

**NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – WEDNESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2025**



<b>Title of Report</b>	<b>NEW LOCAL PLAN – OUTCOMES FROM THE CALL FOR GENERAL NEEDS EMPLOYMENT SITES 2025</b>	
<b>Presented by</b>	Ian Nelson Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager	
<b>Background Papers</b>	<a href="#">Need for Employment Land Update Note (July 2024)</a>  <a href="#">Additional Proposed Housing and Employment Allocations (March 2025)</a>  Local Plan Committee Report 30 July 2025: <a href="#">Additional Proposed Employment Allocations: Consideration of Responses to Consultation</a>  <a href="#">Site Assessments</a>  <a href="#">Sustainability Appraisal of Sites</a>  <a href="#">National Planning Policy Framework</a>  <a href="#">Local Development Scheme (February 2025)</a>	<b>Public Report:</b> Yes
<b>Financial Implications</b>	The cost of the Local Plan Review is met through existing budgets which are monitored on an ongoing basis.	
<b>Legal Implications</b>	The Local Plan must be based on robust and up to date evidence.	
	<b>Signed off by the Section 151 Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b>	No staffing implications are associated with the specific content of this report. Links with the Council’s Priorities are set out at the end of the report.	

	<b>Signed off by the Head of Paid Service:</b> Yes
<b>Purpose of Report</b>	To consider additional general needs employment sites for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p><b>THAT THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. SUBJECT TO THERE BEING NO OPPORTUNITY TO INCLUDE THE SITE IN A REGULATION 18 STAGE CONSULTATION AND THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER WORK INCLUDING TRANSPORT MODELLING, VIABILITY ASSESSMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS, AGREES LAND EAST OF CARNIVAL WAY, CASTLE DONINGTON (EMP63 (PART)) IN APPENDIX A BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.</b></li> <li><b>2. SUBJECT TO THERE BEING NO OPPORTUNITY TO INCLUDE THE SITE IN A REGULATION 18 STAGE CONSULTATION AND THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER WORK INCLUDING TRANSPORT MODELLING, VIABILITY ASSESSMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS, AGREES THE FORMER SITE OF MEASHAM COLLIERY, MEASHAM (EMP66) IN APPENDIX A BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE LOCAL PLAN.</b></li> </ol>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Committee has made considerable progress identifying general needs<sup>1</sup> employment sites for inclusion in the new Local Plan.
- 1.2 On [16 December 2024](#) Local Plan Committee considered the representations to the proposed employment site allocations in the 2024 Regulation 18 consultation. The Committee agreed, subject to the outcomes of further transport, infrastructure and viability assessment, six general needs employment sites and locations to go forward to the Regulation 19 version of the plan. The six sites are:
- EMP89 West of Hilltop, Castle Donington
  - EMP73(part) North of Derby Road, Kegworth
  - EMP60 Burton Road, Oakthorpe
  - IW1 Isley Woodhouse
  - A5 Money Hill
  - EMP90 Land south of East Midlands Airport (subject to the Development Consent Order decision, the site could provide up to 20% general needs

<sup>1</sup> General needs' employment land is land for offices, industry and smaller scale warehousing (units up to 9,000sqm). Warehouse units of 9,000+ sqm are categorised as 'strategic warehousing'.

floorspace)

- 1.3 At its meeting on [30 July 2025](#), the Committee agreed EMP98 Land between Ellistown Terrace Road and Wood Road, Ellistown/Battram for inclusion in the Regulation 19 plan.
- 1.4 The combined supply from these sites, plus vacant land within established industrial estates, is insufficient to meet the employment needs evidenced in the [Need for Employment Land Update Note \(July 2024\)](#). The residual requirements, i.e. the shortfall, are shown below.

**Table 1 – Residual requirements (2025-42)**

	Offices	Industry/smaller warehousing
Residual requirements	39,319sqm (c 13.1ha)	At least 31,972sqm (c 11ha)

## 2 CALL FOR SITES 2025

- 2.1 The [2025 Additional Sites Consultation](#) document anticipated there could be a shortfall of between 12 and 19ha of employment land and included a Call for Sites for general needs employment and also for potential lorry parking locations. The employment sites which were submitted in response to the call are listed in Table 2 below. The first three are new sites which have not been assessed previously. The remaining four are sites or parts of sites which have been submitted previously. In some cases, updated information was supplied.

**Table 2 – 2025 Call for Employment Sites submissions**

Ref	Site	Status	Proposed use	Ha
EMP99	Land north of rail line, Hemington	New site	Employment	6.8
EMP100	Land at Fields Farm, Measham	New site	Employment	5.7
EMP101	Land north of Wood Road, Ellistown/Battram	New site	Employment	11
EMP63 (part)	Carnival Way (Option 1), Castle Donington	Part of a previously submitted site	Employment	1.8
EMP63	Carnival Way (Option 2), Castle Donington	Previously submitted site	Employment	8.7
EMP90 (part)	MAG site, south of East Midlands Airport	Part of a previously submitted site	Employment	41.28
EMP66	Ex-Measham Mine site, Measham	Previously submitted site	Employment	3.6

## 3 ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

- 3.1 Officers have assessed the new employment sites and reviewed any additional information supplied with the resubmissions. For the new sites (EMP99, EMP100, EMP101), detailed site assessments have been prepared, incorporating the outcomes of the Sustainability Appraisal. For EMP63, EMP90 and EMP66, the existing assessments have been updated. The assessment process for each site is explained in Table 3.

**Table 3 – Assessment process**

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Assessment process</b>
EMP99	Land north of rail line, Hemington	New site	New site assessment, including SA.
EMP100	Land at Fields Farm, Measham	New site	New site assessment, including SA.
EMP101	Land north of Wood Road, Ellistown/ Battram	New site	New site assessment, including SA.
EMP63 (part)	Carnival Way (Option 1), Castle Donington	Part of a previously submitted site	This is a considerably smaller site than EMP63. EMP63 assessment and SA have been updated
EMP63	Carnival Way (Option 2), Castle Donington	Previously submitted site	EMP63 assessment has been updated
EMP90 (part)	MAG site, south of East Midlands Airport	Part of a previously submitted site	EMP90 assessment has been factually updated to recognise that there is a current planning application on the northern half of EMP90 (24/00727/OUTM). The site will be assessed and addressed at a detailed level through this application.
EMP66	Ex-Measham Mine site, Measham	Previously submitted site	Updated assessment and SA.

3.2 Sites have been assessed following the same format and using the same criteria as for all the other candidate sites. As a result, there are two sites which officers consider are appropriate for allocation.

- EMP63(part) - Carnival Way, Castle Donington (Option 1)
- EMP66 - Ex-Measham Mine site, Swepestone Road, Measham

**EMP63(part) – Carnival Way, Castle Donington (Option 1)**

3.3 As part of the 2025 ‘Call for Sites’ the promoters of the Carnival Way site submitted two options for development of the site. Option 2 (8.7ha) was a resubmission of a site which has been assessed previously, and Option 1 relates to a smaller area (1.8ha) located to the southwest of the larger site.

3.4 In terms of the larger site, this was previously assessed and not proposed for allocation due to a dismissed appeal decision on the site for employment development. The Inspector found that development would undermine the physical and perceived separation and open and undeveloped character between Castle Donington and Hemington.

3.5 The Option 1 site is significantly smaller than the larger site. It is promoted for around 6,750sqm of floorspace for Class E(g)(iii) use (light industry), B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution) use. It comprises the field immediately to the east

of Carnival Way and to the south of an existing area used for storage (of cars). The proposed smaller site would not result in development extending any further eastward than the storage area to the north of the site.

- 3.6 Officers have undertaken a detailed site assessment of the smaller site (Option1), and it has also been subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The smaller site scores better in the SA than the larger site for SA12 (biodiversity and geodiversity), this is due to the reduced site area not containing any ecological features. The remaining SA scores are unchanged.
- 3.7 In addition, updated information has been sought from the Highways Authority, Ecology and Heritage Teams at Leicestershire County Council who advise that there are no objections to development of the smaller site.
- 3.8 It is considered that the sensitive design of units and the inclusion of landscape buffers and screening would potentially overcome the Inspector's observations regarding the perceived separation between Castle Donington and Hemington. As the development would not physically extend further eastwards than existing development the physical separation between the two settlements would not be affected. As such, the smaller site is proposed for allocation for employment use.

#### **EMP66 – Ex Measham Mine site, Sweptstone Road, Measham**

- 3.9 This site was previously assessed as part of the site assessment process that supported the Regulation 18 Local Plan (2024). At that time the site was not recommended for allocation given it is a candidate Local Wildlife Site and also having regard to its rural location.
- 3.10 The site was re-submitted as part of the Call for Sites 2025. The submission included additional and updated information including a Preliminary Ecology Appraisal, Transport Technical Note and Vision Document.
- 3.11 The site is being promoted for general needs employment land, specifically small units, 'start-up' and 'grow-on' space. The site promoters have advised that the design of the units would be in keeping with its rural location utilising a natural colour scheme and timber cladding, the inclusion of renewable energy generation and green infrastructure elements, landscaping and tree planting. The site would also provide a link onto the existing Public Right of Way network.
- 3.12 Officers have updated the detailed site assessment in light of the additional information submitted by the site promoters. In addition, revised comments have been sought from the Highways Authority, the Ecology Team and the Planning, Historic & Natural Environment Team at Leicestershire County Council. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has also been updated.

#### **Highways**

- 3.13 In terms of access to the site the Highways Authority has no objections subject to mitigation measures. This would include the potential localised widening of

Sweepstone Road to accommodate HGV movements. The impacts of HGV movements through the Gallows Lane/Sweepstone Road junction would need to be examined.

- 3.14 The Highways Authority notes that the site is in a poor location in terms of sustainable transport options. The site promoters consider that the footpath on the southern side of Sweepstone Road could be uncovered to provide a pedestrian route towards Measham. The Highway Authority advises whilst this may be possible the footpath would need to meet the required standard of construction and meet the existing footway towards Measham. They note that access for cyclists would be difficult along Sweepstone Road because of its restricted width and the relatively high vehicle speeds.
- 3.15 Although access to the site by a range of sustainable means of transport may not be possible, the NPPF (para. 89) states, in terms of supporting a prosperous rural economy, that sites to meet local business needs in rural areas “may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable”.

### **Landscape**

- 3.16 The Landscape Sensitivity Study for the site concludes that its overall landscape sensitivity to new employment development is low as the landscape lends itself to employment development due to its industrial past. In terms of visual sensitivity, the Study notes that there are higher susceptibility receptors including the farm to the northwest and residential property to the east of the site, although views are restricted by intervening vegetation. Overall visual sensitivity is medium-low to change arising from new employment development. The Study identifies opportunities for development to retain and enhance boundary vegetation and to improve accessibility to the public right of way adjacent to the site.

### **Ecology**

- 3.17 The site is currently identified as a candidate Local Wildlife Site (cLWS). It was identified as such in 2007 due to the presence of early successional community and mixed grassland on the post-industrial site (former colliery tip).
- 3.18 The site promoters have submitted a Preliminary Ecology Appraisal of the site. LCC Ecology has assessed the appraisal against the Local Wildlife Site (LWS) criteria and note that the promoter’s survey completed in 2025 did not find the same level of interest compared to the 2007 survey. This may partly be due to the natural site maturation as the previous survey identified ‘early successional habitats’, partly due to the existing management of grassland on site and partly due to the level of survey recently completed.
- 3.19 LCC Ecology note that one of the recommendations in the 2025 appraisal is for further botanical survey work to be completed and it may be that this records

additional species which would indicate that the site retains its LWS value, but they conclude at face value the recent survey suggests that the ecological value of the site may have declined.

### Previously Developed Land

- 3.20 The site is former mineral workings with areas of hardstanding on the part of the site closest to Swepstone Road. Mineral extraction sites are usually subject to restoration and aftercare conditions. The NPPF definition of Previously Development Land (PDL) excludes minerals sites where restoration has been required through the development management process. There has been some uncertainty as to whether the site was subject to restoration conditions and as such whether it is greenfield or PDL.
- 3.21 As part of the Call for Sites (2025) the site promoters submitted an assessment that concludes the site accords with the definition of PDL in the NPPF. In light of this assessment officers sought additional advice from the LCC as the Minerals Planning Authority. This revealed that LCC agreed to the retention of the hardstanding on the site and that the site was signed out of the post-colliery aftercare agreement in December 2002. This means that the site constitutes PDL as per the definition in the NPPF.

### Revised SA Assessment

- 3.22 Considering the PDL status of the site, the revised Sustainability Appraisal (SA) score has changed from a significant negative to a significant positive in regard to SA14 (Land-use efficiency). The rest of the SA scoring is unchanged.

### Summary

- 3.23 It is considered that the sensitive design of buildings, using natural colour schemes and materials such as timber cladding as well as smaller footprint buildings, lower roof heights, and the provision of green infrastructure, landscape buffers, planting and screening could mitigate any adverse impact of development on its countryside setting. As such, it is proposed that the site be allocated for employment use.
- 3.24 Maps of both sites and draft Policy wording are included in Appendix A.

## 4 NEXT STEPS

- 4.1 If the Committee agrees with the recommendations, the residual requirement for industrial/smaller warehousing would reduce as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4 – Revised residual requirement**

		<b>Offices (sqm)</b>	<b>Industrial/smaller warehousing (sqm)</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Residual requirement (Table 1)</b>	39,319sqm	At least 31,972sqm
B	EMP63(part) - Carnival Way (Option 1)	0	6,754sqm
C	EMP66 Ex-Measham Mine site	0	10,033sqm

<b>D</b>	<b>Additional supply (B+C)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16,787sqm</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>Revised residual requirement (D-A)</b>	<b>39,319sqm (c13.1ha)</b>	<b>At least 15,185sqm (c 5.2ha)</b>

4.2 Officers will consider whether and how this gap can be bridged and will report back to the Committee.

4.3 The shortfall in office floorspace is considerable. The report to the [16 December 2024](#) Local Plan Committee contained the following commentary on this matter which is still considered to be valid.

*“3.22 [There is] a considerable shortfall in the provision for new office space. Employment forecasts in the [Need for Employment Land Update Note \(July 2024\)](#) show that the number of people in office-based jobs will increase which, on the face of it, translates into a need for new office premises. Crucially, however, a market demand for new stock is not evident. Linked to this, speculative office development is currently not viable. Increased home and hybrid working since the pandemic will have had a bearing but the lack of demand in the district was evident before this. There were successful developments in the 2000s-2010s (for example the Ivanhoe Business Park in Ashby) but relatively little since then. As an illustration, the planning permission for three new office buildings at the E M Point site near Castle Donington (18/02227/FULM) looks unlikely to be built out and a revised application for office, research, light industry, general industry and warehousing uses is currently under consideration (22/01116/FULM) [Now approved]. The applicants for the redevelopment of 3,638sqm of good quality offices for a Lidl food store at Ashby (23/01153/FULM) were able to demonstrate a lack of market demand. Further, developers are not promoting realistic office sites through the Local Plan process (see paragraph 37 of the [Employment Topic Paper](#)).*

*3.23 There is some risk in not planning for the full requirement but as outlined, it is considered that there are compelling signs that the forecasts are out of step with actual demand. With a view to flexibility, it may be necessary for the plan to outline an approach if office demand does return during the lifetime of the plan”.*

4.4 The recommendations ask the Committee to agree these sites for inclusion in the Regulation 19 Plan without a commitment to include them in an ‘informal’ Regulation 18 consultation beforehand. Whilst this is not ideal, the Government’s December 2026 submission deadline for Local Plans to be examined under the current system means this is recommended. Officers consider that the imperative of meeting the deadline substantially outweighs the more limited risk of not exposing these two sites to informal public consultation first. If, however, it proves essential to undertake an additional Regulation 18 consultation for other reasons, these sites could be included at that stage.

