

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (A7)

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS (MARCH 2025)

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: A7	SITE NAME: PACKINGTON NOOK (LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY)
----------------	------------------------	---

* A standard template response was submitted by the following 77 respondents. This table of respondents is cross referenced in the main table of responses below.

Respondent ID	Respondent Name
18; 26; 90; 114; 116; 124; 127; 131; 149; 171; 175; 181; 186; 205; 207; 208; 215; 220; 232; 237; 238; 250; 251; 252; 254; 256; 258; 260; 263; 267; 268; 270; 271; 273; 274; 279; 280; 281; 286; 287; 292; 293; 297; 298; 299; 302; 303; 304; 308; 316; 317; 320; 324; 326; 327; 330; 331; 337; 340; 343; 350; 351; 355; 357; 358; 359; 360; 368; 369; 377; 472; 473; 474; 475; 476; 483; 486	Joanna Lowery; Yvonne Siwek; Helen Davis; Kathryn Hellier; Stuart Carter; Abbie Wilson; Peter Graves; Patricia Willday; Andrew Wilson; Michèle Garner; Andy Statham; Sarah Jane Statham; Mike Lockett; Suzanne Windridge; Phillip Windridge; Betsy Lynn Mattison Howarth; Scott Willday; Mark Sturman; Sandra Lascelles; Jacob Willday; Ian Willday; Jade Hazelwood; Edith Stevenson; David Davis; Douglas Courtney; Sally Walker; Ian Harding; Phil Bloor; David John McGibbon; Simon Boyd; Tom McGibbon; Keith Kadansky; R Kadansky; David Tweedale; Nigel Carlisle; Jenny Holdam; Helen Thomas; Alex Weston; Jane Johnson; Glenis Haslam; Matthew Robbins; Paul Brook; Richard Neilson-Gatenby; Neil Simkins; Emma Simkins; Sian Wilson; Kay Hodgetts; Joy Lunn; Patricia Tracey Cook; Michael Haywood; Ian Retson; Elizabeth Hinsley; Emma Weston; Rob Walker; Clare Timms; Rob Shaw; Alexander Pratt; Nicola Lappage; John Wilson; Adam Clay; Michael Harry; Roger Barlow; Patrick Maxwell; Rosemary Kershaw; Stewart Kershaw; Paul Russell; Julie Maxwell; Neela Larrier; Alison Whitham; Sue Guilbert; CJ Hart; Mr Twyford; Dr Foutlds; PJ Hatton; J Sheffield; Hannah Davis; Mark Hinsley

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
Principle of Development				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has a negative planning history, previous applications for housing were dismissed at appeal in 2010 and 2014. The council should review the conclusions of those dismissals, which make clear why the site continues to be undeliverable. The reasons for dismissal are still relevant (landscape/character impact, noise impact, traffic/road safety impact) Constraints on the site have worsened due to large-scale development in Ashby over the last 15 years and the impacts of climate change on flooding and landscape issues. 	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation.		*Please refer to table above 16; 19; 61; 68; 97; 104; 118; 119; 122; 230; 233; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 328; 329; 334; 354; 356; 391	*Please refer to table above Paula Holbrook; Ed Holbrook; Andy Jones; Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Jane Cotton; Willesley Environment Protection Association; Mark Stephens; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Brian Everitt; Andrew Bailey; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen; Margaret Hawksworth; Norma Jackson
The site has been subject to a previous refused appeal on grounds including landscape, which are still applicable			289; 290	Fisher German (Mr Botham); Fisher German (Richborough Estates)
The site was discounted in 2024 as unnecessary to meet the district's housing need			61	Andy Jones
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Support the allocation as a reserve housing site. Site offers a well-integrated extension to Ashby, the most sustainable location outside the Principal Town. Has the potential to deliver at least 1,100 homes, Employment land, Community hub and primary school extension, Public open space, sports facilities, and a local centre, Traffic and flood alleviation measures 			83	Pegasus Group (Hallam Land Management and Jelson Homes)

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is within walking distance to town centre and services, has the potential for flexible bus services like ArrivaClick, Supports health and well-being through open spaces and active travel routes • Hallam Land and Jelson Limited are working together on a joint masterplan with phased delivery and sustainable transport links. • In terms of deliverability, there are no insurmountable technical constraint, there is strong market demand, the site is under control of two experienced developers, the Council's SHELAA confirms active promotion and no availability issues • There is potential for wider benefits including flood risk reduction in Packington, traffic relief on key local roads, school expansion with improved access and parking, support for Ashby Ivanhoe Football Club through enhanced facilities 			
Scale of Development			
[Money Hill should be sufficient to meet long term housing need]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	*Please refer to table above 16; 19; 119; 233; 235; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 328; 329; 334; 354; 402	*Please refer to table above Paula Holbrook; Ed Holbrook; Thomas Lockwood; Andrew Bailey; Packington Nook Residents Association; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen; Gary Bateman

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

[Opposition to the scale of development proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are too many homes in Ashby already.• The scale of this site is too large/• disproportionate/is more than is required to meet housing needs /would increase Ashby by nearly 50%]• Ashby has been allocated a higher proportion of homes than Coalville• Loss of historic market town character]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	61; 68; 92; 118; 122; 204; 234; 249; 269; 276; 413; 423	Andy Jones; Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Paul Hutchinson; Mark Stephens; Heather Murray; Lesley Birtwhistle; JM James; Louise Pritchard; Josie Lockwood; Louise Reading; Peter Marples; Louise Bell
This site of 1100 dwellings has been allocated to fill a potential shortfall of 677 should the HS2 safeguarding remain. This would represent an overallocation of 423 dwellings. Whilst we accept that overallocation is legally permissible, we believe that alternative sites should be found that provide much closer to the identified potential shortfall.		162	Ashby Town Council
[Ashby Town Council has provided a table to show how the distribution strategy would be impacted if this site was allocated, stating that the Key Service Centres would receive 28% of the new development, almost twice the optimum agreed by the Local Plan Committee, with the Principal Town receiving 5% less than its share. If the additional 1,200 homes at Money Hill were added, the Key Services Centres would be allocated 22% more homes than the agreed distribution strategy]		162	Ashby Town Council
Reserve Allocation			
[Allocating as a reserve site will make it harder for the Council to refuse future planning applications or defend refusals on appeal.	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	16; 19; 68; 97; 104; 119; 335; 391	Paula Holbrook; Ed Holbrook; Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Jane Cotton; Willesley Environment Protection Association; Thomas Lockwood; Ashby Civic Society; Norma Jackson

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

<p>[If the reserve sites are suitable, available, and achievable then why not allocate them? If these sites are more achievable than identified the allocations, it is preferable to propose these as allocations. Having a realistic prospect of sites coming forward in the local plan period, will provide more assurance to the council, partners, and examining Inspectors that that planned supply will be able to meet the identified housing requirement including the unmet need within the HMA]</p>	<p>In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation</p>	48	Leicester City Council
<p>[The site is proposed only to address the potential non-removal of the HS2 safeguarding route, which has already been cancelled-</p>		61	Andy Jones
<p>[There is no need for (HS2 land?) to still be held and the onus should be on the relevant authorities to release it, not local communities to absorb yet more housing. If a reserve allocation is made that absolves the relevant authorities from their duty to act responsibly and in a timely manner and that site could be in limbo indefinitely.]</p>		122	Heather Murray
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [The proposal is a proactive response to the uncertainty surrounding HS2 safeguarding • Until the Safeguarding Directions are lifted any assumption on the delivery of homes on the affected sites is flawed, adding uncertainty to the district's housing strategy] 		83	Pegasus Group (Hallam Land Management and Jelson Homes)

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [The reserve sites policy wording needs flexibility to avoid blocking delivery under unforeseen circumstances. • Collaboration with the Council on refining the policy wording is welcomed. • Tying site release solely to HS2 safeguarding decisions is overly restrictive and complex. • Other valid triggers for release include housing or employment land shortfalls or stalled allocated sites. • Rigid policy triggers could create uncertainty for developers and the community, risking delivery of this key site.] 	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	83	Pegasus Group (Hallam Land Management and Jelson Homes)
Any Local Plan policy must clearly and precisely set out the circumstances in which the Site would lose its reserve status, and also the circumstances in which the principle of development would be acceptable.		97; 119	Jane Cotton; Thomas Lockwood
[It is highly probable that the government will not remove the HS2 safeguarding in time, leading to the site's full allocation in the Local Plan. Consideration of the site's merits should be based on the assumption of its full allocation. The wording of the consultation document implies the site could be included even if safeguarding is withdrawn. That would be wholly unacceptable and is an example of how the Council phrases its documents to provide it with maximum flexibility whilst appearing to be taken account of public opinion]		162	Ashby Town Council
[Reserving the site will sterilise it because of future uncertainty]		204	Lesley Birtwhistle

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [The site has not been sufficiently tested against other options, including smaller sites around Ashby • The Council is pre-determining future strategic growth in Ashby without sufficient evidence, particularly relating to concerns raised by the Inspector in the previous appeal • While the principle of reserve sites is supported, sites of such size and complexity should not be assigned as reserve sites due to their lack of responsiveness. • Sites of this scale should be allocated when required and supported by robust evidence, not included as reserve sites • If reserve sites are needed to safeguard the Plan, they should be smaller, more responsive sites that can deliver quickly as required. • There are concerns about impacts on access and insufficient evidence that a site of this scale can be delivered without undue transport harm 1. • The approach adopted for this allocation is not considered effective or justified and should be removed 	<p>In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation</p>	<p>289; 290</p>	<p>Fisher German (Mr Botham); Fisher German (Richborough Estates)</p>
---	---	-----------------	---

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

Deliverability			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• [The Council has not provided sufficient evidence that the site is developable according to the NPPF definition• No evidence of proposed mitigation, including the masterplan, has been provided for public scrutiny• Without evidence of the site's developability and viability, its inclusion in the Regulation 18 consultation is flawed and premature <p>The site should be removed from the consultation and only reconsidered if satisfactory mitigation evidence is available]</p>	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	97	Jane Cotton
[The principle of delivering this reserve allocation is questioned. Sites of this scale may take several years to come forward and are generally more complex and take longer to determine through the planning process. The site was previously dismissed on landscape, noise, road safety and sustainability impacts and the access points have not been agreed with the local highways authority]		111	Define Planning & Design (Bloor Homes)
[There are concerns about impacts on access and insufficient evidence that a site of this scale can be delivered without undue transport harm]		289; 290	Fisher German (Mr Botham); Fisher German (Richborough Estates)
Alternative sites			
<p>[The site's proposed allocation is directly related to the Council's decision to remove Meadow Lane (C76) contrary to officer advice. The decision was politically influenced.]</p> <p>[104 also add that this decision potentially breaches council rules risking reputational and financial damage]</p>	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	104; 162; 230; 233	Willesley Environment Protection Association; Ashby Town Council, Brian Everitt; Andrew Bailey

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

[It is probable that Meadow Lane will be added at Examination, resulting in a further over-allocation if Packington Nook is retained]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation		Ashby Town Council
[Call upon officers to re-examine their figures for Isley Woodhouse. The developers maintain they can deliver significantly more than the Council's assumption of 1950 houses by the end of the plan period]			Ashby Town Council
Masterplan			
A masterplan should be developed in consultation with residents , including a public exhibition before any decisions are made.	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	*Please refer to table above 16; 19; 68; 119; 122; 230; 233; 235; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 328; 329; 334; 354; 356	*Please refer to table above Paula Holbrook; Ed Holbrook; Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Brian Everitt; Andrew Bailey; Packington Nook Residents Association; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen; Margaret Hawksworth
[A Joint Concept Plan is being developed to show how the site can meet future housing and employment needs]		83	Pegasus Group (Hallam Land Management and Jelson Homes)

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2024, site promoters claimed a “working masterplan” would address technical constraints. • When recently requested, only outdated legacy documents were provided. • Unless officers have access to a current masterplan through private discussions, it is not publicly available. • Constraints on the site have worsened and remain unresolved. • These unresolved issues make the site increasingly difficult to deliver and potentially undeliverable. 	<p>In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation</p>	235	Packington Nook Residents Association
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive scheme of development for the site is essential, including design layout and infrastructure • This should be secured by a site-wide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), not a Masterplan • Only a site-specific SPD has the necessary planning and legal weight to ensure delivery in accordance with the Local Plan • An SPD will be subject to public consultation and scrutiny by relevant statutory and non-statutory consultees • The NPPF supports the use of SPDs in such circumstances • A masterplan prepared by site promoters would be inadequate and provide less control and detail • The inadequate developer masterplan for Money Hill is an example of the failure of the master planning process 		97	Jane Cotton

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

Highways and Access			
<i>Traffic Impact</i>			
It is likely that National Highways will have significant interest in the site in respect of impact on the SRN. Detailed modelling will be required to inform this. RAG Rating: Amber	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	150	Leicestershire County Council (Local Highways Authority)
Given the scale and proximity of the site to the A42, the site is likely to have a material traffic impact on the SRN. A Transport Assessment submitted in support of any planning application for this site would need to demonstrate the extent of traffic impacts. However, junctions of interest to National Highways in relation to this site will include A42 junctions 12 and 13.		161	National Highways
[The impact of traffic generated by the site is not simply limited to where entrances to the site are located, but on the whole traffic situation in Ashby. Traffic through the town centre is already congested.]		235	Packington Nook Residents Association
[In the 2010 appeal decision the Inspector concluded (In respect of the impact on Junction 13 of the A42) "...clearly the Highways Agency is not in a position to satisfy itself that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the Strategic Road Network (Document HA4A). It cannot be concluded that the proposal could be satisfactorily mitigated, and so it would not be rational to leave these matters to be resolved by planning conditions." And in conclusion 17.73 there would be "An undue risk of harm to road safety."		235	Packington Nook Residents Association

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

<p>Traffic has increased since the last application and any additional housing will effect access in the following areas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Leicester road Tesco's and Nottingham road. Through town for Burton road and School Lane (Doctors) A42/M42 A511 through to Burton A511 to Leicester. 	<p>In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation</p>	118	Mark Stephens
[The development would exacerbate existing traffic issues in Ashby/]		16; 19; 372; 413; 414	Paula Holbrook; Ed Holbrook; Lucy Matthews; Peter Marples; Mika Wharton
Ashby is now a very busy through route especially if A42 is shut		234	JM James
[Ashby experiences gridlock every morning]		305; 306	Chigusa Shimada; Nick Carpenter
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Traffic associated with Willesley School creates gridlock / queues of 30 mins. Onstreet parking in the local area associated with the school has a severe impact on road safety – photographs provided by 356 Margaret Hawksworth] 		312; 335; 356; 363; 414	Nina Clewes; Ashby Civic Society; Margaret Hawksworth; Sarah Warner; Mika Wharton
[There is no confirmation from the Highway Authority or National Highways that increased traffic from the site can be acceptably or cost-effectively mitigated. Ashby Town Centre already faces significant congestion, and the Money Hill Development is expected to worsen this. Without clear evidence that severe traffic impacts can be addressed, Site A7 should not be included in the draft Local Plan]		97	Jane Cotton

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

[With all the ongoing development in Ashby, the town is at risk of losing its rural character and becoming overwhelmed by people and vehicles. The town centre, especially Market Street, cannot handle the additional traffic, and more houses will likely lead to gridlock]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	204	Lesley Birtwhistle
Proposed Access Points			
No evidence presented to suggest that safe and appropriate forms of access could be achieved to the site from any adjoining highway. Measham Road would initially appear be the most appropriate location for two points of access. It is unclear if a safe and suitable access onto Lower Packington Road could be achieved.	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	150	Leicestershire County Council (Local Highways Authority)
[As access would not be on to the A42], we have no objections to this allocation in principle, subject to a Transport Assessment setting out the traffic and transport impacts, and an assessment of other potential boundary related impacts. The above submissions should accompany any planning application for this site		161	National Highways
Any access roads will impact other existing housing estates it will be impossible to access and egress Ashby for commuters to Birmingham and to and from the A42		249	Louise Pritchard
The local estate roads would become 'rat-runs' for residents of the new development/ additional volume traffic would add to the congestion along Leicester Road and the Wood Street junction		319	David Harrison

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCHE (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

Lower Packington Road			
<p>[Concerns about traffic safety and congestion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Occupants of the site would use their cars to access supermarkets, secondary schools, GPs, and employment areas, leading to severe impacts on congestion and road safety on Lower Packington Road and Avenue Road, both of which have dense on-street parking, speed cushions and a 20-mph speed limit which operates along with a crossing patrol at school times. • The “alternative route” north from a Lower Packington Road access would be along Leicester Road into the congested traffic light junction at Wood Street.] • [Photographs of congestion provided by 329:Helmut Rath] 	<p>In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation</p>	<p>*Please refer to table above</p> <p>68; 119; 122; 233; 235; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 319; 328; 329; 334; 335; 354; 356; 363</p>	<p>*Please refer to table above</p> <p>Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Andrew Bailey; Packington Nook Residents Association; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; David Harrison; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Ashby Civic Society; Wendy Bullen; Margaret Hawksworth; Sarah Warner</p>
<p>[Concerns about traffic safety and congestion on Lower Packington Road and surrounding roads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road is narrow and dangerous • Cars often travel in the middle of the carriageway/The roads become single carriageways due to parked cars • The road is already too busy and cannot cope with additional traffic • There are obstructed views along the road • Increased traffic would make the road unsafe particularly for pedestrians, children walking to school; mothers and toddlers, cyclists • The road already experiences significant on-road parking issues associated with Ivanhoe Football Club 		<p>16; 19; 61; 122; 170; 235; 249; 276; 277; 300; 312; 354; 363; 399; 423</p>	<p>Paula Holbrook; Ed Holbrook; Andy Jones; Heather Murray; Amy Birch; Packington Nook Residents Association; Louise Pritchard; Louise Reading; Michele Geary; Jane Cureton; Nina Clewes; Wendy Bullen; Sarah Warner; Ann Thompson; Louise Bell</p>

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

No part of the development should have a vehicular access onto Lower Packington Road or any other access that would be likely to distribute traffic onto the local road network (Lower Packington Road, Upper Packington Road or Avenue Road).	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	230	Brian Everitt
Measham Road			
[Access from Measham Road would result in congestion on Tamworth Road with occupants potentially using the A42 to get to supermarkets and employment areas, adding to severe congestion at junction 13]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	*Please refer to table above 68; 119; 122; 233; 235; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 328; 329; 334; 354; 356	*Please refer to table above Carrie Hamilton-Tweeddale; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Andrew Bailey; Packington Nook Residents Association; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen; Margaret Hawksworth
[Concerns about the traffic safety and congestion on Measham Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is already difficult to turn out onto Measham Road; Measham Road already sees a large volume of traffic Speeding on this road up to the A42 		204; 300; 319; 391	Lesley Birtwhistle; Jane Cureton; David Harrison; Norma Jackson
[Unless a safe access solution is provided, the site should not be allocated. Any masterplan should focus on access from Measham Road, potentially through a roundabout or right-turn junction and a secondary access, which should be feasible given the road's length.]		230	Brian Everitt

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

Tamworth Road			
<p>[Concerns about the impact on road safety and congestion on Tamworth Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The road is already congested and at times impassable with parents on the school run /large vehicles such as refuse trucks For residents trying to get onto the main road it is unnervingly dangerous 	<p>In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation</p>	<p>68; 107</p>	<p>Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Jameela Mian</p>
Sustainable Transport			
Walking			
<p>The site is not within walking distance of secondary schools, supermarkets and GP.</p>	<p>In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation</p>	<p>*Please refer to table above</p> <p>68; 119; 122; 230; 233; 235; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 328; 329; 334; 354</p>	<p>*Please refer to table above</p> <p>Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Brian Everitt; Andrew Bailey; Packington Nook Residents Association; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen</p>
<p>[The location of the site means that residents would use their car to travel to local amenities/work, having a detrimental impact upon traffic levels, particularly in the town centre/A42/Tesco Island/Nottingham Road/Avenue/Lower Packington Road]</p>		<p>162; 170; 230; 276; 423</p>	<p>Ashby Town Council; Amy Birch; Brian Everitt; Louise Reading; Louise Bell</p>
<p>[Paragraph 22 of the 2010 appeal decision shows the site is not sustainability located in walking and cycling terms]</p>		<p>235</p>	<p>Packington Nook Residents Association</p>

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCHE (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

Cycling			
Ashby is poorly served by cycle paths, there isn't even a cycle path to the cycle centre at Hicks Lodge.	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	*Please refer to table above 68; 119; 122; 233; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 328; 329; 334; 354	*Please refer to table above Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Andrew Bailey; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen
<ul style="list-style-type: none">There are few safe, dedicated cycle routes in or around the town.The road network does not support the provision of safe cycling facilities.Road traffic would put people off cyclingLocal authorities show no interest in improving these services, making the site unsustainable.		230; 242	Brian Everitt; Lesley Bailey
Bus Provision			
[Concerns with existing bus provision: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Existing bus provision is poorInadequate bus services would not discourage car useThere are no direct bus routes towards Derby, Nottingham or TamworthPublic transport on Measham Road is non-existent].	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	*Please refer to table above 10; 68; 119; 122; 162; 230; 233; 235; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 328; 329; 334; 354; 372	*Please refer to table above Lisa Brown; Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Ashby Town Council; Brian Everitt; Andrew Bailey; Packington Nook Residents Association; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen; Lucy Matthews

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

[Paragraph 23 of the 2010 appeal decision shows the site is not sustainability located in public transport terms]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	235	Packington Nook Residents Association
Rail Provision			
[No rail provision in Ashby/The railway station is highly unlikely to re-open/ Uncertainty around the reopening of the Ivanhoe line means increased car journeys and congestion]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	*Please refer to table above 10; 68; 118; 119; 122; 233; 235; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 328; 329; 334; 354; 372	*Please refer to table above Lisa Brown; Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Mark Stephens; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Andrew Bailey; Packington Nook Residents Association; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen; Lucy Matthews
This site is approximately 400m south of the railway and will require consideration should it come forward in terms of potential impact on operational railway safety. We note also comments in relation to HS2 safeguarding.		87	Network Rail

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

Impact on National Forest Way / open space / sports facilities			
[It is entirely correct to say the rights of way should be retained, but if walkers are faced with views of housing and tarmac roads (including many years of construction noise and blight), the landscape amenity which is provided in this area will be completely lost. Those walkers might as well walk around the streets in Ashby if that is their aspiration]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	*Please refer to table above	*Please refer to table above
[The development of the site would destroy all the benefits mentioned by appeal Inspector (paras 13-15). It would be a considerable walk through built-up streets (including many years of site excavation and building) and the distinction of the National Forest Way will be lost for ever. We see no possible mitigation to this.]		68; 119; 122; 170; 233; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 328; 329; 334; 354;	Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Amy Birch; Andrew Bailey; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen
[The site is used by many local residents recreationally for rural walks/dog-walking; it provides open countryside views; car-free walking; mental wellbeing, access to wildlife, green space. These benefits will be lost / the landscape and character of the town will be substantially harmed]		235	Packington Nook Residents Association
		68; 118; 119; 230; 249; 276; 300; 305; 306; 356; 363; 423	Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Mark Stephens; Thomas Lockwood; Brian Everitt; Louise Prichard; Louise Reading; Jane Cureton; Chigusa Shimada; Nick Carpenter; Margaret Hawksworth; Sarah Warner; Louise Bell

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

Ivanhoe Football Club			
<p>[Concerns about the potential loss of Ivanhoe Football Club:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ivanhoe FC provides an important recreational amenity in a country setting. Assume a masterplan will intend to relocate the club elsewhere and undo everything the club has done to make this a good venue for football. Development would result in the loss of football pitches at Ivanhoe FC making them less accessible and downgrading facilities Sport England objected to the Money Hill development stating there was insufficient sports facilities in the area to cope with the projected increase in population. 	<p>In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation</p>	<p>*Please refer to table above</p> <p>10; 16; 19; 68; 119; 122; 170; 233; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 318; 319; 334; 354</p>	<p>*Please refer to table above</p> <p>Lisa Brown; Paula Holbrook; Ed Holbrook; Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Amy Birch; Andrew Bailey; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen</p>
<p>[Object to the allocation as it has not been demonstrated that: 1) the playing field [at Ashby Ivanhoe FC] would be retained or; 2) that if the land is proposed to be built on, then any of the exception criteria in paragraph 104 of the NPPF would apply]</p>		96	Sport England
<p>The applicant (or “agent of change”) would need to include details of measures to protect both the operation of the playing fields at Ashby Ivanhoe FC and Western Park from any significant adverse effect arising from the siting of this proposed housing development in order to comply with [paragraph 200] of the NPPF.</p>		96	Sport England

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCHE (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

Biodiversity			
Even if the habitats around Packington Nook Lane and the Gilwiskaw Brook are preserved they would lose their value entirely when surrounded by housing development and tarmac road	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	*Please refer to table above	*Please refer to table above
		68; 119; 122; 233; 235; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 328; 329; 334; 354	Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Andrew Bailey; Packington Nook Residents Association; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen
[The above is supported by paragraph 7.18/17.24 of the Inspector's appeal decision]		235	Packington Nook Residents Association
[The proposals will have a negative impact on biodiversity]		249; 276; 300; 305; 306; 356; 363; 372; 413; 414	Louise Pritchard; Lousie Reading; Jane Cureton; Chigusa Shimada; Nick Carpenter; Margaret Hawksworth; Sarah Warner; Lucy Matthews; Peter Marples; Mika Wharton
[Development would impact upon Gilwiskaw Brook and the River Mease SAC] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both should be protected They are a precious local resource They will have to cope with increased drainage The surrounding landscape needs to be maintained if they are to function for the wildlife for which the SSSI was designated 		10; 107; 136; 319	Lisa Brown; Jameela Mian; Andrew Large Surveyors; David Harrison

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

[Achieving 10% Biodiversity Net Gain could be challenging and would likely require expensive or uncertain off-site compensation, potentially leading to adverse effects on local biodiversity. Potential conflict with the NPPF]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	68	Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale
[The proposals to do provide a sufficient environmental and wildlife separation zone between Ashby and Packington]		92	Paul Hutchinson
[The proposals will impact on the following flora and fauna: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bull head fish in the Gilwiskaw Brook • Great Crested Newts • Rare and special trees • Established and ancient hedgerow • Barn owls • Red kites • Foxes • Badgers • Hedgehogs 		118; 170; 262	Mark Stephens; Amy Birch; Jane Sharp
[Willesley Primary School children deserve a healthy environment with wildlife, mature trees, and open fields.]		262	Jane Sharp

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

Heritage			
[The unique nature of Rotherwood and the avenue of trees (survivors of an historic avenue which ran from Willesley Hall to Ashby Castle) – would lose their value entirely when surrounded by housing development and tarmac roads]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	*Please refer to table above	*Please refer to table above
		10; 68; 92; 119; 122; 233; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 318; 319; 334; 354	Lisa Brown; Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Paul Hutchinson; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Andrew Bailey; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen
The site includes an avenue of ancient lime trees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this once linked the Castle and Willesley Hall It has historical and landscape value Development would compromise or permanently destroy this feature It needs to be valued and respected People need some place of reference that there is a history preceding the now. [Photograph provided by 356- Margaret Hawksworth] 		10; 61; 107; 356	Lisa Brown; Andy Jones; Jameela Mian; Margaret Hawksworth
I can confirm that Historic England has no concerns to raise in respect of the proposed allocations and harm to designated heritage assets. We note that the Conservation Officer has considered the additional allocations and agree with the provisions set out in paragraph 5.9 in relation to the proposed reserve housing site (land south of Ashby de la Zouch - Packington Nook, A7) which would have the potential to impact GII listed Rotherwood.		197	Historic England
[The plans will be detrimental to the historic features in the town]		249	Louise Pritchard

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

<p>[In May 2022 I said that development would affect the setting of Ashby Mill. Ordnance Survey maps indicate a mill pond of unusual design to the NW of the mill complex. LIDAR data indicates the earthwork remains of the mill pond. It indicates other earthworks (probably former quarries) in the field to the north of the mill. If you are minded to allocate housing at Packington Nook, then an area including the mill pond and the quarries should be set aside as public open space.</p>	<p>In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation</p>	<p>400</p>	<p>NWLDC Conservation Officer</p>
<p>Landscape/Visual Impact</p>			
<p>[Will significantly alter Ashby's rural market town character]</p>	<p>In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Lisa Brown</p>
<p>[A7 is on high sensitivity landscape and its development would erode Ashby's distinct rural-edge character, harming protected heritage settings. The site adjoins Packington Conservation Area and development has potential for significant landscape impacts particularly on views from public rights of way and surrounding open countryside. Potential for conflict with the NPPF]</p>		<p>68</p>	<p>Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale</p>
<p>NWLDC Site Assessment A5 EMP17 states, the site forms an attractive and important rural edge to the settlement</p>		<p>92</p>	<p>Paul Hutchinson</p>
<p>Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plan Review – Appendix 5 identifies this are of land to be an important view within the context of Ashby de la Zouch and describes it as being: 'View over parkland / open countryside with mature trees and old ridge and furrow pasture. This is a valued gateway view'</p>		<p>92</p>	<p>Paul Hutchinson</p>

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

[Would destroy the unique character of Ashby on the approach from J12 of the A42]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	107	Jameela Mian
Major constraint is the adverse impact on landscape character and visual impact		136	Andrew Large Surveyors
[Would greatly diminish the area's natural beauty and harm local residents' quality of life.]		170	Amy Birch
[The Ashby Settlement Fringe Assessments highlight that this site is one of the few remaining intact pasture landscapes around Ashby, reflecting its unique 18th and 19th-century enclosure history. The area's distinctive rural fringe character, as recognised by both the Local Planning Authority and previous Inspectors, remains unchanged and highly sensitive. Allocating this site would risk permanently destroying a valued landscape that is integral to Ashby's identity as a small market town. Other sites should be considered first, given the significant adverse landscape impact identified in the assessments.]		230	Brian Everitt
This route represents such an inspiring gateway to our beautiful town particularly when compared to the gateway from the East which is simply awful. I am sure the journey inspires the same feelings in many residents and visitors to our historic town. I am sure the journey inspires the same feelings in many residents and visitors to our historic town.		402	Gary Bateman

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

Flood Risk and Drainage			
Large site with modest allocation. Significant flood risk from the Gilwiskaw Brook and this area should be allocated for public open space and recreational uses. Surface water flood risk outside of the Gilwiskaw Brook corridor is generally low, with the exception of an area in the south-west corner of the site adjacent to the A42. If brought forward, the LLFA would expect the developer to enhance flood storage along with Gilwiskaw Brook corridor and therefore reduce flood risk downstream.	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	150	Leicestershire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority)
The sites includes land within Flood Zones 2 and 3, associated with the Giliwiski Brook, a Main River of the Environment Agency. We are pleased to see that there is a requirement for no development to be located in Flood Zones 2 or 3. An application for a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP) will need to be submitted, unless an exemption applies, for any works within 8 metres of the Main River.		480	Environment Agency
Considerable section of the site is in flood zones 2 and 3, and there are sporadic areas at high risk of surface water flooding throughout the site		136	Andrew Large Surveyors
It should be noted that the discharge of surface water into National Highways drainage systems is not permitted		161	National Highways
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main sewer system is under strain, with frequent overflows and flooding. A proposed pump-out scheme to divert treated wastewater away from the Mease is unbuilt and unproven. Concern about the delay of pumping out (until at least 2027) and potential downstream impacts on the River Tame. 		235	Packington Nook Residents Association

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCHE (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Development of the site will create more run-off and cause flooding which could have been avoided. • Flooding is worsening in Ashby and Packington and this will be accelerated by climate change • Sewage infrastructure is inadequate / sewage has mixed with flood water in Ashby and this is highly likely worsened because of development that has already happened] 	<p>In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation</p>	<p>*Please refer to table above</p> <p>68; 107;118; 119; 122; 170; 230; 233; 235; 242; 262; 269; 276; 300; 305; 306; 311; 312; 313; 319 328; 329; 334; 354; 356; 363; 401;</p>	<p>*Please refer to table above</p> <p>Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Jameela Mian; Mark Stephens; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Amy Birch Brian Everitt; Andrew Bailey; Packington Nook Residents Association; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Louise Reading; Jane Cureton; Chigusa Shimada; Nick Carpenter; Phillip Caren; Nina Clews; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; David Harrison; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen; Margaret Hawksworth; Sarah Warner; Nikki Kearney-Taylor;</p>
<p>[Flooding is already an issue at/would exacerbate flooding at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gilwiskaw Brook/River Mease • Station Road/Under the Station Rd railway bridge • Mill Farm • Packington village • Measham Road • Lower Church St Ashby • Bath Grounds • Western Park • Tamworth Road • Ivanhoe Football Club • A7 itself • Packington School • Willesley School 		<p>*Please refer to table above</p> <p>10; 16; 19; 68; 119; 122; 230; 233; 235; 242; 262; 269; 270; 305; 306; 311; 312; 313; 319; 328; 329; 334; 354; 356; 366; 372; 401; 413; 414; 423</p>	<p>*Please refer to table above</p> <p>Lisa Brown; Paula Holbrook; Ed Holbrook; Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Brian Everitt; Andrew Bailey; Packington Nook Residents Association; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Louise Reading; Chigusa Shimada; Nick Carpenter; Phillip Caren; Nina Clewes; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; David Harrison; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen; Margaret Hawksworth; Packington Parish</p>

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coleorton Lane/Spring Lane/Normanton Road/Heather Lane/Century Drive and on to the Gilwiskaw Brook 			Council; Lucy Matthews; Nichola Kearney-Taylor; Peter Marples; Mika Wharton; Louise Bell
As a member of FLOAT in Packington, I work with the EA and LCC to advocate for flood protection measures. Building on land like A7 threatens vital soakaway areas needed to protect the village, some of which the EA has identified as important for managing brook flow—especially since the A42 was built without adequate flood provision. Although NWLC (Mike Murphy) holds recent flood statistics, these are missing from the 2024 Atkins Report. Our local MP, Amanda Hack, also raised these flooding concerns in the House of Commons in January, and I plan to follow up with her to help safeguard our village.	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	401	Nichola Kearney-Taylor;
there are very serious concerns with the potential for flooding in addition to failing to meet the Environment Agency objectives around the UK Water Framework Directive. The EA have previously rejected proposals for development of this site on the same grounds.		402	Gary Bateman
Use of SUDs have proven to be inefficient in other areas where this mitigation has been used in other developments.		118	Mark Stephens
STW raised an number of concerns in the previous application. STW have made some amendments, but need to be capacity is still at risk with incidents of manholes spilling sewerage along the Packington Nook footpath and down into the Gilwiskar.		118	Mark Stephens

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCHE (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

The proposal is on Calvert’s which will already make existing flooding worse	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	249	Louise Pritchard
[Catastrophic flooding in Ashby (1986), repeated incidents in Packington, and two floods at Willesley Primary School in the past seven years—despite new flood defences in 2023—show ongoing drainage issues, with excess water regularly affecting Weston Close residents and frequent intervention needed from Severn Trent.]		262	Jane Sharp
Noise Impact			
[Noise on the southern and eastern sides of Ashby is constant, even throughout the night. Cannot see how the design of the site could reduce noise pollution encountered by residents]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	*Please refer to table above 68; 119; 122; 233; 235; 242; 262; 269; 311; 313; 328; 329; 334; 354; 356	*Please refer to table above Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Thomas Lockwood; Heather Murray; Andrew Bailey; Packington Nook Residents Association; Lesley Bailey; Jane Sharp; Josie Lockwood; Phillip Caren; Marie L Beaumont-Caren; Barry Smith; Helmut Rath; Sue Rath; Wendy Bullen; Margaret Hawksworth
[Noise from the A42 impacts the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none">It was a reason for the 2010 planning appeal dismissalThe noise has worsened since 2010The noise is constant and exacerbated by the prevailing windIt falls within a Noise Exposure Category where planning permission should not normally be grantedNoise is exacerbated during summer and significant traffic issues.		97; 136; 230; 262; 305; 306	Jane Cotton; Andrew Large Surveyors; Brian Everitt; Jane Sharp; Chigusa Shimada; Nick Carpenter

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

An independent noise assessment must be carried out although we cannot see how Policy D2 (Amenity) could be satisfied alongside a development of this scale.	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	235	Packington Nook Residents Association
Other Environmental			
This land appears to me to be land within the Greenbelt, and is described as a greenfield site in document NWLDC Site Assessment A5 EMP17	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	92	Paul Hutchinson
NWLDC Site Assessment A5 EMP17 describes the land type as being grade 2 and grade 3 agricultural land (grade 1 being the highest quality) – The loss of high-quality agricultural land should be avoided		92	Paul Hutchinson
I cannot envisage how our pleasant market town can possibly survive this relentless drive toward replacing valuable agricultural land with housing		402	Gary Bateman
[This site falls within the Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) for coal and sand & gravel. A Minerals Assessment, as per Policy M11 of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be completed to ensure minerals are not unnecessarily sterilised.]		150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
[Potential land instability from coal mining should be investigated with the Mining Remediation Authority.]		150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

[The site's large scale may have cumulative effects on local waste management infrastructure, especially given its proximity (600m) to the safeguarded Packington STW site (N16), so compliance with LMWLP Policy W9 is needed. Any new development must also address the 'agent of change' principle from paragraph 200 of the NPPF, requiring mitigation for new sensitive uses introduced near existing facilities.]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
95 ha. 2009 Geophysics survey across N half of area (ELE5886) indicated a number of potential features including enclosures, bank, ditch & mill leat. Planning consultation (CLE5052) recommended exploratory investigation & excavation. Scale of the development with known archaeology will necessitate pre-determinative archaeological evaluation, followed by appropriate mitigation secured by condition on any planning approval.		150	Leicestershire County Council (County Archaeologist)
Infrastructure			
[General concern about the impact upon existing infrastructure which is already at capacity/ Existing infrastructure including health and education, sports facilities, library cannot cope]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	16; 19; 68; 204; 234; 249; 269; 276; 300; 305; 306; 312; 363; 391; 402; 413; 423	Paula Holbrook; Ed Holbrook; Carrie Hamilton-Tweedale; Lesley Birtwistle; JM James; Louise Pritchard; Josie Lockwood; Jane Cureton; Lousie Reading; Chigusa Shimada; Nick Carpenter; Nina Clewes; Sarah Warner; Norma Jackson; Gary Bateman; Peter Marples; Louise Bell
[Development would inevitably be split between multiple developers, therein avoiding requirements for local amenities (schools, doctors surgery etc)]		119; 269	Thomas Lockwood; Josie Lockwood

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

There are no services in this part of town and we have no knowledge of any proposals for such services with your vague suggestion of this new suburb	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	335	Ashby Civic Society
Primary Education			
Willesley Primary School is already oversubscribed and causes traffic issues.	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	10	Lisa Brown
The local school (Willesley) is at full capacity with the infants section containing sports hall, classrooms and library designed for ½ the capacity it currently hold. The junior section is class room only and is also full.		118	Mark Stephens
The new Hastings school at School lane is across town and not suitable walking distance for children.		118	Mark Stephens
All primary schools are at full or near full capacity.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [There are enough school places in primary and secondary schools in Ashby, though not always in the preferred schools. • Local parents can be denied places at schools that fill empty spaces with out-of-catchment children, impacting primary schools affected by the falling birth rate. • Proposed area A7 will engulf Willesley Primary school, potentially increasing its admission number (AN) to 75/90, leading to significant building works and noise disturbance. • Uncertainty about the use of Section 106 funding for the school until a large proportion of homes are sold. 		262	Jane Sharp

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

<ul style="list-style-type: none">Increased AN at Willesley Primary School will exacerbate traffic, noise, congestion, and air pollution, with safety issues due to traffic/pedestrian conflicts.The development will cause congestion on Avenue Road, Grange Close, Lower Packington Road, Weston Close, and Measham Road, with access issues for emergency services and refuse operatives.Increased delivery vehicles on the road, vying for stopping places, adding to congestion.]			
Secondary Education			
All secondary schools are near to full with the split between Ivanhoe and Ashby not making as significant impact on space.	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	118	Mark Stephens
Ivanhoe receives pupils from outside Ashby to the west including Moira. These areas are also being developed and numbers for Packington Nook should not be taken in isolation.		118	Mark Stephens
[The Secondary Schools will not be able to cope with the additional number of pupils]		204	Lesley Birtwistle
[Would exacerbate the existing shortage of secondary school places, with no clear indication of how additional demand would be accommodated]		276; 423	Louise Reading; Louise Bell
Healthcare			
Castle medical is stretched/the doctors surgery is struggling	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	118; 414	Mark Stephens; Mika Wharton
There are no NHD dentists		118	Mark Stephens

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

Other infrastructure			
The new parking at Money hill will not cater for those on south of the town/There is insufficient parking for workers or shoppers	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	118; 363; 372	Mark Stephens; Sarah Warner; Lucy Matthews
[Ashby does not have a hospital, a local police station, a standalone post office]		204; 363	Lesley Birtwistle; Sarah Warner
Other Comments			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">[The site scored badly in the Sustainability Appraisal and the NWLDC site assessment highlights several constraints including biodiversity, landscape, heritage]	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	162	Ashby Town Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none">If the site is added to the Local Plan, a detailed list of required measures must be included; Provisions in the Masterplan and Design Code; Expected level of local services on-site; Section 106 mitigation measuresThe Council must avoid repeating past mistakes from Money Hill Phase 1, including: Inadequate funding for safe walking and cycling routes; Failure to secure a free on-site community facility; Insufficient pre-secondary education provision on-site		162	Ashby Town Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The consultation but lacks detail on the employment element of site A7.It vaguely mentions potential employment use in the south-west of A7, only as part of a wider mixed-use development.No specifics are provided on: The amount of land proposed for employment use; The type of employment allocation; Access arrangementsObjects to this lack of detail and transparency and request full Reg 18 consultation before any employment allocation is made]		162	Ashby Town Council

APPENDIX N – LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (PACKINGTON NOOK) (A7)

I understand the government has targets in mind by why not look at all the current empty properties and invest in renovating those for people to live in?	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this site as a reserve allocation	363	Sarah Warner
We bought our house for the views of open countryside across this site]		372	Lucy Matthews
, I cannot envisage how our pleasant market town can possibly survive this relentless drive toward replacing valuable agricultural land with housing. The change of use of land on the Money Hill site has already had devastating consequences on the natural amenity of the local area, preservation of wildlife and sustainable habitat. Noise and dust pollution and much increased traffic are apparent and hectares of productive arable farming land has been permanently lost. Proposed mitigations appear to be minor and inspire no confidence in their effectiveness.		402	Gary Bateman
The significant increase in antisocial behaviour and crime around Ashby has been apparent over recent years and I fear this will only worsen with the increased population		402	Gary Bateman
I strongly believe that the current house building model is outdated and needs to be changed. Continually repeating the proposals for 3, 4 & 5 bedroom new build houses on the countryside is unsustainable and unaffordable to many, central government need to propose a new model		92	Paul Hutchinson
I believe that the wording in the document relating to this site focusses too much on why this site should be developed rather than equally why it should not be developed		92	Paul Hutchinson