



**SOUTHFIELDS LOUGHBOROUGH LE11 2TN TEL(01509)634763 FAX(01509)219723**

**DIRECTORATE OF PLANNING & TECHNICAL SERVICES**

**Jonathan Hale BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI ARICS**  
**Director**

David Hankin BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI  
Head of Plans & Conservation

Development Plans Division  
Room 210  
The Planning Inspectorate  
Tollgate House  
Houlton Street  
Bristol  
BS2 9DJ

**Please Contact:** Mr G Longley  
**Direct Line:** 634763  
**Our Ref:** GL/LP/CBC/0/1  
**Your Ref:** PINS/X2410/429/9  
**Date:** 31<sup>st</sup> July 2000

Dear Ms Lyons,

**Borough of Charnwood Local Plan, Inspector's Report - Points of Clarification**

Thank you for your letter dated 6 June 2000 which enclosed Mr Stephens's report. May I firstly convey the Council's appreciation for the delivery of the report in line with the estimated date and for its clear structure and concise style.

You did mention in your letter that should the Council consider that there is a lack of clarity in any statements in the report, it can seek clarification/amplification from the Inspectorate. There are several matters upon which the Council would appreciate such clarification. Please find these set out on the attachment to this letter.

I hope the matters raised are self-explanatory, but should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Mr Guy Longley  
Principal Local Plans Officer

Encs.

## **CHAPTER 2: STRATEGY**

### **Para. 2.100**

Could the Inspector clarify whether the second sentence of para. 2.100 should read "...while higher density development within the urban area allocations also should **assist** in the provision of an element of smaller dwellings..." rather than **exist**?

### **Para. 2.160**

The objection by LR Evans Esq. (5623/4471) in relation to the limits to development at Pond Street, Seagrave was withdrawn (see page 1 of Appendix 5). Paragraph 2.160 of the Inspector's conclusions should therefore be deleted.

### **Para. 2.183**

Could the Inspector clarify whether his recommendation (i) also should refer to PC20 concerning the limits to development at the rear of 32 Kings Lane, South Croxton in the light of his conclusion at para. 2.166?

## **CHAPTER 4: POPULATION AND HOUSING**

### **Para. 4.47**

In para. 4.47 the Inspector suggests that the reasoned justification (RJ) should make clear that all allocated sites differentiate between requirements and matters where planning obligations may be sought. PC82, which the Inspector has endorsed in part, did include such a change to paragraph 4.30 of the Plan. Could the Inspector clarify whether the changes proposed to paragraph 4.30 under PC82 satisfactorily address his concerns as outlined at para. 4.47 of his report in relation to the wording of the RJ?

### **Para. 4.174**

In the penultimate sentence of para. 4.174 the Inspector concludes that sub para. (x) of Policy H1(g) should be reworded. However, this does not appear to have been translated into the recommendations at para 4.243. Could the Inspector clarify his intentions in relation to sub para. (x) of Policy H1(g) in the light of his conclusions at para. 4.174?

### **Para. 4.176**

In para. 4.176 the Inspector concludes that the RJ should be amended to indicate that the development would need to be phased in line with an agreed programme. However, this does not appear to have been translated into the recommendations at para. 4.243. PC88, which the Inspector has endorsed in part, did include a change to add a further paragraph to the plan referring to the need for phasing. Could the Inspector clarify whether the changes to the RJ proposed under PC88 satisfactorily address his concerns about phasing?

#### **Para. 4.200**

The Inspector refers to the distance from the allocated housing site H1(g) to the main industrial areas of the town as about 3 miles. It would appear that the metric equivalent as given in paragraph 4.220 has been missed from this point in the report. For consistency it is considered that the figure at para. 4.200 should be given in kilometres rather than miles.

#### **Para. 4.436**

In the fifth sentence of para. 4.436 the Inspector indicates that he considers the bus lanes referred to in the Policy do not need to be continuous, but they do need to bypass the likely queues that will build. However, In his recommendations at para. 4.528, specifically sub clause viii) a) reference is made to “carriageway improvements along the A6 to secure dedicated bus lanes southbound and northbound from the site to Redhill Circle”. This could be taken to imply the provision of continuous bus lanes from and to the site and Redhill Circle.

Could the Inspector therefore confirm whether he feels the wording of his recommendation in relation to this sub-clause accurately reflects his conclusions at para. 4.436 that the bus lanes proposed do not need to be continuous?

#### **Para. 4.439**

In para. 4.439 reference is made to Strategy Policy 4 of the Structure Plan. Could the Inspector clarify whether this reference should be to Transport Policy 4?

#### **Para. 4.484**

The fifth sentence in para. 4.484 states that:

*“Bearing in mind the site factors and the advice in paragraph 76 of PCF (GD/27), I consider it would be unwise to plan for higher densities than those already earmarked for this site,…”*

This appears to be at odds with the preceding sentence in the paragraph and the comments in para. 4.487 where the Inspector indicates that he considers that higher density development may be possible on the site.

It would appear that he accepts that higher densities could be achieved on the site but that it would be unwise to **rely** on the site achieving higher densities as it would be unlikely that these could be accommodated within the plan period. Could the Inspector’s comments on density be clarified, bearing in mind his conclusions at para’s. 4.484 & 4.487.

#### **Para. 4.826**

At para. 4.826 the Inspector starts to address the issue of the compatibility of the site with strategic policy. He notes that the policies of the LSP seek to locate development within and adjoining urban areas, and in locations offering transport choice along corridors between urban areas. Para. 4.827 proceeds to consider whether the site falls within an identified transport choice corridor.

It is not clear from this section whether the Inspector considers that the site can be seen to be adjoining the Loughborough urban area, and therefore compatible, in this respect, to strategic guidance. This was not something that the Council, in evidence to the Inquiry, took issue with. Paragraph 8.6 of CP/30/1 acknowledges that the amendment to the master plan suggests that Garendon would be located adjacent to the urban area of Loughborough. However, notwithstanding these changes to the scheme, it was maintained at para. 8.9 of CP/30/1 that, by virtue of its character and road connections, the site would function essentially as a separate community.

At para. 4.816 the Inspector notes the changes made to the proposal by the objectors, where the original concept of a free standing new settlement has given way to a more integrated and phased extension to housing development on the western side of Loughborough having its own local centre.

It would be helpful if the Inspector could confirm, possibly through additional text at para. 4.827, whether in his view the site can or cannot be seen to be adjoining the urban area for the purposes of strategic policy?.

#### **Para. 4.852**

In paragraph 4.852 the Inspector comments on the ability of the site to provide opportunities for cycling and walking. He concludes that in a population that is generally regarded as ageing, the majority would be unlikely to regard those facilities as a true alternative, regardless of how well they had been designed and how comprehensive their coverage of the site.

It would appear that this comment is not necessarily site specific and would seem to question the general viability of cycling and walking as alternative travel modes to the car. It would also seem at odds with the Inspector's comments at para. 4.182 where he recognises the importance of cycling in Loughborough and the potential for future growth. Could the Inspector's reasoning behind the statement in para. 4.852 be amplified/clarified particularly in relation to his conclusions in para. 4.182 and the advice in PPG13.

#### **Para. 4.1037**

In relation to Policy H1(i), Gaddesby Lane, Rearsby the Inspector finds support for this housing allocation in location and scale terms having regard to the SIMDO criteria (see para. 4.255). However, in dismissing the omission sites H/57, H60 and H/61 put forward at Rearsby by objectors, the Inspector concludes that the settlement *'is not a sustainable location within the strategies promoted in the period of the Plan'* (see para. 4.1037).

Could the Inspector clarify that the first sentence of para. 4.1037 relating to the locational merits of Rearsby is made in the context of a consideration of large scale development on all three omission sites (H57, H60 and H61)?

#### **Para. 4.1102**

At para. 4.1101 the Inspector, in recommending this site, concludes that the Proposals Map would also need to be modified to make clear which part of the omission site would comprise the housing allocation, together with any specific requirements for structural landscaping under Policy RT/9. However, these comments do not follow through to a specific recommendation at para. 4.1102. It would appear that, for completeness, these comments should form part of the Inspectors recommendation in relation to this site.

#### **Para. 4.1111**

In para. 4.1111 the Inspector notes that he has recommended a further allocation at Rothley H/63. This recommended additional allocation lies immediately to the west of the Loughborough Road site. With this in mind, could the Inspector clarify/amplify that his conclusions in relation to site H/64, particularly in relation to landscape impact, are not altered by his decision to recommend the allocation of the nearby site H/63 for housing?

#### **Para. 4.1354**

In para. 4.1352 the Inspector concludes that built development on the site should be confined to the lower slopes, as proposed by the Objector. Consequently, he goes on to recommend the allocation of a **developable** area of 2.3ha ie. that part of the objection site below the 88m contour line (as defined by the objector's suggested limits to development submitted to the Inquiry). However, the detailed policy wording recommended in 4.1354 requires that built development on the 2.3ha site should be restricted to the lower slopes whilst providing for substantial block planting and landscaping to a minimum depth of 20 metres along the northern edge of the development. This would appear to suggest the provision of landscaping on land below the 88m contour thereby reducing the developable area below the 2.3ha indicated.

To avoid confusion and possible misinterpretation, it would be helpful if the Inspector could:

- clarify what he means by the phrase 'the lower slopes of the site' in criterion (i) of the recommended policy;
- specify the extent and location of the net developable site area he considers appropriate and the location of the suggested 20m landscaped buffer in relation to this developable area together with the associated amendments to the limits to development for this part of the village.

## **CHAPTER 6 RURAL LAND AND ECONOMY**

#### **Para. 6.71 (final bullet point)**

In para. 6.71 the third issue listed refers to land north of the A6 Bypass and the Inspector states at the end of para. 6.74 that this issue has been considered under Policy H/55. However, the land referred to in this objection lies beyond omission site H/55, to the north of the A6 bypass. This issue was considered by the Local Plan Inquiry Sub-Committee at its meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup> September 1998 (see attached extract and original objection by Wm Davis Ltd). But it does not appear to have been addressed directly by the Inspector either in relation to H/55 or CT/3(vi).

## **CHAPTER 7 TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT**

#### **Para. 7.32 (8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> bullet points)**

These issues, relating to alternative alignments for the Epinal Way Extension to join the A6 near "Bull-in-the-Hollow Farm" do not appear to have been addressed by the Inspector.

The issue was considered by the Planning Committee at its meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> August 1997 (see CD/29, Chapter 7 Transport and Traffic Management, para. g) page 8).

**Para. 7.77**

These objections relate to Policy TR/3(iii) which safeguards land to allow for the widening of the **existing** Epinal Way/ Warwick from Ling Road northwards to Derby Road. It is distinct from Policy TR/2(i) which safeguards the line of the Epinal Way **extension** southwards from Ling Road. The Inspector appears to incorrectly, in para. 7.78, to refer to his conclusions under Policy TR/2(i) in addressing these objections in relation to the widening of the existing Epinal Way.

These objections were considered Planning Committee at its meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> August 1997 (see CD/29, Chapter 7 Transport and Traffic Management, para's. a) to c), page 20).

**Para. 7.173**

Following the Inspector's recommendation at para. 7.173 to delete the last sentence from the second new paragraph to the plan proposed under PC187, it would appear that the last sentence of the Policy TR/23 reading *"Less parking capacity will be acceptable where the Borough Council is satisfied a centre has good access by non-car modes."* should also be deleted for the same reasons. Could the Inspector clarify that this is what he intended?

**Para. 7.202**

In para. 7.202 the Inspector refers to an objection by Messrs Bowler and indicates that he has considered the objection 'above'. It is not clear where this objection has been considered by the Inspector. Messrs Bowler's objection is summarised at the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point at para. 7.198 and relates to the provision of a roadside service facility south of Loughborough. This does not seem to have been specifically addressed either in relation to Policy TR/32 dealing with a site specific allocation north of Birstall, or TR/33 which deals with general locational criteria in relation to roadside services.

Messrs Bowler's objection was considered by Planning Committee at its meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> August 1997 (see CD/29, Chapter 7 Transport and Traffic Management, d) page 71).

**POLICY CT/2(vi) DEVELOPMENT IN GREEN WEDGES  
(LOUGHBOROUGH/QUORN) [LAND NORTH OF THE A6 BYPASS]**

**Summary of Objection**

**321 William Davis [Originally recorded as objector ref 3865]** seek the removal of land to the north of the A6 bypass currently dominated by blocks of woodland, as not being critical to the separation of Quorn from Loughborough.

**ASSESSMENT**

*The objector has also sought the deletion of land to the south of the A6 bypass and north of Farley Way from the Green Wedge and promoted its allocation for housing. This was considered separately under policy H/55 in the Report to Planning Committee of 5th June 1997 and no change was made in response.*

*The A6 bypass does not form a landscape feature of such significance as to prevent the through flow of the landscape to the north and east of Quorn. The blocks of woodland north of the bypass and at the eastern edge of the Green Wedge areas as defined are strong landscape features in the area between Quorn and Loughborough. They frame the wider area of structurally important land between Quorn and Loughborough and are properly included in the Green Wedge definition.*

**RECOMMENDED RESPONSE**

***No further change.***

**POLICY CT/4(g): DEVELOPMENT IN AREAS OF LOCAL SEPARATION  
(WANLIP/BIRSTALL)**

**Summary of Objection**

**4731 D Geary** Whilst the Area of Local Separation around Wanlip is supported, it should be extended to include the area of open land adjacent to Rectory Road known as The Park.

**4742 Mrs E A Davison** The defined Area of Local Separation around Wanlip should include The Park.

**ASSESSMENT**

*This issue was the subject of objections from Wanlip Parish Meeting, Birstall Parish Council and 6 residents of Wanlip Village reported to the Planning Committee on 3rd July 1997. On that occasion it was resolved that no change should be made to the*

## BOROUGH OF CHARNWOOD LOCAL PLAN: DEPOSIT DRAFT

### **Objection to Policy CT/3 Definition of green wedge - land adjacent to Farley Way, Quorn.**

#### **Reason for Objection**

It is considered that the objection site should be deleted from the proposed Loughborough/Quorn green wedge for the following reasons:

1. A review of the green wedge boundary is merited given the scale of housing requirements set out for the Borough of Charnwood in the Leicestershire Structure Plan. Green wedge policy allows for review at each roll-forward of the Structure Plan as housing requirements are revised. For this reason, the boundaries do not need to take account of longer term development needs, as in the case of green belt.
2. The Local Plan makes insufficient provision of land for new housing to meet the requirements of the Leicestershire Structure Plan (see separate objection to Policy H/1, paragraphs 4.14 - 4.19).
3. Development of the site, south of the A6 bypass, would not compromise the perceived separation of Loughborough and Quorn, by preserving open fields adjacent to the A6 bypass beyond Beacon View Farm. The site is separated from these fields by existing tall hedgerows, 3-4.5m in height. Existing development on Farley Road is visible above these hedgerows and further development upon the objection site would not change the nature or character of these views.
4. That part of the objection site to the north of the bypass, dominated visually by small blocks of woodland, is not critical to the separation of Loughborough and Quorn.

# Borough of Charnwood Local Plan

## Objection by Wm. Davis Ltd

Land at Farley Way, Quorn

