

APPENDIX O
CONSULTATION RESPONSES SEEKING ALLOCATION OF LAND OFF STEPHENSON
WAY (C19B)

RESPONSES TO PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: 19	SITE NAME: STEPHENSON GREEN COALVILLE
----------------	------------------------	--

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>Site C19 is being promoted for housing development, particularly bearing in mind that it is located within an existing settlement. Note that the site has been subject to assessment within the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report of Site Options (March 2023) and the Coalville Housing Site Proforma.</p> <p>Various comments were made regarding the Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>Site C19 does not have a significant negative effect against SA2 as it remains perfectly accessible to community facilities via sustainable means of transport. To suggest otherwise is incorrect and inappropriately skews the assessment.</p>	<p>For the reasons set in the Committee report (paragraphs 7.52 to 7.58), it is considered that it would be appropriate to allocate this site.</p> <p>The County Highway Authority have commented that access should be provided from both the A511 (Stephenson Way) and Hall Lane. Therefore, any allocation would need to be subject to a requirement to achieve this in conjunction land off Torrington Avenue/Hall Lane.</p> <p>The Council's Sustainability Appraisal consultants have responded as follows.</p> <p>SA2: This is because of assumptions and SHELAA showing Coalville as beyond reasonable distance. Clear</p>	<p>That land off Stephenson Way (see Appendix V) be proposed to be allocated for around 700 dwellings subject to being developed in conjunction with land off Torrington Avenue/Hall Lane, Whitwick (C19a) and:</p> <p>(A) Securing vehicular access from Stephenson Way through to Hall Lane; and</p> <p>(B) The remainder of the AoS north of the former mineral railway (excluding that occupied by Coalville Rugby Club) being retained as undeveloped land in perpetuity; and</p> <p>The design of any development taking into account the proximity to Coalville</p>	195	Marrons o/b/o William Davis Homes Limited

<p>SA8 relates to reducing the need to travel and increasing the numbers of people walking, cycling or using the bus for their day-to-day travel needs. No explanation is provided to justify this score.</p> <p>SA13 relates to Landscape and a significant negative effect has been recorded. There is no explanation whatsoever within Table 4.1 as to why a significant negative effect has been recorded for this site. An Area of Separation designation does not relate to landscape or townscape quality, sensitivity or value given that Site C19 is, after all, located within the Limits to Development and surrounded by built form on all sides. To adjudge the landscape impacts of such a site coming forward for development as “significantly adverse” is plainly incorrect and cannot be substantiated.</p>	<p>mitigation is set out relating to this, which is not unreasonable given the A511 runs between the site and town centre. It is not possible to include the provision of a GP surgery on site, as the respondent points out that this will be dependent on final site yield.</p> <p>SA8: This is due to some facilities being within 'amber' walking distance from the site, as assessed by the client in SHELAA forms. No change proposed.</p> <p>SA13: Not PDL but within settlement boundary. Score is therefore in line with the assumptions. Should the site be taken forward, mitigation measures and policy would be taken into account in the assessment of an allocation and the residual score might be improved.</p>			
---	--	--	--	--

<p>SA14 relates to ensuring that land is used efficiently and effectively. Site C19 has been assessed as resulting in a significant negative effect in this regard, as have all site options which are not previously developed land and are over 1 hectare in size. This approach, however, ignores the fact that C19 is within the Limits to Development of the Coalville Urban Area as it is surrounded by built form. To put it on the same footing as greenfield land outside of and on the edge of existing settlements in respect of using land efficiently is perverse, particularly when the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to give great weight to the benefits of using land within existing settlements for development.</p> <p>In terms of the site proforma it is noted that the site is assessed as being unlikely to provide opportunity to improve the Green Infrastructure Network. However, the area is of low biodiversity value and limited public access and recreational opportunities. Development could increase the value of this area in respect of both of these.</p>	<p>SA14: Scoring is in line with assumptions. The loss of greenfield land will be permanent and irreversible. No change proposed.</p> <p>The points are noted. It is the case that development would erode a large area of undeveloped land. However, it does need to be recognised that development would provide an opportunity to enhance Green Infrastructure to some degree. Therefore, an amber score would be more appropriate.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Object to the imposition of a restrictive designation such as an Area of Separation that prevents land within an existing and highly-sustainable settlement from coming forward to meet housing needs. A clear and convincing justification is required as part of the plan-making process. The NPPF does not provide a precedent for Area of Separation. The methodology used to assess the Area of Separation is considered to be flawed, for example because no weighting are attached to the criteria and the area largely comprises arable land which are broadly inaccessible.</p> <p>A report is submitted which assesses parts of the proposed AoS</p>	<p>The methodology used to assess and define the Area of Separation is considered to be robust. However, the desirability of maintaining the AoS has to be balanced against the need for new housing and for the Local Plan to be based on a sustainable pattern of development as required by the NPPF.</p>			
<p>Note that Public Rights of Way which cross the site will be potentially impacted</p>	<p>Noted</p>		<p>192</p>	<p>Leicestershire Local Access Forum</p>