

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS (MARCH 2025)

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: K12	SITE NAME: LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH			
MAIN ISSUES RAISED		COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
Highways and Access					
Vehicular Access & Traffic					
No issues raised and safe and suitable access appears achievable. RAG Rating: Green		These comments reflect those previously received from the local highways authority. LCC explain that a green RAG rating means 'Suitable access'.	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Local Highways Authority)
Provision of a safe and suitable access from Ashby Road A Transport Appraisal has been prepared which demonstrates how a safe and suitable access is achievable from Ashby Road		This would need to be signed off by the local highways authority as part of any future planning application	No change	132	Stantec UK (Caddick Land)
[Concerned about the increase of traffic and negative impact upon road safety: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Will increase traffic on Ashby Road and because of the bus gate, all traffic will be directed towards the village centre.Will exacerbate existing problems with traffic and speeding on Ashby Road and associated residential streets.Will exacerbate congestion and parking issues on Ashby Road associated with Kegworth Primary		The Council will have to carry out transport modelling as part of its Local Plan evidence base. This will identify the highways impacts of the proposed development in the area, including on more local roads and whether any negative impacts can be sufficiently mitigated through road improvement schemes, sustainable transport measures etc. These measures will then be identified in the	No change at present	1; 81; 173; 283; 310; 398	Steven Morton; Michael Davies; Carl Sutton; Jane Dennis; Nick Goode; Ana Margarida Carvalho da Silva; Rebecca Graham

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

School and Handkerchief Day Nursery. <ul style="list-style-type: none">The cumulative impact on traffic/road safety with K7 will be unacceptable	Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will accompany the Local Plan. As set out at paragraph 3.23 of the consultation document, a Transport Assessment would be required as part of a future planning application.			
The proposal would increase traffic and create safety issues without any detailed traffic assessment or proposed mitigation.		No change	342	Ana Margarida Carvalho da Silva
[The development will increase the illegal use of the bus gate on Ashby Road]	The concerns about the misuse of the bus gate are understood – such misuse is a traffic offence rather than a planning matter.	No change	81; 173	Michael Davies; Carl Sutton
Predict that bypass access will be opened creating possible issues with traffic flow on the bypass / A453 junction with cars then risking crossing the west bound flow to access the A453, an accident waiting to happen.	The site does not adjoin the Kegworth bypass. Access on to the Kegworth bypass is not proposed, would not make an efficient use of land and is unlikely be accepted by the highways authority.	No change	1	Steven Morton
There is no possibility of 'safe access' to Ashby Road, and ingress/egress to and from the proposed development must be solely onto the bypass, surely the point of the bypass			310	Nick Goode
Pedestrian Access				
Ashby Road is a busy route and lacks a footpath on the development side.	The lack of a footpath on the southern side of Ashby Road is acknowledged at paragraph 4.50 of the consultation document and mitigation required at part (2)(b) of the draft policy.	No change	342	Ana Margarida Carvalho da Silva

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

There is no footpath on the southern side of Ashby Road. The Plan itself acknowledges that a pedestrian crossing or footway must be provided, confirming the site is not safely accessible.	See above, if appropriate mitigation can be provided, it would make the development acceptable in planning terms.	No change	397	Roy Todd
The Masterplan [included with the representations] illustrates how a footway can be provided to the southern side of Ashby Road in accordance with the requirements of the policy. The footway would connect into the existing footway to the east and it is expected that this can be delivered within highways land without the need to remove any existing vegetation.	Noted	No change	132	Stantec (Caddick Land)
Public Right of Way L45a				
[The Masterplan shows a potential connection to public right of way L45a, with a route through the site linking to Ashby Road. Whilst the exact nature of this connection beyond the site boundary is yet to be determined, as land beyond the site boundary is controlled by Caddick Land, creating this link is feasible].	Noted	No change	132	Stantec (Caddick Land)
While a connection [to L45a] proposed, no assurance is given that its open, valued character will be preserved.	Whilst views from the footpath will change as a result of the development, the footpath only crosses the far SE corner of the site meaning the majority of the existing footpath will remain in open countryside.	No change	397	Roy Todd

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

Sustainable Transport				
[The proposed allocations in the northern parishes are poorly served by public transport. There is no genuine choice of transport modes- residents of would be reliant on the private car. The majority of those travelling to the airport already travel by car which adds to congestion on the highway network and contributes to carbon emissions.]	K12 is served by the Skylink Derby bus service which runs along Ashby Road. There are four buses an hour towards East Midlands Gateway, East Midlands Airport and Derby in one direction and Loughborough and Leicester in the other direction. The nearest bus stops are less than 400m (5 mins walking).	No change	101	Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council
Infrastructure				
[Concerns about the limited infrastructure in Kegworth in general/significant investment in improving and expanding local services is required/Recent development has not resulted in additional infrastructure]	The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan, is currently being updated to reflect the additional housing allocations, this will confirm the mitigation required for existing infrastructure/the provision of new infrastructure as appropriate.	Await the outcome of the update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan	1; 81 173; 310; 342; 376	Steven Morton; Michael Davies; Carl Sutton; Nick Goode; Ana Margarida Carvalho da Silva; Michael Powell
[The cumulative scale of development] creates a substantial stress on the existing facilities and social structures of the village, e.g. schools, medical services, recreation/sports facilities, sewerage and drainage systems, and the addition of K12 [140 dwellings] is a step too far.			365	Kegworth Parish Council

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

Primary education				
<p>[Concerns about primary school provision in Kegworth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing school is already at capacity. • Further growth would worsen the situation. • Children already have to go outside of the village for education. • The Council's site assessment notes that further expansion of the school may be possible but the site is limited and that any significant further housing in Kegworth may require a new school. • Further development [at the school?] would only add more chaos to the High Street traffic and associated safeguarding issues 	<p>The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan, is currently being updated to reflect the additional housing allocations, this will confirm the mitigation required for existing infrastructure/the provision of new infrastructure as appropriate.</p>	<p>Await the outcome of the update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p>	<p>1; 173; 310; 342; 398</p>	<p>Steven Morton; Carl Sutton; Nick Goode; Ana Margarida Carvalho da Silva; Rebecca Graham</p>
Healthcare				
<p>[Kegworth Surgery is oversubscribed and cannot accommodate an increase in residents.</p>	<p>The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan, is currently being updated to reflect the additional housing allocations, this will confirm the mitigation required for existing infrastructure/the provision of new infrastructure as appropriate.</p>	<p>Await the outcome of the update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p>	173; 342; 398	Carl Sutton;; Ana Margarida Carvalho da Silva; Rebecca Graham
<p>The surgery is as it was 20 years ago</p>			310	Nick Goode

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

[140 dwellings at K12 would result in an increase of 339 patients for Orchard Surgery.]	These comments are noted. Kegworth is in the management of the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Integrated Care Board who are due to be consulted as part 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.	Await the outcome of the update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan	487	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board
Other Infrastructure				
Nursery places are always hard to come by	Nursery provision is generally managed by the private sector and not something funded by S106 contributions.	No change	1	Steven Morton
[There are limited retail outlets in Kegworth]	This is not an issue just for Kegworth and is reflective of trends in online shopping. An increase in population may create more demand for retail/class E services	No change	173; 310	Carl Sutton; Nick Goode
[Parking in the village is poor]	The proposed development would need to provide sufficient off-road parking spaces to serve the proposed dwellings (as determined by the highways authority. The site's location is not considered suitable to provide a car park to serve the local centre (unlike the Money Hill development in Ashby for example).	No change	1	Steven Morton

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

Existing leisure facilities are limited and there is a requirement for additional public open space, sports pitches and associated facilities. Kegworth Imps Junior Football Club is in desperate need of additional pitches, as many of their teams are currently forced to play outside the village.	The Council has recently commissioned a Playing Pitch Strategy, Built Facilities Strategy (Sport & Community) and an Open Space Strategy. This will include looking at the need for open space, sports and recreational facilities in Kegworth.	No change	173	Carl Sutton
There must be more amenities vital for the health, well-being, and social needs of existing residents and the community			173	Carl Sutton
There is little or no policing presence in Kegworth with the result that anti social behaviour is increasing alarmingly. This includes but is not limited to low level vandalism, street racing by 'contestants' from across the East Midlands, drug trafficking, dozens of daily unchecked motoring offences from ignoring traffic signs, running red traffic lights, speeding, driving through bus gates, parking on pavement (to the extent that pedestrians, never mind mothers with prams or disabled in buggies or with walkers) have to walk on the road, and illegal parking on double yellow lines such that bus services are finding it increasingly difficult to navigate the village.	These concerns are noted. Whilst these are behavioural issues outside of the planning system. However, new development in a given area increases the population and Leicestershire Police are able to request S106 contributions, where they comply with the three tests in the CIL	No change	310	Nick Goode
Flood Risk and Drainage				
No concerns	Noted	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority)

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

<p>[There are existing flooding issues on the site and in the local area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues with the existing drainage system (balancing area on Whatton Road) has resulted in the site itself; Langley Drive, Springfield and Broadhill Rd, Fox Hills, Derby Road, Whatton Road flooding after heavy rainfall.. • Springfield is named after a natural spring – the area floods after heavy rain. • The land drains to the south-east and there is no natural outfall on the site's SE boundary. • The replacement of greenfield land with tarmac and concrete will increase the flood risk in the local area. • How will the proposed development mitigate flood risk elsewhere in Kegworth? • Severn Trent/local highways authority not taking responsibility for flooding in the local area. • The flooding has worsened since the bypass was built • Residents have to use pumps at least once a year to prevent flooding. • The proposed development will make the situation worse. 	<p>Photographs were submitted by several residents which demonstrated instances of flooding in the local area. It was not always clear where the photos were taken from but there is clearly an issue around Springhill and adjoining streets and local residents are concerned.</p> <p>The government's flood map for planning shows that there is a risk of surface water flooding in the south-eastern corner of the site and officers will query this with the LLFA who have no concerns.</p> <p>A flood risk assessment and surface water drainage strategy would be required as part of any future planning application. The assessment will need to establish whether a proposed development is likely to be affected by future flooding and/or whether it would increase flood risk elsewhere. It would need to identify mitigation measures to deal with any effects or risk, to the satisfaction of the lead local flood authority.</p>	<p>Request further comments from the LLFA/elaboration on their 'no concerns' response</p>	<p>1; 81; 173; 283; 310; 318; 376; 388; 389; 392</p>	<p>Steven Morton; Michael Davies; Carl Sutton; Jane Dennis; Nick Goode; Lorraine Harrison; Michael Powell; Stephen Evans Jeff Gill; Nathan Alton</p>
--	---	--	--	--

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

<p>[A Flood Risk and Drainage Feasibility Technical Note has been prepared. The site is in Flood Zone 1 and at a very low risk from surface water flooding. The ground conditions on the Site will be unsuitable to support water infiltration techniques and to comply with planning policies and requirements, an attenuation pond with a flow control chamber will be proposed in the south east corner of the Site where there is surface water flooding risk and where the levels are lowest]</p>	<p>These comments are noted, albeit a flood risk assessment / drainage strategy would need to be approved by the lead local flood authority</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>132</p>	<p>Caddick Land</p>
<p>Principle of Development</p>				
<p>We think identification of a 'reserve site' for Kegworth to countermeasure loss of other sites and the need to allocate additional sites for the district because the local plan timeline has been expanded are not the same thing, and it is a misstep to simply add the K12 site to proposed allocations without consideration of other potential site within C0425 Revision 4 [Sustainability Appraisal]</p>	<p>The reasons for doing this were explained in the consultation document. The Local Plan needs to plan for sufficient sites over the plan period. If it does not and it cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply, it leaves itself open to speculative development.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>365</p>	<p>Kegworth Parish Council</p>
<p>[Should the HS2 safeguarding be lifted, K12 should not be required. The existing planning permissions in place for a total of 251 dwellings should be prioritised.]</p>	<p>The government confirmed it was lifting the HS2 safeguarding on 17 July 2025, but this does not change the recommendation to allocate this site.</p>		<p>173</p>	<p>Carl Sutton</p>

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

Having attended the Local Plan consultation community drop-in session at Kegworth Village Hall on 5th February 2024 we noted from Inset Map 15 of Kegworth (attached) that the Land South of Ashby Road is outside of the Limits to Development boundary and is part of the Countryside. This was a major factor in our purchase of [our home]	As above. Whilst these comments are noted, it is important to state that planning is concerned with land use in the <i>public</i> (as opposed to <i>private</i>) interest.	No change	173	Carl Sutton
<i>Site provides function of separation / buffer to M1/ East Midlands Gateway</i>				
[The site provides separation between the housing and industrial developments / infrastructure and allowing housing creep in these areas only increases the sense of Kegworth being hemmed in between roads and industry. The ‘village’ is really suffering from expansion and industrial creep. Perhaps more rapid decisions regarding the future of Ratcliffe on soar Power Station would accelerate the building of a ‘new village’ with its own identity. Though I fear that this area would be already allocated for yet more industry to take up the green belt land.]	There are limited options for further growth in Kegworth and this is deemed to be the most appropriate site. Ratcliffe on Soar is in Rushcliffe Borough Council and forms part of the Freeport.	No change	1	Steven Morton
[Losing this site as a green buffer would diminish village life and quality, eroding the pleasant aspects that make it unique. Prioritising greenfield development is short-sighted; brownfield sites should be used instead]	As above. In addition, the Council is unable to meet its housing requirements on brownfield land alone.	No change	81	Michael Davis

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

<p>[The site serves as a green buffer between Kegworth and the airport Developing it would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intrude on nearby homes, • Remove a zone that protects community identity, • increase traffic and air pollution on the village edge. <p>Such development undermines sustainable goals and landscape integrity.</p>	As above – traffic and air pollution dealt with elsewhere in this document	No change	362	Noel Suthesh
Cumulative Scale of Development				
<p>The cumulative scale of development in Kegworth and the Northern Parishes (committed and proposed allocations) is inappropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slack and Parr (188 dwellings) • K7 (110 dwellings) • K11 (150 dwellings) 	K7 and K11 have effectively been since the adoption of the plan in 2017 and were intended to contribute towards the district's housing need up to 2031. The new Local Plan plans for the period up to 2042.	No change	81; 101; 173; 342; 365;	Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council; Ana Margarida Carvalho da Silva; Kegworth Parish Council
Agricultural land needs to be preserved in this area given the amount of development that has taken place in the area (bypass, East Midlands Gateway, warehousing, solar farms etc)	The loss of agricultural land has been weighed against the need for housing	No change	283	Jane Dennis
Amenity value				
[The land provides a valued green/amenity space/access to nature and is valuable for mental health	Appreciate that the character of the site will change, in terms of amenity space, the only public access is on the PROW in the very SE corner of the site.	No change	81; 376	Michael Davies; Michael Powell

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

The K7 site has a well-used public footpath and this will be the only remaining open space in this entry to the village. Beyond, we have M1, airport, East Midlands Gateway and a Rail freight terminal. This is a class case of an actual “green belt”	It is assumed the reference should be to K12 not K7. See above.	No change	365	Kegworth Parish Council
Build to Rent/HMOs				
[There is more potential for HMO if the houses are rented]	<p>The site is being promoted by a private rental developer and operator. They will have carried out due diligence/undertaken market research before deciding to take on the site.</p> <p>All build to rent properties would be operated/managed by a single company. Whereas HMO landlords often rent out living areas as bedrooms to maximise income this is not in the business model of the site promoter.</p> <p>In any event, the provision of a Build to Rent scheme is not a policy requirement, the information was provided given that HMOs are a concern in Kegworth.</p>	No change	1; 173	Steven Morton; Carl Sutton;
[Question the location of the site as a Build for Rent; such schemes are normally located in larger towns/cities and tend to be more expensive than comparable properties in the private rental market.]			173	Carl Sutton
A 140-unit Build-to-Rent model in a rural setting is untested locally, and no evidence of market demand or viability has been provided.			342	Ana Margarida Carvalho da Silva
The proposed increase to 140 homes, delivered as a Build to Rent scheme, means no homes would be available for purchase. This single-tenure model is entirely unsuitable for Kegworth and does not serve long-term community stability or housing need.			397	Roy Todd

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

<p>[There is sufficient existing housing stock in the village that is currently being used as HMOs for University of Nottingham students. The campus is in Nottinghamshire and I'm quite sure the Council will not develop greenfield sites in Sutton Bonnington to house students so why should the Local Plan]</p>	<p>The concerns regarding HMOs are noted and a Local Plan policy is proposed on this issue. The Council does however need to plan for its local term housing need and failure to do will open the door to speculative development on non-allocated sites.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>81</p>	<p>Michael Davies</p>
<p>Design / Residential Amenity</p>				
<p>The details of the plans are not available but considering the size of the area and the number of houses I would predict that narrow streets and limited driveway parking would be available and therefore street parking in this and adjacent areas will become de rigour.</p>	<p>These concerns are noted and are matters that will be dealt with as part of a detailed planning application.</p>	<p>Add the following policy requirement: A design which respects the amenity of residential properties to the east. Add additional information to the supporting text at Reg 19 stage.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Steven Morton</p>
<p>The west facing housing on Springfield have views and clear sunlight. This development will clearly affect those houses and the height of the buildings should take into consideration the impact they will have on existing properties.</p>	<p>Parking provision and road widths would need to be provided in accordance with the local highway authority's standards.</p>		<p>1</p>	<p>Steven Morton</p>
<p>The site sits higher than our homes, meaning significant loss of light and privacy for neighbouring gardens—this is not addressed in the policy.</p>	<p>Matters like separation distances, overlooking, character etc. will need to be consistent with the Council's Good Design Guide and need to satisfy the Council's Urban Designer.</p>		<p>342</p>	<p>Ana Margarida Carvalho da Silva</p>
<p>It is also likely that a proportion of any new housing on both sites would not be commensurate with and not in character with current properties.</p>			<p>81</p>	<p>Michael Davies</p>

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

The Masterplan depicts how the development will be ‘outward facing’, creating active frontages to the northern, western and southern boundaries.	Noted	No change	132	Stantec UK (Caddick Land)
[Landscaping is planned for the southern and western boundaries, combining new planting and strengthening existing hedgerows, especially in the southwest to help reduce noise from East Midlands Airport and the M1]	Noted	No change	132	Stantec UK (Caddick Land)
The southern and western boundaries are described as “arbitrary,” lacking defensible landscape features, meaning any development will be visually intrusive and poorly integrated into the village.	The draft policy requires landscaping on these boundaries	No change	397	Roy Todd
Biodiversity				
[The wildlife buffer of 5 metres should be considered an absolute minimum surrounding the whole site to ensure the wildlife that’s regularly seen here; Roe deer, pheasants, foxes, badgers, bats etc feel free to roam and fly.	This requirement was recommended by the county council ecologist. The proposals would also need to provide 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The hedgerows are required outside of gardens and as such would be managed as part of the site’s open space maintenance.	No change	1	Steven Morton
Hedgerow buffers are not enough to mitigate habitat loss, and the lack of defensible boundaries risks further sprawl.			342	Ana Margarida Carvalho da Silva
[While the Masterplan supports retaining most existing vegetation around the site, the eastern boundary vegetation would need to remain as part of rear garden boundaries.	A solution for the eastern hedgerow would need to be agreed with the county ecologist	No change	132	Stantec UK(Caddick Land)

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

Alternatives, such as omitting development or placing fences against the hedge, pose issues with land use efficiency and hedge maintenance. It is therefore recommended that “where possible” be added to the policy for practical application.]				
The development will destroy natural habitats, and no ecological survey has been presented.	The comments on the ecological potential of the site are noted. 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 advised that there is the potential for bats, badgers on site and great crested newts nearby. Any onsite/offsite mitigation will be agreed by the ecologist at Leicestershire County Council. The site promoters will now also be required to provide a 10% biodiversity net gain as part of the development.	No change	342	Ana Margarida Carvalho da Silva
We can confirm that badgers inhabit the area (or at least come to die on the adjacent Ashby Road and Bypass) and that Raptors (Red Kite) regularly hover over this area as part of a foraging zone.			365	Kegworth Parish Council
this land is a haven for wildlife including Bats , sparrow hawks, Red Kits and many other species.			376	Michael Powell
[K12 is in the Impact Risk Zone for Attenborough Gravel Pits 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

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

Noise, Vibration & Air Quality				
<p>The site is unsuitable for housing in noise and/or air quality terms due to its close proximity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kegworth Bypass (car cruising and racing) • East Midlands Airport (in operation 24 hours/7 days a week) • M1 motorway • A6 and A453 • Operational disturbance from East Midlands Gateway and the proposed Freeport • Increased volume of HGV traffic (noise and diesel emissions) • Night-time logistics and freight movements • Smell of jet fuel <p>The proposed development would be contrary to NPPF paragraph 185.]</p>	<p>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.</p>	No change	81; 310; 318; 362; 283; 398	Michael Davies; Nick Goode; Lorraine Harrison; Noel Suthesh; Jane Dennis; Rebecca Graham
<p>[The noise from the airport is significant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mitigation can be provided in back gardens • No mitigation for having windows open during night • It causes sleep deprivation • Research by the University of Leicester has linked long term exposure to aircraft noise to health conditions including stroke and cardiovascular disease, hypertension, sleep disturbance and mental health deterioration. 	<p>In terms of air quality, the proposals are likely to require an air quality assessment in line with the Council's Air Quality SPD.</p>		283; 310; 362; 365; 397	Jane Dennis; Nick Goode; Noel Suthesh; Kegworth Parish Council; Roy Todd;

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

[A Feasibility Noise Assessment by Apex Acoustics Ltd (Appendix H) evaluates both road and aircraft noise across the Site. The report recommends mitigation measures such as positioning garden fencing and homes to shield from motorway noise, orienting gardens to the north and east for aircraft noise protection, and placing taller buildings to the south to further reduce noise impacts.]	Noted – a detailed noise (and vibration) assessment would need to be prepared and signed off by the Council's Environmental Protection team	No change	132	Stantec UK (Caddick Land
Turning houses to face one way or the other will make zero difference to the noise levels	Noted, the Noise Assessment will identify appropriate mitigation measures and will need to satisfy the Council's Environmental Protection team	No change	310	Nick Goode
Any noise assessment should include aircraft taking off to the east as noise levels are significantly increased in these circumstances.	Noted, existing noise levels should be measured over a set period of time, including overnight, at times when aircraft is taking off. The methodology will be agreed with the Council's Environmental Protection Officer. Noise monitoring should be done during 'worst case' scenarios, taking into account wind direction etc.	No change	173	Carl Sutton

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

The Local Plan openly acknowledges the requirement for a Noise Assessment, confirming the severity of these impacts. It proposes wholly inadequate mitigations, such as orienting back gardens away from these boundaries, which do nothing to address the continuous, intrusive, and health-damaging nature of noise exposure in this location.	It is for the Noise Assessment to identify mitigation measures and for the Council's Environmental Protection to approve. The supporting text provides some examples of what could be provided.	No change	397	Roy Todd
[There is no mention of the close proximity to the A453 and M1 which results in persistent noise and poor air quality, intensified by heavy road and air traffic. It is difficult to justify rating this site as having only "Minor Negative" impacts under SA9, given the clearly significant negative effects]	The M1 as a source of noise is mentioned at paragraph 4.52. The Council's consultants have scored the SA based upon a detailed methodology/framework.	No change	365	Kegworth Parish Council
[There is no reference to the significant negative impacts on health and wellbeing (SA1) from this site's proximity to the eastern end of the East Midlands Airport runway. While existing homes may qualify for noise insulation grants, new properties here would not, despite being within the highest noise zones on the EMA's current "2011 Lden Noise Contour Map."]	Noise is dealt with under SA9. The Council's consultants have scored the SA based upon a detailed methodology/framework.	No change	365	Kegworth Parish Council

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

It is surprising that site selection has not considered these points and the local plan deems this to be one of the most suitable sites within the district for additional housing allocation! That is hard to accept and it is highly possible that the planning inspectorate might take a dim view of this compared to some sites in C0425 that have been rejected for selection.	Noted. The adopted Local Plan underwent examination by a Local Plan Inspector and the site was designated as a reserve site.	No change	365	Kegworth Parish Council
Vibration				
[The planes flying over the site would result in a vortex which is a circulating current of air, causing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vibrations affecting the structure of homes • Sleep disturbance • Impact on mental wellbeing 	Noted	Include a requirement for a Noise <u>and</u> Vibration Assessment at Regulation 19 stage	283; 318; 365;	Jane Dennis; Lorraine Harrison; Kegworth Parish Council
East Midlands Airport / Public Safety Zone				
[The site is located to the north of the East Midlands Airport Public Safety Zone; however, memories remain of the Kegworth Air Disaster in 1989 where 47 people lost their lives and 74 sustained serious injuries. Building new homes adjacent to the Public Safety Zone and virtually under the flight path is ill thought out and with substantial risk.	The site is located outside of the Public Safety Zone. However given the statements made regarding the culpability of the Council on this issue, officers are in the process of seeking legal advice.	No change subject to the outcome of legal advice regarding the Public Safety Zone.	173; 283	Carl Sutton; Jane Dennis

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

<p>[The site lies directly under the precision approach path for Runway 27 at East Midlands Airport. Aircraft regularly descend over the site at altitudes of approximately 200–300 feet above ground level (AGL). At this point in the flight path, aircraft are in final landing configuration — low speed, low thrust, and with minimal room for deviation.</p> <p>This proximity to an active flight corridor exposes the site to a non-theoretical risk of aircraft failure or misalignment. It is within the final 1.5 nautical miles of the runway threshold, an area that should be preserved as a buffer, not intensified with residential occupancy.</p> <p>The 1989 Kegworth air disaster occurred within this very corridor. The crash resulted in 47 fatalities and remains one of the most serious aviation incidents in UK civil aviation history. Site K2 falls within the same trajectory. Allocating this land for housing, with full knowledge of its location and history, invites foreseeable risk and may establish a precedent of legal liability in the event of future incidents.</p>	<p>The site is located outside of the Public Safety Zone. However given the statements made regarding the culpability of the Council on this issue, officers are in the process of seeking legal advice.</p>	<p>No change subject to the outcome of legal advice regarding the Public Safety Zone.</p>	<p>362</p>	<p>Noel Suthesh</p>
--	--	---	------------	---------------------

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

<p>Under CAP 772 and Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) safeguarding rules, councils are obligated to consult on developments that could attract birds near an airport.</p> <p>Site K2, if developed for housing, would introduce over 140 homes — each with domestic bins, composters, food waste and gardens. These create a bird attractant environment beneath the active flight path.</p> <p>This would increase the risk of bird strikes during final approach — a critical safety issue, particularly for large cargo and passenger aircraft operating at low altitude.</p> <p>It is incumbent on the Council to ensure that new development does not exacerbate aviation hazards. Failure to address this may result in legal exposure in the event of avoidable incidents.</p>	<p>The site is located outside of the Public Safety Zone. However given the statements made regarding the culpability of the Council on this issue, officers are in the process of seeking legal advice.</p>	<p>No change subject to the outcome of legal advice regarding the Public Safety Zone.</p>	<p>362</p>	<p>Noel Suthesh</p>
---	--	---	------------	---------------------

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

<p>Should Site K2 be allocated for housing, it would establish a record of foreseeability — meaning the Council will have been formally warned of safety, health and environmental risks.</p> <p>If, in the future, an aviation incident, health impact or legal dispute arises related to this development, the Council — and, by extension, its officers and advisers — could be subject to scrutiny under the principles of public liability and professional negligence.</p> <p>The risks outlined here are well-documented, well-known and entirely preventable.</p>	<p>The site is located outside of the Public Safety Zone. However given the statements made regarding the culpability of the Council on this issue, officers are in the process of seeking legal advice.</p>	<p>No change subject to the outcome of legal advice regarding the Public Safety Zone.</p>	<p>362</p>	<p>Noel Suthesh</p>
--	--	---	------------	---------------------

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

<p>The Kegworth Air Disaster of 8 January 1989 occurred just 1,200 metres from this site, when British Midland Flight 92 crashed short of the runway, killing 47 people and seriously injuring 74. This site falls squarely within the impact zone of a similar incident. More recent events include an engine failure on a One Air cargo Boeing 747 in February 2025, which led to an emergency landing at East Midlands Airport. Aviation safety has improved, but mechanical failures and human error remain common causes of incidents. According to the UK Civil Aviation Authority and IATA, accident risk remains present—especially with older aircraft used in cargo operations, such as those handled at East Midlands. If the Council knowingly permits housing in such a location, any future incident would immediately call attention to these warnings. Should a crash or health impact occur, the decision to allocate Site K12 would be used as evidence that the Council acted negligently, having ignored clear expert findings, legal obligations, and its duty of care to residents. Moreover, individual officers or decision-makers who proceed with approval despite these documented risks may find themselves personally liable, should negligence be established through</p>	<p>The site is located outside of the Public Safety Zone. However given the statements made regarding the culpability of the Council on this issue, officers are in the process of seeking legal advice.</p>	<p>No change subject to the outcome of legal advice regarding the Public Safety Zone.</p>	<p>397</p>	<p>Roy Todd</p>
---	--	---	------------	-----------------

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

future legal action or inquiry. The case for foreseeability is overwhelming.				
Other Environmental Issues				
The allocation is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area.	Noted	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
Safeguarded waste sites are at Citrus Grove (N30) and Kegworth STW (N10 east). These are around 1km to the North.	Noted	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
[The proposals 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)
Further, the views from Ashby Road, the bypass, and the vantage point at the top of Broad Hill, which are all much used by recreational walkers, will be severely impacted by the scale and mass of this development	It is considered that the site will be seen in the context of surrounding built development	No change	365	Kegworth Parish Council

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

Other				
No traffic, ecology, healthcare, education, or viability assessments have been published to justify this allocation.	The Local Plan will need to be accompanied by traffic modelling, an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and a Viability Assessment, but in order to do that work, we need to have a full plan in place (see paragraph 1.17 of the consultation document – ‘what happens after this consultation?’). The Leicestershire County Council ecologist has been consulted on the site but the site promoter will be required to an up to date ecological assessment and any necessary species survey as part of any future planning application. This work will need to be approved by the county ecologist.	No change	342	Ana Margarida Carvalho da Silva
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [We note that the Local Plan draft includes K7 as 150 dwellings] • [The site has permission for 110 dwellings] • It is inappropriate to include 150 in the plan as it may predetermine the existing outstanding planning application (for 160) and is inconsistent with the site’s planning history] 	It is unclear where this figure of 150 dwellings has been taken from. The Local Plan has accounted for the committed number of dwellings at this site, i.e. the 110 that has planning permission. Table 12 of the consultation document references 110 dwellings, not 150.	No change	365	Kegworth Parish Council

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

<p>The local plan needs to identify how potential new housing need will be met within the planning period. We note that there seems to be no allowance for infill or windfall development. Within any period, there is always a significant number of such developments, building with the boundaries of existing properties, self builds, etc. Some local authorities include such an allowance in the plan and it can be estimated by a number of methods. It seems inappropriate to allocate additional greenfield sites whilst keeping this type of development 'in the back pocket'. The local plan should be complete and realistic.</p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that any windfall site allowance must be backed by compelling evidence and be realistic, considering previous delivery rates and future trends. Although the Council's SHELAA includes a number of small sites, many are in unsustainable locations. Historic windfall delivery rates are based on unreliable data as many such sites were approved when the Council did not have an up-to-date Local Plan making predictions about future windfall supply unreliable. As a result, it is difficult to predict windfall development with sufficient certainty into the housing supply.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>365</p>	<p>Kegworth Parish Council</p>
<p>In summary a less appropriate development site would be hard to find. Rather than building warehouses within the village for example between Prichard Drive and the old A6 AND between Brickyard Lane and the Bypass these plots would be better deployed to housing since egress/ingress would enable traffic largely to be contained outwith the village</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>310</p>	<p>Nick Goode</p>

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

When the bypass planning application was agreed I thought the part of that planning agreement was that there would be no 'back filling' of the land?	The development of this site is not precluded by any agreement relating to the bypass	No change	398	Rebecca Graham
Part (1) of the consultation documents begins with the phrasing "Land rear of south of Ashby Road...". It is believed that this is a typographical error and the words "rear of" should be deleted so the text instead reads "Land south of Ashby Road...". Caddick Land would be grateful for this correction in the next iteration of the Plan.	Noted. 'Rear of' is a typo.	Use correct site name in future versions of the plan.	132	Stantec UK (Caddick Land)
Evidence Base				
[The summary text says the site is not well located to existing communities and services but there is a positive finding under SA8 (reducing the need to travel)]	Noted	Review when the SA is updated at Reg 19 stage	132	Stantec UK (Caddick Land)
[Additional Housing Site Assessments does not reflect the latest position on HS2 and refers to K7 and K11 as being deliverable and that the Council does not propose to allocate any further sites in Kegworth]	Circumstances are constantly changing – the position has recently changed again (17 July 2025)	The site assessments will be reviewed and updated where appropriate	132	Stantec UK (Caddick Land)
[Site proforma should not describe the boundaries as 'arbitrary']	Noted		132	Stantec UK (Caddick Land)
[Disagree with the proforma conclusion on green infrastructure]	Noted		132	Stantec UK (Caddick Land)
[Agree with proforma that any impact on the landscape is capable of mitigation]	Noted	No change	132	Stantec UK (Caddick Land)
[Agree with proforma that it is possible for noise to be mitigated to an acceptable level]	Noted		132	Stantec UK (Caddick Land)

APPENDIX H – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12)

In response to the proforma highlighting that a great crested newt survey is required, our ecologists conclude a survey is not needed and precautionary working methods would be sufficient to prevent impacts]	Noted – however this is something that would need to be discussed and agreed with the county ecologist	No change	132	Stantec UK (Caddick Land)
[Do not agree with the conclusions on the proforma regarding site access]	These comments were based on the SHELAA and the local highways authority has now provided more specific comments relating to this site	The site assessments will be reviewed and updated where appropriate	132	Stantec UK (Caddick Land)