

**Charnwood Local Development Framework**

Devonshire Square Development Brief.

Former General Hospital Site & Aumbery Gap  
Development Brief.

**Supplementary Planning Documents**

# **Statement of Main Issues Raised through Public Consultation**

**February 2007**

**Devonshire Square Development Brief  
and  
Former General Hospital & Aumbery Gap Development Brief  
Supplementary Planning Documents  
Statement of Consultation of Main Issues Raised through Public Consultation**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004<sup>1</sup> a local planning authority shall not adopt a Supplementary Planning Document until:

- Representations made in respect of the draft SPD have been considered;
- A statement is prepared setting out a summary of the main issues raised in these representations and how these main issues have been addressed in the SPD which it is intended to adopt.

This document sets out the main issues raised through public consultation on the draft Devonshire Square Development Brief SPD and the draft Former General Hospital & Aumbery Gap Development Brief SPD and indicates how these main issues were addressed in revising the SPDs for adoption.

Ten responses were received on the SPD. The responses include comments from Leicestershire County Council, Loughborough & District Civic Trust, Leicestershire Constabulary, Harborough District Council, Seagrave Parish Council, National Association of Shopfitters, Birstall Parish Council

---

<sup>1</sup> Regulation 18(4)(b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

## 2. MAIN ISSUES RAISED THROUGH CONSULTATION AND HOW THE ISSUES WERE ADDRESSED

Respondent	Comments	Response of Director of Development
<p>Barrow-upon-Soar Parish Council</p>	<p>DEVONSHIRE SQUARE</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The integrity of Queen’s Park should be maintained.</li> </ol> <p>FORMER GENERAL HOSPITAL &amp; AUMBERRY GAP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Concerns regarding conversion of the old hospital into yet more student accommodation, with the provision of only 21 parking spaces.</li> <li>3. Trust that the inclusion of student accommodation will not have result in increased housing need elsewhere in the Borough.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agreed that the integrity of the Park must be maintained. Text has been amended to reinforce this message.</li> <li>2. The Briefs accord with government guidance, which seeks to minimise dedicated car parking within town centres.</li> <li>3. This is unlikely. Elements of student housing may play a part in ensuring that redevelopment projects with wider benefits to the Town Centre are viable. Furthermore, purpose built student housing has the potential to release family homes now occupied by students for families.</li> </ol>
<p>Charnwood Borough Council – Change Management (Environment)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The vision statements do not capture the development sites’ potential to provide ‘gateway’ buildings, which could achieve high standards in quality, design &amp; sustainable construction. The need for higher (‘inspirational’) standards of sustainable construction is not highlighted.</li> <li>2. Reference should be added to ‘Planning Policy Statement 22: Renewable Energy’ &amp; to Regional Planning Policies which support the reduction of energy demand, the increase of energy efficiency &amp; the development of renewable energy.</li> <li>3. Devonshire Square development’s proximity to Queen’s Park provides an opportunity to incorporate green designs, which will blur the edge of development with that of the park. There is the potential to include green roofs within both development sites.</li> <li>4. The sustainability paragraphs aren’t specific enough to provide developers with the necessary details to produce a satisfactory application. BREEAM or EcoHomes assessment requirements as stated in ‘Leading in Design’ should be included. A standard of ‘very good’ is desirable with high scores in the energy and water sections.</li> <li>5. Suggest the inclusion of details of the energy hierarchy as listed in Regional Policy 40 (&amp; Leading in Design) as a preferential</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Briefs have been amended to acknowledge this comment, including rewording of the ‘Vision’ statements and additions to the ‘Sustainability’ sections.</li> <li>2. The suggested references have been added (see ‘Planning Policy’ sections).</li> <li>3. Text amended to acknowledge these comments (see ‘Development Principles’ section of the Devonshire Square Brief).</li> <li>4. Texts amended to acknowledge these comments (see ‘Sustainability’ sections).</li> <li>5. Texts amended to acknowledge these comments (see ‘Sustainability’ sections).</li> </ol>

	<p>sequence to the use of energy within developments. Reference needed to the Council's requirement for developers to include energy efficiency &amp; renewable energy equipment on site to reduce predicted carbon emissions of the development by at least 10%.</p> <p>6. Should also include a requirement for developers to produce a 'rainwater &amp; grey-water feasibility study' to identify the potential for water recycling.</p> <p>7. A statement relating to sustainable construction techniques to reduce the use of natural resources &amp; reduce waste would be welcomed. A requirement for developers to submit a 'site waste management plan' to minimise the disposal of waste to landfill, by reducing wastage of materials on site &amp; encouraging re-use &amp; recycling of wastes that arise would also be welcomed.</p> <p>8. Should mention need for the use of recycled materials in the development. Waste &amp; Resources Action Programme case studies show that a 10% minimum requirement is achievable in various building types with no increase in cost of materials.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISALS</p> <p>9. Although the appraisals assess what is in the SPDs, they fail to acknowledge the opportunities that have been missed in terms of delivering sustainable development through the proposed developments.</p>	<p>6. Texts amended to acknowledge these comments (see 'Sustainability' sections).</p> <p>7. Texts amended to acknowledge these comments (see 'Sustainability' sections).</p> <p>8. Texts amended to acknowledge these comments (see 'Sustainability' sections).</p> <p>9. SA amended to acknowledge this comment.</p>
<p>Charnwood Borough Council – Landscape, Biodiversity &amp; Trees</p>	<p>1. Disappointed that biodiversity has not been taken into consideration at all within the documents. There is an existing biodiversity resource in Loughborough town centre, which has been ignored. The presence &amp; requirements of protected species &amp; the wider biodiversity, including existing habitats &amp; species, should be fully acknowledged &amp; taken on board to ensure that they will not be adversely affected by development proposals &amp; that robust mitigation measures will be implemented to retain sustainable populations.</p> <p>2. Urban renaissance should seek to encourage wildlife &amp; deliver biodiversity gain. Should encourage opportunities for building-in beneficial biodiversity or geological features as part of good design.</p> <p>3. The briefs need to reflect current government guidance (ref.</p>	<p>1. The comments have been addressed with a 'Biodiversity' section added to both Briefs.</p> <p>2. The comments have been addressed with a 'Biodiversity' section added to both Briefs.</p>

	<p>PPS9), follow good practice &amp; deliver sustainable biodiversity protection &amp; enhancement for Loughborough. The integration of biodiversity within the briefs should also be viewed as a unique opportunity to give Loughborough a strong sense of place &amp; deliver a striking design for the town centre.</p>	<p>3. The comments have been addressed with a 'Biodiversity' section added to both Briefs.</p>
<p>Charnwood Borough Council – Housing &amp; Health</p>	<p>Overall, support encouragement of residential development on town centre sites &amp; welcome the inclusion of affordable housing. Detailed comments are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the summary of Policy H/5 in both briefs would like to see “town” replace “area” as the final word. Town centre sites should be expected to cater for need throughout the town &amp; not just need in the immediate area.</li> <li>2. Suggest that reference to the Council’s SPD on Affordable Housing be added to both briefs.</li> <li>3. Both briefs mention the 30% affordable housing target. However, they go on to suggest that shared ownership properties are as acceptable as rented properties. This is not the case as the Affordable Housing SPD makes clear. An opportunity to discuss affordable housing being “predominantly for rent” would be welcomed.</li> </ol>	<p>The support for the SPDs is noted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Suggested amendment made to texts.</li> <li>2. Suggested reference added to 'Planning Policy' section of texts.</li> <li>3. Texts corrected as suggested (see 'Appropriate Uses' sections).</li> </ol>
<p>Cllr Jill Vincent</p>	<p>Concerned that there will be proposals for speculative development of student flats. A policy needs to be developed which will allow appropriate responses to such applications based on a proper understanding of supply &amp; need. It is suggested that there is a need to exert some control over the numbers available in flats in the town centre because the outcomes of oversupply against demand/need may be flats standing empty, or the displacement of students from Campus accommodation (which would then stand empty). Private sector houses might be freed up to return to the normal housing market. This should not be left to chance &amp; we should act in partnership with the University so as to ensure town centre accommodation for students is provided at a level justified by need.</p>	<p>The Council’s recently adopted 'Student Housing Provision SPD' recognises the opportunity for purposed built student housing within Loughborough Town Centre and identifies the Opportunity Site as a potential location. In considering the acceptability of any proposals for the Opportunity Site incorporating elements of student housing, the Council will expect them to represent one component within a well-designed, mixed use scheme demonstrably compatible with the policies of the adopted Local Plan, and the principles set out in the Council’s 'Leading in Design SPD' and added to in the Development Brief.</p>

<p>East Midlands Regional Assembly</p>	<p>Welcome the comprehensive approach to development by considering these sites together. Both sites represent the highest priorities for development as defined in RSS8 Policy 2 – Locational Priorities for Development. In principle the objectives of the SPD are in close conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy. The detailed criteria also accord strongly with the criteria set out in RSS Policy 4 – Promoting Better Design. Overall, the SPD provides an excellent summary of the overall policy context and development requirements and the axonometric illustrations and related materials give a very clear illustration of the practical application of policy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Choice of Materials and Design and Construction Waste – A policy context is provided by the Regional Waste Strategy (Policies RWS 1 &amp; 7).</li> <li>2. Transport – The SPD could require prospective development proposals to demonstrate how they will integrate with public transport and footpaths/cycle way networks to provide access to key town destinations.</li> <li>3. Energy Efficiency, CO2 and Renewable Energy – Suggest that more emphasis is placed on energy as a factor in building design in order to meet regional CO2 targets.</li> <li>4. SUDS – The relatively intense form of development and large roof areas give reason for consideration of sustainable drainage and grey water capture for use within buildings and to store and irrigate associated landscaping etc.</li> </ol>	<p>The support for the SPDs is noted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reference to the RWS added within ‘Planning Policy’ section.</li> <li>2. This comment has been acknowledged in the ‘Public Realm’ sections of the Briefs.</li> <li>3. The ‘Sustainability’ sections of the Briefs have been strengthened to address this comment.</li> <li>4. The ‘Sustainability’ sections of the Briefs have been strengthened to address this comment.</li> </ol>
<p>English Heritage</p>	<p>Do not have the capacity to comment on the Development Briefs at the present time. This does not reflect our obligation to advise you on, &amp; potentially object to, any specific development proposals which may subsequently arise and may have adverse effects on the historic environment.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>English Nature</p>	<p>The Development Briefs do not explore or encourage methods of identifying or protecting existing biodiversity, &amp; do not encourage the identification of opportunities for enhancing the biodiversity resource. This can be done through creative layouts &amp; building</p>	<p>The comments have been addressed with a ‘Biodiversity’ section added to both Briefs.</p>

	<p>designs (e.g. green roofs, nesting sites on buildings etc.). Protecting &amp; enhancing biodiversity through forward planning documents is a requirement of Planning Policy Statement 9 and should be addressed in the Development Briefs.</p>	
<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p><b>DEVONSHIRE SQUARE</b></p> <p>1. In principle the proposal to re-align the Wood Brook is supported if it can be demonstrated that it will lead to flood risk &amp; biodiversity improvements. The Borough Council's work on a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for Wood Brook has yet to be completed making comment upon the viability of the proposals in terms of flood risk difficult. Whilst improvements to the Wood Brook are welcome, the brief should acknowledge that the final built form of the development &amp; alignment of the brook must remain flexible. The Agency will only consent to the brook's diversion if current flood defence &amp; biodiversity standards are met. In the absence of information to confirm that the re-alignment will lead to flood risk &amp; biodiversity improvements on the channel the Agency is unable to give any preliminary agreement at this time to the diversion. The re-alignment may provide an opportunity to create increased flood storage in Queen's Park that could alleviate flood risk in the wider area. This opportunity should be considered in the SFRA currently being prepared.</p> <p>2. The brief's illustrations should be amended to show an 8m (not 4m) 'buffer strip' on both sides of the brook channel.</p> <p>3. The brief must acknowledge that the brook diversion will be subject to EA approval.</p> <p>4. Request that a further key aim for the built form should be "to avoid an increase in flood risk to Loughborough town centre".</p> <p>5. In re-aligning the brook, a replacement trash screen will be required upstream of Granby Street, details of which will require EA consent.</p> <p><b>DEVONSHIRE SQUARE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</b></p> <p>6. The outcome of the emerging SFRA will inform the Sustainability</p>	<p>1. Comment noted and acknowledged in the Devonshire Square Brief (see 'Flood Risk' section).</p> <p>2. The illustrations will be amended to show the required 'buffer strip' and a reference has been added in the 'Flood Risk' text.</p> <p>3. Text amended to acknowledge comment.</p> <p>4. Suggested addition made to aims of the Brief (see 'Purpose of Brief').</p> <p>5. Text amended to acknowledge comment (see 'Flood Risk').</p> <p>6. Comment noted.</p> <p>7. SA amended to acknowledge this comment.</p>

	<p>Appraisal. The absence of important baseline information may bring the soundness of the appraisal into question.</p> <p>7. The development brief offers the potential to contribute to the wider reduction of flood risk &amp; the 'significant positive effect' of Sustainability is worthy of note in Paragraph 27.</p> <p>FORMER GENERAL HOSPITAL &amp; AUMBERRY GAP</p> <p>8. Under 'sustainability' (page 23) reference should be made to the use of sustainable drainage principles for the management of surface water. Opportunities should be sought to reduce discharges to the watercourse which may help to alleviate flood risk issues in the town centre.</p>	<p>8. SA amended to acknowledge this comment.</p>
<p>Margaret Evans on behalf of the Haydon Road Residents Association</p>	<p>DEVONSHIRE SQUARE</p> <p>1. Our priority is not to lose any of the Queen's Park but to extend the park over Granby Street car park &amp; into Devonshire Square. This is an opportunity to increase a valued, attractive &amp; well-used recreational space.</p> <p>2. John Storer House should be rebuilt on its present site, to an attractive design with the park landscaped to include JSH in its boundaries. The Wood Brook should flow through the extended park.</p> <p>FORMER GENERAL HOSPITAL &amp; AUMBERRY GAP</p> <p>3. Object to the proposal to build student accommodation on the site of the old hospital. The town centre would be overwhelmed by any more student accommodation &amp; the town centre community would be grossly out of balance. It's time the university was told to "build on campus" &amp; developers were told to "build economical town centre housing". There would then be a living heart to the town instead of a transient population who change each year without any attachment/love of the town.</p> <p>4. A bus station with excellent facilities where residents &amp; visitors alike could wait in safety &amp; comfort for their buses &amp; coaches would be a commendable asset.</p>	<p>1. Agreed that the integrity of the Park must be maintained. The text and illustrations have been amended to reinforce this message.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. The Brief acknowledges these as possible options.</p> <p>3. The Council's recently adopted 'Student Housing Provision SPD' recognises the opportunity for purposed built student housing within Loughborough Town Centre and identifies the Opportunity Site as a potential location. The Brief recognises that elements of student housing may play a part in ensuring that redevelopment projects with wider benefits to the Town Centre are viable. Furthermore, purpose built student housing has the potential to release family homes now occupied by students for families.</p> <p>4. Leicestershire County Council's Transport Project proposals for Loughborough Town Centre include enhanced facilities for bus users and operators focused on two on-street bus hubs. The proposals do not include the creation of a dedicated bus station.</p>

Leicestershire Constabulary	<p>1. Any public car park, including the retained section of the Granby Street &amp; the proposed multi-storey, should be designed in accordance with the ACPO Safer Parking Scheme.</p> <p>2. Ground level parking should be overlooked (i.e. from principal rooms in the case of residential development) &amp; relate directly to entrance doors.</p> <p>3. Residential parking areas should have access control and not be open to the street.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISALS</p> <p>4. If new car parks are designed to Safer Parking standards; crime, anti social behaviour will be reduced &amp; community safety increased &amp; therefore have a 'significant positive effect'.</p>	<p>1. Text amended to acknowledge comment (see 'Access for Servicing and Car Parking' section).</p> <p>2. Text amended to acknowledge comment (see 'Access for Servicing and Car Parking' section).</p> <p>3. Comment noted but the encouragement of natural surveillance through good design is considered to be more appropriate than the promotion of physical barriers.</p> <p>4. SA amended to acknowledge comment.</p>
Leicestershire County Council	<p>DEVONSHIRE SQUARE</p> <p>1. The removal of traffic from Wards End/Granby Street will be subject to securing appropriate Traffic Regulation Orders. A proper assessment of the implications of any displaced traffic will be required. Important to identify the volume and nature of the vehicles transferred onto the constrained South Street route to ensure they can be safely accommodated.</p> <p>2. In view of the emerging Government stance on private and Local Authority contributions to major road schemes, it is the County Council's desire to secure a financial contribution to the Inner Relief Road (IRR). However, it is not something which can be justified in terms of a reasoned highway impact arising as a direct consequence of the development. This site might be expected to benefit commercially from an environmentally attractive and well serviced town centre, which is one of the aims of the IRR. The Borough Council is therefore recommended to negotiate a contribution through its planning policies.</p> <p>3. It is recommended that the new public path along the eastern boundary of Queens Park, connecting Browns Lane and Granby Street, should be designed to also accommodate cyclists.</p> <p>4. Noted that 3 vehicular accesses are to be provided. This is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design considerations.</p>	<p>1. The text amended to acknowledge this comment.</p> <p>2. Comment noted but the Development Brief confirms Local Plan Policy CA/4a, which states that "the Borough Council will seek to negotiate reasonably related contributions to assist in the provision of those elements of the Loughborough IRR necessary to service adequately the redevelopment proposals".</p> <p>3. The text has been amended to acknowledge this comment (see 'Public Realm').</p> <p>4. Text acknowledges these comments (see 'Access for Servicing and Car Parking').</p>

There should be no private car parking provided for the occupiers of any commercial/office development other than that which can be demonstrated to be absolutely essential.

5. Concerned that any significant reduction in the capacity of the Granby Street car park will have a detrimental impact on Charnwood Museum's visitor figures & will also affect the Carillon & Loughborough Library. In addition concerned that loss of on-street parking in Granby Street will significantly affect visitor figures to the above.

6. Consider that the opportunity has been missed to address the problem of lack of coach parking spaces in central Loughborough, which affects use of the Museum.

7. If proposals go ahead it must be accompanied by better "brown signage" within Loughborough.

8. The Community Services Department would welcome the opportunity to discuss concerns with the Borough Council, in particular to discuss the scope for a replacement library within the Devonshire Square proposals.

#### FORMER GENERAL HOSPITAL & AUMBERRY GAP

9. The documents contain traffic management proposals (e.g. a two-way Southfields Road with implications for the A6/IRR junction) that have not been fully assessed or modelled. The suggested 300 space car park will generate a large number of traffic movements & the access requirements & implications on the adjoining road network will need to be examined. A view cannot be provided on these proposals until they can be modelled, using modelling works being undertaken on the IRR Major Scheme Business Case.

10. The proposed key pedestrian link between High St and the Magistrates Court is noted, though consideration will need to be given to prevent indiscriminate pedestrian crossing of the IRR.

11. There should be no private car parking provided for the occupiers of any office/commercial development other than that which can be demonstrated to be essential.

12. The IRR is referred to as a 'boulevard & appears to be illustrated as a dual carriageway with a line of trees along a central

5. The Brief requires the removal of surface parking at Granby Street, with replacement parking to be multi-level as part of the redevelopment scheme. The level of parking required is being examined in the 'Loughborough Parking Strategy'.

6. It is considered that the provision of coach parking within the Devonshire Square site would be an inappropriate use for this important Town Centre site.

7. Agreed that the legibility of the Town Centre would be improved by better signage. This issue is covered in the 'Public Realm' section of the Town Centre Masterplan.

8. This interest is welcomed and is a possibility that merits further discussion and a feasibility study.

9. The comments have been acknowledged in the text (see 'Vehicular Access and Parking' section).

10. This issue should be considered in the detailed design of the IRR.

11. The text acknowledges this comment (see 'Access for Servicing and Car Parking').

12. The reference within the text has been corrected and the illustrations will be amended to accord with the County Council's current IRR proposals.

13. This issue is being examined in the Loughborough Parking Strategy, which is currently being prepared.

14. The text acknowledges these comments (see 'Implementation' section).

	<p>reserve. This is inconsistent with the County Council's current design philosophy.</p> <p>13. The County Council needs to be satisfied that there is a need for a 300 space car park as proposed by the brief.</p> <p>14. The comprehensive development of this area is linked to the implementation of the IRR and a reasonable contribution will therefore be sought to this scheme. However, it is acknowledged that parts of the site can be developed in advance of the IRR being built.</p>	
Loughborough University	<p><b>FORMER GENERAL HOSPITAL &amp; AUMBERRY GAP</b></p> <p>1. Gives general support to the proposed regeneration of this area &amp; in particular welcomes the inclusion of 'blot on the landscape' sites fronting Barrow Street &amp; Leicester Road. Also support aims in the brief relating to a mix of activity, retention of the existing hospital building/ frontage, proposed building heights, &amp; the aim of excellent standard of design.</p> <p>2. There should be a key aim of creating strategic cycle links through &amp; between the town centre &amp; the residential areas beyond.</p> <p>3. It is important to create safe cycle &amp; pedestrian links across the inner relief road.</p> <p>4. General support is given for properly managed student accommodation within the town. Believe purpose-built accommodation is better for students than family homes. Also it should release family homes now occupied by students for families.</p> <p>5. Whilst the site provides an ideal opportunity for managed student accommodation care should be taken with the quantity of accommodation. An ideal managed hall would be 350-400 bedrooms. Above this size it no longer has a hall identity &amp; becomes very difficult to manage. Developments of this size should have adequate senior residents on site secured by a Section 106 agreement to provide pastoral care.</p> <p>6. Sufficient suitable secure cycle storage facilities are needed, not just Sheffield stands.</p>	<p>1. This support is welcomed.</p> <p>2. This issue is recognised in the 'Transport and Movement' and 'Public Realm' sections of the Town Centre Masterplan.</p> <p>3. Agreed and acknowledged in the Town Centre Masterplan.</p> <p>4. General support for properly managed student accommodation noted.</p> <p>5. The support in principle for managed student accommodation and comments relating to size are noted. The scope to secure management arrangements through a Section 106 agreement is a matter for consideration in the assessment of any proposals for the Opportunity Site incorporating elements of student housing.</p> <p>6. This issue has been addressed in the Brief (see</p>

		'Cycle Facilities' section).
Mr. J Barnes	<p><b>FORMER GENERAL HOSPITAL &amp; AUMBERRY GAP</b></p> <p>1. Development is necessary but student accommodation is unimaginative and does it add value to the town centre?</p> <p>2. More green space/areas where people can sit outside would be welcome.</p>	<p>1. The Brief outlines the potential benefits of purpose built student housing (see 'Appropriate Uses' section) as part of a wider, mixed use scheme, which contributes to the regeneration of the area and supports the viability and vitality of the Town Centre.</p> <p>2. The Brief and the Town Centre Masterplan recognise the importance of creating a high quality public realm, including the delivery of biodiversity gain.</p>
Mr. James Fernandes	<p><b>FORMER GENERAL HOSPITAL &amp; AUMBERRY GAP</b></p> <p>1. Any buildings (on the Aumberry Gap site) above the existing height would be detrimental to the light currently received by (residential) property in Pinfold Gate. A gradual increase away from the existing property would be acceptable.</p> <p>2. The rest of the scheme is acceptable; subject to ensuring parking at the secure courtyard (to the rear of cottages in Pinfold Gate) is not taken over by other developments.</p>	<p>1. The Brief acknowledges that the height of development should reduce towards Aumberry Gap and respect the modest two storey scale of the Pinfold Gate cottages (see 'Scale of Development' section).</p> <p>2. The status of this parking is unclear. Its retention is a matter for the relevant interests in the land to address and is outside the scope of the Brief.</p>
National Trust	No specific comments to make.	Noted.
RPS Planning (on behalf of Keyhaven Developments Ltd)	<p><b>FORMER GENERAL HOSPITAL &amp; AUMBERRY GAP</b></p> <p>1. Vision statement - should clarify that a mix of uses across the entire area is sought &amp; not necessarily on individual sites within it. Also the term 'distinctive architecture' should be clarified.</p> <p>2. Planning Objectives - A significant residential content is one of the principals for the area. In view of policy support for student</p>	<p>1. The 'Planning Objectives for the Area' have been amended to recognise the requirement for "a mix of uses across the site". The meaning of 'distinctive architecture' is clarified in the 'Built Form and Layout' section of the Brief.</p> <p>2. The 'Planning Objectives' have been amended to recognise this point and further clarification relating to this</p>

accommodation, it is considered that this objective should state 'including student accommodation'. Similarly this reference should be added to the 'Appropriate Uses' section of the brief in relation to the Aumberry Gap part of the site.

3. General Principles – Should acknowledge that the IRR will create a new context & that the scale of development that is appropriate on sites adjacent to it should reflect the future character of the town rather than the existing context. This comment is similarly relevant to the Built Form & Layout section.

4. With reference to a comprehensive approach, believe that the brief should clarify that individual development sites can come forward separately provided it can be demonstrated that they do not prejudice the comprehensive redevelopment of the area as a whole.

5. Appropriate Uses – For the avoidance of doubt believe that the document should specifically state that an affordable housing requirement does not apply to student accommodation.

6. On the basis of the existing planning policy context, believe that the text relating to the Aumberry Gap site should be reworded to state that managed student accommodation will, rather than may, be acceptable. It is argued this should be justified on the basis of need, student/residents balance, sustainability & accessibility of location, rather than 'requirements for lower car provision'.

7. Built Form and Layout – Believe that it is appropriate to state "the Council seeks development that creates a strong sense of place and has regard to the character of the town centre", rather than "based upon the character of the town centre". Consider that paragraph 2 of this section, relating to the 'approach to architecture', is unclear and suggest that it is deleted or reworded using more easily understood terminology. Also, whilst supporting the approach in principle, suggest rewording of final paragraph to recognise that for practical or other reasons the provision of "an abundance of windows and doors" will not always be possible.

8. Scale of Development & IRR Frontage/Aumberry Gap – Very concerned that the brief severely restricts the height of development in the area. Consider that more clarity is required and that there is scope for greater height along the route of the IRR

issue has been added to the 'Appropriate Uses' section of the Brief.

3. This point has been acknowledged in the 'Scale of Development' section of the Brief and text has been added to clarify the considerations relating to proposals for 'high buildings'.

4. The 'Phasing' section of the Brief clarifies this point.

5. This would be inappropriate as consideration of affordable housing will depend on the particular nature of any development proposed for the site.

6. The text has been amended to acknowledge more fully the opportunity for purpose built student housing (see 'Appropriate Uses').

7. Text has been amended to acknowledge comments (see 'Built Form and Layout').

8. The text has been amended so that guidance relating to height is less prescriptive (see 'Scale of Development').

	<p>along Barrow Street. Consider that brief should be amended to allow greater height here with potential for development of up to seven/eight storeys in places.</p> <p>9. Heritage Assets – Believe that the brief should specifically state that the retention of the existing, very poor condition buildings on the Pinfold Gate and Leicester Road frontages of the Aumberry Gap site is unnecessary because they appear beyond viable restoration.</p> <p>10. Developer Contributions – Consider that any planning obligations relating to development within the area should be specified in the brief. Where a financial contribution is to be levied, the level and how it is calculated should be set out.</p>	<p>9. The text has been amended to acknowledge that these buildings are not required to be retained because of their condition (see ‘Heritage Assets’).</p> <p>10. The text has been amended to clarify the range of likely planning obligations but the specific requirements will depend on the particular development proposals submitted (see ‘Developer Contributions’). Currently the Council is preparing ‘Section 106 Developer Contributions SPD’, which will provide clarification.</p>
<p>Ruth Youngs – Chair of Charnwood Pedestrian Consultative Committee</p>	<p><b>DEVONSHIRE SQUARE</b></p> <p>1. The majority of the brief appears acceptable but note that pedestrianisation is proposed for Devonshire Square and suggest that this is extended to include all of Wards End. Narrow pavements, the proposed provision of a service vehicle loading bay and the continuation of on street car parking will not make this area acceptable for pedestrians or an appealing entry to the town centre.</p> <p>2. Are the Queen’s Park toilets to be improved?</p> <p>3. Cycle facilities should allow enough space for trikes to use them. Also applicable to the former hospital site.</p> <p><b>FORMER GENERAL HOSPITAL &amp; AUMBERRY GAP</b></p> <p>4. Could do more to encourage efficient use of natural &amp; local resources.</p> <p>5. Aumberry Gap- why is it assumed that only student parking can be restricted &amp; not parking for the wider public?</p> <p>6. Pavements along the IRR should be uncluttered by street signs. Pedestrian routes should be direct &amp; have seating, bins etc.</p>	<p>1. In conjunction with the Town Centre Masterplan, improvements are proposed to Wards End, which give greater priority and comfort to pedestrians but maintain the road’s essential role in providing vehicular access to this part of the Town Centre.</p> <p>2. This is outside the Brief’s remit but is to be examined in the Council’s ‘Green Flag Management Plan’ for the Park.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. Amendments to the ‘Sustainability’ and ‘Biodiversity’ sections of the Brief address this issue.</p> <p>5. Guidance which seeks to minimise dedicated parking provision in town centre locations is acknowledged (see ‘Access for Serving and Car Parking’).</p> <p>6. Agreed and acknowledged in the Town Centre Masterplan as well as the Brief.</p>
<p>Sport England</p>	<p>We support the thrust of the draft SPD. However, we note that</p>	<p>Agreed that the integrity of the Park must be maintained. The</p>

	<p>the Devonshire Square development site boundary includes some current green space in Queen’s Park, including the bowling green. This appears to contradict the brief’s planning objectives &amp; local plan policy for open space. Additionally we feel that, if necessary, the brief should address the needs of the bowling green users.</p>	<p>text and illustrations have been amended to reinforce this message and to avoid impact on the bowling green.</p>
<p>Storer &amp; Ashby Area Residents’ Group</p>	<p><b>DEVONSHIRE SQUARE</b>  Agree with the overall plans &amp; believe they will make a major improvement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Queen’s Park - Totally opposed to any loss of park &amp; green area. Strongly recommend increasing the size of the park &amp; several opportunities for extension are suggested. Support the idea of opening up all the park borders, subject in the case of Brown’s Lane to safe fencing, a major crossing to the leisure centre &amp; car park. Suggest a new pavement &amp; road narrowing to discourage vehicle use of Brown’s Lane. The bowling green should be left where it is.</li> <li>2. Wood Brook – Should not be hidden away, suggest diverting it further into the park to make it even more of a feature. Fully underground the culvert &amp; keep it as an emergency flooding facility, also allowing the opportunity for the park to be opened up to John Storer House (JSH) &amp; the planned new development.</li> <li>3. Building Design – All new buildings must fit within the character of the Queen’s Park Conservation Area.</li> <li>4. Building Use – JSH should be rebuilt where it is, to a design in keeping with the Conservation Area &amp; locality. High quality flats &amp; social housing may be appropriate in the area next to the park. Buildings next to the park should only be two storeys high to preserve views.</li> <li>5. Queen’s Park Conservation Area – The plans should help to make this area a mixed/balanced community again. No student accommodation should be allowed.</li> <li>6. Bedford &amp; Devonshire Squares – There should be no parking within the squares &amp; none on the street between. Support the full pedestrianisation of the squares, including the north side. Parking</li> </ol>	<p>1. Agreed that the integrity of the Park must be maintained. The text and illustrations have been amended to reinforce this message and to avoid impact on the bowling green. The treatment of Brown’s Lane is examined in the Town Centre Masterplan.</p> <p>2. Amendments to the Brief acknowledge these comments (see ‘Flood Risk’, ‘Built Form and Layout’ and ‘Public Realm’ sections).</p> <p>3. Need to respect the Conservation Area acknowledged in the Brief</p> <p>4. The Brief does not exclude JHS remaining on its existing site. Requirements include “architectural excellence” and “a harmonious relationship with Queen’s Park” but it is not considered appropriate to limit the height of development to two storeys.</p> <p>5. The scope for a mix of uses, including residential, is acknowledged but student accommodation is not specified.</p> <p>6. The treatment of the Squares is examined in the Town Centre Masterplan. The Brief indicates that parking within the site will be multi-level.</p>

	<p>should be in adequately provided multi-storey car parks.</p> <p>7. Traffic – The two way arrangement for Southfields Road appears sensible &amp; the access proposals for Wood Gate are supported. Strongly believe that traffic calming &amp; pedestrian/cyclist crossing improvements are needed to Browns Lane. Traffic calming is also considered necessary in Frederick Street &amp; the streets that run off it. A one way system is suggested.</p> <p>8. John Storer House – A rebuild &amp;/or improvements would be welcomed. It should be incorporated into the park area &amp; New Street could be fully pedestrianised.</p> <p>9. Granby Street – Strongly support the proposals for Granby Street, which are a must whatever happens &amp; could be done now. Objection to parking at any time in Granby Street.</p>	<p>7. These issues are outside the scope of the Brief but are addressed in the Town Centre Masterplan.</p> <p>8. Comments noted and acknowledged in the Brief apart from New Street, as some degree of vehicular access is likely to continue to be needed.</p> <p>9. Comments noted. Consideration of on street parking in Granby Street is outside the scope of the Brief.</p>
<p>Wymeswold Parish Council</p>	<p>1. Concerned about effects on access from the A60 &amp; the provision of parking for visitors to Loughborough from the Wolds villages.</p> <p>2. Concerned about any detrimental effect on Queen’s Park.</p> <p>3. Some concern about the over provision of student accommodation in the town centre.</p> <p>4. Consider there is a need for more large shops, with associated parking, to enable ease of use by shoppers.</p>	<p>1. It is acknowledged that any development proposals will need to be examined in detail by the Local Highway Authority. Parking provision is being examined in the ‘Loughborough Parking Strategy’.</p> <p>2. Agreed that the character of the Park must be maintained. Text has been amended to reinforce this message.</p> <p>3. This issue is outside the scope of the Briefs.</p> <p>4. Comment noted.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments of Town Team* on Opportunity Site Development Briefs 28/06/06</b>	
Mariners Quay Residents	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need to know how much of Queens Park will be lost. Can't afford to lose any.</li> <li>2. Currently not aware of built development when in the Park. New buildings will change this.</li> <li>3. The view down New Street could be damaged by the relocated John Storer House. Needs to be carefully handled.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Brief amended to exclude any part of the Park.</li> <li>2. Brief emphasises need for sensitive, high quality development.</li> <li>3. Brief emphasises need for sensitive, high quality development.</li> </ol>
Action for a better Charnwood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What constitutes the Park? Is the Park a retreat or part of the town? Is it grass or a community space? More thought needs to be given to how to merge hard and soft surfaces.</li> <li>2. Development should be stepped back along the Park edge to avoid adverse impact of height.</li> <li>3. Children's play areas should be retained.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Brief amended to stress the importance of the Park.</li> <li>2. Sensitive treatment to Park edge strongly encouraged in the Brief.</li> <li>3. Amended Brief does not affect the play area.</li> </ol>

Chamber of Trade and Commerce	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chamber concerned re the loss of car parking spaces in the nearest car park to the Town Centre.</li> <li>2. Re-routing of the Woodbrook will be very expensive – is it viable?</li> <li>3. Could culverts be improved to allow build over?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Level of public parking appropriate to be examined in the emerging 'Loughborough Parking Strategy'.</li> <li>2. Viability will need to be assessed.</li> <li>3. EA objection likely to any proposal of this nature.</li> </ol>
Loughborough University	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would the proposed Arts venue be viable? May be better to have commercial use.</li> <li>2. Need to be more creative on the treatment of Devonshire Square.</li> <li>3. Could car parking be provided under buildings?</li> <li>4. The building mass has a large footprint, could this be reduced?</li> <li>5. Would the Park remain open all day?</li> <li>6. Better to keep Wards End closed to traffic all day.</li> <li>7. Is the bowling green a barrier?</li> <li>8. What do we mean by a "landmark" building?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Further work will be required to assess the feasibility of the 'Arts Centre' aspiration.</li> <li>2. Noted.</li> <li>3. Brief does not exclude this option.</li> <li>4. The 'Built Form and Layout' section of the Brief examines how building mass might be broken down.</li> <li>5. An issue for the 'Park Management Plan', not the Brief.</li> <li>6. Noted but some degree of access to this part of the Town Centre will need to be maintained.</li> <li>7. Noted. Bowling green excluded from Brief.</li> <li>8. Text amended to clarify meaning.</li> </ol>
Disability Forum	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. John Storer House must stay in the centre.</li> <li>2. Careful thought needs to be given to links with the Leisure Centre and access to John Storer House.</li> <li>3. John Storer House could be enhanced and bigger.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. Agreed.</li> <li>3. The Brief encourages improved facilities for JSH.</li> </ol>
Hastings Community		

Association	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Be aware of the impact of the Inner Relief Road on people of Hastings Ward. Must make sure it is as pleasant as possible and adverse effect is minimised in relation to traffic speeds and safe crossing.</li> <li>2. Need to take account of the impact of high density housing on local services.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This issue is identified in the Town Centre Masterplan.</li> <li>2. Noted.</li> </ol>
AstraZeneca	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Better to have office accommodation on the Hospital site to protect the retail core.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Brief does not exclude this option within a mix of uses.</li> </ol>
Loughborough Churches Together	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need to look at best practice elsewhere on student housing provision to avoid the problem of buildings becoming redundant.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Study commissioned in conjunction with the Town Centre Masterplan.</li> </ol>
Chamber of Trade and Commerce	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. May be a case for some retail in the scheme for the Hospital site.</li> <li>2. Question the wisdom of the proposed new link through the site.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Brief does not exclude this within a mix of uses.</li> <li>2. Noted but this link is considered to be a desirable addition to the Town's network of pedestrian and cycle routes.</li> </ol>
General Comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retail uses along Inner Relief Road unlikely to be viable.</li> <li>2. How will we achieve retail uses fronting on to the new public space linking the IRR to High Street? Will it be a safe route at night?</li> <li>3. How will we judge proposals to replace the Victorian Hospital Building?</li> <li>4. Building heights should rise towards the centre of the site rather than at the edges.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The creation of high quality 'active' frontages is encouraged, which may or may not involve retail uses.</li> <li>2. Ditto.</li> <li>3. See amended text ('Heritage Assets').</li> <li>4. Noted. Text has been amended to clarify issue of height of new development (see 'Scale of Development' section).</li> </ol>



**\*Town Team Membership**

Mariners Quay Residents Assoc  
Limehurst Avenue and Linden Road Residents Assoc  
Loughborough University  
Charnwood Arts  
Carillon Centre Management  
Loughborough Archaeological and Historical Society  
AstraZeneca  
Youth Forum  
Loughborough Students Union  
Community Relations Council  
Registered Social Landlord  
Local Pubs/Clubs (Pubwatch)  
Police  
Borough Councillors  
Disability Forum  
Rushes Centre Management  
Loughborough and District Civic Trust  
Action for a Better Charnwood

Storer Area Residents Association  
Hastings Community Association  
Quality Bus Partnership  
Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce  
Quorn Parish Council  
Loughborough Market Traders  
County Council  
William Davis

A summary of all representations has been prepared and considered by Cabinet on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2007 before finalising the SPD for adoption. Details are set out in Appendix 1 and 2.

The 'Statement of Consultation' (Charnwood Borough Council, July 2006) published alongside the Draft Devonshire Square Development Brief and the Former General Hospital & Aumbery Gap Development Site SPD's sets out the details of initial consultation undertaken with key stakeholders and other bodies prior to formal public consultation.

## **Appendix I – Cabinet Report and Minute**

### **CABINET – 15<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2007 Report of the Director of Development**

ITEM 11a THE CHARNWOOD LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK-  
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS: 1. DEVONSHIRE  
SQUARE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF; 2. FORMER GENERAL  
HOSPITAL/AUMBERRY GAP DEVELOPMENT BRIEF.

#### **Purpose of the Report**

To consider the responses to the public consultation on the draft Development Briefs for Loughborough Town Centre Opportunity Sites at Devonshire Square and the Former General Hospital and Aumberry Gap and to approve the briefs for adoption as Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) with the following recommended amendments.

#### **Recommendations**

1. That the Devonshire Square and the Former General Hospital and Aumberry Gap Development Brief SPDs be adopted on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2007 and made available as directed by Regulation 19 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004;
2. That authority is delegated to the Director of Development to make any further necessary minor amendments/corrections that do not affect the policy content of the documents.

#### **Reasons**

1. To meet the requirements of Regulation 19 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004;
2. To enable the timely publication of the final versions of the SPDs.

#### **Policy Context**

The adopted Borough of Charnwood Local Plan sets out a clear land use strategy to guide and control development in Loughborough Town Centre. The two sites are identified as key development opportunities in the Local Plan. The Development Briefs have been prepared in conjunction with the Loughborough Town Centre Masterplan. The importance of the Town Centre Masterplan and the Development Briefs is recognised by their inclusion in the Council's Corporate Plan and in the Community Strategy. The Development Briefs are necessary to guide the future physical development and improvement of these key Loughborough Town Centre Opportunity Sites.

#### **Background**

The adopted Borough of Charnwood Local Plan Policies CA/4a (Devonshire Square) and CA/4b (Former General Hospital / Aumberry Gap) set out the general planning policy and design context for the development of these sites, which is expanded upon in the briefs. The purpose of the SPDs is to supplement the broad planning and design policies to ensure an integrated, planned and appropriate approach to the redevelopment of these important parts of the Town Centre. Public consultation on the Development Briefs has been carried out in conjunction with consultation on the Loughborough Town Centre Masterplan. In addition, the documents have been prepared in consultation with the Town Team. The comments received are summarised in Appendices 1 (Public Consultation) and 2 (Town Team) along with recommended

action/changes. The preparation of the Development Briefs has followed the requirements for SPD set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Once adopted, the SPDs will be accorded significant weight in the determination of planning applications relating to the sites. Copies of the Development Briefs are attached as Appendix 3 (Devonshire Square) and Appendix 4 (Former General Hospital and Aumberry Gap) to this report. The Sustainability Appraisals for the Development Briefs are attached as Appendix 5 (Devonshire Square) and Appendix 6 (Former Hospital and Aumberry Gap).

### Financial Implications

In conjunction with the Town Centre Masterplan, the Development Briefs have significant implications for future investment and expenditure by the Council and its partners. In particular, Council owned land is affected in the case of the Devonshire Square site and both Development Briefs contain proposals for improvements to the public realm, for the creation of new public spaces and highways improvements. The Council will need to continue its success in securing contributions to such works through S106 Agreements and through bids to the LSEP in addition to maintaining its own programme of public realm investment. The provision for public realm improvements that is made for the remaining years of the Council's current Capital Programme will need to be considered in the forthcoming review of the programme. Section 106 Developer Contributions SDP, setting out the Council's process for negotiations to secure planning obligations prior to and during the process of planning applications, is being prepared and has reached public consultation stage.

### Risk Assessment

<b>RISK</b>	<b>LIKELIHOOD</b>	<b>IMPACT</b>	<b>MITIGATING MEASURES</b>
That there will be insufficient private sector interest to deliver the key proposals of the Development Briefs.	Low	Medium	Develop an implementation Plan that identifies potential investors and developers. Be prepared to use compulsory powers if necessary. Ensure that high quality public realm and transport proposals are implemented
That insufficient funding will be available to deliver the public realm or transport elements of the Development Briefs.	Medium	High	Seek to maximise contributions from S106 Agreements and other funding bodies. Programme improvements to concentrate on key priorities.
That the County Council's LTP bid is unsuccessful (particularly relevant to the former Hospital site and Aumberry Gap).	Low	High	Revisit transport strategy and investigate alternative solutions and sources of funding.

### Background Papers:

1. 'Borough of Charnwood Local Plan' (2004)

2. Draft Loughborough Town Centre Masterplan (January 2007)
3. Cabinet Item 18<sup>th</sup> May 2006 – Loughborough Town Centre Masterplan
4. Cabinet Item 20<sup>th</sup> July 2006 – Charnwood LDF Development Brief SPDs
5. Cabinet Item 21<sup>st</sup> September 2006 – Loughborough Town Centre Masterplan and Supplementary Planning Documents.

Key Decision: YES

Officer to Contact: Martin Tincknell [Martin.Tincknell@charnwood.gov.uk](mailto:Martin.Tincknell@charnwood.gov.uk)  
Jonathan Hale [Jonathan.Hale@charnwood.gov.uk](mailto:Jonathan.Hale@charnwood.gov.uk)

**Extract from Minute of Cabinet Meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2007.**

**THE CHARNWOOD LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK –  
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS; 1. DEVONSHIRE SQUARE  
DEVELOPMENT BRIEF; 2. FORMER GENERAL HSOPITAL/AUMBERRY GAP  
DEVELOPMENT BRIEF**

The Director of Development reported upon the response to the public consultation on the draft Development Briefs for Loughborough Town Centre Opportunity Sites at Devonshire Square and the Former General Hospital and Aumberry Gap and sought approval for adoption of the briefs as Supplementary Planning Documents (item 11 on the agenda filed with these minutes). A report setting out the recommendations of the Scrutiny Commission on this matter was also submitted (filed with these minutes).

**RESOLVED**

- 1. that the Devonshire Square and the former General Hospital and Aumberry Gap Development Brief SPDs be adopted with effect from 26<sup>th</sup> March 2007 and made available as directed by Regulation 19 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004;**
- 2. that the recommendations of the Scrutiny Commission be noted.**
- 3. that delegated authority be given to the Director of Development to make any further necessary minor amendments/corrections that do not affect the policy content of the documents.**

**REASONS**

1. To meet the requirements of Regulation 19 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004;
2. To acknowledge the comments and recommendations.

3. To enable the timely publication of the final versions of the SPDs.