

**NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – WEDNESDAY 30 JULY 2025**



<b>Title of Report</b>	<b>LOCAL PLAN – ADDITIONAL PROPOSED HOUSING ALLOCATIONS: CONSIDERATION OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES</b>	
<b>Presented by</b>	Ian Nelson Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Background Papers</b>	<p><a href="#"><u>Draft North West Leicestershire Local Plan 2024-2042 – Additional Proposed Housing and Employment Allocations for Consultation (March 2025)</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Report to Local Plan Committee – 11 March 2025 (Proposed Housing Allocations in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages)</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Report to Local Plan Committee – 16 December 2024 (Proposed Housing Allocations – Isley Woodhouse and Coalville Urban Area)</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>National Planning Policy Framework (publishing.service.gov.uk)</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (2021)</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Coalville Housing Sites Assessment</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Ashby de la Zouch</u></a></p>	<b>Public Report: Yes</b>

	<a href="#">Housing Sites Assessment</a> <a href="#">Castle Donington Housing Sites Assessment</a> <a href="#">Ibstock Housing Sites Assessment</a> <a href="#">Kegworth Housing Sites Assessment</a> <a href="#">Measham Housing Sites Assessment</a> <a href="#">Appleby Magna Housing Sites Assessment</a> <a href="#">Packington Housing Sites Assessment</a> <a href="#">Ravenstone Housing Sites Assessment</a> <a href="#">Additional housing sites: site assessments</a>	
<b>Financial Implications</b>	The cost of the Local Plan Review is met through existing budgets which are monitored on an ongoing basis.	
	<b>Signed off by the Section 151 Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Legal Implications</b>	The Local Plan must be based on robust and up to date evidence.	
	<b>Signed off by the Monitoring Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b>	No staffing implications are associated with the specific content of this report. Links with the Council's Priorities are set out at the end of the report.	
	<b>Signed off by the Head of Paid Service:</b> Yes	
<b>Purpose of Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider the Regulation 18 consultation responses made on the 13 additional proposed housing allocations and two proposed reserve housing allocations.</li> <li>To agree the preferred sites to take forward for allocation in the Regulation 19 plan.</li> </ul>	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER WORK INCLUDING TRANSPORT MODELLING, VIABILITY ASSESSMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE</b>	

	<p><b>REQUIREMENTS, THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE AGREES THAT:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. LAND OFF THORNBOROUGH ROAD (C18) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 105 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.</b></li> <li><b>2. LAND OFF HALL LANE AND TORRINGTON AVENUE (C19A); LAND OFF STEPHENSON WAY (C19B) AND BROOM LEYS FARM (C46) ARE ALLOCATED AS A SINGLE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT AREA IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN, TO PROVIDE AROUND 1,200 DWELLINGS IN TOTAL.</b></li> <li><b>3. LAND SOUTH OF THE GREEN, DONINGTON LE HEATH (C90) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 62 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.</b></li> <li><b>4. LAND ADJACENT TO 194 BURTON ROAD, ASHBY-DE-LA-ZOUCH (A31) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 30 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.</b></li> <li><b>5. LAND SOUTH OF PARK LANE, CASTLE DONINGTON (CD9) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 35 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.</b></li> <li><b>6. LAND REAR OF 111A HIGH STREET, IBSTOCK (IB20) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 46 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.</b></li> <li><b>7. LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 140 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN, SUBJECT TO CONFIRMATION THAT THE SITE IS ACCEPTABLY LOCATED IN RELATION TO THE EAST MIDLANDS AIRPORT PUBLIC SAFETY ZONE.</b></li> <li><b>8. LAND OFF LEICESTER ROAD/ASHBY ROAD, MEASHAM (M11) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 300 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN, UNLESS FURTHER WORK ON SURFACE WATER FLOODING DEMONSTRATES A LOWER</b></li> </ol>
--	---

	<p>CAPACITY IS MORE APPROPRIATE.</p> <p>9. LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 150 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.</p> <p>10. LAND AT MEASHAM ROAD, APPLEBY MAGNA (AP1) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 37 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.</p> <p>11. LAND WEST OF REDBURROW LANE, PACKINGTON (P7) IS DEFERRED FOR CONSIDERATION AT A FUTURE MEETING OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE.</p> <p>12. LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9) IS ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 50 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN.</p> <p>13. FURTHER TO THE GOVERNMENT'S LIFTING OF THE HS2 SAFEGUARDING ROUTE, LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCHE (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7) BE NO LONGER PROPOSED AS A RESERVE ALLOCATION SITE.</p> <p>14. LAND AT SPRING LANE AND REAR OF 55 NORMANTON ROAD (P5 AND P8) IS DEFERRED FOR CONSIDERATION AT A FUTURE MEETING OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE.</p>
--	--

## 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Local Plan Committee report follows on from the Local Plan Committees of 16 December 2024 and 11 March 2025 where it was resolved that the Council should consult on a further 13 additional housing sites and two reserve housing allocation sites (**Table 1 over the page**). These sites formed part of an additional Regulation 18 consultation ([Draft North West Leicestershire Local Plan 2024-2042 – Additional Proposed Housing and Employment Allocations for Consultation](#)) which took place over six weeks between Friday 21 March and Friday 2 May 2025.

**Table 1: Additional Proposed Housing Allocations and Proposed ‘Reserve’ Housing Allocations (March 2025)**

Site reference	Site Name	Number of dwellings (approximate)
<b>Principal Town</b>		
C18	Land off Thornborough Road, Coalville	105
C19a	Land at Torrington Avenue, Whitwick	242
C19b	Land off Stephenson Way, Coalville	700
C90	Land south of The Green, Donington le Heath	62
<b>Key Service Centres</b>		
A31	Land adjacent to 194 Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch	30
CD9	Land south of Park Lane, Castle Donington	35
<b>Local Service Centres</b>		
lb20	Land rear of 111a High Street, Ibstock	46
K12	Land south of Ashby Road, Kegworth	140
M11	Land off Leicester Road/Ashby Road, Measham	300
M14	Land off Abney Drive, Measham	150
<b>Sustainable Villages</b>		
Ap1	Land at Measham Road, Appleby Magna	37
P7	Land west of Redburrow Lane, Packington	30
R9	Land off Church Lane, Ravenstone	50
<b>Reserve Sites</b>		
A7	Land south of Ashby de la Zouch (Packington Nook)	1,100
P5/P8	Land rear of 55 Normanton Road, Packington	23

- 1.2 Prior to this additional Regulation 18 consultation (‘the 2025 consultation’), the Council consulted on proposed housing allocations between January and March 2024 (‘the 2024 consultation’). The identification of additional housing allocations was deemed necessary because of:
- The removal of some of the 2024 consultation sites due to concerns about deliverability.
  - Amendments to the capacity (number of dwellings) of some of the 2024 consultation sites.
  - Extension of the plan period from 2040 to 2042.
  - A reduced capacity from the proposed new settlement at Isley Woodhouse (site reference IW1).
- 1.3 Two reserve sites were consulted on. The first (Land south of Ashby de la Zouch - A7) was identified in response due to the ongoing uncertainty about the safeguarded HS2 route which is currently preventing the delivery of c.677 dwellings in Kegworth

and Measham. The second (Land rear of 55 Normanton Road, Packington – P5/P8) was identified because of uncertainty about whether an appropriate vehicular access could be achieved at another proposed allocation in Packington (Land west of Redburrow Lane – P7).

- 1.4 Further detail on the need for additional and reserve housing allocations is set out in Section 3 of the 2025 [consultation document](#).

## 2 STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

- 2.1 This report updates the Local Plan Committee on:

- HS2, the Local Plan evidence base and a proposed new settlement at Norton Juxta Twycross.
- An overview of the consultation, including the number of respondents and responses by site.
- A summary of and response to the key issues raised by respondents to the proposed additional housing sites and reserve site.

- 2.2 It then goes on to recommend which sites should be taken forward to the Regulation 19 plan, subject to the outcome of ongoing evidence base work, including transport modelling, viability assessment and the infrastructure delivery plan.

- 2.3 This report is structured as follows:

- **Section 3** – provides an update on HS2 and evidence base work
- **Section 4** – provides an overview of the consultation
- **Section 5** – updates on the additional proposed housing allocations in the Coalville Urban Area
- **Section 6** – updates on the additional proposed housing allocations in the Key Service Centres
- **Section 7** – updates on the additional proposed housing allocations in the Local Service Centres
- **Section 8** – updates on the additional proposed housing allocations in the Sustainable Villages
- **Section 9** – updates on the additional proposed reserve housing allocations

- 2.4 In accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the Council is required to “take into account any representations made to them”. As with the December 2024 and March 2025 Local Plan Committee reports, officers have prepared appendices which incorporate the following information:

- **Site reference number** – this corresponds to the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). Where sites were submitted after publication of the 2021 SHELAA the numbering sequence for each settlement was continued.
- **Site name** – as above.

- **Main issues raised** – this summarises and groups together the various comments made. It should be noted that not all respondents necessarily made exactly the same points but made comments on similar themes.
- **Council response** – officers have provided a response to the comments.
- **Action** – this summarises any actions required in response to the comments made.
- **Respondent's ID** – each person/ organisation responding to the consultation was given a unique number
- **Respondent's name** – provides the name of the individual or organisation and (if relevant) on whose behalf their comments are made.

2.5 The appendices are included separately to enable members to be able to have easy access to both the report and the appendices at the same time. For clarity, the complete list of appendices is:

- **Appendix A:** Land off Thornborough Road, Coalville (C18)
- **Appendix B:** Land at Torrington Avenue, Whitwick (C19a)
- **Appendix C:** Land off Stephenson Way, Coalville (C19b)
- **Appendix D:** Land south of The Green, Donington le Heath (C90)
- **Appendix E:** Land adjacent to 194 Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch (A31)
- **Appendix F:** Land south of Park Lane, Castle Donington (CD9)
- **Appendix G:** Land rear of 111a High St, Ibstock (Ib20)
- **Appendix H:** Land south of Ashby Road, Kegworth (K12)
- **Appendix I:** Land off Leicester Road/Ashby Road, Measham (M11)
- **Appendix J:** Land off Abney Drive, Measham (M14)
- **Appendix K:** Land at Measham Road, Appleby Magna (Ap1)
- **Appendix L:** Land west of Redburrow Lane, Packington (P7)
- **Appendix M:** Land off Church Lane, Ravenstone (R9)
- **Appendix N:** Land south of Ashby de la Zouch (Packington Nook) (A7)
- **Appendix O:** Land rear of 55 Normanton Road, Packington
- **Appendix P:** Other sites being promoted by landowners/developers/agents (see paragraph 4.5)

### 3 UPDATES

#### HS2 Safeguarding

- 3.1 As referenced above, the ongoing uncertainty about HS2 led to officers proposing a potential reserve site at land south of Ashby de la Zouch (A7).
- 3.2 As members will be aware, on 17 July 2025, the government announced in a statement from the Secretary of State for Transport that:
- “I am today formally lifting the safeguarding directions for the former Phase 2b Eastern Leg (between the West Midlands and Leeds), removing the uncertainty that has affected many people along the former route.”*
- 3.3 The Eastern Leg of HS2 affected proposed housing sites in Measham and Kegworth. In view of the government's announcement, it is no longer necessary for the Local

Plan to include a reserve site at Packington Nook, Ashby de la Zouch. The recommendations allow for this. Notwithstanding this, the various comments received in response to the consultation are included at **Appendix N** for completeness.

## **Evidence Base**

### ***Housing Requirements***

- 3.4 Following changes to the standard method made by the government, the issue of housing requirements across Leicester and Leicestershire is the subject of ongoing work with the other Leicestershire authorities. Clarity in respect of this is anticipated shortly, but for now the plan continues to be based on the previously agreed requirement of 686 dwellings each year.

### ***Transport Modelling***

- 3.5 Transport modelling has been commissioned from Leicestershire County Council and is anticipated to be completed by the end of October 2025.

### ***Infrastructure Delivery Plan***

- 3.6 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being updated to assess the likely impact from the additional proposed housing (and employment) allocations upon all infrastructure types other than highways. The report is expected later in the summer. Further work on highways will be undertaken when the transport modelling work has been completed.

### ***Flood Risk***

- 3.7 Several comments were received from the Lead Local Flood Authority (Leicestershire County Council) highlighting areas of surface water flood risk within some of the proposed allocation sites. In March 2025, The Environment Agency updated the Flood Map for Planning datasets to include both a climate change scenario and three present-day surface water flood risk scenarios. In addition, the 2024 National Planning Policy Framework has been strengthened and plans need to take into account all sources of flood risk in a sequential approach to the location of development (paragraph 172). In light of these updates, officers are currently liaising with the consultants who prepared the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment on the possible need to update the evidence base. At this time there is no reason to think that this would result in any of the proposed allocations as not being considered suitable, but specific policy requirements may need to be included in the next version of the Plan.

### **Proposed New Settlement at Norton Juxta Twycross**

- 3.8 Members may recall that the report to this Committee on 14 August 2024 advised that as part of the 2024 consultation, representations had been submitted for a potential new settlement near to Norton Juxta Twycross in Hinckley and Bosworth ([Appendix B to Item 11](#)). Whilst most of the development would be in the borough of



Hinckley and Bosworth, the site does extend into North West Leicestershire.

- 3.9 The site promoters submitted more detailed representations as part of the 2025 consultation. Officers have several concerns about this site:
- These proposals have emerged late on in the North West Leicestershire Local Plan preparation process, when so much of the evidence base has been or is in the process of being prepared.
  - It is unclear if this site will be proposed for allocation by Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (it is understood that the Council will be asked to consider a draft plan in September 2025).
  - There are significant concerns about the impact of this proposed settlement upon North West Leicestershire, particularly in terms of infrastructure provision.
- 3.10 In light of the above, officers have concluded that at this time proposing the allocation of this site in the North West Leicestershire Local Plan would be premature.

#### **4 OVERVIEW OF CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 In total, 380 responses were submitted to the Council as part of this consultation. 321 respondents (84%) were local residents; 28 (7%) were landowners/developers/agents; 21 (6%) were statutory consultees and 10 (3%) were parish or town councils.
- 4.2 The number of responses received for each proposed allocation site are set out in **Table 2**. The responses do not total 321 as some respondents commented on more than one site. It should also be noted that several respondents (mostly statutory consultees) responded with a general 'no comment'.

**Table 2: Consultation Responses by Site**

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Number of consultation responses</b>
C18	Land off Thornborough Road, Coalville	40
C19a	Land at Torrington Avenue, Whitwick	99
C19b	Land off Stephenson Way, Coalville	31
C90	Land south of The Green, Donington le Heath	15
A31	Land adjacent to 194 Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch	12
CD9	Land south of Park Lane, Castle Donington	8
lb20	Land rear of 111a High Street, Ibstock	13
K12	Land south of Ashby Road, Kegworth	21
M11	Land off Leicester Road/Ashby Road, Measham	10
M14	Land off Abney Drive, Measham	19
Ap1	Land at Measham Road, Appleby Magna	8
P7	Land west of Redburrow Lane, Packington	8
R9	Land off Church Lane, Ravenstone	18
A7	Land south of Ashby de la Zouch (Packington Nook)	141
P5/P8	Land rear of 55 Normanton Road, Packington	11

- 4.3 In addition to the above, seven local residents submitted responses after the consultation deadline: Two responses were for Land at Torrington Avenue, Whitwick (C19a) and Land off Stephenson Way, Coalville (C19b); one related to Land south of The Green, Donington le Heath (C90); two were for Land south of Ashby de la Zouch (A7) and one related to land south of Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch (A27 – a site which was consulted on in 2024). Whilst these responses are not directly referenced in the appendices to this report, officers have reviewed them and are satisfied that the matters raised were similar in nature to those raised by others.
- 4.4 The consultation document made clear that the Council was only seeking views on the additional housing and employment sites. However, some respondents did provide comments on the 2024 allocation sites either to object (local residents) or to promote sites for development (landowners/developers/agents). Some landowners/developers/agents also provided comments on topics such as housing need and the local plan period.
- 4.5 For members' information, comments outside the scope of the consultation are summarised in brief below. At this stage, officers have not responded to these comments in further detail as these sites were not part of the consultation.

#### *Local Residents*

- 17 objected to the proposed allocation at Land south of Burton Road Ashby de la Zouch (A27).
- Five objected to the proposed allocation at South of Church Lane, New

- Swannington (C48).
- Four objected to the proposed allocation at Land at Broom Leys Farm, Coalville (C46).
- Two objected to the proposed broad allocation on land west of Whitwick.
- In general terms, four objected to more development across the district, two objected to more development in Ashby de la Zouch, one objected to more development in the Coalville Urban Area and one objected to all new development in the flood plain/catchment of the Gilwiskaw Brook.
- Four sent an email that did not include a response/attachment.

#### *Landowners/Developers/Agents*

- 12 respondents commented on / sought to promote a site or sites outside the scope of this consultation (see **Appendix P**)
- Six respondents provided comments on general matters such as housing requirements and the Local Plan period
- Two supported the deletion of Land at Old End and 40 Measham Road, Appleby Magna Ap15/Ap17 as a housing allocation

#### *Parish/Town Councils*

- Two provided comments on proposed housing sites outside the scope of this consultation. This includes Ashby Town Council who raised a number of queries on behalf of local residents in respect of site A27.

## **5 PRINCIPAL TOWN**

- 5.1 The Coalville Urban Area (CUA) is the district's Principal Town. In accordance with the agreed development strategy, it should be the location for 35% of all new housing development. The consultation included four additional sites in the CUA, including three within the Coalville/Whitwick Area of Separation. As set out in the report to the [16 December 2024 Local Plan Committee](#), it is deemed necessary to allocate sites within the Area of Separation if the agreed development strategy is to be maintained. The alternative approach would require allocating land in lower order settlements which would be difficult to justify at the Local Plan examination.

### **Land off Thornborough Road, Coalville (C18)**

- 5.2 There were 40 responses to this proposed allocation; 31 local residents; six statutory consultees; two landowner/developer/agents and one from Whitwick Parish Council. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix A**.
- 5.3 This site is located in the Area of Separation. It is identified as a Priority B site in the Area of Separation Study (A being the highest priority).
- 5.4 The consultation responses covered a broad range of issues with the greatest number relating to infrastructure, highways, flooding, impact upon the Area of Separation, biodiversity and air quality.
- 5.5 One change is proposed to the draft policy to address concerns from the County

Council in respect of surface water flooding, together with an amendment to the supporting text (see **Appendix A**). In addition, other changes are proposed to the supporting text.

- 5.6 It is recommended Land off Thornborough Road Coalville (C18) is allocated for around 105 dwellings in the Regulation Local Plan.

#### **Land at Torrington Avenue, Whitwick (C19a)**

- 5.7 There were 99 responses to this proposed allocation; 88 local residents; eight statutory consultees, two landowner/developer/agents and one from Whitwick Parish Council. Officers understand that a petition against this site is currently being undertaken. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix B**.
- 5.8 The site comprises land which is identified in the Area of Separation study as being priorities A and B. In view of the amount of new housing required in the CUA, together with the lack of alternatives that are acceptable to this Committee, the allocation of this site is now considered to be necessary.
- 5.9 The consultation responses covered a broad range of issues with the greatest number relating to infrastructure, highways, flooding, impact upon the Area of Separation, biodiversity, impact on health and wellbeing and air quality.
- 5.10 The site promoter raised concerns about the requirement for joint working with the promoter of C19b, although they have suggested that the promoter of Broom Leys Farm (C46) should also be required to be involved in joint working. From a highways perspective, the County Council has made a similar comment.
- 5.11 As set out in **Appendix B**, officers accept that C19a and C19b will be subject to their own specific layout and design. However, in the interests of sound planning, it is considered that development needs to be coordinated to ensure that the integrity of the remaining Area of Separation is maintained but also to ensure that new development provides the infrastructure and services to meet the needs of residents.
- 5.12 In the interests of achieving this coordinated approach, officers recommend that Broom Leys Farm (C46) should be identified alongside Land off Hall Lane and Torrington Avenue (C19a) and Land off Stephenson Way (C19b) as a single Strategic Development Area. Wording for a revised Strategic Development Area policy will be presented to a future meeting of this Committee.
- 5.13 It is recommended that Land off Hall Lane and Torrington Avenue (C19a) and Land off Stephenson Way (C19b) are allocated for around 950 dwellings, alongside Broom Leys Farm (C46) allocated for around 266 dwellings, to provide for a single Strategic Development Area.

#### **Land off Stephenson Way, Coalville (C19b)**

- 5.14 There were 31 responses to this proposed allocation; 21 local residents; seven statutory consultees; two landowner/developer/agents and one from Whitwick Parish

Council. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix C**.

- 5.15 The consultation responses covered a broad range of issues with the greatest number relating to infrastructure, highways, flooding, impact upon the Area of Separation, biodiversity and air quality.
- 5.16 As noted above, it is recommended that this site forms part of a Strategic Development Area alongside sites Land off Hall Lane and Torrington Avenue (C19a) and Broom Leys Farm (C46).

#### **Land south of The Green, Donington le Heath (C90)**

- 5.17 There were 15 responses to this proposed allocation; eight local residents; seven statutory consultees and two from landowners/developers/agents. In addition, two responses were received without a name and so are not duly made. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix D**.
- 5.18 The consultation responses covered a broad range of issues including infrastructure, highways, flooding, impact upon the character of the area and loss of countryside. No issues were raised that would suggest that the site should not be allocated.
- 5.19 It is recommended that Land south of The Green, Donington le Heath (C90) is allocated for around 62 dwellings in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

### **6 KEY SERVICE CENTRES**

- 6.1 The district's Key Service Centres are Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington. The consultation sought views on two additional housing allocations; one in Ashby and one in Castle Donington. The proposed reserve allocation on land south of Ashby (A7) is dealt with in **Section 8** below.

#### **Land adjacent to 194 Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch (A31)**

- 6.2 There were 12 responses to this proposed allocation: eight local residents; three statutory consultees and one from Ashby Town Council. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix E**.
- 6.3 The main concerns raised by local residents and the Town Council related to road safety, the impact upon existing homes (overlooking and the loss of privacy and construction-related impacts), the loss of a green space used by residents for dog walking etc., biodiversity and surface water flooding. There was also a general concern about the negative impact of more housing in Ashby.
- 6.4 There were no objections from statutory consultees; notably the local highways authority and the lead local flood authority (both Leicestershire County Council).
- 6.5 Officers propose the following should be added to the draft policy (see **Appendix E** for more details):
- In response to a local resident comment and with the aim of providing

additional screening and softening the edge of the proposed development, add a requirement for a landscape buffer, including tree planting, to the southern boundary.

- A requirement for a Minerals Assessment as requested by Leicestershire County Council.

6.6 No changes are proposed to the capacity of the site. The consultation document stated that it may be possible to deliver more than the stated 30 dwellings, but this is reliant upon the site promoters demonstrating a higher quantum of development was achievable whilst not compromising good design. The site promoter (a housebuilder) did not respond to the consultation but have contacted policy officers separately to confirm that they are working up a scheme for pre-application discussion.

6.7 It is recommended that Land adjacent to 194 Burton Road, Ashby-de-la-Zouch (A31) is allocated for around 30 dwellings in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

#### **Land south of Park Lane, Castle Donington (CD9)**

6.8 There were eight responses to this proposed allocation; three statutory consultees; two parish councils; two landowner/developer/agents; and one local resident. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix F**.

6.9 No representations were submitted to the 2025 consultation on behalf of a landowner/developer. Whilst there has been interest in the site in recent years, the lack of developer associated with the site raises deliverability concerns. This will need to be considered by officers further as a Local Plan housing trajectory is developed. Nonetheless, a policy for the site is necessary to guide the development of a site that would otherwise be in the limits to development.

6.10 As confirmed in the consultation document, CD9 would be in the limits to development by virtue of the proposed allocation on Land west of Castle Donington (CD10). Comments were made about the suitability of CD9 as a standalone site (Castle Donington Parish Council), that CD9 should form part of a wider masterplan with CD10 (Leicestershire County Council) and that CD9 should make reasonable contributions towards infrastructure required cumulatively with CD10 (site promoters of CD10 and Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board).

6.11 Whilst CD9 and CD10 are in different ownerships and are likely to be delivered by different parties, it is officer's preference that they form part of a comprehensive scheme. In this regard, officers recommend that:

- The draft policies for both CD10 and CD9 include the requirement for a masterplan incorporating both sites.
- The policy for CD9 includes a requirement to make reasonable contributions towards infrastructure as part of a cumulative development with CD10 (see **Appendix F**).

6.12 There was local resident concern about the impact on local infrastructure, facilities and services and parish council concern about the impact of more housing

development in the north of the district. Other issues raised related to the need to provide appropriate pedestrian connectivity (local highway authority), doubts that a suitable pedestrian crossing could be provided (Castle Donington Parish Council) and the need to retain the drainage ditch abutting Park Lane (lead local flood authority). More information on the latter is being sought from the county council although it not something which should preclude the allocation of the site.

- 6.13 It is recommended that Land south of Park Lane, Castle Donington (CD9) is allocated for around 30 dwellings in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

## **7 LOCAL SERVICE CENTRES**

- 7.1 The district's Local Service Centres are Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham. The consultation sought views on four additional housing allocations; one in Ibstock, one in Kegworth and two in Measham.

### **Land rear of 111a High Street, Ibstock (Ib20)**

- 7.2 There were 13 responses to this proposed allocation; six statutory consultees; five local residents; one parish council and one landowner/developer/agent. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix G**.
- 7.3 The main concern raised by several parties relates to the potential site access on High Street:
- In heritage terms, the Conservation Officer reiterated his preference for an access via Hextall Drive and his recommendation that the site access to High Street was not included in the red line. In their representations, the site promoters stated this could not be facilitated due to what they perceive as irresolvable land ownership constraints. Planning officers consider that the site access to the High Street should stay in the red line because a pedestrian link at the very least is required to provide a more direct walking route to services and facilities.
  - In road safety terms, the local highways authority has said the access appears acceptable in principle.
  - Officers consider that the wording of the policy for an access which avoids or minimises harm to the Conservation Area is acceptable.
- 7.4 The lead local flood authority has identified an isolated depression in the middle of the site with a high risk of surface water flooding and have suggested that it is either retained as open space or addressed as part of the Flood Risk Assessment which is required as part of a planning application.
- 7.5 No further comments were received that would suggest the site should not progress as an allocation and it is recommended that the site is allocated for around 46 dwellings in the Regulation 19 Plan.

### **Land south of Ashby Road, Kegworth (K12)**

- 7.6 The consultation document confirmed that the Council is proposing to allocate this

site, meaning it would no longer be a reserve site contingent on the outcome of HS2 safeguarding.

- 7.7 There were 21 responses to this proposed allocation; 15 local residents; three statutory consultees; two parish councils and one landowner/developer/agent. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix H**.
- 7.8 Local residents and Kegworth Parish Council confirmed that they do not feel the scale of development is appropriate or that the site is suitable in noise, airport safety, road safety terms or flood risk/drainage terms. In response to these objections:
- Noise - The draft policy in the consultation document requires a noise assessment which would also need to provide appropriate mitigation. Officers note a recent consultation response from the Council's Environmental Protection officer, dated 13 June 2025 and made in relation to the adjoining site (application ref 16/00378/FULM) confirmed that residential development would be acceptable subject to the implementation of noise mitigation measures. On this basis, there would be no justification for precluding K12 on noise grounds in advance of a noise assessment being undertaken.
  - Airport Safety – some local residents felt that the site should not be developed due its proximity to East Midlands Airport. The site is outside of the Public Safety Zone and is already allocated as a reserve site in the adopted Local Plan. However, due to statements made by these residents on the Council's culpability should an accident occur in the future, further legal advice is being sought and the recommendation at the beginning of the report allows for the outcome of this advice.
  - Road safety - the local highways authority is satisfied that a safe and suitable access can be provided. The levels of cumulative traffic will be addressed as part of the transport modelling work described in **Section 3**.
  - Flood risk - Whilst the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has no concerns about the allocation of this site, there is a clear local concern and several photographs of flooding in the Springhill area were submitted as part of the consultation. Officers are seeking a more detailed response on this issue from the LLFA.
- 7.9 Residents and the parish council also highlighted several concerns regarding the impact upon infrastructure and open space/sports facilities. These are both the subject of ongoing evidence-based work which would be used to justify any S106 contributions.
- 7.10 The recommendation at the beginning of the report allows for the outcome of legal advice regarding the East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone.

#### **Land off Leicester Road/Ashby Road, Measham (M11)**

- 7.11 The consultation document confirmed that the Council is proposing to allocate this site, meaning it would no longer be a reserve site contingent on the outcome of HS2 safeguarding.



- 7.12 There were 10 responses to this proposed allocation; six statutory consultees; two local residents; and two landowner/developer/agents. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix I**.
- 7.13 The Lead Local Flood Authority (Leicestershire County Council) has identified 'several isolated depressions/low spots within the site [which are] presenting as high surface water flood risk' before concluding that this may impact the number of dwellings that can be delivered at the site. Officers acknowledge that further work is required to justify the capacity of dwellings, but it should not preclude the allocation of the site at this stage.
- 7.14 There were no other comments that would preclude the site from being allocated. It is recommended that the site is allocated in the Regulation 19 Local Plan but that further work on the potential capacity given the surface water flood constraints is required.

#### **Land off Abney Drive, Measham (M14)**

- 7.15 The consultation document confirmed that the Council is proposing to allocate this site, meaning it would not be contingent on the outcome of HS2 safeguarding.
- 7.16 There were 19 responses to this proposed allocation; nine statutory consultees; eight local residents; and two landowner/developer/agents. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix J**.
- 7.17 The consultation responses covered a wide range of issues including highways, flood risk/drainage, heritage, the Ashby Canal, residential amenity and pollution, infrastructure, biodiversity and the River Mease. There were several comments about the site access from Abney Drive, with some residents saying this should be a secondary access, but others saying the principle of one access on to Abney Drive was acceptable (local highways authority) and that a vehicular access onto Horses Lane would be unsuitable (local highways authority and Conservation Officer).
- 7.18 A policy requirement has been added regarding the development of land which the lead local flood authority has confirmed has a high surface water flood risk.
- 7.19 Inland Waterways is requesting S106 contributions or works that would implement the restoration of the Ashby Canal. Any contributions would need to meet the three legal tests in the CIL Regulations; at this stage there is no evidence that a planning obligation for the Ashby Canal is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
- 7.20 It is recommended that Land off Abney Drive is allocated for around 150 dwellings in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

### **8 SUSTAINABLE VILLAGES**

- 8.1 There were three additional proposed allocations in the Sustainable Villages: Land at Measham Road, Appleby Magna (Ap1); Land west of Redburrow Lane, Packington

(P7) and Land off Church Lane, Ravenstone (R9).

#### **Land at Measham Road, Appleby Magna (Ap1)**

- 8.2 There were eight responses to this proposed allocation; two residents; four statutory consultees and two landowner/developer/agents. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix K**.
- 8.3 There were no objections raised by the statutory consultees. Where concerns were raised these were related but were not limited to the principle of development, identification of a preferential site in Breedon on the Hill, highway matters, flooding, biodiversity, amenity, as well as several non-planning matters.
- 8.4 Key points to note are:
- The site is being promoted on behalf of landowners comprising the consortium who brought forward the development to the south and have confirmed there is developer interest in the site.
  - The local highway authority is satisfied that a safe and suitable access can be achieved from Steeple View Lane.
  - The site is located within Flood Zone 1, which is the lowest risk area for flooding. A small part of the site is at risk of surface water flooding although this is not considered to be a reason not to allocate Ap1. In addition, a Flood Risk Assessment and sustainable drainage strategy will be submitted as part of any future planning application, identifying any increase in flood risk and appropriate mitigation.
  - The impact of this allocation on infrastructure capacity and provision will be addressed in the update to the Infrastructure Developer Plan.
- 8.5 Other issues and concerns raised relate to matters that will be dealt with by other policies of the draft Local Plan or will be dealt with at the planning application stage and are not things that should affect the principle of development at this stage (for example, BNG and the impact on residential amenity).
- 8.6 It is recommended that Land at Measham Road, Appleby Magna (Ap1) is allocated for around 37 dwellings in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

#### **Land west of Redburrow Lane, Packington (P7)**

- 8.7 There were eight responses to this proposed allocation; two residents, one Parish Council, three statutory consultees and two landowners/developer/agents. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix L**.
- 8.8 Comments related to the principle and level of housing, environmental considerations, site accessibility, highway safety, and capacity of infrastructure provision.
- 8.9 Key points to note are:
- The local highway authority has advised that at this time it has not been demonstrated that the site can provide for a safe and suitable access.

- The site is located within Flood Zone 1, which is the lowest risk area of flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment and sustainable development strategy will be required as part of any future planning application, identifying any increase in flood risk and appropriate mitigation.
  - The site is located within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel and Coal, and a policy requirement would be needed to ensure the provision of an appropriate Mineral Assessment as part an application.
- 8.10 Other issues and concerns raised relate to matters that will be dealt with by other policies of the draft Local Plan or will be dealt with at the planning application stage and are not things that should affect the principle of development at this stage (for example, archaeology).
- 8.11 The consultation proposed to allocate Land west of Redburrow Lane (P7) due to the need for an additional housing allocation in Packington, in light of the reduced capacity of the proposed housing allocation of Land south of Normanton Road (P4). However, it was acknowledged that there were several outstanding matters principally relating to highway issues including visibility and the introduction of a new vehicular access close to existing vehicular access points. These issues would need to be resolved for P7 to be allocated in the Regulation 19 plan.
- 8.12 The site promoter has engaged with the local highway authority to seek a solution to these issues and has proposed what they consider to be suitable measures to reduce vehicle speed including the relocation of the 30mph speed zone and gateway traffic calming features. However, the local highway authority has suggested that they do not support this approach although no further explanation has been provided. This information has only been received recently, and officers consider that ruling out this site now may be premature and so it is considered beneficial to undertake further work on this matter. Once this work is completed, officers will be in a position to advise a future meeting of this Committee if the highway matters have been resolved and report a conclusion on the suitability of P7 as an allocation.
- 8.13 It is recommended that consideration of Land West of Redburrow Land, Packington (P7) be deferred to a future meeting of the Local Plan Committee once further work has been undertaken.

#### **Land off Church Lane, Ravenstone (R9)**

- 8.14 There were 18 responses to this proposed allocation; 13 residents; three statutory consultees and two landowner/developer/agents. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix M**.
- 8.15 The consultation responses covered a broad range of issues with local residents commenting on highways (traffic and road safety), impact on the Conservation Area, infrastructure, flooding and drainage, odour and whether there was a need for more housing in Ravenstone., impact upon the character of the area and loss of countryside.

- 8.16 Whilst there were no objections from the local highways authority and lead local flood authority, there is still some concern from the Conservation Officer about whether a suitable development could be delivered, with the main concern being an access from Church Lane. Discussions on this issue are due to take place with the developers and the Conservation Officer.
- 8.17 Whilst this issue requires resolving, it should not preclude the site from being allocated at this stage. It is recommended that Land off Church Lane (R9) is allocated for around 50 dwellings in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

## **9 RESERVE SITES**

### **Land south of Ashby de la Zouch (Packington Nook) (A7)**

- 9.1 This site was identified as a proposed reserve site in the event that the HS2 safeguarding had not been lifted by the time the plan gets to Regulation 19 stage. The reasons behind this proposal were set out in detail in the 11 March Local Plan Committee report.
- 9.2 This site received the highest number of responses across the consultation. There were 141 responses to this proposed allocation; 123 residents; 11 statutory consultees, five landowner/developer/agents and two parish/town councils. There was a broad range of objections to the proposal from local residents, Ashby Town Council, Packington Parish Council, Sport England and some landowner/developer/agents. All responses are summarised at **Appendix O** for completeness. However, in light of the government's recent announcement lifting the HS2 safeguarding, it is no longer proposed to identify the site as a reserve allocation.

### **Land at Spring Lane and rear of 55 Normanton Road, Packington (P5/P8)**

- 9.3 This site was identified as a proposed reserve site in the event that highways concerns at the proposed allocation site at Land west of Redburrow Lane, Packington (P7) could not be satisfied.
- 9.4 There were 11 responses to this potential allocation; three residents; one Parish Council, six statutory consultees and one landowner/developer/agent. A summary of the main issues raised is at **Appendix O**.
- 9.5 Comments related to the principle of development and level of housing, site accessibility, highway safety, environmental considerations and infrastructure provision as well as several non-planning related matters.
- 9.6 Key points to note are:
- The local highway authority has questioned whether access via Grove Close would entail the crossing of third-party land, in addition to concerns raised over the potential lack of visibility to the south of the access.
  - Some representors have raised concerns about the potential scale of development and uncertainty over the suitability of the access or whether the landowner has the appropriate authority to remove the gated entrance that

- currently serves the existing properties on Grove Close.
  - The site is located within Flood Zone 1, which has the lowest risk area of flooding. However, the lead local flood authority has advised that there is a high surface water flood risk along the eastern boundary and extensively in the north-western corner of the site. Development should be avoided in these areas, and this constraint could impact on the capacity of the site.
- 9.7 Other issues and concerns raised relate to matters that will be dealt with by other policies of the local plan or will be dealt with at the planning application stage and are not things that should affect the principle of development at this stage (for example, archaeology).
- 9.8 The consultation proposed sites P5 and P8 be considered as an alternative allocation, for around 23 dwellings, in the event access issues at P7 could not be resolved and subject to the outcome of further consultation and ongoing work. As detailed earlier in this report, there is some uncertainty over whether the highway matters relating to P7 can be resolved and officers are not yet in a position to make a recommendation on the suitability of P7 as an allocation.
- 9.9 Work is also currently ongoing assessing the suitability of P5 and P8 focusing on several issues including site accessibility, the impact of environmental constraints, the relationship of the site with the character of the area and whether it could provide an inclusive form of development. The consultation responses will inform this work as will a Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment of the potential allocation. Officers are not yet in a position to report a conclusion on the suitability of this site as an allocation in the event that it is not possible to resolve issues relating to site P7.
- 9.10 In addition, and for information, officers have recently become aware of discussions taking place, outside of the Local Plan process, on Land at Spring Lane (P3). This site has previously been promoted through the Strategic Housing and Employment Availability Assessment (SHELAA) and has subsequently been subject to a site assessment and Suitability Appraisal. The assessment highlighted that there was no developer interest in the site at the time and highlighted concerns about the potential impact of development on the countryside.
- 9.11 It is recommended that Land at Spring Lane and rear of 55 Normanton Road (P5 & P8) be deferred for consideration together with site P7 to a future meeting of the Local Plan Committee.

Policies and other considerations, as appropriate	
Council Priorities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning and regeneration</li> <li>- Communities and housing</li> <li>- Clean, green and zero carbon</li> </ul>
Policy Considerations:	The Local Plan is required to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and other government guidance and requirements.

Safeguarding:	None discernible.
Equalities/Diversity:	An Equalities Impact Assessment of the Local Plan review will be undertaken as part of the Sustainability Appraisal.
Customer Impact:	No issues identified
Economic and Social Impact:	The decision itself will have no specific impact. The new Local Plan as a whole will aim to deliver positive economic and social impacts and these will be recorded through the Sustainability Appraisal.
Environment, Climate Change and zero carbon:	The decision, of itself, will have no specific impact. The new Local Plan as a whole will aim to deliver positive environmental and climate change impacts and these will be recorded through the Sustainability Appraisal.
Consultation/Community/Tenant Engagement:	The Regulation 18 Local Plan has been subject to consultation. Further targeted consultation is proposed. Further consultation will be undertaken at Regulation 19 stage.
Risks:	<p>A risk assessment for the Local Plan Review has been prepared and is kept up to date. As far as possible control measures have been put in place to minimise risks, including regular Project Board meetings where risk is reviewed.</p> <p>The report highlights the potential risks associated with the issues considered as part of the report.</p>
Officer Contact	<p>Ian Nelson Planning Policy Team Manager 01530 454677 <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Joanne Althorpe Principal Planning Policy Officer 01530 454767 <a href="mailto:joanne.althorpe@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">joanne.althorpe@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p>

