

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS (MARCH 2025)

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: R9	SITE NAME: LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE
---------	-----------------	---

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
Highways and Access				
Traffic				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 50 additional houses will add 50-100 cars using Church Lane. Church Lane cannot withstand the increase in traffic The Lane accommodates 3 businesses (Kings Arms, Mark One Motors /and Teknic) - all contribute to increased traffic. In addition to this at certain times of the year, and well over 12 hrs a day, for weeks on end there is a stream of heavy tanker lorry's in and out of the Slurry Farm 	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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan	No change subject to the outcome of transport modelling	11; 155; 182; 184; 373; 394; 405; 407; 479	John Riley; Joanna Lane; Phillip Bollands; Jane Beck; Andrea Burton; Laura Ewart; Catherine Andrews; Steve Preston; Stephen Gosling

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

Church Lane / Wash Lane				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Church Lane and surrounding local roads are effectively single carriageway due to parked cars] • The junction at Wash Lane is already difficult and dangerous, • On street parking means there are difficulties in passing when vehicles meet from opposite directions • Cars regularly mount the pavement/cars being head on as people refuse to give way. • Church Lane would benefit from being a one way system • Church Lane is a “speedway”/rat run - there is no traffic calming • Speeding is an issue on Church Lane (straight road, no 30mph sign) • Additional speed limit signage is under discussion. Speed measures elsewhere in Ravenstone are ineffective with one Police report stating 20% of motorists exceed limits despite measures in place • On 20 March 2025, the closure of the A511 at the Ash Hoo roundabout caused traffic chaos with HGVs using Church Lane as a cut-through, resulting in an RTC at the Wash Lane junction • A motorcyclist was injured in March 2022 	<p>A Transport Assessment / Transport Statement would be required as part of any future planning application. The applicants would need to undertake a range of work to the satisfaction of the highways authority, including junction capacity assessments; speed surveys and a Road Safety Audit. Any necessary mitigation would need to be provided for.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>11; 106; 155; 164; 182; 184; 373; 405; 407</p>	<p>John Riley; Kirsten-Reece Tarpey; Joanne Lane; Alan Tarpey; Phillip Bollands; Jane Beck; Andrea Burton; Catherine Andrews; Steve Preston</p>

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Church Lane is in a worsening state of repair – potholes damage cars, new ones appear weekly and they are poorly filled and degrade within days • Tractors frequently use the road, leaving behind muck and dirt that damages cars, including a smashed wing mirror costing £237 to replace - will the Council cover the cost? • More homes will put more pressure on the use of Church Lane and impact its state/maintenance • People parking on Church Lane have had their cars damaged] 	<p>These are highways rather than planning issues. It is an offence to deposit mud and other materials that would interrupt other users of the highway. It is recommended that this issue (together with the potholes) should be taken up with the local highways authority (Leicestershire County Council).</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>106; 155; 164; 184</p>	<p>Kirsten-Reece Tarpey; Joanna Lane; Alan Tarpey; Jane Beck</p>
<p>The site is capable of delivering a safe and suitable access from Church Lane</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>89</p>	<p>Redrow Homes</p>
<p>Safe and suitable access is likely, however improvements to pathways need to be completed due to the site not being in a sustainable area with limited access to local amenities. RAG Rating: Amber</p>	<p>Amber means 'issues with potential access.' Comments are noted. Part 2(b) included a requirement for O42 to be retained and enhanced. This connects to Piper Lane which is a byway and provides a more direct route to people walking towards the school/recreation ground etc. LCC should make clear if any further improvements are required.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>150</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council (Local Highways Authority)</p>

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

[I previously suggested that the principal vehicular access could be taken from Ravenslea. The policy does not reflect my advice]	Access via Ravenslea would need to use Piper Lane – Piper Lane is a byway and does not meet (and does not look to be capable of meeting) the highways standards necessary for a development of this size.		400	NWLDC Conservation Officer
Sustainable Transport				
<i>Walking and Cycling</i>				
[The site would make] enhancements to the existing public right of way (O42) ensuring good connectivity for both new and existing residents	Noted	No change	89	Redrow Homes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pathways are narrow and only on the eastern side for much of the lane. The amenity of using the lane by walkers, children going to school, horse riding, and road users would be impacted significantly. • Will be more dangerous for pedestrians & residents living on Church Lane • There is a narrow pavement on one side of the road only, the higher traffic levels will increase the danger for pedestrians of which there will be more if the site is built upon. • There will literally be nowhere for residents of Ravenstone to walk from their homes as every which way is now a busy road. There is no peace 	Comments about the footway on Church Lane are noted. However, a connection via the public right of way/Piper Lane would offer an alternative walking route and the local highways authority has requested improvements to pedestrian access to make the development acceptable (see above). For those wanting to walk for leisure (if this is what is being suggested?) there are several public rights of way providing walks into open countryside on the western side of Ravenstone.	No change – the draft policy proposed a requirement to retain and enhance public right of way O42	106; 155; 182; 184	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey; Joanna Lane; Phillip Bollands; Jane Beck

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

Public Transport				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor public transport links in the area Buses are being cut around Coalville and Ashby People will have to use their cars to travel to work The loss of the Ivanhoe line will compound the issue. The local plan should assess the requirements for public transport to sustain the combined effects of all the developments 	Ravenstone is served by the hourly 15 bus service. Whilst the destinations served by this bus are fairly limited, it does provide a connection to the Coalville Urban Area, which is the top tier of the Council's settlement hierarchy. There are bus stops on Church Lane / Coalville Lane within walking distance.	No change	11; 182; 373	John Riley; Phillip Bollands; Andrea Burton
Principle of Development				
Scale of development				
<p>[Objections to the scale of development proposed in Ravenstone. Ravenstone has received more new housing than other "sustainable villages,"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100 homes approved off Wash Lane <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heather Lane Fosbrooke Close. Raunstone Close & barn conversion Jenny's Lane Ibstock Road <p>The plan fails to consider the cumulative impact of these projects.]</p>	<p>The reasons for allocating this site was set out in the 11 March 2025 Local Plan Committee Report.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of development in highways and infrastructure terms is in the process of being assessed and will form part of the evidence base upon which the Local Plan is examined by an independent Planning Inspector.</p>	No change subject to the outcome of transport modelling and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	11; 182; 314; 373	John Riley; Phillip Bollands; Juliet Howells; Andrea Burton

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

<i>Need for housing</i>				
[The site] will contribute towards meeting NWL's housing requirements. The site is being brought forward by a leading national housebuilder that will ensure much-needed homes can be delivered within the plan period	Noted	No change	89	Redrow Homes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Where is the proof that all 50 homes will be sold and occupied promptly after construction? • Developments in Hugglescote and Coalville have many empty, boarded-up homes, indicating a lack of research into the need for these homes. • This has already been approved and will be built by Allison Homes, so why are you asking for objections?] 	The Council has to plan for its long term housing requirements. If this is not done and the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply, it would leave itself open to speculative housing development.	No change	106	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be a reduction in agricultural land. • Why is the council not assessing "Brown Field" sites before planning to take away more green Field sites? • What other measures have been looked at to mitigate having to build at all? Where else could homes be built or other houses repurposed at a lesser cost? 	See above. Also, the loss of agricultural land needs to be weighed against the need for housing (see above). The Council cannot meet its housing requirements on brownfield sites alone.	No change	106; 164	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey; Alan Tarpey
Government talk about being self sufficient, yet continue to build on land			373	Andrea Burton

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

that could be used to grow crops and support British farming				
[We understand we are supporting the rest of the county but enough is enough]	The majority of homes proposed in North West Leicestershire are to meet its own needs + to address the imbalance of homes and jobs in the north of the district.	No change	314	Juliet Howells
[A previous refusal for 9 homes off Church Lane raises serious questions about approving 50 now; the same concerns apply and are even more pertinent given increased housebuilding in NW Leicestershire]	This appeal decision relates to a different site (at the Church Lane/Wash Lane junction) and to a decision made eight years ago. Each site/application needs to be judged on its own merits.	No change	184	Jane Beck
Coalescence				
[The proposals will erode/close the gap between Ravenstone and Coalville, harming the settlement pattern/resulting in a loss of village identity/one large conurbation]	The site assessment acknowledges the impact upon coalescence but concludes that Piper Lane provides a defensible boundary.	No change	106; 136; 164; 373	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey; Andrew Large Surveyors; Alan Tarpey; Andrea Burton
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [The Council's assessment in November 2024 concluded that development of R9 would result in the coalescence of Ravenstone and the Coalville Urban Area. • It would conflict with Policy S3 (ii) which aims to maintain the physical and perceived separation between settlements. • It would conflict with draft Policy S4 which emphasises respecting the landscape's appearance and character. 	This appeal decision relates to a different site (at the Church Lane/Wash Lane junction) and to a decision made eight years ago. Each site/application needs to be judged on its own merits.	No change	115; 155	JJM Planning (Leigh Holloway); Joanna Lane

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning permission for 9 dwellings in this location was previously refused due to the significant harm it would cause to the rural character and appearance of the area. • The Planning Inspector noted that the development would urbanise Church Lane and erode the transition from built development to the countryside, making Ravenstone and Coalville appear closer together . • 50 dwellings would have a more significant impact on coalescence 				
Landscape and Visual Impact				
The site is well-contained by mature trees and hedgerows, which will help integrate development into the existing landscape and maintain Ravenstone's character.	Noted. The Council would seek the retention of these features for landscape and visual impact (as well as ecological) reasons	No change	89	Redrow Homes
<p>[The Council's proforma identifies significant landscape impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'the site prevents coalescence between Coalville and Ravenstone' - 'the site forms an open field which provides a rural setting for the village' - 'the field is not particularly well related to the built form of Ravenstone' - 'development of the site would result in an encroachment into the countryside, to the detriment of the visual amenity of the site and surroundings 	<p>Landscape and visual impact needs to be weighed against the need for housing.</p> <p>The site assessment carried out by officers does note these LSS conclusions <u>but</u> it also points out the findings that "<i>the arable fields between Church Lane and the A447 [i.e. R9] are considered to be of a slightly lower quality due to fewer natural features and intact hedgerows</i>"</p>	No change	115; 155	JJM Planning (Leigh Holloway); Joanna Lane

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

<p>[The site is assessed as part of parcel 21RAV-B in the Landscape Sensitivity Study (LSS). The LSS sets out that this is a rural landscape which is valued for the pastoral parkland and deciduous woodland setting to the Ravenstone Conservation Area, as well as the wider rural setting. The LSS concludes that the overall landscape sensitivity medium-high. The visual appraisal element concludes there are scenic views. Higher susceptibility receptors include the community at the settlement edge, and recreational receptors on PRoWs and both apply to this parcel of land. Overall visual sensitivity is considered to be medium]</p>	<p>It is also concluded that the western part of the parcel (i.e. the pastoral parkland and deciduous woodland – not R9) has higher landscape susceptibility to change due to the presence of landscape and heritage designations, landcover, scale and natural features. These elements also form a stronger sense of place in the parcel.</p> <p>The scenic views within the parcel are also noted as being ‘particularly concentrated around the <i>west</i> edge of the Conservation Area’ and the more open views to the wider landscape are in the <i>central</i> portion of the parcel (R9 is in the west of the parcel).</p>		115; 155	JJM Planning (Leigh Holloway); Joanna Lane
Flood Risk and Drainage				
No concerns.	Noted	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority)
What impact will more concrete have on possible flood avoidance?	A flood risk assessment and drainage strategy will be required as part of any future planning application to demonstrate that the development is acceptable and this would need to take into account the small area of surface water flood risk on Church Lane	No change	106; 164	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey; Alan Tarpey
[Church Lane floods in heavy rain. The development will increase the risk of flooding]			182; 184	Phillip Bollands; Jane Beck

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

	(as shown on the government's Flood Map for Planning).			
[Church Lane already has drainage issues, recently highlighted by Severn Trent needing to clear blockages like nappies and wipes]	Noted. This is an issue resulting from improper usage and is a water company maintenance issue rather than a planning issue.	No change	106	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey
Where and how will the infrastructure be in place to ensure no disruption of water pressure or supply will affect other residents?	Noted although this is a water company issue.	No change	106	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey
Minerals and Waste				
The allocation is mostly within MSAs for Sand & Gravel and Coal. An MSA for Brick Clay is adjacent, but could be within a small part of the site] 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]	Noted – this is something that can be done at the planning application stage.	Add brick clay to the policy requirement	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
[We encourage you to consider the potential issue of land instability associated with coal mining works that could be present at the site]	The site is in a Low Risk Coal Development Area. However, it seems to be adjacent to a High Risk Area – should a Coal Mining Risk Assessment be required, this could be requested by the Mining Authority at the planning application stage in accordance with Policy En6.	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
[The site is approximately 940m from the safeguarded Snibston Drive waste site (N20)and over 1km from Ravenstone STW (N17). Any allocation	Noted	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

must comply with LMWLP Policy W9 and the 'agent of change' principle in paragraph 200 of the NPPF, requiring necessary mitigation before sensitive development is completed]				
Archaeology and Heritage				
2.6 ha. No formal investigations yet undertaken and no previous consultations. Proximity to historic core & possibility of prehistoric archaeology. Will require pre-determination evaluation, followed by appropriate mitigation secured by condition upon any future planning permission.	Noted, this is a matter for the planning application	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (County Archaeologist)
I note the proposal to set the housing back from Church lane and maintain the hedgerow to limit the visual impact on the conservation zone. However it is not clear how the hedgerow will be maintained and how its appearance will be enforced. In other areas I have seen that residents who have the properties up to the hedgerows use their own boarder treatments that can look awful (Hugglescote grange for instance). I would like to understand how this impact will be managed	This is an important point and it is recommended that maintenance of the site frontage hedgerow forms part of the site's public open space (and is maintained either by the parish council or a management company) rather than being put into the ownership of individual homeowners.	Subject to the outcome of further discussions with the Conservation Officer (see below) consider a policy requirement confirming the site frontage is retained as public open space	11	John Riley
We note the Conservation Officer's comments regarding views from Church Lane and the public right of way. While we recognise the importance of carefully considering the relationship between new development and the historic environment, we believe that an	A proposed policy requirement for 'a layout which minimises harm to the Ravenstone Conservation Area' was included in the consultation document.	No change at present, subject to any further policy requirements or advice put forward by the Council's Conservation Officer		

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

appropriate design response can be achieved through high-quality landscaping and the site layout. We welcome the opportunity to work collaboratively with the Council to establish a suitable approach that protects and enhances the Conservation Area while making efficient use of the site.	As confirmed above, access to the site can only be taken from Church Lane. Further discussions with the Conservation Officer are required on this matter and a decision needs to be made in the context that harm to the Conservation Area needs to be weighed against other planning matters.			
Please refer to the advice that I offered to you in July 2022. I said that harm may be minimised “by omitting development within about 45m of Church Lane” and hence by retaining “the hedges and trees that line Church Lane” (I said that “this may suggest a principal vehicular access via Ravenslea”). The consultation document refers to an “access from Church Lane”; it refers to the retention of hedgerows, “except where removal is required to accommodate access”. This does not reflect the advice that I offered.			400	NWLDC
[The development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area]			182; 184	Phillip Bollands; Jane Beck
The Council’s Ravenstone Conservation Area Appraisal and Study (September 2001) identified unlisted buildings of architectural or historic interest which are considered to			155	Joanna Lane; Jane Beck

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

contribute positively to the streetscape of the area, including 20 Church Lane Farm, 22 Church Lane and 25 Church Lane - All of which would be detrimentally affected]				
[Setting development back 45m raises concerns about whether the site can deliver the required amount of housing and if such a setback would fit with the established character of nearby buildings, which is located in close proximity to the highway]			115; 155	JJM Planning (Leigh Holloway); Joanna Lane
[I draw your attention Appendix C of the 2001 Conservation Area Appraisal]	Appendix C includes Policy E10 of the Local Plan – this policy has since been replaced.	No change	184	Jane Beck
The proposed development would not be in keeping with existing buildings in the conservation area and wider village	This is something that would be taken account of at the detailed design stage – and would involve discussions between the developer, the Conservation Officer and the Council's Urban Designer	No change	373	Andrea Burton
Pollution				
[Traffic will cause air/noise pollution / will worsen existing air/noise pollution]	The location in relation to the A447 may necessitate an air quality assessment in line with the Council's Air Quality SPD	No change	106; 164; 182; 184; 373	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey; Jane Beck; Phillip Bolland; Alan Tarpey; Andrea Burton
[Odour is an issue in the local area, for example sewage and from the tractors constantly moving waste to and from the lagoons]	An odour assessment has been requested for R12, but to date this has not been raised as an issue for this site.	If Environmental Protection highlight this as an issue, include as a policy requirement.	106; 164	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey; Alan Tarpey

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

The problem of litter will increase.	Bins can be provided as part of any open space provision but the dropping of litter is an unfortunate behavioural issue.	No change	106; 164	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey; Alan Tarpey
[How can building 50 more homes in a tiny village be justified when we are aiming to cut emissions and achieve net zero within six years?]	The Council has to meet its long term housing needs.	No change	106	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey
[What environmental compensation will be made—such as tree planting or requirements for energy-efficient homes—and will this be reported publicly?]	All submitted and approved documentation will be on the Council's planning portal.	No change	106	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey
How will construction impacts be respectfully and diligently managed (noise, dirt, dust, pollution, traffic, roadblocks, disruption of wildlife habitats)?	<p>Whilst there will be impacts at the construction stage, these will be temporary. Construction will only take place during prescribed hours and housebuilders often have their own construction code of conduct within which they work.</p> <p>The impact of wildlife habitats and the mitigation required needs to be properly understood through an ecological assessment/discussion with the county ecologist.</p>	No change	106	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey
Biodiversity				
What environmental consultations have been done? We know we have a lot of wildlife around here, including bat habitats, but no heed was paid to this for the recent development of the two	The county council ecologist was consulted on all sites as part of the site assessment work. An up to date habitat survey and any necessary species surveys will be	No change	106	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

homes behind Church Lane and their homes have now been lost and eroded	required as part of any planning application and would need to satisfy the county ecologist. 10% Biodiversity Net Gain would also need to be achieved.			
[The report overlooks many species—owls, bats, great crested newts, frogs, toads, and hedgehogs—some of which are protected. Abundant wildlife can be seen and heard in the area and enjoyed as a community amenity. At minimum, further study is required.]			155	Joanna Lane
[The development threatens local wildlife, green spaces, and the rural landscape—natural assets that, once lost, cannot be restored]			182	Phillip Bollands
Green spaces should be protected in the interest of the environment and local wildlife			373	Andrea Burton
The village is currently rural, with the surrounding fields providing a haven for wildlife and supporting the wider aims of the National Forest. This housing development would totally go against this.	The site is currently arable land. In addition to Biodiversity Net Gain, the site would also have to provide National Forest planting.	No change	394	Laura Ewart
There will be a loss of hedgerows, which will impact wildlife.	As above. Also, the starting point of the proposed policy is to retain as much hedgerow and possible and for it to be managed going forward (not put into people's gardens where it could be removed)	No change	106; 164	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey; Alan Tarpey
Infrastructure				
Education				
[The school is over-subscribed/at capacity]	Noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is in the process of	No change, subject to the outcome of the	11; 373	John Riley; Andrea Burton

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

[What planning is in place for additional schools?]	being updated to include the new housing allocations	Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	106; 164	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey; Alan Tarpey
Healthcare				
[There is no GP surgery/dentist in the village]	The impact upon the local GP surgeries is being assessment as part of an update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No change, subject to the outcome of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	11	John Riley;
[Doctors/dentists are under strain/heavy demand]			182; 373; 394	Phillip Bollands; Laura Ewart; Andrea Burton
[What planning is in place for additional healthcare?]	It is a nationwide trend for dentistry to be provided by the private sector.		106; 164	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey; Alan Tarpey
[50 dwellings at R9 would result in an increase of 120 patients split between Hugglescote Surgery, Whitwick Road, Long Lane and Broom Leys. If all the additional housing sites were allocated (including reserve sites) this would result in a 2% increase in patients at Hugglescote Surgery, a 6% increase at Whitwick Road, a 4% increase at Long Lane and a 6% increase at Broom Leys. 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
Other				
[There are very few amenities or industry in Ravenstone; One shop, one pub and there are not any other services that may be needed to support a larger village]	Ravenstone has amenities sufficient to identify it as a Sustainable Village in line with the Council's Settlement Hierarchy Study. Ravenstone is also in close proximity to the Coalville	No change	11	John Riley

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

The village / surrounding towns do not have infrastructure to support additional housing	Urban Area which is the district's Principal Town.		373	Andrea Burton
Infrastructure should be provided up front	This is a common response from residents but in most cases it is appropriate for some development to take place before S106 contributions are made. It depends on the specifics of the site.	No change	479	Stephen Gosling
Other				
What about people who wish to move from Ravenstone? This new Development will ruin the remaining "country views" people come here for and prevent people here being able to sell as the village will now become a built up eyesore.	Planning is concerned with land use in the <i>public</i> interest; meaning impact on private views is not a planning matter.	No change	106	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey
Who will these homes be sold to, are they private or social housing? Where is the documented support that proves they are required and will sell - i.e. that the demographic they are proposed for, can afford them?	The proposals will comprise market and affordable housing (the latter in line with the definition in the National Planning Policy Framework). There will be evidence underpinning the amount of affordable housing required and the mix of housing (e.g. by number of bedrooms) required in the district.	No change	106	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey
We realise that there is a housing crisis but the homes that have been built don't appear to be 'affordable'			314	Juliet Howells
How much extra money will we be expected to pay in our already growing council tax bills to have to pay for extra bin collections etc when these houses are all in place?	The homes that are built will also be required to pay council tax.	No change	106	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)

The addition of the 50 homes will add to the unoccupied collection of "Executive" houses that are In Hugglescote that noone can afford and don't want. The trend for buying a new house is waning.	There is no evidence to support this comment. The Council is required to meet its long term need for housing.	No change	106; 164	Kirsten-Reece Tarpey; Alan Tarpey
It is my understanding that the site owner no longer lives in Ravenstone and this parcel of land was retained with the hope of future planning and building for financial benefit. However, if successful they will not be adversely affected by the development of the area, the loss of amenity, as they are no longer resident.	This is not a planning consideration	No change	155	Joanna Lane
[Other Sustainable Villages offer suitable sites for growth without harming the local environment. Previously, the Council identified site R12 off Heather Lane in Ravenstone as the preferred location, allocating only 50 of its possible 137 dwellings. Further development should focus on this site to avoid the issues linked with site R9 off Church Lane]	The reasons for identifying another site in Ravenstone were set out in the 11 March 2025 Local Plan Committee. In the same committee it was agreed to increase the capacity of R12 to 85 dwellings.	No change	155	Joanna Lane
Green spaces should be protected to help improve wellbeing of residents.	Comments are noted – the retention of this site as an arable field needs to be weighed against the need for housing. A requirement for the footpath to be retained is included in the draft policy and developers would also be required to provide open space or make an offsite contribution.	No change	373	Andrea Burton

APPENDIX M – LAND OFF CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9)