

APPENDIX A

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
	Ravenstone	Suggests a western extension to the Draft Limits to Development to allow for development through to the end of the Plan period	The proposed revision would represent a large western extension to the built-up area of Ravenstone and the inclusion of large areas of countryside contrary to the Limits to Development methodology. Development in this area may be considered if there is a need to allocate more housing development sites in Ravenstone. However, it should be noted that landowners/developers have not actively promoted the development of this area through the North West Leicestershire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.	No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development
Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society	Ashby de la Zouch	Wants to see town centre open space protected.	The purpose of defining Limits to Development is to contain development within broad settlement/built up areas. The issues outlined above represent other possible policy areas which might be included in the Local Plan and/or Neighbourhood Plans and for which different methodologies would be required. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to include these as part of the methodology for Limits to Development.	No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development
Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society	Ashby de la Zouch	Money Hill area to be included if identified in the Local Plan as an area for development.	Development boundaries include peripheral sites where there is an extant planning permission for residential or employment	The need for the Local Plan to allocate Money Hill, Ashby de la Zouch as a residential/ employment site be considered. If the site is allocated as

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
			development. This is not the case with Money Hill but this will be kept under review.	part of the Local Plan, the Limits to Development will need to be adjusted accordingly.
	Measham	Identifies the need for infrastructure improvements to cope with population growth.	Infrastructure providers will be consulted as part of the process of preparing the new Local Plan, as to ensure that the need for new infrastructure is identified.	No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development
Heather Parish Council	Heather	Reconsider Draft Limits to Development to allow for development between St Johns Football Club And 9 Ravenstone Road	Planning permission has been granted on this site.	Revise Heather Draft Limits to Development to include land between St Johns Football Club And 9 Ravenstone Road. Please see the amended plan 1 within Appendix A
Heather Parish Council	Heather	Need to consider the proposed Re-development of existing site to provide 14 residential units at MTS Logistics, Mill Lane, Heather	This site is currently the subject of planning application ref: 14/00396/FULM and has yet to be determined. Even if the site is granted planning permission, the site is isolated and clearly detached from the principal built-up area and so in accordance with the Limits to Development methodology should be excluded from within the boundary.	No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development.
Measham Parish Council	Measham	Planning decisions are not made adhering to the current local plan so how can we be sure future planning decisions will be. We know there are already developments underway that are outside these limits. Take into consideration existing planning applications.	The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. So, while the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing sites, Limits to Development	No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development.

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		<p>The current application being considered for Atherstone Road contravenes the existing Local Plan. It is requested that Local Plan policy M2 is retained and applied to this whole site.</p>	<p>have to be considered as not being up-to-date. In view of this, an increasing amount of development, particularly housing, has been granted beyond Limits to Development. This is partly the reason for reviewing Limits to Development as part of the preparation of the new Local Plan. Current planning applications have not been included within the draft revised Limits to Development and will only be included if they are approved. The draft Limits to Development may need to be reviewed, to include any further planning permissions before the Local Plan is submitted to the Secretary of State for examination.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the brickworks site is a separate matter from the Limits to Development and will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>	
Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society	Ashby de la Zouch	<p>Limits to Development should take into account approved planning applications and protect Protected open space. Proposed allocations. The Limits to Development currently proposed bear no relationship to limits</p>	<p>Development boundaries include peripheral sites where there is an extant planning permission for residential or employment development.</p> <p>The purpose of defining Limits to</p>	<p>Revise Ashby de la Zouch Draft Limits to Development include land between Buton Road and Moira Road, Shellbrook. Please see the revised amended plan 2 for Ashby de la Zouch within Appendix A.</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		<p>that will form part of the final local plan. It is therefore pointless consulting on maps that will bear no relationship to the final plan.</p> <p>Burton Road part 2 should be included as approved application.</p>	<p>Development is to contain development within broad settlement/built up areas. The issues relating to open spaces outlined in the Civic Societies comments are other possible policy areas which might be included in the Local Plan and/or Neighbourhood Plans and for which different methodologies would be required. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to include these as part of the methodology for Limits to Development.</p> <p>The development of up to 275 dwellings on land between Buton Road and Moira Road Shellbrook Ashby De La Zouch, has been permitted (14/00578/OUTM) subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement and should be included within the Limits to Development.</p>	
David Bigby	Ashby de la Zouch	<p>They include the buffer between the new Leicester Road Housing and the Coalfield Way Business Park which should NOT be designated for development.</p> <p>Also they include various school playing fields on the edges of Ashby which should be excluded. Namely, Ashby School, Willesley School and Woodcote School</p>	<p>The Limits to Development do not identify sites for development but only areas which cannot be considered as countryside. The methodology excludes playing fields and other open spaces where these are on the periphery of the built area and not well related to the settlement. The inclusion of playing fields and other open spaces within the LTD does not mean that such sites are</p>	

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		<p>Also I would prefer a distinction to be drawn between areas designated for housing development and areas designated for commercial, industrial and business development. It is important that the business parks on the outskirts of Ashby are not developed for housing. E.g. Smisby Road (Tournament Field) and Dents Road.</p>	<p>automatically suitable for development. Other policies in the Local Plan will need to consider these issues.</p>	
Chris Smith	Ashby de la Zouch	<p>The criteria seem to be land that is either developed or has approval for development. It is not clear why there needs to be a consultation on the current status of development as this is a matter of fact rather than opinion or views on development. Surely the criteria should be about the limits of development that will meet the Local Plan objectives. The proposal may be that but it doesn't say so.</p> <p>I would argue that the area between the Royal Hotel and Castle is not an area of development or development potential. Any development in Ashby should be confined to outside of this area.</p>	<p>If there is a need for the settlement to accommodate housing or employment growth this will be done by the allocation of development sites within, or most likely, adjoining Limits to Development.</p> <p>The area of land between the Royal Hotel and the Castle represents another policy area which might be included in the Local Plan and/or Neighbourhood Plans and for which different methodologies would be required. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to include these as part of the methodology for the Limits to Development.</p>	<p>No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development.</p>
Packington Nook	Ashby de la Zouch	<p>We very much agree with the proposal to route the southern limit of</p>	<p>The council is under obligation to discuss proposals with potential</p>	<p>No revisions to the proposed Limits to</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
Residents Association		<p>development to exclude the site known as Packington Nook. In this case, we would want the Council not only to adopt this boundary as a long term policy but also to ensure that officers are clearly instructed not to "coach" planning applications that would lie outside the boundary.</p> <p>We are concerned that there are no boundaries within the outer limits that would protect green spaces, specifically:</p> <p>public parks, including Bath Grounds, Western Park;</p> <p>school and recreational playing fields;</p> <p>the undeveloped areas around Ashby Castle ancient monument;</p> <p>allotments</p>	<p>applicants even if the proposal is contrary to the Councils policies.</p> <p>In response to protecting green spaces, these are other possible policy areas which might be included in the Local Plan and /or Neighbourhood Plans and for which different methodologies would be required. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to include these as part of the methodology for Limits to Development.</p>	Development.
Thomas Taylor Planning Ltd	Moira	<p>An area of land between Moira Primary School and Driftside was previously within Limits to Development on the Proposals Map of the adopted Local Plan. This site had previously had the benefit of an unimplemented planning permission which was allowed on appeal in 2002. In 2014 it was resolved to grant outline permission for up to 18 dwellings on this land subject to the prior completion of a S106 Agreement. This is the current position and therefore it would seem logical to place this land within the proposed limits to</p>	<p>The erection of up to 18 dwellings (Outline - 14/00175/OUTM) on land South of Drift Farm, Blackfordby Lane Moira is to be permitted subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement. There is also outline planning permission for (13/00951/OUT) for a dwelling north of Drift House.</p>	<p>Revise Moira Draft Limits to Development to include land with planning consent at Drift Farm, Blackfordby Lane. Please see the amended plan 3 within Appendix A</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
Castle Donington Parish Council	Castle Donington	<p>development.</p> <p>The proposed Limits of development as per the plan document are acceptable. However, the Parish Council feels strongly that the Area of Separation between Castle Donington and Hemington cum Lockington should be retained, including up to the A150 corridor.</p>	Comments noted.	No revisions to the proposed limits to development.
Nicola Bullivant-Parrish	Donisthorpe	<p>These seem to be exclusive of other important factors, one of which I consider to be traffic and associated road safety. The infrastructure of the village is such that it is already under strain at times from large and heavy goods vehicles. Should extra housing be built, then it is hard to see how this extra traffic is going to be dealt with. Secondly, the EYFS at the village primary school now has 30 children in it and inconceivable as to how more children could possibly be accommodated within the school and its facilities.</p>	<p>Sustainable settlements should allow for some rural housing development to help retain local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Although the North West Leicestershire Core Strategy was subsequently withdrawn, its approach to identifying sustainable rural communities received little or no objection. In it, Sustainable Villages were identified as those places which contained at least five community services and facilities. Donisthorpe has a primary school, shop, Post Office, Public house, Recreation Ground, community Hall and Place of Worship. The inclusion of any site within the Limits to Development does not automatically mean that proposed development would be approved. It will also be necessary to consider other matters such as the impact upon the</p>	

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
			<p>highway network, impact upon the amenity of adjoining properties and the wider area as well as the impact upon infrastructure.</p>	
<p>Thomas Taylor Planning Ltd</p>	<p>Breedon</p>	<p>Broadly yes although it would be helpful if LtD could also be identified around smaller settlements and groups of buildings to help clarify their visual and functional relationship with their surroundings and to help to distinguish (with some degree of certainty) where built development ends and the surrounding countryside begins. There remains some potential for accommodating small-scale development within these locations (eg leisure, tourism and employment - as well as housing) and the identification of LtD in these locations (including groups of buildings separated from, but close to, the edges of larger settlements) will provide additional policy guidance to help protect the wider countryside from unrestricted sprawl without fundamentally harming the Council's focus on directing the majority of development to the sustainable settlements identified elsewhere. The "hierarchy" implied by the current list of "sustainable" settlements need not be affected by this and could be distinguished through</p>	<p>Smaller settlements with no or very limited services and facilities are not sustainable locations for development. While there will be no blanket restriction on all housing development in these places, opportunities will be more limited. As a consequence, there will be no need to identify Sustainable Settlement Boundaries for settlements with no or limited services and facilities. The Limits to Development Policy will need to be read in conjunction with the Countryside policy which will allow for some appropriate development, which could include leisure and tourism.</p> <p>Breedon Priory is a garden centre that has diversified into a range of uses including craft shops, cafe etc. The buildings and their surroundings still have an agricultural appearance and retain a relationship with the surrounding open area. The site is quite different in character and use to the adjoining homes and business around The Green and the housing along the east side of Ashby Road.</p> <p>The site has a well landscaped frontage</p>	<p>No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		<p>appropriately worded planning policies.</p> <p>The LtD should be extended at the western edge of Breedon to include the land within and surrounding Breedon Priory Nurseries. There is an extensive area of buildings and parking/delivery areas associated with the existing uses there. They form a clearly definable part of the settlement and are both visually and functionally well-related to the settlement being close to the village green and the centre of the village. A small area of land to the rear of the pub car park between the Nurseries and properties on Melbourne Lane should also be included as it is also visually well-related to the nurseries and enclosed by mature hedges.</p>	<p>to Ashby Road so that when entering the village from the south, the site appears to be a continuous part of the countryside. Agricultural buildings and nurseries will only be included within the Limits to Development where they relate well to the existing settlement.</p>	
Thomas Taylor Planning Ltd	Diseworth	<p>The LtD should be extended at the eastern edge of Diseworth to the rear of properties on Grimes Gate and Clements Gate to include a small area of land which adjoins the northern boundary of the Bull & Swan car park. The car park (which is included within LtD) together with this adjoining land are well-related to each other visually and are within the same ownership. They form a single parcel of land and are separated from adjoining countryside to the east by a strong,</p>	<p>The small area of land adjoining the northern boundary of the Bull & Swan car park in Diseworth appears to be largely scrubland associated with existing properties on Grimes Gate. Even if it were developed, the inclusion of this small parcel of land within the Limits to Development would not have the effect of extending the built-up area of the village into the open countryside.</p>	<p>The Diseworth Draft Limits to Development should be extended at the eastern edge of Diseworth to the rear of properties on Grimes Gate and Clements Gate to include a small area of land which adjoins the northern boundary of the Bull & Swan car park. Please see the amended plan 4 within Appendix A.</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		defensible mature hedge along their eastern boundary. This parcel of land is well-related to the structure and pattern of development within the settlement rather than forming part of the surrounding countryside.		
Thomas Taylor Planning Ltd		In this respect, Newton Burgoland should be included within the list of settlements with a LtD boundary drawn around it. The village benefits from a primary school, general stores, an outreach post office (Tues/Weds), a Pub/Restaurant and a Church as well as employment opportunities in nearby farming enterprises. These facilities support a range of nearby settlements and recognition with a LtD line would provide an opportunity to further sustain these services and facilities.	Few services exist within Newton Burgoland. Residents are relatively isolated from shops, significant employment opportunities, medical services and cultural/recreational facilities. The bus service through the village is less than hourly and does not extend into the evening or Sundays, the last bus, on the current timetable, being at 17:56. Consequently, the accessibility to a range of local services for residents of any proposed new housing would be limited.	No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development.
Thomas Taylor Planning Ltd	Heather	The LtD should be extended at the western side of Heather to include the land and buildings known as "Dawson's Yard". Heather is considered to be a sustainable settlement and there have been a number of residential developments permitted there in recent years. Dawson's Yard represents an extensive range of buildings on the edge of the settlement which are clearly not part of the surrounding, undeveloped countryside. Although on	Dawson's Yard is clearly detached from the principal built-up area of Heather and should be excluded from within the boundary.	No revisions to the proposed limits to development

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		<p>the edge of the settlement, they are well-related to it and the pattern of development that extends along Sweystone Road.</p>		
Thomas W Redfern	Packington	<p>The proposed limits to development in Packington do not fully take into account the areas of development potential.</p> <p>The open paddock land at the rear of 53 Normanton Road, Packington has been excluded from the proposed limits to development notwithstanding that the planning permission (14/00109/OUT) recently granted for 4 dwellings on the land will be issued when the S. 106 Agreement has been executed (see submitted application plan ref. 4955/1). The limits should at least be reinstated to include the application site as in the currently adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan and further extended to include the paddock land between this site and the chicken farm to the north-east, edged in blue on the submitted application plan as land which has potential for and is available for development.</p>	<p>Planning permission for the erection of up to four dwellings on land at rear Of 53 Normanton Road, Packington is to be permitted subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement (14/00109/OUT).</p>	<p>Revise Packington Draft Limits to Development include land at rear of 53 Normanton Road. Please see the amended plan 5 within Appendix A.</p>
Willesley Residents	Ashby de la Zouch	<p>If it is necessary to change the limits to development for Ashby to accommodate additional development then this should be on the north side of the town between the existing</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development.</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		<p>development and the A511 Ashby Bypass. Development in this area would be more sustainable and have better access to the main road network. The undeveloped land to the South side of Ashby between the A42 and the Leicester to Burton mineral railway line , and in particular the land between the railway line and Willesley Lane has a high landscape and amenity value and is an important gateway into the National Forest Open Access areas.</p>		
<p>Ibstock Parish Council</p>	<p>Ibstock</p>	<p>Following the recent draft limits to development for Ibstock, the Parish council were very happy at the tight boundary that has been proposed on this document.</p> <p>As a Parish we have been subject to a huge increase in housing over the past couple of years, and this has lead to our services being pushed to its limits.</p> <p>The roads cannot cope, especially at peak times, often large queues, and large volumes of traffic. Parking is a major problem, alone with the other stretched services like schools, doctors etc.</p> <p>Our only observation is the allotment gardens on Station Road, we would like</p>	<p>The inclusion of any site within the Limits to Development does not automatically mean that proposed development would be approved. It will also be necessary to consider other matters such as the impact upon the highway network, impact upon the amenity of adjoining properties and the wider area as well as the impact upon infrastructure.</p> <p>Generally, peripheral playing fields, environmental space, allotments and community gardens should not be included within the boundary.</p>	<p>Revise Ibstock Draft Limits to Development to exclude the allotments on Station Road. Please see the revised amended plan 6 within Appendix A.</p>

Representor	Settlement	Comment	Response	Recommendation
		to see them excluded from the plan, as being allotments, they should not be under consideration for development?		
Kegworth Parish Council	Kegworth	<p>There is very little land left within the limits to development for Kegworth to grow. The Parish Council is mindful of the fact that Kegworth is a “restrained village” due to the flight path of the East Midlands Airport and the possibility of flooding from the River Soar. However, Councillors did wonder whether it would be possible to include the area of land along Derby Road and towards J24 of the M1 within the limits to development, an area about which there is at present a planning application pending from the land owner. The Parish Council is concerned that there is very little land in and around Kegworth that could be used for sport and recreation purposes and, within this planning application numbered 14/00541 for 150 houses, there is the provision for sports and recreational areas which would be laid out by the applicant and be able to be used by residents of Kegworth. For this application to be challenged because it is not within the limits to development would not be helpful.</p>	<p>The Planning application has not been included as the draft Limits to Development as it is yet to be determined. If the application is approved then this will be taken into consideration as part of the Limits to Development as part of the final plan.</p>	<p>No revisions to the proposed Limits to Development. At this time but that the Limits to Development will be adjusted in the event of planning permission being granted for the development referred to.</p>

