RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS (MARCH 2025)

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: M11	SITE NAME: LAND OFF LEICESTER ROAD/ASHBY ROAD, MEASHAM
---------	------------------	--

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
[The proposed policy requirements are supported at this time. As the allocation is progressed /confirmed by the Council, the applicant will seek to update key supporting technical evidence supporting the planning application to ensure it is up-to-date and robust to allow for an expedient determination of the planning application]	Noted	No change	88	Pegasus Group (Hallam Land)
[Allocating around 450 dwellings in Measham is only slightly above the 426 planned in the adopted Local Plan. Given limited growth since 2017, a more proactive approach—allocating additional sites—would better meet local housing needs and support Measham's sustainability as outlined in NPPF paragraph 83.]	The 426 dwellings at Measham Waterside should now be able to come forward following the lifting of the HS2 safeguarding. No further sites in Measham are considered necessary as part of the new Local Plan.	No change	111	Define Planning & Design (Bloor Homes)

Highways				
[Concerned about the potential increase in traffic movements due to the proposed housing sites at Measham and Appleby Magna. The impact on the A444 needs to be assessed and any mitigation measures identified/traffic modelling needs to consider the impact on the A444/J11 of the M42]	The Council is carrying 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 outside the district boundary where relevant), and whether any negative impacts can be sufficiently mitigated through road improvement schemes,	No change subject to the outcome of transport modelling	98; 241	South Derbyshire District Council; Derbyshire County Council
[Financial contributions should be sought from developers to address the traffic impacts on the A444 through legal agreements associated with any planning permissions	sustainable transport measures etc. Any financial contributions would need to meet the three legal tests in the CIL Regulations: Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms Directly related to the development Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development		98	South Derbyshire District Council
There is a live application (18/00498/OUTM) at this site but we have advised safe and suitable access is achievable via the two access points on Leicester Road and Ashby Road. The layout may need to prevent through trips using these two access points. An up-to-date traffic impact assessment would be required but it is still likely to be achievable. RAG Rating: Amber	Noted	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Local Highways Authority)

Infrastructure				
 Concerned about the impact of 900 new homes on existing infrastructure Concerned that developers retract offers for infrastructure improvements later in the process It would be better to meet housing targets by building new villages; this would create further employment opportunities. 	Noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is in the process of being updated to include the new housing allocations. The Council is proposing a new settlement but not all the Council's housing needs can be met in this one location, particularly given how long such sites can take to start delivering homes.	Await the outcome of the update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan	248	Rachel Hollis
You have gone against the wishes of 90% of the people in Measham. We don't have the infrastructure for these houses, the roads are atrocious, the doctors can't cope with the current demand, let alone if we have more houses.			338	Ann Ramsell
[300 dwellings at M11 would result in an increase of 726 patients for Measham Medical Centre. If all the additional housing sites (including reserve sites) were allocated this would result in an increase of 2,575 patients (16%) on the Medical Centre's register. The ICB also 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.	Await the outcome of the update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan	487	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board

River Mease / Biodiversity				
The sites lie within the River Mease Special Area of Conservation and it will be important to secure appropriate mitigation as part of these development	Noted and agreed. It is not necessary to duplicate policies so reference to the River Mease is not required in this policy.	No change	98	South Derbyshire District Council
proposals. [The site is in the River Mease SAC. We reiterate the advice within Policy En2 that all development within the Mease catchment will be required to demonstrate that it will not cause an adverse effect on the SAC i.e. that it will not contribute additional phosphorous to, or otherwise cause an adverse effect upon, the River Mease SAC, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. This may be achieved via: • Delivering bespoke phosphorous mitigation • Contributing to a strategic mitigation scheme (i.e. Developer Contribution Scheme). Developments in these locations must meet the requirements of the Habitat Regulations.]			345	Natural England

We are keen to work with the Council to deliver or contribute towards an appropriate mitigation scheme if required. It is noted that Severn Trent Water are upgrading two key Sewerage Treatment Works to ensure that treated foul flows can be pumped out of the River Mease catchment. This would also provide the necessary capacity to allow the development to come forward. This issue is not seen as constraint preventing the delivery of the proposed allocation	Noted	No change	88	Pegasus Group (Hallam Land)
I'm concerned about the impact to wildlife that this could have - the wharf plus two larger developments means that a significant amount of wildlife could be displaced. What about the wildlife? What about the bees?	The county ecologist had no objection to the information submitted with the 2018 outline application, subject to conditions on the following matters: Retention of hedgerows Retention of onsite ponds Updated GCN surveys Biodiversity Management Plan SuDS to be designed to maximise benefit to wildlife Lighting strategy Vegetation clearance outside of bird nesting season Native landscape planting The ecological assessments are now out of date and need to be updated.	No change	338	Rachel Hollis Ann Ramsell

Several isolated depressions / low	The LLFA had no objections	No change for the time	150	Leicestershire
spots within the proposed allocation site	subject to conditions when they	being, subject to		County Council
are presenting as areas of high surface water flood risk. The proposals will need to consider how this risk will be mitigated. Flood risk may impact on number of dwellings deliverable. No other concerns.	responded to the planning application. However, the national planning policy context for managing flood risk has changed since the application was submitted. The comments about the capacity of the site are noted and reflected in the recommendation to members. Officers are currently seeking advice on the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	further feedback from the Council's flood risk consultants		(Lead Local Flood Authority)
Given the extent of the recent flooding in the area, I'm concerned about the impact of the scale of the development on the villages flood resilience. Ashby Road is considered high risk for surface flooding, and so I am particularly concerned about the impact of such a large development near Ashby Road and what this could mean for flooding. The land off Leicester road often gets incredibly wet and boggy when it rains, clearly absorbing a lot of the water in the area. If this is built upon, I'm concerned about where all of this surface water will go.	Noted – see above	See above	248	Rachel Hollis

Need for housing Is there really a need for over 900 new	The Council is obliged to provide	No change	248	Rachel Hollis
homes in the village? Measham is a	sufficient housing sites to meet its			
oleasant, semi-rural place, but such a	long term housing needs. Sites			
arge-scale development feels	have been allocated in accordance			
disproportionate to its size and	with the Council's Settlement			
nfrastructure. While I support some	Hierarchy. If the Council does not			
new housing, like at Measham Wharf	allocate sufficient sites to meet its			
and Abney Road, two major	needs, then it will leave itself open			
developments plus Abney Road seem	to speculative development.			
excessive for the village to manage or				
require.]	The 11 March 2025 Local Plan			
bought a house in a village because I	Committee Report provided some	No change	338	Ann Ramsell
wanted to live in a village not some	justification for the inclusion of			
extension of Ashby, everywhere will join	more sites in Measham: "Since			
up like some sort of urban	2011 [the start of the adopted Local			
ungle. Lastly, there is no housing	Plan], 288 homes (net) have been			
crisis, only a greed crisis. Everyone	built in Measham (an average of 22			
wants bigger, newer and more. The	a year), which is comparatively low			
estate agents are full of smaller,	compared to the other Local			
cheaper houses but no one wants them	Service Centres. This is a further			
pecause much wants more. I am	consideration that would mean it			
horrified that AGAIN the council/	would be reasonable to revisit the			
government is going against the very	strategy for Measham."			
people who they are supposed to				
represent.				

Minerals and Waste				
Allocation is within an MSA for coal. 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 draft policy included a requirement for a Minerals Assessment (2)(e). However, a Minerals Assessment was submitted as part of the planning application, with LCC concluding that they agreed with the findings and had no objections.	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
Furthermore, whilst it is out of our remit to comment specifically on the matter, we do encourage you to consider the potential issue of land instability associated with coal mining works that could be present at the site. In this regard we recommend that NWLDC should consult the Mining Remediation Authority for any known issues if they have not already done so.	The Coal Authority did not respond to this consultation but did review the Coal Mining Risk Assessment submitted with the outline planning application and recommended a planning condition for a site investigation prior to the reserved matters stage.	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
No waste safeguarding issues	Noted	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)

Archaeology				
[2018 planning recommendation for exploratory investigation (CLE15384) Will require appropriate mitigation secured by condition upon any future planning permission.]	Noted; the need for a planning condition does not impact the proposed allocation of the site.	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (County Archaeologist)
[We would refer you to your County curators for archaeological advice in respect of non-designated assets for C19a, C19b, M11, if that has not already been undertaken	See above	No change	197	Historic England