

APPENDIX G – LAND REAR OF 111A HIGH STREET, IBSTOCK (IB20)

APPENDIX G – LAND REAR OF 111A HIGH STREET, IBSTOCK (IB20)

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS (MARCH 2025)

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: IB20	SITE NAME: LAND REAR OF 111A HIGH ST, IBSTOCK
---------	-------------------	---

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
Heritage Assets				
[Will require pre-determination evaluation (trial trenching), followed by appropriate mitigation secured by condition upon any future planning permission.]	Noted, this is something that will be dealt with at planning application stage.	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (County Archaeologist)
Whilst the Conservation Officer would prefer access to be taken from Hextall Drive, there are irresolvable landownership constraints which we have provided details of to the Council. Access from Hextall Drive would also remove the direct access to services and facilities on the High Street, for which we have an agreed position with the highway authority	The NPPF directs that “ <i>where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.</i> ” Officers have to accept the site promoter’s position regarding access at Hextall Drive and weigh an access from High Street (which would be preferable in walking and cycling terms and for which the site promoter’s have proposed some mitigation) against the need for housing.	No change	91;	Pegasus Group (Davidsons)
This is a conservation area and to plough through a beautiful historical properties garden just for profit is wrong. This is a listed area.			30	Dean Lawrence
[Previously advised that the demolition of the roadside boundary wall and the loss of garden land at 111 High Street would harm the significance of the			400	James White (NWLDC Conservation Officer)

APPENDIX G – LAND REAR OF 111A HIGH STREET, IBSTOCK (IB20)

conservation area, to a less than substantial degree. I asked whether “alternative development options would facilitate vehicular access to the site” (n.b. the Royal British Legion owns a ransom strip between Hextall Drive and the site). In December 2024 I said that you should “allocate the body of the development site but not the access”; the consultation document does not reflect that advice				
[The site access has been designed to achieve both an appropriate access and minimise the harm on the character and appearance of the conservation area and setting of the listed buildings. 3D visualisations show how this could be achieved.]	Noted and it would be helpful for the Conservation Officer to provide views on the mitigation proposed	No change	91;	Pegasus Group (Davidsons)
The ‘illustrative layout’ submitted in March 2024 indicates that the croft behind 119 High Street would be retained as open space; I am pleased that this is the case.	Noted	No change	400	James White (NWLDC Conservation Officer)
Will impact upon the historic Overton Road, with the oldest house in Ibstock	To date, this is not a concern that has been raised by the Conservation Officer.	No change, although a heritage assessment will cover this, if necessary.	479	Stephen Gosling
Highways/Access				
[Would like confirmation that the development would not incorporate a pedestrian or vehicular access via Thomas Street]	No access to Thomas St is proposed the developers or has been recommended by third parties.	No change	42	Paula Fray

APPENDIX G – LAND REAR OF 111A HIGH STREET, IBSTOCK (IB20)

[Land close to the site access has tanks underneath and was not built for a number of vehicles driving past]	No statutory party has raised this issue as a concern, but these comments have been passed on to the site promoter for their consideration	No change to the allocation	54	[Name redacted for safeguarding]
I am objecting to 46 houses,80 cars approx all coming onto High St , How they will get out when the Postal workers are sorting and getting ready for delivery ,it will be mayhem.	High Street is subject to double yellow lines but there is a parking bay outside of the Post Office. It is not clear how cars accessing and egressing the site would interfere with cars parked legally in the parking bay. The local highways authority has not raised this as an issue. See above for comments on Hextall Drive.	No change	54; 411	[Name redacted for Safeguarding]; Andy Tonkin
[The potential access on to High Street is in an area which is greatly used by the Post Office and one that is already a 'pinch point' since Post Office delivery vans monopolise the nearby layby for loading their delivery vans. Providing access at this point will involve considerable disruption to the existing commercial activities of Ibstock residents in general, particularly elderly residents who use the Post Office greatly. A better access would be the suggested access off Hextall road. Nevertheless <u>pedestrian access</u> should be provided to the high street, via a lane]			411	Andy Tonkin
[The Highway Authority had previously raised concerns about whether a suitable access could be achieved in the gap between 109 and 111a High Street to offer 2-way traffic, or pedestrian walkways but now accept	Noted and confirmed below.	No change	91	Pegasus Group (Davidsons)

APPENDIX G – LAND REAR OF 111A HIGH STREET, IBSTOCK (IB20)

the principle of the proposed access submitted with these representations]				
Further to the pre-app submitted which included access drawings, [the site access] appears acceptable in principle. Site needs to be included in any strategic master planning exercise and cumulative assessment of Ibstock. RAG Rating: Green	<p>Comments on the acceptability of the site access are noted.</p> <p>It is not clear LCC means by a strategic masterplanning exercise. However, they will be aware that the Council is undertaking transport modelling to assess the cumulative impacts of development proposed in the Local Plan.</p>	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Local Highways Authority)
[At its meeting on 2 April, the Parish Council agreed that IB20 is not a suitable site for development due to the access issues as raised by Highways. The [Parish] Council has not changed it's position on any developments. It was suggested that the site IB20 development be reduced by at least half to reduce the impact on the High Street, and move those houses to the Blackberry Farm development.]	<p>The site has been identified to meet the district's housing requirements on the basis that it would deliver 46 dwellings. Making an efficient use of land is an important planning consideration. As a smaller site, Ib20 has the potential to contribute towards housing supply in the short term (this would be confirmed in a housing trajectory at Reg 19 stage). This is an important consideration given the number of large-scale sites proposed which generally take longer to start delivering homes.</p>	No change	344	Ibstock Parish Council

APPENDIX G – LAND REAR OF 111A HIGH STREET, IBSTOCK (IB20)

Flood Risk / Drainage				
We can confirm that all development will take place in Flood Zone 1	Noted, although surface water flooding has been raised as an issue by the Lead Local Flood Authority.	No change	91	Pegasus Group (Davidsons)
No development should be located in the south-east of the site within the Flood Zones 2 and 3 associated with the ordinary watercourse at the site boundary. There is an isolated depression in the middle of the site with a high risk of surface water flooding. Retain this area as open space or address the issue within the flood risk assessment. No concerns with the deliverability of the 46 units.	Comments regarding the capacity of the site are noted as is the potential for dealing with this area as part of the overall drainage strategy for the site.	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority)
According to the latest information available to the Environment Agency the Southern area of the site is located with Flood Zones 2 and 3, and which is associated with an Ordinary watercourse. We are pleased to see that there is a requirement for no development to be located in Flood Zones 2 or 3.	Noted	No change	480	Environment Agency
[Concerned about flooding as a result built development]	Noted see above responses from the LLFA and Environment Agency. The applicant would need to submit a Flood Risk Assessment and a sustainable drainage strategy as part of the planning application.	No change	479	Stephen Gosling

APPENDIX G – LAND REAR OF 111A HIGH STREET, IBSTOCK (IB20)

Ecology / Biodiversity				
There used to be newts in the stream at the bottom, have they all decided to leave	As part of any future planning application, the site promoters will be required to undertake detailed habitat survey which will also identify the need for any species surveys. The county ecologist has advised that there is the potential for badgers and great crested newts; if this is still the case, surveys and any appropriate mitigation would be required. The site promoters will now also be required to provide a 10% biodiversity net gain as part of the development.	No change, this is a matter for the planning application	54	[Name redacted for Safeguarding];
The proposed policy wording needs to be clarified. It could be read as suggesting that all existing hedgerows need to be retained except those that need to be removed for access. This would significantly impede the development of the site as there is a hedgerow running east/west which if fully retained would reduce the capacity of the site undermine the logical layout of the site. This doesn't appear to be the intention of the policy, as it goes on to refer to the five metre buffer of natural vegetation, where existing hedgerows will be retained.	The site hedgerows should be kept as far as possible but may need to be removed to accommodate the access and crossing points.	No change	91;	Pegasus Group (Davidsons)

APPENDIX G – LAND REAR OF 111A HIGH STREET, IBSTOCK (IB20)

[Ib20 is in the is in the Impact Risk Zone for Ashby Canal Site of Special Scientific Interest. Following a precautionary approach, any proposal must provide sufficient evidence that any water discharges arising from the development will not cause significant impact to the relevant designated site]	Noted, the potential impact upon SSSIs is something that is covered by Policy En1 and would be covered as part of any planning application	No change	345	Natural England
Other Environmental Issues				
[A Minerals Assessment may not be necessary, as Policy M11 allows development in Mineral Safeguarding Areas if the local plan has already considered mineral sterilisation. Since this was addressed during plan preparation and consultation, the requirement could be unnecessary. If needed, an assessment can be provided at the planning application stage.]	See below, LCC has concluded a Minerals Assessment would be required	No change	91;	Pegasus Group (Davidsons)
Allocation is partly within an MSA for Sand & Gravel. As such, we recommend that a Minerals Assessment is undertaken in line with Policy M11 of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (LMWLP) to support any allocation of these sites in new policy, ensuring that the mineral is not needlessly sterilised by future development.	The consultation document included a requirement for a Minerals Assessment (Ib20 part (2)(g)).	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
Safeguarded waste sites over 1km away to the south at Ibstock STW (N9).	Noted	No change		

APPENDIX G – LAND REAR OF 111A HIGH STREET, IBSTOCK (IB20)

The supporting text should refer to the site's location in the National Forest.	Noted – this was an oversight.	Update the supporting text at Regulation 19 stage	165	The National Forest Company
Principle of Development				
Shouldn't be allowed to be built on, should be a protected area, the site has been turned down multiple times	The site was an allocation in an earlier version of the Local Plan.	No change	479	Stephen Gosling
Infrastructure				
Where is the infrastructure?	The need to contribute towards existing infrastructure will be dealt with in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan which is being updated to assess the impact of the additional housing allocations.	No change, subject to the outcome of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	30	Dean Lawrence
Hardly any parking at doctors and on the High Street in general, too much traffic in Ibstock and the surrounding area, can't get into the doctors, dentists, schools.	As above. In addition, residents at this site should be able to walk to services and facilities on the High Street (which includes the GP surgery)– the proximity to the High Street was one of the factors that weighed in favour of its allocation.		479	Stephen Gosling
[46 dwellings at Ib20 would result in an increase of 111 patients for Ibstock and Barlestone Surgeries: an increase of 11% on their register. The ICB recognises that further work will need to take place to consider the cumulative effect of these proposed sites alongside sites that have already been approved]	These comments are noted. This information will feed into an update of the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan which is currently being undertaken. This will consider the cumulative impact of all the proposed housing allocations on healthcare and any necessary mitigation.		487	Leicester Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board