

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
408	Michael	Reid	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	This extensive building on green belt should be avoided at all costs! Whilst the large infill between Stephenson's college and new Swannington, would significantly impact the already stretched resources of the locality. Building beyond New Swannington, across Red Hill's to Whitwick Moor, will significantly impact the scenic rural countryside views enjoyed by many locals, given the hilly local landscape and will devastate access to nature and footpaths across the open land towards Swannington enjoyed by so many. Reduce [the proposed LtD] and do not go beyond New Swannington, towards rechills a local beauty spot.
409	Andrew	Palmer	n/a	Chapter 4 Housing Allocations	[On all development proposed in Whitwick] The Village alresdy sees a lot of through traffic, Leicester road takes a lot of traffic from the markfield directions. The junctions to hall lane and silver street are already very busy. To access cosville from Whitwick is problematic enough already, with Church lane and Silver street, taking too many cars. It is frequently standstill trying to negotiate these roads, with cars taking to the pavement to get past on coming traffic frequently. The local shops and infrastructure do not have the parking facilities to accommodate more residents. The coops - both in whitwick and also thringstone have less than 40 spaces between them. The roads are narrow and the access out of the village is terrible. The local bus route does not service the area very well, so people will be dependent on cars. The junction of the Dumps is already perilous to pull out of in both directions. The entire area is saturated with houses, it really cannot take many more.
410	DEBORAH	HARDY	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	I LIVE ON LEICESTER ROAD IBSTOCK IT IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE TO HAVE JUST ONE ACCESS/EXIT FROM THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ONTO LEICESTER ROAD. THE ROAD IS ALREADY DANGEROUSLY NARROW IN PLACES AND THE VOLUME OF TRAFFIC IS HUGE ALREADY. IT CAN TAKE ME (WITH NO EXAGGERATION)5-10 MINS TO GET OUT OF MY DRIVE IN THE MORNING NOW - I CAN'T IMAGINE HOW BAD IT WILL BE WITH AN ADDITIONAL 900+ VEHICLES (BASED ON A 2 CAR HOUSEHOLD). THERE HAS TO BE ANOTHER ACCCESS ROAD IF THIS PROPOSAL GOES AHEAD. AS IT STANDS WE DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH DOCTORS, DENTIST OR HIGH SCHOOL PLACES FOR THE RESIDENTS NOW . IT SEEMS LIKE THE FOCUS IS BUILDING AT ANY COSTS, REGARDLESS IF THE INFRASTRUCTURE CAN COPE OR NOT. THIS IS THE IDEAL TIME TO PUT IN THE LINK ROAD YOU HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT FOR YEARS BETWEEN ELLISTOWN & THE A447 TO REDUCE THE TRAFIC FLOW THROUGH IBSTOCK.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
411	Jodie	Williamson	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	There are already lots of additional housing in Hugglescote and Ellistown being built. This is unnecessary
412	Robert	Pegg	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	I wish to object to the proposal of building houses on the land off Leicester Road. The local infrastructure can't handle the extra strain this will cause; People living in the VILLAGE didn't sign up to it being turned into a TOWN and most importantly all the countryside is being lost and its having an intense negative impact to the environment.
413	Leah	Moore	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock E7 Midland Rd Ellistown	Traffic is already an issue especially on Leicester road in Ibstock as is schooling and getting a gp appointment in Ibstock. The housing allocation will result in an increase in these issues and also eventually leading to the village joining its surrounding villages with no greenery/ open space in between!
414	Emily	Massey	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	The village has too many people for the services and roads that are in place this needs upgrading before a new housing site should be considered. The council seems to only care about money not providing a good service to the current residents. The green spaces for locals are being reduced and the movement of the Leicester round path is madness.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
415	Adam	B	n/a	CD10 Park Lane Castle Donington	<p>I am actually so shocked and disheartened by this proposal, I moved to Castle Donnington over 5 years ago now, because it was a nice quiet LITTLE village, but with the developments that have taken place over the years, it is beginning to feel more like a town, and you plan on building more homes?! This used to be such a magical village fairy-tale village, but the council continue to keep concreting over everything, and now you have your eyes on blue bell woods?! Like where do we draw the line, because you people in charge, just keep approving these destructive acts. Bluebell woods used to be a magical place, where myself and others played as a kid, and what I find so disheartening, is the next generation will never be able to see the beauty that used to exist here! You are literally destroying everything around us, then wonder why children don't go outside in this over populated Out of any council I actively watch house building wise, I'd definitely say North West Leicestershire council are building the fastest, I find that in itself concerning, because it feels like this is happening everywhere around me, such as Kegworth and Loughborough, you are absolutely cramming us together, that makes me concerned about pollution, crime and flooding. I look at the developments up the road in places like Broxtowe, where over 7,000 homes will be built on the Barracks site when it closes, or Erewash, Longmoor Lane Long Eaton, the council told us several trees would be protected and aimed for increases in bio diversity for the accident woodland that used to exist here, just to lie to the public and let the developer chop well in excess of 150 trees down. I would like to ask why are we building some many industrial units and places of work, when our highstreets lie empty?! I firmly believe your priorities are wrong, or are you priorities what makes the most money? In todays economy who on earth has the money to buy these expensive units? These will not be the well-paying jobs of the future, just another depressing place no one wants to work.</p>
416	Julie	Doyle	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	<p>I am concerned that the creation of this settlement will increase traffic along the Green in Diseworth making it even more hazardous for residents cycling or walking along the road between Long Whatton and Diseworth. This route is already used as a rat run for workers heading for the businesses on the Airport campus. Also, flooding is an issue in Diseworth, and we won't realise the full impact on the village until the new settlement is completed. By then, the developers will be long gone and Diseworth residents will be left to mop up (literally).</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
416	Julie	Doyle	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	You just have to look at the existing landscape to see that using this land for a distribution hub would be catastrophic for wildlife, air quality, carbon emissions, health and well-being of Diseworth residents - not to mention the visual aspect when entering the village. I would like to see air quality being taken seriously when considering these developments. As the village lies in a dip, the potential for serious further air quality degradation caused by increased development around the village is massive.
417	Rod	Dawson	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	Hello, I went to the event at Castle Donington Community Hub and saw the plan to build 4600 houses at Isley Walton. As a resident of Wilson it will hugely impact our village. It will transform the area from being rural to predominantly urban. There will be continuous urban /industrial/ infrastructure from Wilson to the M1 and beyond. The environmental impact will be massive and change a place where buzzards fly, to a place where it will be a concrete and tarmac covered landscape. No amount of measures to mitigate the environmental impact will make any difference. This is productive farmland that will be gone for ever. In return we will get floods as the water pours off the concrete down the drains and into the streams which will flood. Where will the grain come from when it is concreted over? How far away will it be grown and how much CO2 will be emitted to get it here? How many extra roads will be built to take the extra traffic? Promises of footpaths, cycle ways won't materialise as it's built on a hill and so everyone will drive everywhere. So please turn it down and build houses in places on brownfield sites where environmental impact is low.
418	Georgii	Goodenough	n/a	Ib18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	Ib18 - Strongly opposed. Ibstock has seen more than its fair share of building in the last 10 years. I now no longer recognise the village I grew up in. Proposed building on Leicester Road, Ibstock. People have to live somewhere, I understand that. But Ibstock has seen its fair share, as has Hugglescote. It is already difficult to try and get a space in a school or a doctors appointment. Try investing in infrastructure, parks for children, resources, community. How much of the developers cash are lining the pockets of bureaucrats? It's absurd. Build somewhere else. The pollution this will create will ruin the natural environment. It won't go to plan, it won't be budget friendly and it won't be on time - because nothing this local authority does ever is. Build somewhere else.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
419	Clare	Taylor	n/a	AP5 Health and Wellbeing	This policy seeks to address Objective 1 of the local plan – Enabling Health and wellbeing. Clause 5.45 states "Particular issues include low levels of physical activity, unhealthy eating and weight, social isolation, limited access to services, poor mental health wellbeing and meeting the challenges of an ageing." Clause 5.46 states:"Improving our health and wellbeing requires more than improving access to medical treatment and services" However, the solutions suggested do not in any way refer to the provision of facilities as part of the plan. If green space is being taken away from the existing community then the plan ought to take into consideration investment in leisure and recreational facilities to give back to the community as part of the new infrastructure, so that people living in the area of castle Donington can maintain a healthy lifestyle. Outdoor space is going to be at a premium, thanks to the proposed development, with opportunities for walking, cycling etc being hugely restricted. Therefore, the plan ought to include investment in the provision of leisure facilities such as a leisure centre in order to provide the community with some way of participating in an active lifestyle. Removal of green spaces will undoubtedly have a long-term impact on the poor mental and physical health of the community which will ultimately cost the public purse much more than considering the investment in facilities that support health and wellbeing from the outset.
419	Clare	Taylor	n/a	IF4 Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities	This policy does not go far enough and will result in developers doing minimum to box tick when it comes to the provision of walking, cycling routes and green space. This policy should be more detailed and specific.
420	Gary	Downing	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	Traffic on the Melbourne Road (A447) is already well over capacity and would be unable to cope with any form of increase in use. Along with domestic use the road is used significantly by large vehicles and HGV's due to the local companies. There is already a significant risk to life for which no action has been taken. Volume and speed of traffic is a significant concern.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
421	Michael	Forey	n/a	CD10 Park Lane Castle Donington	Having attended the consultation, I was surprised to learn that the "red line" which was defined as the proposed limit of development actually originated from the consortium of developers. Within this red line there are areas to be protected including woodlands and land close to listed buildings. If the red line were to be included in the agreed plan then there is nothing to stop the developers, in 10-15 years applying for planning permission to build housing on those protected areas, as it is compliant to the agreed plan. This is unacceptable. The red line should be re-drawn to exclude the proposed protected areas. Your representative at the meeting agreed with this but asked me to submit this to you.
422	John	Greenshields	CLA Midlands	Objectives	We support the objectives but there is a lack of detail as to how the planning system will help deliver these objectives. While the planning system has a role in preventing bad development too frequently it is preventing good much needed development. Especially housing, causing the crisis due to lack of supply and rural development.
422	John	Greenshields	CLA Midlands	S2 Settlement Hierarchy	S2 the sustainability heirarchy imposes a glass ceiling on smaller settlements preventing them from much needed development. The policy creates unsustainable settlements rather than trying to lift them and make them vibrant and sustainable. There needs to be stronger support for rural development. Otherwise the Council's objectives will be unmet.
422	John	Greenshields	CLA Midlands	H1 Housing Strategy	Acknowledgement must be given that a trade off must always be made between limiting development and allowing much needed development. Which may need to naturally extend the boundary of a settlement. This can be a good thing provided that it is a well designed development. The planners must remember that land use demands are always in flux and trade offs need to be made. This is within the context of a huge housing shortage and a struggling economy.
422	John	Greenshields	CLA Midlands	H2 Housing Commitments	There is a need to increase the supply of housing, of differing types in differing locations. To give more choice, foster economic growth and make housing more affordable. This will help support local services, provide revenue and take pressure off the Council social care services. The LPA should look upon all rural housing developments favourably rather than threatening them as unacceptable unless they meet certain limited criteria. Otherwise the housing problems will never be resolved and the housing stock will not meet the requirements of the 21st century, such as climate change mitigation and resilience.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
422	John	Greenshields	CLA Midlands	Ec2 Employment Commitments	Additional support must be given to rural development. Nationally the rural economy is 18% less productive than urban areas and the inability to secure planning is a major barrier. There is a significant amount of latent rural growth simply waiting for realistic chances of securing planning. This could reduce inequality around the area, replace lost farm incomes from subsidies and provide well-paid employment opportunities. Easy significant gains, including increased Business Rates and green renewable development by allowing well-designed sustainable rural development. The planning system must take a more positive outlook. Too much development is either being refused or not even coming forward due to the costs and risks involved in submitting a planning application.
422	John	Greenshields	CLA Midlands	En1 Nature Conservation / Biodiversity Net Gain	Rural development, both housing and commercial, must be permitted. So that rural individuals can live, work and invest in the environment. From planting hedges or installing renewables there must be a sustainable local population and economy. Otherwise the Council will not achieve their environmental objectives.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
423	Glenn	Robinson	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	<p>Currently the land on the "New Settlement of Isley Woodhouse" is utilised for valuable and extremely important agricultural purposes which provides an essential and vital food supply for the UK. If we continue to lose this irreplaceable farm asset, we will continue to rely more and more on imports from overseas, which will become increasingly expensive and unavailable. Surely there are other sites which can be used for building houses. This beautiful area provides habitat for nature and would threaten the extinction of many species of wild animals including bats, brown hares, badgers, fox, deer, buzzards, owls, and other species of birds in particular. The destruction of valuable hedgerows and trees is irresponsible and should not be allowed. The proposed area is totally unsuitable for building, the land is subject to floods, and cannot currently cope with water which flows from the fields, the roads would become totally flooded in Isley Walton and Tongue, recently this area has become almost impassable in times of prolonged rain. The road network around the area of Castle Donington and through Isley Walton is totally incapable of handling the current volume of traffic, especially on major events at Donington Park, such as track events and concerts such as "Download UK". The airport plans to have more flights and any expansion of traffic will lead to major disruption. The current local residents of Isley Walton would suffer massively in terms of well-being and would be exposed to extreme stress if any building work was to commence. The current infrastructure including, power, heating, lighting, water and drainage would require a total upgrade through the area which would cause massive destruction for years before starting any housing development. The current residential area of Isley Walton includes many substantial period dwellings including listed buildings and a church, and other large houses with individual character. The residents of Isley Walton are obviously massively opposed to any catastrophic destruction of this area of natural beauty and through representations of the Parish Council will oppose the current planning application.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
424	Nicola	Clarke	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	<p>An Economic Objective - Response - The areas proposed for building are incredibly important to the wildlife in this area, not to mention the outstanding beauty of the open panoramic views, with the housing developments in the area expanding at an alarming rate I'd like to know why destroying thousands of acres of beautiful historic landscape is the 'right thing' to do when there are so many brown belt disused expanses of land all over the county that could be considered in smaller pockets for development. A social objective - Response - Firstly, There is a significant lack of health services to accommodate the increasing number of people living in the area, the local dentists are already overloaded and not taking on any more NHS patients, the doctors surgeries are already at full capacity and this is already starting to effect the level of service in the area. I would also like to point out that last year the decision was made by the local council to stop the only public transport service we have coming through Long Whatton and Diseworth, there is already a lack of support of residents established in the area. The Social Objective to meet the needs of present and future generations has to be incorrect as the local council is already neglecting the needs of residents currently living in the area with huge health, social and mental well being consequences. An environmental objective – Response - Firstly the statement ‘protecting and enhancing our natural historic environment’ is a complete contradiction to what you propose, I wouldn't say that ripping up thousands of acres of natural, unspoilt, wildlife supporting, nature abundant habitat is exactly protecting and enhancing our natural historic environment. To make the statement ‘helping to improve biodiversity’ you will be destroying the biodiversity in the area, not to mention the chemicals and pollution that will bleed into the soil killing the living organisms that makes the soil and nature in this area so diverse in the first place, have we not learned from our mistakes in the past. I refer to the statement ‘ using natural resources prudently’ what exactly does this mean? there will be no natural resources left, I understand from the planning that there are 4 small areas where trees are to be saved, the impact this will have on local wildlife is devastating to say the least, natural resources are being raped all over the country, this is not acceptable on any level. The amount of biodiversity that will be destroyed is criminal. I refer to ‘minimising waste and pollution’ I don't understand this statement at all, it's completely the opposite of what will actually happen if this goes ahead, with fly tipping on the increase and the local litter picking being carried out by local residents not the council, the proposal will create more rubbish, litter and fly tipping which the council already struggles to maintain, as previously commented, it's local residents that carry out litter picking in the area, not the council. With councils facing bankruptcy I fear this will only get worse. The pollution in this areas is increasing rapidly because of the airport and the amount of traffic being brought into the area already by increased housing and warehouses, the roads around our villages weren't built for this amount of traffic, not to mention the size of the transport, pot holes and a lack of safe cycle routes are a massive issue on our country roads, this will only be made worse by the increase of vehicles which in turn will create more pollution, effecting not only the air quality, but the noise pollution also, this is already becoming an issue in this area with increased traffic on the motorways, increased freight flights at EMA which go on 24 hours a day, the increased housing and warehousing will add to the increasing problems, create more traffic, larger vehicles creating more pollution and danger to existing road users such as cyclists & horse riders in the area.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
425	Phil	James	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd lbstock	<p>I am extremely disappointed that this proposal is less than 50m from my property yet there has been no direct contact with neither me or any of my neighbours. A classic case of railroading. There are many concerns and objections that I have with this scheme. Loss of habitat for wildlife species, items such as improvements to footpaths and public right of way will be a simple case of paving them with macadam and removing existing flora will come under the guise of 'low value or disease' to enable the developer to rip them out. Noise and dust during the construction phase will have a direct impact on the quality of life of my family and neighbours. Any proposed secondary access from Melbourne road will lead to a 'rat run' simply diverting through traffic through the new development. How planning can be consented without showing proposed plans seems wrong but as I have found with your website trying to locate this form the less information provided the better as it means less objection and public interest and is pretty underhanded.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
426	Haydon	Warren	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	<p>The land that is proposed for this development, is on a steep incline which leads down into the conservation village of Diseworth. Parts of Diseworth and the buildings, including Diseworth Heritage Centre, currently flood when there is a lot of rainfall. This will only increase if the Isley Woodhouse development proceeds. East Midlands Airport and LCC are now in continuous liaison with Diseworth residents, when the Airport Retaining Ponds are full and need to be released. This action is not taken lightly and does not stop gardens and buildings being flooded. Having dealt with water flow and drainage methods throughout my working career, I can assure you that no matter how many retaining ponds that are built into this proposed development, they eventually have to be released. The only place that gravity will take the thousands of tons of water and debris, will be Diseworth. Be assured that I do not have any problem with new developments, but when it impacts and possibly destroys a Heritage Site, then you will find that the public support against this will grow and grow.</p> <p>The proposed developments will take away the Diseworth Natural Heritage, wildlife habitation, cause light pollution and flooding. Isley Woodhouse is upstream from Diseworth, which already floods in heavy rainfall and will cause tremendous Tsunami's of water to obliterate the village and surrounding wildlife habitation. We as a village, are in constant contact with the Water Management Team of East Midlands Airport during prolonged rainfall, to ensure that they do not release water from their Retaining Ponds during periods where flooding would occur. No matter how many Retaining Ponds are incorporated in the Isley Woodhouse development, water always runs down hill and will flood Grade 2 listed buildings, Heritage and Conservation properties.</p>
427	Chris	Duggan	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	<p>Object. I am blessed to live here because of the green spaes surrouding Diseworth. This helps my mentail health by allowing me fresh air, no nise or light pollution, and the ability to have beautiful views of the amazing English countryside. Development must stay in built up towns and cities. NOT in countryside where wildlife and plant life are. Countryside must remain green. We as Disewoth residntes already suffer from flooding. Addintg tons of concrete to all surrouding area of our village wont just make it worse. It will destroy our village beyond repair. Building anything around or near to Diseworth will never work and cannot be undone.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
427	Chris	Duggan	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	<p>S4: 1. (d) Flood protection I live on Langley Close. Meters from the proposed expansion of Segro Warehouses south of the A453. Currently this is miles of fields. When it rains. It all drains down the fields in Langley Close and further down Clements gate and into Diseworth. My house is already very close to risk of flooding because of climate change.vlf these fields were converted to hundred of tons of concrete. My house would be completely flooded and destroyed. As well as a large majority of Diseworth.</p> <p>(o) Development at East Midlands Airport in accordance with Policy Ec8 There are already a lot of warehouses and buildings currently unoccupied by East Midlands Airport. Why do they need more when they can't even fill the current emptied buildings? I have lived in Diseworth for 37 years. I love the countryside. I love the views, the quiet, the peace. There are many species of animals living right near by. All of which will be destroyed if industrial development happens. We don't need a new town or warehouses surrounding Diseworth. It will not only destroy the land. But kill the wild life. These need to be protected. Not built upon.</p>
427	Chris	Duggan	n/a	H4 Housing Types and Mix	<p>All of this policy doesn't make sense to me. We have worked the land for many years in its current state. With people living and working nearby. If additional workers wish to move here, there are a lot of houses currently for sale and rent. "Affordable housing" will not fix this. But the houses are simply not "Affordable" in the 21st century. We have plenty of available houses that simply need to be made affordable. Not build more of them.</p>
427	Chris	Duggan	n/a	Ec8	<p>7.54 You only have to look at what has happened at other Freeport sites to know this has completed destroyed the surrounding areas. Homes have been destroyed. It is ruining the mental health of people. 7.56 The noise is already loud. 37 years I've lived in Diseworth and every year it gets worse. We constantly complain to the airport and they do not fix the problem. If they were to build further it will only make the problem worse and unsustainable for people and animals. This must stop.</p>
428	Lorraine	Rajput	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd lbstock	<p>I'm just concerned about amount of houses, we need more houses suitable for the elderly so we can downsize and still Stay in the village . More schools , doctors etc a proper facilities to accommodate all the new housing etc</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
429	Tim	Wagstaff	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	<p>You only need to look at the plan of the proposed town at 4.109 to appreciate that its colossal size is at odds not only with all the other proposed sites in the document but also also at odds with what any reasonable person would consider a suitable use of land, especially rural land. Most people would dispute the number of new homes required in the area - 4,500? Really? Surely not - it doesn't need to be this big or destructive. A smaller new town alongside those developments at Ashby and Castle Donington (as are currently being built) as well as sensitive additions to sustainable villages should provide the required number of houses without desecrating such a huge amount of countryside.</p> <p>During the consultation in 2022, I and many others commented on the absurd size of the proposed Isley Woodhouse new town. Whilst few would doubt the need for new houses of good quality in the are, most would appreciate that this proposal is way out in terms of scale. Far too much countryside lost forever, far too many heritage buildings compromised and wildlife overlooked all together. A much smaller scheme, say 1,500 houses only taking a third of the land and keeping development as far away from listed buildings would go some way to mitigate the impact. The area is predominantly rural - so don't allow SO much of it to be lost. It's what makes this are so wonderful to live in. The District punches above it weight from a commercial / economic perspective, has lovely old attractive villages, and excellent communications BUT also has lots of lovely unspoilt countryside. Don't sacrifice one feature for betterment of another. The sum of the parts will be diminished.</p> <p>[Policy EN1] I agree with comments 10.23 - 10.26. Its is an attractive environment to live. How can the new Isley Woodhouse new town ever manage to be beneficial to the area in its current size? Also, how can the developers / promoters of this site ever claim that they can enhance the Biodiversity of the area by concreting over nearly 1,000 acres of countryside. They will have to make massive use of off-site BNG credits which just p[asses the buck - it doesn't enhance this area's biodiversity better at all. Make the settlement smaller so that we can have both - more houses, more economic activity but without desecrating the traditional land use that we all so value.</p> <p>[Policy EN7] I appreciate the value of all heritage buildings in their local historic settings - I am very concerned about the effect that the new Isley Woodhouse new town would have on the settings (views to and from / setting) of all the local heritage buildings.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
429	Tim	Wagstaff	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	If I lived in the village of Diseworth I would be distraught at this proposal. Massive sheds 30m high operating near to residents homes for 24 hours a day! Where was the consultation? Another huge rural land take. Again its far too big - like the site at Isley Woodhouse, the only people who want either site to be so big are the ones standing to make the most money - the land owners and land promoters. Think about the residents!
430	Ian	Robertson	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	If you proceed with Isley Woodhouse Castle Donington the new development & diseworth will all become one entity
430	Ian	Robertson	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	The Freeport will spoil the environs of A Conservation Village & the local community.
431	Douglas	Nicholson	n/a	C74 Lily Bank Thringstone	A planning application has already been rejected on the proposed site the number of houses proposed is far too high for the site area you would be building an instant slum. The site is next to a brook and very low lying at times of heavy rain the site floods any one buying a house would be asking for trouble
432	David	David	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	The village of Diseworth is already notorious for flooding, and I can only see that this proposal will increase the frequency and severity even further. Diseworth itself is a conservation area and I don't see how this can possibly remain true if a brand new town is being developed from our little village. I totally object to this plan!
432	David	David	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	Absurd!!!

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
433	Carol	Metcalf	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	Environmental air quality , lbstock Brick already not good air quality , property is covered daily in brick dust . Needs checking if building work on such a scale is to be passed bringing further air quality issues . Concerns on the amount of increased traffic on the Leicester Road a site of this size will bring . Also the safety of pedestrians. A very fast road . Also noise increase for existing residents living on the Leicester Road. Pressures on services in lbstock . A potential of another 2,000 patients for the lbstock surgery . Already difficult getting appointments. Affects on the environment. Fields on Leicester Road have considerable wild life , badgers , foxes , ducks , owls . Air quality whilst building , lbstock brick dust already an issue for residents . This property covered daily in dust , entering air vents . Potential to de value my property . Will the council compensate local residents , My property fronts Fields that is included in This consultation. This house is not in country side but built up rear , side ,(Richmond Road) new builds on the fields will surround the house from and side if built . Objection raised for this reason .
434	Andrew	Tonkin	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	My concerns are that the proposed plans have either no detail or insufficient detail as regards to how the extra demand that 450 houses will place on existing resources will be met. Currently it is impossible to get access to a doctor within a reasonable time. Similarly dentists are over-subscribed. Such questions need to be answered (and provided for) before the houses are built and not after. It is not sufficient to 'promise 'section 106 money') when that money is never used for the specific facilities that it was allocated for. Specifically, plans only mention the 'Possibility of Community facilities'. The plans need to include specific proposals for achieving this promise, which is only a promise that is ultimately not fulfilled.
435	Kevin	Morrell	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	My only concern with this development is if it does not get built it is going to have a major impact on the housing numbers which consequently will impact the whole of the District with other sustainable settlements having to take up the slack. Is there not a real risk that we putting a significant amount of eggs in one basket and the inspector of the plan will draw the same conclusion and want a robust plan B

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
435	Kevin	Morrell	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd lbstock	<p>I would like to comment on the Land off Leicester road (lb18)</p> <p>Whilst I'm in favour of development in lbstock my concern is because this development is large and it is on the outskirts of the village are the residents going to feel part of the existing village, are they going to integrate and use the facilities that we currently have on offer, or will it be almost like a village on its own. I believe the way to combat this is to maximise the usage of the facilities that we currently have in lbstock and not to put further facilities into the new development which will only lead to competition for resources, I am thinking about a community facility and the School which are currently proposed in the new development. The link road between the A447 and Leicester road is absolutely vital so traffic going north, South and South East can do so without having to go into lbstock on the Leicester road and making a traffic issue that is already congested at certain times of the day even worse. Would it be possible to put extra traffic calming measures in place going in and out of lbstock on the Leicester road as this is currently an issue with residents with a significant number of accidents and speeding traffic. I have concerns that Richmond road which is very narrow and is used as a rat run to go to Hugglescote and Coalville will simply get worse and will impact on the amenity value of the residents of Donnington-la -Heath. Whilst I am all in favour of the new residents integrating into and using the current facilities on offer in lbstock we do have parking issues now, the limited amount of it being the main problem, are there any means that the new development could address this issue.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
436	Hayley	Badock	n/a	CD10 Park Lane Castle Donington	<p>With regards to CD10 Land to the North & South of Park Lane Castle Donington. Particularly 4.62 Impacts on Ecology at Dalbys Covert. I am deeply upset and concerned to see the proposed plans at Park Lane Castle Donington. My biggest concern is the ecological impact on wildlife and loss of habitat in this area. Particularly the planned housing so close to Dalbys Covert and Studbrook Hollow and the other neighboring woodlands. I have walked this area for many years and have seen first-hand the important habitat these woodlands and the surrounding fields provide. Any further encroachment, already started by the previous housing development on this road will cause hugely detrimental damage to the wildlife and ecosystem that is established here. There is a large badger sett in the woods here; an old brook, wildflowers, foxes, and swifts all call this habitat home. The proposed 'buffer' around this development is nowhere near large enough. An average badgers territory is 49-124 acres. They will be completely penned in and have no opportunity to hunt in the nearby fields. This important habitat needs to be protected and left alone as it has been for hundreds of years. Not turned into yet another 'controlled' area of nature surrounded by housing. I strongly urge you to seriously reconsider the parameters and boundary of development to leave more green belt and untouched space for wildlife and for current and future residents of Castle Donington. Another area of concern is that the wildlife and residents of our town have over the last 7 years seen unprecedented levels of development overall. A level or market town hasn't seen in its whole lifetime. In the 9 years we have lived here we will have lost all of the areas of countryside we used to enjoy walking our dog in; impacting mental and physical health of all residents. The natural areas and trees you have mentioned not touching in the proposal will inevitably become overcrowded and no longer the green space we currently enjoy due to the increased population that will come with the proposed new housing development. This will put even more strain on the wildlife that is left. I'm troubled by the prospect of losing this magical place, the thought that it will be gone forever is terribly sad. I understand the pressure on the council for housing and development but as I said previously we have seen so much in Castle Donington. This encroachment is just too much. I strongly urge you to look into your conscience and consult wildlife specialists on this part of your proposal. Please leave more areas for our wildlife and for us to enjoy for hundreds of years to come. What a legacy that would be. Once it's gone it's gone forever.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
437	Richard	Hampton	n/a	CD10 Park Lane Castle Donington	I oppose these plans due to the loss of green belt, ecological impact and loss of wildlife habitat. There is not enough space being left for wildlife in the plan. Also loss of green space for residents to enjoy which impacts the mental and physical health of our residents. Dalbys Covert and the surrounding woodlands and fields should be avoided completely in this plan due to the established badger setts and historical significance. I'm also concerned about the lack of Drs Surgery in the plans as our surgery is already stretched well beyond capacity. This is impacting the health of the towns residents. This will only get more stretched with thousands of new residents.
438	Caroline	Bishop	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	I am writing to voice my concerns of the proposed plans for Broom leys farm, Building more houses will increase the air pollution due to the volume of traffic in the local area, which we need to avoid, it will cause significant harm to the bio diversity in the local area. I'm not sure if you're aware of the current flooding issues that the farm has every time we get any wet weather in the area, which does affect residents gardens at present, this will only increase and cause more flooding damage. Also the idea of adding more traffic lights onto the a511 when we already have so many accidents at the traffic lights that are already there will only increase and cause more accidents. Schools and GP practices are already beyond capacity and surely you do not want to be responsible for adding more onto the workload of the already struggling GP's. I feel you need to look into this idea further and we should be protecting our green wedges instead of causing more harm to our areas.
439	Jamie	Bishop	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	Hello, I am strongly against this proposal mainly do to the following key points- 1 Additional traffic - already very busy broom Leys Road and A511. To add additional traffic lights to the A511 would be catastrophic. The current crossroads has claimed many lives and is an accident hotspot! 2 Air pollution - this would worsen with additional housing in this area, we need to think of all children and patients at the local schools and hospital. We have standing traffic now every day on broom Leys road. This needs to be cut down not increased! 3 Bio diversity- local wildlife habitat 4 Flooding in the fields is getting worse. I have pictures of this if required.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
440	Natalie	Pettitt	n/a	Ap15/Ap17 Old End Appleby Magna	<p>1. More houses which back onto a flood plane. Granted you aren't building houses on the flooded area of the field. But we have a MAJOR flooding issue in Appleby. For 11 years the front of our house on Duck Lake floods when we have slightly more rainfall than usual. Currently we have flooded 5 times in 9 weeks!. The problem- Victorian drains that are crumbling under blackhorse hill bridge. Severn trent have openly admitted it is a major job with half the village needing digging up and the hierarchy won't put their hands in their pockets. Why build more houses when the drainage systems can't cope? Having sewage come up and severn trent not cleaning it is not acceptable.</p> <p>2. [Personal information redacted]. The Dr's surgery. For anyone who works, you don't stand a chance getting in. Phoning over 100 times over 30 mins whilst at work is not acceptable.</p> <p>3. Sir John Moore school for the past 3 years the leavers haven't all gone to the same feeder/catchment school as it keeps changing. In 2020 most children left and went to Market Bosworth. [Personal information redacted] and the catchment school was Ibstock. In 2022 it was Ivenhoe and now there is another plan to make it Ashby. The friendship groups are being divided through councils/education messing with catchments. Get it sorted, and don't get me started on bus passes and through not putting your nearest you aren't entitled. That is crazy! If kids have to travel it doesn't matter if mom put the wrong first choice every child in Appleby should get the same.</p> <p>Just a few negative thoughts. Appleby is the forgotten village, and to our health, child's education and environment the more houses you put into the village the more damaging it will be for everyone. Families are already moving out becuade of the school/bus situation. We have considered it due to lack of emergency response in a life and death situation. PLEASE look at our infrastructure. Whilst warehouse lay dormant at Mercia Park can't this be an urgent care centre? The old rectory, no longer being used for HS2. Can't this be used for a smaller secondary school site. We need to look at what isn't being done or used to make Appleby what it was. Sadly the village is changing for the wrong reasons.</p>
441	Richard	Jones	n/a	Ap15/Ap17 Old End Appleby Magna	<p>The village of Appleby magna cannot take any large scale development until the road is widened to accommodate and the flooding remediated, currently we have fire engines unable to get into the village due to narrow roads and people evacuating houses every few weeks due to the flooding - which would only worsen with housing in greenfield land</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
442	Alan	Ashcroft	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd lbstock E7 Midland Rd Ellistown H3 Sparkenhoe Estate Heather	<p>There should absolutely be no further houses built in the lbstock/Hugglescote area until local facilities are extended to ensure there is fair access for all to schools, GP surgeries, dentists, and shopping facilities as primary examples. lbstock does not have enough services available for another 450 houses to adequately access GP and dental facilities and the local schools will become oversubscribed. Local residents already struggle to get GP appointments at the best of times, another 450 family homes will make this worse.</p> <p>Also the council always fail to insist on the wrong sort of housing and allow the developers to build what they like. None of these new estates contain anything like the correct number of starter homes, or homes for low earners to purchase, instead they focus on housing that costs 10x or more the average UK salary. If you're going to keep selling land off for developers to milk millions from; you could at least show some backbone and make them build what is actually required and make them build some facilities like GP/Dentists/shops and leisure facilities.</p> <p>I'm in agreement that more housing is needed, and I'm not blind to this, but we can't keep building more and more overly expensive houses and stretching local services to the limit.</p>
444	Lloyd	Upton	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	<p>I drive past this proposed site everyday for work to Birmingham. Since the neighbouring mercia park has opened my route takes considerably longer due to the amount of traffic that is now in and around junction 11. I object to this development as I feel the a444 is not big enough wide enough and judging by the surface strong enough to take more heavy traffic. The M42 is a two lane motorway that clearly cannot cope with the volume of traffic it already has. Junction 13 is getting 1200 homes built at money hill development junction 11 has Mercia and junction 10 the worse junction has residential and commercial built in recent years adding considerable time, pollution to an already busy motorway network and therefore should not add this site to further cause volume of vehicles and pollution at junction 11. Also is not this area supposedly the heart of the national forest? Has there not been an increase in injury/ fatal RTC at junction 11 and A42 in particular north bound? This development is going to add more volume to the area that is already struggling.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
445	Rachael	OBrien	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	Current build on Mercia site not even fully occupied. Poor infrastructure, impact on small communities. There is more than Measham involved with massive impact on villages of Derbyshire on A444. Great for Leicestershire as it will have little to no impact on their roads. Nowhere for the traffic to exit safely onto the a444. It would have to exit onto the A444 directly. Traffic already at a standstill towards roundabout, numerous times per day. Traffic lights hinderance already with traffic backed up. Having seen traffic leaving the Mercia site, there would be numerous cars plus Lorries leaving at regular times of day for shift changes. Accident site further down A444 with traffic coming off on the bend into hedgerows. 24 hour operations impact residents along A444 all night long. Vibrations, noise, pollution on a road made for less traffic than already has. Needs full bypass through to derby to allow traffic flow and keep rural locations. Loss of wildlife. Area rich in wild fowl, it's an area of the national forest, not national distribution. . Flooding area to the opposite side, need fields for run off. Other side floods regularly along hedgerow. Noise pollution, fumes pollution, to an already high density area.
446	Michelle	Richardson	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	The use of this land, will significant increase traffic on the A444 through Overseal, as residents we have already seen an increase in traffic through the village, the noise, pot holes and flooding is getting worse. I moved to Overseal to live in a semi-rural area and to live in the National Forest, this area is now turning I to an extreme busy area where the A444 cuts right through the village, it is becoming exactly dangerous to walk along this road with the thunderous traffic go through and the traffic on an evening and early hours of the morning has also increased with developments at Mercia Park and the other side of Overseal in Swadlincote. Further distribution centres will significantly impact Overseal, structurally, environmentally, and adversely affect physical and mental health

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
447	Michael	Godbehere	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	Are you insane! The a444 is full way beyond the level of traffic it can handle, it is a small rural road which local councils have decided is going to be a main trunk road regardless of if it is suitable or not. It is not a dual carriageway but single lane road at 30 mph for most of its length. Mercia park has vastly increased the amount of HGV traffic on this road despite residents being told it would not have any affect on it. Mercia park only has two occupiers as it is, it doesn't need any further building. It was built in completely the wrong place and totally unnecessary.there are already huge warehouse building sites at j10 and j12 why on earth build on green field site in the middle when you could just keep it at these sites. Every motorway junction isn't an invitation to build more warehouses some should be left as farmland. This site is not only in the sac for the River mease but also in the area described as the heart of the national Forrest. No building of any sort should have been allowed here, definitely no more can be permitted and the existing empty units should be torn down and removed if they remain empty for at least one year and restored to farm land to help feed this country.
448	Bethany	Fitzpatrick	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	Effects of pollution, environmental, mental health of residents, infrastructure, wildlife. Residents on the A444 Overseal are already feeling the effects of similar builds with increased traffic/noise pollution general repair and state of the roads, SAFETY of the roads
449	Julie	Matthews	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	The A444 cannot take any more lorries. Overseal is a small village. There are lorries thundering through the village all day and night from the current developments (a significant increase since Magna Park construction)
450	Stuart	Swann	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	My firm preference is for no further development in this area but if any more warehousing facilities, etc. are to be planned and built in the vicinity of Junction 11 of the M42/A42, all HGV traffic from these facilities must be forbidden from ever using the A444 towards toward Burton upon Trent. The significant negative impact on the residential amenity along with the health and wellbeing of people living along this route in communities such as Overseal, Castle Gresley, and Stanton should be the prime consideration in this matter.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
451	Joanne	Cunningham	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	<p>As a resident of Overseal I know that that the A444 cannot cope with a further increase in traffic, both cars and HGVs. We are already suffering as residents with the impacts of noise and air pollution which is 24 hours. The health and mental impact on residents who live along the A444 are already severely impacted as it is. The road itself is under severe strain because of the high volume of traffic now using it. Merica Park has had a far greater impact than the ridiculous highway figures which were originally quoted. As we are South Derbyshire we receive no financial help in order to maintain it, and put in relevant speeding devices to control it. We are the heart of the National Forest, yet what we have become is a commuter village with a link road to the M42. It is beyond a joke that another huge blot on the green landscape is being considered. Mercia Park still has empty available warehouse/industrial space so where is the need to provide more. The build are monstrous man made structures, which bear no consideration to the surrounding countryside. The ecological impact on wildlife, flora and fauna will be damaged beyond repair. Also, we already suffer from major flooding in all areas, due to natural drainage being replaced with 1000s of tons of concrete. NWLDS do not ever consider the impact of their decisions to surrounding Counties, or do they make the consultation meetings available within the surrounding areas that will be affected cross County. Yet there is a need for such developments to exist with access through them. To assume or say traffic will use the M42 is a joke, and deluded judgement. The only people who will benefit from this is NWLDS themselves, with an increase in business rates revenue, and any other forthcoming financial increments from the developers as part of their proposal.</p>
452	Robert	Smith	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	<p>Policy EC3 - Mercia park J11, M42. This area has already increased the amount of heavy good vehicles passing through villages into Swadlincotes industrial spaces. The A444 was not built for these volumes of traffic, yet alone more. Policy S4 - this development does not 'conserve and enhance' this type of building and infrastructure is not what the local area needs. The only benefit to the position is next to the A42/M42. The surrounding areas are not fit for the levels of heavy traffic that this types of buildings draw. Further putting pressure on local services, noise pollution in villages, air pollution, destruction of wildlife habitats. At what point do we realise that we need local areas of countryside untouched, to provide buffer zones from built up areas and roadways to ensure we protect our local wildlife.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
453	Ian	Moreton	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	The proposed development area to the Land North of J11 A/M42 is wholly unsuitable. The infrastructure along the A444 in South Derbyshire cannot cope with the additional traffic brought about by the expansion of Swadlincote and the operation of the new site at Mercia Park. The road through the village of Overseal is over capacity with Lorries operating throughout the night since the opening of Mercia park. The road surface is crumbling and clearly cannot cope with the levels of increased traffic being brought about. There is no word in the proposals around the improvement to infrastructure to support the additional development and it is naïve at best to assume that all traffic will use the M42 to access the site. The A444 is unsafe for cyclists as it is and the increase in traffic to this development will not help that and to suggest that cycling will be used as a method of transportation to reach the site is ill advised.
454	Carl	Sutton	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	The EMP82 Mercia J11/M42 proposal would have an even larger impact to the surrounding area than already felt for village residents. The A444 is the only access and surrounding villages (Measham, Donisthorpe, Moira) are being used as rat runs which have suffered due to increased traffic especially heavy goods vehicles, air pollution and disturbance to the residents which would only increase if the development is passed. Traffic regularly backs up on the A444 now which is not fit for purpose to take that amount and any increasing amount of traffic which has a detrimental impact on residents lives. This area is supposed to be the heart of the national forest attracting tourists not additional commuter's and heavy goods vehicles. I oppose any further development.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
455	James	Cunningham	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	<p>The village of Overseal and the A444 is already full to capacity with the volume of traffic it now takes. The impact on residents with noise, air quality and pollution. As we are across county we do receive any financial assistance in order to maintain the road or make improvements and adjustments with speeding which is an issue. We are the heart of the National Forest and that is fast becoming a joke we have become a commuter village and link road to the M42. Handfast traffic surveys need to be undertaken at a normal time of day for accuracy. Not on a Sunday morning!. We are already seeing impact from Mercia Park, and other industries which operate 24 hours and the impact on volume has increased greatly making residents adjacent to the A444 life unbearable. Also, the ecological impact to wildlife, flora and fauna will be unreversible. This together with a further increase to potential flooding due to what is now natural drainage with fields, being replaced with 100s tons of concrete. It is inevitable that a good proportion of the traffic from this site will utilise the A444 via Overseal which is totally unacceptable. Consultation should be openly shared with bordering Counties to make it more accessible to the ACTUAL villages and residents it will directly affect. It will have no positive outcomes for Overseal, tye only ones who will benefit are NWLDS with the financial gain from business rates and any financial input from the developer for the proposal and development of this site. Enough is enough.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
456	Gavin & Dawn	Bennett	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	<p>Already subject to a refusal of permission from the Secretary of State on use of the Green wedge between whitwick and broomleys farm in Coalville, this is a backhanded method to allocate land to developers. The previous plan was support an area of separation between Coalville and whitwick. If this is approved, it paves the way to chip away at this land, in ever increasing lots.</p> <p>Not only will this lead to increased traffic flow onto an already busy road, where accidents are a common occurrence (last w/c 19th Feb), but the local infrastructure cannot cope with potentially an additional 1000 people. The planned work to widen the carriageway on a511 will already be disruptive enough leading to hellish pollution levels in what was a lovely quiet area. Increased building in the area (Hugglescote) has led to increased dust and noise, impacting on my families and others health. Doctors surgeries are unable to cope, schools are oversubscribed, roads are too busy at peak times. What other infrastructure is planned, none if the plans of the past are anything to go by. This will also remove a recreational area for locals, in an area where there is nothing for children and young people. It will cause noise pollution and disruption during construction at Coalville hospital where patients are sent to recover from major surgeries after discharge from acute services. Not to mention the loss of the local diverse habitat, and an increase in flooding. This is a very bad idea from local planners.</p>
457	Toni	Rheeston	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	<p>This development is going to cause massive problems with lorries along a444 which is already a problem with the Mercia park site and the site in Swadlincote cullina. The road is so busy now with lorries all day and night . The road is in bad repair due to the amount of traffic. The potential for more flooding , noise and air pollution from all the HGVs . Overseal village has become a nightmare with lorries all the residents that live on the road have noise issues with traffic . Property is hard to sell for residents. This site will have a ,major impact on the village of overseal . If the site could actually say the a444 towards Burton wouldn't be affected then ok . Building another eye sore on land which is home to lots of wildlife. This site will impact on every level to the small community of overseal . I totally disagree with this and the ,massive implications of more lorries which is already a major problem</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
458	Angela	Eames	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	Firstly pollution from excessive traffic travelling though the village of Overseal. The impact on air quality which will directly effect the health of residents of Overseal due to such an increase in traffic. The A444 is already full to capacity with traffic travelling through over 24 hours. The infrastructure cannot cope with any more increased traffic travelling through our village up to join the A42 and M42. The proposed sustainable transport is not realistic, whilst the public transport is achievable (as in Mercia Park) , the idea of cycle ways and walking paths logistically is ridiculous and totally unsafe. The impact on the wildlife and including the protected tree area on your plan, will undoubtedly cause irreversible damage due to pollution and habitat. I live in The National Forest at the moment but I am worried that if the proposed development does go ahead we will be nothing more than a gateway to industrialisation.
459	Richard	Billam	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	The extra housing in this area will cause several issues including, increased traffic flow in an already busy area, further road disruption around schools (Broomleys) when these are already significant. No plan to deal with with excess water that will no longer be able to drain. Adding extra homes while the supporting infrastructure is degrading, notably quality of road surfaces and drainage from roads. A recent example is the regular floods caused outside the Leisure Centre (allowing the ditch in the hedge bottom to fill is not dealing with the issue). Meeting demand of houses in Leicester by siting them in Coalville is tenuous at best and is certainly not being supported by the increase in local 'amenities'.
460	William	Crane	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	I object to the planning of housing development on this land. They run a doggy daycare there that many people use (the "parents" Facebook group has over 500 members) and the farm has events on throughout the year which the community love. Removing these would be a detriment to the community. Furthermore, with the addition of 266 houses, there would be a huge increase in traffic in an already traffic-heavy area. Not to mention the Broom Leys/A511 intersection already seeing far too many accidents, increasing the traffic will only worsen this.
461	Ellie	Pacey	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	I strongly object to the proposed building plans on this site. It's an area of separation with fantastic local businesses.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
462	Charles	Starbuck	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	This forms part of the green wedge between Coalville and Whitwick and there is flooding regularly a on the proposed land
463	Joshua	Tallett	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	I don't want this estate to be built as we live directly opposite the farm and not only would this cause major disruption outside of our home it would even most likely affect the value of our house. But worse still it will cause extra pollution in the area excessive traffic and cause destruction to a natural habitat this can not go ahead
464	Rachel	Harrison	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	I think this is atrocious. There are businesses on the land that are thriving and are vital to many residents. There's the yearly pumpkin patch that is great for families and has been growing each year since we moved to the area. There is also the very busy Dogtastic daycare which many people rely on for pet care whilst at work. The roads surrounding it are also already too busy and the junction just up from the proposed site is a site of many accidents, some fatal, and adding even more traffic to an already congested area seems silly and asking for more accidents to happen on an already dangerous junction.
466	Deborah	Chambers	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	Unsuitable area to build as it is already very busy with traffic. This area is already nice to walk around. It doesn't need walkways as there is already a good walking route. It is prone to flooding in some small areas. Tree planting would be good there without the need to build houses. This will have a devastating effect on the local residents who already see a lot of traffic. It is chaotic at school times. There are already 8 schools within an approximately 3 mile radius. People take their children to out of catchment area schools so have to drive there. The air quality is already bad without another 400 or so cars assuming that the 266 houses will all have cars. Devastating effect on nature, biodiversity, peoples health. I work in pharmacy and know how many people suffer from asthma and other related conditions
467	Joshua	Eason	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	The introduction of traffic lights and the recent warehouse distribution centre already built in the area has made the noise, traffic and air pollution bad for residents in the area. Traffic on the A444 to J11 has increased considerably and there is daily congestion all along the stretch of road to the traffic lights. Allowing the go ahead will not only increase traffic in this area, it will increase the load on the A444 coming through villages as there is no bypass from Swadlincote to J11 nd they will come through Overseal.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
468	Kevin	Chambers	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	I strongly object to the plans to build 266 new houses on the site of Broom Leys Farm. The Broom Leys Road/A511 traffic lights are far too busy as it is. The air pollution on Broom Leys is awful. Leave Broom Leys Farm site as it is with all its greenery and wildlife.
469	Kyle	Warner	n/a	IF1 Development and Infrastructure	If you're going to keep allowing housing developments you need to make developers build amenities to accommodate them. Doctors surgeries, schools and other childcare settings, substantial green zones for children to play, conservation, infrastructure for vehicles and goods lorries as we live in a national forest zone and already have a high density of through traffic from local businesses. Build on external areas such as Hugglescote massive development which has been allowed without any substantial infrastructure being built to accommodate it.
469	Kyle	Warner	n/a	En6 Land and Air Quality	In order to meet carbon emissions targets increasing congestion is not going to work, you are going to create a greater area of poor air quality by removing the plants currently filtering the air.
470	Lynda	Stock	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	Local residents fought long and hard to preserve this green wedge. This is farmland and should not be built on. Our infrastructure is hardly capable of supporting the current demands let alone any further increases.
471	Andrew	Millard	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville Ib18 Leicester Rd Ibstock E7 Midland Rd Ellistown R12 Heather Lane Ravenstone	There is insufficient infrastructure in place between Coalville and Whitwick to accommodate the already expansive population. Limited Doctors, Dentists, Secondary Schools, Police, Fire Service, Waste Collections. The Council Tax keeps rising but these resources are all underfunded or do not exist to cover the increasing amount of housing built within the Coalville area within the last ten years. Before plans are even considered this infrastructure needs to be built or plans on how the costs will be covered drawn out. Extra homes does not equal more revenue for the council it equals a poorer way of life for existing residents.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
472	Stephen	Earnshaw	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	In the last few years, over 1000 new homes have been built in the Coalville area, causing problems with traffic, infrastructure and flooding. The air quality in the area is awful - one of the worst areas outside of a city in the country. Despite all of these new homes and people how many new dentists, doctors surgeries or schools have been provided - ZERO. We are seeing our green spaces flattened and concreted over, causing flooding issues where there have never been any before. Traffic is more and more congested. Air quality continues to decline. The traffic lights near to the proposed development at the junction with Stephenson Way has seen 5 serious crashes in the last 2 years alone with one fatality. We are sick of these decisions being made by people who have no connection with, or knowledge of the local area. I would like to wager that these plans would not be passed if they were within the locality of any of the planning committee members homes. These plans are outrageous and will detract from the quality of life of all current and new residents. There is simply no feasible space for new homes without compounding the existing issues.
473	Katherine	Strangeway	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	There is no shortage of housing in Coalville. In fact the only thing we are now starting to lack is green belt land as it all gets swallowed up by buildings. We have stayed around here as we like that we had so much green land. If more disappears then we will move out of the area and I am confident that many others feel the same. There are literally hundreds of available properties locally, why leave those empty in favour of this building? Why disrupt wildlife? Why make the traffic even worse? Broomleys Road is becoming as bad as Bardon Road and our house is sandwiched between the two. Who do we expect to live in these houses? We already have empty houses in the area, in abundance! If people wanted to live here they already would take one of the many houses!
474	Jake	Lyon	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	Development is always good but doing it somewhere like broom leys farm is not the answer. Keep the farm build somewhere else

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
475	David	Manley	n/a	S1 Future Housing and Economic Development Needs	The methodology employed by the Authority to arrive at the annual number of dwellings is flawed as regards the locations identified. Viz. the loading of those extra dwellings (to accommodate the 'overflow' from Leicester) predominantly in the far north west of the district at the furthest remove from the city. In addition this area starved of sensible public transport solutions and hemmed in by further business development with attendant issues of pollutions of all kinds and an already vastly over-subscribed infrastructure is already experiencing profound degradation. There are better options that would alleviate the pressures around J23.
475	David	Manley	n/a	H8 Houses in Multiple Occupation in Kegworth	I welcome a policy on this issue that addresses the potential imbalance between provision for student (and others) accommodation and the overbalancing of such provision to upset both housing provision for families and amenity for permanent residents. A 10% rule within a 100 metre radius is much to be desired - though at present this would see several properties on the road I live (Derby Road) decanted! The car parking issue is determined by many other factors additional to HMO's but again the proposal is welcomed as is the 'sandwiching' restriction though I would stress that, by and large, Nottingham Uni students are good citizens (I say this as a retired Derby academic not Nottingham!). The policy is good, the practice needs to follow.
475	David	Manley	n/a	En5 Area of Separation	This policy re. Coalville & Whitwick is to be welcomed (although I doubt it is strong enough for residents of those areas) but where is a similar policy directive for the Northern Parishes? The statements in relation to both Housing development (already allocated & proposed) and Industrial/Commercial expansion will effectively create an enormous urban conurbation around J23 of 3/5 miles with a large busy Airport at its centre. This relates back to my initial comment re.S1

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
476	Anastasia	Davies	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	This Area of coalville is already heavy on traffic, would exacerbate access issues and risk to children at nearby schools. It depletes ever decreasing greenspace which is good for wellbeing and health for all. We have already seen the impact that pollution has on the health of all citizens (see news articles and reasons for CAZ etc) and this would only serve to decrease the quality of life for citizens living in the area. This area was originally protected and having moved here on the basis of the preservation of green space I am very concerned. looking at increased risk of standing water and flooding with yet more green space paved over. I am also disappointed that the consultation has not be advertised or actively notified to local residents who would be directly impacted.
477	Katie	Smith	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	The objection of any further development that will continue to compromise the A444 traffic. The residents of Overseal who are living on the main road cannot take any more Lorrie's coming through. This is causing severe damage to our quality of life with noise and pollution, the road structure is suffering, we can't sleep the traffic is relentless !!!!! If this doesn't improve we are moving.
478	Rhys	Beaver	n/a	C74 Lily Bank Thringstone	I have now lived on Millhouse Estate for over a year and have serious concerns about accessing the site from Lily Bank, general topography, woodland & hedges, flooding concerns and traffic. Continuation of the site from the recent development would be the best if this site were to become live, otherwise, much more suitable locations would be much more appropriate, the development would suffer with concerns from the noise of the A512.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
479	Linda	Kemp	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	Area is promoted as Heart of the National Forest but the A444 from M42 suffers major amount of traffic already from Mercia Park and major Distribution Centre in Swadlincote. This has increased commuting traffic and heavy lorry traffic on an already busy road. Overseal is a small village with the A44 running through it, many houses are very close to the road and pavements are narrow. The weight of traffic is destroying the road surface, the noise and environment pollution has increased dramatically and neither site is working at full capacity yet so matters can only get worse and that is without a further development being added. Traffic has always been heavy but we now have 24 hour disruption. How can an area be promoted as a tourist destination with this amount of traffic and pollution. Buses and cycling consideration is not a major concern - more heavy distribution traffic and cars on an already busy road is. Without new infrastructure taking traffic out of the village you would be making unbearable conditions even worse and road conditions extremely dangerous. The village is already battling SDDC poor planning decisions regarding this situation without now adding NWL into the mix. There should be no new building without due concern to the infrastructure to support it.
480	Alison	Cooper	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	This is going to destroy farm land and the green triangle
481	Eriks	Katkovs	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	I'm are a resident in Overseal. Living on main Street and traffic impacts our quality of life. Lorries driving on A444 day and night relentlessly, polluting air and damaging roads. This road infrastructure wasn't built for HGV traffic. This affect my life and I would seriously consider to move out of this village
482	Bruce	Scott	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse EMP90 Land south of East Midlands Airport (Freeport)	Please don't ruin the countryside around Diseworth, don't congest the roads, don't create more flooding, ruin our walks and runs.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
483	William Martin	Howe	n/a	Other housing sites	Development of land at Hilltop ref CD7 in SHEELA
484	Megan	Hamilton	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	<p>Having read the proposal for 266 housing to be built on this land as a local resident, regular commuter and user of local services I can only object to this proposal. My initial concerns would be the fact the C46 document states under the Land and Water Contamination topic there are 'No Known Issues' - The site is unlikely to be affected by land contamination or landfill. The site is unlikely to cause groundwater pollution. It is public knowledge that this site has excessive landfill from the underground working when the pits were in operation. How can there be no valid concerns or acknowledgement of this in this section? How safe is it for people to live on this landfill, how safe is it for groundworks to take place disturbing what has been sitting under the ground undisturbed for many years? There was a stream that ran into a pond before this was backfilled with the waste from the pit, how can the council agree to this housing development where people are going to live and children are going to play without completing a full investigation and analysis of the ground contamination? The flooding on this site is vast and happens on a regular basis causing a vast portion of the site to be under water, how is this going to affect the properties that already lie behind the farm boundary where this excess water sits? Where is the water going to be driven once houses are on the land? What infrastructure is going to be implemented to ensure the existing and new properties are not affected, we know global warming is bringing change and our seasons are becoming wetter and the localised heavy rainfall on impermeable and already saturated surfaces will generate more surface water that the current system clearly does not have the capacity to cope with. What sewage system and drainage network is going to be built that will prevent this land overflowing and flooding as it does now? Highway Traffic – anyone that uses Broomley's Road and where it joins the A511 at the traffic lights knows this is already an area of congestion and at school times complete and utter chaos. The proposal of increased traffic to this area seems very ill-considered, regardless of any traffic system that may be put in place it does not take away that Broomley's Road will take the bulk of the extra traffic as the main road to the town centre, schools, doctors and hospital. As residents of this road the number of near misses we see everyday with cars, cyclist, pedestrians, and other road users it is frightening to think this will increase with not just the Broomley's site but the other surrounding site applications too. The current safety measures are not enough at school times, parents at the school will park EVERYWHERE causing visibility and parking hazards, to add more cars to this equation is dangerous and reckless. The additional pollution that will come with this surely has to be a concern. There is a school that accommodates 600+ hundred children aged 4-11 in an area where vehicles will increase the air pollution considerably, it is turning what is a small town into a concentrated area of pollution that can be expected in larger towns and small cities. We understand additional houses are needed however there are better sites than Broomleys Farm, we know the green spaces in our countryside are becoming less and less but this particular area is one of character and seen as a landmark in the area. Building here closes the divide between so many aspects and will take away one of the few things that make Coalville feel like the town that offers everything and not just houses! The loss of habitat and growing space to an area that has been prominent for both of these since the farm was first built seems thoughtless.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
485	Kerry	Chambers	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	The plan mentions a primary school, can you explain how you feel the need for this when there are vacancies at surrounding primary schools as well as lower birth rates. The impact of this could be detrimental to current great schools that could be utilised.
486	David	Lunn	n/a	R12 Heather Lane Ravenstone	Increased traffic, school place availability, leisure and sporting facilities within the village, public house unable to offer facilities, little employment available, only one small shop, few early years places, probably too few affordable houses, little allotment allocated to developments, from past experience section 106 money never awarded directly to the village, danger of village developments linking Coalville and Hugglescote, LCC Highways providing little action on gully cleaning / road sweeping / pavement maintenance / road maintenance / regular grass cutting, speeding prevention, poor interest in the village by some District and County Councillors.
487	Mary	Lorimer	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	lb18 would destroy one of the few remaining bits of countryside in the area. It is adjacent to Sence Valley Park and contains an important byway linking the park to Blackberry Lane and part of the National Forest Way. It is also close to the Kelham Bridge nature reserve and some important ponds which have a colony of herons and other wildlife. Any development would need to be buffered by at least 400m of trees from these significant areas as they need to be undisturbed. The National Forest Way would also need a buffer of trees either side or a significant width, not just a token effort.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
488	Charlotte	Dolan	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	Building on the land would have a detrimental effect on the existing houses. Broom leys road is already heavily congested when approaching the traffic lights at Stephenson's way during peak times, often stretching back to broom leys school. 266 houses would mean an extra 400 cars - at least, which the roads would not be able to cope with. The additional houses build over the last few years have already made Bardon road congested, and building on broom leys farm would exacerbate the problem. There is a secure dog field at the back of the houses, nearest to Stephenson's way, which is often floods in autumn/winter. If houses are going to be built here, this water wouldn't be able to drain and would instead run off. The proposed field is on an incline to the road/houses, leading to potential flooding to the existing properties. I feel I need to also point out that the proposal has pointed out that an application was submitted and withdrawn in 2014 (14/00808/OUTM) However, it fails to acknowledge an application for the site was submitted and rejected in 2009 (09/01042/OUTM)
489	Andy	Butler	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	Whitwick is a village that suffers with flooding currently and all of these houses will cause more issues as our environment changes. The proposed fields already suffer from flooding. I live on Gracedieu Road and every time there is heavy or persistent rain we are issued with flood warnings from Grace Dieu brook but worse than this is the flooding caused by Severn Trent systems not being able to cope and popping the man holes on our road and flooding it with sewerage. Severn Trent have admitted that it's an old system that can't cope and then you want to add another almost 1000 homes onto it, this is absolutely ridiculous and will cause catastrophic damage to residents in the affected areas. There would need a massive investment in the infrastructure to even consider allowing these fields to be built on as all that water would come our way. I have lots of photos of the current flooding that occurs when it rains heavy.
490	T	Taylor	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	Whitwick development, the proposed fields are full of wildlife, Badgers, Foxes, Birds of prey, Bats, Voles. It is the only green area left that you can walk through in the village and the current road structures are already stressed out it's madness to allow more traffic through the village

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
491	Janet	Shaw	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	West of Whitwick and C48 together these developments would add a very broad swathe of new housing (the Whitwick broad allocation is on steep / wet land) ... there are already congestion issues on the roads around the Whitwick broad allocation and frequent bumps / near misses at two junctions near there.
492	Adele	Woods	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	There is already not enough infrastructure in Whitwick to properly accommodate residents. There is no information as to the proposed s106 provisions that would be made in particular access to housing and education as the schools are already at capacity and getting appointments with a GP is difficult.
493	Jennifer	Robertson	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	Don't build houses on existing green fields!! We moved to Whitwick in June 2021 from Earl shilton because the council were planning build houses on the open fields where we walked our dogs. We came to Whitwick and fell in love with the open spaces and ability to walk into nature in a few steps. Plans to use these existing green fields to build on is worrying and frustrating. We came to Whitwick to have a good quality of life where I could walk our dogs without getting into a car. Planning to build houses when there is already too many cars on the road, too few school Places and difficulty getting a GP appointment is also foolish. The council need to seriously reconsider the plans to build on existing fields before there is no space for us enjoy.
494	Stuart	Boam	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	The amount of housing being proposed is beyond what local facilities can cope with. Road infrastructure is barely coping and there is a deficit of school places and essential services like access to GPs

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
495	Phil	Lewin	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	The planning document says that land was identified in 2022 for an additional primary school in Ibstock. I feel this is unnecessary since currently neither St Denys infant school, nor the junior school are full and neither are projected to be at capacity in the next 6 years. Consequently, an additional mainstream school would not benefit the community. In addition, a further mainstream school is currently under construction in ellistown and would also provide additional local capacity. The area where parents do need additional capacity is in specialist school provision. There is an increasing demand locally for facilities for MLD and SEMH pupils. Currently, whilst there are a small number of places at St Denys special unit and at Dovebank, many local pupils are having to travel a considerable distance to receive an education if they have significant additional needs.
496	Eeden	Varney	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	The primary school in Ibstock is not even full! So it doesn't make sense at all and the traffic is bad enough as it is, why anyone would want to make it worse I really don't know.
497	Rosemary	Logue	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	There is already a large development, Mercia Park, at the junction which is not yet fully utilised. In the light of the huge areas of warehousing and distribution centres in this part of the East Midlands, is this new site really necessary? The A444 is a busy road and, were the two sites to be fully occupied, the impact on traffic in the area for residents, commuters and commercial vehicles would be overwhelming.
498	Adam	Chambers	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	I am concerned about the proposal to add another 450 houses to the Village of Ibstock. I don't believe that the current highways could cope with the additional traffic this would bring to the village and the safety of pedestrians using the A447 through the village that is already a very busy road. I don't believe there is a need for an additional school to be built knowing now that the primary and Junior schools are currently under subscribed with students it is an unnecessary project. With regards to village facilities like the doctors surgery it is already difficult to get an appointment and to add another 450 households to this village would be a total disaster on its services.
499	Ruth	Hubball	n/a	Chapter 4 Housing Allocations	[Redacted] There is no infrastructure or room to put such in. Fields regularly flood. This is a ridiculous proposition. Not enough roads, schools, playgrounds etc to support this.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
500	Danielle	Partner	n/a	Ib18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	<p>I want to oppose the planning of this housing allocation in Ibstock with the addition of a new primary school. Within the village, we currently have 2 schools that cater for children aged 4-11years old. This is made up of an infant school and a junior school. In most recent years, neither school has been full and have places that are still available. This current academic year is no exception. Both schools can hold 90child per year group, which equates to 270 children for the infants and 360 for the juniors. Low birth rates have meant that both schools have not been at capacity for a few years and adding a new primary school will only exacerbate the situation. Job losses will be guaranteed should this development go ahead. Both schools in the village were graded Good by Ofsted in their last inspections and continue to be good schools. There is no need for another school, catering for primary aged children, in the area. The building of 450 new homes in Ibstock would greatly impact our already busy roads. The main road through Ibstock can be blocked frequently by lorries and other vehicles due to the road no being suitable for such heavy traffic at all hours of the day and night. Crossing roads is already a dangerous game, especially with children, it will be made worse by the additional housing that is being proposed.</p>
501	Nicola	Marlow	n/a	Ib18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	<p>I do think that an extra school would be welcome into the area. It states currently that there are spaces left at ibstock Junior school but for how long? If the houses are going to go ahead then the few spaces that are available now will not be sufficient for the proposed amount of houses that will be built and the amount of children that would need school places. Another school would be good for parents to have a choice, especially if it was a primary school that went from reception to year 6. This I feel would be extremely appealing for parents to give the children a less disruptive experience as Ibstock's children go through a 3/4 school journey. I really do feel this option would be more appealing and less disruptive to children and their education and one as a parent of children currently in education one that I would be interested in. Also a little competition is good for everybody.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
502	Lee	Bridges	n/a	Ap15/Ap17 Old End Appleby Magna	<p>Appleby Magna is a sustainable village as outlined in the Settlement Study undertaken in 2021. Due to the size of the village and the lack of available services, i.e. schools, post offices, general stores, doctors surgeries, recreational and community facilities as well as accessibility by public transport and non -car modes, a Limits to Development plan was introduced, which restricted development in Appleby Magna. The New Local Plan is in contradiction to this Settlement Study and previous Limits to Development in relation to Land at Old End, Appleby Magna (App 15) and 40 Measham Road, Appleby Magna (App 17). Fundamentally, the New Local Plan is not in line with Appleby Magna's local plan for development and is outside the previous Limits to Development which was set. Appleby Magna does not have the required services in accordance with the Settlement Study and Limits to Development to grow in population any further. The allocation of 32no. dwellings at Land at Old End, Appleby Magna (App 15) and 40 Measham Road, Appleby Magna (App 17) is too great for the sustainable village and the available services within the local area. There isn't sufficient access to Measham Road to have approximately 64 additional vehicles (2 vehicles per dwelling) entering and exiting Measham road. At the proposed development at Land at Old End, Appleby Magna (App 15) and 40 Measham Road, Appleby Magna (App 17) there is significant ecological gains, which will be lost. There are existing habitats for great crested newts, badgers, wildlife, bats, biodiversity all of which need to be protected.</p> <p>The proposed New Local Plan does not provide any gains in biodiversity or wildlife at all. There is no net gain being proposed whatsoever. Site Ap15 is identified as a historic Local Wildlife Site and should be kept as such. The proposed development will cause damage to the environment and wildlife habitats.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
503	Helen	Warren	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	This housing development is barely in NW Leicestershire! The location is absolutely wrong on several levels. Why place such a huge development so far north in the county? Especially taking into consideration all the housing developments in progress in close proximity to this location. The location of this development would be a travesty. There would be an increased risk of flooding in Diseworth (AP7,5.6-5.66). Mitigating flooding factors is a work in progress that has involved EMA and LCC and a group of volunteers from within the village. Development in the location proposed would have a huge negative effect on the work the aforementioned agencies have achieved. AP5, 5.46 air and noise pollution would be impacted in a negative manner. The loss of open space and green areas to walk would be detrimental to locals mental well being. The extra vehicles resulting from such a housing development would be immense and would add to the pollution and make the roads horrendous. The location of the housing development of Isley Woodhouse is in the wrong location. This siting will have a detrimental effect on the environment, the ecology of the local area and will change the nature of our Diseworth village from semi rural to a squeezed in suffocated place to live.
503	Helen	Warren	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	We are surrounded by industrial warehouses in this locality. To use greenfield sites to build yet more is irresponsible.
503	Helen	Warren	n/a	S1 Future Housing and Economic Development Needs	I disagree that there is a need for that amount of new houses to be built per year, 686 is an unrealistic amount. I feel this is a means to meet corporate greed. There are plenty of brown space areas that could be renovated and repurposed. The strategic distribution requirement is unnecessary and also unrealistic.
503	Helen	Warren	n/a	AP3 Renewable Energy	Rather than take up whole fields with solar panels it would be preferable to place solar panels on all new builds.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
503	Helen	Warren	n/a	Ec1 Economic Strategy Ec2 Employment Commitments	The Polices of Ec1 and Ec2 should NOT be changed. Development of the countryside in this country should be kept to a minimum. This is of particular importance in our local area where any further development would result in a huge, very noticeable loss of precious countryside. The destruction of so much food growing land and the destruction of so many hedgerows that the Wildlife Trusts are petitioning to keep would be a shameful act of vandalism.
504	Jay	Rocks	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	The idea to extend the Local Plan to build 283 houses behind Thornborough Road and 500 houses behind Brooks Lane is insane. [Redacted]. There are hundreds of new homes being built 15 minutes away in Hugglescote. The roads will not be able to cope. 2000 odd extra people with no school & doctor spaces. Obviously you know how bad the traffic is around this area anyway but you don't care you'll [say] "we are making the A511 bigger." Literally the whole local community don't want this to go ahead. Let's see if you're democratic or not.
505	Jonathan	Harrison	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	We realise you have to build somewhere but it's a mistake to build here. We moved to Howe Road because it was peaceful and safe for our cats, children and us, that won't be the case if you build here. There will be so much disruption, noise, dirt and traffic while these are being built. You do not have the infrastructure in place such as schools and Doctors surgeries to build all these homes here. This area is also home to endangered wildlife such as bats and owls. Thornborough Road is already complete Mayhem at anytime of day, you will only exacerbate this. In short, think of the residents of Howe Road and surrounding areas, let them live in peace. Don't kill and displace endangered wildlife, please build somewhere else.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
506	Michael	Gooch	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd lbstock	<p>on looking at the local plan I yet again see that lbstock is due to have more development on top of what has already done where the likes of Whitwick are having very little. The plan do not address the issues of Traffic, doctors, dentist etc and there is no indication when the school that is proposed will be built. Traveling at current school drop of or pick is a no go since parents do not seem to want to walk. In the past when planning permission has been sort for a development the county council say there will be no impact - well there is. We live behind the current school and face the rath of parents who park there cars with no consideration for others or people who use the footpaths/block are drives park in such away no emergancy vechile could get down the street. I appreciate we need more houses and we need a local plan or developers will build where they like but not at the cost of our current standard of living. The thing is I know this is a done deal and what objections come from this cosultation will have no effect on the draft as the council will use its better to have this than nothing approach. It will be when the developers start putting in planning permission that we will realy see if our representative up hold their pledges that got them elected re no to more housing in lbstock. or like Whitwick you have a barrestor on you side who will challenge and defeat the local council.</p>
507	Stephanie	Barker	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	<p>I object for the new housing development in Whitwick behind brooks lane and Thornborough road. Because it's going to cause more congestion on the roads. We will get more flooding as there's no where for the water to go. There going to destroy all the animals habitat.</p>
508	Karen	Booton	n/a	Chapter 4 Housing Allocations	<p>[Coalville Urban Area] All of these houses are not sustainable, not needed and certainly not affordable. What is needed first in our area is NEW SCHOOLS, DOCTORS SURGERIES WHERE THE DOCTORS ARE THERE, A LOCAL HOSPITAL THAT USED FOR LOCAL PEOPLE. I don't see any of this anywhere.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
509	Declan	Owens	n/a	Limits to Development CUA/06	<p>I am glad to see that C57 has been ruled out of the proposed revised LtD boundaries. I am however concerned that the proposed LtD/CUA/06 boundaries include site C58 all the way up to the boundary of Cademan Wood. There are a number of planning submissions awaiting decisions that are presently outside of the current Limits to Development but would be contained within these revised boundaries. The inclusion of C58 feels like an inevitable acceptance of these developments. Indeed any developments, in addition to those currently submitted, would not be possible in the rest of the area demarked by the revised boundary without demolition of exiting houses to the north of Loughborough road as there is no other method of access. It feels like this may be encouraged by the revision of this boundary. The boundary does not appear to consider a suitable buffer to the SSSI Cademan Woods as included in most recent development of bungalows on Berrington Court. Equally I do not understand the inclusion of C58 as per the findings in the site assessment document: A) scores poorly in all areas (other than SA4 and SA6 that all developments score well on) B) Inclusion of a suitable buffer to the SSSI Cademan woods would reduce development opportunities below 10 houses so would not be subject to formal allocation C) adverse impact on character and appearance of wider area and rural approach to Whitwick D) is in an area assessed being high landscape sensitivity and medium-high in respect of visual sensitivity. Indeed the site assessment document recommends that C58 is not included. Considering the small number of houses (which are unlikely to be affordable homes either!) that this change allows the negative trade offs do not feel warranted. Indeed this would also cause increased traffic at an already dangerous road junction (end of Swannymote Road). There have been two serious accidents in proximity of this junction that I am aware of since we moved in December 2021. It is also worrying that there is insufficient secondary school provision to deal with this development. I am deeply concerned that allowing this boundary change will ruin this rural approach and encroach on SSSI woodland. Once urbanisation of this area is accepted it feels inevitable that C57 will also be included in the future, completely changing the face of Whitwick beyond recognition.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
510	Anthony	Kay	Railfuture	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	The proposed new town to the south of East Midlands Airport is very poorly situated with respect to the railway network. Although it could be served well by buses, by diverting existing services on routes connecting the airport with Nottingham, Derby, Leicester and Coalville, there is still a need for good connections to the national rail network for longer-distance travel. It should therefore be noted that there will be a need for fast and frequent bus services connecting Isley Woodhouse with East Midlands Parkway station. There are also separate proposals to extend the Nottingham Express Transit tram system beyond its present terminus at Clifton South via the Ratcliffe Power Station redevelopment site and East Midlands Parkway station (all in Rushcliffe District) to East Midlands Airport. If this tram system extension is built, it should also serve the Isley Woodhouse new town. The North West Leicestershire Local Plan should make appropriate reference to and suitable provision for this scheme within the Council's area.
510	Anthony	Kay	Railfuture	IF6 Leicester to Burton Rail Line	This policy needs to be strengthened, in particular with regard to safeguarding all possible sites for stations and ancillary facilities. The current plans being progressed by Network Rail include stations in Coalville and Ashby, so all possible sites within these towns need to be safeguarded. However, the current Network Rail plans constitute a Minimum Viable Product, and it is possible that further stations will be built at a later stage. Therefore, possible stations sites in Moira (also serving Conkers), Swannington and Beveridge Lane (for the Bardon Employment Area and Ellistown) also need to be safeguarded. Here, "safeguarding" means that any development that would prejudice the provision of a station and associated pedestrian, cycle and vehicle access and parking should not be allowed. Paragraph 9.40 of the proposed policies mentions the railway line that passes close to Castle Donington. Following the cancellation of HS2 Eastern Leg, it is important to find some other way to provide fast rail services between Birmingham and Nottingham, and this line is the obvious route for such a service. However, if it is reopened to passenger services, this would also give an opportunity to open a station at Castle Donington, which would be justified by the major housing and employment developments that have been built there in recent years and which are envisaged in this Draft Local Plan. There is therefore a need for a further Infrastructure policy to safeguard land for a station at Castle Donington.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
511	NIGEL	CHAPMAN	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	I feel I need to make in writing my firm objections in regards to the above named proposals. I regularly walk the public right of ways through this fields and have done for over 40 years, mainly because of the diverse wildlife which I often see while walking. The public footpath at the end of School Lane is part of The Ivanhoe Way trail which was created by Leicestershire County Council and the Leicestershire Association of Parish and Local Councils, to celebrate the centenary of civil Parish Councils in 1994. There is a footbridge below the hill from School Lane which spans the brook from which I've gathered watercress for many years and often see newts and other creatures around the banks of the brook including voles and occasionally the blue flash of a Kingfisher along there. Once across the footbridge I have seen field mice within the wheat when grown. I understand that right of ways would be retained but the local wildlife would be destroyed but not only that, there would be even more much needed arable land lost to housing. I feel the proposal is for far too many houses on an area of natural beauty which would destroy the local area especially when you take into account the extra cars and demands on the local amenities this proposal would bring.
512	Mark	Howes	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd lbstock	lbstock is a small village with limited public resources, adding an additional 450 new homes will put too much strain on these resources. This will also put a lot more strain on our roads, which are already extremely busy. Plus the current primary school isnt at full capacity, so a new school isnt required. Adding an additional 450 new houses to this village will have a negative effect on the village and it resources.
513	Kirsty	Marriott	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	It's absolutely disgusting that the council are wanting to build another 783 houses on land which has established wildlife habitats, public footpaths, farming land that produces food for human consumption, tree protection orders and natural water springs. Not only that you cannot get an appointment at your local GP surgery and there are little spaces left within the school system. Why build more houses over our farmlands and fields! Not only that this was mining land which surely isn't safe to build on. You are again proposing to build on farmland which actively produces food for human consumption. You want to build on public footpaths, natural springs, established habitats and areas of green space with tree protection orders. These areas support mental health and wealth being, all of which you can't get support for within your local GP surgery which are overrun with patients!

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
514	Karen	Harrup	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	I wish to object to the proposed changes to the limits to development off Brooks Lane and Thornborough Road. I currently reside on Brooks Lane which has a beautiful outlook of fields and nature. The wildlife around this area is beautiful and building on this land would take more away from this. The biggest issue however is the traffic on Brooks lane that is already overloaded. To build more houses would put more pressure on the roads and make it even more dangerous than it currently is. This in turn would increase noise pollution in the area. There would need to be alot of thought and planning that went into accessing this development in order to stop Brooks Lane and the road into Swannington being used even more. We have a beautiful house and view but also understand the need for more housing. Our concern is for the safety of residents and road users in this already heavily used road.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
516	Grace	Hamilton	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	<p>Having read the proposal for 266 housing to be built on this land as a local resident, regular commuter and user of local services I can only object to this proposal. My initial concerns would be the fact the C46 document states under the Land and Water Contamination topic there are 'No Known Issues' - The site is unlikely to be affected by land contamination or landfill.</p> <p>The site is unlikely to cause groundwater pollution. It is public knowledge that this site has excessive landfill from the underground working when the pits were in operation. How can there be no valid concerns or acknowledgement of this in this section? How safe is it for people to live on this landfill, how safe is it for groundworks to take place disturbing what has been sitting under the ground undisturbed for many years? There was a stream that ran into a pond before this was backfilled with the waste from the pit, how can the council agree to this housing development where people are going to live and children are going to play without completing a full investigation and analysis of the ground contamination? The flooding on this site is vast and happens on a regular basis causing a vast portion of the site to be under water, how is this going to affect the properties that already lie behind the farm boundary where this excess water sits? Where is the water going to be driven once houses are on the land? What infrastructure is going to be implemented to ensure the existing and new properties are not affected, we know global warming is bringing change and our seasons are becoming wetter and the localised heavy rainfall on impermeable and already saturated surfaces will generate more surface water that the current system clearly does not have the capacity to cope with. What sewage system and drainage network is going to be built that will prevent this land overflowing and flooding as it does now? Highway Traffic – anyone that uses Broomley's Road and where it joins the A511 at the traffic lights knows this is already an area of congestion and at school times complete and utter chaos. The proposal of increased traffic to this area seems very ill-considered, regardless of any traffic system that may be put in place it does not take away that Broomley's Road will take the bulk of the extra traffic as the main road to the town centre, schools, doctors and hospital. As residents of this road the number of near misses we see everyday with cars, cyclist, pedestrians, and other road users it is frightening to think this will increase with not just the Broomley's site but the other surrounding site applications too. The current safety measures are not enough at school times, parents at the school will park EVERYWHERE causing visibility and parking hazards, to add more cars to this equation is dangerous and reckless.</p> <p>The additional pollution that will come with this surely has to be a concern. There is a school that accommodates 600+ hundred children aged 4-11 in an area where vehicles will increase the air pollution considerably, it is turning what is a small town into a concentrated area of pollution that can be expected in larger towns and small cities.</p> <p>We understand additional houses are needed however there are better sites than Broomleys Farm, we know the green spaces in our countryside are becoming less and less but this particular area is one of character and seen as a landmark in the area. Building here closes the divide between so many aspects and will take away one of the few things that make Coalville feel like the town that offers everything and not just houses! The loss of habitat and growing space to an area that has been prominent for both for these seems thoughtless.</p>
517	Helen	Hamilton	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	[Same response as No. 516 Grace Hamilton]

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
518	Garry	Hamilton	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	[Same response as #516 Grace Hamilton]

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
519	Maxwell	Brooks	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	<p>-Whitwick is a small village with insufficient infrastructure to support another 500 properties.</p> <p>-There are no good options for access to the site. Talbot lane is too small for this increase of traffic and cannot be widened to accommodate it. Brooks Lane is already very difficult due to the current level of traffic and cars being parked outside of properties. Church lane and School Lane also cannot be modified to accommodate the increase in traffic due to houses lining roads both sides. Many roads in the area are already difficult to pass through as it is essentially single file traffic. There is no information within the plan which states where access to this site would be located, the roads mentioned previously are the only roads that could be used as access and none of these are suitable. During peak times this is even more difficult. Adding this much traffic to the area is also going to affect the main routes in Coalville, as well as the routes to major roads such as the M1 and A42, negatively impacting surrounding towns and villages such as Shepshed.</p> <p>-There would be a huge negative impact on current wildlife living in the area. We have lived over looking the proposed site and used it for the last 4 years. In that time we have seen the following animals: Bats, various birds, deer, newts, badgers, rabbits and pheasants. Building on this land would hugely impact these animals and their habitats.</p> <p>-In the local area there is already a lack of dentists and doctors increasing the population is only going to make this more difficult for the new and current residents.</p> <p>-There is also going to be a massive increase for the need of schools, childcare facilities and public transport. Improving the public transport in the area is nearly impossible, the current bus services all struggle with getting through the village as is due to cars being parked on roads and traffic.</p> <p>-On the day of writing this the air pollution has been measured as UNHEALTHY. Building 500 properties will only increase air pollution not only through the added cars but also the process of actually building and developing the site.</p> <p>-This area was not on previous plan (2011 to 2031) where 9620 dwellings were needed in the area without using greenbelt land. There are to be 3500 dwellings built in south Coalville and as stated in this plan only 1,900 are expected to be completed before 2031. Prioritising building these will take away the need for more housing in the area. At the time, in item 7.9 2011 - 2031 plan, it states only 600 more dwellings would be required. The new plan has increased massively with this site alone having 500 and then slightly further up having another 283. These two sites alone make up</p> <p>-Around LE67 there are plenty of brownfield sites that are not being utilised first or even considered. These areas of land would be much more suitable than taking away greenbelt land for development.</p> <p>-There is a stream running through middle of planned site which has been known to flood in the past.</p> <p>-There are many mine shafts under the land around the planned area which should be taken into consideration.</p> <p>-The plans state public rights of way will be kept as well as current tree-lines and hedgerows. This would need clarification as many of the public footpaths are through the middle of where the developments would be as are the hedgerows and trees.</p> <p>-Properties along Talbot street facing over these sites will be negatively impacted and thought should be put into how to lower the impact onto these properties.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
520	Ellie	Leeland	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	I am against the build in the area of Whitwick. The area already has 3 over stretched primary schools and extremely over stretched secondary schools. If these houses were to be built a new primary and secondary school would need to be built. Which considering there is a huge shortage of teachers this would not be easy to fill. I do not want my child's education to suffer because this has not been considered. You are already proposing to take out the fields our family enjoys going outside and enjoying nature. Destroying homes for so many wild creatures.
521	Gayle	Baker	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	The proposed West Whitwick site is set in area of natural beauty, part of which includes a natural geologic fault line. The land is currently designated as agricultural and producing high yield, necessary food production. Local roads are narrow, dangerous in parts and all amenities are over subscribed. The proposed development will totally spoil and swamp this village. A number of smaller evenly spread developments throughout the district, with a maximum of 100 houses, would be far more appropriate.far more appropriate. Id be far more [text missing] I would suggest that the urban area of Coalville would not logically include all of Whitwick and Thringstone, which are currently villages, surrounded by attractive countryside. The proposed plan would see this area becoming an extension of Coalville Urban area and these attractive communities will be lost forever. Smaller, more evenly spread developments of no more than 100 houses would preserve the environment much more effectively. The council should be much more imaginative in it's strategic plan rather than yielding the to pressure of builders and other large scale landowners in deciding where houses will be built. It looks as though the council are taking the easy option.
521	Gayle	Baker	n/a	S1 Future Housing and Economic Development Needs	I would suggest that the urban area of Coalville would not logically include all of Whitwick and Thringstone, which are currently villages, surrounded by attractive countryside. The proposed plan would see this area becoming an extension of Coalville Urban area and these attractive communities will be lost forever. Smaller, more evenly spread developments of no more than 100 houses would preserve the environment much more effectively. The council should be much more imaginative in it's strategic plan rather than yielding the to pressure of builders and other large scale landowners in deciding where houses will be built. It looks as though the council are taking the easy option.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
522	Howard	Baker	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	The proposed development West of Whitwick is set in attractive countryside with an abundance of wildlife, including ponds and trees. The development will swamp the area and no longer attract visitors to walk in the woods and Swannington Incline. It is already difficult to get an appointment with the local GP, the roads are busy and schools are full. The development is totally out of proportion and will turn an attractive village into part of the currently unattractive Coalville urban area. Surely the council should be working towards improving run-down areas rather than ruining the places that people would want to live..
523	Kathy	Rocks	n/a	C48 South of Church Lane	Is this some kind of joke!! Outside my house it already floods so badly, with water pouring off the fields opposite, and you think building a load of houses is a good idea. I moved here 13 years ago from overcrowded, polluted hell hole of Leicester. I moved here because it's a village. I moved here because it would be less polluted. And now you are proposing nearly 800 new homes, each one will most likely have 2 vehicles each, so that's an extra 1600 vehicles up and down this road. You will be making it as busy as an A road. Have you heard of "you reap what you sow?" [Redacted]. The NHS is on its knees - why - too many people in this country. Can't get a GP appointment, too many people here. Schools oversubscribed - too many people here. [Redacted].

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
524	Patricia	Hening	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse EMP90 Land south of East Midlands Airport (Freeport)	<p>I was privileged to live in Diseworth with my husband for 25 years. During that time I watched a small established community which exhibited care and concern for the continued social and mental health for its inhabitants over the years. This was not new. Diseworth history goes back 1000years, recording Roman times and medi-evil times in a number of books produced by th Diseworth Heritage Centre. The village is basically a cluster of houses, originally built around a church, which spreads out through four roads or 'Gates' as the ancient term suggests. There is no ribbon development in Diseworth. One of its highlights is the fact that one cannot walk far without meeting someone from a part of the cluster. The village boasts an active Parish Church, a village school and community hall and a Heritage Centre. Contact with ach other is maintained through the village website, and for those who do not wish or are unable to access the internet, a village magazine, delivered ten times a year, to every house. This latter item has been produced and delivered by local volunteers for at least 30 years and has won a National Award. Residents meet each other at coffee mornings, and at well organised events in the Village Hall, Church and Heritage Centre. Over the many years what has transpired is a Community spirit, an essence, of support and care for each other. Diseworth is not insular. It reaches out to its sister village, Long Whatton, with whom it shares its Parish Council; its website ensures it hosts many visitors to its many functions.The planned development of so many houses swamping Diseworth gives rise to a very real concern that the true essence of the village will be swallowed up or haemorrhaged into a wider conurbation; it currently experiences intrusion form East Midlands Airport, the Motorway and the M42. It is regularly flooded owing to its geographical position: how will hundreds more buildings affect this aspect of Diseworth. In the 1600's the village was purchased by Lady Margaret Beaufort (mother of Henry VII) to found a college in Cambridge. The purpose ot the village was to produce revenue from its many farms and properties to fund the training of Anglican priests in England. Reference to this is available. This is not a nimby appeal. It is a cry for recognition for a small village which has survived many hardships in the past and yet continues to be a shining example of village life. During my years in Diseworth I became involved in community work in the village, in NWLeics, in the County and nationally. I witnessed many other rural communities, but none seemed to have the caring essence of Diseworth, not just the people, but the buildings and the land. I urge the Planning Committee to reconsider this proposal.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
525	T.	Nicklin	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	<p>I am writing to object to the inclusion of the land as per above in the local plan for development, particularly as this is probably for industrial units. Following the development of land on the opposite side of the A444 for Jaguar/Land Rover there have been a number of issues which have developed, affecting the residents and land owners in the area, particularly in Netherseal and other surrounding villages. The various Agencies (Highways & Environment etc.) apparently carried out surveys into the impact of the JLR development and reported that it would be minimal, these appear to be incorrect. One of the main concerns is the amount of traffic now using the A444, not just at 'rush hours' in the morning and evening, even though the existing units are not fully occupied. Already traffic frequently queues back from the J11 island to Acresford, a distance of nearly 2 miles, at these times and it can take over 15 minutes to reach the current island. Traffic queues of this length and time will have an impact on air quality in the area, as well as being frustrating to travellers. We are aware that traffic has increased through local villages, including our own, as drivers are seeking alternative routes to avoid the J11 island due to the delays. The only way to access this area of land is from the A444 as on its other side is the A42, so either another island will need to be installed to facilitate access and exit or at a minimum a set of traffic lights or more probably a combination of both, therefore causing further congestion. Whilst I am aware that building industrial sites local to the motorway network is preferred as in theory this reduces traffic on relatively smaller roads. Unfortunately, this is generally not the case as those that work on such sites generally travel on the local roads, and suppliers also use the local roads again causing congestion e.g., pallet supply to JLR from Swadlincote, this is also causing disruption and noise throughout the night to residents in Overseal. Any expansion in the area will exacerbate the issue. I am also aware that since the area that JLR occupies has been developed, local land owners are suffering increased flooding from the Mease and other local water courses, due to increased run off. Whilst I understand that stormwater retention ponds were installed on this site all these do is reduce the immediate discharge of water from an area, the overall discharge from an area will be the same just over a longer period which does not help when flooding already occurs in these areas. By building on any ground the natural drainage into the ground is reduced, and such large areas have a significant effect on this. The proposed area will not give water discharge in the same area as JLR, but will still discharge into the Mease at an earlier point raising the probability of increased flooding in that area and further down. I would also raise the points that allowing development of this kind on good farming ground reduces the areas available for food production, a facility that our nation is reducing at an alarming rate, just as the de-industrialisation of our nation makes us reliant on others for our supplies. It also seems that 'planners' do not require the use of roofs of industrial buildings for solar (photo-voltaic) panels, but appear to prefer to allow further farmland to be used for installation of solar farms. I would suggest that it should be made policy that any industrial buildings, and on this site in particular, are required to be designed to accommodate and fitted with photo-voltaic panels as part of any approved planning permission.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
526	Haydn	Stanney	n/a	H8 Houses in Multiple Occupation in Kegworth	The District council has provided absolutely no evidence that HMOs have any impact on local amenities, and report from the local council in 2020 regarding article 4 in Kegworth (https://minutes-1.nwleics.gov.uk/documents/s27143/Proposed%20Article%204%20Direction%20-%20Kegworth%20Houses%20in%20Multiple%20Occupation%20Cabinet%20Report.pdf) admits they found no link between HMOs and amenity issues. Additionally, students make up around 77% of HMO usage and are 20.6% of the population of Kegworth using census data, student numbers from the University of Nottingham, and data from the district council around council tax and property numbers. Therefore not only is a limit unnecessary, but 10% is an arbitrary number that is not reflective of the situation within Kegworth. Additionally, requiring 1 parking space per occupant is a ridiculous proposal as people living within HMOs are far more likely to work/study in the same place, be that the University or the airport, and so are less independent than other homes so have less need for multiple cars, not more. For example, I am a student living in a HMO and do not own a car, not even learning to drive until my 4th year of University. This entire policy is not supported by any evidence, and blatantly puts other homes above HMOs with no material grounds or basis to do so, and should be removed from the local plan.
527	Julia	Howard	n/a	S3 Local Housing Needs Villages	S3. Having it confirmed that Charley has been excluded from this policy due to its settlement nature being a hamlet, there should at the very least be an exception for special needs and the elderly with linked family status within the policy. Alternatively as there are very few hamlets like Charley's we should be entitled to take advantage of this policy. H7. The same point applies to self build. S[text missing]
527	Julia	Howard	n/a	S4 Countryside S5 Residential Development in the Countryside	S4 splitting dwellings as permitted within the NPPF para 80 should be included. (if not to be permitted development in the future and short term holiday let's ie airbnb) S4. 1(g)The removal of extensions with reference to S5 should be deleted as this policyS5 refers to replacement dwellings only not extensions.
527	Julia	Howard	n/a	AP2 Amenity	Nowhere does it say that all policies must be read in conjunction with each other for example AP2 on noise should apply to all policies.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
527	Julia	Howard	n/a	AP3 Renewable Energy	AP3 the document on renewable and low carbon energy study 21 states the new target for solar can be achieved from roof tops. Roof tops does not appear in AP3 and should be amended to include the inclusion of roof tops. The policy only refers to housing. AP3 has had deleted from the existing policy CC1 cumulative effect that would result from other existing renewable energy schemes. And the impact on economic social and environmental benefits for the communities closest to the proposal. These should not be deleted. AP3. Wind power should have sites excluded that should be archaeological protected, or deemed to be local wildlife sites.
527	Julia	Howard	n/a	H7 Self-build and Custom Housebuilding	Self build should apply to Charley, see response to S3.
528	Melanie	Lindsley	The Coal Authority	En6 Land and Air Quality	The Coal Authority records indicate that within the North West Leicestershire area there are recorded coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth including mine entries, coal workings and reported surface hazards. These features pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety. We are therefore pleased to see the inclusion of Policy En6 in the draft plan which identifies that where site are located in the Development High Risk Area planning application must be accompanied by an appropriate assessment and where necessary measure to avoid any adverse impacts.
529	John	Dunncliffe	n/a	C48 South of Church Lane	Church lane and new Swannington This is far to large for local roads and services which are poor and need improvement before any further pressure put on them
529	John	Dunncliffe	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	West Whitwick (C47 C77 C78 C86 C81)These proposals will put unreasonable pressure on local services which are poor at present also will cause further problems and disruption to the local road system without doubt will be the end for wildlife and the environment the proposed scheme is far to large to inflict on the resident/local community. Whitwick will become the sea of housing similar to the disaster at hugglescote.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
530	Eileen	Turrell	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	This is a total destruction for our country side With no consideration for the wild life also the disruption to traffic etc it will be a drain on the public services which is severely impacted already u consider the new hospice a well thought out plan and a welcome addition to the area in its now tranquil surroundings but what you are now considering is a concrete jungle ruining what little countryside we have left
531	Orest	Mulka	Ashby Canal Association	IF7 Ashby Canal	In order to save you time, I wish to say that Ashby Canal Association concurs with the response given by Geoff Pursglove of Ashby Canal Trust

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
532	Phillip	Collings	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	<p>I refer to 'Broad Location, West Whitwick (C47,C77,C78,C86,C81)' Proposal 4.31 gives no timeline, however being included in the 2040 plan and ommitting this is very concerning as a resident. This proposal would be build up to my boundry, but no details are provided. I suggest that this is left out of the find 2040 'plan' as that is exactly what this not.</p> <p>I see the location as floored in a number of ways.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Due to the fact that a 3rd party has suggested it as a business opportunity rather than a specific need fro housing. 2. That there are multiple different land owners, meaning no cohesive plan can be sought at the present time. 3. The total area of that of individual plots are not disclosed in the document. 4. Access from Talbot Lane would be inappropriate due to the size of the road 5. Access from Brooks Lane/Church Street would course unnacceptable levels of traffic at shool times. 6. Coupled with the proposed development in New Swannington, traffic would be a major issue. 7. Flooding - most of the plots have a brook running through, and with C47 having a large hill at the centre, this would pose a threat not only to the new developement, but existing housing also. 8. Local infrastructure could not handle 2 developments, currently 1 coop for Whitwick and a handful of corner shops would be insufficient. 9. The schools in the area are already at capacity, this would require a new primary school, before secondary education in the area is even considered. 10. The 'broad location' is mostly used for farming, which of course would be lost. 11. The beauty of the area would be desimated 12. Wildlife in these fields is abundant, this would be lost <p>In summary, I do not beleive enough work has been done to include this broad location in the plan for 2040 and that there are plenty of other areas in NW Leics with better transport links, existing infrastructure and less enviornmental damage than this.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
533	John	Turner	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	These proposals would put a huge strain on all already overloaded amenities, it is already difficult to get Doctors appointments and the limited available parking would be much worse also for the schools .Talbot Street is very busy most of the day and night, at times it is like a race track.The influx of the extra people would make the situation much worse. In a time when we are trying to save the planet this plan will totally destroy an an area of outstanding beauty which is a haven of pleasure for wildlife and existing residents.
534	Andrew	Charter	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	There is no capacity for additional people at any school, health care, dentists. Roads are horrendous and travelling at standard times easily doubles your travel times. The proposal for additional housing is not just stretching capacity but massively exceeding. All dentists do not offer NHS appointments and emergency appointments at doctors are required when they open. 10 minutes after and you cannot get an appointment. There is no capacity within the local area.
535	Edward	Latimer	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	Due to the proposed size of the area being developed this will cause an increase to the traffic through the villages near by, including the village where I live, Overseal. Currently the new development across the road has increase the traffic through the village by over 250%. the noise levels during the day and especially in the evening is extremely uncomfortable and causing me and my wife to lose sleep, I do not want the volume of traffic to be any more than we already have.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
536	Brenda	Harper	n/a	C48 South of Church Lane	<p>This is a mass over development of housing in this area and also the wider area around Coalville, whichever way you choose to go, Hugglescote, Ashby, Shepshed and on to Loughborough. It will increase, traffic and a need for services that are unsustainable, eg schools, GPs. Many projects such as these may be accompanied with promises of such services, which are never fulfilled once the houses are built. We moved to Thornborough Rd in our retirement as a planning proposal was refused to build 270 houses at the rear of the property, and as I understand this area is now designated as 'Countryside' which matches the arable land and wildlife who reside in their ever shrinking environment. The land remains Countryside, how can it suddenly be designated 'not'. We bought our property because of this, our living area is at the rear of the property, so affords views accordingly. We have invested considerably in our property with the recent addition of a new roof, only to face the prospect of a view of an estate, and increasing pressure on local services. In addition we would probably face a decrease in the price of our property, which is the product of our working life. I believe this is a major over commitment by the Council to tick the government boxes, it takes no account of existing residents. As regards Thornborough road, the only winners of this plan would be McDonalds and KFC. We live in The National Forest, but with current planning, it will just become giant housing estate with each town and village just rolling into each other.</p>
537	Sue	Clarke	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	<p>The development is disproportionate to the needs of the local area. Whitwick in the 2021 census had a population of 10,451 people. The plan to build 500 new houses would increase this dramatically. There is no local need for this size of development. Therefore the proposed development is over-bearing, out-of-scale and would be out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity. Not only would the loss of existing views from neighbouring properties be adversely affected, the loss of countryside to the west of Whitwick would be devastating to wildlife habitats and the local environment. Therefore, the visual impact of the development would be too severe. Whitwick and Coalville have always enjoyed a green space between them, this development would ultimately destroy this, which would not benefit the local community.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
538	Tom	Clarke	MRTPI Trust	Theatres IF2 Community Facilities	We welcome and support the plan's support for its valued facilities, including protection from loss. However, we recommend some minor changes to make the policy more effective. Supporting paragraph 9.14 should make clear that cultural facilities also includes theatres and other such performance venues, of which there are a few in the district including the Century Theatre and Venture Theatre. We urge that the marketing period for 'commercial' community uses is increased to at least twelve months, but ideally eighteen or longer. This is because where a community may seek to bid on a property it is likely that a period of greater than six months is required in order to fundraise and submit grant applications. It will also better demonstrate a facility is genuinely no longer required and protect from unnecessary loss in line with paragraph 97 of the NPPF (2023).
539	Shirley	Briggs	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse EMP90 Land south of East Midlands Airport (Freeport)	The proposed creation of Isley Woodhouse and the Segro development fly in the face of the Council's commitment to "conserve a district's natural environment" while Objective 10 notes the need to se brownfield sites. These developments will build over useful farmland, destroy natural habitats and wreck the rural nature of the surrounding villages. If the government and its local departments were really interested in the "green agenda, countryside would not be swallowed up in this way. This contribution to the consultation pleads that more green space is not allowed to be covered by concrete and tarmac."
539	Shirley	Briggs	n/a	En1 Nature Conservation / Biodiversity Net Gain	10.32 notes the importance of "health and well being", the need to create "attractive places" and to respond to "climate change".Covering the land with buildings and infrastructure does not allow for any of these. As above, I beg that we may be allowed to keep our green spaces. they are important, small though they may be in the universal scheme of things, to our mental and physical health, and to the well-being of the natural habitats around us. Please do not build over any more greenfield sites.
540	Alan	Lees	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	Objection to development of transport related warehouses leading to increase of traffic including large numbers of HGV vehicles using the A444 and potentially rat run rural village traffic, please log my objection
541	Judith	Lees	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	I strongly object to the development of (LtD reference)large transport related warehouses due to this leading to increased volume of traffic using the A444 potentially creating rat run rural village traffic .please ensure you log my objection to this

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
542	kelvin	Eatherington	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	Object to the proposed building of 500 houses on Talbot Lane
543	Robert	McNamara	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	We already are seeing building on green field sites in Coalville and the surrounding areas. the Broom Leys farm is a great place to walk and enjoy the open space. We live on Buckingham road which connects to Broom Leys road and we are already seeing in creasing traffic, pollution and noise due to cars using these roads.
544	Michael	Owens	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	It seems that the proposals for development behind Thornborough Road and West Whitwick are not at all well thought out and take no account of the complete lack of infrastructure to sustain an additional 783 homes, roughly 1,800 inhabitants and 800 vehicles. It is clearly not suitable for the largest proposed development and takes no notice of the wishes of incumbent inhabitants, myself and my wife included. The traffic increase cannot be sustained by Thornborough Road, Spring Lane, Swannington and the A511. I would suggest that NWLDC commits to making Coalville and its surrounding areas fit for purpose as a host area before committing to such a fanciful scheme. I also believe that there are some restrictive covenants on the land behind 284 Church Lane. We would be firmly against this proposed policy. [sic] s its environs
545	Steffan	Saunders	South Derbyshire District Council	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	It is requested that effective landscape screening be provided and that built development be designed to mitigate any impact on the rural character of South Derbyshire to the west. It is also requested that any transport impacts within South Derbyshire associated with the development of this site, in terms of highway capacity, safety and local amenity, be identified and satisfactorily mitigated, including in respect of any heavy goods vehicle movements. Finally it is requested that developer contributions be sought toward sustaining the long term financial viability of existing bus service 9, which passes the proposed site and connects East Midlands Gateway to Ashby, Swadlincote and Burton. The service provides an essential sustainable transport option for residents of those settlements, travelling for employment or air transport, to and from this location and will be beneficial to residents of the proposed new Isley Woodhouse settlement for the same reason.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
545	Steffan	Saunders	South Derbyshire District Council	CD10 Park Lane Castle Donington	It is requested that effective landscape screening be provided as part of development on this site to protect the rural character of the part of South Derbyshire that lies to the north and west of the River Trent. It is also requested that any transport impacts within South Derbyshire associated with development on this site, in terms of highway capacity, safety and local amenity, be identified and satisfactorily mitigated.
545	Steffan	Saunders	South Derbyshire District Council	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	It is requested that any transport impacts within South Derbyshire associated with the development of this site, in terms of highway capacity, safety and local amenity, be identified and satisfactorily mitigated, particularly in respect of any heavy goods vehicle movements. It is also requested that developer contributions be sought toward sustaining the long term financial viability of existing bus service 9, which passes the proposed site and connects East Midlands Gateway to Ashby, Swadlincote and Burton. The service provides an essential sustainable transport option for residents of those settlements, travelling for employment or air transport, to and from this location. It will also be beneficial to those seeking access to this potential strategic distribution site and to employers located thereon seeking to attract staff.
545	Steffan	Saunders	South Derbyshire District Council	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	It is requested that effective landscape screening be provided and built development be designed to mitigate any impact on the rural character of South Derbyshire to the north west. It is also requested that any transport impacts within South Derbyshire associated with development on this site, in terms of highway capacity, safety and local amenity, be identified and satisfactorily mitigated, particularly in respect of any heavy goods vehicle movements using the A444. It is noted that Mercia Park is currently connected to Swadlincote by bus service 9a and it is requested that developer contributions be sought toward any necessary enhancement to this service, in terms of hours of operation and frequency of services. The service provides an essential sustainable transport option for Swadlincote residents travelling to and from employment and is also beneficial to employers in this location seeking to attract staff. Finally, it is requested that effective surface water drainage be required in connection with proposals to develop the site to prevent any additional runoff that may affect land and watercourses within South Derbyshire, including the River Mease.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
545	Steffan	Saunders	South Derbyshire District Council	Limits to Development BI/01	<p>It is considered important that the physical separation of Woodville and Blackfordby be maintained. In recent years development on the peripheries of both settlements has encroached upon the countryside separating the two, bringing them closer together and raising the unwelcome prospect of coalescence. On this basis it is requested that the following amendment be made to the proposed changes to the Limits of Development: LtD/B1/01: Whilst inclusion of the extent of the new built development at Butt Lane is appropriate, objection is made to the inclusion of the undeveloped area of landscape planting to the north of Middleton Close and Pickering Drive as this is considered to be inconsistent with points 3 and 9 of the methodology. Point 3 indicates that generally open areas of countryside are excluded, including woodland and other greenfield land, whilst point 9 indicates that peripheral areas of environmental space are excluded. On this basis it is considered that the Limits to Development should exclude the land to the north of Middleton Close and Pickering Drive.</p>
545	Steffan	Saunders	South Derbyshire District Council	Limits to Development Wv/01	<p>It is considered important that the physical separation of Woodville and Blackfordby be maintained. In recent years development on the peripheries of both settlements has encroached upon the countryside separating the two, bringing them closer together and raising the unwelcome prospect of coalescence. On this basis it is requested that the following amendment be made to the proposed changes to the Limits of Development: LtD/Wv/01: Whilst inclusion of the extent of the new built development to the east of Hepworth Road at Butt Lane is considered appropriate, objection is made to the inclusion of the curtilage of the residential property identified as 'The Bungalow', accessed from Butt Lane. The Bungalow is set back and isolated from the residential development fronting Butt Lane. Its curtilage is so large as to be more of a piece with the countryside than with the nearby built development, particularly as it projects outward and away from the built up area, with open fields both to the north and south- east. It's inclusion is considered to be inconsistent with points 5 and 6 of the methodology. Point 5 states that 'Boundaries should generally follow property curtilages except where the boundary is not well defined or so large that it appears as part of the open countryside surrounding the settlement'. Point 6 states that 'isolated or sporadic development which is detached from principal built-up area is excluded'. On his basis it is considered that The Bungalow and its curtilage should be excluded from the Limits to Development.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
546	Robert	Ansiingh	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	I moved here from Loughborough 10 years ago to enjoy a cleaner environment and to be close to attractive walks and nature in this area. Your proposal will spoil all of that for a lot of people. The roads will grind to a halt and be even more dangerous, getting a doctor's appointment will be impossible and the whole village community will be dissipated. I am disgusted by the lack of meaningful consultation on this massive change from my local council.
547	Margaret Diane	Turner	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	The proposed plans would change Whitwick out of all recognition, the roads are extremely busy everywhere with few parking areas. Where are the new schools to be built? We shall also need more doctors and health centres with adequate parking. The proposed area for development is greatly used by residents for regular exercise and wellbeing away from the very busy and noisy roads. Surely any plans should be considered for development on brownfield sites not greenfield. Once it has gone it's gone. This plan will destroy all the wildlife in the area (birds, bats, foxes, deer and numerous others)
548	Susan	Ansigh	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	We have settled here well and I enjoy living in the safety of a village community. I love the abundant wildlife and walks across the footpaths to Swannington Incline etc. I already struggle to get a doctor's appointment and the roads are already very busy. People already leave their cars running when shopping at the Co Op or picking up fish and chips, for people with any sort of breathing problems, these proposals will impact on the mental and physical health of the community.
549	Pauline	Price	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	The village already has far too many houses and the traffic on Talbot Street is diabolical. I've seen numerous accidents from my window. If all this increased traffic is allowed access onto Talbot Lane and then subsequently travels to towards the motorway through Whitwick and Thringstone it will be a nightmare. Planners should concentrate on providing good quality more densely built housing in Coalville, rather than being driven by huge profits for builders and landowners.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
550	John	Price	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	We moved here from Oxfordshire and while we live in an attractive and friendly village, I have found the lack of access to medical services and the narrow, busy, poorly designed road network challenging. Your proposal will totally spoil the attractive countryside and make journeys impossible. [Personal information redacted]. I agree with my wife that planner should concentrate on developing Coalville much more effectively and not ruin our beautiful countryside and kill off our wildlife unnecessarily.
551	Kenneth	Neal	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	This area has been built on enough over the years. Whitwick now joins up with Thringstone and should never, ever join up further to Coalville. Public transport is poor, the roads are busy and this attractive side of Whitwick should not be spoiled to make vast profits for builders and land owners. I am really worried about the difficulty I already have getting a doctor's appointment. The development will lead to excess flooding at the bottom of Talbot Lane and I am outraged by the council wanting Whitwick to be part of Coalville.
552	Julie	Kinton	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	how can you build on a field and land that floods over to the roads regularly, causing houses on Talbot Lane to flood, what about the badgers set and nature that has become established? owls, deer, foxes all lost. what about the dangerous lane and junction at Talbot street which has far too many accidents already? The privacy of us on Talbot Street all gone. Why so many houses in one area its madness? how about the doctor's surgery we can't get appointments as it is?, all the small side roads will become rat runs for cars, roads more dangerous for children to cross. what about the school up in Swannington and the parking that is already dangerous? this plan is seriously going to cause major issues in this what was once a small nice village.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
553	Natasha	Styles	McCarthy Stone	AP6 Health Impact Assessments	<p>We note that the Council is exploring thresholds for requesting an HIA to support planning applications as detailed in para 5.54 of the consultation. The Council should note that there is a common misconception that older person's housing places an additional burden on healthcare infrastructure and therefore rather than requiring applicants of older person's schemes to show that there is capacity in healthcare systems and to show that the scheme will not have a health impact, the policy should instead recognise the health benefits that delivering older people's housing can bring to individuals. Older Persons' Housing produces a large number of significant benefits which can help to reduce the demands exerted on Health and Social Services and other care facilities – not only in terms of the fact that many of the residents remain in better health, both physically and mentally, but also doctors, physiotherapists, community nurses, hairdressers and other essential practitioners can all attend to visit several occupiers at once. This leads to a far more efficient and effective use of public resources. A report “‘Healthier and Happier’ An analysis of the fiscal and wellbeing benefits of building more homes for later living” by WPI Strategy for Homes for Later Living explored the significant savings that Government and individuals could expect to make if more older people in the UK could access this type of housing. The analysis showed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each person living in a home for later living enjoys a reduced risk of health challenges, contributing to fiscal savings to the NHS and social care services of approximately £3,500 per year. • Building 30,000 more retirement housing dwellings every year for the next 10 years would generate fiscal savings across the NHS and social services of £2.1bn per year. • On a selection of national well-being criteria such as happiness and life satisfaction, an average person aged 80 feels as good as someone 10 years younger after moving from mainstream housing to housing specially designed for later living.’ <p>In addition, specifically designed housing for older people offers significant opportunities to enable residents to be as independent as possible in a safe and warm environment. Older homes are typically in a poorer state of repair, are often colder, damper, have more risk of fire and fall hazards. They lack in adaptations such as handrails, wider internal doors, stair lifts and walk in showers. Without these simple features everyday tasks can become harder and harder.</p> <p>Recommendation: For the plan to be in line with national policy and effective the following wording should be added the policy area to recognise the health benefits of older persons housing. Specialist Housing for older people has a number of health benefits and proposals for such schemes will not be required to submit a Health Impact Assessment.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
553	Natasha	Styles	McCarthy Stone	H5 Affordable Housing	<p>Draft Policy H5 considers affordable housing but does not propose an affordable housing requirement for this consultation and instead suggests that a percentage requirement will follow once the whole plan viability assessment has been undertaken.</p> <p>Due to lack of published relevant evidence, it is therefore difficult to comment on the policy. It difficult to ascertain if the policy is realistic or deliverable and is contrary to para 31 of the NPPF that requires the preparation and review of all policies to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. We advise that by limiting scrutiny of a Viability Study, the Council is reducing the opportunities for comment on a crucial element of the evidence base that will inform policy and deliverability directly and the Local Plan would be less robust as a consequence.</p> <p>The Council will be aware of the increased emphasis on Local Plan viability testing in Paragraph 58 of the NPPF and that the PPG states that “The role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan making stage. Viability assessment should not compromise sustainable development but should be used to ensure that policies are realistic, and that the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine deliverability of the plan” (Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 10-002-20190509). The evidence underpinning the Council’s policy requirements should therefore be robust and be used to form deliverable and realistic policies.</p> <p>The viability of specialist older persons’ housing is more finely balanced than ‘general needs’ housing and we are strongly of the view that the older person’s housing typologies should be robustly assessed separately in the forthcoming Local Plan Viability Study that still needs to be undertaken to inform the plan and affordable housing requirements. This would accord with the typology approach detailed in Paragraph: 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509) of the PPG which states that: “A typology approach is a process plan makers can follow to ensure that they are creating realistic, deliverable policies based on the type of sites that are likely to come forward for development over the plan period. If this is not done, the delivery of much needed specialist housing for older people may be significantly delayed with protracted discussion about other policy areas such as affordable housing policy requirements which are wholly inappropriate when considering such housing need.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
553	Natasha	Styles	McCarthy Stone	H5 Affordable Housing (cont)	<p>The Council must therefore ensure that an up-to-date Viability Study is undertaken to inform the future plan. The new Viability Study must include a number of typologies that includes older person's housing and if older person's housing is found to be not viable an exemption must be provided within the plan in order to prevent protracted conversations at the application stage over affordable housing provision.</p> <p>We would direct the Council towards the Retirement Housing Consortium paper entitled 'A briefing note on viability prepared for Retirement Housing Group by Three Dragons, May 2013 (updated February 2013 ('RHG Briefing Note') available from https://retirementhousinggroup.com/rhg/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/CILviability-appraisal-issues-RHG-February-2016.pdf. The RHG Briefing Note establishes how sheltered housing and extra care development differs from mainstream housing and looks at the key variables and assumptions that can affect the viability of specialist housing for older people. These key variables include unit size, unit numbers and GIA, non-saleable communal space, empty property costs, external build cost, sales values, build costs, marketing costs and sales periods.</p> <p>In presenting this submission, it is relevant to note that McCarthy Stone which has traditionally developed retirement housing schemes for the middle market where it has proved more viable to do so. It is, through its new "Evolve" housing concept now better able to develop</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
553	Natasha	Styles	McCarthy Stone	H11 Accessible, Adaptable and Wheelchair User Homes	<p>We note that Draft Policy H11 requires sites all sites to deliver housing built to M4 (2) standards and for sites of 10 or more dwellings to deliver at 9% of market housing to be M4(3)(2)(a) compliant.</p> <p>The Council should initially recognise that the proposed changes in building regulations will require all homes to be built to part M4(2) of the Building Regulations. This will remove the need to reference this in the local plan and should be removed.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is common for Local Authorities to conflate the needs of ‘wheelchair users’ with the needs of older people in the community. A supportive local planning policy framework will be crucial in increasing the delivery of specialist older persons’ housing and it should be acknowledged that although adaptable and accessible housing can assist it does not remove the need for specific older person’s housing. Housing particularly built to M4(3) standard may serve to institutionalise an older person’s scheme reducing independence contrary to the ethos of older persons and particularly extra care housing.</p> <p>Whilst we acknowledge that PPG Paragraph 003 Reference ID: 63-003-20190626 recognises that “the health and lifestyles of older people will differ greatly, as will their housing needs, which can range from accessible and adaptable general needs housing to specialist housing with high levels of care and support’, the Council should note that ensuring that residents have the ability to stay in their homes for longer is not, in itself, an appropriate manner of meeting the housing needs of older people.</p> <p>Adaptable houses do not provide the on-site support, care and companionship of specialist older persons’ housing developments nor do they provide the wider community benefits such as releasing under occupied family housing as well as savings to the public purse by reducing the stress of health and social care budgets. The Healthier and Happier Report by WPI Strategy (September 2019) calculated that the average person living in specialist housing for older people saves the NHS and social services £3,490 per year.</p> <p>We would also like to remind the Council of the increased emphasis on Local Plan viability testing in Paragraph 58 of the NPPF and that the PPG states that “The role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan making stage. Viability assessment should not compromise sustainable development but should be used to ensure that policies are realistic, and that the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine deliverability of the plan” (Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 10-002-20190509). M4 3 Housing in particular has a cost implication will serve to reduce the number of dwellings that can be delivered on a site, affecting affordability and further reduce viability.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
554	Thomas	Redfern	Mr Darren Betteridge	S2 Settlement Hierarchy	In relation to the proposed settlement hierarchy and for the purpose of clarification, reference to 'Coleorton' should be accompanied by a specific reference to 'Lower Moor Road' as in the the currently adopted Local Plan. In addition, a new paragraph (4) should be added stating:- "If during the plan period, any of the Local Housing Needs Villages were to gain facilities to the extent that they would meet the requirements of a Sustainable Village, this would be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications in these settlements".
555	Amy	Wheelton	South Derbyshire District Council (Cllr)	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	Land north of J11 A/M42 (EMP82) It is requested that effective landscape screening be provided and built development be designed to mitigate any impact on the rural character of South Derbyshire to the north west. It is also requested that any transport impacts within South Derbyshire associated with development on this site, in terms of highway capacity, safety and local amenity, be identified and satisfactorily mitigated, appropriate funding towards speed averaging cameras/highways mitigations on the A444 through s106/IL/CIL should be paid particularly in respect of any heavy goods vehicle movements using the A444. Farmers in South Derbyshire are suffering flooding to farmland from the first part of this development which should be addressed. It is noted that Mercia Park is currently connected to Swadlincote by bus service 9a and it is requested that developer contributions be sought toward any necessary enhancement to this service, in terms of hours of operation and frequency of services. The service provides an essential sustainable transport option for Swadlincote residents travelling to and from employment and is also beneficial to employers in this location seeking to attract staff Finally, it is requested that effective surface water drainage be required in connection with proposals to develop the site to prevent any additional runoff that may affect land and watercourses within South Derbyshire, including the River Mease.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
556	Christine	Jarmin	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	<p>Whitwick is a small village with insufficient infrastructure to support another 500 plus properties and their residents.</p> <p>-There seems to be a severe lack of access routes to support this proposal. Talbot lane is much too small for this increase of traffic and cannot be widened to accommodate it. Brooks Lane is already very difficult due to the current level of traffic and cars being parked outside of properties. Church lane and School Lane also cannot be modified to accommodate the increase in traffic due to houses lining roads both sides. Many roads in the area are already difficult to pass through as it is essentially single file traffic. There is no information within the plan which states where access to this site would be located, the roads mentioned previously are the only roads that could be used as access and none of these are suitable. During peak times this is even more difficult. Adding this much traffic to the area is also going to affect the main routes in Coalville, as well as the routes to major roads such as the M1 and A42, negatively impacting surrounding towns and villages such as Shepshed and Hugglescote.</p> <p>-There would be a huge negative impact on current wildlife living in the area. I regularly spot bats, owls, buzzards, deer, newts, badgers, rabbits and pheasants. Building on this land would hugely impact these animals and their habitats, I don't believe that the usual 'work around' of adding bird boxes onto a housing estate is a suitable solution either.</p> <p>-In the local area there is already a lack of dentists and doctors. Increasing the population will only have a detrimental effect and these facilities would need to be considered in proposed plans.</p> <p>-There is also going to be a massive increase for the need of schools, childcare facilities and public transport. Improving the public transport in the area is nearly impossible, the current bus services all struggle with getting through the village as is due to cars being parked on roads and traffic.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
556	Christine	Jarmin	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick (cont)	<p>On the day of writing this the air pollution has been measured as UNHEALTHY. Building 500 properties will only increase air pollution not only through the added cars but also the process of actually building and developing the site.</p> <p>-This area was not on previous plan (2011 to 2031) where 9620 dwellings were needed in the area without using greenbelt land. There are to be 3500 dwellings built in south Coalville and as stated in this plan only 1,900 are expected to be completed before 2031. Prioritising building these will take away the need for more housing in the area. At the time, in item 7.9 2011 - 2031 plan, it states only 600 more dwellings would be required. The new plan has increased massively with this site alone having 500 and then slightly further up having another 283.</p> <p>-Around LE67 there are plenty of brownfield sites that are not being utilised first or even considered. These areas of land would be much more suitable than taking away greenbelt land for development.</p> <p>-There is a stream running through middle of planned site which has been known to flood in the past.</p> <p>-There are many mine shafts around the planned area which should be taken into consideration.</p> <p>-The plans state public rights of way will be kept as well as current tree-lines and hedgerows. This would need clarification as many of the public footpaths are through the middle of where the developments would be as are the hedgerows and trees. Whitwick is specifically travelled too BECAUSE of the local rambling sites and the village's history. This would have an effect of the amount of tourists we receive to view our beautiful countryside. People here specifically live here for the location and the views locally available. Plenty of dog owners and dog walkers use this site everyday.</p>
557	Sheila	Dakin	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	<p>NO to Isley Woodhouse Development on grounds of flooding. Diseworth brook is already heavily used to release water from balancing ponds. Force of water flow is eroding brook banks in our fields and damaging the Sheepwash. Diseworth is in a basin! More floods now than in all 55 years I have lived here. Diseworth is hugely affected by the airport. No more!</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
558	Elizabeth	Barham	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	<p>Changes to the original plan to maintain an area of separation between Coalville and Whitwick should be kept. Green spaces are necessary in large conurbations, to enhance the well being of the existing residents where nature can be natural and everyone can experience nature without having to travel in polluting vehicles to experience it. Plans to build 266 houses on this plot are un-necessary, a safety hazard and environmentally counter productive. The land currently floods throughout the winter, building more housing will cause more flooding in the area. The loss of habitat is detrimental to the wider population, the visual aspect will be destroyed along with the biodiversity of the area. The proposal for this houses has a plan for access from Stephenson Way, this will be too close to the existing traffic lights at the junction of Broom Leys Road and Stephenson Way. The A511 is a major route from the M1 and A42, it has major congestion times every day. With the stop start of the existing junction the air pollution is already high, having another junction so close would be extremely harmful for us as local residents, not to mention the increased noise and possibility for even more accidents. An access to this housing proposal is also planned for Broom Leys Road. This is directly opposite to another right turn from Broom Leys Road to Buckingham Road. This would be extremely dangerous! Broom Leys Road is another major route to the M1 for emergency vehicles, as well as bus route and busy road because of the schools and hospital. To add another housing estate entrance to this route is HAZARDOUS, there will be a serious accident on Broom Leys Road if this happens. Additionally, having two access points to this housing development will add a 'rat run' from Stephenson Way and Broom Leys Road - how dangerous!</p> <p>The area around this proposal will not be able to support new residents; the local doctors are already over-run, Broom Leys Primary School is over subscribed and the jobs would be out of Coalville, public transport is poor and well as the wider infrastructure. The local plan should develop brown spaces to support the existing residents rather than ruining the Green spaces that we still have.</p> <p>This would be a very poor decision for the local authority to build on Broom Leys Farm!</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
559	Stephen	Foxall	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	Development Reference C47, C77, C78, C86, C81. This development would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity and local wildlife with increased pressure on an already strained infrastructure i.e. full doctors, dentist and schools. The removal of these large areas of green space would not be conducive to the mental health of local people. The local area is becoming over developed and this would increase traffic generation to an already crumbling road network with higher levels of pollution in an area that already suffers from poor air quality standards.
560	Ann	Hughes	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	I object strongly to any further development of this junction for the following reasons: a) The A444 is a rural A road which dissects a number of villages, including Overseal. It is a single carriageway road with houses and businesses having full direct access, many houses relying on on-road parking, increasing numbers of side roads to access new housing developments, and with residents needing to cross the road for access to the school, shops, church, pub etc. b) the road is already very busy and we have seen an increase in HGV traffic since Mercia Park opened and a further significant increase since another logistic site opened in Swadlincote. As residents living on the A444 we are suffering from 24/7 noise, vibrations and pollution from the huge numbers of large HGV vehicles. The condition of the road surface is also deteriorating due to the overuse and as there is a history of sink holes opening up in the area we fear that it will not be long before another large void suddenly appears in the road, with potentially fatal consequences. This road cannot take any additional HGV traffic. c) We were told that Mercia Park traffic would not use the A444, but it clearly is. This type of traffic should be restricted to motorways and nationally managed strategic routes.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
561	Steven	Sharpe	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	I am very concerned by this proposal. I live in Overseal where we have a main A road running through the village . The A444 has now become a truckers freeway 24 hours a day that has become a complete nightmare for residents living alongside the A444. Please do not allow anymore infrastructure to be built here that generates HGV movements along the A444. Overseal has had enough . Any future development at the Mercia park site should have the exits for the HGVs to be straight onto the A/M42 . People who live alongside the A444 are beginning to suffer health issues due to lack of sleep and also school children are asking to be driven to school because they are afraid to cross or walk alongside the A444. It really is that bad .
562	Emma	Peachey	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	Absolutely object to this proposal mainly on the grounds of transport - traffic through ibstock is often stand sill and parking is quite dangerous. The village can't cope with any more adding to it. Those fields provide health and well-being for many people who enjoy living in a rural area and don't want villages merging and large towns being created. The noise, disruption and risk associated with a new development - ruining wildlife and trees, hedges etc when we should be looking after our environment shows we have got our priorities wrong. We also do not need a new school in the area when we know we have schools that are not at capacity! As a governor of a local school I am aware that numbers of school intake in the area are low so building a new school and creating more travel carnage with that is not necessary.
563	Phillip	Hopkins	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	C46: Plans for this area suggest access either from Broom Leys Road or the A511. Has anyone considered that as part of the new A511 Growth Corridor plans, due to commence 2025, a right turn onto Broom Leys Rd (Westbound) is to be removed. This means all traffic accessing Forest Rd / London Rd / Long Lane will be required to pass through Coalville. Add 266 homes and this problem will become more acute.
563	Phillip	Hopkins	n/a	C48 South of Church Lane	C48: In addition to the loss of countryside, without the addition of a new traffic island (unilkely) access via Spring and / or Thornborough Rd is going to make any new junction a traffic nigtmare. Has the proposed upgrade to Thornborough Rd roundabout taken into considertaion the proposed increaed traffic flows from both this C48 and the plans for "West Whitwick" (C47/77/78/86/81)?

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
563	Phillip	Hopkins	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	C47/77/78/86/81. West Whitwick 500 Homes. It is good to read that rigorous controls are to be put in place to ensure that promoters work collaboratively and a comprehensive masterplan is established. Also that the area is only identified as a Broad Location for Growth. That said I fail to see how any large-scale development could possibly access the adopted road network, being bound and constrained by Talbot Lane, Redhill Lane and Church Lane without making the traffic flow in and around Whitwick and Thringstone a future living nightmare for existing residents. Also the topography of parcel C77 in particular is highly unlikely to make it attractive for development. the loss of open countryside is not welcomed. I do not agree that the land proposed as " West Whitwick" identified only as a "broad location for growth" should be included in the Limits to Development area.
563	Phillip	Hopkins	n/a	Limits to Development (other)	Your map illustrations of the areas affected are ludicrously hard to decipher, giving no points of reference (road names/ landmarks). This is very misleading and does not invite comment by the Public.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
564	Michelle	McNally	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	Having recently moved to the area from Tamworth the reason for moving was because of the over development of Tamworth which caused over population, local flooding, road damage & traffic increase in a lovely area facing woodland due to housing being build on flood plains & fields. The village of Whitwick & even the surrounding areas of Thringstone, Coleville were a delight to move to... green fields, historic villages full of history & residents that have lived here many years was what attracted us to this lovely area. Our property directly faces the proposed sight- at present our view is fields with housing just visible at the top of the hill- unspoilt views which is full of wildlife. Since moving here for the first time we have seen falcons, herons, pheasants, owls which many people never get to see in their lifetime in the wild. By building houses in this area will deter this wildlife from the area. Traffic noise & speeding is already an issue on Talbot Lane - this will increase with the housing proposal, pollution, noise, more strain on public services - GP's which at present provide an exceptional service at Whitwick Health Centre will be our under pressure, schools will not be able to provide for all families in the new housing areas, traffic will cause disruption, road wear & tear & public noise & disruption from more families in the area. Why spoil this area? Greed? I understand the need for housing but why build on this site? It will be a complicated build due to the hillside = local flooding which is already an issue in the area.
565	mark	payne	n/a	AP2 Amenity	AP2 Sensible. Investment from the companies developing land around and in Kegworth would be welcome. Playgrounds, sports facilities, pedestrian crossings and a larger school would all help.
565	mark	payne	n/a	AP8 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems	AP8 local streams are polluted by run off from an overloaded water treatment plant - or other sewage related problem.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
565	mark	payne	n/a	H8 Houses in Multiple Occupation in Kegworth	Policy H8 HMO in Kegworth The threshold of so many HMOs in a street etc is misleading. Kegworth is not a town - the village is small enough that the number of HMOs has an impact no matter whereabouts in the village they are. I'd like to see the village considered as a whole, rather than a limit set for individual streets. It is difficult for local people to purchase property as much is snapped up by prospective landlords for short term lets, rather than being available for families. Infrastructure has not been improved in the area, and this compounds the issues
565	mark	payne	n/a	IF2 Community Facilities	Facilities in the village [Kegworth] have been taken over by volunteers. this is to avoid them disappearing altogether. Pubs and independent shops have disappeared, businesses being replaced by accommodation usually. The removal of public toilets has impacted many residents - particularly the elderly. This has increased the risk of isolation in the village.
566	Emma	Pearson	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	The development is disproportionate to the needs of the local area. Whitwick in the 2021 census had a population of 10,451 people. The plan to build 500 new houses would increase this dramatically. There is no local need for this size of development. Therefore the proposed development is over-bearing, out-of-scale and would be out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity. Not only would the loss of existing views from neighbouring properties be adversely affected, the loss of countryside to the west of Whitwick would be devastating to wildlife habitats and the local environment. Therefore, the visual impact of the development would be too severe. Whitwick and Coalville have always enjoyed a green space between them, this development would ultimately destroy this, which would not benefit the local community.
567	Gary	Webb	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	Ibstock/ Leicester Road are already unable to cope with the traffic from the developments that have already taken place and there already issues with speeding traffic and noise for the people that live along them.
567	Gary	Webb	n/a	E7 Midland Rd Ellistown	Midland Road is already a heavy traffic area,also the village of Ellistown has already lost enough green areas and wildlife habitat.
567	Gary	Webb	n/a	EMP24 Midland Rd Ellistown	There is already too much heavy traffic on Midland road,the village cannot afford to loose another green area to industrial units.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
568	Mark	Peachey	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	The development proposal fails to take into account the already congested Leicester Road. Turning out of Victoria Road and surrounding streets is already a challenge with the amount of traffic on Leicester Road. During Peak times there are always traffic jams from the coop back to Ibstock brick. With the building of the new Aldi store opposite the Amazon site, these proposed 450 new houses (with potentially an extra 1000 cars) will all flood onto the Leicester Road for cheaper groceries making Leicester Road gridlocked. The fields that are here are relied upon by the local wildlife, and the residents who currently live here for it's village feel, and do not wish for it to be swallowed up and merged with nearby Ravenstone and Ellistown. It will lose it's identity, which as an ex-mining community is vitally important to its residents. Finally the Ibstock Junior school is not at capacity, yet a new primary school is being proposed. St Deny's infants and Ibstock Junior School do not need to be diluted by merging villages together and adding more schools, when the current ones that are working well are not at capacity.
569	Phil	Ellis	n/a	C48 South of Church Lane	Object in principle to loss of agricultural land - we need food on tables as well as roofs over heads. However, if developed the opportunity should be taken to mitigate existing school traffic problems with turning area/parking spaces on Church Lane; suggest traffic signals will also be required at Spring Lane/Thornborough Road junction given visibility problems.
569	Phil	Ellis	n/a	En3 The National Forest	En3 - National Forest tourism policies should continue to apply to the Fishing Lakes site off Spring Lane, Swannington - these units should not become for residential occupation to help meet housing targets.
569	Phil	Ellis	n/a	En5 Area of Separation	En5 If land to South of Church Lane, Whitwick is developed, the remaining buffer up to the Incline should be designated as an area of separation between Whitwick and Swannington.
570	Gaynor	Armston	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	I object to these proposals because 1) it will destroy wildlife habitats 2) unclear information on infrastructure (entry and exit points) eg doctors, dentists, schools, 3) flooding regularly happens during heavy rain so houses will make flooding occur more often, 4) extra traffic on already clogged roads, 5) removing Whitwick's village status.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
571	Emma	Harris	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd lbstock	<p>The road is already significantly over capacity with traffic. There is a speed issue and 3 accidents occurred in 1 week though the summer of last year due to speed. I raised this with the council who practically insinuated that without a serious incident they would not look into it further. There are no crossings by the park. Residents park on the road by the park meaning children and families are crossing between parked cars with buses, HGV and a heavy amount of traffic on the road. We regularly have speeding vans on the road which in itself tells the council that there is an issue with speed. The thru road will not reduce this and will increase traffic as no one on this side of the development will drive towards sence valley to go to Hinckley. Schools are already at capacity with lbstock college trying to extend to accommodate children within the village. The roundabout in ellistown is dangerous with the entrance and exit of the petrol station. The location is poor with the roundabout and zebra crossings, additional traffic towards the M1 will be horrendous. The doctors surgery, even with the extension is poor and so is the location on a tight narrow road with a serious lack of parking and it is used as a cut thru to get to the top end of the village ie Leicester road. We do not have a dentist, the library is non existent, public buses are poor. Basically the infrastructure is totally lacking and adding 450 houses is a very poor decision. Although I appreciate the council tax would help the councils debt!</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
571	Emma	Harris	n/a	E7 Midland Rd Ellistown	The road is already significantly over capacity with traffic. There is a speed issue and 3 accidents occurred in 1 week though the summer of last year due to speed. I raised this with the council who practically insinuated that without a serious incident they would not look into it further. There are no crossings by the park. Residents park on the road by the park meaning children and families are crossing between parked cars with buses, HGV and a heavy amount of traffic on the road. We regularly have speeding vans on the road which in itself tells the council that there is an issue with speed. The thru road will not reduce this and will increase traffic as no one on this side of the development will drive towards sence valley to go to Hinckley. Schools are already at capacity with ibstock college trying to extend to accommodate children within the village. The roundabout in ellistown is dangerous with the entrance and exit of the petrol station. The location is poor with the roundabout and zebra crossings, additional traffic towards the M1 will be horrendous. The doctors surgery, even with the extension is poor and so is the location on a tight narrow road with a serious lack of parking and it is used as a cut thru to get to the top end of the village ie Leicester road. We do not have a dentist, the library is non existent, public buses are poor. Basically the infrastructure is totally lacking and adding 450 houses is a very poor decision. Although I appreciate the council tax would help the councils debt!
571	Emma	Harris	n/a	EMP24 Midland Rd Ellistown	The roundabout with the otero station on the corner is dangerous

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
572	Joyce	Black	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	If Whitwick is designated as the Urban District of Coalville it will no longer be treated as a village in terms of planning decisions. I do not agree with this designation. The housing proposals as indicated above will totally devastate the beautiful area in which I live, irretrievably destroy the community as we know it. Furthermore, it will increase traffic on the local roads and do much damage to much of the local wildlife in the surrounding area. Increasing the housing footprint will also put the local infrasture under greater stress, making it more difficult to access local medical services, schools of choice etc. There are other brown sites within NWL which would be more appropriate for building as much of the utility services are already in place and would make better use of vacant land. The housing proposals as indicated above will totally devastate the beautiful area in which I live, irretrievably destroy the community as we know it. Furthermore, it will increase traffic on the local roads and do much damage to much of the local wildlife in the surrounding area.
573	E A	Wells	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	Surrounding roads are far too busy for c500 extra dwellings and the vehicles that will mean. With no bus service and the pressure on doctors and other infrastructure this should not be allowed to be part of the local plan.
574	K A	Wells	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	Talbot Lane is already dangerous due to the speed and amount of traffic and the lack of a pavement to allow us to walk to whitwick and there is no bus service to the centre of Whitwick. The local infrastructure is already overloaded and so this proposal shoud not be included in the local plan.
575	Nicola	Pickering	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	I think that this is worse think that could happen in this area for the wildlife . Also the infrastructure is not in place doctors schools are already struggling
576	Kathleen	Ingall	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	This p[roposal will totally devastate the beautiful area in which I live, irretrievably destroy our community as we know it, clog up our roads, kill off all current wildlife and make it EVEN MORE DIFFICULT TO ACCESS MEDICAL SERVICES, SCHOOLS OF CHOICE, IT WILL CERTAINLY OVERWHELM OUR LOCAL HOSPITAL AND TOTALLY WIPE OUT ANY HOPE OF POLICING IN OUR AREA. [sic] SPITAL

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
577	Richard	Pickering	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	My objection is the impact on the area wildlife , traffic and the community. There is already not enough doctors and schools
578	Ronald	Ingall	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	Devastate our beautiful area. Destroy our local community. Totally clog up our country lanes and roads, Wipe out all the wildlife in our vicinity. Medical services will be overwhelmed with new patients making appointments even more difficult and all the local schools with be bursting at the seams.
578	Ronald	Ingall	n/a	AP7 Flood Risk	Building on all our Green Spaces - Chances of major flooding in the area more likely
579	Matthew	Turner	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	I do not believe this area is suitable for a housing development, access to this area is extremely limited and North street, Brooks lane, Talbot street and Talbot lane are all extremely busy roads, especially at peak times. I know for a fact that the area of c77 and c47 flood on a regular basis. There is a small brook running through c77 which I was given to believe was a conservation nature area and I have seen loads off amphibious species there including newts last summer. I understand that houses need to be built but as a local beauty spot and natural habitat this seems like it should be thoroughly researched before any development plan are made.
580	Karl	Pigott	n/a	Chapter 4 Housing Allocations	I don't agree with building houses on agricultural land you should be building on brown field sites.which already have existing infrastructures.I don't know who decides on your policies but they obviously do not live in the area or care about the environment or wildlife.
580	Karl	Pigott	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	You are proposing a spiralling mass of housing that will destroy individual villages, farmland and increase flooding and pollution.
580	Karl	Pigott	n/a	CD10 Park Lane Castle Donington	You have already extended a small town without extending suitable facilities.
580	Karl	Pigott	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd lbstock	The type development you propose does not provide a level of employment in proportion to the land being used.
580	Karl	Pigott	n/a	Chapter 5 Employment Allocations	You should only develop ares for manufacturing which increases employment not warehousing which has minimal employment.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
580	Karl	Pigott	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	I suggest that businesses work smarter not bigger warehousing is not a productive use of farmland.
580	Karl	Pigott	n/a	H1 Housing Strategy	I don't agree with building houses on agricultural land you should be building on brown field sites. which already have existing infrastructures. I don't know who decides on your policies but they obviously do not live in the area or care about the environment or wildlife. This is a small village separated from other villages by farmland and should not be built on. We need our farmers to make this country self sufficient in supplying food to stop expensive importation.
580	Karl	Pigott	n/a	Ec1 Economic Strategy	You should only develop ares for manufacturing which increases employment not warehousing which has minimal employment.
580	Karl	Pigott	n/a	IF5 Transport Infrastructure and New Development	The increased traffic would destroy the local environment increase pollution and detrimental to local wildlife.
580	Karl	Pigott	n/a	En1 Nature Conservation / Biodiversity Net Gain	Your policies don't consider the local wellbeing of the residents or wildlife only the businesses who want to make money out of developing the area. If you carry on like this we won't have any rural environments left.
581	Kathleen	Pigott	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	By law, Brown field sites should be used up first before building houses on green fields. Diseworth floods regularly as it is, building on the fields surrounding the village is only going to make this worse.
581	Kathleen	Pigott	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	The type of development planned, and the number of people employed is not in proportion to the amount of farm land you will be destroying

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
581	Kathleen	Pigott	n/a	S1 Future Housing and Economic Development Needs	I totally object to using the country side surrounding our village for warehouses and housing. This will destroy our village ,
581	Kathleen	Pigott	n/a	H1 Housing Strategy	There are lots of brown field land that would be better environmentally than using green field sites. Houses should not be built on green field sites when brown field sites are available. The affect these developments would have on the village would be disastrous. You need to review your polices regarding the environment and our wildlife.
581	Kathleen	Pigott	n/a	IF5 Transport Infrastructure and New Development	The traffic would be greatly increased. This would create a lot of air pollution which in turn would affect the residents and also the local wildlife.
581	Kathleen	Pigott	n/a	En1 Nature Conservation / Biodiversity Net Gain	The environment would be very much affected. With lots more traffic. This would also affect the wildlife, and mental and physical health of the residents who can at the moment walk in the country lanes to see the birds and wild life, farm animals etc.
582	Emma	Goode	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	Development in these areas would add a large detrimental effect to the local area. The land is rich with wildlife and is a much needed area for different species. The brook going through the land is teaming with different species. This is also a really popular area for walking and I have actively spoken to people walking in this area around the swannington incline who have travelled from afar to walk here. These walkers spend money in local businesses. The other issue is that there is not the infrastructure to support this amount of housing in both Whitwick and Thringstone. Already there is large waiting times at the doctor's and the bus route keeps getting reduced. Spaces in the local primary schools is already at a premium and there is only the Castle rock school complex for the secondary pupils. With the land behind a brooks Lane also being quite inclined, large amounts would need to be spent on infrastructure and the brook already floods in high rain and the land gets overly waterlogged. Removing the grass for concrete would increase this problem.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
583	Nicola	Coleman	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd lbstock	Opposed to having more greenery lost and more people in the village. More pressure on local services like shops, doctors etc. Busier roads, more traffic, more litter.
584	Stephen	Alderson	n/a	Chapter 4 Housing Allocations	Think Coalville and the surrounding areas particularly Hugglescote has been subject to a huge amount of development and it should be spread over the region more fairly.
584	Stephen	Alderson	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd lbstock	Again lbstock has been subject to a huge amount of development and it needs to be spread around the region more fairly
584	Stephen	Alderson	n/a	R12 Heather Lane Ravenstone	Again this is concentrating build development in the Coalville area which has really been overdeveloped compared to other areas.
584	Stephen	Alderson	n/a	EMP24 Midland Rd Ellistown	This development will be close to residential areas and as industrial areas can operate 24 hours a day 7days a week this the wrong place for it.
585	J	Lewis	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	My main concerns to this very large development are: That is is taking away a large part of our beautiful countryside and natures habitats that resides here. This development would have a huge impact on the character of our village and landscape. Plus the history of the area. The significant increase in traffic that a development of this size would bring to our road and surrounding smaller roads that are already very busy would be bad. Including access to such a vast development. I also feel that our local amenities are not sufficient. Whitwick is a beautiful village, a part of the National Forest that would be ruined by such a huge development.
586	Gail	Alderson	n/a	Chapter 4 Housing Allocations	Coalville and surrounding area particularly Hugglescote has been over developed . Compared to some of the surrounding villages. Developers should be made to put in all the facilities that they promise from the start. Hugglescote was promised a school doctors shops and nursery which have not materialise. Spread the building more fairly in stead of saturating the same area's.
586	Gail	Alderson	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd lbstock	lbstock has been over developed. This is going to take away all the wildlife leading down to Kelham Bridge nature reserve. And spoil the surrounding area of the park.
586	Gail	Alderson	n/a	R12 Heather Lane Ravenstone	Again Coalville area as had more than it fair share of over development. Needs to be spread around more fairly.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
586	Gail	Alderson	n/a	EMP24 Midland Rd Ellistown	To built a industrial estate where residential houses are is shameful .The traffic on this road is very busy now . And it will mean more traffic going through Hugglescote crossroads and Coalville .Some of these businesses will be operating 24 hours a day . It is shameful that you are thinking of putting an industrial estate around residential houses. These roads in the surrounding area will not cope with the amount of traffic . There is plenty of units standing empty.
587	Barry	Beniston	n/a	C48 South of Church Lane	Main concerns regarding development of fields behind Thornborough Road- Fields are prone to flooding causing back gardens to be flooded. Neighbours have had to use pumps to keep water away from properties. This has happened a number of times this winter. Building on this land will cause the problem to worsen. Local roads are already clogged up with traffic at certain times of the day the added volume will bring it to a standstill. Local schools are already at capacity and wouldn't cope with the influx of children this development would bring. Loss of habitat to wildlife.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
588	Lisa	Webster	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	I object to the housing development in the area of Whitwick/ New Swannington. I question whether the need for the amount of accommodation is out of date, whether it is a Government projected housing estimate. Having experience of being actually in the community, people cannot afford to buy houses, they cannot afford to buy houses to rent and cannot afford to rent! The current rental is £900 a month, where an average person is suppose to be on £38,000 a year. This is not the case in this area, as many people have more than one job and cannot afford to leave their partner. There are empty houses in the area and therefore the houses will not be filled. The infastructure in the area is not sufficient, there are not enough primary spaces and certainly not enough secondary spaces. Most people cannot get a doctors appointment or dentist appointment. The children are the ones that will suffer, as the parents cannot afford the leisure centre prices and therefore rely on empty grassland to be able to play on! This will also become worse in April with the idea of 2 year old funding, as this will lead to pre-schools and nurseries closing. All of this is a lack of understanding by the Government! The animal population, of which in this area there are:- toads, frogs, badgers, foxes, squirrels, hedgehogs, newts and bats have all been seen in the area which will obviously be unhoused. There is also the drainage in the area that has cost a lot of money to put right around Howe Road. I feel that this decision has been made without a thorough understanding of the area and the people.
589	Russell	Mosedale	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd lbstock	There have been 4 big houses estates been made since we been here 11 years ! The roads are not suited for more traffic, sewage cannot take anymore houses! We have many roads with pot holes and cars parking all over the place! The Doctors cannot cope with more residents it's take 3-4 weeks to get appointment it's not necessary for the residents of lbstock to be dumped on again! Enough is enough!

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
590	Simon	Bailey	n/a	Chapter 4 Housing Allocations	<p>I strongly object to the local housing allocation proposals. These open spaces are important recreational assets to local residents and are vital to the health and well-being of the local community. They house woodland & wildlife such as badgers, bats, foxes and newts I feel that the Council should be looking to protect these areas which help maintain the eco-logical balance of nature. These pockets of Green Space are demising at a rapid rate within Coalville and the surrounding villages causing flooding and the Council should be doing more to address this. Local services are already stretched, primary school spaces are limited with siblings having to attend different schools, whilst secondary schools are already fully attended with the likes of Newbridge High School having to build extra classrooms to cope with current demand. People cannot get doctors appointments and NHS dental care is scarce with children being unable to register. I accept that sites like the old Hermitage Leisure Centre and 'The Oak' public house site are in need of regeneration and housing would be appropriate but I feel that sites with dwellings in excess 250 dwellings are not needed. Mortgage rates are at their highest since 1998 and with the cost of living, large residences are not affordable for local people as salaries in the area are below the national average with some having to work more than 1 job just to get by with many others having to rely in food banks. We are already seeing local road networks congested and the number of cars parked on roadsides is becoming dangerous. The main access roads are particularly bad to Coalville eg Hermitage Road, Brooks Land and Thornborough Road. Loughborough Road Whitwick is also already very unsafe at school times.</p>
591	Jessica	Curtis	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	<p>Additional housing in this area will put significant strain on the local road networks, which already struggle to cope. Loss of habitat for local wildlife, muntjac deer often seen in the area. Loss of food producing farmland. Massive strain on services including the primary school which my daughter attends and my sons will also attend. Impact upon local secondary schools too. Strain on other services such as medical. None of these services have been invested in to cope with such a huge amount of housing. This area is semi rural, beautiful and just cannot cope with additional housing and people. Many areas of the land are prone to flooding</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
592	Stephen	Barham	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	<p>Why had this plan be tabled yet again as has been several times in the past and already declined. You are wasting peoples time in even bringing this to the point it is at. As you already know:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is part of the previous 'Green wedge' of land that seperates one of the largest villages in the UK, Whitwick and the urban area of Coalville Town. It has already been agreed and voted on the development of housing in this area will create a sprawling house mass, merging Whitwick and Coalville. Therefore, as above, why are you tabling this again? The situation has not changed from the past application. This a waste of peoples time to prepare the same responses and not correctly representing the area, that we pay you for with our taxes. - As you are aware, the Stephenson Way/Broom Leys Road road junction is lethal already, with a constant stream of dangerous accidents occuring typically on a monthly basis. Thus in part is due to the poor design and lack of consideration for the amount of area needed to construct a safe junction. This goes back to failures of the original planning and improvements to the Stephenson Way bypass, that were never correctly considered nor designed correctly. - Due to the existing dangerous state of the design and layout of the existing Stephenson Way/Broom Leys Road junction and the heavy traffic throughfare including a majojor trunk route for companies such as, McVities, Bardon, Morrisons, Tescos, many of the growing Bardon Industrial Estate, to even considering adding a further junction between the existing foot bridge and the traffic lights, beggers belief. Again, I sit here wondering why I even need to write this reply and the integrity of our District Council and councillors. - Broom Leys Primary school is one, if not the latgest, primary school in Leicestershire and the UK, in terms of students. It is already far to big to provide the environment to guarantee a successful education for students of such a young age and vulnerability to such a large group of school 'Children'. It would therefore be ridiculous to build further houses in this catchment area, to further disadvantaging the future sussession of our next generation, by over capacity at the school.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
592	Stephen	Barham	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville(cont)	<p>There has already been major developments in the close vicinity including Forest Lea/Buckingham Road Estate, Botts Hollow Estate, Long Lane estate, the estate to the West/rear of Bardon Road and the top of Greenhill Road. Surely there has been enough development in close vicinity and therefore again, we question why this proposal has even got to this stage, wasting peoples time to respond.</p> <p>- If you lived on Broom Leys Road, you would know that the road and the fields associated with this proposal are subject to continual flooding whenever there is any heavy rain. Therefore again, we question why this proposal has even got to this stage, wasting peoples time to respond.</p> <p>- If you lived on Broom Leys Road, you would know that the road congestion, for what is a residential area, or was until past developments have already been past, is not fit for purpose for the current development capacity. Let alone adding more congestion, with housing and a further two road junctions, which will lead to more congestion, and more importantly, danger to pedestrians and cyclists. I thought we were meant to be working towards Nett Zero in 2050 and encouraging more pedestrians and cyclists? It is already very dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists on the pavements of Broom Leys Road, when it is a daily occurrence where both are put at risk due to the volume and speed of traffic. This high volume of traffic is at such a state now that all cyclists ride on the paths rather than on the road where they should be. At some point there is sure to be either injury or fatality due to the differentiation of speed of cyclists on paths, traversing the end of residents drive ways. The traffic needs to be reduced, not increased by more housing.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
593	Karen	Oliff	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse EMP90 Land south of East Midlands Airport (Freeport)	<p>My response relates to both Policy EMP90 (the EMA / SEGRO industrial / warehousing development to the East of Diseworth) and IW1 (Isley Woodhouse new settlement to the West of Diseworth). I wish to oppose the local planning proposals for the Freeport site at Isley Walton. This will have major impact on our community and village. This rural community was the reason I moved here 24 years ago. It's a wildlife haven for all various species of animals and plants. Building a new town will devastate our community. The roads already in the area are becoming busier with the airport and the traffic congestion is already a problem. I can often smell and taste the pollution from the airport. We really don't need any more traffic to pollute the lungs of Diseworth. We already have to contend with our lay-bys on the entrance to our village being littered and occupied with non residents vehicles which use them as car parks because the airport is a no waiting zone. Our village is disrespected in many ways and now even more so with these proposals afoot. The roads in the area will not cope with this additional load. When download was on in the Summer it took me 2 hours to get to my front door from work along the A42. This event was given no thought and money and greed from businesses in the area were the only people that benefited (Melbourne Hall to name one). Diseworth got nothing! Adding more concrete will increase flooding risks. The new village farm should have never gotten planning in many people's options as this increased flooding because the water from the fields had nowhere to go. Building more concrete will increase the flooding in our village. There are many more sites that lend themselves to this type of development Diseworth is not it! The roads and infrastructure cannot cope. This development will devastate our landscape and be harmful to future generations to come. Mental health and wellbeing is important to our communities and children. Any such development will impact this massively. The countryside walks and farmland will be destroyed. SEGRO will be a blot on our beautiful landscape. The A453 from Nottingham is a much better sight for this development where it doesn't impact residential areas. Please spare our beautiful countryside and the village we have lived and raised our children. NWLDC's proposals for these developments conflict starkly with other laudable policies in the DLP which promote well-being, caring for the countryside, flooding, pollution, air quality, climate change, sustainability, employment, heritage and more. One of my prime concerns is that, for planning purposes, these developments should NOT be seen in isolation from each other.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
593	Karen	Oliff	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse EMP90 Land south of East Midlands Airport (Freeport) (cont)	<p>The cumulative effect on Diseworth of so many factors from multiple directions (including loss of wildlife habitat and rural landscape, air quality, light, noise, flooding, mental and physical health, traffic and more) must be viewed holistically. The 'Green Lungs' around Diseworth are threatened with being lost forever. It seems to me that both the EMP90 and IW1 developments are driven by Freeport Designation of our Area. As NWLDC is represented on the Freeport Board, how can you persuade me that your apparent support for both of these developments is not being pushed on to you by Central Government? If NWL had not been designated as a Freeport Zone, would you still be supporting the inclusion of these development proposals in the Draft Local Plan? I am also concerned about the 'reach' of the Freeport designation. Where is the joined-up thinking of the three counties of Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire? Why does NW Leics (and particularly Diseworth) appear to be bearing the brunt of this? And may I ask about the "levelling up" justification of the Freeport designation of our area? I understand that NW Leics has some of the "highest levels of employment in the UK, with 1.2 jobs for every person of working age" (quoting from our MP). How does that qualify?!</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
594	Vicky	Saunders	n/a	H8 Houses in Multiple Occupation in Kegworth	<p>We desperately need the amount of HMO's halting in our village of Kegworth and the new proposals will hopefully go towards this. We are a small Village, in the countryside and with employment opportunities locally. We should be a village predominantly aiming for residents to be families, either renting through local authority, renting privately or buying. We have far too many HMO's in existence already and this needs curbing asap. We are not a University Village, we are not in the same county as Nottingham University and we should not be subject to landlords buying properties here with a view to leasing to students, purely because property is cheaper than other surrounding villages. This pushes out others, including families who need to move here to be near extended family, for childcare, for employment, for schools and for a nice peaceful family life. This same reasoning applies to older couples who are priced out of the village but again need to be here to be closer to their family who may need to care for them as they age. There are too many large pockets of HMO's in the Village of Kegworth and when renters in these properties are students it means they receive the same benefits as other residents but without paying council tax. The landlords are exempt. This is grossly unfair on others in a small Village. We have pockets of hmo's, a large proportion for a small Village. This is not in line with community spirit and the council needs more empathy with permanent residents. We will only be able to apply the new proposal re hmo's if we have a definitive list of where they are. We have 3 bed properties which house 4 students, these fall under the radar and means we have many more hmo's than registered. We have planning applications for too many extensions, meaning that if these properties are ever sold on, they are out of the realm of family housing as they will be far too big and expensive for families to buy. Parking is an absolutely horrendous situation in Kegworth and I welcome the new proposals for the houses to only be turned into HMO's if they can house as many cars as residents. We have been advised in the past that due to many students being vet students, they need cars for their placements, We then have a situation where a 3 bed family home houses 5 students with a car each, on very narrow old streets not designed for so many vehicles (Kegworth is a historic village). This is grossly unfair on permanent residents. Parking becomes very dangerous and unfortunately many students park extremely inconsiderate and dangerously, wrapping around corners, on pavements etc. This makes life for pedestrians, disabled people, the elderly, families with young children, prams etc very dangerous and frustrating. This is seen constantly lately on the corner of Sutton Road and Thomas Road but in many pockets of the village. We need an up to date, thorough survey of where hmos are and this needs to include all hmo's, not just 5 plus beds or the new necessary proposals will not work. The situation with landlords buying is desperate and we have clusters, too many in close proximity which affects community life and having a run of hmo's together. On Shepherd Walk, Thomas Road, Kirby Drive, Sutton Road we have at least 12 and Kirby Drive isn't listed on your most up to date data. We need our Village to be a diverse village. not a student village</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
595	Angela	Tredwell	n/a	C48 South of Church Lane	We live on a busy road where every available green space has been built on. These plans will kill the village and take the only green fields left to us. Ancient Whitwick will become overdeveloped Ibstock.
596	Mark	Short	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	I am concerned that the new housing at "Land of Leicester Road" may result in extra traffic through the existing Bakers Croft housing estate. This concern is based upon the mention in the plan of a "Potential second access on to Melbourne Road (A447)". I am also concerned about the burden that the new housing will place on the local infrastructure, in particular transport and health services. The sections in the plan relating to infrastructure do not contain enough concrete actions to convince me that infrastructure capacity will be increased to handle the increase in population which the new housing would bring.
597	Sue	Bull	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	The A447 is a busy road. Speed limits not observed. It can take 10mins or more to access onto the road from Frances Way/Sence Valley. 450 more homes will increase levels of traffic through village. If new road built across to Leicester road this will also increase traffic through to Ellistown where road already narrow. Is a new primary school necessary? Does existing school have spaces? If so how will this impact? There are no public transport links at this end of the village so increased reliance on private vehicles. Loss of habitat for birdlife including skylarks and owls. These fields flood so increased flooding risk. Increased light, noise pollution. Drs is at capacity. How will they cope with an increase of dwellings? Concern that roads through any development may link to Frances Way making a 'rat run'. The distinctive character of local villages will be lost as they become merged.
597	Sue	Bull	n/a	AP7 Flood Risk	Considering the level of existing flooding a flood risk assessment should be mandatory and not 'if required'.
597	Sue	Bull	n/a	H1 Housing Strategy	Not taking into account the impact of future development on existing communities and the need to keep the individual nature of villages. Extended development will make villages such as Ibstock and Ravenstone merge.
597	Sue	Bull	n/a	En1 Nature Conservation / Biodiversity Net Gain	Increasing development will have an impact on biodiversity, loss of habitats ant scheme to compensate for loss will not be as good as the lost environment.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
597	Sue	Bull	n/a	En3 The National Forest	Being in the heart of the National Forest development should be kept as an absolute minimum.
598	Laura	Kristiansen	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	This proposed settlement of 4500 houses is in a historic rural area of outstanding natural beauty. It is completely wrong to build a large settlement on beautiful countryside. Such a large development should be attached to an existing city environment where there are road links and public transport to support it. The roads in this area cannot support such an increase and there are not sufficient public transport links. The area is also on a hill and is known for flooding. If this proposal was to go ahead a substantial fund for flooding must be in place as you are increasing the risk by building on greenfield sites.
599	Trevor	Armston	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	I wish to object to the inclusion of Site C47, C77, C78, C86, C81 as building/development land in the NWLDC Local Plan for the following reasons. The site is completely unsuitable and would require considerable amounts of investment and expenditure for the development of the housing and infrastructure. The site sits within a valley with a stream that runs down to Talbot Lane with rolling hills caused by numerous amounts of ex coal mining activities which are still moving to this day. Flooding is a regular occurrence at the bottom of the site on Talbot Lane and I have plenty of videos showing this. Taking all the above into account, it would be highly unlikely that any commercial developer would take the whole site on due to the high build costs. Therefore, only Housing Associations would consider taking the site on for social housing with the help of government grants etc. Whitwick/Thringstone does not need any more large-scale social housing as it is already classed as a deprived area so development of this nature would only make things worse. At present, the site is designated as countryside having an abundance of wildlife owing to a stream running through the valley and with various habitats within the agricultural landscape. There are lots of footpaths, well used by people who appreciate being out in the countryside. All this will be lost if development goes ahead plus the loss of yet more farmland. Coalville and the surrounding villages are already struggling to cope with the amount of houses being built with little in the way of infrastructure ie schools, doctors dentist etc without all these new large scale proposals. Finally, the council must have considered where access points will be built so why haven't they put these forward..

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
600	Matthew	Tredwell	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	This is in reference to the Limits to Development, in regards to the Fields behind Brooks Lane and fields behind Thornborough Road. I am very strongly against this development. Whitwick is not an Urban Area of Coalville. I am disgusted at how all of Whitwick's green areas are being turned into housing developments. I haven't spoken to any residents who actually want more houses built in our village. This proposal is a disgrace.
601	Jake	Danvers	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	There will be no more green area left around here.the A511 backs up as it is with out added construction traffic and then hundreds of extras cars . You can't get a doctors appointment as it is let alone adding hundreds more people to the list .plus it will only push the flooding further out towards people houses .no one wants to live in a densely populated area it fine as it is else we end up like sardines in a tin
602	Christophe	Hughes	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	The A444 North of Junction 11 is already severely overloaded and cannot support any further freight traffic. Public transport in the area is almost completely non-existent, and would certainly not be sufficient to allow access from the villages between the A/M42 and Burton upon Trent to any potential employment opportunities within the new development.
603	Trevor Des	McNally	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	I am new to the area. The infrastructure of the local area will be overwhelmed and cause issues with roads, local flooding, damage to wildlife, overcrowding of the local villages, increase in anti social behaviour, pollution, increased demand on local GP surgeries, schools & disruption to the local area regarding increased noise, roads will need to be built through more green land & cause this beautiful local area to become an overcrowded 'town' no longer a village. Greed is what has meant this proposal has been put forward - with no thoughts to this historic area which has remain unspoilt until now.
604	graham	hibberd	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	I am concernd about the number of houses being built, that will ruin our beautiful village and outlook. Also the infrastructure needed to support this on an already overwhelmed road network, hospital, doctors and schools. I do not agree with the proposals, nor does my family.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
605	Mark	Jepson	n/a	EMP73 Derby Rd Kegworth EMP73 Remembrance Way Kegworth	<p>I am in agreement with the Kegworth Parish Council response to this proposal.</p> <p>I agree that at present, Kegworth has a distinct position slightly offset from the extensive transport connections from which we benefit. This is a very attractive part of living here - we have good connections and employment opportunities. However, some aspects of this are already intrusive e.g. the traffic flow through roads which are inappropriate (as indicated by restricted access to large vehicles - however badly followed) and the presence of air traffic. The inclusion of additional "employment" allocations to these land areas would add additional levels of traffic and would contribute to a lack of distinct character for our historic village. The village has a long history and contains at least 24 listed properties or features of interest which we work hard to preserve for future generations. Large industrial developments within our village will impact this protected character.</p> <p>Green space is of utmost importance for the mental well-being of people living in Kegworth. Access to local green space (public park space for example) is somewhat lacking at present and the outlook across the M1 for new housing proposals do not seem very appealing. Retaining the areas proposed for this development as open space, residence will at least be able to view fields and green spaces. Development of large scale industrial units here will adversely affect this ability and remove an important buffer between Kegworth and the busy road infrastructure.</p> <p>I also agree that this area is well-served locally for "employment" and this proposal therefore seems more driven to commercially serve potential industrial investors than to serve local residents. The easy access to road infrastructure and other transport links mean local residents have easy access to three local major cites (Derby, Nottingham, Leicester), nearby large towns (Long Eaton, Loughborough), all of which provide ample employment. Therefore, having additional "employment" is unnecessary.</p> <p>The local Parish Council also raise points about the aqueduct and the flood areas which would be prudent to note.</p> <p>However, in order to support further development of any industry which requires HGV access we must also include clear provisions to limit HGV access through the village, especially on Side Ley and Nottingham Road which are unsuitable for such vehicles as indicated by the 7.5 tonne limit which is widely ignored by through traffic. Narrowing roads and installing one way systems would prevent this and increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists in our village.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
605	Mark	Jepson	n/a	Limits to Development K/01	Regarding the small proposal to extend the limits of development behind the current Refresco site and to reduce the limit around London Road and Brickyard Lane will not have a significant impact so are not opposed. However, in order to support further development of any industry which requires HGV access we must also include clear provisions to limit HGV access through the village, especially on Side Ley and Nottingham Road which are unsuitable for such vehicles as indicated by the 7.5 tonne limit which is widely ignored by through traffic. Narrowing roads and installing one way systems would prevent this and increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists in our village.
606	David	Hayes	n/a	H8 Houses in Multiple Occupation in Kegworth	I welcome the proposals in the draft policy H8 and as well as my observations below I support the views submitted by Kegworth Parish Council in respect of this subject which I believe should be incorporated into your draft policy. I feel that the narrative to support your proposals understate the situation. Page 69 para 6.73 refers to the loss of smaller housing stock. I live on a road with 22 four bed roomed houses of which five are HMO's. It would seem that you should delete the word smaller. No reference is made to the price distortion of the housing market for smaller properties to the detriment of both first-time buyers and older persons wishing to downsize. The increasing number of larger family homes (such as on Heafield Drive) that are being adapted for HMO use limits the availability for families wishing to move into the village for employment reasons or to be nearer to elderly relatives. Page 70 para 6.85 is rather 'wishy washy' and understates the problems. the word could should be replaced by the word does!
607	Alison	Morley	NWLDC (Cltr)	CD10 Park Lane Castle Donington EMP89 Hilltop Farm Castle Donington	I oppose the suggested development in the Castle Donington Park Ward, and I call on the Alliance/Administration to clearly publish their rationale in choosing this site, rather than the other sites put forward by developers at the time.
608	David	Gubb	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	I would be opposed to the construction of new homes on these sites. I like living in a rural village and i feel it is a shame that so many of them are expanding to such an extent. We are very lucky to live in such a beautiful area, with plenty of walking available through the fields and woodland so close to our home. I would be very sorry to lose this.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
609	John	Perry	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	<p>I wish to object to the inclusion of Site C47, C48, C&7, C78, C86, C81 as building/development land in the NWLDC Local Plan for the following reasons :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Infrasturcture The site is completely unsuitable for development & would require considerable expenditure re: infrastructure if it was adopted. Existing infrastructure within the NWL District cannot cope with the current population's requirements. Additional housing would make existing infrastructure problems even worse. 2) Countryside C 48 is currently designated as Countryside. Any alteration to this designation would be a disaster for the local wildlife & the villagers who enjoy the environment. Any building development would completely destroy this green space & would contradict the current demands to "protect our planet". 3) Flooding The proposed site is based on a valley with an existing flood plain & its attendant problems with water run-off. Additional housing stock would cause major problems to an already overloaded system. 4) Schools It is highly unlikely potential developers would provide additional school facilities due to the high cost involved. Existing schools could not cope by absorbing children from an additional 500 homes. 5) Possible Social Housing It is my opinion that in the event of planning being allowed no commercial developer would want the site due to the extremely high development cost envisaged. Therefore it may only be a Housing Association or Charity that would consider the site for social housing on the assumption that development grants etc. could be obtained. The Whitwick/Thringstone area does not need any further social housing as it is already considered as a deprived area & a development of this nature would exacerbate existing problems. 6) Leicester City Council Problems I am concerned that Site C 48 & other sites in the proposed Local Plan are, allegedly, only being included because Leicester City Council have major problems with their own housing plans & NWLDC, together with other district councils, are being "persuaded" to increase their plans to cover LCC shortfalls. This Statement has been prepared by me & my husband, John Perry

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
610	Gail	Perry	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	[Same response No. 610 John Perry]
611	Liam	Perry	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	<p>I wish to object to the inclusion of Site C47, C48, C&7, C78, C86, C81 as building/development land in the NWLDC Local Plan for the following reasons : -</p> <p>1) Infrastructure The site is completely unsuitable for development & would require considerable expenditure re: infrastructure if it was adopted. Existing infrastructure within the NWL District cannot cope with the current population's requirements. Additional housing would make existing infrastructure problems even worse.</p> <p>2) Countryside The sites are currently designated as Countryside. Any alteration to this designation would be a disaster for the local wildlife & the villagers who enjoy the environment. Any building development would completely destroy this green space & would contradict the current demands to "protect our planet".</p> <p>3) Flooding The proposed site is based on a valley with an existing flood plain & its attendant problems with water run-off. Additional housing stock would cause major problems to an already overloaded system.</p> <p>4) Schools It is highly unlikely potential developers would provide additional school facilities due to the high cost involved. Existing schools could not cope by absorbing children from an additional 500 homes.</p>
612	ANTHONY	PEARSON	n/a	H8 Houses in Multiple Occupation in Kegworth	<p>There are enough HMO's in Kegworth. The old Methodist church is currently being converted into 9 flats with no parking, despite considerable opposition from residents and the parish council. At least 9 extra cars will have to park on High Street which is largely full already. The people who occupy HMO's are largely of a transient nature, eg students and workers from the airport who do not contribute to village life. So there are less people willing to join local societies which slowly wither away. We already have a large number of refugees billeted in Kegworth, and although I am not aware of any trouble, it seems to me that the village is increasingly full of strangers.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
613	John	Saunders	n/a	H8 Houses in Multiple Occupation in Kegworth	<p>HMO's are discussed in the topic paper dated Feb 2024 with reference to Kegworth where it is acknowledged that HMO do impact on the village and its residents. My thoughts/concerns are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HMO's need regulating and monitoring beyond the initial approval stage, they can all say theres enough parking and residents won't park on pavements etc however this is rarely true. Every day I see on of the many HMO's in my area with pavements blocked or grass verges torn up from bad parking. Many times forcing people to walk in the road. - There are HMO's in this village that aren't declared who looks into or tackles this? - A very large percentage of this village are exempt from paying council taxes due to being students however they still access the same services and resources which have to be paid for by a dwindling minority. - Families are being forced out the village as landlords buy up family homes to make a quick profit. - Kegworth has a high burden re: HMO's due to the airport staff and Notts Uni students, we are in a different county from the University but because its cheaper that Sutton Bonnington we have the burden. - Any HMO development is passed despite any objections from residents and local councillors. I have previously objected to a HMO expansion that had been started without permission. This was overruled due to my concern of parking being unfounded according to NWLDC. When I walk past daily I have to walk in mud due to cars blocking the pavement. - Small or large HMO's still have the same issues stated above so I fail to see why they should be treated ddifferently, also who is checking the occupancy levels periodacally to ensure system isnt abused? - Who is monitoring and mapping out HMO's as I can see from the appendix in the HMO doc that many arent listed.
614	B	Greasley	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	<p>Broom Leys Farm is classed as an area of separation and agreed by the local council I just can't understand why the Meadowlane land that was considered No1 for development has been swapped for this proposal and strongly object.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
614	B	Greasly	n/a	C83 London Rd Coalville	Proposed Planning C83 London road Coalville The junction for this site is a proposed death trap I just can't believe this to be considered.
615	Amy	Collis	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	The road already has periods of the day where the road gets very busy and traffic backs up. With a school already around the corner too, introducing hundreds of new houses to the area would increase this problem even more and would be very unsafe. There is low visibility over the hill on Thornborough Road too. On top of this, we have not long moved into our house. The house was sold to us at a higher price due to the views of the field across the road, and years of building work and eventually a large estate would then significantly reduce the potential sale price of our houses. We were told that similar plans in the past had also been rejected by locals in the area and I believe they will still have the same attitudes. When we bought the house under these pretences, we did not assume that this would come back up and would potentially have to live across from a building site for potentially many years (which would cause lots of audible and visual disruptions).
616	Verity	Cave	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	The plan is making whitwick join with Coalville and will make the village of whitwick a town. I have lived in Whitwick all my life and the beautiful countryside will be gone. The doctors and schools are full, we will struggle to use the services with more residents. The flooding in Whitwick especially this winter will just get increasingly worse. One of the developments is looking to be built on the fault, surly houses can not be built on this?
617	Aaron	Cave	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	Having been a resident in Whitwick for over 20years I feel the amount of proposed housing will ruin the village of whitwick, it will become more of a town. We will lose our beautiful countryside, flooding will get even more worse than it is currently and the changes of getting in the doctors which is already a struggle will be impossible.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
618	Sandra	Ramp	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	<p>I believe that the proposed housing allocation of C46 Broom Leys Farm under policy H3 is not in the interests of the local community under the following grounds:</p> <p>Proposed housing at C46 violates the statement "We want to maintain, and where possible enhance, the environmental, 23 economic and social value of the countryside consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework " Flooding - Policy AP7 - the site already floods heavily each winter and development of this area will only make this worse and affect local properties.</p> <p>Area of Separation - Policy S4 & Policy EN5 - The proposed site of C46 directly violates the boundary of the Area of Separation as determined in previous plans. The council's previous study of this area concluded that Broom Leys Farm "identified that development would be likely to have a significant effect on the open character of this part of the AoS." For this reason I believe that building houses on this space is unlawful. Furthermore, in your communication "LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – 15 NOVEMBER 2023" it stated that "allocation of site C46 at this stage could be regarded as being somewhat premature." That this has now changed largely due to just ONE councillor and without any other sound and legal reason is absolutely disgusting and the local residents I have spoken to are all horrified at this. I believe a successful challenge of this decision can be made due to this reason.</p> <p>Air Pollution - Policy EN6 - The impacted area by this development already has one of the worst areas of air quality locally. The crossroads of Broom leys Road/A511 is especially bad. More housing and the associated cars will only make this worse.</p> <p>Traffic - Policy IF5 - The traffic around this area is already saturated especially Broom Leys Road and the A511 at school and rush hour times. Another 200+ houses and their associated cars will only make this problem far, far worse. Another set of traffic lights on the A511 is also a terrible idea and will hold up the industrial traffic/lorries making traffic jams and air quality even worse around this site.</p> <p>Infrastructure - Policy IF1 - the doctors surgeries at Long Lane and Broom Leys are already overwhelmed by the number of patients they have to accomodate and further houses will only exacerbate this. This proposed plan makes no provision for further infrastructure other than a 'contribution from the developer'.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
618	Sandra	Ramp	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville (cont)	<p>Loss of Habitat - Policy EN1 - Housebuilding on the open countryside at C46 will result if significant loss of biodiversity and homes for many species. This area provides homes & food for many species of birds and animals including Red Kites, Buzzards, Sparrowhawks, Frogs & Toads, Common Newts, Bats, Tawny Owls, Foxes and Badgers plus a huge variety of smaller birds (including rarer migratory birds such as fieldfares and redwings).</p> <p>I would like to formally register my objection to any housebuilding or other development on site C46 - Broom Leys Farm.</p>
618	Sandra	Ramp	n/a	H1 Housing Strategy	<p>Policy H1 states that "housing development should address the needs of the area". In your communication of the "LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – 15 NOVEMBER 2023" it stated that land off Meadow Lane (C76) was more suitable and "allocation of site C46 at this stage could be regarded as being somewhat premature.". I am horrified that this has now been changed purely due to politics (largely due to one councillor) and without any other sound & legal reasons. C46 does not address the needs of the immediate area - in fact the opposite is true. A development on Broom leys Farm will have a hugely adverse effect on the area due to air quality, flooding, traffic, loss of biodiversity, extra pressure on infrastructure and loss of area of separation.</p>
618	Sandra	Ramp	n/a	En5 Area of Separation	<p>EN5 - Proposed housing at C46 violates the statement "there is a presumption against development that would result in the physical coalescence of Coalville and Whitwick and the loss of the separate identity of the two settlements." In your previous communication "LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – 15 NOVEMBER 2023" it stated "the AoS study still identified that development would be likely to have a significant effect on the open character of this part of the AoS." and "allocation of site C46 at this stage could be regarded as being somewhat premature." I am horrified that this has now been changed purely due to politics (largely due to one councillor) and without any other sound & legal reasons. The area of separation is extremely important to this area and there is a large opposition to building on it. This will also impact Coalville Hospital as the in-patients currently find the open views help with their mental health which will be destroyed by building houses all over this area. I am fully against adjusting the boundary of the Area of Separation to exclude Broom Leys Farm.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
619	Darren	Ramp	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	[Same response as #618 above]
620	Sarah	Fielding	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	<p>Our village does not have the road infrastructure to take more vehicles these number of houses would generate. Our schools both from preschool up to high school do not have the available spaces or provision for the families the area has as it stands never mind more. Classes are at capacity in our school reception last year. Our doctors surgeries and medical practices are already over number so much that it's impossible to get appointments.</p> <p>One of the joys of living in a village as we do is the green and open spaces for walking and taking children to explore. Building in these lands is sacrilege taking away nature, destroying habitats and not protecting our nature for generations to come. We don't want to be a town or a city we want to be a national forest village! Less free land means more flooding! We have enough of that in this area!</p>
621	Jamie	Norton	n/a	IF1 Development and Infrastructure	<p>I have scanned the few hundred pages of documents - lots of houses in lots of areas outlined. There is a lack of clarity on what additional services will be explicitly committed to with the new houses.</p> <p>Appointments at Doctors and spaces for schools are already overly challenging and the loss of skilled resources from the area linked to services being overwhelmed are notable. Please can the actual new surgeries and schools and core utilities to support the additional housing be listed and audited for completion?</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
622	Lisa	Turner	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	<p>Potential Locations for Strategic Distribution: Land north of J11 A/M42 (EMP82) (1) Land east of A444 and west of A42 Stretton le Field is identified. Any further development of this site is a huge concern to the people of Overseal. The A444 to and from this strategic site is at absolute capacity in terms of car and HGV use. The increased noise and fumes from HGVs already has an impact on the wellbeing of people within the main arterial routes the A444 supports. There is poor infrastructure with a huge impact on an area that is supposed to be the heart of 'The National Forest'. HGV's are using the route through the village day and night with excessive speed and lack of regard for the local community. There has been a huge transformation of the are since its coal mining days and the environmental benefits of the National Forest are a huge asset to residents and visitors in terms of environment and personal well-being. I appreciate the A444 is a major route for many but statistics and data on the road use already shows the voulme well exceeds the expected use of an 'A' road. The area is prized for its recreational and amenity value and along with the adverse health effects, this should be at the forefront of any decisions for further development of this area. DEFRA's noise policy statement for England expressively refers to the impact of noise exposure, annoyance and sleep disturbance giving rise to adverse health effects. Living with the increased noise of traffic any further development will create cannot be ignored for local villages on a route to this proposed site.</p>
623	Carol	Allen	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick	<p>We live on a lane which is not made for a large housing development which you are proposing the traffic here is horrendous and to add to it with this development would cause chaos most of the day plus it would be good if we didn't have to lookout on a big housing estate. We have a a large housing estate built at the back of our houses.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
624	Carol	Southerd	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	<p>Development can only be accessed from the A444, which frequently has traffic queues to the island in this area. There will be traffic both turning in and out, causing issues going to the island and backing up to it. Natural environment areas considered do not include the close adjacent area. National Forest in South Derbyshire. Short sighted view. The consequent effects of further development at J 11 on SouthDerbyshire will be detrimental -and at odds with -your objectives for the preservation and careful development of Countryside in your own NW Leicestershire. My objections focus on the potential increase in traffic. Impact of noise pollution and air quality. Infrastructure already unable to cope. No cross border funding noted for repair maintenance etc. There will be irreversible ecological impact on wildlife and habitats. Increasing the risk of flooding where it is already an issue. Impact to the neighbouring area of protected trees. And unachievable sustainable transport. ie walking and cycling. Dangerous and inaccessible. Overseal is the heart of the National Forest but is fast becoming nothing more than a link road to the A42/M42 and a gateway to industrialisation.</p> <p>AP2. amenity. Contrary to the objectives in this element of the plan, the increased industrial activity although sited in NW LEICS will not impact the rural lanes of Leicestershire. . Extra burden will be put on the villages in AA444 in Derbyshire, principally Overseal.</p> <p>The enjoyment of our village has been blighted already by this Motorway Junction. Traffic flow is excessive at all times of the day. In fact the M42 and AA42 are constantly blocked either side of this junction. Noise, odour, safety, vibration, Road condition/ deterioration.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
625	Aimee	Ridler	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	I strongly oppose the building of the housing development at Isley Woodhouse. The village is already struggling with flooding due to water running off the fields around the village, and the development will certainly increase the flood risk dramatically. This is unfair on the residents of Diseworth. The run off water is a very real threat to Diseworth. I also believe that the roads around the village will not be able to cope with the increased traffic to and from the new development - when it is being built (construction traffic) and when it is finished and there hundreds of additional cars on the roads. I strongly oppose this development. There are so many run down buildings, warehouses in the Leicestershire area that are unsafe and an eye sore, and I cannot understand why these cannot be knocked down and developed into housing, instead of stealing from the green belt around a beautiful English village in the countryside. Appalling.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
625	Aimee	Ridler	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	<p>I am deeply saddened by the proposal of a Freeport on the edge of Diseworth and I strongly object. My husband and I chose spent a lot of time considering and choosing Diseworth as a place to buy a home and start a family, and subsequently raise our daughter, and the reasons we did so are due to the lack of traffic, lack of air pollution and lack of light pollution. Also we choose Diseworth due to it being a quiet, countryside location surrounded by green lungs. The proposed Freeport would completely destroy and take away all of the reasons that I have stated, and much more. It will cause a dramatic and dangerous increase in traffic. It will cause a green deal of light and air pollution, and a lot of noise. [Personal information redacted] and very upsettingly I think that the Freeport would cause significant safety issues [to Diseworth Primary School] in terms of traffic - and also pollution. The school is located on a blind bend and having numerous lorries going past constantly will be very very dangerous. It breaks my heart that the school children attending this small village school will be subjected to seeing this every day. The traffic will negatively affect the current pupils at the school but I believe that it jeopardises the future of the school in general; Parents will not want send their children to a school in such close proximity to a Freeport, with busy and dangerous traffic right outside its front door. If parents opt for different schools with safer locations this will obviously lead to the demise and possible closure of this long-treasured primary school. On a personal note, I am not exaggerating at all when I say that I am devastated about this potential development happening on the edge of our beloved village. It will completely destroy this quintessentially British, beautiful village, purely because of greed and lazy planning. There are so many run down, empty warehouses and factories locally which could be demolished in order to build something like this. I very strongly object to this.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
626	Carly	Snee	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse EMP90 Land south of East Midlands Airport (Freeport)	<p>I strongly object to both the IW1 and EMP90 proposed developments for the following reasons:-</p> <p>1] Wrong Place. Diseworth is a Conservation village in a rural setting. To desecrate the fields, hedges, trees and wildlife is unforgivable. People choose to live here because of the peace, the community spirit, surrounding countryside walks and farmland. Building on such a vast scale will be hugely detrimental to physical wellbeing and will cause massive pollution as the village is located in a dip. The damage to mental health will be enormous. Once farmland is concreted over the green spaces will be gone for ever. We need cows, sheep and, crops to be self sufficient locally to lessen imports and reliance on other countries. Use brownfield sites instead.</p> <p>2]. Housing and pollution. Not so many 'new builds' are needed. Many remain unsold. Young people cannot afford them. 4,500 houses will add 10,000 cars to local roads. Worse, flooding will ensue.</p> <p>3]. A Freeport should not be built in a rural area when there are so many other suitable situations - e.g. near the Ratcliffe power station. The buildings will be of monstrous dimensions, dwarfing our Conservation village. The road traffic, noise and pollution will cause immense harm to physical and mental health. How can it be democratic for people in a city far away to make decisions that will ruin our village of Diseworth? Did any of them leave their offices and visit us and realise what they have decreed is necessary? People, animals, birds and green spaces are more important than the proposed Freeport. Please put it elsewhere in an urban environment.</p> <p>4]. Doctor's Surgeries and Schools. There are not enough staff in the local surgeries now so how will there be any available for new ones? Where is the funding? Local schools could not absorb more pupils and other housing developments make promises to build new ones, as well as surgeries, and fail to deliver.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
627	Andrew	Lane	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	Broom Leys farm is located in a green space area providing a buffer between Whitwick and Coalville on the other side of the Coalville bypass, Stephenson Way. It seems to me that keeping this separation and the green space area next to Coalville Community Hospital, Sharpley Avenue Recreation Ground and Coalville Rugby Club is essential to the area. I presume access would be from Broom Leys Road and already very busy road with a school, hospital and GP surgery close by in one direction, whilst a very short distance the other way is the already VERY busy traffic light junction where Broom Leys Road crosses the also VERY busy A511 Stephenson Way. The relatively recent housing estate accessed via Buckingham Road is also opposite. I understand that 266 houses are proposed for the Broom Leys farm location; with today's car society this would be another 500 + cars needing to have access via existing roads; this would seem likely to cause severe congestion at peak times and increased traffic throughout the day. Access to Coalville and the area of Broom Leys is already very limited due to the single carriageway A511 from the BirchTree roundabout all the way around Coalville on Stephenson Way. It seems to me that a better site for new housing would be where the roads are already capable of safely having housing estates next to them. The dual carriageway where Bardon Rd and Shaw Lane are for example - ie Old Hall Farm.
628	Sandra	McNally	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	I am objecting to building on land of 700 houses near where I live, I have moved to this beautiful country side for the views and wildlife, and I believe both will be spoiled by your plans to build, please think of generations to come that will never get to see our unspoiled views, this is such a beautiful place , please leave it at that and let elderly people enjoy the rest of their lives here,the roads and infrastructure will not be able to cope with all these extra houses.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
629	Nigel	Lane	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	Destruction of 750 acres of agricultural land and miles of ancient hedgerow. Too close to the conservation village of Diseworth, racetrack and airport. Increase the flooding issues for Diseworth and Long Whatton as both villages already suffer the effects of the brook and holding ponds run off from fields and the brook overflowing. Local roads will be unable to cope with the increase in traffic and Diseworth will become a rat run. Lazy planning to put so much of NWLDC housing needs in one place. The conservation village status of Diseworth will be lost when it adjoins such a large housing development. There will be a huge increase in air, noise and light pollution greatly affecting the health and wellbeing of Diseworth residents. I do not support the new town development of Isley Woodhouse in anyway (Policy IW1)

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
629	Nigel	Lane	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	<p>I can not object strongly enough to the potential location for Strategic Distribution at Land south of East Midlands Airport (EMP90) This location is completely in the wrong place when suitable land is going to be available just up the road when the power station closes.</p> <p>The conservation status of our village will be lost as we will be part of a logistics hub. The village will be plagued by 24hour noise and light pollution. Noise and light pollution not only disrupts the natural beauty of our surroundings but also has detrimental effects on our health, wellbeing and environment. These will disturb the sleep patterns of humans and animals alike leading to a range of health issues including insomnia, fatigue and stress. This development would be right next to the village which will create a huge amount of rain water runoff which will only further exacerbate flooding issues in not only Diseworth but also Long Whatton and Hathern. No amount of drainage will prevent this from happening. This proposal will result in the loss of fertile agricultural land and miles of wild hedgerow resulting in loss of habitat for a huge variety of wildlife. Increase in traffic as the village becomes a rat run for workers and logistics vehicles. The village roads are not equipped to deal with the potential huge increase in traffic that this development would bring. The village school is situated on a blind bend so any further increase in traffic would present a very real danger to school children. The local plan states “we do consider that the potential impacts on Diseworth, particularly in terms of heritage, landscape and amenity are likely to be unacceptable based on the current extent of the designated freeport land”. So in conclusion how can you even consider the very land that you know is unacceptable. You cannot justify the use of this land when you state the very arguments for not using it in the first place.</p> <p>Undemocratic process if the government impose the development of this land due to Freeport status. Ultimately if this proposal goes ahead it will destroy the heritage and heart and soul of this beautiful village. Shame on anyone who votes for the proposal to go ahead. In conclusion I object to this proposal (EMP90) in the strongest possible manner. There is no possible version of this proposal that would be acceptable.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
630	Thomas	Lane	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	<p>Its far too close to Diseworth and the Race Track</p> <p>This will destroy 750 acres of agricultural land and miles of ancient hedge rows</p> <p>Dramatically add to the flooding issues that Diseworth and Long Whatton have</p> <p>The local roads will not be able to cope with increased traffic flow and our village (Diseworth) will become a through route</p> <p>There will be a massive increase in air, noise and light pollution ruining the rural feel which will massively affect the health and mental state in a negative way</p> <p>A large housing development such as this would destroy the conservation village status of Diseworth</p> <p>In conclusion I DO NOT support the new housing settlement of Isley Woodhouse (policy IW1) in ANY way, shape or form</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
630	Thomas	Lane	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	<p>It would be impossible for me to put into words how strongly I OBJECT to the potential location for the freeport development (EMP90)</p> <p>This development comes straight up to the village which will cause a huge amount of extra rain runoff which will lead to further flooding issues than what is already caused by the airport - Which could also be made worse again by the new settlement above which I have also objected too. This surely can not have been thought through</p> <p>This will lead to the loss of the conservation status of our village (Diseworth) instead becoming a logistics park</p> <p>I am terrified this development will cause 24 hour 7 day a week noise, light and air pollution. This will ruin the natural beauty of our surroundings and lead to the decline in the health of our villages residents be them human or wildlife</p> <p>The village will again become a through route for warehouse workers and transport vehicles. Again I have to refer to a previous point of the proposed new settlement at 'Land to the South of East Midlands Airport'(Isley Woodhouse) which would further increase the traffic throughput of the village which our rural roads are simply not able to cope, and will never be made able to cope, with that scale of traffic. Yet again I cannot see how this has been thought through and seen to be acceptable</p> <p>I was fortunate enough to spend the later years of my childhood in this village and it's a very sad thought to think that my children will not be able to enjoy Diseworth in the same way I have</p> <p>Even your own local plan states that this is an unsuitable location - If this isn't a blatant contradiction then I don't know what is</p> <p>If the government imposes this development on this land due to its Freeport status it will go against everything democratic about this country and we may as well be a dictatorship</p> <p>In conclusion, AGAIN, I DO NOT support the Freeport development (EMP90). There will not be a version or amendment of this I will ever accept.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
631	Stuart	Jobburn	n/a	C48 South of Church Lane	<p>I have lived on Thornborough Road for 24 years. The traffic has increased significantly during that period, there are regular queues from McDonald's island back past the allotments on Thornborough Road. Also cars have difficulty joining Thornborough Road from Spring Lane. With the development of the suggested 783 houses near New Swannington and Whitwick will add significant congestion on Thornborough Road.</p> <p>This would have a negative and unacceptable impact on residence in respect of noise and air quality.</p> <p>The local primary school and surrounding schools are currently at full capacity. They cannot cope with the increased number of students that these housing developments would bring to the area. The associated increase in traffic will also present a safety risk to the many children walking to and from school.</p> <p>The proposed Thornborough Road development would have a direct visual impact on our lives. We currently have a view over the open fields from our house.</p> <p>The field behind the houses on Thornborough Road regularly floods. There are many large ponds formed in the field which have remained there all winter this year. Some of the residents suffer flooding of their back gardens. The housing development will only increase the risk of flooding.</p> <p>Developing this green space will have a negative impact on the wildlife in the area.</p> <p>I am very surprised that the Thornborough Road development has been added to the draft local plan. A few years ago a planning application for that location was rejected as it wasn't suitable. How can the view from the local council now deem it a suitable development location. Please reconsider this allocation within the local draft plan.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
632	Stephen	Vigor	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	<p>Atypical policy . . . a nod to local residence consultation. Your weak attempt at 'informing' the residence of Diseworth by presenting a few out of date and inaccurate powerpoint images was wholly inadequate. The lack of knowledge surrounding the proposals and inability of your staff to answer even basic questions of the impact of the EMA/SEGRO development should be considered to be an embarrassment for you. Whoever planned, designed and briefed the product should have done a lot better. You have no answers for the blight the proposed development would deliver to your residents, your council tax payers. The lack of consideration given to increase in traffic and the inability of the local roads to cope with the increase. The fact that there is already 1,000,000 square feet of unused and un-required warehouse/storage space available within a short radius of the proposed sight is ignored. The flooding and drainage issue, not even considered. The fact that no business case appears to have been considered, that even if built, any tenant is likely to have just taken advantage of cheap/funded/reduced terms but closed a unit elsewhere in the region. Your plan considers nothing in relation to heritage, our infrastructure our sustainability. It's yet another example of cheque book capitalism, churning money for the benefit of a few, to the detriment of the many. It's the wrong plan, in the wrong place, at the wrong time. It delivers no community benefit, no local benefit, no long term sustainability. You just have to look at the I-Port development in South Yorkshire. Go there, come back. Tell me if you think replicating that to the boundaries of Diseworth, Long Whatton and Kegworth is fair and reasonable?</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
633	Penny	Bass	n/a	C48 South of Church Lane	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the above housing allocation areas. All of these areas are unsuitable for housing use. There are mining shafts in the West Whitwick proposal area and regular flooding occurs there. By developing in these areas it will disrupt natural water drainage and therefore force excess water to Thringstone, an area that suffers greatly with flooding.</p> <p>The fields are currently used for growing crops and these fields are at the highest risk of flooding, if they were to be developed with houses we will be losing valuable land for providing food. It adds to a continuing reduction in available land for producing food. Where will the food be grown in the future, surely agricultural land should be looked after for future generations .</p> <p>There is no decent infrastructure to support a development of this proposed size. The surrounding roads are very narrow and unsuitable serving the access to the fields where the development is proposed. The access at the Church Lane end is extremely busy on a bad unsafe bend. A large increase in traffic at the other side of the west Whitwick proposal would result in traffic trying to turn onto a very busy road in the dip of a hill where there is already traffic calming in place presumably as there is already a problem with speeding. Parking is a very big problem already as most homes will own at least two cars and new developments never provide enough parking spaces therefore encourage people to park in potential dangerous spots and pavements which causes pedestrians to use the road to walk around the parked cars.</p> <p>The schools, nurseries, doctors surgeries and dentists are all over subscribed. It is impossible to get an appointment at the local GP surgery. Where will a huge influx of new people go for these services, will there be provisions made if not this will result in a lack of quality of life if everyone cannot access these basic needs.</p> <p>The reduction of open space in this development area will affect the habitat of wildlife, during COVID the government were actively encouraging people to walk in the countryside for the benefit of our mental health, this is an area which many local people including my family enjoy walking in and we would be devastated to lose wildlife and see mature trees and hedgerows destroyed for a development on this scale.</p> <p>There is an increase in people who work from home and this will be taking away the benefit of beautiful countryside. Not everyone owns a car and should have the right to enjoy the countryside in their local area.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
634	Lee	Ramsell	n/a	EMP82 North of J11A/M42	This proposed development is In the heart of the national forest on a historic piece of green belt land, which provides a habitat for rapidly disappearing wildlife. The sheer diversity of wildlife that can be readily seen from the A444 will be lost and another green space will be lost to another unneeded and unwanted warehousing development. This development will not provide any more local jobs as there is a saturation for the tiny surrounding villages already. Additionally there are no public transport links so those unable to drive could not benefit. The surrounding country roads cannot take any more volume of HGV traffic which will inevitably be present when short cuts are used. The planning committee needs to realise that this development will bring no net benefit for the area and will only increase pollution and traffic and decrease green spaces and wildlife habitat.
635	Christ	Simmons	n/a	EMP24 Midland Rd Ellistown	EMP24, does not seem obvious that the weight limit restrictions through the village and Ibstock are regularly flouted already without adding further industrial units within the zone? In relation to both the industrial estate and also the proposed housing estate 'the double mini roundabout in Ellistown is a recognised pinch point' would you not consider a that ///recruiter.overgrown.gurgled to be a much worse pinch point already without the addition of further commercial and private vehicles? Does this really leave a green gap between Hugglescote and Ellistown or just make us a suburb of Coalville?
636	Robert	Ridler	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	I strongly oppose this due to the inevitable impact on local flooding. Traffic will also become a nightmare as the infrastructure is not adequate to cope with 4,000 new houses being built here. We moved to a quiet, small, rural village for the peace and quiet it offers; not to be ruined by building a new toy town next to it, making us, the residents suffer. There are far more appropriate parcels of land available, nearby, that would not have the same adverse impact on a village like ours. These policies and decisions are made by ill-informed individuals who have no interest in the impact it will have on local residents.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
636	Robert	Ridler	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	The creation of a Free Port, on the edge of our beautiful, quiet, little village is an absolute travesty. Areas designated by ill-informed politicians who will likely have never even been to the area to see it for themselves and what impact it will have on our local community. The noise, traffic, and light pollution created by putting a Free Port that literally backs onto our village would be horrific. There would also be an increased safety risk for our children who walk to and from, to attend the local village school. This is purely just laziness from politicians, as there are far more appropriate sections of land, literally a handful of miles away, the other side of the M1, which is old, dis-used brown land near the power station. That itself we understand to be de-commissioned very soon too.
637	Catherine	Lofthouse	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	This proposed site encroaches upon the Kelham Bridge Nature Reserve managed by the Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust. The proposed site contains a balancing pond of biodiversity value and runs parallel with the river Sence. Any development here will result in loss of green space and negative impact on biodiversity and wildlife. Part of this proposed site is in Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath parish, although this has not been properly noted in this draft plan. There's a risk of loss of separation between the settlements of Ibstock and Donington-le-Heath.
637	Catherine	Lofthouse	n/a	E7 Midland Rd Ellistown EMP24 Midland Rd Ellistown	Development of these sites will exacerbate problems with flooding at Hugglescote cemetery and surrounding land, including the Scout Hut, at Station Road in Hugglescote. These sites have flooded multiple times this winter, causing damage to property and traffic problems.
637	Catherine	Lofthouse	n/a	Limits to Development CUA/09	Extending the limit of development in Townsend Lane could cause ribbon development and loss of green

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
638	Marie	Brierley	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	<p>NW1 - this new housing settlement is too close to Diseworth and far too close to the runway, the air quality of those living so close to the airport would be awful. The noise from the airport and racetrack would be unbearable for residents. Who would this development be serving for; there is a huge ongoing housing estate in Castle Donington - is there really a need for more? There has been no investment of infrastructure, spectators visiting the race track will put off by the difficulty of getting there. The amount of wildlife that will be lost is incomprehensible, at a time when we are being encouraged to more green, this is a contradiction of the policies coming out of Westminster! I have lived in Diseworth for 13 years, since 2019 the flooding had increased immensely, how will this new scheme improve this? At a time when as a country we are concentrating on being zero neutral and protecting our wildlife, why would we be looking at concreting over so many fields, destroying ancient hedgerows and wild life. Would any MP from Westminster agree to such thing, unless it was lining their pockets? Diseworth falls within a conservation site, since living here I have had to respect this when upgrading my property, of which I have accepted. Why has this part of North West Leicestershire been proposed at the same time, to put it all on this local area is cruel, lazy and inconsiderate - why put all NWLDC needs in one area. I purposely moved into this area 13 years ago, to live within a community; after living in the suburbs of Nottingham all of my life. Therefore, I do not support the new town development of Isley Woodhouse (policy IW1).</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
638	Marie	Brierley	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	<p>EMP90 - where shall I start, where has this nonsense come from. Can I ask whose pockets we are filling? We have a weekly food bank to serve our local community, how is this small community going to help. How is this warehousing going to serve our local community? Currently these are not serving our local community, this has an impact of increased traffic. Government consistently encourage us to go outdoors and exercise, this will be taken away from us if this development goes ahead. Can I ask who is going to gain from this development, can you please explain how the residents of Diseworth will gain from this, how many people from Diseworth will gain from this development. We already suffer from a huge amount of litter, why should local residents be local wobblers collecting litter, this will become greater with more lorries in the local area. What about the local flooding, how will this be dealt with. NHS - I'm being told to be healthy, how is this development going to support this. I love stepping out my front door and having an incredible amount of wildlife, birds, bats, foxes, badgers, some protected by greed and corporations - why would you kill off the habitate? I am constantly being told by government to be more green, however, this proposal goes totally against what the world is totally saying. It is so disappointing that the local authority hasn't taken residents on this journey. I could go on, however, the way to respond to this local plan has been so difficult and excluded so many residents, I hope you can live with your decisions. There's so much more I could say, however I feel the decisions from Westminster have already been made. What difference can a person like mine make?</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
639	karen	Franklin	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	<p>I believe that the proposed location is too close to Diseworth and will have a massive impact on wildlife loosing 750 Acres of farmland and 7.5 miles of hedgerow especially with the prospect of miles more of hedgerow and trees being demolished if the proposed development on the freeport land goes ahead. Diseworth will potentially loose its rural nature, conservation village status should these plans go through.</p> <p>Flooding problems are going to be exacerbated causing home owners in Diseworth and Long Whatton further flooding issues, recently run off water from the fields caused massive problems in Diseworth and Long Whatton causing the brook to flood into local homes.</p> <p>Noise and pollution from increased traffic using the villages as a rat run when local major roads are blocked, busy or closed. The potential of thousands of homes on our doorstep is going to have a massive negative impact noise and pollution with the increased volume of traffic coming through Diseworth and Long Whatton. The current road infrastructure cannot cope with this massive housing estate, who is going to fund this ? Not Highways as they have no money.</p> <p>Why such a massive amount of housing in one place ? Surely the timing its not coincidence that so many developments are being considered at the same time ?</p> <p>How can we in Diseworth maintain our conservation status if we are to be adjoined to this massive development ?</p> <p>I do not support the new town development of Isley Woodhouse (policy IW1)</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
639	karen	Franklin	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	<p>The Potential Location for the Freeport development (EMP90)</p> <p>Diseworth could potentially lose its conservation status being so close to an industrial logistics site, the "green lungs" will be massively affected by noise, air and light pollution and set to lose acres of biodiversity rich farmland and miles of hedgerow. I do not believe that the impact of this development will be minimised by any amount of screening. It is impossible to shield or screen this amount of 24 hour lighting, air or noise pollution with such close proximity to our village.</p> <p>The proposed site runs downhill towards Diseworth, where is all the water going to run when the fields are covered in concrete? The water is going to drain down into the lower parts of Diseworth causing flooding to roads and homes.</p> <p>The increase in traffic into the village is going to cause safety concerns for Diseworth school, the entrance is on a blind bend which is going to be a major safety issue for parents and children crossing the road. The roads into and through the village can't cope with extra traffic with diversions rerouted through Diseworth and Long Whatton yet alone on a regular basis. Are there any plans to monitor/ manage the infrastructure?</p> <p>I notice the Local Plan states that you consider that the potential impacts on Diseworth in terms of heritage, landscape and amenity are likely to be unacceptable based on the current extent of the designated freeport land, so if you know it's unacceptable why would you consider using this land?</p> <p>The impact of allowing SEGRO destroying this land will be detrimental to the landscape, wildlife, the physical and mental health and wellbeing of its community.</p> <p>THEREFORE I ASK NWLDC NOT TO INCLUDE THIS SITE (EMP90) FOR POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
640	Felix	Bass	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	The area for the proposed development floods regularly and has suffered with subsidence. The roads aren't suitable for a large amount of new houses and would cause a lot of congestion. The roads are already busy in these areas. Parking would also be an issue as there is no where to park in the area surrounding the fields and the entrance and exists onto the site have dangerous bends. There's a shortage of doctors and dentists in the areas as you can't get an appointment with them. The schools are over populated and won't have enough places for a lot of new children. A lot of the land is being used to grow food and a lot of land has already been lost to housing. I object to the proposed development on these fields and the size of the development as they'll be too many people and I don't feel that there are enough facilities in this village.
641	Charlotte	Kozlowski	emh	H1 Housing Strategy	H1 - Positive to see that NWLDC recognise the need for varied house types and adapted properties for households with additional or complex housing needs in the district.
641	Charlotte	Kozlowski	emh	H4 Housing Types and Mix	H4 - Its useful for us to have guidelines for NWLDC's desired house types to work to, but also to have the ability to flex these standard when the site, location or housing needs require it. It would be useful to have an indication of what 'proportion' of 1- and 2-beds homes would need to be single-storey to meet requirements.
641	Charlotte	Kozlowski	emh	H6 Rural Exceptions Sites	H6 - We approve of support for rural exceptions sites, outside the limits of developments, as these accommodate the unique needs of rural communities. S106 agreements that stipulate that properties remain 'affordable in perpetuity' can limit the number of lenders that households are able apply for affordable ownership properties with. In these instances, we would request that NWLDC support an RP with a DPA Waiver to Homes England and/or a cascading mechanism that satisfies any RP and prospective purchasers' lender requirements.
641	Charlotte	Kozlowski	emh	H10 Space Standards	H10 - Households will greatly benefit from new homes being built to NDSS – larger spaces for growing families, study space and homeworking areas. However, emh have concerns that the increase in floor area is going to impact viability and reduce the number of dwellings on fully affordable projects. With building regulations and government incentives encouraging the application of Future Homes Standards, Net Zero Carbon, and Passivhaus technologies, will there be any guidance regarding space needed for plant equipment?

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
641	Charlotte	Kozlowski	emh	H11 Accessible, Adaptable and Wheelchair User Homes	H11 - Building all properties to Cat M4(2) will restrict the ability to step properties on sloping development sites – what measures would an applicant need to provide to demonstrate that step-free access is not viable? This is also an issue on affordable developments which have self contained flats/maisonettes, which is emh’s and residents’ preferred housetype for 1 bed dwellings. In this instance, the provision of lifts is financially unviable both in capital cost and future service charge provisions. This would render Part M4(2) unachievable on first floor dwellings. The increase in minimum floor areas will make including for adaptable features such as wider doorframes and corridors achievable.
642	Stuart	Flude	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	As a resident of church lane new Swannington I’d like to oppose against the plans to put nearly 800 further homes within this area the surrounding roads, schools, doctors surgeries cannot cope with more people there is also flooding in the fields which will only be worse if houses are built and where will this flood water go then? Our local wildlife will be affected we have newts in our garden and often see bats and muntjac deer amongst other wildlife
643	Mark	Fern	n/a	D8 Ramscliff Avenue Donisthorpe	The land at the back of ramscliff has a problem with trapped methane gas cisco have tested for gas in the 4or5 bore holes in the field the bore hole in the field at the bottom of my garden was tested and showed that 87 percent of methane gas was present there is a bore hole in my garden which was tested and luckily had a negative result and I think to build in the field would be very dangerous for the village plus the access to the site would cause massive problems on ramscliff avenue
644	Taylor j	Flude	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	[Same response as #642 above]

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
645	Michael	Deacon	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock E7 Midland Rd Ellistown	<p>I am really against the idea of more houses being built. Current new build housing isnt even half occupied, so why more. The main concern is the traffic situation within ibstock and surrounding villages. It is already at a point where the smallest of disruptions causes major traffic delays and our roads cannot cope with all the traffic that comes through as it is. Extra housing here and in surrounding to villages will bring additional traffic. Leicester road has more traffic than a dual carriageway. Residents have vocalised to elected MPs over the years the issues of traffic & pollution and this build would greatly impact on current residents lives and health, both physically & mentally.</p> <p>Our local facilities cant cope as it is and with extra houses which would bring thousands more residents will be overwhelmed. From the local shops, pharmacy, GP, dentists and even garages. Parking is already an issue on the streets with more to come. The mini roundabouts already are treacherous and would be congested all the time, this is proven already when we have closures or diversions near by as the village comes to a standstill with even the smallest amount of extra traffic. Its already very hard to get help and support at GP & dentists as even current residents cannot get any NHS treatment, so any new build residents would have no options on care. The extra housing would mean that local people would have to travel further afield for care, shopping etc. Some that do not have access to any personal or public transportation would be completely isolated and struggle immensely. This was witnessed during covid when certain things were in short supply & many older people without family support struggled when things were no longer available in local shops.</p> <p>We as a country are looking to become more self-sufficient so building over all usable green space is not only ruining the environment but also the ability to sustain ourselves. The wildlife will also suffer significantly. Having moved here some years ago i have witnessed this decline in wildlife due to over building/population & traffic, it is a huge issue to British wildlife.</p> <p>These new builds would very likely suffer flooding and the loss of drainage land would also likely to cause further issues for current residents with standing water and floods becoming an issue due to over population, not enough drainage and sewage systems overflowing with rainfall. In recent months we have already seen local roads and areas that don't normally flood do so due to poor drainage, which again leads to certain route being impassable and traffic being a huge concern.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
646	Eleanor	Littlehales	n/a	lb18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	<p>We are a small village, surrounded by many other lovely small villages. The traffic situation is already at breaking point unfortunately, our roads cannot cope with all the lorries and cars that come through as it is. We would not be able to handle the number of extra vehicles that this and other proposed builds would bring. Let alone the extra pollution this would bring to the current residents, many of us have vocalised to elected MPs over the years the issues of traffic & pollution and this build would greatly impact on current residents lives and health, both physically & mentally.</p> <p>Our local facilities are stretched and cannot cope with extra builds which would bring hundreds more residents. From the local shops, pharmacy, GP, dentists and even garages. All would be so over run, there would be no parking, people would park on streets. The mini roundabouts would be congested all the time, this is proven already when we have closures or diversions near by as the village comes to a standstill with even the smallest amount of extra traffic. Its already very hard to get help and support at GP & dentists as even current residents cannot get any NHS treatment, so any new build residents would have no options on care. This overcrowding would mean that local people would have to travel further afield for care, shopping etc. Some that do not have access to any personal or public transportation would be completely isolated and struggle immensely. This was witnessed during covid when certain things were in short supply & many older people without family support struggled when things were no longer available in local shops.</p> <p>We as a country are looking to become more self-sufficient so building over all usable green space is not only ruining the environment but also the ability to sustain ourselves. The wildlife will also suffer significantly, there are many animals living on this land that would have no where else to go and become extinct from the area. Having moved here some years ago i have witnessed this decline in wildlife due to over building/population & traffic, it is a huge issue to British wildlife.</p> <p>These new builds would very likely suffer flooding and the loss of drainage land would also likely to cause further issues for current residents with standing water and floods becoming an issue due to over population, not enough drainage and sewage systems overflowing with rainfall. In recent months we have already seen local roads and areas that don't normally flood do so due to poor drainage.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
646	Eleanor	Littlehales	n/a	E7 Midland Rd Ellistown	<p>The new builds would very likely suffer flooding and the loss of drainage land would also likely to cause further issues for current nearby residents with standing water and floods becoming an issue due to over population, not enough drainage and sewage systems overflowing with rainfall. In recent months we have already seen local roads and areas that don't normally flood do so due to poor drainage. More vital green space loss results in a detrimental effect on not only our wildlife but the environment.</p> <p>Increase in traffic would cause significant disruption to current residents and nearby villages, with roads unable to handle the amount brought by these new builds.</p>
647	DIANE	POWELL	n/a	H8 Houses in Multiple Occupation in Kegworth	<p>I do not agree with the proposed threshold policy proposed re planning applications for HMOs in Kegworth. The threshold percentage of HMOs should be applied to the whole of Kegworth rather than using the 100m from the centre of a property formula when considering a planning application. The proposed strategy is likely to have the opposite of the desired effect. The spread of HMOs is proliferating (already 14.6% as quoted in the Draft Plan). Every other property in the village is bought either privately (from landlords who live as far away as Cornwall) or by local estate agents, for the HMO rental market. A lucrative investment, but it is destroying the character of the village, and brings other detrimental effects already quoted in the Plan. The issue of parking is one of the most significant, as often in the case of older houses which are HMOs, they do not have any onsite parking space. Many streets/roads have become single lane thoroughfares due to vehicles parked on both sides of the carriageway..</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
648	Graham	Bass	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	<p>I am commenting on the proposals put forward for the siting of a 783 houses in the area listed in 16 above however some of those comments below will be relevant to those other developments proposed in and around the Coalville area.</p> <p>Housing density of this nature in this particular area of Whitwick will reduce natural drainage of the land and increase the probability of flooding in the lower areas bordering Thringstone village. Additionally, this particular area is still "moving" due to the collapse of abandoned mine workings in areas immediately adjacent to the site.</p> <p>A large development in this area will invariably increase traffic on existing roads that were never designed for this type of use. The proposed site location will result in other "short cuts" being used to avoid delays at peak times, but these will funnel traffic through Swannington, Whitwick and Thringstone, none of which have suitable traffic management to control the increase in those flows and being villages all have an issue on the main road routes with roadside parking resulting in reduction in road width during key commuting hours and weekends.</p> <p>Access to services such as Schools, Doctors, Dentists and Local Hospitals are all at a stretch and it is already impossible to get appointment at short notice. If a visit is necessary, most if not all have limited parking in close proximity to their own site which results in additional roadside congestion.</p> <p>Housing plans rarely appear to take into account the number of parking spaces required for the types of homes being built and there is often overspill where smaller properties are grouped together with little by way of parking space for 1 car where most homes have at least 2 adult drivers which can often result in parking outside the development area they have moved into creating further local congestion problems.</p> <p>There is a real concern that the fields, trees and brook/stream running through part of this the site will be lost and result in a reduction of natural habitat of trees, fields, insects and wildlife and all at a time where we are constantly reminded of the need to consider our "Ecological footprint".</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
649	Christophe	Nedza	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane	<p>I vehemently oppose both the proposals stated in the Proposed Housing and Employment Allocations For Consultation document for any area that is currently inside the existing limits to development, in particular South of Church Lane, New Swannington (C48) and Broad Location, Land West of Whitwick (C47/C77/C78/C81/C86), and changing the boundaries to the limits of development as suggested in the Proposed Limits To Development For Consultation documents for the aforementioned areas in New Swannington and West of Whitwick. As noted in the document, a planning application (16/01407/OUTM) for residential development was refused in 2017, primarily because the site was in the countryside. This area provides valuable green space for residents as does the land West of Whitwick (C47/C77/C78/C81/C86). The local countryside green spaces are essential for maintaining the natural beauty of our area and preserving biodiversity. Whilst these sites are primarily in agricultural use there is thriving biodiversity in these areas. Building houses in these areas would disrupt ecosystems, endanger wildlife habitats, and diminish the scenic value that makes our area unique. The rural aspect of our local villages is often described as the main draw and benefit of living in this area. Many residents, including myself, value the tranquillity and serenity of our countryside green spaces and oppose any development that would disrupt this environment. Building houses in these areas would undermine previous work in protecting our green spaces and would show an utter disregard for the opinions, values, and efforts of local residents who have sought to preserve our remaining countryside. If the local council maintains that their policy 'protects and seeks to improve the things that are important to people' then due consideration must be shown to previous campaigns to ensure that our greenbelt land is not developed, and our villages retain access to vital green spaces. These green spaces provide valuable opportunities for outdoor recreation, such as hiking, dog walking, and birdwatching. Building houses in these areas would limit our access to nature, depriving residents of the physical and mental health benefits associated with outdoor activities. Whilst the policies being developed in the Local Plan seek to address Health and Wellbeing, to allocate this green space for housing would counteract this entirely by removing our access to open spaces. The number of houses planned for these areas is not proportionate; we have already seen the new housing estates that are constantly appearing across the county with high density, overcrowded housing offering little in the way of quality of life for its residents. Adding more houses to green spaces would increase the risk of flooding and increase traffic congestion on local roads and strain existing infrastructure, including schools, healthcare facilities, and utilities. No matter how sustainably we build houses, each house is likely to have at least one, if not multiple vehicles that will be added to the area. There would undoubtedly be an increase in air and noise pollution and a reduction in air quality. This would not only harm the local environment but also contribute to climate change, exacerbating global environmental challenges.</p>

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
649	Christophe	Nedza	n/a	Broad Location West Whitwick C48 South of Church Lane (cont)	<p>As noted in the documents, the limits of development are there to 'distinguish between settlements and the 'countryside' ... and define the locations where development ... should be restricted to the circumstances specified in the Countryside policy in the Local Plan'. If we extend the boundaries now, we set a precedent that allows the boundaries to keep being pushed, each time reducing the green space in between developments until we have nothing left.</p> <p>The villages in our area each have their own unique charm, history, and sense of identity. Building houses in local countryside green spaces would inevitably lead to the merging of these villages as urban sprawl creeps into once distinct communities. This loss of individual identity is deeply concerning to local residents who cherish the character and heritage of their villages. The merging of villages could erode the sense of belonging and community pride through the loss of local identity that residents have valued and sought to sustain over the years. Maintaining the integrity of our villages is essential for preserving the cultural fabric of our region and safeguarding the heritage that defines us.</p> <p>Instead of encroaching on green spaces, efforts should focus on brownfield redevelopment, urban infill, and sustainable housing initiatives. By repurposing existing urban areas and promoting smart growth policies, we can meet housing needs without sacrificing precious green spaces. Once green spaces are developed, they are lost forever. It is essential to consider the long-term consequences of sacrificing these irreplaceable natural assets for speculative housing needs.</p> <p>Building houses in local countryside green spaces is shortsighted and detrimental to the environment, community well-being, and future generations. We must prioritise the preservation of these valuable natural resources for the benefit of all. Failure to do so and renegeing on decisions to protect this green space, would at best show a complete disregard for the local community, and at worse reinforce local opinion that if the price is right, our countryside is for sale.</p>
650	J	Greasley	n/a	C46 Broom Leys Farm Coalville	Broomleys Farm was put into land of separation by Coalville Council I can not understand why the option 1 Meadow Lane for 400 houses was changed for this proposal as I understand by the councillor for that ward and then organised a online partition against the proposed development at Broomleys Farm !!
650	J	Greasley	n/a	C83 London Rd Coalville	Policy No C83. I am strongly against this proposal the access will be a death trap.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
651	Amanda	Hack	n/a	S1 Future Housing and Economic Development Needs	It is clear the North West Leicestershire is an attractive place for people to live and work and growth of new homes and industrial land has been significant in recent years. It needs to be recognised that the % growth in the District has been way ahead of other parts of Leicestershire. The increase in requirements allocated due to the Statement of Common Ground with Leicester City, is something that is expected within the legal requirements of neighbouring authorities and yet there is no land boundary with Leicester City. The issue has been caused with Leicester City being land locked and developments being restricted to brownfield or loss of green space. The amount of land that has been allocated for homes in recent years across the whole of the District there appears to be a reliance on larger homes. Its useful to see that consideration is given to smaller and affordable homes and/or economic developments. Finally within this section...although it will be reflected in other sections that there has been little consideration to the land allocated within the Freeport Site where this employment land (which has been redlined by Government) considers requirement for land allocated through the district.
651	Amanda	Hack	n/a	AP2 Amenity	AP2 Amenity The Plan, in relation to Amenity is problematic. If you consider the impact of the Freeport on the small village of Diseworth. The specifics in 5.8 of the documentation, 'noise, light and the quality of life of...existing residents' its not clear how this will apply. The freeport red line development from government sits outside the local plan it is clear how the Local Plan and residents can influence the outcome.
651	Amanda	Hack	n/a	AP4 Reducing Carbon Emissions	AP4 Reducing Carbon Emissions The plan to consider WLC assessments of future developments, is a step forward, however the plan then introduces the words 'not...economically viable' with reference to a district fund. The opportunity for new homes and industrial units to consider net zero during the development would be more effective.
651	Amanda	Hack	n/a	AP7 Flood Risk	AP7 Flood Risk The consideration of flood risk seems to apply for the risk of new developments flooding. There is little consideration of how flood risk increases for others as new developments remove protections for existing homes. There are so many flood risk areas in NWLeics, the impact on current homes/businesses has to figure/

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
651	Amanda	Hack	n/a	H4 Housing Types and Mix	H4 Housing Types and Mix The consideration of the housing type and mix is useful, there is need to ensure that enough affordable homes (rent & shared ownership) developed. Relationships with Social Housing providers and provision of NWL increasing its own stock will be key.
651	Amanda	Hack	n/a	H5 Affordable Housing	H5 Affordable Homes - The definition of affordable covers a number of tenures. The area that has been falling behind nationally has been the proportion of homes for rents that are social/affordable. Significant numbers of Shared Ownership has hidden the numbers of 'rental' properties that are brought to the market. It would be useful to see this presented more clearly.
651	Amanda	Hack	n/a	H8 Houses in Multiple Occupation in Kegworth	H8 HMO in Kegworth - The impact of HMO's can't be under estimated in communities. Considering this in the Local Plan is an important consideration and welcome this inclusion.
651	Amanda	Hack	n/a	H11 Accessible, Adaptable and Wheelchair User Homes	H11 Accessible, Adaptable and Wheelchair User Housing - Its not clear in the Local Plan on the demand for adaptations via Disabled Facilities Grant or waiting on the Housing register. Where there is known demand has this been reflected in the plan?
651	Amanda	Hack	n/a	Ec6 Start up work space	Ec6 Start up work space - NWL has significant numbers of larger sites developed. The opportunity for small organisations to move to new premises, the Local Plan considering this will be useful for business growth.
651	Amanda	Hack	n/a	Ec12 Tourism and Visitor Accommodation	Ec12 Tourism and Visitor Accommodation - The value of tourism is important to the NWL economy and opportunities to develop is important. However, its welcomed that the Local Plan looks to restrict the loss of facilities.

No.	First Name	Last Name	On behalf of	Policy	Comments
652	Duncan	Watts	n/a	Ib18 Leicester Rd Ibstock	<p>We have lived in the village for over 15 years as new inhabitants to the village from other district villages. During this time the volume of traffic converging at peak times along Leicester Road, Chapel Street and Ashby Road (via the A447) on to the roundabout outside the Co-Op causes considerable congestion along all approach routes, as demonstrated by recent route closures/traffic lights. A site visit to the then new housing development opposite the Sence Valley entrance on the A447 (Frances Way) did show future development of this site so what is being proposed is nothing new. However, plans importantly showed a relief road running from the A447 through to Leicester Road via roundabouts on each of these roads. Why has this not been included in this new local plan development? Not only would it alleviate a lot of the traffic mentioned at the start of this comment but would also stop any artificial 'rat-run' being created by those wishing to avoid the aforementioned pinch point and for the safety to residents of this new housing area. It should be an enforced part of any development.</p>
653	Hannah	Robinson	n/a	IW1 Isley Woodhouse	<p>IW1 - The location is already over-saturated with traffic. It is much too close to the airport, the racetrack and the village of Diseworth. Traffic will increase hugely and it is already too busy here. Nature will be destroyed and the already strong likelihood of flooding will increase dramatically. Agricultural land and hedging will be destroyed and noise pollution will increase. There are not enough local amenities at present. Schools, doctors, dentists etc, for those who need it. The A453 will become even busier and more dangerous and local villages will feel the impact hugely.</p>
653	Hannah	Robinson	n/a	EMP90 Land south of East Mids Airport (Freeport)	<p>EMP90 - the village of Diseworth which has history dating back to the doomsday book will no longer be a rural place steeped in history and nature. It will become an industrial site. Noise and light pollution will affect local people and nature and green space will be lost forever. Village life and its huge benefits will be completely lost, children will not grow up surrounded by the educational and mental health benefits of green space and nature. Residents will lose much needed natural space. Traffic will increase. Nature will be lost. Flood risk will increase and the village will be surrounded by industrial nuisance where green fields once lay. There are more suitable sites which wouldn't impact on a beautiful village.</p>