

**APPENDIX O – LAND AT SPRING LANE AND REAR OF 55 NORMANTON ROAD,
PACKINGTON (P5/P8)**

APPENDIX O – LAND AT SPRING LANE AND NORMANTON ROAD, PACKINGTON (P5/P8)

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS (MARCH 2025)

HOUSING	SITE NUMBER: P5 & P8	SITE NAME: Land at Spring Lane and Normanton Road, Packington
----------------	---------------------------------	--

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
Principle of Development				
If the reserve sites are suitable, available, and achievable then why not allocate them? If they are more achievable than the preferred 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 planned supply will be able to meet the identified housing requirement including the unmet need within the HMA	<p>The preferred housing allocations are considered to be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>Any additional housing allocations will also be expected to satisfy the above.</p>	No change at present. Await the outcome of further assessment work.	48	Leicester City Council
<p>Packington has exceeded its housing allocation for the adopted plan period. The allocations should either be deleted or reduced in size.</p> <p>Packington is in danger of losing its village character and appeal.</p>	<p>The new Local Plan must identify locations for additional development needed for the coming years. The scale of development proposed is considered appropriate for Packington.</p>	No change.	366	Packington Parish Council
The size of the allocation/development is inappropriate for Grove Close. No more than 3 houses should be allowed.	Development must make efficient use of land whilst also taking into account other matters such as the area's character, setting, design and	No change at present. Await the outcome of further assessment work.	154, 413	Diane Powney, Peter Marples

APPENDIX O – LAND AT SPRING LANE AND NORMANTON ROAD, PACKINGTON (P5/P8)

	constraints, which will inform the quantum and layout of development.			
Site is well related to the existing built form.	The site is located adjacent to the currently defined Limits to Development.		136	Andrew Larger Surveyors Ltd
Highways				
Safe access is achievable	The local highway authority has raised potential access issues, including the ability to achieve visibility to the south. This matter is being looked into further.	No change at present. Await the outcome of further assessment work.	136	Andrew Large Surveyors Ltd
The red line does not support the proposed layout as the access to the adopted highway via Grove Close is not included within the red line. Grove Close would need be included within the red line boundary to achieve suitable access. However, it is unclear if this would require crossing third party land. The site has a RAG Rating: Amber which suggests there are issues with the potential access.	The site promoter has provided information detailing the access drive to be in the same ownership as P8. However, the local highway authority has raised concerns regarding achievable visibility to the south. This matter is being looked into further.	No change at present. Await the outcome of further assessment work.	150	Leicestershire County Council (Highways Authority)
Access could be achieved via Spring Lane however due to its restricted width it would need widening or passing places to be created. Also concerns that there are no current pedestrian/cycle facilities to Spring Lane.	Noted. There are also further concerns in respect of access from Spring Lane – the loss of/impact on the frontage hedgerow which comprises a Candidate Local Wildlife Site as well as the potential for an overly prominent development in this setting.	No change at present. Await the outcome of further assessment work.	150	Leicestershire County Council (Highways Authority)

APPENDIX O – LAND AT SPRING LANE AND NORMANTON ROAD, PACKINGTON (P5/P8)

Access is only appropriate for six houses. A development of 23 houses would produce 46 additional vehicles. Is it legal or safe to remove the pathway and widen the road?	The local highway authority has advised that a 4.8m wide access would be an acceptable width for a private drive serving up to 25 dwellings.	No change.	154, 413	Diane Powney, Peter Marples
Grove Close is a singular and narrow road and not suitable to cope with extra traffic. It does not allow for the free flow of vehicles in and out of the site. Parked cars causing problems. The removal of the gates and pillars would not facilitate the two-way flow of vehicles.	An access width of 4.8m should facilitate two cars passing and the local highway authority has raised no objection on these grounds. No issues have also been raised over the presence of the gates, provided that they are set back an appropriate distance from the highway boundary.	No change	154, 413	Diane Powney, Peter Marples
No consultation regarding the removal of the gates/pillars. This is controlled by Grove Close Management Ltd who would oppose its removal. However, their removal would not facilitate two way flow of traffic.	The local highway authority has raised no issues over the presence of the gates. However, the promoter has indicated that the gate could be removed as part of development. Given the conflicting information, this matter is to be looked into further.	No change at present. Await the outcome of further assessment work.	154, 413	Diane Powney, Peter Marples
Refuse vehicles cannot drive up Grove Close, therefore refuse is placed on Normanton Road for collection. Additional houses would exacerbate this situation.	The local highway authority has advised that a refuse vehicle could enter and exit, however this would need to be demonstrated by tracking,	No change	154, 413	Diane Powney, Peter Marples

APPENDIX O – LAND AT SPRING LANE AND NORMANTON ROAD, PACKINGTON (P5/P8)

	as part of any planning application.			
Access from Spring Lane is the only suitable solution but should not be permitted due to encroachment onto P5.	Access off Spring Lane raises highway and ecology concerns as well as potential impact on the character on the area.	No change.	154, 413	Dianne Powney, Peter Marples
Highway safety concerns, including a road listed in the Leicestershire Road Safety Partnership as a 'community concern site', with speeding in the village and its use as a cut through to Ashby. Traffic calming measures are being investigated as a means of alleviating these issues.	Should the site be allocated and as plans for the site get more detailed, the developer will be required to carry out a road safety audit as part of a future planning application; this will look at existing road safety in the local area and the implications on road safety of the proposed development. The developers would need to mitigate any road safety impact to a suitable standard and to the satisfaction of the local highway authority.	No change at present. Await the outcome of further assessment work.	366	Packington Parish Council
Flooding				
High surface water flood risk on the eastern boundary and an extensive area in the north-western corner associated with the adjacent ordinary watercourse. A sequential approach to site layout should be taken, avoiding development in these areas.	The site is in Flood Zone 1. However, the Flood Map for Planning shows a propensity for surface water flooding in parts of the site. This could have an impact on site capacity.	No change at present. Await the outcome of further assessment work.	150	Leicestershire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority)
No concerns raised with regards to safe access/egress.	A flood risk assessment will be required in support of any			

APPENDIX O – LAND AT SPRING LANE AND NORMANTON ROAD, PACKINGTON (P5/P8)

Many houses/roads in the village suffer from flooding and damage. Development has increased the frequency of flooding and a reduction in natural drainage. Climate change and new development will exacerbate this, despite land lying in a low flood risk area.	planning application on this site in line with NPPF footnote 63. SUDs will also be required. Mitigation measures will need to be identified to deal with any effected or risk, to the satisfaction of the lead local flood authority (Leicestershire County Council).		366, 401	Packington Parish Council, Nikki Kearney-Taylor
Flood prevention and mitigation measures are not adhered to, regulated, monitored or maintained after properties have been built.	There are mechanisms in place (conditions attached to permissions) that require the maintenance and management of SUDS infrastructure for the lifetime of the development.	No change	401	Nikki Kearney-Taylor
FLOAT in Packington is trying to implement measures to help Packington. The land at Housing Allocation A7 acts as a soak away and protects Packington from flooding. And the Environment Agency has identified some of this land to assist with flow from Gilwiskaw Brook —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	In view of the announcement on 17 July 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport, it is no longer proposed to include this A7 as a reserve allocation	No change	401	Nikki Kearney-Taylor

APPENDIX O – LAND AT SPRING LANE AND NORMANTON ROAD, PACKINGTON (P5/P8)

follow up with her to help safeguard our village.				
River Mease				
<p>The site is the River Mease SAC. We reiterate the advice in Policy En2 that all development within the catchment will be required to demonstrate that it will not cause an adverse effect on the SAC i.e. that it will not contribute additional phosphorous to, or otherwise cause an adverse effect upon, the River Mease SAC, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. This may be achieved via:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering bespoke phosphorous mitigation • Contributing to a strategic mitigation scheme (i.e. Developer Contribution Scheme). <p>Developments in these locations must meet the requirements of the Habitat Regulations.</p>	Noted. It is not necessary to duplicate policies so reference to the River Mease is not required in this policy.	No change	345	Natural England
Other Environmental Issues				
The supporting text should refer to the site's location in the National Forest.	Noted. Should this site proceed as an allocation, the supporting text would be updated.	No change at present. Await the outcome of further assessment work.	165	The National Forest Company
All allocations should incorporate opportunities for Green Infrastructure. Recommend guidance set out in the Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles & Standards Green Infrastructure Home is considered within each potential allocation. The	It is agreed that the incorporation of Green Infrastructure (GI) within development is an important objective, but it is considered that the issue is adequately addressed in draft Policy En1	No change	345	Natural England

APPENDIX O – LAND AT SPRING LANE AND NORMANTON ROAD, PACKINGTON (P5/P8)

emerging Leicestershire & Rutland Local Nature Recovery Strategy should also be a consideration.	and does not need to be repeated in individual site allocation policies.			
All allocations should incorporate opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. Any site allocation should clearly set out the BNG requirements for development, including both on-site and where appropriate off-site provision (acknowledged the policy requirements for BNG are set out in policy En1).	BNG is dealt with in national policy and guidance, in addition to the requirements of draft Policy En1.	No change	345	Natural England
Infrastructure				
There will be a need for contributions to enhancements to local schools and other community facilities. All housing sites will be assessed as to whether there is a requirement for additional school places, this would be in relation to negotiating s106 contributions. This may include extending existing schools, remodelling existing schools, allocating land for new schools and creation of new schools.	Noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is in the process of being updated to include the new housing allocations.	Await the outcome of the update to the Infrastructure Plan.	150	Leicestershire County Council
Insufficient infrastructure to support development	An update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared to assess the cumulative impact of all proposed site allocations on existing infrastructure and to set out how the impact might be mitigated/new infrastructure required. This Plan will be informed by	Await the outcome of the update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan	154, 413	Diane Powney, Peter Marples
New development will place a further strain on our oversubscribed infrastructure. Residents are having to use infrastructure elsewhere (Ashby and Measham). Do not select all the land offered in and around Packington			366	Packington Parish Council
The primary school will need to be extended. It is already oversubscribed			366	Packington Parish Council

APPENDIX O – LAND AT SPRING LANE AND NORMANTON ROAD, PACKINGTON (P5/P8)

with children having to travel outside of the village to school.	engagement with infrastructure providers, including the local education authority and the NHS Integrated Care Boards.			
Lack of new doctor surgeries to cope with additional patients.			366	Packington Parish Council
23 dwellings at P5/P8 would result in an increase of 56 patients, split between the Castle Medical Group and Measham Medical Centre. If all the additional housing sites were allocated this would result in an increase of 1,469 patients (8%) on Castle Medical Group's register and an increase of 2575 patients (16%) on Measham Medical Centre's register. The ICB also recognises that further work will need to take place to consider the cumulative effect of these proposed sites alongside sites that have already been approved.			487	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board
Minerals				
Located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for Coal. Therefore, recommend a Minerals Assessment in line with Policy M11 of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (LMWLP), ensuring that the mineral is not needlessly sterilised by future development.	Should this site proceed as an allocation, a policy requirement can be added to require the provision of a Mineral Assessment for Coal.	No change at present. Await the outcome of further assessment work.	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
There may be the issue of land instability associated with coal mining works that could be present at the site. Recommend that the District Council consult the Mining Remediation Authority for any known issues.	The Mining Remediation Authority were consulted on the proposed allocation and no representation was made.	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)

APPENDIX O – LAND AT SPRING LANE AND NORMANTON ROAD, PACKINGTON (P5/P8)

Waste				
There are no site-specific waste safeguarding issues as Packington STW (N16) is over 1km to the south west.	Noted	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Authority)
Heritage				
All consulted sites are considered to have a heritage potential at 'medium risk'.	Noted	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council
No prior investigative work has been undertaken. Given the proximity of the historic core and the possibility of an earlier landscape below the ridge and furrow, will require pre-determination evaluation followed by appropriate mitigation secured by condition upon any future planning permission.	Noted. As set out at paragraph 3.23 of the consultation document, a Desk Based Archaeology Assessment (followed up with any necessary archaeological site investigation) will be a requirement for most sites including site P5/P8. The need for a planning condition does not impact the proposed allocation of the site.	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council
Limited harm would arise from the development and development would affect the rural setting of Packington House.	The impact of development on the setting of Packington House (a Grade II Listed Building) would need to be assessed as part of any planning application.	No change	400	NWLDC – Senior Conservation Officer
Other Comments				
Detrimental impact on the value of Grove Close properties	This concern is noted however the impact of development on property values is not a planning consideration.	No change	154, 413	Diane Powney, Peter Marples

APPENDIX O – LAND AT SPRING LANE AND NORMANTON ROAD, PACKINGTON (P5/P8)

The owner of P5 is not aware of the proposal nor do they consider these to be appropriate.	The site promoter has indicated that all site owners of P5 and P8 are aware this site has been submitted to the Council for consideration as an allocation. And all owners have entered into an agreement with Keller Construction to promote the site for development.	No change	154, 413	Diane Powney, Peter Marples
Concerns raised over the speculative nature of the proposal and put forward by a local builder and through a planning agent (former CEO of a neighbouring council). This and their influence is a concern.	The sites have been submitted to the Council through the SHELLA and Local Plan consultation process. As with all potential allocations, the site shall be subject to a comprehensive assessment and public consultation.	No change	413	Peter Marples
Applications are approved and then subsequent applications on adjoining sites are made. Development should consider comprehensively rather than as piecemeal.	This potential allocation supports the comprehensive development of P5 and P8. Any windfall development proposal would need to satisfy the policies of the Local Plan.	No change	413	Peter Marples