

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS (MARCH 2025)

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: M14	SITE NAME: LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM
----------------	-------------------------	---

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
Highways & Access				
Further information has been requested on this live application (18/01842/FULM), however a single point of access from Abney Drive has been provisionally accepted in principle. Horses Lane is considered to be unsuitable for vehicular access. Access via Dennis Way Appears to be unachievable given the red line and geometry of Dennis Way. RAG Rating: Amber	Noted	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Local Highways Authority)
Some initial discussions with LCC highways have been undertaken although LCC have requested further information on certain matters. However, ultimately LCC concluded in their response to the application (October 2018) in relation to the proposed access that 'the extension of the turning head on Abney Drive to allow access to the development is acceptable in principle to the LHA'.	This reflects the advice given by the local highways authority.	No change	141	Savills (David Wilson Homes)

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

As a requirement of the Nursery Fields planning permission (14/00273/FULM), this has been upgraded to a 1m wide breedon gravel footway link with bollard lighting. The public right of way is retained in the proposals with minimal vehicular access crossings	Noted	No change	141	Savills (David Wilson Homes)
<p>[Concerned that Abney Drive is the only access proposed for construction and operational traffic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be a significant increase of 300/400 extra car journeys a day on Abney Drive • Abney Drive has onstreet parking issues meaning it is rarely clear/residents, guests and delivery vehicles need to park on Abney Drive • Construction and operational traffic could have health implications on mainly retirees that live on Abney Drive • There are five roads already feeding on to Abney Drive • The bend above the junction with Abney Crescent makes visibility difficult when coming on to Abney Drive • There have been accidents between Abney Drive and Abney Crescent • The pathway from Abney Walk onto Abney Drive is downhill, and kids often come down on bicycles or 	As confirmed by the highways authority above, further information is required from the applicants to demonstrate that the proposals are acceptable in highways terms. However, this is not something that should preclude that allocation of the site from the Local Plan	No change	80; 109; 130; 257; 325; 347	David Hamilton; John Wheeldon; June Dwyer; Simon Green; Steve Key; Diana Drake

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

<p>skateboards, which could lead to accidents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abney Drive is narrow, impacting access for construction, emergency and civil amenity vehicles. The entrance narrows between the two bungalows as you enter the new site off Abney Drive There is a ransom strip preventing access 				
[Access should be via Dennis Way. This would mitigate the negative impacts on Abney Drive (congestion issues/construction traffic)]	Confirmation will be sought from the site promoters as to why this is not achievable	No change at this stage given the highways authority response	80	David Hamilton
[There should be two access points, i.e. Abney Drive and Dennis Way. Dennis Way would be more appropriate for construction traffic]			325; 347	Steve Key; Diana Drake
[The construction traffic would further deteriorate the potholes, full width trenches and speed humps on Atherstone Road]	Comments are noted, but potholes are highways issues rather than planning matters and should be taken up with the county council as local highways authority	No change	257	Simon Green

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

[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, sustainable transport measures etc. Any financial contributions would need to meet the three legal tests in the CIL Regulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	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]			98	South Derbyshire District Council
Flood Risk/Drainage				
No major concerns, high surface water flood risk area appears to be in an enclosed area surrounded by woodland. I suspect this area will not be used for housing.	Noted and agreed; a requirement to retain existing trees was included in the draft policy	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority)

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

Keep building on our green areas is not a good idea, water will naturally flow down hill on to Atherstone Road	The site is located in Flood Zone 1 and includes an area at risk of surface water flooding that should remain undeveloped. A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy is required to demonstrate that the proposals would not increase flood risk on or off site. The planning application lacked sufficient information, and the LLFA requested further details.	No change	109	John Wheeldon
Potential for surface water running downhill in a southerly direction towards properties already located on Dennis Way, Atherstone Road and Meadow Gardens			257	Simon Green
Drainage from the site is also a huge problem			347	Diana Drake
Minerals and Waste				
Site is within an Minerals Safeguarding Area for Brick Clay and appears to also be in MSA for Coal too. 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.	Noted and see below.	Amend requirement to include coal.	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
DWH have produced a Minerals Assessment and it has concluded given the close proximity to residential receptors, any mineral operations on-site would result in significant nuisance, disturbance and amenity impact to local residents with negligible benefit in terms of meeting a need for uneconomic mineral resources.	Noted and agreed given the site is surrounded on three sides by residential development. However, the County Council would need to review and approve the findings of the report before the policy requirement is removed.	See above.	141	Savills (David Wilson Homes)

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

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.	Noted, the Coal Authority did not respond to this consultation, but they did respond to the planning application for this site and had 'no objection on the basis that the [Coal Mining Risk Assessment] concluded that the risk from unrecorded coal mine workings on the development site is negligible due to geological mapping and borehole records recording rock head cover of approximately 50m, and that the Kilburn seam is commonly too thin to have been worked'	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
Snarestone STW (N18) is situated over 1km to the South and therefore there are no waste safeguarding issues	Noted	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
Archaeology/Heritage				
[2018 Geophysical Survey detected no anomalies beyond the former brickworks & ridge & furrow. 2019 planning consultation recommended further exploratory investigations (CLE15994), followed by 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)

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

<p>[The railway bridge at Horses Lane is included on a draft list of local heritage assets. It should continue to serve 'Ibstock Cottages' and the other existing houses on the south side of the railway cutting. It should not serve the 150 houses proposed under M14. Hence a barrier to vehicular traffic should be erected at NGR 43351 31157]</p>	<p>This is a detailed design issue, but it is considered that this is something that can be 'designed out' of the development.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>400</p>	<p>NWLDC Conservation Officer</p>
<p>Deliverability</p>				
<p>[Concerned about deliverability of the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unresolved issues related to highways, design, drainage, ecology, and National Forest • it does not appear work has been undertaken to address the technical issues • it would be expected that these issues would have been resolved by this time with the only issue outstanding being the River Mease mitigation] 	<p>Now that the site is proposed as an allocation, there is an incentive to address these technical issues in advance of identifying a River Mease solution.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>111</p>	<p>Define Planning & Design (Bloor Homes)</p>
<p>Even if the [River Mease] mitigation is not resolved within the next couple of years, there are mitigation programmes currently being developed and therefore at the worst case the Site will be delivered mid-way through the plan period. This should be reflected in the Draft Plan's housing trajectory.</p>	<p>Noted - We will prepare a housing trajectory to inform the Regulation 19 Plan.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>141</p>	<p>Savills (David Wilson Homes)</p>

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

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

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

Ashby Canal				
<p>[Under the Transport & Works Act Order which is due to happen this summer, ACA will be the owners of the “dismantled railway” which borders the northern side of the site: If planning permission is granted, a Section 106 or similar agreement should require the developer to contribute to 200 metres of canal and towpath bordering the site. This would increase property values by 15-20% and provide residents with a direct walking route to the High Street and countryside, along with potential moorings. Given traditional funding sources have diminished, this is an important opportunity to help deliver the long-supported canal restoration policy.]</p> <p>[The Ashby Canal’s protected restoration route borders the eastern site boundary along the old railway, offering leisure, environmental, and access benefits for the community. Developers should help fund the canal and towpath construction—potentially through a Section 106 agreement or CIL—with a suggested levy of £1,000 per home, which would meaningfully support canal reinstatement without affecting the marketing of the houses.]</p>	<p>Any planning obligations would need to meet the three legal tests in the CIL Regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>Further evidence is required, at this stage officers are unclear how the CIL tests would be met in this case.</p>	No change	385	Ashby Canal Association
			419	Inland Waterways Association

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

Amenity / Pollution				
DWH have produced a Noise Assessment and it has concluded with the implementation of the specified mitigation strategy, sound levels across the proposed development can be readily attenuated to achieve acceptable sound levels.	Noted, the conclusions of the noise assessment will need to be approved by the Environmental Protection team.	No change	141	Savills (David Wilson Homes)
[When we moved to the area we were informed that those fields were a noise buffer between houses and the brickyard. We are surprised that there haven't been complaints from the phase 1 development about the noise from the brickyard. When they originally came to check noise levels they came at a weekend when it wasn't noisy.]	Noted – noise monitors are usually left in place to record noise over a specified period. The methodology for the noise assessment would need to be agreed with the Council's Environmental Protection team.	No change	325	Steve Key
[In the past, noise from the Brickworks has been an issue]	Noted. The Noise Assessment must identify suitable mitigation measures, which require approval from the Council's Environmental Protection team.	No change	347	Diana Drake
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [At its closest point, the site is about 239 metres northeast of Measham Landfill and Forterra Building Products Ltd. • Building new developments within 250 meters of a landfill can expose nearby residents to odour, noise, dust, and pests. The severity of these impacts depends on the landfill's size, the type of waste it takes, and the weather 	Noted	Add a requirement for odour and dust assessment at Regulation 19 stage	480	Environment Agency

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The permit for Measham Landfill was issued in August 1977 and updated twice: in April 1994 to increase capacity and in December 1995 to limit waste types• Over the past 5 years, the Environment Agency has found no amenity issues associated with the landfill.• It is important that planning decisions take full account of paragraph 193 of the NPPF.• Where the operation of an existing landfill could have significant adverse effects on new development (including changes of use), the applicant should be required to provide suitable mitigation for these effects. Mitigation can be provided through the design of the new development to minimise exposure to the neighbouring landfill and/or through financial contributions to the operator of the landfill to support measures that minimise impacts				
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

Infrastructure				
Services in this area are now stretched, surely you can realise how local towns and villages are being totally ruined with over building. Find somewhere you can build a new town or village with its own services instead of keep tapping into what is already overloaded. Schools and Doctors just wont cope, as they are struggling now.	<p>Noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is in the process of being updated to include the new housing allocations.</p> <p>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.</p>	Await the outcome of the update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan	109	John Wheeldon
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [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.] 			248	Rachel Hollis
Lack of any provision for increased capacity to our already overstretched village GP surgery, the addition of 150 dwellings will further lengthen waiting times for appointments beyond already unacceptable levels.			257	Simon Green
No provision for any further expansion of the already full primary schools in the village			257	Simon Green
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			338	Ann Ramsell

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

demand, let alone if we have more houses .				
[150 dwellings at M14 would result in an increase of 363 patients for Castle Medical Group. 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				
[DWH request that wording is added to the Policy for Site M14 or elsewhere in the Draft Plan (e.g. Draft Policy EN2 – River Mease SAC) to state that once a mitigation programme has been agreed, the proposed allocations that fall within the SAC catchment area, such as Site M14, will be prioritised above speculative schemes, so these draft allocations can be delivered in the short term.]	Pumping out should resolve this issue. However should a mitigation scheme/developer contributions be required, sites that would otherwise be appropriate in planning terms should be allocated to the mitigation scheme on a first come first served basis (as has been done to date).	No change	141	Savills (David Wilson Homes)

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

<p>[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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering bespoke phosphorous mitigation • Contributing to a strategic mitigation scheme (i.e. Developer Contribution Scheme). <p>Developments in these locations must meet the requirements of the Habitat Regulations.]</p>	<p>Noted. It is not necessary to duplicate policies so reference to the River Mease is not required in this policy.</p>		345	Natural England
<p>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.</p>	<p>Updated ecological surveys would need to be completed and any mitigation identified, to the satisfaction of the county ecologist.</p>	No change	248	Rachel Hollis
<p>What about the wildlife? What about the bees ?</p>		No change	338	Ann Ramsell

APPENDIX J – LAND OFF ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14)

[In the past there have been issues with Japanese Knotweed in the area]	Japanese knotweed is an invasive species. The site promoters will be required to update their habitat survey. The ecologists undertaking this survey would be required to identify any invasive species on the site.	No change	347	Diana Drake
[Hedgerows have been retained in the submitted planning application where possible and additional planting is proposed, including a tree buffer along the western boundary.]	Noted; these are matters for the planning application and would need to be approved by the county ecologist, tree officer and urban designer	No change	141	Savills (David Wilson Homes)
[The Arboricultural Impact Assessment confirms that to facilitate the proposed development (as per the submitted layout) no significant tree loss is required.]			141	Savills (David Wilson Homes)
Provision of an Environmental Management Plan could be conditioned	Noted		141	Savills (David Wilson Homes)
Other				
[What is happening to the Measham Waterside, where the drains are already laid and as far as we know there was outlining planning permission for 450 houses and the builder was going to build a marina and pay for so much length of the canal, why is this not being proposed, which would be a bigger benefit for Measham village, as we understand HS2 has been cancelled via Measham.]	The government confirmed in July 2025 that it is lifting the HS2 safeguarding (which affects the Waterside site). This confirmation should enable this site to come forward.	No change	325	Steve Key