jo Straw, Kirsty Marriott, Ellie Leeland, Phillip Hopkins, Angela Tredwell, Matthew Tredwell, John Perry, Gail Perry, Liam Perry, Penny Bass, Christopher Nedza, Neil Hoult</p>
<b>Loss of Countryside</b>				
<p>The area should be protected under Policy S3. The site is designated as Countryside in the Local Plan (and it does not fall within exceptions of Policy S5 of the draft LP)</p>	<p>The protection of areas of countryside has to be a balanced against the need to address future housing requirements through the allocation of land for development. The proposed</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>81, 355, 402, 403, 536</p>	<p>Neil Jefferies, Joanne Lunn, Whitwick Parish Council, Susan Conti, Brenda Harper</p>

<p>There has to be a balance of open space and housing. Councillors are temporary custodians of the countryside and should respect residents' opinions.</p>	<p>site is in a sustainable location which is well related to services and facilities. Any proposed development is required to incorporate open spaces and tree planting.</p>			
<p><b>Loss of Green Wedge/Area of Separation and settlement identity</b></p>				
<p>Loss of land formerly designated as Green Wedge or Area of Separation and as a Countryside Priority Area. The land is an important Green Wedge between Whitwick, New Swannington and Swannington., without which there will be no separation.</p> <p>A Green Wedge needs to remain in place along the western Limits of the Parish to retain character.</p> <p>Site has not been assessed as to whether it should be designated as an Area of Separation. If it was assessed, it would be found to provide separation between Coalville and Whitwick.</p> <p>Council are renegeing on its commitment to maintain these Areas of Separation. Once their value is lost it can never be reversed.</p>	<p>The land in question was identified as Green Wedge in the Local Plan of 2002. However, in the adopted Local Plan, the site is identified as countryside. Similarly, the Countryside Priority Area was a policy of the 2003 Local Plan, which was not taken forward in the adopted Local Plan. In preparing a new Local Plan, the Council has to have regard to wide range of factors, including the need to identify sites for housing development to meet the future needs of the district.</p> <p>There will still be a significant gap between Swannington and this part of the Coalville Urban Area. However, the proposed policy could be strengthened to make it clear that there should be significant landscaping and</p>	<p>That an additional requirement be included to state:</p> <p>“A comprehensive landscaping scheme, particularly along the western boundary of the site, to help mitigate the visual impacts of development and to enhance the visual separation to Swannington”</p>	<p>63, 75, 81, 262, 297,298, 355, 398, 399, 403, 406, 536, 595, 649, 654, 655</p>	<p>Neil Riley, Neil Jefferies, Mr &amp; Mrs Hopkins, CH Kyriakou, John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Joanne Lunn, Richard Derbyshire, Alexandra, Derbyshire, Brenda Harper, Angela Tredwell, Christopher Nedza, Susan Conti, Jo Straw, Neil Hoult, Linda Hoult</p>

	<p>tree planting along the western boundary of the site.</p> <p>Areas of Separation are restricted to large open areas within the built-up area. This site is not within the built-up area, but on the edge of.</p>			
<b>National Forest/Charnwood Forest</b>				
<p>Development will encroach into areas designated as National Forest and Charnwood Forest. The Charnwood Forest has a unique landscape, and 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 change	81, 355, 407, 536	Neil Jefferies, Joanne Lunn, Angela Burr, Brenda Harper
<b>Loss of Wildlife Habitat/Biodiversity</b>				
<p>Fields are extensively populated by multiple wild birds and a variety of other wildlife such as bats, foxes and rabbits.</p> <p>Development will endanger wildlife habitats and local ecosystems and diminish the biodiversity that thrives within them.</p>	<p>Other policies of the plan include 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	63, 71, 75, 81, 97, 254, 267, 278, 279, 286, 297, 298, 355, 360, 378, 397, 395, 398, 399, 407, 507, 513, 514, 520, 536, 587, 591, 609, 610, 611, 628, 631, 633, 642, 644, 648, 649	Neil Riley, Johanna Telford, Mr & Mrs Hopkins, Neil Jefferies, Shirley Brotherhood, Stephen Caulfield, Iva Knapcikova: R Houlton, Paul Burton, Chris Jobburn, John

				Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Joanne Lunn, Doreen Pepper, Leanne Flude, Pat McReynolds, Richard Derbyshire, Alexandra Derbyshire, Angela Burr, Stephanie Barker, Kirsty Marriott, Karen Harrup, Ellie Leeland, Brenda Harper, Barry Beniston, Jessica Curtis, John Perry, Gail Perry, Liam Perry, Sandra McNally, Stuart Jobburn, Penny Bass, Stuart Flude, Taylor J Flude, Graham Bass, Christopher Nedza
<b>Flooding and drainage</b>				
The area is susceptible to flooding. Large ponds have formed on the site and remained all through the winter.	Proposed draft policy AP7 seeks to direct development to areas at least risk of	No change	63, 81: 97, 278, 297, 298, 337, 338, 360, 378,	Neil Riley, Neil Jefferies, Shirley Brotherhood, R

<p>The situation is made worse by the geological ground make up of impermeable clay.</p> <p>Development will reduce natural drainage and increase the risk of flooding, even if SUDs schemes are provided as local watercourses are minimal. Excess water will be forced to Thringstone, an area that already suffers with flooding.</p> <p>Drainage gets blocked due to Victorian piping. The drains will become overwhelmed.</p>	<p>flooding. The site is located within Flood Zone 1, which is the lowest risk area for flooding. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the Local Plan confirms that the site satisfies the Sequential Test.</p> <p>The SFRA also identifies that the site is within area with low permeability. However, 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 Lead Local flood Authority did not raise any objection to a previous application (16/01407) which was refused for other reasons.</p>		<p>393, 397, 398: 399, 400: 403, 406, 407, 507, 523, 587, 591, 609, 610, 611, 631,633: 640, 642, 644, 648: 649</p>	<p>Hoult, John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Deb Unwin, Richard Unwin, Doreen Pepper, Leanne Flude,</p> <p>Daniel Wagstaff, Pat McReynolds, Richard Derbyshire, Alexandra Derbyshire, Christine Jorgens, Susan Conti, Jo Straw, Angela Burr, Stephanie Barker, Kathy Rocks, Barry Beniston, Jessica Curtis, John Perry, Gail Perry, Liam Perry, Stuart Jobburn, Penny Bass, Felix Bass, Stuart Flude, Taylor J Flude, Graham Bass Christopher Nedza</p>
--	---	--	--	--

This site is located in Flood Zone 1.	Noted	No change	404	The Environment Agency
<b>Flooding to Property</b>				
<p>The fields retain water which results in properties being flooded. Flooding with sewage water also an issue. Residents have had to use pumps to keep water away from their properties.</p> <p>The water does not drain away fast enough and the road outside is higher than the kerb level.</p> <p>Development may further increase the risk of properties flooding.</p> <p>The area around the corner shop is identified as 'high risk' on the Government's website].</p>	<p>A report from Leicestershire County Council in respect of flooding in 2017 identified that one property on the east side of Thornborough Road (i.e. the opposite of the proposed development) was flooded as a result of a combination of the location of the property at a low level, heavy rainfall resulting in saturated ground and a blocked outfall.</p> <p>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>	No change	279, 286, 402, 406, 523, 587, 631	Paul Burton, Chris Jobburn, Whitwick Parish Council, Jo Straw, Kathy Rocks, Barry Beniston, Stuart Jobburn
Development would pollute the waterways.	Any development will be required to incorporate appropriate measures to ensure that existing watercourses are protected from pollution.	No change	97	Shirley Brotherhood

<b>Subsidence/Mining land</b>				
<p>The land has previously been mined. Query the stability of the land and the underground support the houses might need. Subsidence has been experienced in a number of existing properties.</p> <p>The Thringstone fault runs through part of the site and there are disused mine shafts on the site.</p>	<p>The Coal Authority has not identified any issues with this site in its response.</p> <p>A previous planning application on the site (16/01407/OUTM) included a Phase 1 Desk Based Study assessing the potential hazards / contamination risks. This concluded, amongst others, that no further investigation or remediation was necessary with regard to coal mining issues at that time. It also noted that the Coal Authority had indicated that any ground movements due to coal mining should have stopped.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>63, 278, 279, 402, 513, 640, 648</p>	<p>Johanna Telford, R Hault, Paul Burton, Whitwick Parish Council, Kirsty Marriott, Felix Bass, Graham Bass</p>
<p>The site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for coal. Any allocation would need to take account of the viability of the extraction of the mineral resources in line with policy M11 of the LMWLP.</p>	<p>The site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for coal. The Leicestershire Waste and Minerals Plan which forms part of the Development Plan for the area, requires that account be taken of the viability of the extraction of the mineral resource. It would be appropriate to include an additional requirement in the policy.</p>	<p>That the following requirement be included as part of the site allocation policy:</p> <p>Provision of a Mineral Assessment for at or near surface coal</p>	<p>341, 355</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council, Joanne Lunn</p>



<b>New Swannington Primary School</b>				
<p>New Swannington Primary School has very limited access, space for passing, extensive double parking and extremely narrow walkways causing extreme risk of accidents for both pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The situation would not be solved by additional access to any new housing development as Church Lane would still be used as the primary access for the school increasing the risk of accidents.</p> <p>No parking included for a car park for the school. If development goes ahead the opportunity should be taken to mitigate existing school traffic problems with turning area/parking spaces on Church Lane].</p>	<p>The previous planning application on the site (16/01407/OUTM) included provision of car park to serve the school. However, this is not something that could be specifically required as part of any development.</p> <p>In its response to the consultation on the draft Local Plan, the County Highway authority has advised that the issue of access to this site should be considered in junction with the proposed West of Whitwick Broad Location. It is understood that the site promoter has agreed to do this.</p>	No change	63, 97, 286, 289, 337, 338, 378, 395, 398, 399, 569, 631	Neil Riley, Shirley Brotherhood, Chris Jobburn, Swannington Parish Council, Deb Unwin, Richard Unwin, Leanne Flude, Duncan White, Richard Derbyshire, Alexandra Derbyshire, Phil Ellis, Stuart Jobburn
<b>Accessibility to Facilities</b>				
Limited facilities in the area: The nearest secondary schools are 2 miles away and doctors' surgery a mile away making accessibility for this location an issue.	The site is well located in respect of access to public transport, primary school, leisure facilities (including the new leisure centre), shops (including two supermarkets) and also Stephenson College.	No change	81	Neil Jefferies
<b>Infrastructure</b>				
No capacity at local schools, a similar situation for local doctors, dentists, shops and many other services	The need to contribute towards the cost of additional infrastructure is recognised in	No change	63, 81, 97, 254, 286, 297, 298, 337, 338, 355,	Neil Riley, Neil Jefferies, Shirley Brotherhood,

<p>including public transport, sewage and wastewater which is already under resourced.</p> <p>Not enough jobs or entertainment.</p> <p>Development would put a strain on utilities.</p>	<p>the draft policy. A draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies that this site will be required to contribute towards the provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary education,</li> <li>• Secondary education,</li> <li>• Healthcare,</li> <li>• Policing and</li> <li>• A variety of Green Infrastructure</li> </ul> <p>Further work will be undertaken to address what contributions are required in respect of transport (including public transport), as well as any impact upon viability of development.</p>		<p>360, 378, 393, 397, 398, 400, 402, 406, 407, 409, 504, 513, 520, 523, 536, 544, 587, 591, 609, 610, 611, 628, 631, 633, 640, 642, 644, 648, 649, 654</p>	<p>Stephen Caulfield, Chris Jobburn, John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Deb Unwin, Richard Unwin, Joanne Lunn, Doreen Pepper, Leanne Flude, Daniel Wagstaff, Pat McReynolds, Richard Derbyshire, Christine Jorgens, Whitwick Parish Council, Jo Straw, Angela Burr, Andrew Palmer, Jay Rocks, Kirsty Marriott, Ellie Leeland, Kathy Rocks, Brenda Harper, Michael Owens, Barry Beniston, Jessica Curtis, John Perry, Gail Perry, Liam Perry, Sandra McNally, Stuart Jobburn, Penny</p>
---	--	--	---	---

				Bass, Felix Bass, Stuart Flude, Taylor J Flude, Graham Bass, Christopher Nedza, Neil Hoult
<b>Traffic and highways</b>				
<p>Area lacks any major roads to cope with increased traffic. More logical to concentrate development in areas which have access to major roads and/or bypasses.</p> <p>There will be increased levels of traffic on already very narrow and congested roads that are not designed or built for heavy traffic. Concern for the safety of residents, road users and pedestrians. Church Lane is especially difficult at school times and there have been minor traffic accidents and near misses or cars with pedestrians. A number of other roads including Thornborough Road, Spring Lane and Brooks Lane are very busy and so additional development would result in gridlock.</p> <p>A number of junctions in the wider area, including the A511 roundabout, Spring Lane, The Dumps and Silver Street, are busy and difficult. New traffic signals will be needed at Spring</p>	<p>In its response to the consultation on the draft Local Plan, the County Highway authority has advised that the issue of access to this site should be considered in junction with the proposed West of Whitwick Broad Location. It is understood that the site promoter has agreed to do this.</p> <p>Further detailed transport modelling will be undertaken to inform the final version of the plan.</p>	No change	63, 75, 81, 86, 97, 254, 258, 262, 267, 278, 286, 289, 297, 298, 337, 338, 340, 360, 378, 393, 395, 397, 398, 399, 400, 402, 403, 406, 409, 491, 504, 507, 514, 523, 536, 544, 563, 569, 587, 591, 615, 628, 631, 633, 640, 642, 644, 648, 649, 655	Neil Riley, Mr & Mrs Hopkins, Neil Jefferies, Claire Caulfield, Shirley Brotherhood, Stephen Caulfield, Sue Kyriakou, CH Kyriakou, Iva Knapcikova, R Hoult, Chris Jobburn, Swannington Parish Council, John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Deb Unwin, Richard Unwin, Michael & Anita Fletcher, Doreen Pepper, Leanne Flude, Daniel Wagstaff, Duncan White, Pat McReynolds, Richard

<p>Lane/Thornborough Road junction given visibility problems. Has the proposed upgrade to the Thornborough Road roundabout taken into account increased traffic flows from both C48 and the west of Whitwick allocation?</p> <p>The local bus route does not service the area very well, so people are more dependent on cars.</p>	<p>A number of bus services currently pass along Thornborough Road, including direct services to Coalville Town Centre, Loughborough, Leicester, East Midlands Airport and Nottingham.</p>			<p>Derbyshire, Alexandra Derbyshire, Christine Jorgens, Whitwick Parish Council, Susan Conti, Jo Straw, Andrew Palmer, Janet Shaw, Jay Rocks, Stephanie Barker, Karen Harrup, Kathy Rocks, Brenda Harper, Michael Owens, Phillip Hopkins, Phil Ellis, Barry Beniston, Jessica Curtis, Amy Collis, Sandra McNally, Stuart Jobburn, Penny Bass, Felix Bass, Stuart Flude, Taylor J Flude, Graham Bass, Christopher Nedza, Linda Hoult</p>
<p>(Highways) Query as to why this site is not included as part of the west of Whitwick Broad Location. This would</p>	<p>At the time that the draft plan was prepared those sites that comprise the West of</p>	<p>That the following be added to the list of requirements:</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>

<p>provide an opportunity for a comprehensive, master planned approach which could help overcome some of the transport challenges in this location.</p>	<p>Whitwick Broad Location were being promoted separately from each other and this site. Since then, it has become apparent that most of the West of Whitwick Broad Location and this site are largely in the control of one site promoter (Gladman Developments). As a result, there is now significant confidence that this site could be brought forward for development.</p> <p>Whilst it still appropriate to maintain this site as a separate entity, it would be appropriate to ensure that any future development is co-ordinated with development of the West of Whitwick site.</p>	<p>Co-ordinate development with land West of Whitwick (C47, C77, C78, C81 and C86), particularly in respect of vehicular access and design and layout.</p>		
<b>Parking</b>				
<p>There are existing parking issues on local roads, any increase in traffic would cause further parking issues, particularly along Church Lane which would become dangerous for pedestrians.</p> <p>New developments never provide enough parking spaces encouraging people to park in potentially dangerous spots and along pavements.</p>	<p>Further detailed transport modelling will be undertaken to inform the final version of the plan, which will need to consider the impact upon the existing highway network.</p> <p>The requirements for parking provision are established by Leicestershire County Council as the Highway</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>75, 81, 633, 640, 648</p>	<p>Mr &amp; Mrs Hopkins, Neil Jefferies, Penny Bass, Felix Bass, Graham Bass</p>

	Authority. These require a minimum of 2 spaces per dwelling, with 3 for properties with 4 or more bedrooms.			
<b>Public Rights of Way/Recreation</b>				
<p>There are multiple well used public rights of way across the site that would be greatly affected or lost.</p> <p>Footpaths would not be accessible during construction.</p> <p>Will reduce access to the countryside for local residents. This contradicts Local Plan Policy on Health and Wellbeing.</p>	<p>The draft policy requires that existing public rights of way N43, O12 and O13 which cross the site are retained and enhanced, so ensuring that they are accessible to local residents. They will also maintain access to the wider countryside.</p>	No change	63, 81, 86, 262, 267, 286, 289, 298, 355, 395, 513, 649	<p>Neil Riley, Neil Jefferies, Claire Caulfield, CH Kyriakou, Iva Knapcikova, Chris Jobburn, Swannington Parish Council,</p> <p>Rhiannon Fleming, Joanne Lunn, Duncan White, Kirsty Marriott, Christopher Nedza</p>
<p>Note that there is the potential for a number of Public Rights of Way to be impacted by development of this site.</p>	<p>There are four rights of way which affect this site (N3, N36, O14 and O15). This is reflected in the wording of the draft policy which requires that they be retained and enhanced.</p>	No change	192	Leicestershire Access Forum
<b>Pollution</b>				
<p>There would be increased levels of pollution including noise, air, and dust pollution that would not only occur during development but afterwards. This would have negative and</p>	<p>Any proposed development will be required to comply with other policies of the plan which seek to ensure that the amenity of existing and future residents is minimised.</p>	No change	63, 71, 75, 262, 267, 278, 297, 298, 393, 514, 615, 631, 649	<p>Neil Riley, Johanna Telford, Mr &amp; Mrs Hopkins, CH Kyriakou, Iva Knapcikova, R</p>

<p>unacceptable impacts on residents' health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Increases in emissions from cars will contribute to climate change, exacerbating global environmental challenges.</p>				<p>Hoult, John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Daniel Wagstaff, Karen Harrup, Amy Collis, Stuart Jobburn, Christopher Nedza</p>
<b>Other Issues</b>				
<b>Consultation</b>				
<p>Residents have not been made aware of the proposals. The Council has failed to consult the affected population.</p> <p>Consultation was not conducted with inclusivity in mind, the Council needs to review its processes for engaging with the public.</p> <p>All local residents should be informed and granted an extension to respond to the consultation. The online response form was confusing, overly detailed and not fit for purpose.</p>	<p>The consultation was advertised on the Council's website and via Parish and Town Councils, whilst those already on the Council's consultation database were contacted directly. Over 600 responses were received to the consultation, of which 79% were from local residents or businesses.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>63, 75, 86, 254, 403</p>	<p>Neil Riley, Mr &amp; Mrs Hopkins, Claire Caulfield, Stephen Caulfield, Susan Conti</p>
<b>Resident Opinion</b>				
<p>Local residents have previously rallied to ensure green belt land is protected and to be faced with the same battles shows a complete lack of consideration for the wishes and needs of the local community.</p>	<p>The Council is legally required to prepare a Local Plan that addresses the future needs of the district.</p> <p>This includes where development should take</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>297, 298, 504, 536, 544, 600, 649</p>	<p>John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Jay Rocks, Brenda Harper, Michael Owens, Matthew Tredwell,</p>

<p>It is NWLDC Policy to 'protect and seek to improve things that are important to local people' as such due consideration must be shown to previous campaigns to ensure greenbelt is not lost.</p> <p>Development would undermine previous work in protecting our green spaces and would show an utter disregard for the opinions, values and efforts of local residents who have sought to preserve the remaining countryside. Consideration must be given to previous campaigns to ensure the land is not developed.</p> <p>Major over commitment by the council to tick Government boxes that takes no account of existing residents.</p>	<p>place having regard to a range of planning considerations. A failure to make the necessary provision will leave the Council vulnerable to speculative planning applications.</p>			<p>Christopher Nedza</p>
<p>NWLDC should give due time, consideration and acknowledgement to all residents.</p>	<p>The Council is required to have regard to comments made in response to any consultation.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>407</p>	<p>Angela Burr</p>
<p><b>Unmet Need for Leicester City</b></p>				
<p>Concerned that the sites in and around Whitwick are only being included in the Local Plan because Leicester City have major problems with their housing plans.</p> <p>Have you informed local people that you have promised 7,000 houses to be taken from Leicester County Council?</p>	<p>The Council is under a Duty to Cooperate with the other Leicestershire authorities to ensure that all the housing needs of Leicester and Leicestershire are met. Leicester City is unable to meet all of its needs and so its necessary for other</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>609, 610, 654, 655</p>	<p>John Perry, Gail Perry, Neil Hoult, Linda Hoult</p>



	authorities to make provision over and above their own needs. This was agreed through a Statement of Common Ground signed off by the Council in September 2022			
<b>Miscellaneous</b>				
Believes there are restrictive covenants on land behind 234 Church Lane.	234 Church Lane does not adjoin the site	No change	544	Michael Owens
SHELAA 2021 allocates C48 a timeframe of 11-20 years and as such the site shouldn't be included in the Local Plan, certainly not without an up-to-date re-assessment.	The SHELAA is part of the evidence base to inform the Local Plan, but of itself it does not determine the planning status of any specific site. The SHELAA provides only an indicative timeframe for possible development. As part of the Local Plan it will be necessary to prepare a housing trajectory to show when sites are likely to be developed.	No change	355	Joanne Lunn
The Draft Local Plan has not been updated to reflect changes to the NPPF and is based on a NPPF before the NPPF dated December 2023.	The Local Plan will be updated to take account of any changes to the NPPF or other changes as part of the Regulation 19 plan.	No change	355	Joanne Lunn
The new LP should recognise that Whitwick is a sustainable village in its own right. It should not be considered as part of the Coalville Urban Area.	The Coalville Urban Area is comprised of different settlements which together function as one, with a good range of services and	No change	406, 600	Jo Straw, Matthew Tredwell

<p>Whitwick is not an Urban Area of Coalville.</p>	<p>facilities spread throughout the urban area which meet most of the day-to-day needs of residents.</p> <p>There are a good range of services and facilities available within, or close to, Whitwick which mean it is much more sustainable and hence a location for new development, than Sustainable Villages, which by their nature are smaller, stand alone and with fewer facilities.</p>			
<p>Due to the extremely high development costs of the site, it would end up being developed by a Housing Association or charity due to development grants being available. The Whitwick/Thringstone area does not need any further social housing as it is considered a deprived area and development of this nature would exacerbate existing problems.</p>	<p>There is no suggestion at this time that the site would not be viable. It is understood that part of the site is controlled by a housing association, but the vast majority is controlled by another site promoter. Any future development will include a mix of tenures and house types.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>609, 610</p>	<p>John Perry, Gail Perry</p>
<p>Very close to Swannington Incline, an important historical landmark in the area. If the site is developed the land up to the Incline should be designated as an Area of Separation between Whitwick and Swannington.</p>	<p>Other policies of the plan seek to ensure that due regard is paid to heritage features. It is not necessary to repeat them in every site policy.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>262, 289, 569</p>	<p>CH Kyriakou, Swannington Parish Council, Phil Ellis</p>