

APPENDIX N – RAVENSTONE CONSULTATION RESPONSES

RESPONSES TO PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS CONSULTATION

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: R12	SITE NAME: Land at Heather Lane, Ravenstone		
MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
Site Access				
[There is a conflict between parts (2)(a) and (2)(b) as the construction of an access from Beesley Lane will require a section of hedgerow to be removed].	A section of hedgerow will require removal to accommodate the construction of an access but should otherwise be retained.	Amend wording of part (2)(b) to make clear that some section of hedgerow can be removed to accommodate the construction of a site access: “Existing hedgerows to be retained (except where removal is required to accommodate access) within a five metre vegetated buffer, outside of gardens.”	99	Allan Reed
[The site does not adjoin the public highway; evidence that the site can be accessed through the adjacent residential development is required]	The site is owned by Leicestershire County Council and there is a right of access from the adjacent development. The local highways authority is now satisfied on this point and has also confirmed that an additional 100 dwellings could be served from this access (i.e. 150 in total when accounting for the 50 existing dwellings).	No change	136; 243;341;	Fisher German (William Davis Homes); Avison Young (Jelson Homes); Leicestershire County Council (highways authority)

Environmental matters				
<p>[An 80 metre high wind turbine is located in the adjacent field, directly to the west. The site experiences flicker, shadow and adverse noise impacts and is unsuitable for residential development].</p>	<p>Whilst the distance between the turbine and the proposed allocation plays a part in determining whether the impact of the turbine is unacceptable, so do factors such as topography, the local environment and nearby land uses (see Planning Practice Guidance for more information).</p>	<p>Add a policy requirement for a noise and turbine impact assessment to part (2) of the policy.</p>	<p>99</p>	<p>Allan Reed</p>
	<p>The turbine is a safe separation distance from the allocation site (i.e. the fall over distance, which is the height of the turbine to the tip of the blade + 10%). However, noise and visual impact can impact beyond this distance.</p>			
	<p>The Council's Environmental Protection team is not aware of any complaints about the impacts of the turbine from existing residents on Beesley Lane. However, as R12 is closer to the turbine, the Environmental Protection team has said they would require a noise / turbine assessment as part of any planning application.</p>			

APPENDIX N – RAVENSTONE (R12)

<p>[The site adjoins a Local Wildlife Site (Miners Wood). Hares, bats, frogs and considerable bird activity are frequently observed on site and a wildlife assessment will be required].</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 2.14 of the consultation document set out the technical reports that would be required for most (if not all) of the proposed allocation sites. The list included a Phase 1 Habitat Survey and any necessary species surveys. This will consider both on and off-site impacts on biodiversity. The development would also need to achieve 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>99</p>	<p>Allan Reed</p>
<p>[The site is unsuitable for housing because it is in close proximity to a local sewage farm].</p>	<p>Part (2)(g) of the draft policy required “Potential odour impacts on residential amenity [to be] addressed in the scheme’s design.”</p> <p>The Council’s Environmental Protection team is not aware of any existing complaints relating to the waste water treatment works but would require an odour impact assessment to be provided as part of any planning application.</p>	<p>Amend part (2)(g) as follows: “Provision of an odour impact assessment and the mitigation of any potential odour impacts on residential amenity are addressed in through the scheme’s design.”</p>	<p>99</p>	<p>Allan Reed</p>
<p>[The site is unsuitable for housing because it is crossed by electricity pylons]</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the (small scale) overhead power lines are a site constraint However, it is not a barrier to development of the whole site. The site promoters have</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>99</p>	<p>Allan Reed</p>

APPENDIX N – RAVENSTONE (R12)

	prepared a masterplan which assumes the overhead lines can be diverted or placed underground.			
[The site should be used for National Forest Planting rather than housing].	National Forest planting will be required as part of the development and there is adequate space to provide this on site.	No change	99	Allan Reed
[Impact on public right of way identified]	The public right of way crosses the far north-western corner of the site; its route would not be impacted by the proposed scale of residential development.	No change	192	Leicestershire Local Access Forum
[A planning application for non-mineral development on this site should be accompanied by a Mineral Assessment in accordance with Policy M11 of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2019-31.]	Part (2)(e) of the draft policy included a requirement for a Minerals Assessment	No change.	341	Leicestershire County Council (planning)
[No comments from a waste safeguarding perspective].	Noted	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council (planning)
It is not clear how the Conservation Area has been considered in the site assessment work. From the information available, it is not clear whether the site could be developed or delivered in the way the Council anticipates.	The site is some 280m from the Conservation Area at its nearest point. Impact on the Conservation Area was not a consideration for the application directly to the north (16/01151/OUTM) which has been built out for 34 dwellings.	No change	357	Historic England

APPENDIX N – RAVENSTONE (R12)

	As a consequence, officers do not have any concerns about the impact of R12 upon the Conservation Area.			
Sites lies within Flood Zone 1	Noted. The site is of such a scale that it would require a Flood Risk Assessment / drainage strategy as part of any future planning application.	No change	404	Environment Agency
Other matters				
[Masterplan work is being carried out which will demonstrate that the site can deliver more than 50 dwellings without extending development further into open countryside than the existing built form].	A masterplan has been prepared and submitted to officers outside of the consultation. It assumes that the overhead lines can be diverted or placed underground and that 85 to 100 dwellings are achievable on site. The site would still incorporate large areas of open space in the western and southern parts of the site.	Increase the capacity of the site to around 85 dwellings.	341	Leicestershire County Council (landowner)
[Whilst not being promoted by a housebuilder, the site is deliverable. It is the County Council's normal practice to bring sites to market immediately on the grant of planning permission].	Noted and it is recognised that LCC has done this at Snibston Discovery Park and at the adjacent Beesley Lane development.	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council (landowner)
[The development of the site for housing is not needed:	The location of future development is informed by the Council's settlement hierarchy. Coalville is at the top of the	No change	99; 486; 584; 586;	Allan Reed; David Lunn; Stephen

APPENDIX N – RAVENSTONE (R12)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is agricultural and should be developed for housing as a last resort • R17 will provide an adequate supply of housing to the local area so R12 isn't needed/ • The Coalville area has been overdeveloped / development should be spread around more fairly • Ravenstone is an unsuitable location for more development 	<p>hierarchy and the focus for housing development. R17 is located in Ravenstone Parish but adjoins the Coalville Urban Area. Ravenstone is a Sustainable Village meaning it is deemed suitable for further housing development. The Council cannot meet its housing need on previously developed land alone and greenfield land will need to be utilised.</p>			<p>Alderson; Gail Alderson</p>
<p>[The development of R12 in addition to R17 will place an unnecessary strain on local resources].</p>	<p>Any negative impacts upon local services (e.g. schools, healthcare) will need to be mitigated for the development to be considered acceptable in planning terms. This is often done in the form of financial contributions to existing services, secured by a legal agreement. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan assesses the impact that our proposed allocations would have and the likely mitigation required.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>99</p>	<p>Allan Reed</p>

RESPONSES TO PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS CONSULTATION

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: Various	ALTERNATIVE HOUSING SITES IN RAVENSTONE		
MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
<p>[Land at Church Lane (R9) would make a meaningful contribution to the Council’s housing requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would deliver 60-67 homes, affordable housing, a range of house types and tenures, open space, homes delivered to the Redrow 8 standard of design and financial contributions. • The significant negative scores in the Sustainability Appraisal can be mitigated] 	<p>As above, officers consider that Ravenstone’s proximity to Coalville mean the potential for additional housing sites should be considered. R9 was previously discounted because there was another site in Ravenstone that would not impact upon the Conservation Area or reduce the gap between Ravenstone and the Coalville Urban Area. However, this site is well-related to facilities and services within Ravenstone and has good access to public transport to Coalville. It is also well-related to the built pattern of Ravenstone. The site would reduce the gap between Ravenstone and Coalville, but it is bound by Piper Lane which provides a logical and defensible boundary to this part of Ravenstone. The Council’s Conservation Officer has made recommendations for the site to minimise the impact upon the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Propose the allocation of Land at Church Lane, Ravenstone (R9), subject to further consultation. It is proposed that the draft policy allocates the site for 50 dwellings which is consistent with the SHELAA methodology. The policy should also incorporate the recommendations of the Council’s Conservation Officer by requiring the retention of the hedgerow and trees that line Church Lane and incorporating a 45m development-free buffer along Church Lane.</p>	<p>182</p>	<p>Boyer Planning (Redrow Homes)</p>

APPENDIX N – RAVENSTONE (ALTERNATIVE SITES)

<p>[Land off Ibstock Road (R18) should be considered for allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council will need to find more suitable sites to meet its housing needs • This site could deliver 65 dwellings • The site is unconstrained save for overhead lines which can be incorporated into open space <p>The site is controlled by a housebuilder and is deliverable]</p>	<p>We have now completed a site assessment for this site.</p> <p>We recognise that our proposed housing strategy needs revisiting and that Ravenstone’s proximity to Coalville is a material consideration. Officers agree that the site has few environmental constraints. However, we have chosen to discount it based upon its relationship to the main built up area of Ravenstone and its comparative distance to facilities, services and public transport. The highways authority has also flagged concerns about access to the site.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>136</p>	<p>Fisher German (William Davis)</p>
--	--	------------------	------------	--