

Appendix A – Consideration of the Reg 18 representations

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
GENERAL COMMENTS			
General	Leicestershire County Council (341)	It would be worthwhile listing those settlements without Limits of Development and ensuring policies likely to affect such settlements e.g. Rural Exception Sites reflect this in their narrative.	<p>Policy S2 – Settlement Hierarchy identifies the different categories of settlements in the district. The lowest tiers – Local Housing Needs Villages and Small villages/hamlets – do not have Limits to Development.</p> <p>It is agreed that this could be made more explicit in the plan by including a new section of supporting text which explains the role of Limits to Development and how they have been defined.</p> <p>Action: add a new section to the supporting text to explain the Limits to Development.</p>
General	Historic England (357)	<p>As a general comment, the Plan will need to consider the proposed changes to limits to development in respect to impacts on heritage assets and their setting, whether positive, neutral or harmful.</p> <p>Our main concern relates to the proposed extension to limits to development at Castle Donington where land to the north and south of Park Lane is proposed. We have provided advice on the proposed</p>	Noted. The Limits to Development methodology identifies that the LtD broadly distinguish between the main built up area of a settlement and the surrounding countryside. It also makes clear that the process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		allocation CD10 and would recommend that further work in respect of the site allocation and proposed limits to development is undertaken to establish whether the site is developable and deliverable in the manner anticipated and whether the proposed limits to ref development would need to be smaller as a result of any such work.	other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail. HE's concerns regarding the allocation of site CD10 are addressed in the site representations schedule for site CD10 – Land north/south of Park Lane, Castle Donington. No change
General	Phillip Hopkins (563)	Your map illustrations of the areas affected are ludicrously hard to decipher, giving no points of reference (road names/ landmarks). This is very misleading and does not invite comment by the Public.	Noted. The overall clarity of maps is determined by the GIS system that the Council currently uses. To try to help, the LtD consultation document did include some larger scale maps to better illustrate the proposed changes. No change
COALVILLE			
CUA/03 [pages 4 & 12]	Hugglescote & Donington le Heath Parish Council (391)	LtD/CUA/03 – Houses between Beveridge Lane and East Lane Bardon This proposed extension of development limits requires careful planning to prevent increased surface water and sewage runoff into the river Sence and surrounding networks. It is crucial to devise strategies to mitigate the harm caused by potential flooding and sewage discharge.	Noted. This change extends the LtD to include existing residential development. As outlined elsewhere, any planning applications within this area will still be subject to all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as the ones mentioned in this representation. No change

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
CUA/04 [pages 4 & 8]	Leicestershire County Council (341)	It is not entirely clear what the proposed changes to the Limits to Development are for Hugglescote and Donington le Heath, specifically with reference to LtD/CUA/04 which already appears to be within the Limits to Development within the made Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Neighbourhood Plan.	<p>In the light of the Local Plan Committee's decision at its meeting on 16 December 2024, the LtD need amending to exclude part of site EMP24 in Ellistown. The presentation of the proposed LtD changes in the wider area can be addressed at the same time.</p> <p>Action: Refine the proposed change LtD/E/01 to exclude part of the land previously included in EMP24 and to clarify the alignment of the LtD in the Ellistown/ Hugglescote area. (see map in Appendix B)</p> <p>CUA/04: this amendment includes the competed houses at Rangers Rise/Perkins Close in the LtD in accordance with the Limits to Development methodology ref [2]. This change aligns the Local Plan LtD with the boundary in the made Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>No change.</p>
CUA/05 [pages 4 & 12]	Hugglescote & Donington le Heath Parish Council (391)	LtD/CUA/05 – Land to the rear of Berryhill Lane, Donington Le Heath The Parish Council objects to developing the specified parcels of land, emphasising the importance of preserving green spaces between built environments and parish boundaries. Development of these areas	The proposed change is considered to be both minor and appropriate as it brings the LtD to the rear of the property Windyridge on Berryhill Lane into line with the adjacent properties The Brambles and Stelandine. As outlined elsewhere, any planning applications within this area will

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		risks infringing upon the village's natural environment and diminishing its openness.	still be subject to all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as the ones mentioned in this representation. No change.
CUA/06 [pages 4 & 9]	Declan Owens (509)	<p>I am concerned that the proposed LtD/CUA/06 boundaries include site C58 to the boundary of Cademan Wood. There are a number of planning submissions awaiting decisions that are presently outside of the current Limits to Development. Concerns about the proposed change include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inevitable encouragement of/acceptance of these developments. • it would not be possible to access the rest of the area demarked by the revised boundary without demolition of existing houses north of Loughborough Road. • The boundary does not consider a suitable buffer to the SSSI Cademan Woods • The findings in the site assessment document for C58 found: A) scores poorly in all areas (other than SA4 and SA6 that all developments score well on) B) Inclusion of a suitable buffer to the SSSI 	<p>The proposed change includes land which has been developed (Berrington Court) and also land with planning permission for a self-build dwelling (23/00170/OUT). To take account of these whilst also creating a logical boundary means including some intervening land which is the subject to a current application for 5 self-build homes (23/01344/OUT). As outlined elsewhere, planning applications within this area are subject to all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as the ones mentioned in this representation. It does not follow that planning permission will automatically be granted on sites within the LtD.</p> <p>It also does not follow that this LtD change means that SHELAA site C57 – south of Loughborough Road Whitwick will be developed in the future. As outlined in the representation, there are</p>

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		<p>Cademan woods would reduce development opportunities below 10 houses so would not be subject to formal allocation C) adverse impact on character and appearance of wider area and rural approach to Whitwick D) is in an area assessed being high landscape sensitivity and medium-high in respect of visual sensitivity. The site assessment document recommends that C58 is not included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would also cause increased traffic at a dangerous road junction (end of Swannymote Road). • There is insufficient secondary school provision to deal with this development. • Allowing this boundary change will ruin this rural approach and encroach on SSSI woodland. • Once urbanisation of this area is accepted it feels inevitable that C57 will also be included in the future, completely changing the face of Whitwick beyond recognition. 	<p>sound planning reasons why site C57 is not being proposed for inclusion in the Local Plan.</p> <p>No change.</p>
CUA/07 [pages 4 & 7]	Redrow Homes (182)	The school facilities to the east of Meadow Lane have still been put forward as a proposed addition to these limits (Ref: LtD/CUA/07). The proposed changes to	Noted. Land at Meadow Lane Coalville is not proposed to be allocated for housing. In the light of this, and having regard to

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		the limit around the school extends to the same boundary of Warren Hills/Leicester Road which the Meadow Lane site would also extend. We argue, Land at Meadow Lane would make a logical inclusion as would keep in line with this defined road marking. Furthermore, the site has strong existing containment being bordered by Meadow Lane to the south-east, the existing built form to the south-west and defined woodland/SSSI on the western edge. We consider that the site makes a logical addition to the limits of development and would not encourage further spread of development.	the LtD methodology, the land is not included in the LtD. No change.
CUA/07 [pages 4 & 7]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. Inclusion of land within the LtD does not, of itself, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network. No change.
CUA/08 [pages 4 & 6]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
			<p>applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network.</p> <p>No change.</p>
CUA/08 [pages 4 & 6]	Mr Gooding (345)	LtD/CUA/08 - Fully supported.	Support welcome.
CUA/09 [pages 5 & 8]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	<p>The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network.</p> <p>No change.</p>
CUA/09 [pages 5 & 8]	Hugglescote & Donington le Heath Parish Council (391)	Site Ref: LtD/CUA/09 – Land south of Townsend Lane, Donington Le Heath. The Parish Council objects to developing the specified parcels of land, emphasising the importance of preserving green spaces between built environments and parish boundaries. Development of these areas risks infringing upon the village's natural environment and diminishing its openness.	<p>Land immediately south of Townsend Lane is under construction (15/00891/FUL) and it is appropriate to include it in the LtD [methodology ref. 8].</p> <p>No change.</p>

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
CUA/09 [pages 5 & 8]	Catherine Lofthouse (637)	Extending the limit of development in Townsend Lane could cause ribbon development and loss of green space.	The proposed change relates to land with planning permission only. No change.
CD/01 [pages 18 & 19]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network. No change.
CASTLE DONINGTON			
CD/01 [pages 18 & 19]	Castle Donington Parish Council (277)	Castle Donington Parish Council feels there is no requirement to increase the limits of development although does not object to the proposed LtD/CD/01 proposal in isolation.	Government guidance on Plan Making requires plans to be kept up to date. It is necessary to review the LtD from the adopted Local Plan (2017) so that they are up to date for example to include development which has been built and permitted over the intervening years as is the case here. The parish council's position on CD/01 is noted. No change.
CD/02 [pages 18 & 19]	Castle Donington Parish Council (277)	It is also noted that the proposed change of LtD/CD/02 is undesirable but is	Noted.

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		preferable to the current planning application (23/00883/FULM) for an adjacent site off Hill Top.	No change.
IBSTOCK			
Ib/01 [pages 21,22,24]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	<p>The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Ib/03 [pages 21 & 22]	Ruth Cox (159)	Ib/03 would be logical to do and would promote the use of resources available and could assist the development off Leicester Road, Ibstock Ib18. This land should be part of the allocation. This land facilitates essential demands for housing and amenities to be met in the area. This will not only enhance the area considerably but compliment and improve what has been proposed within the 'Local Service Centres'.	<p>Support welcome.</p> <p>It is considered that the housing allocation Ib18 – Land off Leicester Road can be developed successfully without requiring the land resulting from this LtD change (Ib/03) to be incorporated into the allocation.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Ib/03 [pages 21 & 22]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
			<p>themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Ib/03; Ib/04 [pages 21 & 22]	Davidsons & Westernrange (235)	The inclusion within the limits to development is supported and correctly reflects the land available for housing development. The consequential changes to the limits as a result of the proposed allocation of site Ib18 are considered to be logical.	Support welcomed.
KEGWORTH			
K/01 [pages 25 & 26]	Cllr Carol Sewell (128)	Support	Support welcomed.
K/01 [pages 25 & 26]	Kegworth Parish Council (134)	Support	Support welcomed.
K/01; K/02 [pages 25,26,27]	Mark Jepson (605)	<p>Regarding the small proposal to extend the limits of development behind the current Refresco site and to reduce the limit around London Road and Brickyard Lane will not have a significant impact so are not opposed.</p> <p>There should be clear provisions to limit HGV access through the village, especially on Side Ley and Nottingham Road which</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The respondent made similar comments about HGV access in connection with the proposed employment site allocations in Kegworth. These points were responded to in Appendix A of the Local Plan Committee report about proposed</p>

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		are unsuitable for such vehicles as indicated by the 7.5 tonne limit which is widely ignored by through traffic. Narrowing roads and installing one way systems would prevent this and increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists in our village.	employment land allocations dated 16 December 2024. No change.
K/02 [pages 25,26,27]	Cllr Carol Sewell (128)	Support	Support welcomed.
K/02 [pages 25,26,27]	Kegworth Parish Council (134)	Support	Support welcomed.
APPLEBY MAGNA			
AM/01 [pages 31 & 32]	Clarendon Land and Development (144)	The proposed changes to the Limits to Development (reference LtD/AM/01) include the site (AP17) as a proposed housing allocation within the Limits of Development of Appleby Magna.	If it is agreed to delete Ap17 as proposed in the “Local Plan - Proposed Housing Allocations in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres And Sustainable Villages” report on this agenda, it is recommended that the land continue to be included within the LtD. Ap15 and Ap17 have been considered as part of the site assessment work and this concluded that they are suitable for residential development. However, due to issues relating to their deliverability as a comprehensive development and the subsequent capacity of each individual site, they are no longer being recommended for allocation. The land has a strong visual relationship with the village, emphasised by the fact there is an

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
			<p>existing dwelling on part of the land, and it does not appear as a substantial tract of open countryside (methodology point 5) with residential development immediately to both the north and the south. Including the land within the LtD would create a logical boundary (methodology point 4) and would connect development to the north and south within a continuous LtD (methodology point 7). Furthermore, by virtue of the site assessment work done, the principle of development on these sites is considered acceptable.</p> <p>No change.</p>
AM/01 [pages 31 & 32]	Lee Bridges (502)	<p>Appleby Magna is a sustainable village as outlined in the Settlement Study undertaken in 2021. Due to the size of the village and the lack of available services, i.e. schools, post offices, general stores, doctors' surgeries, recreational and community facilities as well as accessibility by public transport and non -car modes, a Limits to Development plan was introduced, which restricted development in Appleby Magna.</p> <p>The New Local Plan is in contradiction to this Settlement Study and previous Limits to Development in relation to Land at Old End, Appleby Magna (App 15) and 40 Measham Road, Appleby Magna (App 17).</p>	<p>If it is agreed to delete Ap15 and Ap17 as proposed in the "Local Plan - Proposed Housing Allocations in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres And Sustainable Villages" report on this agenda, it is recommended that the land continue to be included within the LtD. Ap15 and Ap17 have been considered as part of the site assessment work and this concluded that they are suitable for residential development. However, due to issues relating to their deliverability as a comprehensive development and the subsequent capacity of each individual site, they are no longer being recommended for allocation. The land has a strong visual relationship with the</p>

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		<p>Fundamentally, the New Local Plan is not in line with Appleby Magna's local plan for development and is outside the previous Limits to Development which was set.</p> <p>Appleby Magna does not have the required services in accordance with the Settlement Study and Limits to Development to grow in population any further.</p> <p>The allocation of 32no. dwellings at Land at Old End, Appleby Magna (App 15) and 40 Measham Road, Appleby Magna (App 17) is too great for the sustainable village and the available services within the local area. There isn't sufficient access to Measham Road to have approximately 64 additional vehicles (2 vehicles per dwelling) entering and exiting Measham road.</p>	<p>village, emphasised by the fact there is an existing dwelling on part of the land, and it does not appear as a substantial tract of open countryside (methodology point 5) with residential development immediately to both the north and the south. Including the land within the LtD would create a logical boundary (methodology point 4) and would connect development to the north and south within a continuous LtD (methodology point 7). Furthermore, by virtue of the site assessment work done, the principle of development on these sites is considered acceptable.</p> <p>No change.</p>
AM/03 [pages 31 & 32]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network.

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
			No change.
AM/04 [pages 31 & 32]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	<p>The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network.</p> <p>No change.</p>
BELTON			
Be/01 [pages 33 & 34]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	<p>The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Be/01 [pages 33 & 34]	Rosemary Groves (124)	Object to this proposal. There is a need to ensure development on this site is restricted to conversions and agricultural character is retained.	Permission has been granted for new building development on this site (20/000627/OUT and 23/01089/REM), and not solely for the conversion of one

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		<p>Its inclusion is based on the proposed development of the site. Permission was initially granted in 2020 for the conversion of the agricultural buildings. Little progress has taken place with respect to these works.</p> <p>The inclusion of this site within the Limits to Development would change the status of the site as it would become residential land. Future development would be subject to less restrictive criteria when considering development.</p>	<p>building. It has therefore been established that new development can be acceptable in this location and the site has an extant planning permission. However, on reflection, item 8 of the LtD methodology is the more appropriate justification for its inclusion within the Limits to Development.</p> <p>No change.</p>
BLACKFORDBY			
BI/01 [pages 35 & 36]	National Forest (146)	We consider that the limits to development in relation to the Butt Lane development should be amended to only include the housing element of the development, i.e. run along Lawton Road. The change in the limits to development as shown includes a significant area of National Forest planting delivered by the development, which we consider should be excluded from the limits to development.	On reflection, despite the proposed changes encompassing the extent of the development approved under application 17/01556/REMM, the area to the north of Middleton Close and Pickering Drive is viewed as open space peripheral to the housing development. There is a clear delineation between the built development and the open space. Action: Refine the proposed change LtD/BI/01 to exclude land to the north of Middleton Close and Pickering Drive.
BI/01 [pages 35 & 36]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
			<p>individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>BI/01 [pages 35 & 36]</p>	<p>South Derbyshire District Council (545)</p>	<p>It is considered important that the physical separation of Woodville and Blackfordby be maintained. In recent years development on the peripheries of both settlements has encroached upon the countryside separating the two, bringing them closer together and raising the unwelcome prospect of coalescence. On this basis it is requested that the following amendment be made to the proposed changes to the Limits of Development: LtD/B1/01: Whilst inclusion of the extent of the new built development at Butt Lane is appropriate, objection is made to the inclusion of the undeveloped area of landscape planting to the north of Middleton Close and Pickering Drive as this is considered to be inconsistent with points 3 and 9 of the methodology. Point 3 indicates that generally open areas of countryside are excluded, including woodland and other greenfield land, whilst</p>	<p>On reflection, despite the proposed changes encompassing the extent of the development approved under application 17/01556/REMM the area to the north of Middleton Close and Pickering Drive is viewed as open space peripheral to the housing development. There is a clear delineation between the built development and the open space.</p> <p>Action: Refine the proposed change LtD/BI/01 to exclude land to the north of Middleton Close and Pickering Drive.</p>

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		point 9 indicates that peripheral areas of environmental space are excluded. On this basis it is considered that the Limits to Development should exclude the land to the north of Middleton Close and Pickering Drive.	
BI/03 [pages 35 & 37]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network. No change.
BREEDON ON THE HILL			
Br/02 [pages 38 & 39]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network. No change.

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
DISEWORTH			
Dis/01 Dis/02 Dis/03 Dis/04 [pages 40 & 41]	Cadwallader Family (188)	We agree with the proposed changes to the Limits to Development for Diseworth, in ensuring that the main built-up area is included to logical and defined boundaries. It is felt that future allocations for development should be focused around working with the natural boundaries of the village, allowing for organic growth.	Noted. No change.
Dis/01 [pages 40 & 41]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network. No change.
Dis/01 [pages 40 & 41]	Jeffrey Guy (352)	General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It appears that the limitation plan is simply catching up with reality. Surely any proposed development should reflect the plan, not the other way round. Cart and horse comes to mind. • This limits the development of the village, whilst not protecting it from external development encroaching up 	Where sites are proposed for allocation the LtD are extended around the allocation as a consequence. However no Local Plan housing allocations are proposed in Diseworth (or Long Whatton) because there is a Neighbourhood Plan in preparation. The Neighbourhood Plan currently includes an allocation at Tea Kettle Hall. Should this allocation proceed, and the Long Whatton and

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		<p>to the boundary of the village limitation zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology item 9 states that “Peripheral playing fields, environmental space, allotments, community gardens, cemeteries and schools are excluded”. There appears to be an inconsistency, with the Primary School included and the allotments excluded. 	<p>Diseworth Neighbourhood Plan be approved at Referendum before the Regulation 19 Local Plan is agreed by Council, any consequent changes will be incorporated in the Regulation 19 Plan.</p> <p>The primary school building and playground is located within the main built-up area of Diseworth sandwiched between existing buildings and its inclusion within the LtD is consistent with part 2 of the methodology. It is not located at the periphery of the village and its exclusion from the LtD would not be appropriate under part 9 of the methodology.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Dis/02 [pages 40 & 41]	Jeffrey Guy (352)	Should reference methodology item 2.	<p>The proposed change is to include the full extent of a number of rear gardens. The LtD methodology signals that LtD should be aligned to visible features where possible (item 4) and should generally follow property curtilages except where these are very extensive (item 5). The methodology reference is considered appropriate.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Dis/02 [pages 40 & 41]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
			<p>themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network.</p> <p>No change.</p>
DONISTHORPE			
Don/01 Don/02 Don/03 Don/04 [pages 42-46]	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe & Acresford Parish Council (175)	ODAPC is supportive of the proposed changes to limits of development in our parish for the villages of Oakthorpe & Donisthorpe.	Noted. No change.
LONG WHATTON			
LW/02 [pages 50 & 52]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	<p>The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network.</p> <p>No change.</p>
LW/03 [pages 50 & 51]	Harlow Bros Ltd (346)	LtD/LW/03 - Needs to be amended to reflect historic planning permission	It has not been demonstrated, through a Certificate of Lawful Development for

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		<p>15/00575/FULM for Construction of new access road to serve existing timber yard along with change of use of existing trade counter and sales/display building to general storage use and erection of replacement trade counter and sales/display building together with revised parking and access arrangements. See attached plan.</p>	<p>example, that the permission 15/00575/FULM has been implemented. On this basis, there is not the justification to include this area of land within the LtD. In addition, the consultation document proposed the inclusion of a smaller area of hardstanding/open storage within the LtD (reference LtD/LW/03). The Council's Development Management Team have since advised that these works are not in compliance with the planning permission granted under 15/00575/FULM and would appear to be unauthorised. On this basis, it is no longer considered appropriate to include this area within the LtD. The LtD should revert to the alignment shown in the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the area of land which was subject to 15/00575/FULM is included in the Pre-Submission Draft of the Long Whatton and Diseworth Neighbourhood Plan. Should this proposal be carried forward and included with the version of the Long Whatton and Diseworth Neighbourhood Plan approved at Referendum before the Regulation 19 Local Plan is agreed by the Council, any consequent changes to the LtD will be incorporated in the Regulation 19 Plan.</p> <p>Action: Do not take forward LtD/LW/03 and exclude land at Harlow Bros Ltd,</p>

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
			Hathern Road from the LtD. (See Map in Appendix B)
MOIRA			
Mo/03 [pages 53 & 55]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	<p>The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Mo/05 [pages 53 & 57]	Metacre Ltd (207)	<p>Support the proposed changes to the settlement boundary (LtD/Mo/05). Housing allocation Mo8 is partly within but mostly adjoining the Limits to Development. Metacre would like to re iterate the development limit could be further extended to the north of the site to reflect the site area assessed in various Local Plan Evidence Base Documents.</p>	<p>The LtD change reference Mo/05 includes the dwelling built under permission 11/00611/FULM in the LtD. The representation also refers to the adjoining land which is a proposed housing site in the Regulation 18 Plan (Mo8 – Land off Ashby Road Moira) and suggests that this site could be enlarged to the north. This matter is dealt with in the “Local Plan - Proposed Housing Allocations in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages” report on this agenda.</p> <p>No change.</p>

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
OAKTHORPE			
Oak/01 [pages 59-61]	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe & Acresford Parish Council (175)	ODAPC is supportive of the proposed changes to limits of development in our parish for the villages of Oakthorpe & Donisthorpe.	Noted. No change.
PACKINGTON			
Pac/02 [pages 62 & 63]	Peveril Homes Ltd (65)	Supports the proposed site allocation P4 at Packington.	Comments in respect of the proposed allocation P4 are noted and addressed within the “Local Plan - Proposed Housing Allocations in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages” report on this agenda. No change.
SWANNINGTON			
Swa/02 [pages 66 & 67]	Swannington Parish Council (289)	Former Highway depot, Main Street. When was it decided that this piece of land was within the limits of development? Was Swannington PC consulted?	It was a proposal in the LtD in the Reg 18 consultation document to include this land in the LtD. It was not a decision at that point. Having considered the consultation feedback, it is still considered that this change (LtD/Swa/02) is appropriate and that this land should be included in the LtD in accordance with methodology point 4. No change.

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
Swa/02 [pages 66 & 67]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	<p>The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network.</p> <p>No change.</p>
WOODVILLE			
Wv/01 [pages 68 & 69]	Leicestershire Local Access Forum (192)	[Possible impact on PROW identified]	<p>The process of defining the LtD does not amount to a detailed appraisal of individual sites. They do not, of themselves, decide whether planning permission should be granted. Planning applications will need to comply with all other relevant NPPF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including on matters of detail such as impacts on the PROW network.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Wv/01 [pages 68 & 69]	South Derbyshire District Council (545)	It is considered important that the physical separation of Woodville and Blackfordby be maintained. In recent years development on the peripheries of both settlements has encroached upon the countryside separating the two, bringing	Woodville does not have Limits to Development in the adopted Local Plan. The draft Local Plan proposes LtD around Woodville. These are shown in LtD/Wv/01.

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		<p>them closer together and raising the unwelcome prospect of coalescence.</p> <p>LtD/Wv/01: Whilst inclusion of the extent of the new built development to the east of Hepworth Road at Butt Lane is considered appropriate, objection is made to the inclusion of the curtilage of the residential property identified as 'The Bungalow', accessed from Butt Lane. The Bungalow is set back and isolated from the residential development fronting Butt Lane. Its curtilage is so large as to be more of a piece with the countryside than with the nearby built development, particularly as it projects outward and away from the built up area, with open fields both to the north and south- east. It's inclusion is considered to be inconsistent with methodology Point 5 ('Boundaries should generally follow property curtilages except where the boundary is not well defined or so large that it appears as part of the open countryside surrounding the settlement') and Point 6 ('isolated or sporadic development which is detached from principal built-up area is excluded'). On his basis it is considered that The Bungalow and its curtilage should be excluded from the Limits to Development.</p>	<p>In LtD/Wv/01, the property The Bungalow and its grounds are within the LtD. The Bungalow lies to the rear of the row of detached properties which front onto Butt Lane. The Bungalow sits within an extensive plot. It is sited towards the western edge of this plot and the house itself relates moderately well to the houses on Butt Lane.</p> <p>The property's curtilage comprises an expansive informal garden area extending to the north and north east. The eastern, triangular portion of the garden projects into the agricultural field to the east. This part of the plot has a stronger relationship with the open countryside to the north, east and south than to the residential development on Butt Lane.</p> <p>Taking this as a whole, it is agreed that the LtD should be amended to exclude the portion of the plot to the north and east of The Bungalow which is more open in nature and better related to the adjoining countryside. The house itself and outbuildings to the rear would not be removed from the LtD.</p> <p>Whilst LtD will normally follow property curtilages, part 5 of the methodology</p>

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
			<p>recognises that this may not be appropriate in all cases.</p> <p>Action: Refine the proposed change LtD/Wv/01 to exclude land to the north and east of The Bungalow, off Butt Lane, Woodville (see Map in Appendix B).</p>
REQUESTS TO AMEND THE LtD			
<p>Request to extend LtD in Thringstone. (submitted as a change to CUA/01)</p>	<p>Mr & Mrs Musson (347)</p>	<p>LtD/CUA/01 - Needs to be amended to reflect historic planning permission 16/00736/OUT & reserved matters 19/02037/REM for the erection of a two-storey dwelling with attached garage. When planning permission was granted, the Council considered that the principle of residential development on the site was acceptable and distinguished this small area of land from the countryside beyond and confirmed that the approved development would not be prominent within the rural landscape.</p>	<p>The land opposite, on the western side of Lily Bank is part of the proposed housing allocation C74 – Land at Lily Bank. In view of this, and the fact planning permission has previously been granted, inclusion of this land in the LtD is justified. [methodology reference 8]. To achieve a sensible boundary, the sloping green space contained by Millhouse Estate road is included within the LtD as are the properties fronting the Lily Bank.</p> <p>Action: Amend the LtD to include land at Millhouse Estate, Thringstone. (see Map in Appendix B)</p>
<p>Request to extend LtD at Bardon (submitted as a change to CUA/08)</p>	<p>Aggregate Industries Ltd (107)</p>	<p>Aggregate Industries would like the proposed limit of development at Bardon to be extended and include Aggregate Industries Office complex and Bardon Hill Quarry Processing Area. We therefore seek LtD/CUA/08 to be amended to include our existing offices and Bardon Hill</p>	<p>It is agreed that the industrial and office buildings at the western edge of the site relate to the wider built-up area, particularly with the completion of Tungsten Park on the opposite side of Bardon Road. The LtD should be amended to include these buildings and</p>

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		<p>Quarry Processing area. It is believed the proposed boundary is logical and can follow defined features and protects the land for long term employment use.</p>	<p>the minerals railway line provides a logical boundary to follow. The area of active quarrying extending to the east does not have this visual relationship with the built-up area and this area should continue to be outside the LtD.</p> <p>Action: Amend the LtD to include the buildings at the western edge of the Bardon Hill Quarry site. (see Map in Appendix B)</p>
<p>Request to extend LtD at Ashby (submitted as a change to A/01)</p>	<p>David Stanley Transport (348)</p>	<p>LtD/A/01 - Needs to be amended to reflect the pattern of development on the northern side of Nottingham Road - opposite Flagstaff Island. Suggested LtD line would include previously developed land including 163 Nottingham Road, polytunnels and shop associated with aquatics business and unauthorised engineering works (ponds and banks) together with adjoining access drive and nearby group of dwellings. Suggested boundaries is logical and follows defined features that are visible on-site and on the Ordnance Survey plan and does not represent isolated or sporadic development given it's close association with the extensive development directly opposite at Flagstaff Island and nearby retail and housing development to the west and east respectively.</p>	<p>The area in question comprises sporadic development interspersed with pools and quite dense vegetation. There is a current, undetermined application for a haulage depot (18/00679/FULM). Unlike Flagstaff Island to the south of Nottingham Road which is urban in character, this area appears as semi-rural.</p> <p>No change</p>

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
Request to extend LtD at Long Whatton	The Trustees of Lord Crawshaw 1997 Discretionary Settlement (the Whatton Estate) (161)	[Reasoning set out for the inclusion of Land north and south of Hathern Road within the LtD in accordance with draft policy LW&D22 of the Long Whatton and Diseworth Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Draft (2021-2039)]	<p>The Pre-Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan proposes a housing allocation for approximately 90 dwellings on land to the south of Hathern Road. Land to the north of Hathern Lane is identified for a new community centre. If this proposal is included with the version of the Long Whatton and Diseworth Neighbourhood Plan approved at Referendum and done so before the Regulation 19 Local Plan is agreed by the Council, any consequent changes to the LtD will be incorporated in the Regulation 19 Plan.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Request to extend LtD at Ashby	Paul Fovargue (204)	The methodology in the consultation document states that sites at the edge of a settlement with extant planning permission for residential or employment development should be included. By that rationale, the consented G-Park site should be brought within the limits to development of Ashby de la Zouch. Our client's land east of Corkscrew Lane lies adjacent to this committed development, and represents a logical and naturally contained location for development. The triangular parcel is bound by the railway line to the south, the A511 to the east and Corkscrew Lane	<p>The A42 acts as a clear and definitive boundary to the edge of Ashby. Although the physical distance is not that great far, the G-Park site is not visually well related to the built-up area.</p> <p>No change.</p>

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		(with the approved G-Park scheme beyond) to the west. In accordance with the methodology, these are logical, defined, visible features, suitable for use in defining limits to development. Should our client's site be allocated for development, it should therefore be brought within the limits to development of Ashby de la Zouch, along with the adjacent site to the west.	
Request to extend LtD at Moira	Metacres Ltd (207)	Amend Moira LtD to incorporate land between Furnace Lane, Shortheath Road and the Ashby Canal. This would include Site Mo10 (Land Adjacent to Fire Station Shortheath Road) which has already been assessed in various Local Plan Evidence Base Documents. This would provide a logical extension to (LtD/Mo/01 and LtD/Mo/02). [Detailed reasons provided]	This representation refers to land comprising Mo10 and seeks the allocation of this site. This matter is dealt with in the "Local Plan - Proposed Housing Allocations in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages" report on this agenda. Mo10 is not proposed as a housing allocation. In the light of this, and having regard to the LtD methodology, the land is not included in the LtD. No change.
Request to extend LtD at Moira	Terry and Sue Carpenter (7)	A report has been submitted justifying inclusion of Machine House, Moira and adjacent land. Key issues raised are as follows: - There is a need for Local Planning Authorities to ensure the delivery of some smaller housing sites to conform with the NPPF. The LPA should identify land and	This land comprises a mix of greenfield and brownfield land (including a small number of residential uses and employment land). There is residential development to the north, south and west and includes development built since the adoption of the current Local Plan. The greenfield element of the area is located within the extent of built development and

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		<p>to accommodate at least 10% of the requirement on sites less than 1 hectare. If Council are not minded to make small scale allocations it would be appropriate to take a slightly more flexible approach when reviewing settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Sites is adjacent to the settlement boundary. Moira is a sustainable village. It is well located to services and facilities, including bus links, convenience store, post office, village hall and primary school.</p> <p>Cannot subscribe to the Council's view that the site is somewhat detached from the existing settlement, not form part of the village setting and is physically related to the countryside.</p> <p>Rather, the site is immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary (on 2 sides), with further development to the east, does not share a boundary with open land and is urban in nature. Its inclusion would logically round off the settlement boundary with no encroachment into the countryside.</p> <p>In light of the above there are compelling reasons for the Council to take a more</p>	<p>is not sited on the periphery. On reflection, the inclusion of this land in the LtD is justified [methodology reference 2] and comprises part of the main built-up area of the settlement.</p> <p>Action: Amend the LtD to include land at New Field Road, Moira. (see Map in Appendix B)</p>

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		flexible approach to redefining the settlement boundary.	
Request to extend LtD at Packington	S. Mugglestone (83) H. Mugglestone (118); Lucy Bates (120)	<p>The representations identify a number of reasons why P5 should be included within the LtD.</p> <p>A small site that is no suitable as a housing allocation but has a role to play in meeting housing provision at a scale suitable for Packington as a sustainable village.</p> <p>Adjoins the existing LtD, with development to the north and west and in close proximity to the proposed change at Pac/01.</p> <p>Within the village and would represent an infill.</p> <p>Not a prominent site, no technical constraints and development would support local tradesman.</p>	<p>The suitability of P5 as a housing allocation is dealt with in the “Local Plan - Proposed Housing Allocations in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages” report on this agenda. P5 is not proposed to be allocated for housing.</p> <p>This is a greenfield site at the edge of the settlement. It is appreciated that the site is adjacent to the existing LtD boundary, but it is not proposed as a site allocation nor is there an extant permission for the development of this site. In the light of this, and having regard to the LtD methodology, the land is not included in the LtD.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Request to extend LtD to include a plot south of Oaks Road, near Oaks in Charnwood	Michael Bowley (335)	<p>Land south of Oaks Road, west of Oaks in Charnwood.</p> <p>This land currently is not used for residential but it did have a fully functioning farmhouse along with a barn and silo a number of years ago. We would like the area to be marked within the local plan so we can obtain permission to return the site to a family unit in the future.</p>	<p>This land is in a rural location and is not within or adjoining a built-up area. In accordance with the LtD methodology, it should not be included within LtD.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Request to extend LtD at Measham	D Humphries (1)	Seeking the inclusion of land adjacent to 18 Masefield Close within the Limits to	This is land to the east of Masefield Close and comprises greenfield land. It is

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		<p>Development. This representation was received in advance of the consultation and no site plan provided.</p>	<p>appreciated that it is adjacent to the existing LtD boundary, but it is not proposed as a site allocation nor is there an extant permission for the development of this site. In the light of this, and having regard to the LtD methodology, the land is not included in the LtD.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>Request to exclude land from the LtD in Belton</p>	<p>Christoper and Rosemary Groves (142)</p>	<p>Limits to Development behind properties 21 – 29 Church Street, Belton</p> <p>When these properties were built in the early 1990s the Limits to Development (LtD) dissected through the rear gardens of 21-29 Church Street. However, the adopted Local Plan shows the LtD to run along the rear boundary fence line of 21-29 Church Street.</p> <p>However, no consultation was received with respect to this change, when we believe we should have been informed. There is also a restrictive covenant on the properties limiting building. By moving the LtD this gives the impression that the 'restricted' land is developable. Therefore object to the inclusion of this land.</p> <p>All residents in the district should be informed in writing of the current</p>	<p>In respect of the adopted Local Plan, this went through a very full Examination process which met all the legal and consultation requirements in place at the time. This does not include personalised notification to individual homeowners. Details of the preparation process and the Independent Planning Inspector's report on the plan (which confirms that all the necessary procedures were followed) are all available on the Council's website https://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/stages_of_preparation_of_the_local_plan_2011_203</p> <p>In terms of the principle, the respondent considers that the LtD should cut across the rear gardens of the properties rather than follow the rear fence line. The LtD methodology signals that LtD should be aligned to visible features where possible (item 4) and should generally follow property curtilages except</p>

LtD REF [page in LtD Consultation Document]	RESPONDENTS	REPRESENTATION (SUMMARY)	RESPONSE AND ACTION
		<p>consultation. The methods used to consult have been insufficient.</p> <p>Request information on the powers and methodologies used to inform the production of the 2017 Local Plan. As well as an explanation why, we were not consulted directly.</p>	<p>where these are very extensive (item 5). Taking this into account, the current alignment (as per the adopted Local Plan) is considered appropriate.</p> <p>No change.</p>