

APPENDIX M – PACKINGTON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

RESPONSES TO PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS CONSULTATION

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER P4	SITE NAME Land south of Normanton Road, Packington			
MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME	
Principle of Development					
Supports the allocation of P4 but proposes a capacity of 10 dwellings (indicative layout provided) as opposed to the 18 detailed in the consultation documents.	Noted. Given the irregular shape of the site, officers concur with the proposed reduced capacity of this site.	Retain P4 as a housing allocation but with a reduced capacity of 10 dwellings. Consider the allocation of P7: Land West of Redburrow Lane, subject to the outcome of further consultation and the resolution of highways matters.	65	Stone Planning Services (Peveril Homes)	
Further sites should be allocated in the sustainable villages including Packington. Less sustainable villages have greater allocation numbers than Packington.	Based on the proposed reduction in capacity at P4, there is a shortfall in the level of housing originally proposed in Packington. Further work has been undertaken to identify an additional allocation in Packington.	Retain P4 as a housing allocation but with a reduced capacity of 10 dwellings. Consider the allocation of P7: Land West of Redburrow Lane, subject to the outcome of further consultation and the resolution of highways matters.	116, 118	Strategic Land Group (Mr & Mrs Goodwin), Harry Mugglestone	
Development of this scale may also not be in keeping with the character of the area.	The new Local Plan must identify locations for the additional development needed for the coming years This does mean, as in this case, allocating	No change.	118	Harry Mugglestone	

APPENDIX M – PACKINGTON (P4)

	some greenfield land for development. The proposed scale of development is considered appropriate having regard to the range of services and facilities available in Packington.			
The allocation of P4 creates a new line of built form, extending the Limits to Development and intruding into the countryside and creating further opportunity for development to encroach either side.	The Council has prepared a proforma and site assessment for P4, which score and assess this site against a range of criteria and planning issues. These conclude P4 is not a visually prominent site in the village, being set away from the highway, with mature landscaping along its boundaries providing opportunity for landscaping to reduce its visual impact.	No change.	173, 368	Andrew Large Surveyors Ltd (Keller Construction Ltd), Mrs Lesley Birtwistle
Highways				
Pevevil Homes have a right of access through the adjacent development to the north.	Noted.	No change.	65	Stone Planning Services (Pevevil Homes)
Lack of evidence to demonstrate the site can satisfactory accessed. Therefore, do not consider the site to be either deliverable or developable.	Pevevil Homes have right of access through the adjacent development. The County Highway Authority have raised no objection to the principle of this approach.	No change.	243	Avison Young (Jelson Homes)
Further development in Packington is inappropriate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is a small village with limited public transport. 	The proposed scale of development is considered appropriate having regard to the range of services and facilities	No change.	368	Mrs Lesley Birtwistle

APPENDIX M – PACKINGTON (P4)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further development would lead to an increase in car use, higher volumes of traffic and parking problems, impacting on highway safety. 	<p>available in Packington. The County Highway Authority have raised no objection to the principle of development. However, as the plans for the site reach the detailed design stage, road safety and parking will need to be considered. Adequate parking provision will need to be provided and any impacts on road safety mitigated to a suitable standard and to the satisfaction of the local highways authority.</p>			
<p>Environmental Considerations</p>				
<p>P4 is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for Coal, Sand and Gravel as identified within the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2019-31). Policy M11 (of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan) outlines that minerals will be protected from permanent sterilisation by other development. Non-mineral development should be accompanied by a Mineral Assessment of the effect of the proposed development on the mineral resource beneath or adjacent to it.</p>	<p>Further advice has been sought from Leicestershire County Council, who confirmed the site only needs safeguarding for Coal. However, given the site's small scale, its siting adjacent to existing houses and uncertainty if prior extraction would be feasible, it is questionable whether the coal reserves would be worked. As such, Leicestershire County Council raise no objections to the allocation in regards to minerals.</p>	<p>Delete the requirement for a Minerals Assessment subject to confirmation from LCC.</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>
<p>No comments from a waste safeguarding perspective.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>

APPENDIX M – PACKINGTON (P4)

<p>P4 is within a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) area of known severe flooding, surface water during and post construction will impact. Request early engagement from the developer with the LLFA.</p>	<p>Further advice has been sought from the LLFA who confirmed that the allocation is located just downstream of properties at very high risk of flooding (due to the ordinary watercourse breaking its banks). P4 is itself not a flood risk and unlikely to contribute directly to the flood risk of properties. On the basis of this advice, it is considered that the allocation of P4 could not be precluded on these grounds.</p> <p>However, should an application for development be submitted, the LLFA would seek to engage with the developer to discuss ways development could assist in reducing flood risk in Packington, for example, opportunity for flood compensation or flood alleviation schemes.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>
<p>P4 is located in Flood Zone 1</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>404</p>	<p>The Environment Agency</p>
<p>Packington experiences severe flooding which current measures fail to address. Further development will exacerbate the flooding experienced. Development should be directed to</p>	<p>The allocation is located within Flood Zone 1 and there is only a low risk of surface water flooding on a small part of the site. It is acknowledged that parts of Packington experience flooding. However, this</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>368</p>	<p>Mrs Lesley Birtwistle</p>

APPENDIX M – PACKINGTON (P4)

areas with lower probability of flooding.	allocation is on land with lower flood risk.			
Policy Requirements				
Suggest a capacity of 10 dwellings rather than the 18 dwellings proposed.	Noted.	Retain P4 as a housing allocation but with a reduced capacity of 10 dwellings.	65	Stone Planning Services (Peveril Homes)
Site can be delivered in accordance with the other draft policy requirements.	Noted along with comments received on the site's capacity.		65	Stone Planning Services (Peveril Homes)
Concerns raised over the site's ability to deliver 18 dwellings and therefore not a suitable allocation.	The site promoter for the proposed housing allocation Land south of Normanton Road (P4) has indicated the site has a reduced capacity of 10 dwellings. Sites with a capacity of 10 or more dwellings, have been considered for allocation in the new Local Plan. (as detailed in the Council's Site Assessment Methodology)		116, 118	Strategic Land Group (Mr and Mrs Goodwin), Harry Mugglestone
Uncertain how a 10% biodiversity net gain could be provided alongside the delivery of new homes.	Biodiversity net gain can be achieved on-site, off-site or through a combination of on-site and off-site measures, or, as a last resort, through the purchase of statutory biodiversity credits. This level of detail will be dealt with as part of any planning application, although reference to BNG in this policy is a duplication of draft Policy En1.	Delete part (2)(d) from the policy (and all other site policies with the same requirement).	116	Strategic Land Group (Mr and Mrs Goodwin)

RESPONSES TO PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS CONSULTATION

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: Various	SITE NAME: OTHER HOUSING SITES IN PACKINGTON		
MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
<p>Land adjacent to 17 Spring Lane (P5)</p> <p>Queries initially raised over the site area. However, have since confirmed that the site area is 0.4hectares.</p> <p>Suggest that the site has a capacity of 3-4 dwellings rather than the 12 dwellings suggested by the Council in its SHELAA.</p> <p>Suggest that this site should be included within the Limits to Development for a number of reasons including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Packington is a sustainable village that can support the development of small sites. Development in the village should not entirely rely on allocations. • Well located to the settlement and existing Limits to Development. • Not an isolated site in the countryside. • Not a prominent site with limited visual impact • Low grade agricultural land • Small scale development with limited impact, representing infill development with existing residential 	<p>The Council has assessed this site with a capacity of around 12 dwellings, based on a site area of 0.4 hectares. However, concerns were raised over the suitability of the site as an allocation, in terms of ecology (in particular the boundary hedgerows) and the impact of development on the open and rural character of the countryside. The Council's position remains that the site is not allocated.</p> <p>The site owners have since suggested a capacity of 3 – 4 dwellings, however this is not considered efficient use of land for a site of this size.</p> <p>The site's inclusion within the Limits to Development will be addressed under the responses to the Limits to Development consultation.</p>	<p>Consideration be given to including P5 within the Limits to Development, to be addressed in a separate report.</p>	<p>83, 118, 120</p>	<p>Sophie Mugglestone, Harry Mugglestone, Lucy Bates</p>

APPENDIX M – PACKINGTON (ALTERNATIVE SITES)

<p>development providing a back drop to this site. Including the proposed change to the Limits to Development under LtD/Pac/01.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No technical constraints (highways, flooding, , heritage and ecology, contamination) • development would support local tradesman 				
<p>Land adjacent to 17 Spring Lane and Land to the rear of 55 Normanton Road (P5 and P8)</p> <p>Sites P5 and P8 should be allocated instead of P4.</p> <p>An indicative layout plan shows 23 dwellings, plus allowance for Biodiversity Net Gain, National Forest Planting and buffer zones.</p> <p>Benefits of this sites are identified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P5 and P8 are under the same ownership. • Site is accessible to a bus service, services and facilities. • Represents an appropriate completion of the development on this side of the village. • Site can be accessed from Grove Close (falls under the same ownerships as P5 and P8) • The owner is a developer and house builder with a good track 	<p>Clarification has since been provided confirming Keller Construction has entered into an agreement with the two respective owners of P5 and P8, with the intention to be legally bound in promoting the land for residential development by Keller Construction. However, there are still some uncertainties regarding the ownership of P5, as separate representations on P5, indicate there are 3 landowners, different to the landowner submitted under the representation for P5 and P8.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the comments and submission with reference to the comprehensive development of P5 and P8, there are further outstanding concerns. This includes the relationship of development with the village, particularly in terms of its impact on Spring Lane, and relationship with the character of development in the locality. Development would be ‘side’ onto Spring Lane and overall would not comprise an inclusive form of development, as it</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>173</p>	<p>Andrew Large Surveyors Ltd on behalf of Keller Construction Ltd</p>

APPENDIX M – PACKINGTON (ALTERNATIVE SITES)

<p>record of delivering sites quickly within the district.</p>	<p>would appear to be accessed off an existing gated development.</p>			
<p>Land West of Redburrow Lane (P7)</p> <p>Supports the allocation of P7 which could deliver a larger and more proportionate number of homes.</p> <p>An indicative layout has been provided which suggests a capacity of 30-35 dwellings, with housing development located on the northern part of the site. Options for the southern part of the site include open space, drainage pond, provision of biodiversity net gain or grazing paddock.</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken a site assessment of P7 on the basis of a site capacity of around 38 dwellings. Overall, this site is considered reasonably located to the available local services and facilities. However, encroachment into the countryside has been raised as an issue although officers have acknowledged this may be addressed in part if only the site frontage were to be developed. In addition, Redburrow Lane, to the east, would provide a defensible boundary to any development of this site.</p> <p>Indicative layouts provided by the site promoters show built development to be located in the northern part of the site with the southern part to be used to provide for open space, drainage pond and BNG.</p> <p>Having reviewed this information and considered other potential housing sites in the village, P7 is identified as the preferred additional allocation for Packington. However, there are still some outstanding technical matters that require further investigation, including highways issues. This matter is currently ongoing, including input from the County Highway Authority, and a conclusion has not yet been reached.</p>	<p>Consider the allocation of P7: Land West of Redburrow Lane, subject to the outcome of further consultation and the resolution of highway matters.</p>	<p>116</p>	<p>Strategic Land Group on behalf of the owners of 'Land West of Redburrow Lane'</p>