

## **APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

## RESPONSES TO PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS CONSULTATION

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: Ib18	SITE NAME: Land off Leicester Road, Ibstock			
MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME	
<b>Highways and Transport</b>					
<p>[The development will result in an unacceptable increase in traffic/traffic pollution on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leicester Road</li> <li>The A447</li> <li>Traffic in the local area in general]</li> </ul>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No change at present</p>	<p>72; 410; 413; 414; 420; 433; 435; 496; 498; 500; 506; 512; 562; 567; 568; 571; 583; 589; 596; 597; 645; 646; 652</p>	<p>Helen Burrows; Deborah Hardy; Leah Moore; Emily Massey; Gary Downing; Carol Metcalf; Kevin Morrell; Eeden Varney; Adam Chambers; Danielle Partner; Michael Gooch; Mark Howes; Emma Peachey; Gary Webb; Mark Peachey; Emma Harris; Nicola Coleman; Russell Mosedale; Mark Short; Sue Bull; Michael Deacon; Eleanor Littlehales; Duncan Watts</p>	
<p>[Concerned about the potential scale of additional trips on the A447 and potential reduction in amenity and/or air quality as a result. Reserves the right to comment further once transport modelling is completed].</p>			<p>238</p>	<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	

APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)

<p>[The development will result in an unacceptable impact upon traffic safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing speeding traffic on Leicester Road and the A447;</li> <li>There is a lack of pedestrian crossings on Leicester Road;</li> <li>The pedestrian crossing outside Frances Way needs to be enhanced to encourage people to walk to Sence Valley Park;</li> <li>The A447 is used by HGVs and large vehicles;</li> <li>Traffic calming measures are needed on Leicester Road and the A447.]</li> </ul>	<p>The local highways authority (Leicestershire County Council) does not have any objections to the principle of development. However, as the plans for the site get more detailed, the developer will be required to carry out a road safety audit as part of a future planning application; this will look at existing road safety in the local area and the implications on road safety of the proposed development. The developers would need to mitigate any road safety impacts to a suitable standard and to the satisfaction of the local highways authority.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>72; 95; 420; 433; 435; 498; 567; 571; 597;</p>	<p>Helen Burrows; Lucy Cave; Gary Downing; Carol Metcalf; Kevin Morrell; Adam Chambers; Gary Webb; Emma Harris; Sue Bull;</p>
<p>[Existing public transport in Ibstock is poor].</p>	<p>The site assessments underpinning the consultation document confirms that Ibstock is served by the half hourly 15 bus service. Whilst the destinations served by this bus are fairly limited, it does provide a frequent connection to the Coalville Urban Area, which is the top tier of the Council's settlement hierarchy. There are bus stops on Leicester Road and more than half the site is within a 400m radius of existing bus stops. All of the site is within 800m of a bus stop. It is</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>72; 571; 597;</p>	<p>Helen Burrows; Emma Harris; Sue Bull;</p>

APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)

	anticipated that S106 contributions towards public transport will be required as part of any future planning application.			
[Queries whether the proposed allocation could address existing parking issues in the village which will otherwise be exacerbated by more development. On-street parking in Ibstock is a major issue]	The proposed development would need to provide sufficient off-road parking spaces to serve the proposed dwellings (as determined by the highways authority) and is likely to provide a drop off/pick up point for the proposed primary school. The site's location is not considered suitable to provide a car park to serve the local centre (unlike the Money Hill development in Ashby for example).	No change	435; 645	Kevin Morrell; Michael Deacon;
[Impact upon existing public right of way identified]	Parts (2)(d) and (e) of the draft policy referenced the "Retention and enhancement of the National Forest Way within a vegetated buffer" and the "Retention and enhancement of the existing public right of way (Q93) between Frances Way and the National Forest Way".	No change. The details for retaining and enhancing the public right of way will be dealt with as part of the planning application.	192; 414	LLAF; Emily Massey
Items such as improvements to footpaths and public right of way will be a simple case of paving them with macadam	Officers have discussed this issue with the Council's Urban Designer/Principal Planning Officer who felt that whilst developers often prefer to provide rolled gravel (also the preference	The Council's Urban Designer has confirmed that the treatment of new footpaths is an important design issue and will be considered in the	425	Phil James

APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)

	of NWLDC in aesthetical terms) the local highways authority often objects to this, primarily on maintenance grounds.	updated Design Guide (currently being prepared), including whether any specific treatment for sites in the National Forest is appropriate.		
<b>Access /proposed link road</b>				
As per the [Local Highways Authority's] previous SHELAA comments, IN5 policy concerns were raised in respect of any proposed site access to the A447.	Policy IN5 of the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide seeks to restrict new vehicular access points on to roads with a speed limit of 40mph or more. However, the County Council is proposing to revise this policy and consulted on changes in 2024. This would see the adoption of a more risk-based approach and take into account traffic volumes, measured speeds, personal injury collisions, proximity to sensitive receptors etc. Further discussions with the highways authority have confirmed that they would not rule out an access on to the A447 and the site promoters are now working on demonstrating that a suitable access is achievable.	No change at present, the policy wording may need revisiting to cover the possibility that an access on to the A447 is not possible, although the issue may be resolved by the time of the Reg 19 consultation.	341	Leicestershire County Council (highways)
[Concern that the proposals will result in more traffic through the Bakers Grove /Frances Way housing development]	Whilst the access details will be determined at the planning application stage, the draft policy requirement is for an access on to	No change	596; 597;	Mark Short; Sue Bull;

**APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)**

	the A447 rather than Frances Way.			
[Support for link road / Objection to only one access from Leicester Road]	Noted, two access points for the site are still proposed.	No change	410; 435; 652	Deborah Hardy; Kevin Morrell; Duncan Watts
[Link road will lead to rat run]	[The intention of providing a link road is to take traffic travelling north off the mini roundabouts. The road will be designed to discourage speeding.  Further assessment of the proposals will be done as part of any future planning application (see below)	No change	425;	Phil James;
[Link road won't be used by people travelling from the east to Hinckley]	The site promoters will be required to submit a Transport Assessment as part of any future planning application. This will look at the amount of traffic that will be generated by the proposals, where this traffic will go and the impact that this additional traffic will have upon road junctions in the local area.	No change	571	Emma Harris;
[The link road would remove some traffic from the double roundabout on Ashby Road/Melbourne Road]		No change	235	Pegasus Group (Davidsons & Westernrange)
<b>Local services and infrastructure</b>				
<b>General</b>				
[The proposed development will have an adverse impact upon local services and infrastructure in general]	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	No change	72; 412; 414; 433;471; 512; 583; 645; 646;	Helen Burrows; Robert Pegg; Emily Massey; Carol Metcalf; Andrew Millard; Mark Howes; Nicola Coleman;

APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)

	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 and the Section 106 agreement for any future planning application.			Michael Deacon; Eleanor Littlehales
The sections in the plan relating to infrastructure do not contain enough concrete actions to convince me that infrastructure capacity will be increased to handle the increase in population which the new housing would bring.			596;	Mark Short;
Infrastructure needs to be provided before houses are built and not after. It is not sufficient to promise Section 106 money when the money is never used for the specific facilities that it was allocated for.	The timing of infrastructure provision/Section 106 payments will be agreed on a site by site basis. Viability is a consideration, and the timing of new infrastructure will be triggered when the growth in population hits certain milestones. For example, it would not be logical to build a primary school on this site before any houses have been built, as the need for the school will be generated by an increase in population associated with the construction of new homes.	No change	434; 471;	Andrew Tonkin; Andrew Millard;
<b>Schools</b>				
[Negative impact upon schools in general]	Whilst there is capacity in local schools presently, current forecasts do not yet factor in proposed housing growth across the district. The draft <a href="#">Infrastructure Delivery Plan</a>	Update the policy and/or supporting text to require the provision of a one form entry school, on a site capable of accommodating future expansion to a two form entry school.	413; 418; 428; 442; 571;	Leah Moore; Georgii Goodenough; Lorraine Rajput; Alan Ashcroft; Emma Harris;
[The proposed development does not need a new primary	concludes that a total of 135 new primary pupil places would be		485; 496; 498; 500; 512; 562; 568; 597	Kerry Chambers; Eeden Varney; Adam Chambers; Danielle

APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)

<p>school/is a new school necessary?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vacancies at surrounding primary schools;</li> <li>• Lower birth rates</li> <li>• Will adversely impact the existing schools</li> <li>• Will create more traffic]</li> </ul>	<p>generated as a result of this allocation. It has been agreed with the County Council that Ib18 should deliver a 1FE school on a site that is capable of expansion to a 2FE (this means the primary school site needs to be c.2ha in size).</p>			<p>Partner; Mark Howes; Emma Peachey; Mark Peachey; Sue Bull</p>
<p>[The existing schools are not projected to be at capacity in the next six years. A further mainstream school would not benefit the community, especially as a new school in Ellistown would provide additional capacity. There is a need for additional specialist school provision (moderate learning difficulties and social emotional and mental health). Whilst there are a small number of places at St Denys special unit and at Dovebank, many local pupils are having to travel a considerable distance to receive an education if they have significant additional needs.]</p>	<p>The traffic generated by a new primary school will be factored into a Transport Assessment to be submitted as part of the planning application. By locating a school onsite, a proportion of school-related journeys associated with this development would be contained within the site itself.</p> <p>Discussions with the county council about specialist school provision could be accommodated in the district are ongoing.</p>		<p>495</p>	<p>Ibstock Junior School</p>
<p>[Welcome an extra school as the current capacity will not be sufficient for the proposed housing. A all through primary school would be less disruptive for children.]</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>See action in row above.</p>	<p>501;</p>	<p>Nicola Marlow;</p>



**APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)**

<p>There is no indication when the proposed school will be built</p>	<p>This will be a matter for the Section 106 legal agreement. As the education authority, Leicestershire County Council's general rule is that a new school should open in the first September before the completion of the 300<sup>th</sup> dwelling.</p>	<p>No change for the policy, the specific requirements for the site, at the time the application is determined, will form part of the Section 106 agreement.</p>	<p>506;</p>	<p>Michael Gooch;</p>
<p>[Impact upon secondary school]</p>	<p>The draft <a href="#">Infrastructure Delivery Plan</a> concludes that a total of 90 secondary school places would be generated as a result of this allocation and that this demand can be accommodated at Ibstock Community College without the need for expansion.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>72; 410</p>	<p>Helen Burrows; Deborah Hardy;</p>
<p><b>Other infrastructure</b></p>				
<p>[Negative impact upon healthcare services (GP and dentist)]</p>	<p>The proposed housing allocations in Ibstock, Ellistown and Heather are anticipated to increase patient numbers at the Ibstock and Barlestone Surgery by 11.4% (from October 2023 levels). It is anticipated that an extension or other enhancements to the surgery will be required to accommodate this increased demand and this will be funded by Section 106 contributions]</p> <p>Dental surgeries are not generally funded by Section 106 contributions.</p>	<p>No change, financial contributions will be set out in the S106 agreement before planning permission is granted.</p>	<p>72; 410; 418; 428; 433; 434; 442; 498; 506; 571; 589; 596; 597; 645; 646</p>	<p>Helen Burrows; Deborah Hardy; Georgii Goodenough; Lorraine Rajput; Carol Metcalf; Andrew Tonkin; Alan Ashcroft; Adam Chambers; Michael Gooch; Emma Harris; Russell Mosedale; Mark Short; Sue Bull; Michael Deacon; Eleanor Littlehales</p>

APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)

<p>The plan needs to include specific proposals for achieving the proposed community facilities</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 looking at the need for any community type halls in the district.</p>	<p>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 have implications for future development proposals across the district.</p>	<p>434;</p>	<p>Andrew Tonkin;</p>
<p>The existing library is non-existent</p>	<p>Unfortunately the community library in Ibstock has now closed. The draft <a href="#">Infrastructure Delivery Plan</a> says that if possible, the Council Council would look to support the ongoing operation of a library to prevent its permanent loss. The County Council may still make requests for developer contributions to fund new library stock required as a result of growth, but it is not currently anticipated that any funding requests will be made for library premises.</p>	<p>No change at present</p>	<p>571;</p>	<p>Emma Harris;</p>
<p>Sewage infrastructure cannot take any more</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</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>589</p>	<p>Russell Mosedale</p>

APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)

	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.			
<b>Environmental issues</b>				
[Loss of countryside/green spaces/Negative impact on environment/Risk of coalescence/loss of village identity]	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.	No change	412; 413; 414; 487; 512; 568; 583; 597; 637; 645; 646	Robert Pegg; Leah Moore; Emily Massey; Mary Lorimer; Emma Peachey; Mark Peachey; Nicola Coleman; Sue Bull; Catherine Lofthouse; Michael Deacon; Eleanor Littlehales
[Mineral assessment required for brick clay, coal and sand & gravel. Coal Mining Risk Assessment required.]	Part (2)(i) of the proposed policy included a requirement for a Minerals Assessment but this omitted brick clay.  Only a very small part of the site (c.0.13ha) is in a coal development high risk. It is in the far north-eastern corner of the site, which will be kept free from built development.	Add brick clay to part (2)(i):  "Provision of a Mineral Assessment for at or near surface coal, <b>brick clay</b> and sand and gravel."	341	Leicestershire County Council
No comments from waste perspective.	Noted	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council

APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)

<p>[Development of the site would result in a loss of habitat/ have a negative impact upon wildlife species (#597 makes reference to skylarks and owls on the site)]</p>	<p>The comments on the ecological potential of the site are noted. In consultation with the ecologist at Leicestershire County Council, part (2)(f) of the draft policy requires “Existing hedgerows to be retained (except where removal is required to accommodate access) within a five metre vegetated buffer, outside of gardens. As part of any future planning application, the site promoters will be required to undertake detailed habitat survey which will also identify the need for any species surveys. The site assessment underpinning the consultation confirms that surveys for badgers and great crested newts are likely to be required. The site promoters will now also be required to provide a 10% biodiversity net gain as part of the development.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>425; 433; 512; 568; 586; 597; 637; 645; 646</p>	<p>Phil James; Carol Metcalf; Emma Peachey; Mark Peachey; Gail Alderson; Sue Bull; Catherine Lofthouse; Michael Deacon; Eleanor Littlehales</p>
<p>Removing existing flora will come under the guise of 'low value or disease' to enable the developer to rip them out.</p>			<p>425;</p>	<p>Phil James;</p>
<p>The site contains a balancing pond of biodiversity value</p>			<p>391; 637;</p>	<p>Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish Council; Catherine Lofthouse;</p>
<p>[Development of the site would impact/encroach upon Kelham Bridge Local Wildlife Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kelham Bridge Nature Reserve is designated as a Local Green Space in the Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Neighbourhood Plan (Policy ENV1). Development proposals that</li> </ul>	<p>The habitat and species surveys referred to above will need to assess offsite impacts as well as onsite.</p> <p>Any onsite/offsite mitigation will be agreed by the ecologist at Leicestershire County Council.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>391; 487; 586; 637;</p>	<p>Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish Council; Mary Lorimer; Gail Alderson; Catherine Lofthouse</p>

APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)

<p>have an adverse effect the Nature Reserve will not be permitted other than in very special circumstances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kelham Bridge contains some important ponds with a colony of herons and other wildlife. Any development needs to be buffered by at least 400m of trees from these significant areas as they need to be undisturbed.</li> </ul>				
<p>The site runs parallel with the River Sence</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change – see comments made in relation to flood risk below and offsite ecology above.</p>	<p>391; 637;</p>	<p>Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish Council; Catherine Lofthouse;</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site contains an important byway linking Sence Valley to Blackberry Lane and part of the National Forest Way</li> <li>• The National Forest Way would need a buffer of trees either side or a significant width, not just a token effort.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Part (2)(d) of the draft policy included the requirement to retain and enhance the National Forest Way within a vegetated buffer but it is accepted that this could be strengthened.</p>	<p>Amend part (2)(d) as follows:</p> <p>Retention and enhancement of the National Forest Way within a vegetated buffer <b>which incorporates National Forest tree planting</b></p>	<p>487; 586</p>	<p>Mary Lorimer; Gail Alderson;</p>
<p>[The site is historically significant and its historical integrity should be preserved in alignment with the Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Neighbourhood Plan (ENV 2).</p>	<p>The Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Neighbourhood Plan identifies the following in the far north of the site:</p>	<p>Seek the views of the county archaeologist ahead of Regulation 19.</p>	<p>391;</p>	<p>Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish Council</p>

APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)

<p>The northern section of the proposed allocation site has a potential Roman cropmark situated in it but it is not clear how this asset has been considered in the site assessment work or whether the Council's archaeological curators have provided advice as part of the assessment work. From the information available, it is not clear whether the site could be developed or delivered in the way the Council anticipates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MLE21443 Enclosure cropmark north of Blackberry Lane</li> <li>• MLE4549 Roman pottery kilns north of Blackberry Lane</li> </ul> <p>The site promoter's archaeologist has advised that these features are of local to regional importance because they contribute to the understanding of the Roman occupation of the local landscape/Roman roadside settlement to the south/south-west (which would not be developed). They have advised on a programme of mitigation. The development of this site will need to satisfy the county archaeologist, but they did not comment on the Reg 18 Plan. Nonetheless, this issue should not preclude the principle of allocating Ib18.</p>		357	Historic England
<p>[The site adjoins a pig farm which could result in the proposed development being exposed to odour, noise, dust and flies. NPPF para 193 states that new development should integrate effectively with existing businesses and not place unreasonable restrictions upon them],</p>	<p>The site promoters have confirmed that the pig farm use has ceased. The landowners are converting barns at Blackberry Farm to light commercial uses and it was a requirement of the land deal that the pig farm would cease use.</p>	No change	404	Environment Agency

APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)

<p>[Development will have to consider its impact on the operations of Ibstock Brickworks].</p>	<p>The Council's Environmental Protection team has confirmed to policy officers that over the past three years, the Council has had</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>
<p>[Increase in pollution/negative impact on the environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise and dust during the construction phase</li> <li>• Development may experience noise and dust from Ibstock Brick</li> <li>• More litter in the area</li> <li>• Light and noise pollution</li> </ul>	<p>one odour complaint, five dust complaints and one noise complaint relating to Ibstock Brick; considered to be a relatively small number of complaints. The activities at Ibstock Brick are controlled by a permit preventing emissions outside of their boundary. An Environmental Protection officer has confirmed that they would <i>not</i> require a dust or noise survey as part of any planning application.</p> <p>Whilst there will be some noise during the construction phase, works will take place during prescribed hours and housebuilders often have their own construction code of conduct within which they work.</p> <p>Unfortunately littering is a behavioural problem, although litter bins can be provided on the site as part of the open space provision.</p>		<p>412; 418; 425; 433; 583; 597</p>	<p>Robert Pegg; Georgii Goodenough; Phil James; Carol Metcalf; Nicola Coleman; Sue Bull</p>
<p>[The site floods/ The development would increase flood risk elsewhere]</p>	<p>Whilst the site is in Flood Zone 1, land to the north (associated with the River Sence) is in Flood</p>	<p>No change, a flood risk assessment and drainage strategy will be</p>	<p>597; 645; 646;</p>	<p>Sue Bull; Michael Deacon; Eleanor Littlehales</p>

	<p>Zones 2 and 3 and there is a risk of surface water flooding on the site. As the site area is greater than 1ha, as part of a future planning application the promoters would need to submit a Flood Risk Assessment and a sustainable drainage strategy. The assessment will need to establish whether a proposed 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>	<p>required as part of any future planning application</p>		
<p><b>Principle of development / type / scale of development</b></p>				
<p>[Part of the site is in the parish of Hugglescote and Donington le Heath:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This has not been properly noted</li> <li>• This part of the site should be removed]</li> </ul>	<p>The site has been extended by c.9ha since it was originally submitted to the Council's call for sites. This additional land is in the parish of Hugglescote and Donington le Heath. Hugglescote and Donington le Heath has a made Neighbourhood Plan which covers the period up to 2031.</p> <p>It is not unusual for development sites to extend from one parish or even local authority boundary to another. The piece of land is in</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>391; 637;</p>	<p>Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish Council; Catherine Lofthouse</p>



APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)

	<p>closer proximity to the built up edge of Ibstock than the built up edge of Hugglescote or Donington le Heath. If developed, the site would be an extension of Ibstock and the fact that this additional land is not in Ibstock parish is not reason alone for discounting it as such.</p>			
<p>[The housing isn't needed/the scale is too big/there has been too much development in Ibstock/the population of Ibstock will increase/lose its identity]</p>	<p>The Council has identified a need for 686 homes per year in the district. Growth is being directed to the most sustainable settlements in the district; Ibstock is a Local Service Centre and an appropriate location for more housing.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>411; 418; 428; 506; 568; 583; 584; 586; 589; 645;</p>	<p>Jodie Williamson; Georgii Goodenough; Lorraine Rajput; Michael Gooch; Mark Peachey; Nicola Coleman; Stephen Alderson; Gail Alderson; Russell Mosedale; Michael Deacon;</p>
<p>[The proposed development is large and on the outskirts of the village – will residents of the development integrate with the existing village? To combat this, instead of providing a primary school and community facility on site, the existing facilities should be maximised]</p>	<p>Residents at the proposed allocation site will likely use existing shops, healthcare services, secondary school etc. Vice versa, existing residents may use the school or public open space facilities on the new site. This provides the opportunity for people to meet and interact.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>435;</p>	<p>Kevin Morrell;</p>
<p>[The Council fails to insist on the right sort of housing. Need for more starters homes / homes for low earners to purchase]</p>	<p>A percentage of affordable housing will be required as part of the proposals. Draft policies H4:Housing Types and Mix and</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>442</p>	<p>Alan Ashcroft;</p>

APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)

	H5: Affordable Housing will seek a mix of homes. Progress on these policies (and the outcome of the Reg 18 consultation) will be reported to a later date of the Local Plan Committee.			
The type of development you propose does not provide a level of employment in proportion to the land being used.	The site is close to employment opportunities in Ibstock and the Coalville Urban Area (including Hugglescote and Bardon).	No change	580;	Karl Piggot;
<b>Other</b>				
Part (1)(c) of the policy [self and custom housebuilding] is an unnecessary duplication of Policy H7. The inclusion of self-build plots within a site of this size needs to be carefully considered in terms of the practical issues it can create.	The point on duplication is noted. On the basis that officers anticipated that local residents may only be interested in the site allocations consultation document, they wanted to make clear to residents what is likely to be required / provided as part of the overall development.	<b>There is the opportunity to delete duplications of other Local Plan policies at the Regulation 19 stage.</b>	235	Pegasus Group (Davidsons & Westernrange)
[The following parts of the draft policy are covered by other policies so do not require duplication unless there are site specific factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (1)(b) (affordable housing),</li> <li>• (1)(f) (public open space)</li> <li>• (1)(f) (SuDS)</li> <li>• (2)(c) (pedestrian and cycle routes)</li> <li>• (2)(g) (biodiversity net gain)</li> <li>• (2)(h) (National Forest planting)</li> <li>• (2)(k)(S106 contributions)]</li> </ul>	The comments on self-build will be dealt with when Policy H7 is presented to Local Plan Committee.			

**APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (Ib18)**

<p>[Would welcome the opportunity to discuss the Council's aspirations for [extra care housing] so that a site specific requirement can be included in the policy rather than cross referencing Local Plan Policies H4 and H11, which may unintentionally undermine the specific opportunity here.]</p>	<p>Noted. Officers have since advised the site promoters that the <a href="#">Infrastructure Delivery Plan</a> notes that there is growing demand for extra care housing in the district.</p>	<p>The policy will be revisited when the outcomes of Policy H4 and H11 have progressed.</p>	<p>235</p>	<p>Pegasus Group (Davidsons &amp; Westernrange)</p>
<p>[The proposed allocation has the potential to devalue existing properties]</p>	<p>The devaluation of property is not a material planning consideration.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>433</p>	<p>Carol Metcalf</p>

## RESPONSES TO PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS CONSULTATION

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: VARIOUS	ALTERNATIVE HOUSING SITES IN IBSTOCK		
MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
<p><b>[Land to the rear of 111a High Street (Ib20)</b> should be allocated for 46 dwellings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within easy walking distance of facilities and services</li> <li>• The site was previously allocated for development (in the adopted 2002 Local Plan)</li> <li>• The local highways authority now accepts the principle of the site access (drawing included with representations).</li> <li>• The site is well-related to the existing built form of Ibstock.</li> <li>• The impact on the Conservation Area (removal of a section of brick wall to accommodate the access) could be overcome by providing a carefully considered replacement brick wall (using reclaimed brick if possible) (3D visuals provided with representations.)]</li> </ul>	<p>The historic Local Plan allocation did not come forward due to land ownership and highways issues. The Council's Conservation Officer has reviewed the proposals for the site access. Whilst he would prefer that the access to the site was not through the Conservation Area, he has advised that a policy requirement for the access to the site <i>"to avoid or minimise harm to the Conservation Area and other designated heritage assets as far as possible"</i> should be incorporated into any future allocation. He also recommended that the access to High Street is taken out of the allocation red line boundary, to enable the consideration of an alternative access (possibly on to Hextall Drive). Policy officers feel this suggestion needs to be balanced against the fact that an access on to High Street would provide a more direct route to the local centre for pedestrians.</p>	<p><b>Propose the allocation of Land to the rear of 111a High Street (Ib20) for around 46 dwellings, subject to further consultation.</b> Any future policy should incorporate the recommended policy wording from the Council's Conservation Officer regarding the site access. However, because an access on to High Street would encourage walking to the local centre, at this stage it is not recommended that the red line is altered.</p>	211	Pegasus Group (Davidsons)

**APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (ALTERNATIVE SITES)**

<p><b>[Land south of Water Meadow Way (Ib31)</b> should be considered for allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is in a sustainable location and in close proximity to local facilities and services.</li> <li>• The site is deliverable as Jelson owns the site and the land needed for access.</li> <li>• The site is visually well contained.]</li> </ul> <p>[The site promoters have since submitted a capacity plan which shows the northern field free from development and an indicative residential area of around 100 dwellings on the southern two fields].</p>	<p>Officers have now <u>assessed</u> this site. Whilst the site is available for development, in close proximity to facilities and services and visually well-contained to the south and east there are areas of flood risk and a candidate Local Wildlife Site impacting the north of the site. Whilst the submitted capacity plan show that these areas would be kept free from built development, access over to the site would still need to cross areas at risk of flooding. Furthermore, the southern edge of Ibstock is currently contained by the brook; this site would break that barrier and development on the two southern fields would add to a sense of separation.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>243</p>	<p>Avison Young (Jelson Homes)</p>
<p><b>[Land at Curzon Street (Ib24)</b> should be allocated for c.135 dwellings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further development should be accommodated in Ibstock.</li> <li>• The site is in close proximity to local facilities and services.</li> <li>• There are no insurmountable technical or environmental constraints.</li> </ul>	<p>The site assessment underpinning the consultation concluded the following about this site: “Whilst accessibility is scored as good, it would not apply to the whole of the site. The site extends some 600m back from Curzon Street which would provide the only point of vehicular and paved/lit pedestrian access. The</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>656</p>	<p>Define Planning and Design (Rosconn Strategic Land)</p>

**APPENDIX D – IBSTOCK (ALTERNATIVE SITES)**

	<p>highways authority is not currently satisfied that a safe and suitable access could be provided as it would result in a crossroads with Spring Road opposite the site. The site is also in an area of higher visual sensitivity.”</p> <p>No information was submitted as part of the representations that would cause officers to change this assessment.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--