

**Charnwood Borough Council
Further Consultation on the Core Strategy Development Plan Document**

Feedback from Consultation Exhibitions

The following report provides a record of the key points arising from discussion with 813 members of the public who spoke with officers at exhibitions and public meetings held around the Borough between 24th October and 5th December 2008. The points raised are the views of the people who attended the events and are not necessarily those of the council.

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
24 th October 2008	Sileby Community Hall	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General relief that there was no significant development proposed at Sileby • A few were people concerned that there was still a shortfall of recreation land in the village and understood this was unlikely to be resolved unless it was funded by a development scheme, • A few concerns about the SUE options. People wondered where all the traffic generated by each option would go. The Thurmaston option seemed to have potential for a new rail station. Some concern about the proximity to Barkby/ Barkby Thorpe. For the Loughborough option there were concerns about the loss of separation between the town and Shepshed the possible harm to Garendon Park and that the location was not near existing bus routes. View expressed that Loughborough needs a bus station • The no 27 Loughborough to Thurmaston bus service was seen as a success particularly in providing a link to Asda at Thurmaston. The cross valley link to Mountsorrel leisure centre less is well used and more marketing is needed to promote awareness in Sileby.
25 th October 2008	Syston Community Hall	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of the proposal to preserve the green wedge between Thurmaston and Syston.

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the traffic impacts of development on Syston, Barkby and Barkby Thorpe. • Concerns about the impact on the setting of Barkby and Barkby Thorpe. • Concerns about Gypsy and Traveller sites being located close to Syston and the impact of this on the landscape. • Concern about any threat to the Green Wedge between Thurmaston and Syston and agreement that it is better to locate development further south to protect this area. • Highlighted a need for recreational space and concern that the multi use games area being located on the park. • Confusion over the term 'zero carbon development' which could have been better explained on the boards. • Transport a major issue through Syston and there were concerns over more traffic because of new development.
27 th October 2008	Anstey Jubilee Hall	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about Gypsy and Traveller sites being located within an urban extension • Concern that south of Anstey should not be considered for development because of traffic congestion problems. • Many of the questions were about clarification of the process: whether Anstey was actually being considered for development, where the boundaries of the development might be and what the next stages would be in the Core Strategy process • Concern that development wasn't needed given the current financial situation
28 th October 2008	Rearsby Horse and Groom	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the change proposed for East Goscote from a Service Centre to an Other Settlement. Those asked said they use East Goscote for the post office when theirs is not open, the chemist and fish and chip shop. For shopping Rearsby

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<p>residents use Syston, Melton and Leicester. Those asked go to a doctor in Syston and use the Secondary School there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the lack of relationship in the past between housing and employment. • Concerns about the transport links into Leicester from Wreake Valley villages and opportunities for public transport improvements. One suggestion was for a transport hub locally which community transport schemes could be used to get people to. • Highlighted the importance of train travel to people. Most use their free bus passes to get to Leicester or Melton and then catch the train. It was highlighted that Leicester bus station is the opposite end of town to the train station. • Lots of discussion about the implications of the recent appeal decision at Mill Road, Rearsby and the relationship between this and the Core Strategy proposals. • Highlighted a need for allotments • Thurmaston residents highlighted concerns about already high levels of traffic around Asda and along their road to the Industrial Estate. Concerns about the impact of development of the English Countryside around Barkby and Barkby Thorpe. • Concerns about the lack of connection between the south of the Borough and Loughborough, where he council services are provided from. • East Goscote resident raised the issue of areas of separation and raised concerns that they were not mentioned as part of green infrastructure. • Concerns about the lack of proposal for an additional train station linked to the proposed sustainable urban extension at Thurmaston. • Concern that developers and landowners are leading the process. • Concern that no development in smaller places will lead to loss of more services and question over why affordable housing could happen in a place seen as unsustainable.

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
30 th October 2008	Maxwell Drive Community Centre, Loughborough	35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns at loss of greenfield area within Garendon Estate, that it comprises important agricultural land, significant wildlife interest and readily accessible countryside for nearby residents. • Development proposed is huge and would engulf the whole area between Loughborough, Shepshed and Hathern • Concerns that there are already significant noise problems from the M1 Motorway, that these will be worse after the motorway is widened. Noise and related air pollution make this an unsuitable location for development, especially for children to grow up in • People interested to know if and how the long term future of Garendon Park would be secured. Would ownership transfer to the local authority? Or would the landowner retain control and the area be under constant threat for development in the future? • Concern that development would generate significant traffic movements and that the roads would not be able to cope. An A6 and A512 link would not be sufficient. Some people thought it would need to be dual carriageway. • Concerns that the area could not be adequately served by public transport or that people would still want to use their cars whatever we did. • Concerns that the Science Park, the M1 Motorway/ new link road and development area would sever wildlife corridors needed for Garendon Park to thrive. • Suggestion made that Garendon Park and Garden was of low quality and this should be built. Instead a district park should be located to the north next to open countryside. • Support for Wymeswold Airfield as a better location for the SUE as it is considered to be brownfield land and well related to the A60 and A46 and less damaging to the

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<p>countryside. Less people live near the airfield and they would still have good access to surrounding countryside near them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that not enough is being done to control student behaviour in the town and that the town centre has become more for students than ordinary residents. Student accommodation should be on the campus. • The housing figures are too high and they should be reduced, in particular, to take account of the new student accommodation on the University campus so freeing up houses in the existing stock. Housing should not be built to cater for in-migration. • The Science Park extension is unlikely to be successful if the University has too much control in its development. • People could see the merits in opening up Garendon Park to the public and making it into a well managed public facility but this should happen without the development. • Concerns about gypsies and travellers being located here. • Loughborough needs a proper bus station
30 th October 2008	Woodhouse Eaves Village Hall		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about Gypsy and Traveller sites being located anywhere in the borough. • Concern about how the Science Park would effect Snell's Nook Lane • Concern that a road through Garendon Park would be a dual carriageway • There were questions about why we need all the homes planned? Especially with today's economic climate. • Generally supportive of council's approach. One very anti Garendon member of public. Most understood the dilemma we faced. • Could we have the Public Park without the development?

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions about derelict garage in centre of village and settlement hierarchy.
1 st November 2008	Rushes Unit in Loughborough	65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was asked if student houses counted towards the overall housing requirement. If not, do we need so many houses overall? • There was concern about the impact of the sustainable urban extension at Loughborough and its potential to cause traffic congestion. In particular there was concern from residents in Shepshed about the existing congestion on the A512 and the additional impact that this proposal would have on their journey into Loughborough for work. There were more general concerns about what road improvements would be made and what other forms of transport would be provided for. • It was suggested that a key improvement would be a regular circular route around the town that serves the development, industrial areas, railway station, town centre and university. There was also some support for a park and ride site at the edge of the town, following the example in Nottingham close to the motorway. • There was concern that a full bypass of Hathern was not included in the proposals. • There was concern about how the Council is ensuring that houses are more affordable. • It was asked why we need all the homes identified in the plan? Especially with today's economic climate. • There is a need for more affordable housing • We need to plan more responsibly in a way that reduces the need to use the car • There should be a bus station in Loughborough • Maintain attractive footpath routes from Loughborough to Butthole Lane

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
3 rd November 2008	Quorn Village Hall	50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of protecting the identity of Quorn by not building on land between Loughborough and Quorn. • Questions were raised about exactly how many homes would be allocated at Quorn • A lot of people questioned what the definition of a 'service centre' was • There were a lot of questions about the 2006 employment land allocation at South Loughborough • Concerns raised over the location of the Loughborough SUE and health risk from being near to two busy roads (M1 Motorway and A512). • Would the land that is getting planning permission now go towards the overall requirement for housing even if the Core Strategy hasn't been adopted? • Questions raised about the planning application for flats on a former allotment site in Quorn. • Supportive of the need for affordable housing in Quorn. • Does the plan take account of the demographic of the area (concerns over the ageing population of Quorn)?
4 th November 2008	Barrow Upon Soar Parish Offices	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns at the high level of new housing needed. Reduce to take account of vacant properties, student accommodation, reduced international migration, economic downturn • Concerns that planning always seems to promise more than it delivers. It was suggested that the housing development at Willow Way, Barrow is failing to provide the benefits promised. Can the significant benefits suggested for the SUEs really be delivered, especially in the light of current economic conditions? • Support for some development in the larger villages as they have better services and

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<p>public transport access; but concerns there are local problems with overstretched services for example health facilities in Barrow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Thurmaston SUE option would need to be supported by significant transport infrastructure as current provision is inadequate. • For the west Loughborough SUE option, Garendon Park must be transferred into public ownership otherwise it will face development pressures in the future • Concerns that Travellers should not be provided for in Charnwood; although a few people can see the benefit of having properly managed sites to reduce the problems of unauthorised encampments. • It was asked if Barrow might receive any housing development. Will the Proposed Submission document be more specific about which Service Centres might have scope for more development? • Support for an SUE at Wymeswold Airfield because it was considered to be a brownfield site and development would put an end to the various noisy, intrusive activities allowed to use the airfield • Need better bus facilities in Loughborough Town Centre preferably a bus station but on street hubs could be appropriate after traffic is removed • More truly affordable housing is needed (people do not see affordable market housing as affordable by those in need) • Some people asked why Leicestershire County Council is promoting the east Loughborough SUE option and why in the light of their support it is not a Preferred Option • Support for the non inclusion of the north of Birstall SUE option • People like the design of the postcard and the summary leaflet

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
5 th November 2008	Asda, Thurmaston	101	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople site and where this would be located. • Concerns about the settlement identity of Barkby and Barkby Thorpe and whether development would join these villages up to Leicester. There was a feeling that these villages are very attractive and historic and should be protected from major development on their doorstep. • Concerns about the traffic implications of the Thurmaston sustainable urban extension option and frustration about the lack of transport information. • Concerns about how we can identify a preferred location without a better understanding of the transport proposals. • Concern that the MVA transport study under estimates the implications of traffic going north. • Questions were raised about the homes needed and whether the government have over estimated what is required. • Discussion about the role of Queniborough, Rearsby and East Goscote and support for them being identified as an 'Other Settlements'. One resident from Queniborough explained that she does not use East Goscote as a Service Centre, she goes to Syston or Leicester. • Suggested that Barkby should be lower down the settlement hierarchy as it has lost its local store. • Questions were asked why the Council had not split the development between Anstey and Birstall options. Feeling that the Council has made its mind up. Has the Council considered the possibility of not building at Thurmaston and creating a development with less impact even if this means no new secondary school? • Some residents who live close by the option but within the Leicester city area have

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<p>not received postcards so may have missed the opportunity to make comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major concerns about how the traffic issues related to Asda and access into the city will be resolved as there is a limited amount of room to make improvements. • Questions were asked about how the council can know this SUE option is achievable without having better information about how the roads will work. • Frustration about the lack of detail to comment on. • Concerns and fears were raised that the boundary of Leicester city will be changed to include Thurmaston and the proposed extension as it is an extension to Leicester. • Would have like an exhibition at Barkby village as well. • The need for affordable housing in the Syston area was raised. • Feeling that it was a good thing that a site for Gypsies and Travellers has been identified as it might avoid trespassing problems and unauthorised encampments. • Feeling that the decision has been made and that it won't make a difference what people say in this consultation. • Concerns that there are more and more buildings on floodplains. • Concern that there are many empty and under-occupied existing properties that need investment.
6 th November 2008	Shepshed Library	160	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The town centre has a very poor range of shops and its appearance is needs to be improved. • The town desperately needs a supermarket. People are currently going to stores at Coalville and Ashby rather than trying to get in and out of Loughborough • Why are we proposing more housing when there is so much empty housing in the town? Shepshed has many empty flats. Speculators should not be allowed to build

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<p>more.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The view of open countryside from Leicester Road towards Garendon will be ruined if development goes ahead. If development goes ahead it will need to be screened with tree planting and landscaping. • Pleased to see that the development is proposed to be zero carbon • The idea of making the Garendon Park and Gardens a District Park is excellent as this will give public access for the first time. • Concern about the number of homes needed. Can't we make better use of vacant properties? • Has the council tried to oppose the requirement for all these homes? • Concern about the loss of countryside. • Why can't we build on smaller sites and spread the development around the Borough? • Wymeswold airfield is a better location for development and it is considered to be a brownfield site whereas Garendon is greenfield. • It is a good idea to plan for gypsies, travellers and showpeople as part of the proposed development areas as this will enable a mixed community to be achieved and they will be close to services and facilities • The plan has failed to take into account consultation outcomes from September 2007 which identified two priorities of protecting settlement identity and protecting the countryside • Consideration should be given to the area south of Shepshed south of the A512 as a possible growth option.

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shepshed's identity will always be protected by the M1 corridor • It was asked why there was a need for more homes when there are empty properties. • Concern that cycle routes through the Garendon estate to Loughborough from Shepshed will be destroyed. • It was asked what has happened to the proposed Epinal Way northern extension. • Support for a full Hathern bypass, extending the link road shown in the SUE option from the A6 to Shepshed Road, around to the west of Hathern to the A6. • The development is too large and will engulf the nearby communities. • Traffic conditions in and out of Loughborough are intolerable at peak times. The proposals do not seem to provide adequate transport infrastructure. • There appears to be little in the proposals that would benefit Shepshed • Concerns about noise from the M1 Motorway, although a few comments were made by residents who live near the motorway who stated that road noise is not that bad. • Concerns about traffic on the M1 Motorway and the impact that accidents on the motorway have on the local road network when it is diverted. It was felt that the SUE option would exacerbated traffic problems caused by diversions. • Concerns about the loss of open space and pathways through the Garendon estate to walk along and enjoy. • It was suggested that facilities for local food production be incorporated into new developments due to concerns about future food supply. It was suggested, for example, that a community garden plot not just allotments should be provided. It was also suggested that there should be opportunities for communal living with shared laundrette and other facilities to give people the opportunity to live more sustainably.

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be more consultation on transport routes including cycle paths. • There was discussion about the proposals for a golf course west of Shepshed and it was asked if this was a precursor to housing development. • There was some support for the West of Shepshed SUE option in favour of the West of Loughborough SUE option. • There were concerns about increased traffic on the A512 and M1, particularly the M1 Motorway Junction 23 roundabout which is already congested. • Concerns about having a Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople site close by. • Concerns about Shepshed Town Centre and the impact that the Co-op has had on shops and that any further supermarkets will kill off the remaining shops in the town. • Feeling that Shepshed has grown enough. • Concerns about backland development. • Concerns about the loss of agricultural land west of Loughborough. • It was asked why the council was proposing more homes when there are flats empty in the town centre. • Concerns that transport infrastructure will be constrained if the Council does not recognise the current infrastructure problems. • Concerns about the necessary investment needed to support the development proposed.
7 th November 2008	Tesco, Loughborough	145	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science Park taking up a large greenfield area. • Concerns that the SUE option west of Loughborough will destroy separate character of Hathern, Shepshed and Loughborough.

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the impact of the proposed development on Garendon Park and the loss of access to the open space north of the Park. • Concerns about the increase in traffic on Ashby Road that will be created if development takes place on the west of Loughborough SUE option. • Concerns that Loughborough is gradually growing towards Quorn and the impact that on-going development is having on the separation between Loughborough and Quorn. • Concerns about the prospect of a southern road link and the impact this would have on the Outwoods. • Look at other sites first - Garendon last resort. • Use student sites in town centre for housing. • It was considered impossible to build a road as close to the M1 Motorway as that shown as part of the west of Loughborough SUE option. • Students should be moved out of Paget area and families brought in. • Importance of listed buildings was highlighted. • There was no mention of the Gypsies and Travellers sites in the summary leaflet. • Build more housing off Grange Park, south Loughborough • Woodhouse Eaves residents were pleased that the proposals were not going to affect Woodhouse Eaves. • It was asked if student housing to be provided on the Science Park? • Concerns about students taking up family homes and the impact they have on neighbours. • Desire to see a bus station and transport hub in the town.

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the vibrancy of the town centre and the number of empty units in the Rushes. • Concern about the loss of green space between Shepshed and Loughborough which is used by people to go for walks, to cycle to work in Loughborough and as a general recreation area for people in Shepshed and Loughborough. • Concern about the loss of the open environment along the footpath/cycle path between Loughborough and Shepshed. • It was asked why a north of Loughborough option has not been considered. If this is not a decision that could be taken locally (because it is outside of Charnwood's administrative boundary) why has it not been considered as part of the draft Regional Plan? • Concern that brownfield land is not being used first, for example, land within the urban area. Wymeswold Airfield should also be used first as it is considered to be brownfield land. • Concerns about students being located in the town centre and the impact of the atmosphere in the town at night, which people felt would get worse. • Support for more homes for elderly residents to give people more choice. • It was felt that the university community should be kept within the campus. • Interest in the design of new homes and what the proposed development may look like. • Concern about the social impact of students in Loughborough. Particular concern about the impact of students on the town centre which puts off retired people from using the town in the evenings. • There was interest in Tesco's proposal for a wind turbine and concern about the

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<p>impact on local residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was concern about the noise and pollution from new roads. • It was felt that the provision of services and facilities to support the development is essential and there was concern that this wouldn't happen in reality. • Concerns about the loss of the town centre bus station. • There was a lot of discussion and questions about the transport strategy for the sustainable urban extension. There was concern that there should be further consultation if the road proposals changed. • There was a feeling that we should be clearer that private student flat developments count towards the overall housing figures.
7 th November 2008	Mountsorrel Community Hall		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation was raised as a concern particularly problems of gaining access to the major road network when the River Soar is in flood. • Concerns were raised about the impact of the proposed amount of development would have upon settlement identity. • Some concern about where housing development allocated to Service Centres would be located.
11 th November 2008	Wymeswold Memorial Hall	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about losing the settlement identity of the Wolds villages if the Wymeswold SUE Option was brought forward. • It was asked if small scale development would be allowed in Wymeswold to help support the local primary school. • Traffic concerns were raised particularly the traffic problems through Wymeswold. Villagers were therefore concerned that any more development to the East of Loughborough would make the traffic problems worse

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mineral implications of building on Wymeswold Airfield was raised – this wasn't elaborated on in the main document • A lot of people questioned why there was a need for all of this housing • Many people were keen to know whether the SUE option East of Loughborough had actually been discounted or whether they could potentially come into play in the future if evidence suggested that the preferred directions for growth should not be brought forward • There were mixed feeling around whether the settlement hierarchy definition of Wymeswold would benefit the village.
12 th November 2008	Birstall Village Hall	29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the impact of any development north of Birstall will have on roads in the area. • Concerns that any development east of Thurmaston will have an impact on road system more generally, particularly the A46. • There were concerns about the general scale of housing being proposed and the loss of agricultural land. • There were questions about why Birstall was considered as an option for a Sustainable Urban Extension and why it was not preferred. • There was a feeling that Birstall would not be a good location for major development as it would join up with Rothley and take development beyond A46. • There was major concern and anger about the proposal east of Thurmaston from residents living within the area identified in the SUE Option area of search (the red blob shown on the supporting plan) and the impact it would have on their property, views and environment. • There were concerns about the proposal for a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Date	Location	Attendance	Key Issues Raised
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that Birstall will eventually become part of the city rather than Charnwood. • There was a lot of discussion about the Hallam Fields development and why the developer contributions have not yet delivered a Park & Ride Site and other facilities. Concern that contributions would not be achieved. • Concerns about the impact of wind turbines on the landscape and the noise. • There was a discussion about how you get people out of their cars and a feeling that this is unlikely to be successful. • It was asked what the likelihood of smaller scale development north of Birstall and around Wanlip coming forward if a Sustainable Urban Extension is not located there. • Discussions about the settlement hierarchy and role of Barkby and Wanlip. Whilst these settlements are identified as unsustainable locations for development, they could potentially have major urban extensions very close to them. • Questions were raised about the employment proposals in the plan and support was given for not locating employment development at Birstall, as had been proposed in the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation.