

## **Local Plan Committee – Wednesday, 28 January 2026**

### **PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM MR CARL SUTTON**

Environmental Information Regulations disclosures show that on 18 June 2025, Ian Nelson, then Planning Policy Manager at North West Leicestershire District Council, specifically asked Manchester Airport Group, the owner and operator of East Midlands Airport and a statutory consultee, whether it had any concerns regarding the proposed residential allocation of Site K12.

This was followed by a further email on 15 July 2025, in which Mr Nelson stated:

“I was just wondering if you were able to advise on this issue as we are in the process of finalising a report to our Local Plan Committee.”

On 24 July 2025, Manchester Airport Group responded directly to that request and provided site-specific statutory consultee advice, concluding unequivocally:

“For reasons of aircraft noise exposure and disturbance, and residential amenity, it would be inappropriate to allocate this site for residential development.”

Given that Manchester Airport Group, as the statutory airport operator, provided site-specific advice stating that Site K12 is inappropriate for residential allocation on aircraft noise and residential amenity grounds, and that this advice was specifically requested by officers prior to the Local Plan Committee report being produced, can the Committee confirm how this conclusion was presented to Members when Site K12 was considered, and whether the Committee is satisfied to progress the allocation to Regulation 19 in light of that advice?

## RESPONSE FROM THE CHAIR OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE

- Whilst Manchester Air Group (MAG) responded to the March 2025 Regulation 18 consultation (alongside Prologis UK), they did not comment on site K12 as part of their response.
- As a direct result of residents' Regulation 18 comments, Ian Nelson wrote to MAG on 18 June 2025 to establish their views on site K12 and airport safety. At the same time, officers were seeking legal advice on the issue, with the intention of reporting this to 30 July 2025 Local Plan Committee.
- A response from MAG was received on 24 July 2025; after the publication of the 30 July LPC reports. The email trail between MAG and Ian Nelson confirmed that MAG's concerns with the site were about noise rather than safety. At this point in time, officers had requested, but not yet received, legal advice about site K12 and airport safety.
- Whilst MAG's concerns about noise were not reported to LPC, the issue of noise and the suitability of site K12 was raised by Cllr Sutton and referenced in the update report to 30 July LPC, where officers concluded that "excluding this site on the basis of noise without a more detailed assessment, as required in the policy, would be premature." After considering the issue of noise, officers did not propose any changes to the original recommendation that site K12 should be allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan "subject to confirmation that the site is acceptably located in relation to the EMA Public Safety Zone."
- The update report was finalised by Ian Nelson as Planning Policy Team Manager on 30 July and it is reasonable to assume that his email exchange with MAG (24 July), although not explicitly referred to, would not have changed the conclusions set out in the update report.
- It should be noted that there are still several stages before the site can be formally allocated in an adopted Local Plan. MAG can make formal comments at Regulation 19 stage; the Council can change the Plan after the Regulation 19 consultation and the Planning Inspectorate can explore the soundness of allocating site K12 during the Local Plan examination. Furthermore, a site allocation does not equate to a planning permission and any future planning application would need to demonstrate that the proposed development is acceptable in noise terms.