

## CHAPTER 7: TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

### PARAGRAPHS 7.3 to 7.8 - GOVERNMENT GUIDANCE

#### Inspector's Recommendation

7.6 *I recommend that:*

- (i) *paragraph 7.5 of the Plan be modified by the addition of the following sentences after the words "railway projects":*

*"This guidance is outlined broadly in the approved Structure Plan, developed in more detail in this Local Plan and given practicable application through the annual submission of Transport Policies and Programmes (TPPs) to Government. TPPs enable Government to assess proposals for investment and to make appropriate settlements for capital and other expenditure".*

- (ii) *paragraph 7.6 of the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 161 and by the insertion of the words, "and introduce complementary transport measures thereby...", after the words "patterns of development" in the first sentence.*

#### CBC Decision

Recommendation (i): Accept with modification.

Recommendation (ii): Accept.

#### Reasons

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.2 to 7.5 of the Inspectors Report.

The Government replaced annual TPPs with the preparation of five year LTPs in 1999. Two LTPs are prepared in Leicestershire. The County Council prepare the Leicestershire LTP and the County and City Councils prepare the Central Leicestershire LTP covering Leicester and surrounding area. The text recommended by the Inspector in (i) and the text in paragraphs 7.7 and 7.8 of the reasoned justification needs to be amended to refer to Local Transport Plans (LTPs) rather than Transport Policies and Programmes (TPPs).

#### Proposed Modification

**M7.1**

Modify paragraphs 7.5 to 7.8.
-------------------------------

- 7.5 PPG12 'Development Plans and Regional Planning Guidance' carries forward the Government's approach in 'This Common Inheritance'. It states that development plans should include land-use policies and proposals relating to the development of the transport network and related services and the safeguarding of transport routes. They should indicate the timescale and priorities for proposed developments, specifically major road and railway projects. This guidance is outlined broadly in the approved Structure Plan, developed in more detail in this Local Plan and given practicable application through the submission of Local Transport Plans (LTPs) to Government. LTPs enable Government to assess proposals for investment and to make appropriate settlements for capital and other expenditure.

- 7.6 Guidance on 'Transport' (PPG13) published in March 1994 jointly by the Department of the Environment and the Department of Transport emphasises that Development Plans should encourage patterns of development and introduce complementary transport measures thereby giving people the choice of using more environment-friendly means than the car and reducing the need to travel. This can help reduce local air pollution from vehicle emissions as well as reducing other impacts on the environment while also, alleviating congestion. The guidance covers the range of factors influencing the need to travel, namely: residential density, settlement size and structure, neighbourhood planning, access to transport infrastructure and travel demand. A key aspect of this guidance is the importance of local authorities preparing and carrying out their land use planning and transport programmes in ways which will help reduce growth in the length and number of motorised journeys. ~~Central to the guidance is the importance of integrating and co-ordinating the planning of land use and transport infrastructure. Both aspects must be considered together having regard to the relative timescales involved.~~
- 7.7 The Government is ~~placing increasing importance on 'Package Bids' as the appropriate format for County Councils in bidding for funds in 'Transport, Policies and Programmes' (T.P.P's).~~ 'Package bids' has introduced Local Transport Plans (LTPs) as the appropriate format for local transport authorities to bid for transport funding. LTPs are comprehensive assessments of transport needs and proposals for specific areas covering public transport, cycling, walking and demand management to restrain vehicular movements.
- 7.8 The County /City Council~~ss~~' successful ~~package~~ LTP bid for Central Leicestershire includes proposals to extend transport choice into and within the city of Leicester. This is supported by the Central Leicestershire Strategic Transport Study (CALTRANS), the purpose of which is to develop a strategic transport model to assess the contributions that all modes of transport can make to future transport needs in Central Leicestershire in order to inform and justify subsequent package bids for the area. The 'Loughborough/Shepshed Package Bid' is now addressed in the County Council's Leicestershire LTP. This places increased emphasis on demand management measures directed at reducing use of the private car to complement measures to make alternative modes more attractive. It is intended that preparation of this Local Plan and the LTP are moving towards a more sustainable transport strategy in line with PPG13 and subsequent government guidance. ~~A 'Loughborough Package Bid' is currently being prepared covering Loughborough, Shepshed and Hathern to form part of the County Council's 1997/98, 'T.P.P' bid.~~

## PARAGRAPHS 7.12 and 7.13 - THE ROLE OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL

### Inspector' Recommendation

- 7.9 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 162 and FPC 162A except that in the third sentence of paragraph 7.12 the words "trunk roads" and "motorways" be interchanged.*

### CBC Decision

Accept.

### Reason

For the reasons set out in paragraph 7.8 of the Inspectors Report.

**Proposed Modification****M7.2**

[Note: Aspects of this Proposed Modification rely upon the Council's Further Proposed Changes which have not previously been subject to public consultation]

Modify paragraph 7.12.
------------------------

- 7.12 The highway authority responsible for trunk roads and including most motorways is the Secretary of State for Transport. In the plan area this comprises the M1, A6 and A46. The Highways Agency provides day to day management of motorways and trunk roads on behalf of the Department of Transport, and comments directly to the local planning authority about development proposals in the plan area affecting these roads. The County Council performs similar functions to the Highways Agency for local roads. The Borough Council influences the use of transport in its role as local planning authority. Measures will be taken to control development likely to generate unacceptable traffic or environmental impacts, and to foster patterns of development and schemes with good accessibility for all types of transport.~~The Borough Council's power to influence transport choices is limited to its role as Local Planning Authority. Highway powers are held by the County Council with the Department of Transport responsible for motorways and trunk roads (M1, A6 and A46). The Borough Council does not directly operate bus or rail services. The Council can use its planning powers to limit developments which would generate unacceptable traffic or environmental impacts, and to promote patterns of development with good accessibility for all types of transport.~~

### PARAGRAPHS 7.14 to 7.18 - TRANSPORT ISSUES IN CHARNWOOD

**Inspector's Recommendation**

- 7.16 *Having regard to my conclusions at paragraph 7.13, I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 163, updated to reflect the most recent situation.*

**CBC Decision**

Accept. Paragraph 7.15 v) needs to be updated to reflect the current situation at Birstall.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.11 to 7.15 of the Inspectors Report.

**Proposed Modification****M7.3**

Modify paragraphs 7.15 and 7.16.
----------------------------------

- 7.15 The main local traffic problems have been identified through previous local plan exercises, consultations with Parish Councils and local people, discussions with the County Council as Highway Authority and on-site surveys. These problems which are readily apparent at peak hours may be summarised as follows:
- i) Loughborough: Congestion occurs along major roads into and through the Borough's main urban area. This is particularly evident on the A6(T) (Leicester Road and Derby Road), the A60 (Nottingham Road), the A512 (Ashby Road) and links between including the A6004 (Epinal Way/Shelthorpe Road/Warwick Way). Traffic generated by committed developments in the area south of Loughborough has increased pressure on the road access into the south of the town.

There are localised problems in the north-eastern part of the town where terraced residential streets form part of the A60 (King Street/Wharncliffe Road/Queens Road), or otherwise act as primary routes serving the town's major employment areas (Ratcliffe Road/Nottingham Road).

In the town centre present routes require improvement if future development prospects are not to be heavily constrained.

- ii) Shepshed: Much of the highway network in and around Shepshed is of a poor standard. The settlement has experienced substantial growth in recent years bringing further traffic with no significant improvement to the road network serving the central area. It would not be desirable to introduce more traffic onto this road network which does not appear capable of realistic improvement.
- iii) Soar Valley Villages: Implementation of traffic calming and management measures along the old A6 corridor complementary to the A6 Quorn-Mountsorrel Bypass have reduced many local problems of heavy through traffic flows in Quorn and Mountsorrel. Elsewhere there remains no direct flood-free link between Sileby and Cossington and the A6 bypass avoiding Barrow upon Soar. The completion of the A6 Quorn-Mountsorrel Bypass has resolved many of the local traffic problems arising from heavy volumes of through traffic in Quorn and Mountsorrel. However there is no flood-free link between the A6 and the villages of Barrow upon Soar, Sileby and Cossington. In addition environmental problems remain arising from the movement of heavy goods vehicles.
- iv) Wreake Valley Villages: The A46 and A607 both feed into the Thurmaston bypass and Melton Road. This is the only major road into Leicester between the already congested A6 through Birstall and the A47 into eastern Leicester. Even with the new Syston Northern Bypass the limited capacity on the A46 south of Syston remains a problem. At peak periods there is considerable congestion and delay. As a result traffic is increasingly using as an alternative the minor roads through Queniborough, Barkby and Beeby to the detriment of village amenities and highway safety.
- v) Birstall: Following the opening of the A46 Leicester Western Bypass in November 1995 there was a slight reduction in traffic on the A6 through Birstall. However current flows, in common with all radial routes in and out of the City, are still very high and typically about 24,000 vehicles per day.

Between 1997 and 2000 daily traffic flows on the A6 have risen by about 5%. This is within the nationally predicted trend of 2% to 8% for this period. The future traffic demands are nevertheless likely to increase on this important radial route into the City as a result of the committed development allocations along the Soar Valley corridor and in Loughborough. As Beaumont Leys develops in the City traffic flows are expected to increase along Greengate Lane in the absence of any alternative route or remedial measures.

The Central Leicestershire Local Transport Plan recognises the need to provide good alternatives to travel by car. The LTP therefore sets out a strategy for a series of park and ride sites and bus priority measures to serve city based travellers on the northern and western radial routes into the City. One of the potential locations for a park and ride site is adjacent to the A6 north of Birstall.

In Birstall there are high volumes of traffic along the A6 and Greengate Lane, Birstall. The construction of the A6 Bypass of Quorn and Mountsorrel, in significantly reducing journey times between Loughborough and Birstall has

concentrated flows of traffic, especially during peak periods, along the A6 through Birstall. The effects of the A46 Leicester Western Bypass opened in 1995 will be monitored by the Highway Authorities.

- v) Anstey: In Anstey there is congestion around The Nook, particularly at peak periods, due to high volumes of traffic and a poor junction layout. Studies indicate that this is due, in large part, to significant volumes of commuter traffic diverting off the more congested A6 and A50. The completion of the A46 Leicester Western Bypass is expected to reduce traffic through the village centre.
- vii) Heavy Lorry Movements: The continuing, heavy flows of lorries through some local communities has created environmental problems. Problems are most apparent on east-to-west routes through villages such as Wymeswold on the A6006, and Burton on the Wolds on the B676.

7.16 Bus patronage nationally has been in steady decline over many years. Currently commercial services focus on urban and inter-urban routes and almost always operate throughout the main day time period. Rural bus services have not been able to match the mobility offered by the car. In some areas a minimum service can only be maintained with County Council subsidy. Evening services in general do not meet people's needs. ~~There has been a steady decline nationally in bus patronage over many years. With the deregulation of bus services operators have tended to concentrate on the more profitable urban and inter-urban routes at peak times. This means that rural and off-peak services have generally been neglected. In some areas a minimum service can only be maintained with County Council subsidy.~~

## PARAGRAPHS 7.19 to 7.21 - AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

### Inspector's Recommendation

7.19 *I recommend that no modification be made in response to this objection.*

### CBC Decision

Accept.

### Reason

For the reasons set out in paragraph 7.18 in the Inspector's Report.

### Proposed Modification

None.

## POLICY TR/1 - THE SPECIFIED ROAD NETWORK (SRN)

### Inspector's Recommendation

7.23 *I recommend that no modification be made in response to this objection.*

### CBC Decision

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.21 and 7.22 in the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification**

None.

**POLICY TR/2 - SAFEGUARDING AREAS FOR PROGRAMMED ROAD SCHEMES****Inspector's Recommendation**

7.31 *Having regard to my conclusions at paragraph 7.28, I recommend that Policy TR/2 of the Plan be modified to read:-*

*“Planning permission will not be granted for development which would prejudice the construction of new roads or the improvement of the existing highway infrastructure within the reservations shown on the Proposals Map and listed below:*

*New Roads*

- (i) A6004 Epinal Way Extension to the A6 south of Loughborough;*
- (ii) A6 Loughborough Inner Relief Road between Bridge Street and Barron Street; and*
- (iii) A607 Rearsby Bypass*

*Improvements*

*(See recommendations for TR/3i, Tr/3ii, TR/3iii and TR/3iv below and list accordingly).*

(recommendation as amended by Addendum to Inspector's report dated 6/9/2000)

**POLICY TR/2(i) - A6004 EPINAL WAY EXTENSION TO THE A6 SOUTH OF LOUGHBOROUGH****Inspector's Recommendation**

7.46 *I recommend that the Plan be not modified in accordance with PC 164 but that paragraph 7.29 be updated to reflect the current design standards for the Epinal Way Extension, approved by the County Council, and the funding arrangements agreed with developers, in accordance with my recommendations for Policy H/1(g).*

**POLICY TR/2(ii) - A6 LOUGHBOROUGH INNER RELIEF ROAD BETWEEN BRIDGE STREET AND BARROW STREET****Inspector's Recommendation**

7.55 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 165.*

**POLICY TR/2 (iii) - A607 REARSBY BYPASS****Inspector's Recommendation**

7.59 *I recommend that no modification be made in response to these objections.*

**POLICY TR/2 (iv) - A6006 WYMESWOLD BYPASS****Inspector's Recommendation**

7.62 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 166.*

**CBC Decision on Policy TR/2(i) to (iv)**

Accept

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.25 to 7.61 of the Inspectors Report.

**Proposed Modification****M7.4**

Modify Policy TR/2 and add the four highway improvement schemes previously listed under Policy TR/3. Delete Policy TR/3.

**SAFEGUARDING AREAS FOR PROGRAMMED STRATEGIC ROAD AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES**

7.28 **POLICY TR/2**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development which would prejudice the eventual construction of new roads or the improvement of the existing highway infrastructure within the reservations shown on the Proposals Map and listed below:**

**Road schemes**

- i) A6004 Epinal Way Extension to the A6 south of Loughborough;**
- ii) A6 Loughborough Inner Relief Road between Bridge Street and Barrow Street;**
- iii) A607 Rearsby Bypass. ~~and,~~**
- ~~iv) A6006 Wymeswold Bypass.~~**  
**Highway Improvement Schemes**
- ~~iv) M1 Widening;~~**
- ~~v) A512 Ashby Road, Loughborough (between J23 of the M1 and the A6004 Epinal Way roundabout);~~**
- ~~vi) A6004 Epinal Way/Warwick Way, Loughborough (between Ling Road and A6 Derby Road);~~**
- ~~vii) Greenclose Lane, Loughborough (north west of Ashby Road to the Rushes).~~**  
(See also in particular Policies H/1(g), CA/5)

- 7.29 Road Schemes. The Local Plan identifies reservations to safeguard from development the land required for new road schemes proposed by the Highway Authority for which provisions are made in the Structure Plan.

The Epinal Way Extension scheme as approved by the County Council comprises a single carriageway design from the end of the Quorn/Mountsorrel Bypass to a roundabout junction with the distributor road that will serve the proposed south of Loughborough housing development (Policy H/1(g)). The section from this junction northwards to the Park Road/Shelthorpe road roundabout is of dual carriageway design. The overall scheme has related landscaping and noise attenuation measures, crossing facilities and a segregated, joint cycleway/footway. Its implementation should benefit Shelthorpe Road and the A6(T) south of Shelthorpe Road, start to remove primary route traffic the A6(T) through the town centre, enable the introduction of measures to improve access to the town centre along the A6 (T) for non-car modes and facilitate development of the south of Loughborough housing allocation (Policy H/1g).

~~The Epinal Way Extension will be fully funded by the south of Loughborough housing development. Although planning permission was granted in January 1996 for the Epinal Way Extension to link the Park Road roundabout with the A6 Quorn/Mountsorrel Bypass to the east of Woodthorpe, the County Council cannot guarantee that government authority to fund the scheme will necessary enable its delivery within a reasonable timescale. The allocation of land for housing development to the south of Loughborough (Policy H/1(g)), together with a private contribution already in place, offers the opportunity to secure the entire scheme within a guaranteed time span without the need to rely upon the availability of public funding. The road will be constructed to dual carriageway standard compatible with the A6 Quorn/Mountsorrel Bypass together with a joint footway/cycleway and light controlled pedestrian crossings.~~

- 7.30 [No Change].

- 7.31 At present too many uncertainties remain to permit the design of a detailed scheme for a Loughborough Inner Relief Road. However, it is envisaged that the majority of the length of the road should be of single carriageway with dualling only being necessary at Bridge Street and between Barrow Street and Pinfold Gate ~~the ends of the road as shown in the illustrative scheme at Figure 5.~~ It is considered that some element of dualling will be unavoidable in that the new road will have to cater for existing junction traffic, plus A6 diverted traffic together with traffic generated from the identified “opportunity sites”. The detailed design of the scheme, including provision for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, will be the subject of further public consultation at the appropriate time. The Borough Council considers that it will be particularly important in finalising the design details for the Inner Relief Road to ensure that provision is made for cyclists and that frequent, adequate and safe pedestrian crossing facilities are provided to safeguard access for the benefit of those communities severed from the town centre by the new highway.

- 7.32 [No Change].

- 7.33 Planning permission was granted in 1992 for the approved route of an A607 Bypass of Rearsby extending from the eastern end of the Syston Northern Bypass to the existing A607 north east of Rearsby. Construction is subject to Government approval for ‘T.P.P.’ ‘LTP’ funding. The scheme remains a high priority in the County Council’s programme.

- 7.34 The current A6006 through Wymeswold is of a poor standard and passes through a designated Conservation Area of high townscape value. Although the scheme is included in the adopted Structure Plan for construction by 2006 the County Council has not progressed the scheme. It is very unlikely to be funded publicly over the plan period. Given this context

and the absence of development pressure along potential routes no corridor is safeguarded in this Plan. The current A6006 through Wymeswold is of poor standard passing through a designated Conservation Area. The Borough Council will reserve the route for a northern bypass of Wymeswold to be completed within the plan period subject to Government approval for funding.

### **SAFEGUARDING STRATEGICALLY IMPORTANT HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES**

#### **7.35 POLICY TR/3**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development which would prejudice the widening of the lengths of highway listed below within the reservations defined on the Proposals Map.**

#### **Motorway Scheme**

##### **i) M1 Widening**

#### **County road schemes**

##### **ii) A512 Ashby Road, Loughborough (between J23 of the M1 and the A6004 Epinal Way roundabout);**

##### **iii) A6004 Epinal Way/Warwick Way, Loughborough (between Ling Road and A6 Derby Road);**

##### **iv) Greenclose Lane, Loughborough (north west of Ashby Road to the Rushes);**

7.36 Highway improvements. In November 1996 the scheme to widen the M1 between junctions 21A and 23A was withdrawn from the Trunk Road Programme. Provision remains for hill climbing lanes on sections of this route, including for the southbound carriageway south of J23 in the plan area. The Department of Transport's review of the National Road, programme published in November 1995 maintains in the main programme a scheme to widen of the M1 between Junction 21A-23A which includes the motorway corridor through Charnwood. Accordingly this plan safeguards a 30 metre corridor either side of the M1 through Charnwood.

7.37 The principle and extent of the improvement lines along Ashby Road, Epinal Way and Warwick Way in Loughborough was established through the Loughborough Local Plan. These reservations give scope for improvements to the town's infrastructure consistent with the emerging TPP 'Loughborough/Shepshed' Package strategy. They could allow for bus lanes, even segregated bus ways, and cycle lanes rather than additional road capacity. Improvement works are currently dependent upon public funding but private sector contributions could emerge from related development. The principle and extent of improvement lines for Ashby Road and Epinal Way/Warwick Way in Loughborough have been assessed during preparation of the Loughborough Local Plan. They would provide important improvements to the town's main road network as part of the overall transport strategy. Ashby Road between Schofield Road and Snells Nook Lane has been dualled with funding by British Gas as part of the necessary off-site works associated with the national research centre and proposed Science Park. Both schemes are dependent up on funding through the 'T.P.P'

7.38 The improvement of Greenclose Lane would enable traffic circulation to be improved and permit the implementation of priority measures for buses and cyclists as part of wider measures to improve the town centre. The reservation is intended to facilitate such improvement. The

~~reservation for the widening of Greenclose Lane is proposed to facilitate improvements to traffic circulation in Central Loughborough.~~

~~7.39 The A60 Cotes Bridge and Meadow Lane footbridge improvements in Loughborough are strategically important schemes which should be implemented during the Plan period. They are not shown on the Proposals Map as safeguarding areas have not been defined.~~

**Proposed Modification**

**M7.5**

Delete Figure 5. Amend the reservation for the Loughborough Inner Relief Road on the Proposals Map to avoid the Wharf Basin. The land removed from the reservation is to be subject to 'Policy CA/17:Grand Union Canal Opportunity Site.' See Plan M7.5.

**Proposed Modification**

**M7.6**

Amend the Proposals Map by deletion of the reservation for the A6006 Wymewold Bypass. See Plan M7.6.

**Proposed Modification**

**M7.7**

Amend the Proposals Map by deletion of the M1 widening corridor and addition of a corridor to safeguard a hill climbing lane southbound from J23 at Loughborough. See Plan M7.7.

**POLICY TR/3 - SAFEGUARDING STRATEGICALLY IMPORTANT HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES**

**Inspector's Recommendation**

7.68 *I recommend that Policy TR/3 be deleted from the Plan except that schemes (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) be included in Policy TR/2, as proposed to be modified, and the RJ be modified in accordance with PC 170.*

**POLICY TR/3(i) - M1 WIDENING**

**Inspector's Recommendation**

7.71 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 167.*

**POLICY TR/3 (ii) - A512 ASHBY ROAD, LOUGHBOROUGH**

**Inspector's Recommendation**

7.76 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 168.*

**POLICY TR/3 (iii) - A6004 EPINAL WAY/ WARWICK WAY, LOUGHBOROUGH**

**Inspector's Recommendation**

7.79 *I recommend that no modification be made to the Plan in response to these objections.*

**POLICY TR/3(iv) - GREENCLOSE LANE, LOUGHBOROUGH****Inspector's Recommendation**

7.82 *I recommend that PC 169 be not implemented but that paragraph 7.38 of the Plan be modified to read:-*

*“The improvement of Greenclose Lane would enable traffic circulation to be improved and permit the implementation of priority measures for buses and cyclists as part of wider measures to improve the town centre. The reservation is intended to facilitate such improvement”.*

**CBC Decision on Policies TR/3(i) to (iv)**

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.64 to 7.81 in the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification**

See Proposed Modification M7.4 above, which details all changes necessary to Policy TR/2.

**POLICY TR/4 - SOUTHFIELDS ROAD, LOUGHBOROUGH – HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEME****Inspector's Recommendation**

7.89 *I recommend that the existing title “Southfields Road, Loughborough - Highway Improvement Scheme” be deleted and replaced by the following:-*

*“Local Highway Improvement Schemes in Loughborough and Shepshed”, and modified to read:*

*“Policy TR/4*

*Planning permission will not be granted for development which would prejudice the improvement of roads identified in the Loughborough/Shepshed Package of local traffic measures and listed below”.*

*[To be completed as appropriate].*

*and that the RJ be modified in accordance with PC 171.*

**CBC Decision**

Reject with modifications.

**Reason**

The Inspector in paragraph 7.28 of the Report establishes three categories to judge whether road schemes should be included in the Plan. The Southfields Road improvement scheme does not meet the Inspector's first two tests as it is not included in the Structure Plan and is unlikely to be

constructed within the plan period. However the Inspector finds it to be of long term strategic significance in the context of a balanced and integrated transport strategy for Loughborough/Shepshed and worthy of retention in the Plan.

These elements of the Inspector's findings are supported. Paragraph 7.41 should be amended in line with PC 171.

The Inspector does not find the scheme of sufficient importance to merit a separate policy and suggests it is included in a policy identifying local road improvements likely to be implemented in Loughborough /Shepshed through a TPP Package strategy.

This is not accepted. The TPP process has been replaced by Local Transport Plans. The Southfields Road scheme, and other local road improvements are unlikely to be funded through the LTP at least in the plan period to 2006.

The main purpose of including the scheme in the Plan is to safeguard land along this road corridor from development proposals which would otherwise prejudice its implementation. Part of the scheme has been safeguarded in the housing scheme currently being built at the corner of Southfields Road/Victoria Street.

Policy TR/5 is a similar policy safeguarding other local improvement schemes worthy of retention. It is accepted that these local schemes could be funded with the assistance of private funding. The recommended approach is to amalgamate Policies TR/4 and 5 providing guidance safeguarding land for **local** improvement schemes as approved by the Borough Council.

### **Proposed Modification**

**M7.8**

Amalgamate Policies TR/4 and 5, and schemes therein, under a new heading '**LOCAL HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES IN LOUGHBOROUGH**' with the policy guidance and reasoned justification as follows.

**~~SOUTHFIELDS ROAD, LOUGHBOROUGH HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEME~~**  
**~~OTHER LOCAL HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES IN LOUGHBOROUGH~~**

7.40 **POLICY TR/4**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development which would prejudice the implementation of the local improvement schemes listed below ~~improvement of Southfield Road, Loughborough, between Packe Horse Lane and Albert Street~~ within the reservations identified on the Proposals Map:**

- i) Southfields Road (between Packe Horse Lane and Albert Street);**
- ii) Empress Road (north east of the Little Moor Lane junction);**
- iii) Swingbridge Road (west side).**

**Where permitted by redevelopment proposals the opportunity will be taken to secure these local improvements to enable the highway to fulfil its local traffic function more effectively and/or make pedestraian circulation easier and safer.**

7.41 Southfield Road forms part of the gyratory road system serving the town centre. The reservation along Southfield Road safeguards land which would enable improvements along the route consistent with more sustainable transport policies. This could include, bus priority

~~measures, or cycle lanes. The reservation would be enforced where redevelopment opportunities arise during the plan period. The scheme merits a specific policy given Southfields Road's importance in Loughborough's town centre road system. Southfield Road is an important part of the main road network in central Loughborough. It is intended to safeguard areas needed for this highway improvement should redevelopment opportunities arise during the plan period. This improvement is viewed as complementary to the overall transport choice strategy. It is afforded a higher degree of protection as the road serves the Woodgate car park and would serve other town centre development schemes.~~

#### ~~7.42 POLICY TR/5~~

~~The lengths of highway listed below and their reservations defined on the Proposals Map, are those considered of local significance for which the Borough Council will be responsible. Where permitted by redevelopment proposals the opportunity will be taken to secure the widening of these roads and any related junctions to enable the highway to fulfil its local traffic function more effectively and/or make pedestrian circulation easier and safer.~~

- ~~i) Empress Road, Loughborough (north east of the Little Moor Lane junction);~~
- ~~ii) Swingbridge Road, Loughborough (west side).~~

7.43 These Empress Road and Swingbridge Road ~~two~~ schemes are seen as necessary improvements to the road network in Loughborough to accommodate the demands and requirements of modern motor traffic. Where frontages are proposed for redevelopment the opportunity will be taken to achieve highway improvements along the identified sections of road.

### **POLICY TR/5 – OTHER LOCAL HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES IN LOUGHBOROUGH**

#### **Inspector's Recommendation**

7.92 *I recommend that Policy TR/5 be deleted from the Plan, the schemes included therein be listed under Policy TR/4, as modified, and subsequent policies renumbered accordingly.*

#### **CBC Decision**

Accept.

#### **Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraph 7.90 of the Inspector's Report.

It is accepted that Policy TR/5 should be deleted and that the schemes therein should be included in an amended Policy TR/4. However the proposed modification to Policy TR/4 does not accord with the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out under that Policy above.

**Proposed Modification****M7.9**

Delete Policy TR/5 and include the guidance and schemes therein in Policy TR/4 as amended by Proposed Modification M7.8.

**POLICY TR/6 - ROADS AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS TO BE PROVIDED IN ASSOCIATION WITH NEW DEVELOPMENT**

**Inspector's Recommendation**

7.100 *I recommend that:*

- (i) *Having regard to my conclusions at paragraph 7.96, the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 172 and FPC 172A.*
- (ii) *the last sentence of paragraph 7.45 be deleted and replaced by:*

*“It is expected that the Borough Council will seek to negotiate reasonably related contributions from developers to fund these improvements, secured through planning agreements and in accordance with the rules governing planning obligations”.*
- (iii) *references to schemes in paragraph 7.46 be modified to be consistent with the above recommendations.*

**CBC Decision**

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.94 to 7.99 of the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification****M7.10**

[Note: Aspects of this Proposed Modification rely upon the Council's Further Proposed Changes which have not previously been subject to public consultation]

Modify Policy TR/6 and the reasoned justification.

The modification to the Proposals Map resulting from the amendment to sub paragraph (iii) is shown on Plan M5.8.

7.44 **POLICY TR/6**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development which would prejudice the following road and highway improvements which are required in association with specific allocations for development:**

- i) a local distributor road from a new junction north of No.148 Cotes Road to Willow Way, Barrow-upon-Soar;**
- ii) ~~a local distributor road from the A6 to the Great Central Railway across land to the north of Harrowgate Drive, Wanlip;~~**

- ~~ii) iii)~~ a local distributor road between the proposed Epinal Way extension at Woodthorpe and the estate road layout serving the committed ‘Fairmeadow’ development, south of Loughborough;
- ~~iii) iv)~~ a local distributor road between Bishop Meadow Road, Loughborough and the A6 north of Dishley Grange, Hathern; a local distributor road routed to the south of Dishley Pool between Bishop Meadow Road, Loughborough and the north of Dishley Grange, Hathern which allows for an independent access to the Astra Charnwood site routed to the north of Dishley Pool.
- ~~iv) v)~~ the diversion and re-alignment of the A6 to provide a dual carriageway section of road to the north-west of Dishley Grange, Hathern to include a roundabout link to the new distributor road;
- ~~v) vi)~~ a local distributor road between Meadow Lane and Nottingham Road, Loughborough;

#### **Highway Improvements**

- ~~vi) vii)~~ the provision of a flood-free link between Sileby Road, Barrow-upon-Soar and the A6 bypass via Slash Lane, Essex Bridge and Mountsorrel Lane.  
(See also in particular Policies H/1b[re i)] H/1g[re ii)], E/5c)[re iii), and iv)] and E/10[re v)])

- 7.45 None of the schemes listed in this policy is provided for in any programme for public investment but each is required in association with specific proposals for development advanced elsewhere in this local plan. Accordingly it is expected that these schemes should be funded entirely by private contributions secured through related planning agreements. It is expected that the Borough Council will seek to negotiate reasonably related contributions from developers to fund these improvements, secured through planning agreements and in accordance with the rules governing planning obligations.
- 7.46 The new local distributor road at Barrow upon Soar (item (i)) is required to service a new housing development (H/1(b) applies). ~~The major allocation north of Harrowgate Drive and west of the A6 at Wanlip (Policies H/1(r), E/5(g), TR/26, TR/32 and CF/8) occasions the need for the new distributor road listed at item (ii).~~ The housing allocation south of Loughborough (H/1(g)) requires the new distributor road listed at item ~~(iii)~~ (ii) and will also be expected to contribute to the Epinal Way extension. The proposed employment area at Dishley Grange, Hathern will require provision of a new distributor road (item ~~(iv)~~ (iii)) and diversion and re-alignment of the A6 (item ~~(v)~~ (iv)) to provide access. Design of a new distributor road must allow for the implementation of an independent access road to the Astra Charnwood site. The independent access road will need to be designed to minimise impact on the environment in terms of noise and visual intrusion and to safeguard wildlife and ecological interest in the vicinity of Dishley Pool. The employment allocation at Rothley Lodge, Rothley (Policy E/5(f)) creates the opportunity to negotiate a contribution towards provision of a flood-free route between the Hayhill Industrial Estate and the A6 Bypass.

## **POLICY TR/7 - TRANSPORT STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT**

### **Inspector’s Recommendation**

- 7.106 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 173 and be further modified by the deletion of the words, “efficient and commercially viable” in criterion (i) and by the insertion of the word, “compatible” before the word, “land-uses” in criterion (ii).*

**CBC Decision**

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.102 to 7.105 of the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification****M7.11**

Modify Policy TR/7 and paragraph 7.48.
--

7.47 **POLICY TR/7**

**Planning permission will be granted for development which is, or forms part of a larger scheme, for 25 or more dwellings, in excess of 1 hectare (2.5 acres) of employment land, or other proposals likely to function as a major trip generator where the development**  
~~In the determination of planning applications for development comprising or forming part of a larger scheme for 25 or more dwellings, employment land in excess of 1 hectare (2.5 acres) or other proposals likely to function as a major trip generator, the Borough Council will take into account, amongst other requirements, the extent to which the development:~~

- i) is in a location serviced by ~~efficient and commercially viable~~ public transport connections to areas of housing, places of work or other key destinations;
- ii) is close to compatible land-uses or activities with a complementary ~~similar~~ trip generation pattern and so helps reduce overall travel needs;
- iii) ensures that the needs of buses are met by provision of a road layout providing maximum penetration of the development by bus services with all parts of the site falling within approximately 400 metres of a potential bus route, with bus-shelters, bus lay-bys and information points provided at main stops;
- iv) ~~the scheme~~ ensures the needs and safety of pedestrians are met in terms of access to the site and the inclusion of an integrated public footpath system which avoids roads wherever possible and provides pedestrian friendly links between the main land uses within the site, linkages with the established network outside the site, and safe road crossings where needed;
- v) ensures that the needs and safety of cyclists are met in terms of access to the site and the inclusion of special features such as cycleways, cycle lanes, safe cycle crossings and direct links between land uses, and between the site and adjoining cycleway provision;
- vi) ~~conforms in its highway layout and provisions for servicing with the standards set out in the Leicestershire County Council's Highway Requirements for Development (1991). In approving detailed housing layouts the Borough Council will expect schemes to utilise the lowest order of road compatible with the scale of development which it is intended to serve~~ makes adequate provision for vehicular access and circulation, highway design and layout and servicing arrangements. In approving detailed housing layouts the Borough Council will expect schemes to utilise the lowest order of road compatible with the scale of development to be served.

- 7.48 This policy provides guidance on the road layout, public transport provision, footways and cycle access to be sought in new developments. It is complementary to sustainability and transport choice objectives, and is framed to ensure satisfactory access for all travel modes, and avoid over-dominance by provision for road traffic. Detailed guidance is contained in the 'Highway Requirements for Development' prepared by Leicestershire County Council and Borough Council's 'Supplementary Planning Guidance'. Consultations on planning applications will be undertaken with the Highway Authority prior to their determination.

## **POLICY TR/8 - TRAFFIC GENERATION FROM NEW DEVELOPMENT**

### **Inspector's Recommendation**

7.111 *I recommend that:-*

- (i) *the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 174 and FPC 174A, except that:*
  - (a) *criteria (i) and (ii) be deleted from PC 174, and*
  - (b) *the words, "on non-designated sites", be inserted in the first line of the main clause of the policy after the word "development".*

### **CBC Decision**

Accept.

### **Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.108 to 7.110 of the Inspector's Report.

### **Proposed Modification**

**M7.12**

[Note: Aspects of this Proposed Modification rely upon the Council's Further Proposed Changes which have not previously been subject to public consultation]

Modify Policy TR/8 and the reasoned justification.
--

### 7.53 **POLICY TR/8**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development on non-designated sites where the impact of traffic generated by an individual proposal or the cumulative impact together with other committed and allocated development in the locality would:**

- ~~i) cause unacceptable additional danger to safe movement of pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and people with disabilities unless appropriate remedial provision can be made; or~~
- ~~ii) place the capacity available in the highway system under unreasonable pressure; or~~
- ~~i) iii) result in unsafe and unsatisfactory prejudice the safe and satisfactory operation of the highway system particularly along main roads or at main road junctions; or~~

~~ii) iv) have a significant adverse impact on the environment. unless satisfactory and environmentally acceptable improvements to the transport network with a reasonable design life are provided to overcome such harmful effects;~~

Unless measures are proposed to overcome any harmful effects. Where such measures involve improvements to the transport system they will need to be environmentally acceptable, minimise land take and have a reasonable design life.

In all cases measures should help to reduce car use to and from development and contribute to genuine and effective transport choice facilities through the encouragement of walking, cycling and the use of public transport for occupiers jointly or separately.

~~Any improvements considered necessary should minimise land take and contribute to genuine and long term transport choice facilities, and must satisfy the requirements of government guidance on planning gain.~~

~~Where any development would in part, or in total, generate over 250 vehicle movements per day or over 50 vehicles during the peak hour the Borough Council will expect submission of a detailed 'Traffic Impact Assessment'.~~

~~The assessment of individual proposals will also take into account the impact of traffic generated by existing and committed development including allocations made in this Local Plan.~~

7.54 New development must be acceptable in terms of its impact on the existing highway network. Solutions to identified problems will be expected to improve the overall transport system rather than merely pursue road-based solutions. Development proposals should ensure that the impact of traffic generated, access arrangements, related road schemes and improvements, and other transport infrastructure safeguards the environment. Proposals should not have a damaging impact on the character and appearance of a locality. Features such as country lanes, areas of historic, ecological or other interest should be safeguarded. Living and working conditions should be safeguarded from the effects of visual intrusion, noise, emissions and other disturbance.

7.55 [No Change].

7.56 Traffic Impact Assessments will be required for any proposals for development which would in part, or in total, generate:~~Where any development is expected to attract over 250 vehicle movements per day or over 50 vehicle movements during the peak hour the developer may be required to submit a detailed traffic impact assessment in support of his proposals.~~

- over 250 vehicle movements per day or 50 vehicle movements in the peak hour; or
- traffic exceeding 10 per cent of the traffic flows on the adjoining highway, or 5 per cent where traffic congestion exists or will exist; or
- a large proportion of the additional vehicles as heavy goods traffic.

Measures need to be implemented, particularly in peripheral locations to restrain commuter parking, reduce traffic generation and to encourage employees to think and act more environmentally in their choice of transport. Commuter Plans and travel plans have a role to play in reducing use of the private car. The Borough Council has resolved to prepare a Commuter Plan for its employees and wishes to see other employers undertaking similar exercises with their employees.

**POLICY TR/9 - IMPROVING BUS SERVICES AND FACILITIES****Inspector's Recommendation**

7.115 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 175, except that the phrase "Routes with competitive journey times" be deleted and that if possible the Council substitutes a list of routes to which the modified Policy TR/9 would apply.*

**CBC Decision**

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.113 and 7.114 of the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification****M7.13**

Modify Policy TR/9 and the reasoned justification.
--

**7.59 POLICY TR/9**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development which would prejudice the successful implementation of measures to secure high quality bus services. These measures include bus ways, bus lanes and other bus priority measures, bus lay-bays and passenger facilities to enable journeys to work, shopping trips and other trips for recreation, health, education and social activities to be made, along direct routes with competitive journey times.**

**Measures will be focused on the following bus routes :**

- i) Loughborough town services;**
- ii) Leicester/Loughborough/Shepshed via the A6 and A512;**
- iii) Leicester/Melton Mowbray via the A46 and A607;**
- iv) Loughborough/Nottingham;**
- v) Loughborough/East Midlands Airport via the A6.**

~~The Borough Council will continue to co-operate and liaise with the highway authority and bus operators to secure high quality bus services, through the provision of bus lanes and priority measures, bus lay-bays and passenger facilities which enable journeys to work, shopping trips and other trips for recreation, health, education and social activities to be made along direct routes with competitive journey times. Actions will be focused on achieving and maintaining a high level of accessibility along that part of the A6 transport choice corridor in the plan area between the centres of Loughborough and Leicester and on routes serving Loughborough, Shepshed and routes adjoining Leicester~~

7.60 Buses have an important role to play in the Plan's sustainable transport strategy. Greater use of buses, especially at peak periods, can help ease congestion. The 'Quality Bus Initiative' started in Central Leicestershire has now been extended to Loughborough/Shepshed. In October 1996 a 'Quality Bus Partnership' was launched between local authorities and the bus operators. This aims to provide better on-route facilities and information, bus priority measures, better termini, more lay-bays, shelters and stops. Operators are introducing high quality buses. It is intended to extend the initiative to the A6 transport choice corridor between Loughborough and Leicester to achieve and maintain a high level of accessibility. ~~Improvement of provision for buses is an~~

important part of the Plan's transport strategy. The Borough council has stated its support for the County Council's 'Quality Bus Initiatives' to achieve and maintain high standards of service and bus accessibility along the former A6 between the centres of Loughborough and Leicester. The 'Initiative' includes implementation of bus priority measures, improving termini, better on-route facilities and information, more lay-bys and bus stops.

- 7.61 The Soar and Wreake Valley sub areas have a total population of over 100,000, including Loughborough, living in close proximity to a network of bus routes serving Leicester and Loughborough and linking to other County Towns. There is considered to be great potential in these areas to secure modal shift away from cars to bus (and rail). Improved bus services and facilities are a key component of both the successful 'Central Leicestershire' package and the current 'Loughborough/Shepshed' package bid included in the highway authorities LTPs. The Borough Council will support the introduction of bus priority measures. The Soar and Wreake Valley areas have a total population in excess of 100,000 living alongside relatively short bus routes serving the main urban areas of Leicester and Loughborough. In these areas there is great potential to achieve a high level of modal shift to bus and rail. Improvement of bus services and facilities will be a key component of a T.P.P 'Package Bid' for Loughborough and will be evaluated through the Caltrans study for Central Leicestershire.

## **POLICY TR/10 - AN IMPROVED BUS STATION IN LOUGHBOROUGH**

### **Inspector's Recommendation**

7.118 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 176.*

### **CBC Decision**

Accept.

### **Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraph 7.117 in the Inspector's Report.

### **Proposed Modification**

**M7.14**

Modify Policy TR/10 and paragraphs 7.64 and 7.65.
---

### 7.63 **POLICY TR/10**

**Planning permission will be granted for proposals for the rationalisation and/or relocation of the bus station site at Fennel Street, Loughborough to provide an improved central bus station. This will be secured either by Borough Council funding and/or by seeking to negotiate funding from related redevelopment.**  
~~Planning permission will be granted for the provision of an improved central bus station through the rationalisation and/or relocation of the Fennel Street facility in association with the proposed redevelopment of the site.~~

- 7.64 The current bus station is outdated, unsatisfactory and not attractive to bus users and service operators given its location, layout and appearance. Its image would be greatly improved by rationalisation, redevelopment or relocation to provide attractive passenger facilities. Any relocation would need to be centrally placed in relation to the town centre and potential users. In August 1996 the Borough approved a scheme to provide new stands with seating and wider lanes for possible implementation in 1997/98. The bus station would remain in broadly the same location.~~The current bus station is unsatisfactory and unappealing to travellers and~~

~~service operators due to its layout, location and appearance. Passenger facilities would be greatly improved by its rationalisation, redevelopment or relocation to a suitable site elsewhere in the town centre. A solution could be incorporated within and enabled by a redevelopment of the Fennel Street Opportunity Site.~~

- 7.65 ~~This does not rule out other development related proposals. Discussions will be held with bus operators, prospective developers and other interested parties to secure an improved central bus station by negotiation sponsored by related redevelopment.~~ Discussions will be held with bus operators, prospective developers and other interested parties to identify the options available for the bus station, with an appropriate solution to be sponsored by redevelopment.

## **POLICY TR/11 - BUS/RAIL INTERCHANGE NEXT TO LOUGHBOROUGH STATION**

### **Inspector's Recommendation**

7.121 *I recommend that no modification be made in response to this objection.*

### **CBC Decision**

Accept.

### **Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraph 7.120 in the Inspector's Report.

### **Proposed Modification**

None.

## **POLICY TR/12 - SAFEGUARDING AREAS FOR NEW RAILWAY STATIONS**

### **Inspector's Recommendation**

7.128 *I recommend that:-*

- (i) *the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 177 and FPC 177A,*
- (ii) *the Plan be not modified in accordance with PC 178, and*
- (iii) *the Proposals Map be further modified by the reservation of land for the development of the East Goscote railway station, and the RJ of Policy TR/12 be modified appropriately.*

### **CBC Decision**

Recommendation (i) and (ii): Accept

Recommendation (iii): Accept with further modification.

### **Reason**

**Recommendation (i) and (ii):**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.123 to 7.127 of the Inspectors Report.

**Recommendation (iii):**

The Deposit Draft Plan safeguarded a village centre location for the rail station proposed at East Goscote. Following further discussions with the County Council and Railtrack it became apparent that there were technical constraints to the village centre location. An amendment was made to the Plan before the Local Plan Inquiry to indicate on the Proposals Map a wider area of search including a site near Broome Lane. This amended area attracted significant local objection. The Inspector in his Report is clearly concerned that the Plan must set out clear and more specific guidance on the location of the station.

The County Council and Railtrack have been reconsulted on the issues. Both recognise that the village centre site is the preferable in locational terms. However Railtrack believe this location has a significant risk of additional costs due to the proximity of a level crossing. Given this constraint the County Council's Director of Planning and Transportation suggests that the reservation in the Plan should safeguard both options. In ongoing discussions he will continue to press Railtrack to provide for the village centre site in their resignalling plans for the line.

If the Plan indicates a location for the station that proves to be unachievable the Plan will have raised false expectations. On the basis of available evidence the village centre site may not be viable and the site nearer Broome Lane is the most likely location for the station. It is therefore concluded that the Local Plan Proposals Map should identify the Broome Lane site as the location for the station

**Proposed Modification**

**M7.15**

[Note: Aspects of this Proposed Modification rely upon the Council's Further Proposed Changes which have not previously been subject to public consultation]

Modify the Proposals Map by the relocation of the reservation for the proposed East Goscote rail station to a site either side of Broome Lane (see Plan M7.15).

Amend the reasoned justification at paragraphs 7.73 and 7.74.

7.73 Development proposals likely to prejudice the provision of new stations and related infrastructure will be resisted. The Borough Council will press for the early implementation of additional stations. At East Goscote detailed proposals will be expected to ensure satisfactory off-street parking for cars and cycles to facilitate rail-based 'park and ride'. The Thurmaston station is intended to be primarily a "walk and ride" facility. Accordingly no provision is made in the safeguarded area for car parking. However, in the interests of promoting sustainable alternatives provision should be made for the secure parking of cycles in association with the development of the station. and etc Thurmaston and will expect detailed proposals to ensure satisfactory off street parking for cars and cycles, to facilitate rail based 'park and ride'.

7.74 The location of the area safeguarded on the Proposals Map for the proposed station at East Goscote has been determined by operational requirements and the costs of overcoming known technical constraints. The most likely location for the station on the basis of current evidence is near Broome Lane in the area indicated on the Proposals Map. This allows for a Melton bound platform on the north side of the line east of Broome Lane, and a Leicester bound platform on the southern, village side of the crossing. The location of the proposed station at East Goscote near Broome Lane offers the prospect of complimentary car parking provision.

## POLICY TR/15 - OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADDITIONAL RAIL FACILITIES ALONG THE MIDLAND MAINLINE AND LEICESTER TO PETERBOROUGH RAILWAY CORRIDORS

### Inspector's Recommendation

7.131 *I recommend that Policy TR/15 be deleted, (with subsequent policies renumbered accordingly), and replaced with a statement of support for additional rail based facilities on the Midland Mainline and Leicester to Peterborough railway corridors which conform to the policies of this Plan.*

### CBC Decision

Accept.

### Reason

For the reasons set out in paragraph 7.130 in the Inspector's Report.

### Proposed Modification

**M7.16**

Delete Policy TR/15 and amend the reasoned justification.

### ~~7.83 — POLICY TR/15~~

~~Planning permission for new passenger rail stations, rail freight accesses or other rail based facilities along the Midland and Leicester to Peterborough Railway Lines will be granted provided:~~

- ~~i) — there is no adverse impact on the operation of rail services;~~
- ~~ii) — the facilities provide adequate spacing with existing rail-based facilities;~~
- ~~iii) — the environmental impact of the proposal is sympathetic to the site and its surroundings.~~

~~7.84 The Borough Council will support planning permission will be granted for new passenger rail stations, rail freight accesses or other rail-based facilities along the Midland Mainline and Leicester to Peterborough railway lines where there would not be problems because of proximity to existing rail-based facilities, the environmental impact of a proposal is sympathetic to the site and its surroundings and such proposals would conform with the policies of this Plan.~~

## POLICY TR/16 - ACCESS FOR PEDESTRIANS

### Inspector's Recommendation

7.140 *I draw attention to my conclusions at paragraph 7.135 and my recommendations at paragraph 7.148, and recommend that:-*

- (i) the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 180 except that the main clause of Policy TR/16 should read:*

*“The Borough Council will seek to develop its strategy for a network of pedestrian and cycle routes by direct funding and through development proposals in this Plan. The Borough Council will also seek to negotiate contributions to secure off site connections into and improvements to the wider networks of footways and cycle routes where this is practicable and directly related to development schemes. Planning permission will not be granted for development schemes that fail to comply with briefs designed to develop the strategy or to meet the standards for footway and cycle routes contained in Supplementary Planning Guidance.*

*Routes along which measures will be encouraged to make cycling safer and more attractive and which will be protected from development proposals likely to prejudice their use for cycling are shown on the Proposals Map.*

*The proposed routes for cycle measures are: [as listed in PC 180].”*

- (ii) *that the RJ and Appendices to the Plan be modified as may be appropriate in accordance with paragraph 7.138 above.*

### **CBC Decision**

Accept with further modification.

### **Reasons**

The Inspector’s recommended wording for the main paragraphs of Policy TR/16 in recommendation (i) refers to standards for footway and cycle routes.

The Borough Council has adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance standards for cycle routes in Loughborough and is committed to the preparation and adoption of additional Supplementary Planning Guidance for footway standards within a time frame consistent with the adoption of the Local Plan.

The Inspector at paragraph 7.137 of his Report suggests plans showing existing and future cycle routes and footway network would usefully be included as appendices, although this does not carry through into a recommendation. It is accepted that the inclusion of route network plans would help users of the Plan better understand the implication of this aspect of the transport policies.

The Proposals Map already shows the cycle routes proposed in this Plan. However the pedestrian route and future cycle routes are not worked up in sufficient detail to include as appendices in this Plan. The issue should be reconsidered when the Plan is reviewed.

### **Proposed Modification**

**M7.17**

Under revised head ‘**ACCESS FOR CYCLISTS AND PEDESTRIANS**’ delete Policy TR/17 and include the list of proposed routes for cycle measures previously included in a revised Policy TR/16. Modify the reasoned justification at paragraphs 7.88 to 7.90 and 7.92 to 7.99 accordingly.

### **ACCESS FOR CYCLISTS AND PEDESTRIANS**

#### **7.87 POLICY TR/16**

**~~The Borough Council in co-operation with the County Council and other funding agencies will direct available funding to improve and extend safe routes for pedestrians in the plan area. These will be routed between places of residence, employment,~~**

~~shopping, leisure and cultural activity as part of local footway and greenway networks and longer distance routes. All routes must include frequent and safe crossings of roads, and be easy to follow. will seek to develop its strategy for a network of pedestrian and cycle routes by direct funding and through development proposals in this Plan. The Borough Council will also seek to negotiate contributions to secure off site connections into and improvements to the wider networks of footways and cycle routes where this is practicable and directly related to development schemes. Planning permission will not be granted for development schemes that fail to comply with briefs designed to develop the strategy or to meet the standards for footway and cycle routes contained in Supplementary Planning Guidance.~~

Routes along which measures will be encouraged to make walking cycling safer and more attractive and which will be protected from development proposals likely to prejudice their use ~~by pedestrians~~ for cycling are shown on the Proposals Map.

~~Where development is proposed which might derive some advantage from defined routes planning permission will be conditional upon their provision within the site and separate agreements will be pursued through negotiations to ensure the delivery of of-site connections onto the footway network.~~

The proposed routes for cycle measures are:

- i) Woodbrook Way, Loughborough
- ii) Burleigh Way, Loughborough;
- iii) Blackbrook Way, Loughborough'
- iv) Grand Union Canal Towpath, Loughborough;
- v) Charnwood Water, Loughborough;
- vi) Epinal Way extension, Loughborough/Quorn;
- vii) Shelthorpe Road, Loughborough;
- viii) Warwick Way, Loughborough;
- ix) A512 Ashby Road, between Shepshed and Loughborough;
- x) Baxter Gate, Loughborough;
- xi) Fairmeadow development to town centre via ~~Burton Walk/Park Road/Beacon Road, Loughborough;~~
- xii) National Cycle Network Millennium Route via Shepshed Loughborough and the Soar Valley/Charnwood Forest;
- xiii) Woodthorpe to Woodhouse;
- xiv) Land north of Birstall with linkages to the established network;
- xv) Syston to East Goscote along A607 corridor.
- xvi) Castle Hill Country Park in Leicester to Anstey and Thurcaston and Charnwood Forest

**xvii) Alan Moss Road/ Belton Road to railway station, Loughborough**

**xviii) Kirkstone Drive to Ashby Road to Gorse Covert, Loughborough**

**xix) Meadow Lane to town centre, Loughborough.**

**Other schemes may be identified within the plan period as additions and extensions to the network.**

**(See also in particular Policies H/1, E/5)**

- 7.88 The Plan promotes the development of a comprehensive Boroughwide network of footways serving local and long distance movements. This will be based on the existing rights of way network and complement the network of cycle routes. Where it is appropriate and practical the Borough Council will allow joint use of routes by cyclists and pedestrians, and also investigate measures to enable better access for people with disabilities. The Borough Council in cooperation with the County Council and other funding agencies will direct available funding to improve and extend direct and safe routes for pedestrian users across the plan area. These will be routed between places of residence, employment, shopping, leisure and cultural activity as part of local footway and greenway networks and longer distance routes. Such routes may be for shared use with other vulnerable road users where conflict is not expected to arise.
- 7.89 The network will aim to create safer and more attractive routes improving access to places of work, shopping, leisure and other facilities for pedestrians. Improvements could be in the form of pedestrianisation as in Loughborough Town Centre, the widening of pavements, providing better walking surfaces and signage.
- 7.90 The Borough Council has approved a pedestrian strategy for the Borough as a framework to implement measures. Provision for pedestrians will be a key component of the 'T.P.P' Package Bid Local Transport Plans being prepared for Loughborough Leicestershire and Central Leicestershire. Footway standards will be developed to complement the Borough Council's existing cycleway standards.

## **ACCESS FOR CYCLISTS**

### **7.91 POLICY TR/17**

~~The Borough Council in co-operation with the County Council and other funding agencies will direct available resources to improve and extend cycle parking provision and safe cycle routes both on road and as off-road greenways, with signalled road crossings as part of local networks and longer distance cycle routes, including the Inverness to Dover route.~~

~~Routes along which measures will be encouraged to make cycling safer and more attractive, and which will be protected from development proposals likely to prejudice their use for cycling, are shown on the Proposals Map.~~

~~Where development is proposed which might derive some advantage from the defined routes planning permission will be conditional upon their provision within the site and separate agreements will be pursued through negotiations to ensure the delivery of off site connections into the cycleway network.~~

~~The proposed routes for cycle measures are:~~

- ~~i) — Woodbrook Way, Loughborough;~~
- ~~ii) — Burleigh Way, Loughborough;~~

- ~~iii) — Blackbrook Way, Loughborough<sup>2</sup>~~
- ~~iv) — Grand Union Canal Towpath, Loughborough;~~
- ~~v) — Charnwood Water, Loughborough;~~
- ~~vi) — Epinal Way extension, Loughborough/Quorn;~~
- ~~vii) — Shelthorpe Road, Loughborough;~~
- ~~viii) — Warwick Way, Loughborough;~~
- ~~ix) — Ashby Road, Loughborough;~~
- ~~x) — Baxter Gate, Loughborough;~~
- ~~xi) — Fairmeadow development to town centre via Burton Walk/Park Road/Beacon Road, Loughborough;~~
- ~~xii) — Section of the National Cycle Network Millennium Route between Shepshed and Syston;~~
- ~~xiii) — Woodthorpe to Woodhouse;~~
- ~~xiv) — Land north of Birstall with linkages to the established network;~~
- ~~xv) — Syston to East Goscote along A607 corridor.~~

~~Other schemes may be identified within the Plan period as additions and extensions to the network.~~

~~(See also in particular Policies H/1, E/5)~~

- 7.92 The Borough Council will seek to safeguard, extend and improve cycle routes throughout the Borough. The aim will be to create a comprehensive cycle network. This will involve both on-road lanes and off-road routes. Some schemes will provide segregated provision for cyclists while in other locations cycleways will be shared with strategic pedestrian routes. The Epinal Way cycleway in Loughborough is an example of an effective dual use facility.
- 7.93 Provision will be focused on the likely areas of demand, usually on roads with high traffic volumes and at locations with poor cycling safety records. The main objective will be to link residential areas with education facilities, shopping centres, railway stations, and the main areas of employment, and to create strategic links into the countryside based wherever possible on green corridors. The Leicestershire and Central Leicestershire LTPs place an increased emphasis on cycling given the potential for this mode to provide an alternative to the car as part of a more sustainable transport policy.
- 7.94 The Borough Council in implementing its cycling strategy for Loughborough, will in co-operation with the County Council utilise available funding to develop a wider network of cycle routes based on the Epinal Way cycleway creating improved links within the town, and between the town and other settlements. Many short distance movements and recreational trips can be made by cycle if safe and pleasant conditions are available. To be most effective cycle routes should serve desire lines for cycle use, be attractive and inviting to would be users, and segregated from vehicular traffic movements.
- 7.95 The main emphasis will be in providing routes for commuter movements in Loughborough, the Borough's main urban area where the greatest conflict between cyclist and other

road-users exists. New cycle routes will need to provide safe, well-lit corridors. The main demand for new routes appear to be to serve cross-town movements between the housing areas, education facilities, employment areas, town centre and to and from the railway station. It will involve the use of routes on, or alongside existing roads as well as the use of parts of the current footpath network improved to the necessary standards. The standards for the construction of cycleways approved by the Borough Council are included in the Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance.

- 7.96 In March 1993 the County Council adopted a Countywide cycling strategy as part of the Transport Choice Strategy, and is pursuing funding through the ~~T.P.P~~ LTPs. The strategy emphasises the need for better facilities in Leicester and the County Towns. Investment will be directed to secure better cycling facilities and to promote a positive image for cycling. Improved provision for cyclists will be a key aim of the ~~'T.P.P' Package Bid being prepared for Loughborough~~ LTPs. Provision of cycle parking facilities is dealt with in Policy TR/21.
- 7.97 Implementation of this policy will involve discussions with the County Council, Parish and Town Representatives landowners and cycle user groups to identify an overall network of cycle routes and other provision for cyclists consistent with the wider strategy for Leicestershire as a whole prepared by the County Council. The routes shown on the Proposals Map and listed in the policy are those along which measures will be encouraged to make cycling safer and more attractive.
- 7.98 Available public funding will be directed towards the implementation of new cycle routes, advisory routes, junction improvements and cycle parking with priority being given to the areas of greatest demand consistent with the strategy. Contributions will be required from developers where new provision for cyclists is reasonably and directly related to a proposed development while cycling will be promoted as a safe and attractive mode of transport.
- 7.99 The implementation of long distance routes which continue outside the plan area will require close liaison with other adjoining authorities and agencies. The Borough Council has supported the routing of the Inverness to Dover Millennium Route through the Borough.

**Proposed Modification**

**M7.18**

Amend the Proposals Map by the addition of a route along the dual carriageway section of Forest Road, Loughborough (Policy TR/16 i)). See Plan M7.18.

**Proposed Modification**

**M7.19**

Amend the Proposals Map by the extension of the cycle route from Shelthorpe Road, Loughborough as far as Wheatlands Drive alongside the A6 (Policy TR/16 vii)). See Plan M7.19.

**Proposed Modification**

**M7.20**

Amend the Proposals Map by the extension of the cycle route along Ashby Road between Shepshed and Loughborough (Policy TR/16 ix)). See Plan M7.20.

**Proposed Modification**

**M7.21**

Amend the Proposals Map by the deletion of the Burton Walks to Shelthorpe Road link (Policy TR/16 xi)). See Plan M7.21.

**Proposed Modification****M7.22**

Amend the Proposals Map by the addition of the section of the Sustrans National Cycle network through Loughborough (Policy TR/16 xii). See Plan M7.22.

**Proposed Modification****M7.23**

Amend the Proposals Map by the addition of a link from the south of Loughborough housing development to the Woodthorpe to Woodhouse route (Policy TR/16 xiii). See Plan M7.23.

**Proposed Modification****M7.24**

Amend the Proposals Map by the addition of a route alongside the A6 north of Birstall (Policy TR/16 xiv). See Plan M7.24.

**Proposed Modification****M7.25**

Amend the Proposals Map by the addition of a route from Castle Hill Country Park in Leicester to Anstey and Thurcaston and Charnwood Forest (Policy TR/16 xvi). See Plan M7.25.

**Proposed Modification****M7.26**

Amend the Proposals Map by the addition of a route from Kirkstone Drive to Ashby Road to Gorse Covert, Loughborough (Policy TR/16 xviii). See Plan M7.26.

**Proposed Modification****M7.27**

Amend the Proposals Map by the addition of a route from Meadow Lane to town centre, Loughborough (Policy TR/16 xix). See Plan M7.27.

**POLICY TR/17 - ACCESS FOR CYCLISTS****Inspector's Recommendation**

7.148 *I recommend that:*

- (i) *Policy TR/17 be modified in accordance with PC 180 and FPC 180B,*
- (ii) *the Proposals Map be modified to reflect the changes to the routes of cycle ways proposed and their numbering therein, and*
- (iii) *the Plan be not modified in accordance with PC 181.*

(recommendation (i)- as amended by Addendum to Inspector's report dated 23/10/2000)

**CBC Decision**

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out at paragraphs 7.142 to 7.147 of the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification****M7.28**

[Note: Aspects of this Proposed Modification rely upon the Council's Further Proposed Changes which have not previously been subject to public consultation]

Delete Policy TR/17, but include proposed routes for cycle measures in Policy TR/16 as amended by Proposed Modification M7.17.

**POLICY TR/19 - PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY****Inspector's Recommendation**

7.152 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 182 except that criterion (ii) should be deleted and be replaced with the following:-*

- (ii) *“an alternative route can be provided which will not be substantially less convenient to the public nor substantially detract from the public's enjoyment of the path or way, which is safe and which protects the continuity of the wider route”.*

**CBC Decision**

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.150 and 7.151 in the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification****M7.29**

Modify Policy TR/19 and paragraphs 7.103, 7.105 and 7.106.

**7.102 POLICY TR/19**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development affecting an existing right of way (footpath or bridleway) unless:**

- i) **there is no adverse effect on the existing route; or**
- ii) **an alternative route can be provided which will not be substantially less convenient to the public nor substantially detract from the public's enjoyment of the path or way, which is safe and which protects the continuity of the wider route**

~~**In determining planning applications the Borough Council will take into account the extent to which the design and layout of the development provides for the retention of**~~

~~any existing rights of way, or for their diversion towards a suitable and safe alternative route. Any diversion must respect the character and function of the original route.~~

- 7.103 The effect of development on public rights of way is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It is important for planning applications to clearly show proposals to divert or re-route any affected rights of way and to demonstrate safe and equivalent provision is made in lieu of the existing route. Only if a route along the existing line is not feasible should a diversion or stopping up be considered. New routes should be segregated from estate roads and footways and routed through public open space if this is can be secured in the design and layout of development
- 7.104 [No Change].
- 7.105 When applying for planning permission applicants will need to give detailed consideration to the effect of development proposals on any rights of way at the earliest possible opportunity. Where development affects a right of way the procedures laid down in planning legislation for stopping up or diversion of the right of way must be followed before development can take place
- 7.106 [No Change].

### **IMPROVEMENTS TO PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY**

Many existing rights of way are in need of improvement and better co-ordination to create attractive networks. The Borough Council will seek to secure improvements to the right of way network to ensure better access to rural areas. Improvements sought will be:

- better surfacing and drainage of paths;
- way marking and interpretation;
- creation or protection of wildlife habitats.

Improvements to this network should be linked to the re-use of disused linear routes (Policy TR/18) to provide a comprehensive and co-ordinated network linking settlements with the countryside and areas of interest. Scope exists to integrate routes with the bus network to provide 'bus-out-walk-back' trips, and similar initiatives.

## **POLICY TR/20 - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT**

### **Inspector's Recommendation**

7.155 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 183.*

### **CBC Decision**

Accept.

### **Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraph 7.154 in the Inspector's Report.

Modify the heading to 'TRAFFIC CALMING', and amend Policy and paragraph 7.112.
--

### **TRAFFIC CALMING MANAGEMENT**

#### 7.107 POLICY TR/20

**In the determination of planning applications the Borough Council will take into account the extent to which a development includes measures to reduce traffic speeds and assist in the creation of higher quality and safer living and working environments within, and in the vicinity, of the site, as well as the efficient movement of traffic. Traffic calming and management measures would need to address:**

~~The Borough and County Councils will identify areas for the implementation of detailed traffic management measures with provision for full public consultation in their design. The overall purpose of such measures will be the reduction of traffic speeds and to assist the creation of better and safer living and working environments. Traffic management schemes will be directed towards locations where they will:~~

- i) ~~overcome problems related to~~ **arising from traffic congestion;**
- ii) ~~reduction of reduce unnecessary traffic in areas of housing areas, near schools and other areas of intensive public activity; and within bypassed communities;~~
- iii) ~~address inadequate parking provision;~~
- iii) iv) **creating safer improve conditions for cyclists and pedestrians;**
- iv) v) ~~facilitate access by for buses, and other vehicles needing emergency access;~~
- v) **problems related to on and off-street parking;**

**The Borough and County Councils will continue to identify areas for the implementation of traffic calming and management measures to improve the safety, living and working conditions in areas experiencing significant traffic related problems**

7.108 [No Change].

7.109 [No Change].

7.110 [No Change].

7.111 [No Change].

7.112 Other schemes in Loughborough currently under consideration by the Borough Council for traffic management measures are listed below:

- Albert Promenade Area
- Bottleacre Lane
- Burder Street area
- Cumberland Road

- Old Ashby Road
- Radmoor Road
- Victoria Street area

All schemes located in the plan area will be subject to full public consultation on their design and content.

## PARAGRAPHS 7.113 and 7.114 - WEIGHT RESTRICTION ORDER (WROs)

### Inspector's Recommendation

7.158 I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 184.

### CBC Decision

Accept.

### Reason

For the reasons set out in paragraph 7.157 in the Inspector's Report.

### Proposed Modification

**M7.31**

Delete the heading 'WEIGHT RESTRICTION ORDERS (WROs)' and reasoned justification at paragraphs 7.113 and 7.114, and replace with.

## THE IMPACT OF TRAFFIC ON MINOR RURAL ROADS

### WEIGHT RESTRICTION ORDER (W.R.O'S)

#### POLICY TR/A

Planning permission will not be granted for development in locations where it would result in a significant change in the amount or type of traffic using rural roads or roads through villages, and:

- i) the safety of vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders would be endangered; or
- ii) roads are of unsuitable width, alignment or structural condition; or
- iii) the increase in traffic and/or the improvements necessary to accommodate it would harm the rural character of the roads or residential areas alongside them.

Development generating lorry traffic will be located so as to discourage, as far as possible, traffic from using roads other than the Specified Road Network.

Traffic generated by development can have significant adverse environmental effects on minor rural roads in terms of noise vibration, visual impact, accidents and safety, pollution

etc. It will be important to ensure that the impact of even modest new developments is minimised if the character of these roads is to be retained.

Of particular concern will be the impact of HGV traffic. The Borough Council will monitor the situation and support the County Council where it intends to discourage traffic, especially HGV's from travelling on minor rural roads by the use of traffic management and other measures including signing, width and weight restrictions, parking restrictions and road closures.

~~7.113 The County Council keeps under review the need for W.R.O's on the County's roads. At present a number of schemes are under consideration:~~

~~i) Barkby, Beeby and adjoining Parishes: A scheme was approved in September 1992 to restrict lorry movements on roads between the A47, A607 and B6047. Implementation of the whole scheme is currently deferred until the Eastern District Distributor Road is open to traffic. The County Council is currently assessing the impact of the Syston Northern Bypass and considering partial implementation of the scheme to include roads through Barkby and Beeby.~~

~~ii) Soar Valley and Wolds villages: A scheme to restrict lorry movements on roads between the A6 Quorn Mountsorrel bypass, the A46, the proposed A46 Leicester Western bypass, and the B676 between Loughborough and Six Hills is operational. This will help resolve previously identified problems in Barrow upon Soar, and Sileby.~~

~~iii) Former A6 through Quorn: A scheme is now operational.~~

~~iv) B591 between Beacon Crossroads and the junction with the former A6 at Quorn: A scheme has been implemented following the opening of the A46 Leicester Western bypass.~~

~~v) Greengate Lane, Birstall and roads through Thureaston: A W.R.O is now operational.~~

~~vi) Birstall: A proposal is soon to be subject to public consultation seeking to restrict H.G.V's to the A6 through Birstall.~~

~~7.114 The Borough Council will monitor the situation in the plan area. Its response to identified problems will be made in the context of the following statement of intent:~~

~~'The Borough Council supports the County Council's proposals for W.R.O's and other measures on roads in the plan area where the through movement of heavy goods vehicles is considered unreasonably high and a suitable alternative route exists.'~~

## **POLICY TR/21 - PARKING PROVISION IN NEW DEVELOPMENT**

### **Inspector's Recommendation**

*7.164 I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 185, FPC 185A and FPC 185B.*

### **CBC Decision**

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.160 to 7.163 in the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification****M7.32**

[Note: Aspects of this Proposed Modification rely upon the Council's Further Proposed Changes which have not previously been subject to public consultation]

Insert as Appendix 1 to the Local Plan the County Highway Authority's adopted parking standards as presented at Section 9 in the volume of Supplementary Planning Guidance. Delete Policy TR/21 and paragraphs 7.116 to 7.118 of the reasoned justification and replace by the following:

**7.115 POLICY TR/21**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development unless off-street parking for vehicles, including cycles, and servicing arrangements are included to secure highway safety and minimise harm to visual and local amenities. The adopted standards included as Appendix 1 will be used as the starting point in assessing the level of provision and represent the maximum level.**

**In the central areas of Loughborough and Shepshed, District Centres, primarily employment areas and other areas of significant trip generation the quantity of parking within new development will be determined through negotiation based on containing car parking provision. The quantity of parking allowed will reflect the proposed use and the location of development, the availability of public off-street parking; the current, or potential accessibility by non-car modes; the feasibility for commuted payments; the scope for practical measures to significantly reduce the use of private car trips to and from a site; and the need to reduce existing levels of private non-residential (PNR) car parking.**

(See also in particular Policies TR/22, 23 and 24)

~~Planning permission for development will not be granted unless it can be shown that provision has been made for the parking of vehicles, including cycles, off the highway in accordance with the standards set out in the Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance.~~

~~In the determination of planning applications for development which fail to make provision for car parking to the standards the Borough Council will take into account the effect of any special circumstances. Qualifying special circumstances will include situations where the following criteria apply:~~

- ~~i) a site is served by effective public transport services along with provision for cyclists and pedestrians;~~
- ~~ii) existing public off-street parking close to the site can cater for the development;~~
- ~~iii) there are environmental matters of acknowledged importance which are worthy of protection;~~
- ~~iv) in the case of residential accommodation the nature of occupation will ensure that car ownership will remain at a low level in the long term;~~
- ~~v) a developer enters into a legal agreement with the Borough Council to make payments in lieu of part or all of the normally applicable car parking~~

~~requirement to provide alternative measures which comprise an appropriate balance of:~~

- ~~• off-street public car parking close to and convenient for the proposed development;~~
- ~~• measures to improve access by public transport;~~
- ~~• measures to improve access by cycle and on foot.~~

Car parking policies should support the overall locational policies in the development plan. PPG13 at paragraph 4.5 indicates that standards of provision in local plans should be set as a range of maximum and operational minimum standards for broad classes of development. Control of parking provision can have a significant impact on modal choice. Over the plan period the intention is to encourage a gradual reduction in car dependency in favour of a shift to bus, rail, walking and cycling. Restraint based parking provision correctly applied can help reduce congestion and improve the area's attractiveness to investment.

The aim will be to secure a level of parking which as a minimum discourages reliance on the private car but provides sufficient off-street parking to allow development to proceed without creating traffic problems. If parking overflows on-street this can be detrimental to highway safety and the local environment because of the extra circulation and manoeuvring of vehicles.

In Central areas, District Centres, employment areas and other areas with significant trip generation lower levels of provision will be sought by negotiation. Reduced provision will be sought where, for example, the following circumstances prevail:

- a site is served, or is capable of being served, by effective public transport services along with provision for the safe, and direct movement of cyclists and pedestrians;
- existing public off-street parking close to the site can cater for the development;
- local environmental factors of acknowledged importance are worthy of protection;
- a residential development is of a design and nature which ensures that car ownership will remain at a low level, or even car-free, in the long term.

In all such cases the Borough Council may seek to negotiate a legal agreement with the developer to secure commuted payments in lieu of part or all of parking provision related to a development scheme. This would be used to fund alternative measures which would comprise an appropriate balance of:

- off-street public car parking;
- measures to improve access by public transport;
- measures to improve access by cycle and on foot.

The effect of controls over parking associated with development will be less significant unless reductions can also be secured in the current levels of private non-residential parking (PNR) particularly in Central Areas. Where circumstances allow a reduction in PNR parking will be sought through development or redevelopment schemes.

In order to avoid on-street parking problems related to reduced levels of off-street street parking measures will need to be implemented to deter people from driving to and parking in the vicinity of a development. The submission of Commuter Plans with applications would

set out arrangements for reduced car-use from the outset of development. In addition the Borough Council will seek to negotiate contributions towards the implementation of on-street controls in the vicinity of a development where problems are anticipated. In less central sites contributions will be sought from developers to fund improvements to access for non-car modes and so upgrade that areas accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling.

- 7.116 ~~Government guidance in PPG13 ‘Transport’ indicates the parking standards in local plans should be set as a range of maximum and operational minimum standards for broad classes of development. The availability of car parking is widely acknowledged to be a major influence on people’s choice of transport.~~
- 7.117 ~~Over the plan period the intention is to encourage a gradual reduction in car dependence in favour of a shift to bus, rail, walking and cycling. Stronger control over the level of parking provision for cars is needed to manage demand, although it will be important to ensure adequate, good quality provision for those who need to use cars.~~
- 7.118 ~~In this respect the policy guidance makes clear the special circumstances in which car parking standards may be applied on a reduced basis. This allows for developers, who so wish, to make commuted payments in part, or in total, to provide for improvements across the whole range of available transport modes instead of providing exclusively for additional car parking.~~

## **POLICY TR/22 - CAR PARKING PROVISION IN LOUGHBOROUGH TOWN CENTRE**

### **Inspector’s Recommendation**

- 7.169 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 186, brought up to date to reflect relevant progress on the review of public car park management and pricing policies and the Council’s Parking Study.*

### **CBC Decision**

Accept.

### **Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.166 to 7.168 in the Inspectors Report. The Proposed Modification reflects the current situation in relation to car parking issues.

### **Proposed Modification**

**M7.33**

Delete the section entitled ‘**CAR PARKING PROVISION IN LOUGHBOROUGH TOWN CENTRE**’ including Policy TR/22 and paragraphs 7.119 to 7.130 of the reasoned justification, and replace by the following.

### **PUBLIC CAR PARKING PROVISION SERVING IN LOUGHBOROUGH TOWN CENTRE**

#### **7.119 POLICY TR/22**

**Planning permission will be granted for additional off-street public car parking facilities for shoppers and visitors serving the central area of Loughborough shown on the Proposals Map in circumstances where the Borough Council is satisfied the car**

parking is necessary to ensure a continuing and adequate supply of short-stay car parking.

In the case of car parks funded by development the Borough Council will seek to negotiate a legal agreement for the car park to be managed for short-stay users which does not generate significant peak hour traffic movements

~~Within the central area of Loughborough as defined on the Proposals Map the Borough Council will identify provision for car parking to ensure a continuing and adequate supply of short-stay car parking.~~

~~The scale of new provision will be derived from an assessment of needs in the town centre over the period to 2006 which takes into account:~~

- ~~i) the need to replace any existing provision lost as a result of the implementation of pedestrianisation, other traffic management measures and redevelopment schemes;~~
- ~~ii) an allowance for an element of traffic growth stimulated by additions and improvements to shopping facilities in Loughborough town centre;~~
- ~~iii) an allowance for the impact of measures to increase use of bus, rail, cycle and walking modes; and~~
- ~~iv) any other implications arising from the application of the transport, central area and environmental guidance set out in the Plan.~~

(See also in particular Policies TR/21, 23 and 24)

Additional short-term car parking will be needed in Loughborough town centre on a scale which both safeguards the centres vitality and viability and helps meet the Plan's overall objective of gradually reducing car dependency. New parking will be needed to serve additional retail and commercial floorspace

The Borough Council will identify the level of need for short-stay parking based on an assessment of:

- the replacement of existing long and short-stay provision lost as a result of the implementation of pedestrianisation, redevelopment and other traffic management schemes;
- an allowance for traffic growth associated with additions and improvements to the town centre;
- any reduction resulting from the successful implementation of measures to increase the use of bus, rail, cycling and walking as alternatives to the car; and
- any other relevant considerations.

A review of public car park management and pricing is being undertaken by the Borough Council complementary to the demand management measures included in the County Council's Leicestershire Local Transport Plan Submission. This is based on the following principles:

- charges for all-day parking in Council controlled car parks which are high relative to charges for short-stays;
- short-stay spaces to be more accessible than long-stay spaces;

- the implementation of complementary on-street parking restrictions to avoid problems transferring to other areas;
- enforcement against uncontrolled and temporary car parking;
- consideration of the role of park and ride in providing for parking needs for short-stay and, in particular, commuter trips.

This Review will be followed by preparation of a 'Parking Study' to establish the scale and nature of parking provision in the town centre.

The approach adopted in this policy is complementary to the move to restraint based parking standards for new development set out in Policy TR/21.

The intention of this Plan's transport policies is to reduce car-based commuting over time. Any modification of current management and pricing of parking controlled by the Borough Council could increase pressure for on-street parking in areas around the town centre. Residents parking schemes have been implemented in the Frederick street and Victoria Street areas. Other areas for similar traffic management measures will be identified to try and ensure that problems are not transferred from one area to another.

~~7.120 The needs for car parking in Loughborough Town Centre were assessed in a 1989 study based on general traffic growth. This study identified a requirement for a further 560 spaces in the town centre by 1996, 230 more spaces by 2001, and a further 180 spaces by 2006. Together a need for 970 spaces by 2006 was identified.~~

~~7.121 In 1993 the figures were revised to reflect new development and increased parking at the Leisure Centre. The 1996 requirement was increased to 616 spaces, equivalent to 1026 spaces by 2006.~~

~~7.122 The current situation shows further changes. On the credit side of the equation 606 new spaces have been provided in the Beehive Lane car park, completed in September 1994. However, on the debit side, 145 spaces have been lost following the demolition of the Granby Street multi storey facility.~~

~~7.123 Whilst short term car parking needs appear to be met, various developments over the plan period may reduce the overall supply of car parking spaces available:~~

- |   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| <del>i) the redevelopment of the Devonshire Square Opportunity site and Granby Street Car Park:</del>                     | <del>205 spaces</del> |
| <del>ii) the development of the Council's Southfields Road car park:</del>  | <del>80 spaces</del>  |
| <del>iii) the development of vacant land between Packe Horse Lane and Woodgate currently used for informal parking:</del> | <del>70 spaces</del>  |
| <del>iv) the loss of land at Baxter Gate to the Inner Relief Road:</del>  | <del>75 spaces</del>  |
| <del>v) implementation of pedestrianisation and residents parking schemes displacing shopper and commuter traffic:</del>  | <del>100 spaces</del> |
|   | <del>530 spaces</del> |

- 7.124 ~~If all of these schemes were to proceed, then, on the basis of the 1989 study, there would be a substantial shortfall in provision by the year 2006, and that shortfall would be compounded by general traffic growth.~~
- 7.125 ~~The Consultation Draft Local Plan quoted a requirement for 600 additional spaces by 2006 founded upon the need to allow for general traffic growth and the replacement of the Granby Street multi-storey car park.~~
- 7.126 ~~The evidence set out above suggests that the provision of up to 600 new spaces by 2006 would represent a maximum net increase of 70 spaces upon the current situation (December 1995), allowing for the replacement of facilities lost to development.~~
- 7.127 ~~However, Government policy is directed towards measures to reduce reliance on the private car and to encourage more environmentally friendly modes of transport. Local Authorities are particularly encouraged to reduce commuter traffic through on-street parking restraints, control over levels of provision and pricing policies. The success of these initiatives in Loughborough remains to be seen but may influence the need to compensate for lost car parking facilities on a like-to-like basis.~~
- 7.128 ~~Further work on this issue could form part of the preparation of the 'T.P.P' package bid for Loughborough being prepared by the County Council in consultation with the Borough Council. This would have regard to a number of factors including:~~
- ~~—— the need to maintain and improve the attractiveness of Loughborough Town Centre for shoppers, visitors and tourists in order to compete with neighbouring town and city centres;~~
  - ~~—— the availability of on and off street parking in the town centre in the control of both the public and private sector;~~
  - ~~—— the effectiveness of policy initiatives to improve public transport, walking and cycling facilities as alternatives to the car;~~
  - ~~—— the implications of reducing car parking provision for transferring parking problems to other areas within or adjacent to the town centre;~~
  - ~~—— the management of existing spaces by pricing policies and other measures to favour short term parking in the town centre rather than long term commuter parking.~~
- 7.129 ~~The aim of the exercise would be to achieve an appropriate balance which allowed for a level of car parking provision compatible with strengthening the town's prosperity and achieving a gradual shift away from dependence on the car.~~
- 7.130 ~~Any reduction in levels of car parking or change in the management of provision in the town centre could increase pressure for commuter parking in the residential areas around the town centre. As part of a co-ordinated strategy the Borough Council will identify areas where residents parking schemes and other waiting restrictions ought to be implemented. This will ensure that parking problems are not simply transferred from one area to another. Over time the intention is to reduce car-based commuting as part of the transport choice strategy to increase the use of non-car modes, and reduce overall travel needs.~~

## POLICY TR/23 - CAR PARKING PROVISION OUTSIDE LOUGHBOROUGH TOWN CENTRE

### Inspector's Recommendation:

7.173 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 187 except that the sentence, viz. "Where such access is good a lower level of new parking will be justified", be deleted from the RJ. And the sentence, "Less parking capacity will be acceptable where the Borough Council is satisfied a centre has good access by non-car modes", be deleted from Policy TR/23.*

(recommendation as amended by Addendum to Inspector's report dated 6/9/2000)

### CBC Decision

Accept.

### Reason

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.171 and 7.172 in the Inspectors Report and the Addendum.

### Proposed Modification

M7.34

Modify the title to 'PUBLIC CAR PARKING PROVISION OUTSIDE LOUGHBOROUGH TOWN CENTRE'. Delete Policy TR/23 and paragraphs 7.132 to 7.137 and replace by.

### PUBLIC CAR PARKING PROVISION SERVING DISTRICT AND LOCAL CENTRES OUTSIDE LOUGHBOROUGH TOWN CENTRE

#### 7.131 POLICY TR/23

Planning permission will be granted for new public off-street parking serving District and Local Centres where the parking is short-term and necessary to safeguard the vitality and viability of district and local centres.

The scale of provision will depend upon the accessibility of a center in terms of bus, rail, cycling and walking.

(See also in particular Policies TR/21, 22 and 24)

~~Planning permission will be granted for new off-street car parking areas in locations outside Loughborough Town Centre where the following criteria are met:~~

- ~~i) — the proposal provides short-term car parking to safeguard the vitality and viability of district and local shopping centres; or~~
- ~~ii) — the proposal is necessary to provide for the efficient operation and economic competitiveness of primarily employment areas;~~

~~and provided that:~~

- ~~a) — provision does not exceed the standards set out in the Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance;~~

- b) ~~the resultant traffic generation will not result in unacceptable problems of pedestrian/vehicular conflict, congestion and delay; and~~
- e) ~~it is demonstrated that access by bus, rail and on foot is unable to provide for the needs of the shopping centre or employment site under consideration.~~

(See also in particular Policy TR/24)

In 1993 after consultation with Parish Council's ten parishes were recognised as being in need of additional general car parking. These were the parishes of Anstey, Barkby, Birstall, Hathern, Mountsorrel, Rothley, Sileby, Syston, Thurmaston and Woodhouse Eaves. This previous assessment should provide a starting point for the assessment of future parking needs. The emphasis must now be on containing new provision to that needed for short-stay shoppers and visitors.

An adequate supply of public off-street car parking for shoppers and visitors is necessary in district and local centres to enable people to use them, particularly where catchments are not well served, or capable of being served, by non-car modes. In addition the lack of sufficient parking could encourage people to drive to larger centres. The Borough Council will monitor levels of car parking in district and local centres and pursue initiatives to improve the quality, and where justified, the scale of parking serving centres. In coming to a view as to the appropriate level of provision consideration will be given to the accessibility of a centre by non-car modes.

- 7.132 ~~A 1990 Consultants Study of car parking in the ten largest villages in the Borough identified five priority areas in need of additional spaces:~~

- ~~———— Birstall — 35 spaces~~
- ~~———— Anstey — 20 spaces~~
- ~~———— Shepshed — 24 spaces~~
- ~~———— Syston — 24 spaces ———~~
- ~~———— Rothley — 18 spaces ———~~

- 7.133 ~~In 1993 after consultation with the Parish Councils the Borough Council agreed the following arrangements on the provision and management of car parking in the villages:~~

- ~~———— a capital programme of £50,000 for each year between 93/94 and 97/98 for new parking;~~
- ~~———— parishes requiring new parking be asked to make a capital contribution and state a maximum amount;~~
- ~~———— siting of any car park to be decided by the Borough Council in consultation with the Parish Council;~~
- ~~———— delegation arrangements with the Borough Council paying for maintenance and lighting, and the Parish paying for other management.~~

- 7.134 ~~In confirming these provisions the following ten parishes were recognised as being in need of more parking: Anstey, Barkby, Birstall, Hathern, Mountsorrel, Rothley, Sileby, Syston, Thurmaston and Woodhouse.~~

- 7.135 ~~An adequate supply of off-street car parking is needed in district and local shopping centres to enable them to serve people from their local catchments. Where such centres do not usually have good access by other means of travel car parking provision is a necessity. If parking is not available people may drive to other shopping areas adding to traffic movements and adversely affecting the vitality of these smaller centres. The Borough Council will monitor levels of car parking provision and pursue initiatives to improve the quality, and where necessary the scale of provision serving such centres.~~
- 7.136 ~~Employment areas usually require on-site car parking in the interests of operational efficiency and economic competitiveness, particularly where good access is not available by other means, or does not meet business requirements. Levels of parking will be assessed on the basis that the standards indicate the maximum level that should be provided for broad classes of development.~~
- 7.137 ~~In considering all new proposals the availability of access by means of travel other than the car will be weighed in the balance. Where such access is good there will be less justification for the provision of new car parking.~~

**POLICY TR/24 - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF NEW CAR PARKS**

**Inspector’s Recommendation**

7.176 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 188.*

**CBC Decision**

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraph 7.175 in the Inspector’s Report.

**Proposed Modification**

**M7.35**

Modify Policy TR/24.

**7.138 POLICY TR/24**

**Planning permission will be granted for matters of detail relating to car parking proposals where all the following criteria are met:**

- i) they are in locations convenient for the centre or feature they serve, and provide safe and direct access for pedestrians and people with disabilities to those destinations;**
- ii) traffic generation by the car park would not create unacceptable congestion and conflict between pedestrians and vehicles on roads close to the development;**
- iii) measures including signing and lighting are included to ensure easy access, internal circulation, safety and security for vehicles, bicycles and people using the car park;**

- iv) ~~extra wide spaces are provided for people with disabilities and people with small children in line with the standards included in the Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance;~~
- v) screening and landscaping is provided to safeguard the amenities of adjoining properties and land uses.

(See also in particular Policies TR/22, TR/23)

## **POLICY TR/25 - PARK AND RIDE SITE ON LAND ADJACENT TO THE A46/A6 JUNCTION, WANLIP**

### **Inspector's Recommendation**

7.179 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 189.*

### **CBC Decision**

Accept.

### **Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraph 7.178 in the Inspector's Report.

### **Proposed Modification**

**M7.36**

Delete Policy TR/25 and paragraphs 7.143 to 7.146 and replace by.

#### 7.142 **POLICY TR/25**

**Planning permission will be granted for a park and ride site located to the east of the A6, north of Birstall on land adjacent to the A46/A6 junction, Wanlip as shown on the Proposals Map. The facility will be accessed from the A6, and of a scale which is viable and effective to serve Leicester City Centre via the A6 bus corridor. Careful consideration will need to be given to the access arrangements, design and layout, landscaping and screening measures to ensure that the scheme harmonises with the character and appearance of the locality and adjoining land uses.**

~~Planning permission will be granted for a park and ride site to be provided as part of the major development proposed to the north of Birstall. The facility will be accessed from the A6 via a new junction to be provided as part of the overall development. It will be located between the distributor road serving the development and the A46 Leicester Western Bypass. The site will be of a size which will provide a viable and effective facility serving Leicester City Centre via the A6 bus corridor. Careful consideration must be given to the location, design and layout to ensure that the scheme harmonises with the character and appearance of the locality.~~

(See also in particular Policies H/1(r), E/5(g), TR/6, TR/17, TR/26, TR/32, CA/13, CF/18)

- 7.143 The CALTRANS draft strategy envisages a transport strategy for the Central Leicestershire package area of public transport enhancement. Major improvements to bus and rail services, cycling and walking, are envisaged alongside measures to manage the car. Included in the draft strategy are proposals for bus priority measures on radial routes and the development of two bus-based park and ride sites, one on the A6 north of Leicester.

~~This proposal forms part of a comprehensive scheme for the development of land north of Birstall and west of the A6. The package as presented aims to provide a high quality development with supporting infrastructure, the full implementation of which will depend upon the availability of funding from the various commercial components of the scheme. The park and ride facility will not be permitted in isolation~~

- 7.144 The proposed site in operational terms would be acceptable to the highway authorities and is considered to represent the best location to meet the CALTRANS objectives. The scheme could come forward as part of the comprehensive development proposals in this Plan for land north of Birstall and west of the A6. Policy H/1(r) allows for contributions to be sought for the initial funding of the site. The site is well related to the main road network and well placed to utilise the frequent and regular bus services into Leicester. It would form an integral part of the sustainable transport strategy envisaged in the Plan and should help reduce congestion along the A6 corridor. Detailed design and layout, related measures will need to ensure the scheme is assimilated in the landscape and harmonises with adjacent land uses.

~~This site is well related to the main road network. An operational park and ride facility allied to frequent and regular bus services along the A6 corridor into Leicester is a key component of the plan's strategy to improve transport choice and reduce congestion on this main road corridor. Detailed proposals will need to create strong landscaping measures to ensure the site is not prominent in the local landscape.~~

- 7.145 Although this site is considered to be the best location for a park-and-ride site along the A6 north of Birstall, the selection of an alternative site through the CALTRANS study could not be ruled out at this time. Should CALTRANS identify a better site serving the Central Leicestershire area from the A6 this allocated site would not be needed. It would then be treated as part of the country park related to the north of Birstall development, or agricultural land if this scheme does not proceed. Use of the site will need to be monitored to establish patterns of usage and to see whether action is needed to further reduce trips to the site which could have been made by bus and rail in the first place

~~The County Council's "Caltrans" study is currently evaluating the contribution that all transport modes can make to the future needs of the Central Leicestershire area. It is anticipated that bus transport together with park and ride facilities may make a significant contribution to future needs but it is recognised that a park and ride site in this location may not represent the optimum solution to the wider strategic needs of the City. If an alternative site is identified through this exercise which would better serve the Central Leicestershire area and the A6 corridor, the allocated site will be treated as part of the open space permeating the development area. A contribution from the development will however be negotiated to assist in the funding of any alternative site~~

## **POLICY TR/26 - PLANNING CRITERIA FOR PARK AND RIDE SCHEMES TO SERVE LOUGHBOROUGH AND LEICESTER**

### **Inspector's Recommendation**

- 7.183 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 190 except that the word, "security", be inserted before the word, "information", in clause (iv).*

### **CBC Decision**

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.181 and 7.182 in the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification****M7.37**

Modify Policy TR/26 and paragraph 7.148.
--

7.146 **POLICY TR/26**

Planning permission will be granted for bus or rail based 'park and ride' provision adjacent to the Loughborough and Leicester urban areas provided that all the following criteria are met:

- i) the a site is strategically well placed on the main road network and served, or capable of being served, by frequent and direct public transport links to central area destinations routes;
- ii) satisfactory a suitable and landscaped access is provided to the main road network in line with current highway standards;
- iii) the highest standards of design, layout and landscaping and screening are provided to assimilate the site and access arrangements in with its surroundings. Landscaping measures will soften the impact by include structural planting landscaping around the site and access roads and planting within the car parking area;
- iv) the scheme provides on-site facilities for security, information, to include shelters and "cycle and ride" facilities.

7.147 [No Change].

7.148 Park-and-ride sites should provide car parking immediately adjacent to provision for public transport and cycling. They can help reduce the volume and movement of traffic along urban roads and in central areas and so enable more efficient use of road space to the advantage of non-car modes and improved urban environments. Their effectiveness will be enhanced if complementary bus priority measures are in place. Whilst 'park and ride' schemes do not reduce the use of cars they do help remove unnecessary traffic on urban roads. This can help increase capacity in the urban road system and so enable faster and more effective bus services at the same time as reducing the need for car parking in already congested urban centres.

## POLICY TR/28 - HEAVY GOODS VEHICLE OPERATIONS

**Inspector's Recommendation**

7.186 *I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 191.*

**CBC Decision**

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraph 7.185 in the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification****M7.38**

Modify sub paragraph i) of Policy TR/28.

**7.152 POLICY TR/28**

**Proposals for new heavy goods vehicles operating centres and depots or proposals involving the additional development or extension of an existing site, which require planning permission, will not be permitted unless all the following criteria are met:**

- i) satisfactory access is provided to the road network~~access is provided in line with current highway standards;~~**
- ii) adequate space is provided within the operational site to enable vehicles to manoeuvre off the public highway;**
- iii) the road network serving the operational site is suitable for use by road freight traffic generated by the proposal;**
- iv) the proposal does not unacceptably harm the character or appearance of a locality;**
- v) the proposal does not unacceptably harm the amenities of residents in the locality of the operational site;**
- vi) specific provision is made for the parking of heavy goods vehicles which form part of the applicants fleet of vehicles. Suitable provision will need to be found within the development site or, by agreement, on a nearby specified site.**

**POLICY TR/32 - ROADSIDE SERVICE AREA ON LAND ADJACENT TO THE A46/A6 JUNCTION, WANLIP**

**Inspector's Recommendation**

*7.197 I recommend that the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 192.*

**CBC Decision**

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.188 to 7.196 in the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification****M7.39**

Modify line 2 of the introductory paragraph of Policy TR/32 thus.

## 7.32 POLICY TR/32

Planning permission will be granted for a key roadside facility site to serve the needs of passing motorists on about ~~2ha~~ 2.7ha (~~5a~~) (6.7a) of land located adjacent to the A46/A6 junction at Fillingate, north of Birstall, as part of the proposed major development allocation. To be acceptable a proposal must meet all the following criteria:

- i) it provides a full range of facilities for motorists for fuel, refreshment, toilets, car parking, limited parking for lorries, overnight accommodation and landscaped picnic areas;
- ii) the siting and form of development in overall terms minimises the visual impact on the wider countryside, and adjoining development;
- iii) vehicular access is via a new junction with the former A6 to be provided as part of the proposed development north of Birstall. Direct access from the A46 Bypass will not be permitted;
- iv) substantial landscaping measures in the form of planting and mounding are provided along boundaries particularly the frontage with the former A6 and the A46, as well as the proposed distributor road, and the adjacent site proposed for a park and ride facility.

(See also in particular Policies H/1(r), E/5(g), TR/6, TR/25, CA/13, CF/18)

### POLICY TR/33 - PLANNING CRITERIA TO ASSESS PROPOSALS FOR ROADSIDE SERVICE AREAS

#### Inspector's Recommendation

7.203 I recommend that:-

- (i) the Plan be modified in accordance with PC 193 and FPC 193A,
- (ii) having regard to my conclusion at paragraph 7.200, paragraph 7.169 of the Plan be further modified by the inclusion of the following sentence to follow the first sentence:-

*“In addition, the means of access to and egress from the site and the internal road network will be based on the standards of the Highway Authorities and subject to their approval.”*

#### CBC Decision

Accept.

#### Reason

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.199 to 7 202 in the Inspector's Report.

#### Proposed Modification

**M7.40**

[Note: Aspects of this Proposed Modification rely upon the Council's Further Proposed Changes which have not previously been subject to public consultation]

Amend Policy TR/33 and paragraph 7.169 of the reasoned justification thus.

## 7.168 POLICY TR/33

Planning permission will not be granted for new roadside facilities unless all the following criteria are met:

- i) there is an established need in terms of the spacing and location of facilities to justify additional provision~~distances between existing facilities set out in government guidance to justify an additional facility;~~
- ii) the proposed site would provide for a full range of facilities to serve the needs of motorists;
- ~~iii) the access arrangements meet the requirements of the highway authorities;~~
- ~~iii) iv)~~ the scheme is suitably landscaped to provide strong visual and acoustic screening;
- ~~iv) v)~~ the development provides a design and layout, materials, mass and height of buildings and structures, illumination and signage in keeping with the character and appearance of the locality;
- ~~v) vi)~~ the site is not located in a designated Green Wedge and development would not be an unacceptable intrusion into an area of countryside, local separation, or recognised landscape value.

7.169 This general guidance sets out the range of criteria to be taken into account in considering proposals to provide roadside facilities in the plan area. The allocation at the Fillingate A46/A6 junction should provide a full range of facilities to serve needs on these trunk roads. A full range of facilities normally will embrace the inclusion within a single site of parking and rest areas for all motorists including the drivers of cars, buses and lorries, toilets, refreshments, refuelling facilities, overnight accommodation, picnic areas, telephones and 24 hour operation. Elsewhere the scale of provision will be restricted to that necessary to meet gaps in provision. Advice included in DoT Circular 4.88 and PPG13, Annex A recommends that the minimum gap between motorway service areas should be 15 miles and service facilities on trunk roads should be located a minimum of 12 miles and a maximum of 25 miles apart. In addition, the means of access to and egress from the site and the internal road network will be based on the standards of the Highway Authorities and subject to their approval.

## POLICY TR/34 - TRAFFIC IN ROTHLEY AND MOUNTSORREL

### Inspector's Recommendation

7.210 *I recommend that no modification be made in response to these objections.*

### CBC Decision

Accept.

### Reason

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.205 to 7.209 in the Inspector's Report.

### Proposed Modification

None.

**POLICY TR/35 - ROAD TRAFFIC REDUCTION**

**Inspector's Recommendation**

7.213 *I recommend that no modification be made in response to this objection.*

**CBC Decision**

---

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraph 7.212 in the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification**

---

None.

**POLICY TR/36 - PROTECTION OF COUNTRY LANES**

**Inspector's Recommendation**

7.217 *I recommend that no modification be made in response to these objections.*

**CBC Decision**

---

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.215 and 7.216 in the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification**

---

None.

**POLICY TR/37 - CAR FREE DEVELOPMENTS**

**Inspector's Recommendation**

7.220 *I recommend that no modification be made in response to this objection.*

**CBC Decision**

---

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.219 in the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification**

---

None.

**POLICY TR/38 - LOUGHBOROUGH EASTERN BYPASS**

**Inspector's Recommendation**

7.227 *I recommend that no modification be made in response to these objections.*

**CBC Decision**

---

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7.222 to 7.226 in the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification**

---

None.

**POLICY TR/39 - ROAD ACCESS INTO EASTERN LOUGHBOROUGH**

**Inspector's Recommendation**

7.230 *I recommend that no modification be made in response to this objection.*

**CBC Decision**

---

Accept.

**Reason**

For the reasons set out in paragraph 7.229 in the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Modification**

---

None.