

## **APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

RESPONSES TO PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS CONSULTATION

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: CD10	SITE NAME: WEST OF CASTLE DONINGTON		
MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
<b>Access, highways and transport issues</b>				
[The proposed development will result in a significant increase in traffic and pollution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will add to the already excessive traffic on the motorway/major A roads</li> <li>• Will cause unacceptable traffic congestion</li> <li>• The relief road was not designed for the increase in traffic that the proposed development would generate.]</li> </ul>	The Council will have to carry out transport modelling as part of its Local Plan evidence base. This will identify the highways impacts of the proposed development in the area, including on more local roads and whether any negative impacts can be sufficiently mitigated through road improvement schemes, sustainable transport measures etc. These measures will then be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will accompany the Local Plan.	No change at present	89; 277	Stephen Pember; Castle Donington Parish Council
[The components of the draft policy are a good starting point but will need to be reviewed in light of emerging transport evidence]			341	Leicestershire County Council (highways authority)
[Any transport impacts within South Derbyshire, in terms of highway capacity, safety and local amenity, should be identified and satisfactorily mitigated.]			545	South Derbyshire District Council
[The transport modelling commissioned to assess the cumulative impact of EMP90, CD10 and IW1 in conjunction with planned development outside of the district is welcomed.]	Noted	None at present	341	Leicestershire County Council (highways authority)

APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)

[Part 2(a):The provision of a safe and suitable access from Park Lane has been demonstrated [by the site promoters] in principle.]	Noted	No change	183	Turley (Clowes Development (UK), Redrow Homes, Wilson Enterprises)
[Part 2(b) There are no known constraints that would prevent the widening of Park Lane between the bypass and the primary site access.]	Noted	No change		
[Part 2(c) A safe and suitable pedestrian link can be achieved across the Castle Donington Relief Road].	Noted	No change		
Part 2 (d) Active travel routes for pedestrians and cycle routes will be provided within the site.	Noted	No change		
Part 2(e) The transport vision for the site includes extending and expanding the capacity of the existing bus services into the site, providing a circulation loop to enable a bus service to deviate through the development. Our clients will seek to engage with the highway authority, and other stakeholders, such as bus operators, as their proposals for Castle Donington progress.	Noted. Since the site assessment was prepared the my15 bus service has been extended and now stops outside Foxbridge Primary School. The site promoters have done some work looking at how the my15 route could be further extended to serve CD10. Securing a bus service is a key factor in making the development sustainable.	No change		
Part 2(f) The emerging masterplan for the site includes the retention of this existing public right of way	Noted	No change		
[Impact on public right of way identified]	Part (2)(f) of the draft policy referenced the “Retention of the existing public right of way (L87) crossing the southern part of the site”.	No change. The details for retaining and enhancing the public right of way will be dealt with as part of	192;	Leicestershire Local Access Forum

APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)

		the planning application.		
<b>Environmental Issues</b>				
<b>Ecology</b>				
[The development is close to and will impact on the Donington Park Site of Special Scientific Interest, which should be screened from any development]	The SSSI contains a concentration of ancient oaks , supports a rich invertebrate fauna and provides potential roost features for bats and other wildlife. The potential impact upon the SSSI will need to be assessed in detail as part of the planning application and appropriate mitigation identified. Natural England’s comments regarding potential mitigation are noted.	No change	2	Angus Shields
[Any future proposal would need to provide sufficient evidence that it would not damage or destroy the interest features for which the SSSI has been notified. A buffer zone around the SSSI could be considered, potentially using BNG off site units, to provide additional woodland areas.]			223	Natural England
We welcome the requirement (point i) for an Ecological Management Plan to benefit biodiversity and compliment surrounding habitats and designated ecological sites and their connectivity.	Noted	No change	223	Natural England
Part 2(i) The Ecological Management Plan would be provided at application stage	Noted	No change	183	Turley (Clowes Development (UK), Redrow Homes, Wilson Enterprises)
[The proposed development will have a negative impact on wildlife: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is home to a wide range of flora and fauna.</li> <li>• Breaks in the hedgerows would lead to a collapse of the foodchain</li> </ul>	These concerns are noted. The draft policy requirements (including the proposed width of buffers) have been informed by consultation with the county ecologist. A future planning application would need to comply with	No change at present	89; 415; 421; 436; 437	Stephen Pember; Adam B; Michael Forey; Hayley Badock;

APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)

<p>and cause catastrophic destruction of ecosystems and wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hedgerows and trees have been present for over 100 years and should not be removed</li> <li>• Watercourses and ponds are at risk from pollution</li> <li>• The proposals will destroy Dalby's Covert (known locally as Bluebell Woods) and Studbrook Hollow. These areas should be completely protected from development/not included in the redline.</li> <li>• The buffers proposed to Dalby's Covert and Studbrook Hollow are nowhere near large enough.</li> <li>• The proposals will detrimentally impact established badger setts and their hunting territory.]</li> </ul>	<p>these requirements and would need to be accompanied by a detailed habitat assessment (including ponds and watercourses) as well as any relevant species surveys. Hedgerows and trees will also need to be fully assessed, and the outcomes agreed with the county ecologist / Council's tree officer. A 10% biodiversity net gain will also need to be provided as part of the development. Dalby's Covert and Studbrook Hollow can be protected would form part of the Ecological Management Plan and would be protected as open space in the planning permission/ accompanying Section 106 legal agreement.</p>			<p>Richard Hampton</p>
<p>Part 2(j) This requirement does not take into consideration the quality of existing trees and hedgerows and the potential to mitigate the loss with replacement planting. We would therefore recommend that the Council amend the wording of this requirement to allow for mitigation planting if required.</p>	<p>This is a valid point and would apply to all site allocations. The quality of existing hedgerows and trees is something that would need to be agreed with the county ecologist/Council's tree officer.</p>	<p>Consider rewording this policy requirement at Reg 19 to build in flexibility. This would need to apply to all allocation sites to ensure consistency.</p>	<p>183</p>	<p>Turley (Clowes Development (UK), Redrow Homes, Wilson Enterprises)</p>
<p>Part 2(k) The emerging masterplan for the site includes the retention of the Studbrook Hollow LWS along with an appropriate buffer.</p>	<p>The buffer would need to be at least 20m in accordance with the recommendations of the county ecologist.</p>	<p>No change</p>		

APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)

<b>Historic Environment</b>				
[Support the designation of a Conservation Area around Donington Hall but request it is extended to include all the former deer park]	Noted. The possible designation of a Conservation Area around Donington Hall is something that would be prepared and justified by the Council's Senior Conservation Officer.	No change at present as this is something that would take place outside of the Local Plan process	2	Angus Shields
[Development of the site should be avoided due to its historical significance]	There is a requirement in the district for significant additional housing to address future needs. Recent changes in national policy have resulted in a significant increase to the government's standard method (from 357 dwellings per year to 595 dwellings per year). This will mean a new Leicester and Leicestershire Statement of Common Ground will be required in the future. Nonetheless, the increase about the standard method previously agreed was predominantly based upon the imbalance of jobs and homes in the north of the district rather than addressing Leicester's unmet needs. The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan identifies the area centred on the northern parts of A42 and M1 as a location for growth, meaning Castle Donington is an appropriate location to address this imbalance. However, Castle Donington is constrained in all directions apart from to the west, where the impacts of development can be mitigated.	No change to the principle of allocating this site	437	Richard Hampton
[The heritage harm needs to be balanced against the public benefits of the allocation which would be challenging given that this allocation is only required to meet the needs of Leicester].			181	Adams Hendry (MSV Group)

APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)

<b><i>The western boundary</i></b>				
A meaningful area of separation is required between development and Kings Mills.	The parameters plan included a buffer on the western boundary which had been informed by a <a href="#">report prepared by ELG Heritage</a> for the Council. It is however agreed that the Plan could include additional detail about the form the buffer could take. The impact of development with the buffer will also be assessed in detail as part of any planning application.	Update the plan to include more detail on the western buffer.	277	Castle Donington Parish Council
[Not satisfied that the parameters plan takes account of previous advice. Housing development extends further west than I advised. Land to the west of the site should be omitted from the allocation boundary. The land contains archaeological earthworks (please refer to the baseline heritage report). It is not suitable for “open space and landscaping” and should be maintained in agricultural use.]			n/a	NWLDC Senior Conservation Officer
The parameters plan for CD10 shows the area to the west of the allocation as open space. Further information is required as to what this will entail and what degree of screening it will provide to the Hall. The ELG report suggests that this parcel of land should be retained as a naturalistic landscape area reflective of its existing character (paragraph 4.63). This is not reflected in the draft policy.			181	Adams Hendry (MSV Group)
<b><i>Impact on Donington Hall / The southern boundary</i></b>				
There are no issues with the heritage points raised in principle. As a note of correction, Donington Park is a non-designated heritage asset (it is not a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden). Further work will be undertaken to understand the	Noted. Part (2)(l) of the policy included an error. It should have read: “New trees and hedgerows along the southern boundary of the site to reduce the impact on Grade II* listed Donington <b>Hall</b> ”	Amend part 2(l) to refer to Donington <b>Hall</b> rather than Donington Park	183	Turley (Clowes Development (UK), Redrow Homes, Wilson Enterprises)

APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)

implications of heritage impacts in more detail at the application stage. This work will test emerging proposals and determine matters including set backs, landscape screening, densities, scale / heights				
[Development should not compromise the setting of the Grade II* listed Donington Hall which is currently being restored and developed into a hotel. Do not accept the conclusions of the ELG report that there would be no general appreciative change to the setting of the Hall subject to appropriate design and mitigation. The parkland surrounding Donington Hall makes a significant contribution to its setting and the loss of this historic or aesthetic connection will have an impact on its significance.]	The harm on heritage assets is concluded to be <i>less than substantial</i> . The NPPF directs that “[less than substantial] harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The need for housing is a significant public benefit. Part 2(l)(ii) of the draft policy proposed a requirement for “New trees and hedgerows along the southern boundary of the site...” This mitigation measure was informed by a <a href="#">report prepared by ELG Heritage</a> .	Further review part 2(l)(ii) and whether the specific requirement for mitigation for trees and hedgerows is appropriate.	181	Adams Hendry (MSV Group)
[Confirmation is required that the proposed landscaping/shelter belt planting is an appropriate form of mitigation.]	The report does confirm that (p.16) the perception of development from within key viewpoints of the parkland would need to be understood further through detailed design work.		181	Adams Hendry (MSV Group)
[It is unclear whether the landscape buffer concept would be an appropriate one for the parkland area. The Parameters Plan does not assist as the open space landscaping and planting buffer seem to merge together.]			357	Historic England
<b>Flood risk</b>				
[Concerns about flooding in the local area]	Whilst the site is in Flood Zone 1, land to the north (associated with the River		3	Peter Forster



**APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)**

<p>[Land north of Park Lane is in Flood Zone 1. Land south of Park Lane has an ordinary watercourse running through it.]</p>	<p>Trent) is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and there is a risk of surface water flooding on the site. As the site area is greater than 1ha, a Flood Risk</p>		404	The Environment Agency
<p>Surface water should not increase and the rate of run off from green fields should be reduced</p>	<p>Assessment and sustainable drainage strategy will be required as part of a future planning application. This would need to establish whether the development is likely to be affected by future flooding and/or whether it would increase flood risk elsewhere. It would need to identify mitigation measures to deal with any effects or risk, to the satisfaction of the lead local flood authority (Leicestershire County Council).</p>		277	Castle Donington Parish Council
<p><b>Other environmental issues</b></p>				
<p>[What is the justification for the loss of agricultural land? / Agricultural land is high quality and should be retained.]</p>	<p>Whilst the draft Local Plan did include some brownfield sites, it is not possible to meet the Council's future development needs on previously developed land alone. The loss of agricultural land needs to be balanced against the need for housing and the Council's development strategy. Another consideration is that opportunities for future development are constrained to the north, east and south of Castle Donington.</p>	No change	2; 89; 277	Angus Shields; Stephen Pember; Castle Donington Parish Council
<p>[Development should not restrict operation of the motor racing circuit or the associated success/long-term viability of Donington Hall as a hotel. The site is located downwind of the</p>	<p>The site promoters have prepared a Noise Constraints and Opportunities Appraisal Statement which made recommendations about keeping certain parts of the site free from</p>	No change at present, although the outcome of the Council's noise assessment may have	181	MSV Group

APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)

<p>race circuit and the southern half of the site should be excluded to mitigate against this.]</p>	<p>housing development as well as the orientation of habitable (e.g. bedrooms/living rooms)/non-habitable rooms. To verify the potential noise impact, the Council has now instructed a noise assessment to underpin the Plan. This will involve taking appropriate noise readings from both Donington Park and East Midlands Airport and assessing any potential implications for the site (e.g. in terms of capacity/mitigation). This work will be completed in spring 2025 when race meetings have started again. In accordance with the <i>agent of change</i> principle (NPPF paragraph 193), measures will need to be included as part of new development to ensure that there are no negative impacts upon the operation the racetrack or the airport.</p>	<p>implications for the site allocation policy.</p>	<p>183</p>	<p>Turley (Clowes Development (UK), Redrow Homes, Wilson Enterprises)</p>
<p>A noise impact assessment would be provided as part of a planning application, identifying appropriate mitigation measures</p>				
<p>[A c.50m strip of land on the northernmost boundary is located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. Whilst the parameters plan shows the resource would be in an area of open space and so would not be directly sterilised, the construction of built development to the south would prevent future access to the mineral reserve. There may be the potential to use the sand and gravel in the construction of the site. A mineral assessment should be</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Add the following policy requirement:   <b>“Provision of a Mineral Assessment for sand and gravel.”</b></p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council (planning)</p>

**APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)**

required for any application on land located to the north of Park Lane.]				
[A consented mineral extraction at Shardlow Quarry, Derbyshire (code ref: CM9/0811/53) is located within 500m of the site. Dependant on the remaining working life of the quarry and the likely timescales CD10 to come forward, there may be the potential for impacts associated with mineral extraction. Derbyshire County Council should be consulted on this point.]	Derbyshire County Council provided a consultation response but were silent on the proposed allocation at CD10 and Shardlow Quarry.	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council
[No concerns from a waste safeguarding perspective]	Noted	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council
It is requested that effective landscape screening be provided as part of development on this site to protect the rural character of the part of South Derbyshire that lies to the north and west of the River Trent.	The competing requests of different parties with regards to appropriate mitigation for landscape / heritage impact is ongoing and something that needs to be resolved.	The site promoters have been informed that this is something that needs to be resolved as part of formal pre-application discussions.	545	South Derbyshire District Council
<b>Infrastructure</b>				
<b><i>Green Infrastructure/ Open Space / Community Facilities</i></b>				
[The green corridor along Park Lane should connect to wider provision of Green Infrastructure throughout the site, which should include a new large scale green space accessible from the town to address Castle Donington's existing poor access to strategic scale open spaces]	Noted. A large area of open space is proposed on the northern part of the site. Officers are awaiting the outcome of the Playing Pitch Strategy, Built Facilities Strategy (Sport & Community) and an Open Space Strategy (see next page).	Await the outcome of these studies which will inform both Policy IF4: Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities and the final version of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and which will	223	Natural England

**APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)**

<p>There is no leisure centre in Castle Donington meaning the nearest sports facilities would be in Coalville or Ashby de la Zouch.</p>	<p>The Council has recently commissioned a Playing Pitch Strategy, Built Facilities Strategy (Sport &amp; Community) and an Open Space Strategy. This will include a focus upon the provision of a sports hall in Castle Donington. It will look at the suitability of existing provision (in terms of amount and quality) as well as the impact of proposed future growth.</p>	<p>have implications for future development proposals across the district.</p>	<p>277</p>	<p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p>
<p>Open space, sport and recreation is well utilised and will soon be at capacity.</p>				
<p>Community facilities like the village hall, the community hub etc. are well utilised and will soon be at capacity.</p>				
<p>[The proposals would result in the loss of green space for residents to enjoy, impacting physical and mental health]</p>	<p>The proposed development would result in the loss of countryside, but it would provide more accessible public open space for all residents to use, particularly on the northern parcel adjacent to the River Trent. Currently there is no public access to the north of Park Lane and limited public access to the south.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>436; 437</p>	<p>Hayley Badock; Richard Hampton</p>
<p><b>Other Infrastructure</b></p>				
<p>[The existing infrastructure is already unsuitable and cannot cope with an increase in population]</p>	<p>A draft <a href="#">Infrastructure Delivery Plan (Part 2A Infrastructure Schedule)</a> has been prepared to assess the cumulative impact of the proposed site allocations on to existing infrastructure and to set out how the impact might be mitigated. The Plan has been informed by engagement with infrastructure providers such as the local education authority and NHS Integrated Care Boards. This will feed into a Local Plan Viability Assessment</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>89; 277; 580</p>	<p>Stephen Pember; Castle Donington Parish Council; Karl Pigott</p>

APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)

	and the Section 106 agreement for any future planning application.			
[Secondary schools would need improvements – size, services and equipment provision]	The draft <a href="#">Infrastructure Delivery Plan</a> concludes that a total of 216 new pupil places would be generated as a result of this allocation. This equates to a 1.03 form entry. Expansion of Castle Donington College is possible as it sits on a large site and can accommodate growth. The expansion would be funded by Section 106 developer contributions.		277	Castle Donington Parish Council
[Existing medical facilities cannot cope /this will be made worse by more development / sufficient provision for medical facilities needs to be made.]	The draft <a href="#">Infrastructure Delivery Plan</a> concludes that the housing growth proposed in the Reg 18 Local Plan would generate 2,561 patient places and that this would more than double the size of the existing surgery. The current surgery is in a location that prevents it from being able to expand. It is therefore assumed that new patient growth is likely to necessitate the provision of a new healthcare facility within the new settlement at Isley Woodhouse. This would likely be managed in conjunction with the existing Castle Donington Surgery, although it could potentially also be a branch of another of the District's surgeries. Section 106 developer contributions would be required from this development as part of any future planning application.	No change at present although a solution does need to be identified for the northern part of the district.	3; 277; 437	Peter Forster; Castle Donington Parish Council; Richard Hampton

APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)

<p>Sewers and drainage systems already cannot cope</p>	<p>Utilities companies have a statutory duty to provide water and sewage to all new developments. It is their responsibility to ensure that there is sufficient capacity in the system to accommodate new development, even if this involves having to undertake improvements to existing infrastructure. If there are capacity constraints, this this may impact the timing of development rather than the principle of development.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>277</p>	<p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p>
<p>[Part 2(g) [Significant concerns about the requirement to underground the existing 400kV power lines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not necessary to develop the site as the power lines are located in an area of open space and have not influenced the proposed Parameter Plan.</li> <li>• National Grid are unlikely to support the requirement. Undergrounding the overhead lines would either involve the stretch within the site itself (but leaving the length at either end of the site) or require new 'termination towers' to be introduced at / close to the site boundary; or alternatively require works outside of the site to replace the pylons to the east and west with such 'termination towers'. The feasibility of these options</li> </ul>	<p>The site promoters have made a comprehensive case as to why part 2(g) is not justified. The Parameters Plan shows a minimum offset of at least 30+ metres between the pylons and the start of the built development parcels (the distance to actual homes would be further). Such distances would be acceptable having reviewed the National Grid's design guidelines.</p>	<p><b>Delete</b> part 2(g) of the policy.</p>	<p>183</p>	<p>Turley (Clowes Development (UK), Redrow Homes, Wilson Enterprises)</p>

APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)

<p>does not appear to have been considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The requirement would have a significant impact upon viability.</li> <li>• The Allocations document does not provide any explanation as to why the undergrounding is deemed necessary.]</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Need for housing/Type of housing</b></p>				
<p>I oppose the suggested development in the Castle Donington Park Ward, and I call on the Alliance/ Administration to clearly publish their rationale in choosing this site, rather than the other sites put forward by developers at the time.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change, this is a comment for members of the Local Plan Committee to consider.</p>	<p>607</p>	<p>Cllr Alison Morley</p>
<p>[Housing provision needs to reflect local needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Castle Donington has a high proportion of elderly</li> <li>• Affordability for local workers – employees of large local businesses cannot afford new home in Castle Donington which has results in an inflow and outflow of workers everyday and is unsustainable for local roads].</li> </ul>	<p>These comments are noted and the provision of housing in the north of the district seeks to address the imbalance between jobs and homes in the area. Draft policies H4:Housing Types and Mix and H5: Affordable Housing will seek a mix of homes and draft Policy H11 proposed setting requirements for the provision of accessible and adaptable dwellings and wheelchair user dwellings. Progress on these policies (and the outcome of the Reg 18 consultation) will be reported to a later date of the Local Plan Committee.</p>	<p>No change at present</p>	<p>277</p>	<p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p>
<p>A new settlement or land at the far superior Key Service Centre of Ashby de la Zouch, and indeed other sites, should be pursued for housing</p>	<p>The rationale for choosing this site has been set out in previous Local Plan Committee reports.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>277</p>	<p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p>

**APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)**

allocation before this site is considered.				
The existence of the Relief Road would create more dormitory style living as this site would essentially be an isolated estate of houses, be disjointed and fail to promote community cohesion.	Paragraph 98 of the NPPF requires planning policies to plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments. There is the potential for CD10 to provide recreational facilities and meeting places that all Castle Donington residents can use. Vice versa, it is anticipated that new residents would use the facilities and services in Castle Donington (schools, shops, community facilities), again providing the opportunity to mix and meet people.	No change	277	Castle Donington Parish Council
<b>Other</b>				
The land-owners note the broad principles set out in the CD10 Parameters Plan that has been prepared by the Council (also referenced in §4.63 of the Allocations consultation document). We agree that the applicant will work up an emerging Masterplan and phasing plan, to be developed outside of the plan-making process. This will be an iterative document, which will be informed further by detailed technical assessments. A Masterplan led by the applicants within input and guidance from the			183	Turley (Clowes Development (UK), Redrow Homes, Wilson Enterprises)



**APPENDIX C – CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10)**

<p>Council's Officers and other stakeholders, will be provided as part of a planning application.</p>				
<p>The suggestion of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (as per the overarching comments in respect to the policies consultation) for the International Gateway area as a whole would also likely have implications for the policy wording, if this an approach that the district council are minded to adopt.</p>	<p>The merits of such an approach could be considered further, but this should not affect an 'in principle' decision to include CD10 in the Local Plan at this stage.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council (highways authority)</p>