

MINUTES of a meeting of the LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE held in the Forest Room, Stenson House, London Road, Coalville, LE67 3FN on MONDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2024

Present: Councillor J G Simmons (Chair)

Councillors M Ball, D Bigby, S Lambeth, J Legrys, R L Morris, P Moulton, C A Sewell, L Windram and M B Wyatt

In attendance: Councillors A Barker, R Johnson, K Merrie and G Rogers

Officers: Mr I Nelson, Mr C Elston, Mr D Gill, Ms B Leonard, Mr T Devonshire and Ms S Lee

24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor P Lees.

25 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor R Blunt declared a registerable, pecuniary interest, in respect of item 6; he would leave the room for the duration of the item.

In respect of various sites as discussed in items 5 and 6 on the agenda, the following Members declared that they had been lobbied without influence and had come to the meeting with an open mind:

Councillors M Ball, J Legrys, R Morris, P Moulton, C Sewell, JG Simmons, and M Wyatt.

26 PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

The Chair read out a statement, stressing that the Local Plan drafting process was evidence led, and though some of the decisions to be made at the meeting could be controversial or emotive, she called for a civil and amicable debate.

There were four questions asked which set out below together with the responses. Each member of the public who asked a question was invited by the Chair to ask one supplementary question which is also set out together with the response.

Question from Mr J Perry:

“If the Broad Location, C 47/C 81 etc, remains in the Local Plan I am assuming considerations re: access issues (roads) have already been resolved. Based on the anticipated number of houses to be built there may be in excess of 1,000 additional vehicles on those roads. This would render the use of Church Lane as the sole exit impractical & unrealistic.

In my assessment, to satisfy adequate access requirements, the construction of a major road through C48 will be required. This road would then have to cross Church Lane into any planned development.

My question: if this is the case will that road be contained within the proposed development C 47/ C 81.”

Chair's initials

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee:

“The County Highway Authority in their response to the draft Local Plan advised that access to this site should be considered in conjunction with site C48 off Thornborough Road. The site promoter is currently looking at this, but the exact details have yet to be determined but it would suggest that there would be some possible form of connection between the two sites across Church Lane.”

The supplementary question asked if in the future the agreed access arrangements for the broad location at West Whitwick were amended, would this be subject to further public consultation.

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager advised that the matter of access at the West Whitwick sites would be considered at that point if necessary, but there would be a second, more bespoke round of consultation as part of the wider Local Plan drafting process anyway.

Question from Mr P Philips:

“Officers and Members will now be well aware of a growing feeling among the community that public consultation was inadequate in the case of West Whitwick Valley being included for housing development in the proposed Local Plan. This is evidenced by the fact that the majority of those most affected by this inclusion had no knowledge of either the proposal or the consultation until after the consultation closing date. It is noted that in the past consultations have been sent to individual households for far less significant development proposals. In the interest of fairness, transparency and reasonableness, all of which the Council is clearly signed up to delivering, is it agreed that a second public consultation is appropriate in this case, ensuring those most effected are properly and clearly notified”

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee:

“In preparing a Local Plan there is no requirement unlike with planning applications, to consult with individual households in the vicinity of any proposed development site. The approach to the consultation was consistent with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement.

The decision to consult on the draft Local Plan was made at the Council’s Local Plan Committee on 17 January 2024. This was a public meeting which was also streamed live. The report to the 17 January meeting specifically noted that the contents of the draft Plan would be consulted upon for a six-week period, which subsequently took place between 5 February 2024 and 17 March 2024

Information about the consultation, including what was proposed, was on the Council’s website, together with details of the consultation period and how to respond, as well as where public drop-in sessions were taking place. One such drop-in session was for the wider Coalville area at the New Life Church in Margaret Street Coalville on 12 February 2024. In addition, messages were also put out via social media and the local press. The Council also consulted directly with all Parish Councils.

As can be seen from Table 1 of item 5, the number of responses to the proposed West of Whitwick Broad Location was only bettered by that in respect of the proposed new settlement. This would suggest, therefore, that people were aware of the draft Plan.”

The supplementary question reiterated the suggestion that the consultation had been inadequately publicised and asked how many submitted petitions would stimulate another consultation regarding the proposed site at West Whitwick.

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager said there was no threshold as such for petitions, and noted that the West Whitwick site had received the second highest amount of responses to the original round of consultation, which indicated that the consultation had been sufficiently publicised.

Question from Mrs G Armston

“I refer to the West Whitwick proposal to build 500 houses from New Swannington to Talbot Lane and a further 300 houses on Thornborough Road.

In order for the for the Broad Location to be included in the Local Plan, the Limits of Development will have to be moved. Will this be limited to the edge of the proposed development i.e. C81/47?”

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee:

“As part of the draft Plan we did publish proposed changes to the Limits to Development. In respect of the West of Whitwick Broad Location, the proposal was to include all of the site, but no other change was proposed. A review of the Limits to Development, including considering any consultation responses received, will be the subject of a report to a future meeting of the Local Plan Committee.”

The Supplementary question asked about plans for further consultation and the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager reiterated that there would be a second round of consultation, though he also noted that this would be more bespoke than the first round of consultation.

Question from Mr C Taylor:

“The Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs has stated “I am delighted to be appointed as Environmental Secretary. I look forward to tackling the important issues facing our rural communities including championing British food, protecting people from flooding and improving the environment.” Considering these priorities, how does the Council justify the proposed development on the West Whitwick Valley, given its impact on agricultural land, flood risk and local biodiversity?”

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee:

“The Local Plan has to seek to reconcile a number of competing demands. This includes reconciling the need for new development with the need to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land whilst also ensuring that new

development does not exacerbate flooding and making provision for biodiversity net gain.

The Government has made it clear that local plans must address the need for new housing, with a national target of 1.5 million new homes being required over the next five years. A failure to make sufficient provision will almost certainly result in the Plan being considered as not sound at Examination.

In terms of agricultural land quality, information from Natural England suggests that most of the site is grade 4 land (poor quality), with the remainder being grade 3 (good to moderate).

The land to the west of Whitwick 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 site satisfies the Sequential Test as required by national policy. Furthermore, neither the Environment Agency nor the Lead Local Flood Authority (Leicestershire County Council) have raised an objection.

Any new development will be required to deliver biodiversity net gain equivalent to at least 10% as required by the Environment Act 2021.”

The supplementary question noted the various sites around Whitwick which in the questioner’s view might be more appropriate for development, and thus wondered why they hadn’t been included instead of the site at West Whitwick.

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager set out specific issues with two of the named sites and why they had consequently been rejected for inclusion in the draft Local Plan; he also advised that the third site mentioned was one which the Committee had voted to remove in November 2023.

Question from Mr H Baker:

“I have attended the last 3 meetings and heard a number of valid reasons why 500 houses should not be built on the West Whitwick site. They included:

- Underground Streams
- Flood risk;
- Lack of infrastructure and
- Almost impossible access

No one has mentioned the Thringstone fault. This is a very unstable fault which runs in the earth’s surface between Talbot Lane and School Lane, New Swannington, where the ground is very wet. Exactly where it is proposed that the houses will be built.

I have spent some time looking up information about faults in the earth’s surface and understand that if an active fault exists, it has the potential for the surface to rupture and a structure for human habitation should not be built over a fault line. I also found a relatively recent example of a house which had been built on

Thringstone fault and was crumbling badly. The fact that the house was for sale at a knockdown price made the headlines of Leicester Mercury, via Leicestershire Live.

An advantage of a fault line is that the soil on the surface is very fertile and is easy and cost effective to farm.

There is a Health and Safety risk for people buying houses built on a fault line, the cost of house insurance will be high and difficult to find. Particularly if there is also a risk of flooding. Mortgages, in order to purchase the houses are also likely to be either expensive or difficult to obtain.

I would therefore conclude that if houses are built on this site, they are unlikely to be affordable and would contribute to the number of houses currently standing empty within North West Leicestershire.

Do Councillors agree that there are a number of sites available where the land is less fertile, where house building is likely to be more affordable, and be a would safer alternative for residents, than West Whitwick?"

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee:

The article in Leicester Mercury acknowledges that the cause of the subsidence in the instance referred to is not known.

There is no evidence that has been presented to suggest that the Thringstone fault would preclude development. A map on the Northern Mine Research Society website would suggest that the fault does not run anywhere near the site.

[Geology of the Leicestershire Coalfield - Northern Mine Research Society](#)

In any event, the National Planning Policy Framework states that "Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner". Therefore, it will be the responsibility of the developer/promoter to satisfy themselves that there is not likely to be a land stability issue.

The supplementary question raised a separate issue, and Officers advised that they did not have the information to hand and were unable to deal with it as it did not relate to the preceding question.

27 MINUTES

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2024.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor P Moulton and

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2024 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

Chair's initials

28 LOCAL PLAN- PROPOSED HOUSING ALLOCATIONS - ISLEY WOODHOUSE AND COALVILLE URBAN AREA

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager presented the report. Additionally, with reference to the additional papers, he noted that references to Councillor R Sutton as set out in the consultation responses, had in fact been joint responses from Councillor R Sutton, N Rushton, and C Sewell, as well as various parish councillors and a local campaign group.

The Chair advised that each recommendation would be voted on separately.

A Member suggested deferring the considerations of sites relating to the Coalville urban area until 29 January, so the allocation of sites could be considered in the totality.

A motion to defer consideration of Officer recommendations ii-xiii was moved by Councillor J Legrys and seconded by Councillor P Moulton.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

The motion was lost.

Members discussed the proposed new settlement at Isley Woodhouse. Some were concerned about the prospect of delaying the start of development at the Isley Woodhouse development until 2033, and the consequent need to allocate an additional 650 houses throughout the rest of the district. Other Members noted the existing traffic congestion in the area and the need to mitigate this and thus supported the proposed delay.

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager advised that there was significant uncertainty around transport modelling at the location, which could significantly hinder the speed of development. By reducing the emphasis on the new settlement in the first five years of the Plan, the postponement should also significantly reduce the risk of the draft Local Plan not being found sound at Examination stage.

A motion to amend the recommendation, so that 2250 houses were built at Isley Woodhouse by 2042, was moved by Councillor D Bigby and seconded by Councillor J Legrys.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

The motion was lost.

The Officer recommendation (i) was moved by Councillor R Morris and seconded by Councillor M Wyatt.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

Land south of the A453 and East Midlands Airport be allocated as a new settlement for about 4,250 dwellings with 1,950 dwellings up to 2042.

The Officer recommendation (ii) was moved by Councillor M Ball and seconded by Councillor R Morris.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

Land at Church View, Grange Road, Hugglescote (C61) and 186, 188 and 190 London Road, Coalville (C83) be not allocated in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan for the reasons set out in section 7 of this report.

The Officer recommendation (iii) was moved by Councillor R Blunt and seconded by Councillor R Morris.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

Land off Thornborough Road (C18) be proposed to be allocated for around 105 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan subject to the outcome of further consultation.

A discussion took place regarding moving a motion to reinstate the Meadow Lane site in the draft Local Plan. The Legal Advisor, with reference to section 13.1 of the constitution, advised that the motion was not permissible as the site was not an item on the agenda and advised of the appropriate way to submit a Motion on Notice .

A discussion was had about the Area of Separation between Whitwick and Coalville and the need to keep in perpetuity the area of it not being proposed for allocation within the report. The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager advised on the mechanisms to do so such as via a S106 agreement.

The Officer recommendation (iv) was moved by Councillor R Morris and seconded by Councillor J Legrys.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

Land at Torrington Avenue Whitwick (C19a) for around 242 dwellings and Land off Stephenson Way Coalville (C19b) for around 700 dwellings be proposed to be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan subject to subject to the outcome of further consultation and:

- (a) securing vehicular access from Stephenson way through to Hall Lane; and
- (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
- (c) the design of any development taking into account the proximity to Coalville Rugby Club such that there would be no adverse impact upon the operation of the rugby club consistent with the principle of the agent of change.

A Member raised concerns about access to the proposed site at Broom Leys Farm, but the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager advised that the Highway Authority had raised no such concerns.

The Officer recommendation (v) was moved by Councillor R Blunt and seconded by Councillor M Ball.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

Land at Broom Leys Farm, Broom Leys Road, Coalville (C46) be proposed to be allocated for around 266 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan.

The Officer recommendation (vi) was moved by Councillor R Morris and seconded by Councillor D Bigby.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

Land south of Church Lane, New Swannington (C48) be proposed to be allocated for around 283 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan.

A motion to remove the site proposed in officer recommendation (vii) was moved by Councillor M Wyatt and seconded by Councillor R Blunt.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

The land at Kirton Road, Coalville (C73), proposed to be allocated for around 170 dwellings, be not included in the draft Local Plan.

The Officers recommendation (viii) was moved by Councillor J Legrys and seconded by Councillor D Bigby

Chair's initials

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested , the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

Land at Lily Bank Thringstone (C74) be proposed to be allocated for around 64 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan.

The Officers recommendation (ix) was moved by Councillor J Legrys and seconded by Councillor M Ball

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

Land at Coalville Lane/Ravenstone Road (R17) be proposed to be allocated for around 153 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan.

A motion to remove the land proposed at Officer recommendation (x) was moved by Councillor P Moulton and seconded by Councillor C Sewell.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

The motion was lost.

The Officers recommendation (x) was moved by Councillor R Morris and seconded by Councillor M Ball.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

Land at the West of Whitwick (C47, C77, C78, C81 and C86) be proposed to be allocated for around 350 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan.

The Officer's recommendation (xi) was moved by Councillor M Ball and seconded by Councillor R Morris.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

Land south of The Green Donington Le Heath (C90) be proposed to be allocated for around 62 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan subject to the outcome of further consultation.

The Officer's recommendation (xi) was moved by Councillor M Ball and seconded by Councillor M Wyatt.

Chair's initials

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

The former Hermitage Leisure Centre, Silver Street, Whitwick (C92) be proposed to be allocated for around 32 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan.

A Member was concerned whether an allocation of an additional 200 dwellings around Coalville town centre was sufficient. The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager suggested that the figure was realistically deliverable and struck the right balance between ambition and viability.

The Officer's recommendation (xiii) was moved by Councillor M Ball and seconded by Councillor J Legrys.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

That an allowance be made for 200 dwellings from sites in and around Coalville town centre, subject to specific sites being identified in the Regulation 19 Plan.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00pm.

Councillor R Blunt left the meeting at this point.

The meeting reconvened at 8:10pm.

Motion to defer officer recommendations ii-xii (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	Against
Councillor Mike Ball	Against
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Ray Morris	Against
Councillor Peter Mout	For
Councillor Carol Sewell	For
Councillor Lee Windram	Against
Councillor Michael Wyatt	Against
Councillor Richard Blunt	Against
Rejected	
Motion to amend officer recommendation (i) (Amendment)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	Against
Councillor Mike Ball	Against
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Ray Morris	Against
Councillor Peter Mout	For
Councillor Carol Sewell	Against
Councillor Lee Windram	Against

Chair's initials

Councillor Michael Wyatt	Against
Councillor Richard Blunt	Against
Rejected	
Motion to approve officer recommendation (i) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	For
Councillor Carol Sewell	Against
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Richard Blunt	For
Carried	
Motion to approve officer recommendation (ii) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	For
Councillor Carol Sewell	For
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Richard Blunt	For
Carried	
Motion to approve officer recommendation (iii) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	Against
Councillor Carol Sewell	For
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Richard Blunt	For
Carried	
Motion to approve officer recommendation (iv) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	Against
Councillor Carol Sewell	For
Councillor Lee Windram	Abstain
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Richard Blunt	For

Carried	
Motion to approve officer recommendation (v) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	Against
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	For
Councillor Carol Sewell	For
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Richard Blunt	For
Carried	
Motion to approve officer recommendation (vi) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	Against
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	Against
Councillor Carol Sewell	For
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Richard Blunt	For
Carried	
Motion to remove the site identified in officer recommendation (vii) from the draft Local Plan (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	Against
Councillor Simon Lambeth	Against
Councillor John Legrys	Against
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	Against
Councillor Carol Sewell	Against
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Richard Blunt	For
Carried	
Motion to approve officer recommendation (viii) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	For
Councillor Carol Sewell	For
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Richard Blunt	For
Carried	

Motion to approve officer recommendation (ix) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	For
Councillor Carol Sewell	For
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Richard Blunt	For
Carried	
Motion to remove site identified in officer recommendation (x) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	Against
Councillor Mike Ball	Against
Councillor Dave Bigby	Against
Councillor Simon Lambeth	Against
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Ray Morris	Against
Councillor Peter Mout	For
Councillor Carol Sewell	For
Councillor Lee Windram	Against
Councillor Michael Wyatt	Against
Councillor Richard Blunt	Against
Rejected	
Motion to approve officer recommendation (x) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	Against
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	Against
Councillor Carol Sewell	Against
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Richard Blunt	For
Carried	
Motion to approve officer recommendation (xi) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	Against
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	Abstain
Councillor Carol Sewell	Abstain
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Richard Blunt	For
Carried	
Motion to approve officer recommendation (xii) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For

Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	Abstain
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	Against
Councillor Carol Sewell	Abstain
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Richard Blunt	For
Carried	
Motion to approve officer recommendation (xiii) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	For
Councillor Carol Sewell	For
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Councillor Richard Blunt	For
Carried	

29 LOCAL PLAN- PROPOSED EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS: CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

The Principal Planning Policy Officer presented the report.

A Member was concerned about the extensive proliferation of warehouses, and the resulting environmental and aesthetic impacts, in the northern areas of the district such as Kegworth and the surrounding villages.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer advised that, although she appreciated the concerns, that area of the district had particularly excellent transport links which made it attractive to businesses; and the draft Local Plan was required to demonstrate its viability by allocating the most attractive prospective employment sites.

In response to a Member, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager advised that the figure for warehousing was a working figure, which reflected that the northern areas of the district were very attractive to potential employers. He also clarified that any new prospective employment sites would go out to a targeted consultation, after the Committee meeting on 29 January 2025.

A motion to suspend Standing Order 9.1 was moved by Councillor D Bigby, seconded by Councillor J Legrys, and

RESOLVED THAT:

The meeting be extended, by no more than an additional thirty minutes.

Chair's initials

In response to a Member, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager advised that voting for a site for modelling purposes would not prejudice any planning applications at the location.

The Officer's recommendations (i)-(v) were moved by Councillor JG Simmons and seconded by Councillor R Morris.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

- (i) Subject to the outcome of further work including transport modelling viability assessment and infrastructure requirements, that the general needs employment sites and locations in table 4 be proposed to be allocated in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.
- (ii) Subject to the outcome of further work including transport modelling, viability assessment and infrastructure requirements and public consultation, that the general needs employment sites in table 5 be proposed to be allocated in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.
- (iii) That the proposed policy wording changes included in appendix A be incorporated in the Regulation 19 Version Local Plan.
- (iv) The broad approach to the Freeport described in paragraph 4.8 be approved.
- (v) The strategic warehousing sites and locations in table 7 for the purposes of transport modelling be approved.

Motion to approve officer recommendations (i) - (v) (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	For
Councillor Mike Ball	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Simon Lambeth	For
Councillor John Legrys	Against
Councillor Ray Morris	For
Councillor Peter Mout	Abstain
Councillor Carol Sewell	Against
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Carried	

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm

The Chair closed the meeting at 8.58 pm