Dear

Further to Castle Donington Parish Council’s (CDPC) recently submitted comments (attached) regarding the Local Plan, we have considered matters further, consulted trusted advisers and held a meeting of Councillors to discuss the ongoing evolution of the Local Plan.

The following addition submissions are assertively made:

**New settlement**

In principle **CDPC supports the development of a new settlement rather than additional housing allocations to Castle Donington or other nearby locations**. This is because the infrastructure and service provisions required to support new housing and an increased population will be better achieved from a new settlement. Infrastructure and local services are already stretched in Castle Donington. Further housing development will have a significant and detrimental impact on the locality.

A new settlement with the ability to provide the sufficient levels of infrastructure and connectivity could only be of **benefit for the whole area**.

It would appear the companies involved are keen to work with the existing local communities to ensure that there are minimal adverse effects whilst providing a cost effective and stylish development with sufficient provision for services and capacity to sustain it.

**New settlement prioritisation**

CPDC has a **strong preference** for the land between Worthington and Belton being prioritised for a new settlement when compared to the proposed Isley Woodhouse site. The drawbacks of the Isley Woodhouse proposal have been well documented by others and include proximity to East Midlands Airport, Donington Park, the proposed Freeport and Diseworth. New housing will be affected by noise, air pollution, mental health affects.

**Deliverability**

It is understood that there needs to be sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land to deliver the Council’s housing needs requirements and to ensure that a five-year supply can be maintained throughout the Local Plan period.

Having had discussions with Pegasus and other partners at recent workshops, it would appear that the suggested build rate of a new development, Isley Woodhouse , is on the very conservative side and that they would anticipate that they would easily be able to provide a build rate of at least 250 houses per year throughout the plan period.

CDPC supports the view purported by Pegasus, and noted in its submissions, in this regard.

This built rate could be adversely affected if another separate development of 1,000 houses off Park Lane were allowed as this would be aiming at the same market at the same time, thus diluting the sales capacity and thus the build rate of both developments. This would create a lose-lose scenario.

The proposed development off Park Lane will also cause an overconcentration of growth in the one area of the district.

Site allocation to support and match the Council’s ambitions for a sustainable New Settlement could be provided with the delivery of Isley Woodhouse which as proposed provides for exemplar placemaking, landscape led scheme, provision for biodiversity net gain, accessible and affordable providing the housing needs and styles appropriate for the key employment sites of the locality.

**Delivering a new settlement at Isley Woodhouse will achieve the Council’s housing pipeline requirements. Delivering a new settlement at Isley Woodhouse and maximising the number of houses will meet potential future pipeline requirements without the need for further large scale housing provision in Castle Donington. Allowing further housing development in Castle Donington will adversely affect the delivery potential of Isley Woodhouse, both in terms of overall numbers and rate of delivery.**

**Castle Donington or Ashby for further large scale housing provision**

Reports to the Local Plan Committee have suggested that Castle Donington and Ashby are comparable when it comes to deciding housing allocations. This is based on the fact that they are both categorised as Key Service Centres and therefore it has been offered that there is a fine balance between the two locations. **While the two locations are categorised similarly, it is simply ludicrous to suggest that, in reality, they are similar.** The balance is not fine.

In reviewing the documents hitherto submitted, CDPC strongly insists that the proposed settlement hierarchy **fails to take the current differences into account** including the level of choice and size of service provision between the two locations.

The need for a Principal Town is understood, however, the level of services and infrastructure in Castle Donington does not reflect those of Ashby. This is true now, in the near future and in the medium term when considering potential for improvement.

**A separate hierarchy position for Ashby on its own merit is required**. The recent methodology of the recent settlement survey is clearly flawed as it does not reflect reality and masks the full extent of the distinction between Ashby and Castle Donington.

CPDC’s view is that **all settlements should be reassessed** to fully take into account each service available and the type of service in order to fully understand the role of individual settlements. A common sense view should ultimately prevail and the Local Plan should be based on up to date assessments.

Where there is a choice between Ashby or Castle Donington for further large scale housing provision, CDPC’s evidence based view is that Ashby should be chosen.

**Increase of housing provision in Castle Donington – further comments**

Another large scale housing development off Park Lane would, yet again, be a piecemeal development, not allowing for the necessary infrastructure to support the increased numbers of people. There will be no provision within a Section 106 agreement to provide for secondary education (due to the proposed agreed policy plan guidelines), yet the college in Castle Donington is already struggling for capacity and level of service provision, especially since being transferred to a through school – 11-16 years.

The implementation of another 1,000 houses on the other services, especially doctors (the GP surgery is currently closed due to staffing problems) and chemist and other local village **services will not be able to cope**. The proposed development area is at odds and physically separated by the Relief Road to the rest of the built development and the local centre and services. It is likely to become a dormitory style development with no community spirit. Transport will always be needed to get to the existing services and local centre. This will increase the carbon emissions rather than reduce them.

The implementation of another piecemeal development will have increased and major effects of the existing highway provision but will not allow a sufficient need as a standalone development (new settlement) to provide for the increased levels and improvements to the highway infrastructure.

An additional development of 1,000 will only increase the lack of sustainability for Castle Donington without the ability to negate the issues, whereas a larger development – Isley Woodhouse will be able to sustain and provide for necessary strategic highway works and improvements and also the other needs in relation to schooling and health facilities.

The District Council is currently consulting on a parking review to bring forward charges for the carparks in the district. As the village stands this will have an adverse impact on needs of the local community to access services. Add on to this another 1,000 houses and no other provision for new services and it will have a catastrophic adverse effect on those living and working in the local community.

**Housing affordability**

New housing should be **affordable for local workers**. Specific provision may be needed to achieve this over and above that which may be required by national guidelines.

**Highways**

When considering the impact to highways and works required to ensure the road network can support the developments, **a strategic and holistic view must be taken** including all housing proposals, freeport proposals and other large developments. A piecemeal approach, whereby minor amendments are introduced for a particular large project will be potentially disastrous. Highways upgrades should be complete prior to any large scale building works.