

Loughborough University East Park

Supplementary Planning Document

Statement of Main Issues Raised through Public Consultation

January 2006

**Loughborough University East Park Supplementary Planning Document
Statement of Consultation of Main Issues Raised through Public Consultation**

I. INTRODUCTION

Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004¹ 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 Loughborough University East Park SPD and indicates how these main issues were addressed in revising the SPD for adoption.

Consultation on the SPD, setting out various options to address the options for Loughborough University East Park, took place in February/March 2005. Responses to this consultation were considered by Cabinet on the 19th May 2005. The report summarises the issues raised by respondents and sets out the changes made to the SPD in response to these representations.

16 responses have been received on the SPD. These responses include comments from members of the public, Charnwood and North West Leicestershire Primary Care Trust, The National Trust, English Nature, Environment Agency, Highways Agency, Leicestershire Constabulary, Commission for Architecture and the built Environment, Mountfields Drive Residents, Loughborough and District Civic Trust and Loughborough University.

I. MAIN ISSUES RAISED THROUGH CONSULTATION AND HOW THE ISSUES WERE ADDRESSED

	Main Issues	Response to Issue
1	A second university site is needed and land used more efficiently to ensure there is no managed student accommodation in town and houses in Loughborough are maintained for families	Issues relating to the possible expansion of the Campus will be matters for consideration through the preparation of the Core Strategy.
2	Increases in student numbers, housing and the campus are not matched by expansion in the health care facilities.	Appropriate to make reference in the SPD to the need for improved health center facilities on campus. Amend text to indicate that contributions may be negotiated to improved health center facilities in accordance with Policy ST/3 of the adopted local plan.
3	Limit car parking in site	The SPD does not propose additional parking provision, rather a rationalization of existing surface parking within a new multi storey facility. The car parking strategy on campus is to make very limited provision for student parking.

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

4	Increase the number of bed spaces above 450 in the residential zone	The mix of accommodation and academic space outlined is appropriate for this part of the Campus and builds on existing bed space provision in this area.
5	Large number of isolated buildings and a traditional courtyard or open quadrangle would enhance this and be an improvement.	Amend plans to show design criteria to be applied to areas within East Park. Delete detailed block plans.
6	Five storey entrance buildings may be too domineering	On parts of the East Park area 5 storey buildings would not be incompatible with the existing scale and character of the buildings.
7	Refer to Leading in Design SPD with regard for development to be designed in a way that reduces crime, anti social behaviour and promotes community safety.	Amend to include reference to Leading in Design.
8	Height and proximity of academic buildings to the boundary, particularly Oaklands Drive, which may affect the quality of life of local residents.	Proposed buildings are an adequate distance from the boundaries to safeguard the residential amenities of nearby properties.
9	Stronger wording for biodiversity	Amend bullet point 2 of the Redevelopment Scheme – Existing wildlife/nature areas will be retained and enhanced.
10	Potential to adversely impact upon operation of J23 of the M1.	Comments noted. Leicestershire County Council at the stakeholder consultation stage, raised concerns, particularly in relation to the possible additional vehicular access off Epinal Way.
11	A Transport Assessment should be provided to give a detailed assessment of the traffic implication likely to arise from this development. It should assess the existing car parking provision and how this will be revised with the new layout, together with any parking control strategy that will be implemented.	Amend text and plan to delete reference to vehicular access from Epinal Way. Amend text to indicate that a Transport Assessment would be required in association with applications for the development of additional academic floorspace or bedspaces on East Park.
12	Set out clearly that high quality architecture and urban design will be sought as a principle objective at the proposal	Amend text to emphasise the importance of quality energy efficient designs
13	Minor modifications to wording	Suggested minor amendments are appropriate for greater clarity.

To summarise, the key changes are set out below:

- Amendment of text to indicate that contributions may be negotiated to improved health center facilities in accordance with Policy ST/3 of the adopted Local Plan
- Amend plans to show design criteria to be applied to areas within East Park. Delete detailed block plans
- Amend bullet point 2 of the Redevelopment Scheme – “Existing wildlife/nature areas will be retained and enhanced”
- Amend text and plan to delete reference to vehicular access from Epinal Way. Amend text to indicate that a Transport Assessment would be required in association with application for the development of additional academic floorspace or bedspaces on East Park
- Amend to include reference to Leading in Design
- Amend text to emphasise the importance of quality energy efficient designs

- Amend text for greater clarity

A summary of all representations has been prepared and considered by Cabinet on 19th May 2005 before finalising the SPD for adoption. Details are set out in Appendix I.

The 'Statement of Consultation' (Charnwood Borough Council, February 2005) published alongside the Draft Loughborough University East Park SPD sets out the details of initial consultation undertaken with key stakeholders and other bodies prior to formal public consultation.

Copies of the relevant Cabinet report, with the responses from the consultation and minutes of the Cabinet meeting are attached.

CABINET – 19th MAY 2005

Report of the Head of Planning Services

ITEM SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT: LOUGHBOROUGH UNIVERSITY EAST PARK

Purpose of the Report

To consider the responses to the consultation on the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), Loughborough University East Park and approve the document for adoption with the recommended amendments.

Recommendations

1. That consideration is given to the representations made on the consultation draft SPD and the amendments identified by the Head of Planning Services as detailed at Appendix 1;
2. That the Loughborough University East Park SPD, incorporating the amendments identified at Appendix 2 and any further amendments now agreed, be adopted and made available as directed by regulation 19 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) 2004.

Reasons

1. To review the proposed SPD following full consultation on the draft document to comply with regulation 18 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations;
2. To meet the requirements of Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

Policy Context

The Corporate Plan priority is to ensure that the Borough is recognised as leading in Leicestershire for the quality of its living environment for all. The SPD is intended to support this priority and to be particularly relevant to the Council's key aim of a sustainable and economically prosperous environment.

Background

In line with the requirements for the preparation of SPDs set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the initial draft guidance was subject to a four-week key stakeholder consultation period. The representations received were summarised in the Cabinet report of 25th November 2004, which included the comments of the Head of Planning Services on the issues raised. Cabinet approved the draft SPD for public consultation which took place over a 6 week period during February and March 2005. The consultation draft was accompanied by a sustainability appraisal in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

The comments received are summarised at Appendix 1 along with recommended amendments where appropriate. The revised SPD incorporating these changes is included at Appendix 2.

Comments Received and Recommended Amendments

Seventeen responses have been received on the SPD. The responses include comments from the Highways Agency, Charnwood and North West Leicestershire PCT, the Loughborough and District Civic Trust, the University and local residents including residents on Mountfields and Oaklands Drive adjoining the site.

The Highways Agency has expressed some concern over the impact of additional academic floorspace and student bedspaces on Campus on the operation of the M1 Junction 23. In terms of the additional academic floorspace proposed they conclude that it is unlikely to have a significant impact on the trunk road network. The Agency considers a Transport Assessment is required. These concerns reflect comments previously made by Leicestershire County Council in relation to the option of a new vehicular access onto Epinal Way.

In view of these comments it is recommended that the option of an additional vehicular access from Epinal Way be removed from the SPD. Access to East Park from Epinal Way would be solely for pedestrians and cyclists. Vehicles would access the proposed multi-storey car park via the existing main entrance. The SPD should make it clear that planning applications for development within East Park would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment. The proposed layout would not rule out a second point of access in the future if it proved acceptable in highway terms.

A number of local residents have expressed concerns that the replacement of the existing bungalows backing onto Mountfields Drive with academic floorspace up to 3 storeys could have an adverse impact on their residential amenities. The distance between the proposed new blocks and residential properties meets the standard privacy distance of 27.5 metres outlined in the Leading in Design Supplementary Planning document. The East Park SPD emphasises the importance of safeguarding the privacy of adjoining properties and ensuring that, through distance, block orientation and clear definition of public and private space, the residential amenities of adjoining properties can be safeguarded.

The Loughborough and District Civic Trust and CABI emphasise the importance of ensuring high quality, sustainable energy efficient design of new buildings. English Nature has commented on the biodiversity interests on the site. The brief highlights the importance of design quality, the potential for energy efficient design and the importance of incorporating existing wildlife areas within any new development. A reference to the Leading in Design SPD, which provides additional guidance on sustainable design, could usefully be added to the SPD.

The PCT have commented on health facility provision. A health centre is available on Campus to provide for the health needs of students. Adopted Local Plan Policy ST/3 outlines the approach the Council take to securing contributions to necessary infrastructure provision in accordance with guidance set out in Circular 1/97. A reference to the policy could usefully be added to the SPD.

The plans accompanying the SPD should be amended to highlight the main redevelopment zones and the design criteria that will need to be applied to these areas.

These suggested amendments are set out at Appendix 2. The Sustainability Assessment of the draft SPD has been reviewed in the light of these recommended changes. The original appraisal had highlighted possible negative impacts associated with a second vehicular access. The removal of this second access from the SPD and the requirement for a Transport Assessment in association with any planning application should address these concerns. Cross reference to Leading in Design will help to clarify the importance of quality design and energy efficiency.

Background Papers: Loughborough University East Park SPD, Consultation Draft February 2005.

Key Decision: No

Officer to Contact: Guy Longley
guy.longley@charnwood.gov.uk

Loughborough University East Park Supplementary Planning Document
Consultation Draft February 2005

Summary of Responses

Respondent	Summary of Response	Head of Planning Services Response
RN81 RI Porter	Don't decide anything yet. A second university site is needed (beds and facilities) a good site would be Ashby Road/Snells Nook Lane to M1. No managed accommodation in town, Curzon, Wharf etc.	The purpose of the SPD is to outline the design principles for the refurbishment of an existing part of the Campus covered by the adopted Local Plan policy CF/4. Issues relating to the possible expansion of the Campus will be matters for consideration through the preparation of the Core Strategy.
RN93 Charnwood and North West Leicestershire Primary Care Trust	Concerned that increases in student numbers/housing and the campus in general are not matched by expansion in the health centre facilities. Include such expansion in any future development plans for the university or failing that a major contribution will be required to expand local facilities.	<p>It is understood that the PCT are concerned that the health centre building provided on Campus is not large enough to provide the facilities needed for the expanded student population.</p> <p>The adopted Local Plan Policy ST/3 outlines the approach to securing contributions to necessary infrastructure provision associated with new development in accordance with guidance set out in Circular 1/97. The East Park redevelopment will provide additional student bedspaces. It would be appropriate to make reference in the SPD to the need for improved health centre facilities on Campus.</p> <p>Amend text to indicate that contributions may be negotiated to improved health centre facilities in accordance with Policy ST/3 of the adopted Local Plan.</p>
RN95 The National Trust	No comments.	
RN145 T Birkinshaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit car parking on sites particularly for resident students 	The SPD does not propose additional parking provision, rather a rationalisation of existing surface parking within a new multi-storey

Respondent	Summary of Response	Head of Planning Services Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the number of bed spaces above 450 extra in the residential zone • Use style of Hazelrigg and Rutland Halls (neo Tudor?) for future developments to give a solid academic look. A traditional courtyard or open quadrangle would enhance this and be an improvement to what appears to be a large number of isolated buildings. This would not be incompatible with 3-4 storeys proposed and may allow better use of land • 5 storey entrance buildings may be too domineering • Tie in changes to the entrance with changes/ improvements to Epinal Way eg. Improved cycle and pedestrian facilities • Consider an internal transport system/people mover and integrate with better pedestrian/cycle/bus access to the town centre to reduce private car use. 	<p>facility. The car parking strategy on campus is to make very limited provision for student parking.</p> <p>It is considered the mix of accommodation and academic space outlined is appropriate for this part of the Campus and builds on existing bed-space provision in this area.</p> <p>A more indicative zonal plan will be incorporated in the final version which will not show separate building blocks.</p> <p>It is considered that on parts of the East Park area 5 storey buildings would not be incompatible with the existing scale and character of buildings. The provision of buildings of some scale would help to strengthen the focal point of the Campus onto Epinal Way.</p> <p>The revised entrance arrangements relate well with the pedestrian/ cycle system along Epinal Way.</p> <p>A successful shuttle bus service already operates on Campus, linking to the Town Centre.</p> <p>Amend plans to show design criteria to be applied to areas within East Park. Delete detailed block plans.</p>
RNI46 A Soars	Strongly protest at proposal to build large structures at the back of properties in Oaklands Drive. It will dominate my view, have an adverse effect upon the enjoyment of my property and reduce its value.	The proposed 3 storey academic blocks would be some 90 metres away from the rear boundaries of properties in Oaklands Drive. This provides more than adequate to safeguard the residential amenities of these properties.
RNI62 English Nature	Support proposal to add reference to the consideration of biodiversity but recommend stronger wording – ‘the	Comments noted:

Respondent	Summary of Response	Head of Planning Services Response
	<p>protection and enhancement of biodiversity of the campus grounds should be undertaken' – is added. Also recommend that the policies for biodiversity set out in the Leading in Design SPD are followed.</p>	<p>Amend- bullet point 2 of the Redevelopment Scheme- “Existing wildlife/ nature areas will be retained and enhanced.”</p>
<p>RN195 Environment Agency</p>	<p>Support the identification of flood risk and the need for early discussion with the Environment Agency to discuss the likely impact of flooding in relation to the redevelopment proposals. Environment Agency is promoting the adoption of water conservation measures in new development and requests that its recommendations on this subject are made available as pre-application guidance or passed to the applicant through the planning application process.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>RN233 Sileby Parish Council</p>	<p>No comments.</p>	
<p>RN234 Highways Agency</p>	<p>Proposed expansion of the University has the potential to adversely impact upon the operation of the M1 junction 23 and potentially even the sensitive junction 24.</p> <p>The trips associated with the increase in academic floor area are unlikely to result in a significant impact to the trunk road network. A Transport Assessment should be provided to give a detailed assessment of the traffic implications likely to arise from this development.</p> <p>The SPD does not identify the current car parking provision and how this will be revised through the building of a multi-storey car park. The Transport Assessment should assess the existing car park provision and how this will be revised with the new layout, together with any parking control strategy that will be implemented.</p> <p>The recognition, in the Sustainability Appraisal Report, of the</p>	<p>Comments noted. In responses at the stakeholder consultation stage, Leicestershire County Council raised concerns, particularly in relation to the possible additional vehicular access off Epinal Way.</p> <p>In the light of the comments received the reference to a possible additional vehicular access from Epinal Way should be deleted from the document. The access will be for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The SPD should also be amended to make it clear that a Transport Assessment will need to accompany any planning applications for additional academic floorspace or student bedspaces within East Park. The Transport Assessment will need to assess the likely cumulative impact off the additional floorspace/ bedspaces envisaged.</p> <p>Amend text and plan to delete reference to vehicular access from Epinal Way. Amend text to indicate that a Transport Assessment would be required in association with applications for the</p>

Respondent	Summary of Response	Head of Planning Services Response
	need to move away from car use by encouraging good access to the campus via public transport, cycling and pedestrian routes and through the control of the availability of car parking spaces is supported.	development of additional academic floorspace or bedspaces on East Park.
RN266 Leicestershire Constabulary	Refer to Leading in Design SPD with regard for development to be designed in a way that reduces crime, anti-social behaviour and promotes community safety.	Comments noted. Amend to include reference to Leading in Design.
RN325 RL Smith	Should not be allowed to affect the quality of life of local residents.	The SPD includes measures to seek to ensure that new build will not adversely affect the amenities enjoyed by adjoining residential properties
RN326 E Porter	You have got plenty of land. Use it better. Build more student accommodation and leave alone houses in the town for Loughborough families.	The SPD includes provision for additional bedspaces in addition to the existing bedspaces in The Towers and Butler Court.
RN327 Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment	Welcome the masterplan which recognises the need to make full use of the opportunities available and avoids the past piecemeal development on the university campus. Set out clearly that high quality architecture and urban design will be sought as a principal objective of the proposal. Show in diagrammatic form how the site connects and relates to its wider context eg how do you arrive from the train station.	Comments noted. The text should be amended to emphasise the importance of high quality, energy efficient architecture and urban design. Revised plan will show the area in context. Amend text to emphasise the importance of quality energy efficient designs.
RN328 Mountfields Drive Residents	Welcome consultation with local residents and recognition of sensitivity of the redevelopment of the Towers bungalows and the positioning of student residences. Our main concerns are the height and proximity of the academic buildings to the boundary, the increased residential student population and increased sporting use in the area. Please amend the guidelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings K, L, M and F should not be positioned any closer to the boundary fence than is shown on the plan in relation to the existing bungalows to provide an adequate buffer and reduce the impact. Prefer that the blocks are moved further from the boundary. 	Leading in Design provides guidance on design to ensure privacy and the importance of distinguishing between public and private realms. The guidance indicates the standard distance between 3 storey units and residential properties as 27.5 metres. Existing gardens to properties along Mountfields Drive are between 28 and 30 metres long. The indicative plan shows a distance between the proposed blocks and existing properties between 30 and 50 metres. With the necessary privacy distances met, there would be little justification to seek earth mounding or to limit the height of the academic blocks to 2 storeys. The SPD emphasises the importance

Respondent	Summary of Response	Head of Planning Services Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a noise buffer between buildings K, L, M and F to shelter the Mountfields Drive properties eg. By an earth mound and planting of more trees and shrubs This will discourage students from taking short cuts through the properties. It may be best and more environmentally friendly to convert this area into a nature reserve • Buildings K, L, M and F should not have any windows on the west elevation, ie. Closest to Mountfields Drive, to reduce invasion of privacy. • No pedestrian route at back of blocks K, L, M and F to reduce noise and discourage students from taking short cuts through properties • The height of buildings K, L, M and F should be no higher than 2 storeys (with flat or shallow roof). Increase size of other buildings to allow for any resulting loss of floorspace. <p>This is a major development which will have a great potential of affecting the welfare of neighbours if not handled properly. So planning rules should be applied with a little more discretion than if these were domestic dwellings.</p>	<p>of safeguarding the privacy of adjoining properties in this location and ensuring that, through distance, block orientation and clear definition of public and private space, the residential amenities of adjoining properties are safeguarded.</p> <p>No additional recreational provision is proposed in proximity to adjoining residential properties.</p>
<p>RN349 Loughborough and District Civic Trust</p>	<p>Support provision of student accommodation on the campus but there should be clear links with the policies proposed in the Student Housing SPD. These documents should not stand-alone but need to be joined up.</p> <p>This is an opportunity to secure new buildings of an innovative design, demonstrating sustainability in their materials and energy saving. Also an opportunity to consider imposing car parking on campus and to encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Reference could be made to preparation of Student Housing Provision SPD.</p> <p>The SPD refers to the opportunities for energy efficient design of buildings.</p>

Respondent	Summary of Response	Head of Planning Services Response
	<p>Proposed improvements to Epinal Way have come too late. Given the development that has already taken place and the limited frontage available to carry out improvements it may be difficult to reverse the harm of earlier developments. Concern about creating a new access into the campus and opposite the existing access to the College. This would create a crossroads situation and may impact upon traffic flows along Epinal Way.</p>	<p>The aim of the SPD is to seek to improve the Epinal Way frontage as far as is possible through a coordinated approach to the refurbishment of East Park. The reference to a new vehicular access will be deleted.</p>
<p>RN361 GVA Grimley for Loughborough University</p>	<p>Suggest minor modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 9 (page 3) – introduce the words ‘sustainable and’ before the word ‘energy’. • Floorspace capacity (page 3) – reference to 2,800 bedspaces should read ‘2,500 student bed spaces’ and the final sentence should read ‘The University has submitted an outline planning application covering all seven sites’. • Redevelopment scheme (page 3, bullet 2) – delete the word ‘important’ in the second sentence. Whilst the university will be retaining the wildlife areas referred to, the SPD should not implicitly or explicitly elevate the status of these areas. • Detailed design considerations (Page 4, para 1) – this para refers to 8 objectives but there are 10. • Residential zone (page 5, para 1) – amend the second sentence to read ‘First, it helps reduce the current deficit in purpose built student accommodation.’ <p>For the avoidance of doubt, the University is unlikely to be able to produce a Transport Assessment that deals with the prospect of a new vehicular access to Epinal Way before the SPD is adopted. So reference to the undertaking of a Transport Assessment on page 6 should be amended. In terms of the Sustainability Appraisal, it is relevant to note the University:</p>	<p>Comments noted. Suggested minor amendments are appropriate. Applications for additional academic floorspace and student accommodation would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Amend text as suggested for greater clarity.</p>

Respondent	Summary of Response	Head of Planning Services Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads the way in the use of renewable energy and will continue to rely on renewable sources. No brown electricity is used on campus. • Already benefits from a low crime rate and will endeavour to ensure any new development proposed on campus assists with crime prevention and target hardening. • Has a shuttle bus service operating at 10 minute intervals. This was pump primed by the University with no public subsidy. It would be difficult to improve on this level of service. • Has cycle parking facilities and appropriate extra provision will be made in association with new development as necessary. • Welcome the introduction of a reference to reduced car parking standards. Historically, and against its wishes, the University has been required to increase the number of on-site parking spaces available. 	

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT UNIVERSITY EAST PARK ADOPTION

A report of the Head of Planning Services outlining responses to the consultation on the draft Supplementary Planning Document, Loughborough University East Park and seeking approval of the document for adoption subject to certain amendments was submitted (item 7 on the agenda filed with these minutes), together with the comments of the Scrutiny Commission at its meeting held on 17th May 2005.

RESOLVED that the Loughborough University East Park Supplementary Planning Document, incorporating the amendments identified at Appendix 2 to the submitted report, be adopted and made available as directed by regulation 19 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulation 2004.

REASON

As the submitted document establishes a suitable basis for guiding the future development of the East Park area and takes account, in appropriate ways, of issues raised during the consultation stage of the Document's preparation.