



Report

Inquiry held on 9-25 April 2002

by **J M Turner LLB SOLICITOR**
an Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State

The Planning Inspectorate
406 Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square, Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 8902
e-mail: enquiries@planning-
inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

DATED:

CHARNWOOD LOCAL PLAN PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

ref: PINS/X2410/429/1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION 4

Report structure and related matters 4

CHAPTER 2 - STRATEGY 5

Policy ST/2: Armston Road, Quorn 5

CHAPTER 3 - ENVIRONMENT 7

Modification No: M3.43 Policy EV/33 Protection of Floodplains 7

Modification No: M3.44 Policy EV/34 Design of Flood Alleviation Measures (and suggested further change FC3.1) 7

Modification No: M3.58 Policy EV/E A Percent for Art (and suggested further change FC3.2) 8

CHAPTER 4 - POPULATION AND HOUSING 9

Housing land provision - proposed modifications M4.2, M4.3, M4.13 and M4.14 (and suggested further changes FC4.2, FC4.3 and FC4.4) 9

Modification No: M4.3 Policy H/A Land at Factory Street, Shepshed 16

Policy H/35 Pear Tree Lane, Loughborough (Inspector's recommendation 4.876) 17

Policy H/75 Little Haw Farm, Tickow Lane, Shepshed (Inspector's recommendation 4.1205) 19

Modification No: M4.15 Policy H/1(a) North of Bradgate Road, Anstey 20

Policy H/89 Barkby Lane/Barkby Thorpe Lane, Syston (Inspector's recommendation 4.1331) 22

Modification No: M4.18 Policy H/1(d) Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds 23

Modification No: M4.25 Policy H/1(i) South of A607 & North of Gaddesby Lane, Rearsby 25

Policy H/92 Wysall Lane, Wymeswold (Inspector's Recommendation 4.1354) 26

Modification No: M4.16 Policy H/1(b) Cotes Road & Willow Road, Barrow upon Soar 28

Modification No: M4.31 Policy H/1(o) Seagrave Road, Sileby (and suggested further change FC4.5) 29

Recommendations (on objection sites) 31

Modification No: M4.1 Government Guidance (and suggested further change FC4.1) 32

Modifications Nos: M4.7-M4.12 Policy H/1 New Housing Allocations - Proposals Map alterations (and suggested further change FC4.3) 32

Modification No: M4.21 Policy H/1(g) South of Hazel Road & Manor Road, Loughborough 33

Modification No: M4.24 Policy H/1(h) Meynell Road, Quorn 34

Modification No: M4.26 Policy H/1(j) North of Cossington Lane, Rothley 35

Modification No: M4.28 Policy H/1(l) Brook Street, Sileby 35

Modification No: M4.33 Policy H/1(p) Barkby Lane, Syston (and suggested further change FC4.4) 36

Modification No: M4.36 Policy H/1(s) Swifts Close, Wymeswold (and suggested further changes FC4.6 and FC4.6a) 37

Modification No: M4.38 Policy H/2 Density, and related matters 39

CHAPTER 5 – EMPLOYMENT AND BUSINESS 42

Modification No: M5.3 Policy E/1 Planning Criteria for Employment Development 42

Modifications No: M5.5 Policy E/5 New Employment Areas, and M5.6, M5.7, M5.8, M5.10, M5.12 and M5.13, (and suggested further changes FC5.1 and FC5.2) 42

Modification: No M5.9 Policy E/A Future Use of Dishley Grange, Derby Road, Loughborough (and suggested further change FC5.3) 43

Modification No: M5.11 Policy E/5(e) Gaddesby Lane, Rearsby (and suggested further change FC5.4) 44

Modification No: M5.15 Policy E/6 Control of Employment Use in PEAs and employment land allocations (and suggested further change FC5.5) 44

Modification No: M5.17 Policy E/8 Safeguarding Employment Land and Buildings, and Modification No: M5.19 addition of PEA designation to land at Cossington 46

CHAPTER 6 – RURAL LAND AND ECONOMY 48

Modification No: M6.19 Policy CT/16 Extensions to Existing Rural Dwellings (and suggested further change FC6.3) 48

Modification No: M6.20 Policy CT/18 Safeguarding Agricultural Land (and suggested further change FC6.4) 49

Modification No: M6.21 Policy CT/A Intensive Livestock Units (and suggested further change FC6.5) 50

CHAPTER 7 – TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT 51

Modification No: M7.11 Policy TR/7 Transport Standards for New Development (and suggested further change FC7.1) 51

Modification No: M7.15 Policy TR/12 Safeguarding Areas for New Railway Stations 51

Modification No: M7.32 Policy TR/21 Parking Provision in New Development (and suggested further change FC7.2) 53

CHAPTER 8 - [no contents] 55

CHAPTER 9 – RECREATION AND TOURISM 56

Modification No: M4.32 Policy RT/B Recreation Land, Lanes Close, Sileby 56

Modification No: M9.6 Policy RT/7 Safeguarding Existing Recreation Land and Buildings (and suggested further change FC9.2) 57

APPENDIX A - SWIFTS CLOSE OBJECTIONS APP-1

APPENDIX B - INQUIRY PROGRAMME APP-4

APPENDIX C – APPEARANCES APP-5

APPENDIX D – DOCUMENTS APP-8

APPENDIX E - OBJECTIONS LIST APP-13

1. CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

Report structure and related matters

- 1.1 There follows my report and recommendations in respect of the Council's proposed modifications of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan. My task is to inquire into those objections which the Council, in their discretion, wish me to consider.
- 1.2 There is a full list of the 368 objections in Appendix E, and I start each topic with pertinent details and a brief synopsis of the relevant matters put in issue, in the objections specified. The only distinction, enjoyed by the Swifts Close objectors in this respect, is that their number precludes a convenient listing in the text, and they are grouped in Appendix A.
- 1.3 Bearing in mind that my brief is to inquire into objections to proposed modifications, I have not listed the Council's supporters, but I have taken due account of their views where relevant to a topic under consideration.
- 1.4 With the aim of improving readability, I have kept the use of abbreviations and acronyms to the minimum. I refer in places to the existing County Structure Plan, and to its emerging replacement, giving descriptions which should be clear from the context. The Plans are, to give them their formal names -

Leicestershire Structure Plan 1991-2006
Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan

- 1.5 Where I refer to "the Inquiry Inspector", this is my colleague Inspector Stephens, who of course held the Inquiry into and reported on the Borough-wide Plan, assisted by Inspector Bould. Trying not to repeat the same phrase too often, I sometimes simply name my predecessor, instead.
- 1.6 Where I have thought it helpful, I have supported quotations from Inspector Stephens' report by specific reference in the form - "[report para x.xxx]".
- 1.7 The acronyms I have considered appropriate are -

APAC	Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside (Policy CT/7)
CPRE	Council for the Protection of Rural England
GOEM	Government Office for the East Midlands
GPDO	General Permitted Development Order
HBF	House Builders Federation
LTP	Local Transport Plan (rel. - for Central Leicestershire)
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance Note (usually no. 3)
RPG	Regional Planning Guidance
SIMDO	"Sustainability and the Impact of Major Development Options" - Council report

2. CHAPTER 2 - STRATEGY

Policy ST/2: Armston Road, Quorn

Objection

120/320 Mr D K Johar and Company

Objection issues:

- Inquiry Inspector's recommendation in favour of including land within limits to development holds good. Site relates better to built area of development than bounding countryside, designated APAC. Distinct from parkland within APAC and does not serve any supporting function. Recent section 78 refusals do not affect the position.

Assessment

2.1 My colleague favoured a proposed change put to him by the Council to include the site within the limits to development. His reasoning [report para 2.154] was that "recent development in the vicinity has altered the character of the area; the land in question is distinct from the remainder of Quorn House Park and is surrounded [sic] on three sides by residential development."

2.2 I stress, in view of the content of some representations, that I am not assessing a proposal for residential development of the site, but addressing the question whether it should better be included within the village development limits for Quorn, than be designated as part of the adjoining countryside. That might determine whether, in accordance with Policy ST/2, the site could properly accommodate "built development", such as is to be found within a settlement. The policy proviso would still apply that:

"The designation... does not imply that planning permission will be granted for any particular proposal. Planning applications will still have to be considered on their individual merits..."

2.3 It might be the case, purely for the sake of argument and illustration, that the only built development which would be acceptable there, if the site were included within the limits, would be, for example, that permitted in a dwellinghouse curtilage by virtue of GPDO 1995, Sched 2, Pt 1, Class E. "Built development" in a settlement can take many forms; any proposal requiring planning permission would be subject to scrutiny according to the development control process. I add also that no built development might be suitable; there may be proper reasons why land within development limits should be left open.

2.4 I do not therefore agree with the Council that the inclusion of the site within the limits to development would be a positive response effectively to an application for residential development, such that the full rigour of the PPG 3 search sequence is to be applied, with all the resulting consequences.

2.5 Granted that this 0.46 ha site might have difficulty in accommodating at least 14 dwellings without harm - though particularly in the absence of design proposals it is not for me to rule out the possibility - I think the point is of little relevance for my assessment. To take the opposite view implies an acceptance that the most

- appropriate role for all land within settlements is to provide new housing at maximum PPG 3 density. I am sure that is not the Council's position.
- 2.6 Similarly, I gain little assistance from my colleagues' decisions in the section 78 appeals canvassed in relation to this objection. Not only were they concerned with the acceptability of specific development proposals, but to greater or lesser extent cognisance was taken, as it had to be in the context of those appeals, of the fact that in its latest form the emerging local plan favoured the inclusion of the land within the APAC rather than in Quorn's development limits. It is for me to form a judgement on the merits of that choice.
- 2.7 I verified on inspection that the site, trapezoid in shape, indeed has built development on three sides. At its narrower end, it adjoins a parcel of land, the site and curtilage of a dwelling, which proposed modification M2.13 would include within the development limits.
- 2.8 At the opposite end, it adjoins, separated from by a post and wire fence and visually opening out into, the parkland of Quorn House Park and the similarly attractive countryside beyond. I express matters in that way to convey the impression I gained of a difference in the character and appearance of the objection site from that open land south of it.
- 2.9 The proximity of buildings and developed curtilages produces the sense of an enclosed area relating to the built up settlement rather than the countryside. Perhaps somewhat unusually, the ground cover of the site, with its many trees set in scrubland, rather than intimating a rural association, helps to enhance the contrast with the more formal, open parkland which here represents the adjoining countryside. The statutory protection given to those trees would of course be a factor in considering if and how the site might be developed, in due course.
- 2.10 In those circumstances, my judgement is that the site should more properly be designated within the development limits than as part of the APAC. It does nothing to help maintain the qualities justifying that countryside designation. Nor am I concerned as to how it comes about that the site has in effect become detached from the parkland. The fact that that has happened, with the result I have detailed, must be the overriding planning consideration. I shall recommend accordingly.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified by the inclusion within the limits to development, instead of within the Charnwood Forest APAC, of the land shaded grey in Appendix 1 to document P/CBC/120/320/1.

3. CHAPTER 3 - ENVIRONMENT

Modification No: M3.43 Policy EV/33 Protection of Floodplains

Objection

44/150 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

Objection issue:

- Policy fails to reflect PPG 25, para 30's advice as to risk based approach and sequential test.

Assessment

- 3.1 The issue raised is not the extent to which the plan's allocations comply with the relevant requirements of PPG 25, para 30, but whether the Policy sufficiently indicates the intention to apply them in development control.
- 3.2 The proposed modification only seeks to make changes of detail to the draft plan, which can properly be described in themselves as uncontroversial. The omission of any reference to PPG 25 simply reflects the fact that the draft Policy predated the PPG.
- 3.3 The Policy does not, however, weaken the authority of the national guidance, or obviate the need to take due account of it also, as a material consideration. In those circumstances, I agree with the Council that any updating can be left to the review stage, when any subsisting PPG advice can then be taken into account.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M3.43.

Modification No: M3.44 Policy EV/34 Design of Flood Alleviation Measures (and suggested further change FC3.1)

Objection

37/110 Mr G Platts, Environment Agency

Objection issue:

- Modified Policy does not sufficiently reflect PPG 25's emphasis on reductions and non-increase of flood risk.

Assessment

- 3.4 The suggested further change would meet the objector's concern, and I agree that in this latest form the wording changes of the modification, to which there is otherwise no objection, can be commended.

Recommendation - I recommend the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M3.44, subject to the incorporation of suggested further change FC3.1.

Modification No: M3.58 Policy EV/E A Percent for Art (and suggested further change FC3.2)

Objections to Modification

40/116 Mr R Hepwood, Miller Homes

100/289 Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson

Objections to Suggested Further Change

40/125 Mr R Hepwood, Miller Homes

100/67 Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson

Objection issues

- Policy is unclear, particularly in use of term “major development”, poorly worded and not supported by national policy. Difficulties not met by suggested deletion of “major” since more definition of scope of policy is required, and need should be shown.

Assessment

- 3.5 The Policy words “seek to negotiate” demonstrate that the intention is to try to achieve a benefit as part of a planning permission that could not simply be required by the terms of the consent. The point is put beyond doubt in the supporting text - “... through the Policy [the Council] will encourage the **voluntary** [my emphasis] provision of public works of art by negotiation with prospective developers.”
- 3.6 I agree with my colleague Inspector that this is a legitimate aim to seek to achieve - in his words “It is important to give rigorous encouragement to providing works of art when substantial development is taking place.” It is right, too, that any such intention should be advertised in a Policy. Equally, I appreciate the objectors’ concern that attempts to secure their co-operation should be initiated fairly, consistently, transparently and not disproportionately.
- 3.7 I see some difficulty in setting detailed parameters for the Policy, and prescriptiveness is not helped by the factor, referred to by the Council, that good design can, dependent on the circumstances, amount to public art. Nonetheless, as I have indicated, for the Policy to have any point, it must go beyond the ambit of those usual design considerations the application of which requires no voluntary and extra input by the developer.
- 3.8 The Council’s proposed supplementary planning guidance would provide some additional clarity, and that should of course be prepared against the background of a Policy statement stressing the voluntary nature of the developer co-operation the Council would be seeking to achieve.
- 3.9 I think that such co-operation would only legitimately be sought in the case of major development, of the kind where public benefits are commonly sought, and that should be made clear in the Policy. It is not my view, in the circumstances, that further clarification as sought by the objectors is feasible or necessary, and hence the modification can be commended, but without the suggested further change.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M3.58.

4. CHAPTER 4 - POPULATION AND HOUSING

Housing land provision - proposed modifications M4.2, M4.3, M4.13 and M4.14 (and suggested further changes FC4.2, FC4.3 and FC4.4)

Objections

9/340	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Props	40/118	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller
9/341	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Props	40/119	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller
9/349	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Props	46/127	Bryant Homes
16/31	Mr M Parkhouse, George Wimpey Strategic Land	46/183	Bryant Homes
16/33	Mr M Parkhouse, George Wimpey Strategic Land	46/184	Bryant Homes
16/33	Mr M Parkhouse, George Wimpey Strategic Land	46/185	Bryant Homes
17/75	Mr T R Brown	46/186	Bryant Homes
20/79	Mr S Higginson	77/249	Alfred McAlpine
21/95	Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd	77/250	Alfred McAlpine
21/353	Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd	77/251	Alfred McAlpine
23/82	Cllr R Brown, Sileby PC	96/155	Mr I A Moss, HBF
34/101	Crest Nicholson (Residential)	96/280	Mr I A Moss, HBF
34/103	Crest Nicholson (Residential)	96/281	Mr I A Moss, HBF
34/105	Crest Nicholson (Residential)	98/286	Mr R A Wall
34/106	Crest Nicholson (Residential)	100/290	Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson
39/399	Mr R Walters, Hallam Land	100/291	Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson
40/10	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller	100/292	Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson
40/117	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller	128/329	Coats Plc

Objection issues

This analysis will address the issues raised at the Inquiry round table session as to the adequacy or otherwise of plan housing provision to meet structure plan and other relevant policy expectations, and as to the extent to which the approach adopted shows consistency with applicable policy guidance. Specific considerations in relation to various objection sites are dealt with, separately, later in the chapter.

Assessment

Background

- 4.1 Proposed modification M4.2 shows the plan method of seeking to meet the structure plan strategic housing requirement 1991-2006 of 8350 units, and the calculations entailed. Appendix 1 to Topic Paper 2 is an update based on the latest information available at the inquiry, of which I shall take due account.
- 4.2 The approach manifested reflects a response to what was seen, to some extent at least, as a changed situation following the coming into force of the latest version of PPG 3. The Council's expressed intention was to reassess housing land provision so as to ensure compliance with the new policy advice, in the light particularly of two guiding principles.
- 4.3 One was that the fullest possible contribution should be sought from urban land, in the exercise of the PPG 3 search sequence; the other was that less flexibility

need be built into the calculations, in terms of making any general proportionate increase in provision to meet unforeseen shortfalls in expected product, because a 'plan, monitor and manage' approach was to be adopted instead.

- 4.4 In other words, the 'flexibility allowance' of 10% recommended by Inspector Stephens was seen as no longer appropriate. Instead, any unexpected supply deficiencies becoming apparent as a result of ongoing monitoring could, it was thought, be remedied by further land releases, from a defined contingency allocation, at the appropriate time.

The calculations

- 4.5 I note first that the assumption is made that all outstanding planning permissions, after a compensatory allowance for small windfall sites, will be implemented in full during the remaining plan period. In the updated figures, this is subject only to a small deduction for one development, where completions are expected to extend beyond the end date. A net figure of 1231 units is presently derived.
- 4.6 A significant component of the Council's equation is urban capacity, split between a list of sites proposed to be allocated in Policy H/A (updated contribution 161) and other sources which cumulatively are said by the Council to inform a further 'windfall' estimate. That windfall would be in addition to the provision, calculated separately, for small site windfalls of less than ten units.
- 4.7 Modification M4.2 attributes a figure of 370 to what it labels this "additional urban capacity". The text gives the explanation that the estimate is intended to allow for units "coming forward on unidentified windfall sites, or through increases in densities on committed sites." The updated figure is 400. That is net of a 10% deduction regarded as appropriate by the Council.
- 4.8 The remaining source of supply is a number of greenfield sites. Policy H/1 seeks to make new allocations producing during the plan period, in the Council's latest estimation, 872 units. Some sites would continue to produce further contributions beyond that time.
- 4.9 At this stage, I summarise in tabular form Topic Paper 2, Appendix 1, before going on to consider further the various elements, noting however that the completions figure is unchallenged:-

	Pln prov	W'falls	Perm'ns	Comps	Req	Net req
Plan requirement					8350	8350
Less Completions				5488		2862
- do - Net perm'ns product			1231			1631
- do - Small sites		281				
- do - Urban capacity		400				950
- do - H/A sites	161					
- do - H/1 sites	872					-83
Totals	1033	681	1231	5488	8350	[-83]

Existing permissions

- 4.10 As I have indicated, the permissions figure assumes that all outstanding consents will be implemented, excepting only one site - Beacon Road - the subject of a 48 units discount for expected delay beyond the plan period. The validity of that assumption is questioned by a number of objectors.
- 4.11 In particular the Council are challenged on their judgement that the Maxwell Drive site will be able to produce 168 dwellings by the relevant date. The land is currently in Council ownership and is to be marketed shortly, in three lots. Following expected early sales, the assumption is then of an expeditious grant of detailed planning permission thus enabling at least two builders between them to make the suggested contribution. The timetable is, to say the least, ambitious.
- 4.12 In the circumstances, and taking this development as an example, I appreciate the objectors' concern at the potential implications of relying on the product of outstanding permissions to the extent indicated. I observe that these are the circumstances in which some objectors argue for a flexibility allowance of, say, 10% to be applied to the permissions figure of 1231, reducing the expected outcome by some 120 units.

The allocated H/1 sites

- 4.13 The calculations presuppose too that all these sites will make their expected contribution in the plan period; there is no leeway for slippage. In that light I find of especial significance the high degree of dependence on three sites - between them they will be responsible for 85% of the total greenfield product, or 72% of total allocations product if H/A sites are included as well as H/1. It is a truism to observe that even if the development programme envisaged for each site is achievable, and that is subject to my following comments, it is less likely that the outturn for all sites, cumulatively, will be as hoped for.

New build rates

- 4.14 The figures assume an average build rate of 28 units per year per builder. The Council describe that as "a cautiously realistic assumption", based on analysis of past trends and discussions with the industry. That I think is an apt description. Evidence was made available to me of claims by some builders they will be able to improve on the average, and to an extent that seems to me a reasonable reflection of the consideration that the projected trend to higher densities enables quicker construction and more sales.
- 4.15 As against that, I find very credible the evidence of some objectors that there is a natural tendency in the industry to exaggerate, for the purpose of the exercise now underway, projected completions. To boost the capacity of a site to meet housing requirements may be seen as a way of tending to limit overall provision, and consequently restricting competition.
- 4.16 There may be room for particular concern about the potential accuracy of the Council's predictions of delivery from the H/1(r) site at Harrowgate Drive, Birstall. This is a large development expected to contribute by itself almost 30% of the greenfield sites product, and which will carry over significantly into the next plan period.

- 4.17 The Council assumption of 252 units is based on production by two builders, at the rate of 28 units per year. However, there was evidence before me that the practice of the developer presently responsible for the site - Jelson Ltd - is to build out without selling off any part of a site to another builder, contrary to what might happen on other large sites. I have seen too, a letter from the developer's agents indicating that development on the site in excess of 100 units a year is "realistically achievable".
- 4.18 In all the circumstances, it seems to me that there must be considerably increased doubt as to the likely performance of this site, within the plan period.

Small sites

- 4.19 This figure, assessed at 65 dwellings per year, is one of the two windfall elements included in the calculations. The Council have clarified that in effect it makes no allowance for greenfield sites. Their logic is that though the figure derives from historical analysis, which would have included an element of greenfield windfalls, this would have been no more than 16% of completions, which is outweighed by the factor that the small sites build rate has remained higher recently than might have been expected - in the range 81-116 in the last four years.
- 4.20 I consider that justifies the conclusion that the small sites figure adequately reflects the advice in PPG 3 not to make any allowance for greenfield windfalls.

Urban capacity

- 4.21 The remaining sources of supply together represent urban capacity, to which a total figure of 610 units can be attributed. The definition of this contribution stems basically from the urban capacity study carried out by the Council in their attempt to apply PPG 3 precepts to the plan process.
- 4.22 The study, as detailed in the Council's Technical Report 8, identified 17 sites, set out in Appendix 1 to the document. Nine are listed in the H/A allocations of modification M4.3, to which are added two brownfield allocations from the deposit plan. The updating of the position in Topic Paper 2, Appendix 1 reflects the transfer of some of the sites to the 'permissions' category, and what is seen as the effective loss of any contribution, for varying reasons, from others. The ongoing seven candidates as H/A allocations have contributions attributed totalling 161 units.
- 4.23 The updated calculations seek to refine, or perhaps enlarge, the factors which accounted for M4.2's original additional urban capacity estimate. Contributions are still assumed from the sites identified in Technical Report 8, which were not made allocations, excluding some granted permission or completed, and one site refused permission by the Council. A total for these contributions of 141 units is attributed.
- 4.24 A concept of pipeline sites, the subject of undetermined planning applications, is then introduced into the calculations. Two sites are credited with increased densities, and seven 'previously unidentified sites' are listed. A product or increased product is attributed to each, totalling 308 units in all. After the addition of the 141 reflecting what is left from Technical Report 8, the Council propose to discount the resultant figure of $141+308=449$ to a net 400.

- 4.25 The purpose of this exercise is to arrive at an informed estimate as to the rate at which additional, but currently unquantifiable, sources of supply will come forward to augment urban provision, for the remainder of the plan period. Paras 35 and 36 of PPG 3 and the boxed explanation of “What is a Windfall” on page 19 of “Tapping the Potential” are relevant.
- 4.26 Particularly with the addition of recent undetermined applications, I consider it a justified comment that the Council have cast the net very wide in seeking to identify the developable pool of resources which might wholly or in part be translated into actual housing provision. And the evidence available to me of any significant attempt to bring to bear on the issue such relevant factors as the past take-up rate for permissions in this category is limited.
- 4.27 The ensuing high degree of uncertainty as to whether such a permission, let alone a mere application, will be converted to a specific number of dwellings - and the consequences of a changed situation - are illustrated by what I heard of the Moor Lane, Loughborough site.
- 4.28 As to the relevant proposal, it seems clear that the developer’s present intention is currently not to pursue the scheme relied on by the Council for the contribution attributed to it, but instead to provide student accommodation. That would remove from the reckonable pool not only the attributed increased density figure of 52 units, but also the originally approved 49 units figure, with the consequent reduction of the undiscounted total additional urban capacity from 449 to 348.
- 4.29 That is simply one illustration, though one which materially affects the figures. Objectors challenge the prospects of other developments going ahead, and the general point is, in my view, that this category of suggested contribution, the larger site urban windfalls, rests on a highly speculative basis. I do not consider the inherent high degree of uncertainty is at all adequately reflected by the Council’s suggested application of a 10% discount to the total derived.

Conclusions – quantification of land supply

- 4.30 In all, because of the reservations I have expressed about a number of elements in the housing supply calculations, I regard it as quite possible that the structure plan requirement would not in the event be satisfied, on the basis of what is proposed. Essentially, the calculations leave no margin for deviation from some quite optimistic predictions. Any one, or a combination, of the vulnerabilities which I have detailed could easily result in the plan’s expectations not being realised.
- 4.31 These observations would have less force, as criticisms, if the intended mechanism of monitoring and a supplementary allocation would be sufficient to meet any problem which might arise, and to put matters back on course. To an extent, that is the philosophy of PPG 3. Provided plan expectations are robustly based, the unforeseen can be dealt with by monitoring and managing.
- 4.32 However, in Charnwood’s circumstances, the potential difficulties inherent in the plan’s optimistic predictions are aggravated by the short lifetime likely to be left for it after adoption. With an end date of March 2006, it seems to me unrealistic to assume that if at some stage over the next three and a half years or so it were decided that the land supply must be increased, a further allocation would have the required impact, in time.

- 4.33 It remains the Council's responsibility, in my view, so far as practicable to ensure that the overall housing provision of 8,350 dwellings is built during the plan period. With a lead-in time commonly of 12 months to get a new site into production, it would be unlikely that the 'manage' obligation in 'plan, monitor and manage' could be effectively discharged, in this context.
- 4.34 I consider the most appropriate response would be to provide, on plan adoption, an extra pool of resources, of significant size, by means of further firm allocations, so as to anticipate factors such as likely wastage in implementation of permissions, slippages in development programmes, and failure to realise in full expected windfalls. Put another way, a flexibility allowance is needed.
- 4.35 I accept the Council's point that if in the event this results in overprovision, it will probably be at the cost of a greater greenfield landtake than necessary, strictly. That is, however, a risk to be weighed along with the chance of not realising sufficient housing production, and in the circumstances I consider it a risk which should be taken.
- 4.36 By its very nature, the appropriate size of such an allowance cannot be established with mathematical precision. My judgement is that, to have a realistic prospect of it having what is likely to be the required impact on land supply in the Borough in the short plan period remaining, it should be of the order of 500 units.
- 4.37 The figure can be supported in a number of ways. It represents about 17.5% of the outstanding requirement of 2862 units, which I consider not unreasonable, for flexibility, at this stage of the plan's life, and taking into account the strategy of high dependence on a limited number of new sites; it compares with what might well be regarded as the over-optimistic slice of the Council's total projected windfalls of 681; and it is within the range of shortfall estimates predicted by a number of builder objectors, whose evidence I found cogent.

Conclusions – approach to further site selection

- 4.38 In the search for further allocations which follows from this conclusion, I shall not regard myself as limited to the sites categorised in Chapter 3 of Technical Report 9 - "The Local Plan Allocations and the PPG 3 Search Sequence", thus necessarily excluding the "option sites" in Table 3 of the Council's "Response to the Housing Round Table" [of the previous inquiry].
- 4.39 I make the point because of the Council's insistence that in some way my colleague Inspector Stephens failed to take the opportunity open to him explicitly to rank any of these sites, when he recommended that they should be added as allocations, more highly than the original deposit draft allocations. Thereby, it is inferred, the added sites are to be regarded as inferior, in PPG 3 acceptability terms, and not included in the search sequence set out in Technical Report 9.
- 4.40 I regard that proposition as wholly misconceived. On my reading of his report, my colleague simply did all that he felt he should do in recommending the allocation of the additional sites, expressing his satisfaction in the case of each individually that it would represent an acceptable allocation, taking due account of need and weighing this along with other relevant factors including any disadvantages identified. To have gone further, in the terms canvassed by the Council, would have been beyond his terms of reference, and I can read nothing into the omission to do so.

- 4.41 A related matter is the extent to which the process of identification, or exclusion, as the case may be, of sites for allocation in the deposit draft reflects the precepts of PPG 3, and of any endorsement given by the Inspector in his report, in this respect. The answer to this might provide some guidance for my assessment of particular sites.
- 4.42 For all its importance, there is no doubt that the latest version of the PPG did not introduce wholly new and unexpected policy. To an extent, it signalled an acceleration in, and clearly defined, a direction in which policy was already moving anyway.
- 4.43 Developing attitudes were reflected in the Council's preparation work on the local plan, and my colleague was able to say that 'SIMDO' provided a clearly based methodology for the consistent and objective comparative assessment of sites. Transport choice and more broadly based aspects of sustainability were relevant considerations. "In a number of respects, the Plan [could] be seen as anticipating the sequential tests in PPG 3, including the emphasis on sustainable patterns of development."
- 4.44 Nonetheless, matters have moved on, and the clear introduction of a new and important policy stipulation, nationally, is being reflected in pending change at structure plan level. "Planning for the Communities of the Future" foreshadowed the revised PPG 3 in envisaging that to be sustainable, new development should be in locations capable of being well served by public transport. Only for the first time, however, did the latest PPG 3 prioritise the whole range of locations fulfilling this qualification.
- 4.45 Para 30 of the PPG firmly relegates development around nodes in good public transport corridors to a lower order than urban extensions. Emerging structure plan policy is likely to mirror the change. In defining what are acceptable locations for major new development, including housing, usually of more than 100 units, Strategy Policy 2 of the adopted structure plan does not distinguish between proximity on the one hand to the main County towns, including Loughborough and Shepshed, and on the other to the four major transport arteries, three rail and one road, crossing the County and offering public transport potential.
- 4.46 However, whilst the present position is not free from uncertainty, it seems a reasonable prediction that its emerging successor will end this sanctioning of dispersed development across the County, and seek instead to concentrate new development on the urban areas, and specifically the city of Leicester and the designated main towns including Loughborough.
- 4.47 The implications for my task are simply that I cannot regard issues relating to the operation of the PPG 3 search sequence, as already settled in the local plan process, to the extent that they do not fully reflect the PPG's preference for urban edge sites over green node sites in good public transport corridors, where the facts raise these relevant considerations.
- 4.48 Moreover, in view of the clear terms of national policy, no real issue arises as to the degrees of weight to be given to the relevant policies respectively of the adopted Leicestershire Structure Plan and of the emerging Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Plan. The application of PPG 3 will override any uncertainty as to how structure plan policy might bear on the position.

- 4.49 What I cannot do is undertake a full comparative and sequential assessment of all Charnwood's potentially developable sites. The ambit of my enquiries is limited to those sites put in issue as a result of duly lodged objections which the Council have asked me to consider.
- 4.50 This means, for example, that I can make no productive comparison with any site not the subject of an objection. It also means that it would be preferable for me to avoid, so far as practicable, making recommendations which might unduly constrain the Council's freedom to respond, in the longer term, beyond this plan period, to the dictates of evolving policy.
- 4.51 Implicit in that is a recognition that the size of a site will be a significant consideration, so that allocations which can be built out in the plan period may be favoured. Smaller sites may also have the advantage of greater flexibility, in that the risk of non-performance is spread more broadly, and they may be brought on-stream more quickly.
- 4.52 I shall now assess individually the omission sites, looking to find suitable allocations to produce some 500 further units, particularly by reference to the criteria of PPG 3, but taking due account also of the factors I have detailed above, and of other relevant considerations raised in the individual cases. I shall search generally according to the recommended PPG 3 sequence, but postponing consideration of the larger green node candidate sites, for the reasons given.

Recommendations

My detailed recommendations in respect of these proposed modifications will depend on my findings in respect of the specific sites in question. I shall therefore formulate the recommendations after making my assessments, in the way I have indicated.

Modification No: M4.3 Policy H/A Land at Factory Street, Shepshed

Objection
128/329 Coats Plc

Objection issues

- Continued E/8 employment land protection not appropriate and housing redevelopment could make valuable contribution to minimising greenfield landtake.

Assessment

- 4.53 It is clear that the Council substantially accept that the need for any new employment provision in Shepshed would be in the form of small modern units. I should be surprised if that were not so: the prospects of any industrialist wanting to transfer to, or set up a new enterprise in, the objector's large and outdated premises appear to me to be slim, and that is reflected in their unsuccessful marketing record.
- 4.54 A Council letter of 18 December 2001 indicates that a redevelopment proposal might be acceptable provided a sufficient financial contribution were to be forthcoming to fund, at least in part, some new units elsewhere in the town. I

have no real evidence of the extent of need, if any, for such new employment provision, but it should not present an obstacle to the redevelopment of this site, in any event.

- 4.55 The building certainly, and quite probably the location - in a close knit older residential area, are unsuitable for continued industrial use, whilst the site is in PPG 3's highest priority category, as previously developed urban land, for housing. Mixed use redevelopment, to provide an element of business use on-site, would also fall short of the optimum location for such facilities. Those were the considerations which no doubt informed the identification of the land, the Coats Viyella site, in Technical Report 8, as an urban capacity site.
- 4.56 In those circumstances, it seems to me unreasonable that Policy E/8 should now be used effectively as a bargaining counter, to secure some financing for the Council's aims, for which no specific justification has been produced. I am informed simply that there have been enquiries to the Economic Development section for small B1 units, though mainly for office space, and without any particular requirement for location in Shepshed.
- 4.57 My judgement is that the better course of action would be to realise the site's redevelopment potential. I note that Technical Report 8 credited the site with a product of 44 units, on its higher density assumption, and the objector considers that a range of some 36-60 dwellings could be provided, to accord with PPG 3's expectations. A round figure of 50 units would, I consider, be appropriate for plan calculation purposes.

Conclusion

- 4.58 The site should be allocated in Policy H/A with an estimated product of 50 units.
-

Policy H/35 Pear Tree Lane, Loughborough (Inspector's recommendation 4.876)

Objection
46/185 Bryant Homes

Objection issues

- Council have not properly applied PPG 3 search sequence, need for flexibility allowance justifies further allocations, and, as suitable green urban edge site recommended by Inquiry Inspector, land has high priority claim.

Assessment

- 4.59 Development of this site would represent an urban extension of Loughborough. The Council's objections to allocation, apart from the perceived lack of need, are that there would be encroachment on the Loughborough/Hathern Green Wedge, and the loss of best and most versatile grade 2/3a agricultural land.
- 4.60 Visually, the site is well contained, at least below the 55 m level up to which development is proposed. In the local views available, building would be seen simply as an extension, rather further out along the A6, of the existing, hard edged, limit of Loughborough's built form, in this vicinity.

- 4.61 There would be the opportunity, indeed, with a sympathetic layout and landscaping, to provide the town with a more appealing, and permanent looking, edge than it presently has, on this side of the road. To do so would complement a similar design aim entailed in the highway works - A6 realignment, new roundabout and access - necessary to accommodate the planned industrial land extension on the opposite side of the road.
- 4.62 The Green Wedge is not a landscape designation of course, but a policy instrument serving to determine the shape and physical identity of settlements, and to maintain separation. The protected gap along the A6 in this vicinity is only some 900 m wide and, in purely quantitative terms therefore, is vulnerable to the effects of further encroachment.
- 4.63 However, in the particular circumstances I have indicated, a narrower gap, extending from Hathern to Pear Tree Lane, would in fact be a much more clearly defined feature. The landform is such that it would encompass what is actually seen as the open land between the settlements, and it could be provided with a far stronger and better enduring edge at its Loughborough end.
- 4.64 There is no MAFF objection, and the context is of a distribution of best and more versatile land in the Borough which makes it almost inevitable that there should be some losses to necessary development. Like my colleague, Inspector Stephens, [report para 4.865] I accept that the potential loss in this case is not a consideration to be given no weight, however, but to be put in the balance with other relevant factors.
- 4.65 Based on the developer's intention to make an early planning application, it might well be that some 77 dwelling units could be provided within the plan period out of the total expected site product of about 100 units. That would be at the Council's suggested rate of 28 completions per year. The density would be within the PPG 3 recommended range.
- 4.66 My judgement is that the merits of the site, in PPG 3 terms, represent the most persuasive consideration, by a very great measure. As an urban extension, the allocation of the land would accord with the high priority given to this category in the PPG search sequence. It would also be consistent with emerging structure plan policy, so that the, relatively small, further contribution expected from the site after the plan period would not prejudice the plan review at all. These merits override the prospective agricultural land loss.
- 4.67 As to the Green Wedge, I do not even accept that there is any objection of significance to put into the balance. On proper consideration, the functioning of the Policy would be strengthened, not harmed. Granted there would, factually, be 'encroachment', what matters is the effect of it. On a reading of all the relevant parts of Inspector Stephens' conclusions on this issue, I do not consider that is inconsistent with the view he took, and on the basis of which he too looked to the site for a contribution to the Borough housing requirement.

Conclusion

- 4.68 The site should be allocated in Policy H/1 with an estimated product of 77 units (in the plan period - with 23 thereafter).

Policy H/75 Little Haw Farm, Tickow Lane, Shepshed (Inspector's recommendation 4.1205)

Objection

78/260 Mr J Coleman, William Davis Limited

Objection issues

- Inquiry Inspector's recommendation for allocation of site should not have been rejected for lack of need for flexibility when Policy H/B meets same object with PPG 3 lower priority sites.
- Site should be favoured as urban extension in structure plan 'main town', especially since Shepshed has limited windfall potential and Council have rejected officer recommendation for release of significant Coats Viyella site from employment protection.

Assessment

- 4.69 The objector's basic position is that as an urban extension the site should be ranked ahead of any green node site, if supplementary allocations should have to be made to remedy any shortfall becoming apparent during the plan lifetime. I have already indicated my view that the situation has arisen, and that further allocations are to be sought straightaway on that basis. I shall therefore assess the site as an immediate candidate for allocation.
- 4.70 It is accepted that there are no technical planning difficulties in the way of developing the site promptly, as emerged from a recent planning application. The Council's objection, apart from lack of need, or at least a concern on their part, is as to the impact of development on the countryside.
- 4.71 Developing the site would represent a fairly modest extension of the built up area of Shepshed, and as such an extension I agree that its claim for allocation comes before those of lower order sites in the PPG 3 sequence. Only some material objection would cause it to be passed over, and the search to be directed, instead, to sites less well located, on the PPG criteria.
- 4.72 The Council raise as a difficulty that if the PPG recommended density range is applied, then development of the site might have an adverse impact on its surroundings. It is the case that the location is sensitive, on the edge of the town adjoining the countryside, of which the western sector is within the Charnwood Forest APAC.
- 4.73 Density is not an issue to be settled at this stage, though it does of course have its implications for my assessment. I think it would be misguided to assume necessarily that only a low density layout would be acceptable in this location: the advice in paras 54-56 of PPG 3 on designing for quality is to be read in the context of the PPG's aim, expressed in para 57, to avoid the inefficient use of land. In the circumstances he explains about the timing of the introduction of the new guidance, that was advice which was not taken into account by Inspector Stephens.
- 4.74 I add only in this respect that at the interface between town and country there is bound to be development adjoining the open, rural land beyond, even where that has the special recognition of its qualities conferred by an APAC designation.

The best design solution may not always be to taper off densities in an attempt to make the outer reaches of built form less noticeable.

- 4.75 Be that as it may, it is apparent that a scheme to provide 40 dwellings has been satisfactorily canvassed with the Council, at officer level, which means that a housing contribution from the site at a density of 20 units per hectare could be achieved, without causing any visual harm.
- 4.76 It might possibly be that more would be realisable in the event, but I take into account that the imperative to achieve higher densities may at times have to be tempered by other considerations. That is certainly the Council's approach, as can be seen in the varying range of figures attributed to the sites proposed for allocation.
- 4.77 The site at issue is a very strong candidate for allocation, in that it enjoys a high PPG 3 locational priority, and on the objector's evidence, which I accept, could be brought on-stream very promptly. It could thus be relied on to make a definite and significant early contribution towards meeting the Borough housing requirement.
- 4.78 To me, that is a consideration, in the uncertain situation as to housing completions I have identified, which outweighs the possible drawback of a rather less than optimum density being realisable from the site. With a product of 40 units, which can be stipulated for plan calculation purposes, the allocation would be justified. If more can in the event be achieved, then so much the better.

Conclusion

- 4.79 The site should be allocated in Policy H/1 with an estimated product of 40 units.
-

Modification No: M4.15 Policy H/1(a) North of Bradgate Road, Anstey

Objection

100/294 Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson Estates

Objection issue

- Site should be allocated, at least as supplementary, as it is within Central Leicestershire Policy Area, well related to Leicester urban area, and sustainable.

Assessment

- 4.80 Inspector Stephens recommended in favour of the deposit draft allocation of this site, concluding that "development on the site would be an acceptable urban extension reasonably related to the form and scale of the host settlement and would not be materially intrusive" [report para 4.74].
- 4.81 Again - "It is not located on a transport choice corridor although the site is next to a bus route with a 15 minute service which links to the village centre and thence to Leicester, albeit not on a dedicated public transport route in terms of paragraph 2.14 of the LSP. The site, however, can be seen as one which can provide a choice of transport means, rather than relying solely on the private car." In the Inspector's view, "it is not unduly removed from the functional core of the village." [report para 4.60]

- 4.82 The Council's present objection to allocation turns on the priority to be given to the site in the PPG 3 search sequence. Technical Report 9 ranks it below the green node sites as a rural site, to which no recourse is considered to be necessary.
- 4.83 That judgement rests on what I consider is a confusion of existing structure plan terminology with the wording of para 30 of the PPG. As a matter of fact, the site is not within one of the designated structure plan 'transport choice corridors', but the relevance of that can be exaggerated. Its significance is only for the plan's now outdated development distributional strategy.
- 4.84 I think it would be perverse not to categorise Anstey as a node in a good public transport corridor, in PPG terms, or a green node in the Council's phraseology, in circumstances where this substantial settlement, of good facilities, is connected to Leicester, some 6 km distant, by a 15 minute service the route of which is part of the network of the City's main bus operator.
- 4.85 I am sure there is nothing about the intervening route to detract from its qualification as a good public transport corridor. Almost immediately south east of Anstey is part of Leicester's outer ring road, encompassing the main radials into the City. Whether the route is actually a dedicated public transport route penetrating an urban area as referred to in structure plan Strategy Policy 2 seems to me rather beside the point: it certainly sounds like one, and no doubt functions in that way.
- 4.86 My judgement is that the site is a very good green node candidate for allocation, with the potential to make a significant and needed housing contribution. It has the added advantage of consistency with what appears to be an emerging theme of the new structure plan of concentrating development in the Leicester area.
- 4.87 My only remaining reservation is on the issue of density. My colleague has canvassed in his report a possible layout on a site area of some 3.3 ha of 60 dwellings, giving a density of about 18 units per hectare. That is of course low, by PPG 3 standards, but he had the advantage of considering that layout along with the benefit of Inquiry submissions.
- 4.88 His favourable judgement on what was proposed, at least illustratively, is clearly based not simply on any dictate of conformity with adjoining development, but taking into account precisely expressed considerations of amenity and need for protection of features of significant landscape and ecological interest.
- 4.89 Accordingly, it might well be that such constraints would properly result in the achievement of a lower density development than would otherwise be expected. I note too that access constraints might impose a restriction of 60 dwellings. My judgement is that even granted these limitations, it would be proper in all the circumstances to call on the site for its potential housing contribution. If it were to prove possible, by a suitable redesign, to increase the density, then so much the better.

Conclusion

- 4.90 The site should be allocated in Policy H/1 with an estimated product of 60 units.

Policy H/89 Barkby Lane/Barkby Thorpe Lane, Syston (Inspector's recommendation 4.1331)

Objection

16/32 Mr M Parkhouse, George Wimpey Strategic Land

Objection issues

- Need for further allocations still justifies acceptance of Inspector's recommendation for the site.
- Development should be directed to settlements with the best range of services and facilities - Syston is one of the most sustainable settlements in the Borough.
- Allocate in preference to H/1(h), Meynell Road, Quorn and H/1(j), Cossington Lane, Rothley.

Assessment

4.91 I shall refer to three relevant proposals by the notations adopted so far, thus:

Site H/89(a) - Site of 21.5 ha at Barkby Lane/Barkby Thorpe Lane
Site H/89(b) - Part of (a) above, 2.7 ha north of Barkby Lane
Site H/89(c) - Part of (a) above, 7.2 ha north of Barkby Thorpe Lane

The Inspector's recommendation for allocation was in respect of site H/89(b). He recommended against sites (a) and (c).

4.92 I shall narrow the field of my consideration to site H/89(b), for two reasons. One is the extent of the incursion into the Green Wedge in the vicinity would be so great in the case of both the other proposals as to weigh very heavily against recommending them as allocations. The other is that the product which might reasonably be expected from them, at minimum, would be quite likely to extend beyond the plan period, and, as I have indicated, I should prefer so far as possible to avoid making any recommendation for an additional allocation which would have that effect.

4.93 Again as I have already indicated, I am not in a position to make an exhaustive comparison between all possible candidate sites for allocation, including those sites the subject of favourable recommendations by my colleague Inspectors which the Council propose to adopt. Apart from any question of formal restrictions on my power to do so, I do not have the exhaustive information necessary for such a task, and I have not heard representations from all concerned parties.

4.94 The numbers with which I am dealing, in seeking to match housing supply to requirement, mean that I do not have to consider choosing between site H/89(b), on the one hand, and Meynell Road, Quorn and Cossington Lane, Rothley, on the other. All rank equally, as green node sites. To anticipate matters somewhat, I shall express my support for those allocations, after I have dealt with the omission sites. I can now go on to consider the merits of H/89(b).

4.95 The Council's objection, apart from lack of need, is on the ground of harm to the functioning of the Green Wedge proposed to separate the built up areas of Syston and Thurmaston.

- 4.96 I saw on inspection that the open land south of Barkby Lane does indeed very obviously fulfil the role of separating these developed areas, at a point where they are close and the gap may properly be regarded as vulnerable. However, I do not consider the land north of the road, at the tip of the proposed designation, has any supportive role in that function, at least to any very significant degree.
- 4.97 This is a mainly triangular shaped area bounded, for the most part, by the road, railway and development at the eastern limit hereabouts of Syston. The urban development will be consolidated locally, in time, when the H/1(p) allocation is implemented.
- 4.98 The land is open, but its affinity is with the broader tract of open land in the countryside further east, rather than with the remaining Green Wedge south of Barkby Lane. Its containment capacity is, in my view, directed mainly to checking the easterly growth of Syston, rather than strictly to maintaining the gap to the south between the town and nearby Thurmaston.
- 4.99 For this reason, my judgement is that the land could be developed, without material harm to the Green Wedge strategy, bearing in mind the exact nature of the objective the designation seeks to achieve. No other objection stands in the way of making the allocation. Indeed, in terms of location and facilities, it is plain that the Council accept that Syston is very well fitted to accommodate new housing.
- 4.100 Equally positively, though the railway is not a strong landscape feature, it could offer a well defined and enduring boundary to development on the northern frontage of Barkby Lane, which argues in favour of making the housing designation, to complement H/1(p).
- 4.101 Anticipating my view that there is no good reason to restrict the density of development unduly for that allocation, a similar position would apply for this objection site, and the objector's suggested figure of 60 units appears appropriate for the net area likely to be available.

Conclusion

- 4.102 Site H/89(b) should be allocated in Policy H/1 with an estimated product of 60 units.
-

Modification No: M4.18 Policy H/1(d) Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds

Objection

77/252 Alfred McAlpine Developments

Objection issues

- Inquiry Inspector's favourable recommendation still valid in view of allocations shortage. Split between H/A as part previously developed land and H/1 as part suitable new allocation. Would contribute to housing requirements of Wolds area in a village properly serviced to take such development.

Assessment

- 4.103 My search for suitable further allocations by way of considering the objection sites has to depart somewhat here from the apparent orderliness of the sequence commended in PPG 3, para 30. The Council's view is simply that this is a rural site to be ranked after the green node sites.
- 4.104 If I were to accept that proposition as valid, and as the dominant consideration, it would now be appropriate first to bring into assessment the 'reserve' site at Barrow and the one-time further 'reserve' similar green node site at Sileby.
- 4.105 However, as I have indicated, this cannot be a full investigation starting from scratch, and the size of those sites is an adverse factor to be put into the balance when considering how an imminent potential problem can be solved, consistently with relevant policy, without unduly compromising the post plan future.
- 4.106 In any event, it is an over-simplification, as the objector points out, to categorise this site as necessarily at the bottom of the priority list. About a third of it, perhaps rather more, is previously developed land within the PPG 3, Annex C definition, taking into account buildings and what may sensibly be regarded as their associated curtilage, as put to a variety of uses including, apparently, pig swill production, car breaking, haulage depot and scrap yard, as well as agriculture.
- 4.107 In this context, I find it rather remarkable that the Council's only possible reason, as put forward in evidence, for not including this part of the site within Technical Report 7's survey of urban capacity, was that because the decision had been taken to exclude the site from Burton's development limits, it could not thereafter be regarded as an urban site for potential redevelopment.
- 4.108 It seems to me that urban capacity is not to be found only in Loughborough, but that any settlement can also make its contribution to serving the relevant policy aims. RPG 8, para 4.56 sees that as being the case. The objection site is so completely physically integrated into the village development that I consider it quite unjustified to exclude it from assessment in this way. To do so by applying what is really an arbitrary development limit only prejudices consideration of the site's merits.
- 4.109 So I agree with the objector that the PPG 3 advice to favour the re-use of previously developed sites is a positive factor in this case. It is not inconsistent with that judgement also to take into account that the PPG's para 30 stipulation of a search sequence is supplemented generally by para 1's imperative to provide greater choice of housing and specifically by the encouragement, admittedly modest, for some village expansion and infill, in paras 69-71.
- 4.110 My colleague's finding that the allocation would accord with, or strictly that it would not be contrary to, structure plan Strategy Policies 2 and 3 can now be updated by reference to the emerging plan. Although the plan reflects the increased emphasis on an urban concentration of development, the likely introduction of the concept of Rural Centres means that there will remain some scope for suitable housing provision in the villages.
- 4.111 I take the objector's point that Burton would be a possible candidate for designation as a Rural Centre in the local plan review, having some, if not all, of the expected facilities. In particular, there are relatively good sources of

employment locally, and a reasonable bus service, at least during the working day, to and from Loughborough, and in the opposite direction.

- 4.112 Like my colleague, I consider that the Wolds area should continue to see some, if limited, development, to help serve and sustain its communities, and this relatively modest allocation would be beneficial in that respect. A range of housing could be provided to help meet local needs, amongst other markets, if not necessarily within the strict definition of affordable housing, though I note that some provision of that kind might be offered if required. The objection site is an advantageous location, which should be designated accordingly.
- 4.113 I have no reason to question the continued applicability of the criteria for development proposed as part of Policy H/1(d), the effect of which is in part to reduce the site's net developable area to some 1.6 ha. The objector proposes development of some 40-50 units, and in this village location I consider that would represent a creditable attempt, in the spirit of PPG 3, to obtain the optimum density from the site.
- 4.114 Though the figures would be refined at application stage, and probably with a greater weighting to the eastern end of the site, I shall therefore recommend an allocation with a nominal product of 45 units, to be split roughly proportionately between the H/A and H/1 areas.

Conclusion

- 4.115 The site should be allocated, the eastern third in Policy H/A with an estimated product of 15 units, and the western two thirds in H/1 with an estimated product of 30 units.
-

Modification No: M4.25 Policy H/1(i) South of A607 & North of Gaddesby Lane, Rearsby

Objection
119/319 Mr A J P Pochin

Objection issues

- Proposal would be modest and acceptable provision of rural settlement housing achievable in plan period, funding needed traffic calming in village after completion of Rearsby bypass.

Assessment

- 4.116 This was a draft plan allocation, to accommodate some 20 units, on a site which Inspector Stephens considered well related to the host village and acceptable in principle. The doubts over the achievability of the allocation have been resolved now that the Rearsby bypass appears to be imminent, so that the superseded Melton Road can be downgraded, and access can be provided.
- 4.117 However, the impact of PPG 3 is now to put the land, as a rural site, at the bottom of the search sequence priority list. The location is not within a structure plan transport choice corridor, and no evidence has been put to me to show that there are good bus links with destinations such as Leicester and Loughborough.
-

- 4.118 I note the objector's arguments, drawing on the section - "Rural housing - village expansion and infill", that the PPG continues to predicate the provision of some rural housing, to cater for local need, which may not be confined simply to affordable housing.
- 4.119 I agree with that, as a statement of general principle, but I am not satisfied of the existence of real need, in this locality. As to affordable housing, the Council's updated survey information removes the distinction given to the communities of the Wreake Valley as in the greatest need. On the broader level, the plan distribution of housing heavily favours nearby locations at Syston and Birstall, and so the case for augmenting provision in this sector of the Borough is weak.
- 4.120 The objector is right to stress that funding for traffic calming in the village, once the opening of the bypass should have made the future role of Melton Road appropriate for this treatment, would be secured by development of the site, granted that other sources of finance might otherwise be available. Putting that advantage into the balance does not however, in my judgement, justify the allocation. My formal recommendation can follow.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M4.25.

Policy H/92 Wysall Lane, Wymeswold (Inspector's Recommendation 4.1354)

Objections

- 9/351 Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
21/96 Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd

Objection issues

- Charnwood's varied needs presuppose no over-prescriptive application of PPG 3. Balanced housing across Borough includes provision in rural north east sector. Inquiry Inspector's recommendation holds good. Local housing needs of various kinds would be met, and funding of beneficial traffic management measures.

Assessment

- 4.121 This is a further rural site at the bottom of the priority list for the PPG 3 search sequence. I note Inspector Stephens' view [report para 4.1352] that development as proposed need adversely affect neither the character and appearance of the site's landscape setting, nor the adjoining Wymeswold Conservation Area.
- 4.122 With building confined to the lower slopes of the site, I found there would be no long views of the development, of any significance; where it might be seen, notably on the approach from the east, it would simply form part of the mass of village development, broken up by existing hedgerows and trees.
- 4.123 At closer quarters, and specifically on the approach from the north along Wysall Lane, it would be well contained by the ridge line on the slope of which building would be set, and a suitably designed scheme would represent a natural extension of the village.

- 4.124 Development in this location, in the form of two groups of buildings either side of Wysall Lane, would appear as an appropriate use of land easily associated with the settlement form. That would substitute for the present position, which gives an impression of a somewhat arbitrary and faltering straggle of development out from the main village core.
- 4.125 In that respect, I consider the Council's concern as to the potential impact on the Conservation Area is exaggerated: this has a clearly defined identity as the village core, and beyond it, on the village fringes, all that is required is a harmonious layout at a suitable density to retain the semi-rural nature of the setting, and to provide a definite transition into the countryside proper. I regard it as important to enhance the Conservation Area setting in this way, where the same consideration might not arise in the case of a built up area not so designated.
- 4.126 Nor do I consider that the minor works required to improve visibility at the Wysall Lane junction and provide a new footway would mar the setting of the designated area. These would be seen as related more to the new development than as a jarring element of the Conservation Area.
- 4.127 I acknowledge that design considerations might well militate against achieving the kind of density which would otherwise be expected by PPG 3. However, the interests of the Conservation Area represent an important factor to be taken into account, and I do not consider that any density constraints they might impose should necessarily rule out the allocation of the site. Making sufficient housing provision continues to imply, to me, offering some choice and variety.
- 4.128 That brings me to the qualitative aspect, which I agree with the objectors is to be put into the balance along with the strict search mechanism of PPG 3. I have already taken into account a locational element in my assessment of the objection site for nearby Burton on the Wolds. Earlier in the emergence of the new structure plan, it was of course intended that Wymeswold would be the only Rural Centre designated in the plan, in Charnwood.
- 4.129 In circumstances where I consider more housing provision should be made in the Borough, it seems to me at very least that it would be convenient to realise this opportunity to locate a modest part of it in Wymeswold. It is a sound observation made for the objectors that the pattern of proposed distribution very much favours the west and south of the Borough.
- 4.130 Some additional provision in this north eastern sector might well serve local needs in enabling people to continue to live there who would otherwise have to move. And any, limited, increase in population might well have some benefits for the local economy. Some affordable housing could be made available, if required.
- 4.131 Some local employment is available, notably at the nearby former Wymeswold aerodrome. There are bus services which, at least in peak hours, provide a useable connection with Loughborough, some 7 km distant.
- 4.132 There are no offsetting site-specific disadvantages. I appreciate the Parish Council's concern that the village should not be swamped by new housing, but I see no reason why the modest scheme put forward should not be assimilable.
- 4.133 The net developable site area would be some 2.34 ha, for which the provision of 45 dwellings is suggested, as recommended by my colleague Inspector. In the

circumstances I have indicated, that appears to me a realistic and useful contribution, justifying the allocation of the land.

Conclusion

4.134 The site should be allocated in Policy H/1 with an estimated product of 45 units.

Modification No: M4.16 Policy H/1(b) Cotes Road & Willow Road, Barrow upon Soar

Objections

3/338 Mr S Perret
40/120 Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands) Ltd
40/121 Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands) Ltd
40/126 Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands) Ltd
100/65 David Wilson Estates
100/293 Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson Estates
100/296 Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson Estates

Objection issues

- Supplementary arrangement gives Council too much discretion as to implementation.
- Site needed now to meet housing requirements, and drafting changes required to Policy wording.

Assessment

4.135 This is a green node site agreed by the parties to be capable of producing some 360 dwellings in total and an estimated 126 in the plan period. With this site, and the other large possible 'reserve' site at Sileby, I reach the end of my search of the objection sites, requiring still some 123 units to reach the target of 500 extra which I advise should be allocated.

4.136 Barrow upon Soar is a large settlement with a good range of facilities and services, offering easy public transport accessibility, particularly to Loughborough but also in the other direction towards Leicester, by a choice of modes.

4.137 Development as proposed need not be intrusive, though some portion of it would be visible on rising ground. It would, however, fit very well into the existing pattern of building in the settlement, as part of the recent new growth on the northern outskirts, and with the centre in proximity. I see no reason why the adjoining listed building and curtilage, Strancliffe Hall, should be harmed. The new link road required would help traffic circulation in and around the village, or town.

4.138 The plan envisages development at a net density overall of 30 units per hectare, and that would of course satisfy the minimum expectation of PPG 3. Bearing in mind the extended period over which building might well take place, and the fact that separate approvals for sequential phases might be sought, there might well be variations in this respect from one phase to another. It might be possible to achieve significant density increases on some parts of the site.

- 4.139 Be that as it may, there is no reason for concern at what for now must be an overall target figure, which accords with policy. The site is proposed as a supplementary allocation, and my judgement is that circumstances justify bringing it forward immediately, and making the allocation now firm, instead.
- 4.140 As to matters, relatively, of detail, the objector queries two requirements of Policy H/1(b), as set out in the proposed modification, and has canvassed alternative wording with the Council. I agree that alterations would be appropriate. These would be to add “in total, in accordance with Policy RT9,” before “over some 6ha” in criterion (ii), and “or improved transportation links serving” before “Barrow upon Soar railway station” in listed item (a) of the final Policy paragraph.

Conclusion

- 4.141 The site should be allocated in Policy H/1 with an estimated product of 126 units (in the plan period – with 234 thereafter).
-

Modification No: M4.31 Policy H/1(o) Seagrave Road, Sileby (and suggested further change FC4.5)

Objections

- 23/83 Cllr R Brown, Sileby Parish Council
34/107 Crest Nicholson (Residential) Ltd
34/123 Crest Nicholson (Residential) Ltd
44/152 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands
44/354 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

Objection issues

- Whether site should be allocated now, or at all, in the light of possible need, possible availability of alternatives, and suggested inefficient use of land entailed in allocation.

Assessment

- 4.142 I have completed my task of finding some 500 extra dwellings without calling for a contribution from this site. In reaching that position I have satisfied myself of the merits of the Council’s ‘first reserve’ allocation, and also that it should be preferred to Seagrave Road, Sileby. I shall set out my reasons, which will deal also with the substance of the objections.
- 4.143 In some ways there is little to choose between the two sites. Sileby is within the current structure plan’s A6 transport choice corridor, and served by the Ivanhoe railway line. It is a little further from Loughborough than is Barrow, but commensurately nearer Leicester.
- 4.144 Presently, there is a bus service somewhat nearer the Sileby site than in the case of Barrow, but for development of the scale proposed at Barrow, routeing could well be changed in time, to cater for the market. If not, the necessary walk into the town centre is hardly burdensome at 0.6 km distance. Barrow station at 1.5-1.9

- km away is a little inconvenient, but Sileby is not much better at about 1.2-1.5 km, dependent on choice of walking or driving route.
- 4.145 The advantages stressed for Sileby are the closer proximity of particular facilities, namely a local convenience store of the 'minimarket' variety, doctor's surgery and primary school. Sileby town centre is some 1.2 km distant.
- 4.146 It appears that GOEM's concern as to the achievable density of development at Sileby might be regarded as superseded by recent correspondence put to me between the County Highways Department and the prospective developer. The originally intended figure of 200 dwellings had been dictated by the access arrangements but it seems at least possible that a rearrangement would be feasible whereby the site's optimum contribution of some 300 units could be realised, at a density of 39 per hectare. That of course would depend, amongst other factors, on highway capacity.
- 4.147 However, I consider the two sites are crucially to be distinguished by their relationship with the settlements of which their development would be part, including but not limited to the respective village or town centres, and by the services provided in those centres.
- 4.148 Taking the last aspect first, I formed the view on my inspections that Barrow has more to offer than Sileby. My perception was that there is, significantly, a wider range of food shopping, making it more likely that greater use of the local facilities will be made, reducing shopping trips to other destinations. Facilities for eating and drinking appeared more varied. There is of course also a secondary school in Barrow.
- 4.149 It seems to me, moreover, that the available facilities, where choice is an issue, are more likely to be patronised in Barrow than Sileby, thus helping to give them a more secure future. Barrow centre is nearer the major development proposed there than is the case with Sileby. I consider it more likely, not just because of the distance but also because of the simpler route involved, that Barrow would attract more walking trips.
- 4.150 I also consider that, unlike the case at Barrow, the Sileby site has a less integrated relationship with other parts of the town, including other residential areas. There is a sense in which it would represent an obvious extension of the settlement at one of its extremities, reducing the likelihood, for example, of the usual socialising visits by children and adults being made on foot or cycle. In contrast, the Barrow development would be better integrated, with general circulation significantly easier.
- 4.151 These are important factors bearing directly on what can properly be termed the sustainability of the allocations in question. I find Seagrave Road, Sileby deficient in this respect, in the ways I have detailed, and so I shall not recommend in favour of it. There is no merit in making any supplementary allocation at this stage in the life of the plan, so that issue does not arise.

Conclusion

- 4.152 The site should not be allocated.

Recommendations (on objection sites)

I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M4.3 (Policy H/A), subject to the incorporation of suggested further changes FC4.2 and FC4.3, and with the addition of -

<u>Site</u>	<u>Estimated plan period product</u>
Former Coats Viyella factory, Shepshed*	50 units
Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds (eastern part)	15 units

*A consequential amendment to Policy E/8 should be made.

I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M4.13 (Policy H/1) with the addition of -

<u>Site</u>	<u>Estimated plan period product</u>
Pear Tree Lane, Loughborough	77 units
Little Haw Farm, Tickow Lane, Shepshed	40 units
North of Bradgate Road, Anstey	60 units
H/89(b) site, Barkby Lane, Syston	60 units
Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds (western part)	30 units
Wysall Lane, Wymeswold	45 units
Cotes Road and Willow Road, Barrow upon Soar	126 units

Further details should be included in respect of all sites as appropriate. The plan structure presupposes separate sub-policies for each allocated greenfield site, setting out specific development criteria. These should be provided in accordance with the Inquiry Inspector's recommendations, with any necessary adjustments to reflect the above estimates of product, but in the case of Cotes Road and Willow Road, Barrow upon Soar, the sub-policy should follow the wording of Policy H/1(b) in proposed modification M4.16 amended as follows -

Substitute for the first paragraph - "Planning permission for the residential development of land between Cotes Road and Willow Road, Barrow upon Soar will be granted provided the following criteria are met:"

Add "in total, in accordance with Policy RT9," before "over some 6ha" in criterion (ii), and "or improved transportation links serving" before "Barrow upon Soar railway station" in listed item (a) of the final Policy paragraph.

Other consequential amendments should be made, as necessary, including proposed limits to development. The table in proposed modification M4.2 is outdated, and M4.14 would be superfluous, along with suggested further change FC4.5. M4.31 should not be taken forward.

Modification No: M4.1 Government Guidance (and suggested further change FC4.1)

Objection

96/279 Mr I A Moss, House Builders Federation

Objection issue

- PPG 3 does more than “encourage” planning to meet housing requirements of the whole community; it requires it.

Assessment

4.153 The point is taken by the Council, and the suggested further change would alter the wording of the modification to meet the objection. On that basis, it can be commended.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M4.1, subject to the incorporation of suggested further change FC4.1.

Modifications Nos: M4.7-M4.12 Policy H/1 New Housing Allocations - Proposals Map alterations (and suggested further change FC4.3)

Objections

9/342 Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd

9/343 Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd

9/344 Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd

9/345 Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd

9/346 Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd

9/347 Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd

Objection issues

- No evidence that sites will become available for housing, balance tipped too far away from employment use in favour of more lucrative residential, and more comprehensive review of employment needs required.

Assessment

4.154 The suggested further change would restore the Policy E/8 employment land protection to the Perry’s garage site, since the Council accept that any housing redevelopment proposal is unlikely. That would meet objection 9/344, by superseding proposed modification M4.9.

4.155 For the remainder of the sites, I agree with the objector that caution is needed in favouring residential redevelopment of employment sites in urban areas. Meeting the housing requirement with the minimum of greenfield landtake is not the only, or even the paramount, planning consideration in the local plan process.

4.156 That said, all these sites have by now apparently achieved some degree of planning status as housing redevelopment opportunities, making it inappropriate

to seek to continue to protect them for employment use. How the balance should be drawn between the two competing uses, with the appropriate degree of protection given to the less remunerative activity, has not been canvassed in detail before me, and I can offer no further comment.

4.157 In the circumstances, I support the modifications, subject to the further change.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modifications M4.7, M4.8, M4.9, M4.10, M4.11 and M4.12, subject to the incorporation of suggested further change FC4.3.

Modification No: M4.21 Policy H/1(g) South of Hazel Road & Manor Road, Loughborough

Objections

2/2	Mr & Mrs Ralph	64/228	Mr T P Conneally BSc.
6/4	Mr M R Easom	65/230	Mr E D Hancock
13/53	Mrs J Noon, CPRE- Charnwood District	66/231	Ms Z Connelly
20/91	Mr S Higginson	67/232	Mr A C Potts
26/89	Mr S Timmins	68/233	Mrs T Hancock
27/90	Mrs C Timmins	73/238	Mr L J Rixon
30/94	Mrs J Stewart	76/246	Mrs S Rasaiah BSc DipTP MRTPI
38/112	Mr P Fines	87/270	Mrs L J Rixon

Objection issues

- This extension to H/1(g) allocation not required and not supported by Inquiry Inspector. Would cause harm to APAC, listed building and Rainbow Hospice. Site better retained as green edge to development.

Assessment

4.158 The proposed modification would implement the large H/1(g) proposed allocation. The objectors' concern, which the Council have invited me to address, is the proposed addition to the deposit draft allocation, generally at its western end in the vicinity of Park Grange Farm, of a further 1.4 ha or so of land. Plan M4.21 enables the objection site to be identified, by a comparison between the deposit draft notation and what is now proposed.

4.159 Inspector Stephens considered the merits of extended the deposit draft allocation westwards to accommodate two phases of building. Phase 1 would take development up to the farm buildings, including - it is clear to me from the plans supplied by the Council - land to the north between the farm and the hospice. Phase 2 would project further westwards. He recommended in favour of the Phase 1 development, but took the view that Phase 2 would encroach unacceptably on open land which would be better included in the APAC. The modification now sought reflects that.

4.160 It seems to me there is no doubt that the part of the site east of the farmhouse "is in a degraded and untidy state and is substantially screened from wider views by mature trees and hedgerows" [report para 4.970]. It does not serve the aims of the

APAC designation, relating instead to the adjoining built up area, existing and proposed.

- 4.161 I agree with the objectors that some distinction can be drawn for the part of the subject land, north of the farmhouse. It retains much more of a rural appearance, and I accept is likely to offer some support as a habitat for flora and fauna such as larks, meadow butterflies and cowslips.
- 4.162 It is, however, a small parcel of land which I am unable to conclude makes any contribution to the APAC of particular significance. It is seen in longer views from the APAC to merge with the developed area of Loughborough: as a small tongue of land protruding just a little further than the rest of the countryside adjoining the settlement hereabouts it is really no more than a slight boundary irregularity. Its loss would not harm the functioning of the APAC, and could be countenanced as part of a framework to secure a well designed and enduring boundary to the outward spread of the town in this vicinity.
- 4.163 As to habitat loss, it has to be acknowledged that this is an inevitable consequence of extending a built up area to provide more houses. That does not mean that such a loss is to be readily sanctioned, but in circumstances where, as I found, more residential land is needed in the Borough, the question has to be asked whether this land offers any habitat of enhanced significance.
- 4.164 It is meadowland or paddock with hedgerows, and can claim no distinction beyond that. However regrettably in conservation terms, the loss of this small area is outweighed, in my judgement, by the need to make the housing allocation.
- 4.165 I find no other insuperable difficulties. The relationship of development on the site to its neighbours, the listed buildings and the hospice, raises special considerations in each case, of different kinds, but I see no reason why they should not be properly accommodated in the design process for a specific scheme. The appropriate density would also depend, in part, on such factors.
- 4.166 In the absence of any overriding objection from the county highway authority, the same goes for considerations of access and safety. This addition to the proposed allocation can be commended.

Recommendation - I recommend that the additional land at Park Grange Farm identifiable on plan M4.21 be included in proposed allocation H/1(g).

Modification No: M4.24 Policy H/1(h) Meynell Road, Quorn

Objection

16/29 Mr M Parkhouse, George Wimpey Strategic Land

Objection issues

- Not in accordance with PPG 3 sequential approach.
- Delete site in favour of Barkby Lane, Syston H/89(b).

Assessment

- 4.167 The approach I recommend, for the Council to meet the structure plan housing requirement, presupposes the allocation of this site. It is a green node site, at a

level in the PPG 3 search sequence to which recourse is necessary, supported for allocation by Inspector Stephens.

- 4.168 It is a small site, with an estimated contribution of 30 units, which I would favour, for the reasons given, in preference to any allocation with a construction period likely to extend beyond the plan life. Its inclusion would not be at the expense of the H/89(b) Barkby Lane, Syston site.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M4.24.

Modification No: M4.26 Policy H/1(j) North of Cossington Lane, Rothley

Objections

16/30 Mr M Parkhouse, George Wimpey Strategic Land

Objection issues

- Not in accordance with PPG 3 sequential approach.
- Delete site in favour of Barkby Lane, Syston H/89(b)

Assessment

4.169 The approach I recommend, for the Council to meet the structure plan housing requirement, presupposes the allocation of this site. It is a green node site, at a level in the PPG 3 search sequence to which recourse is necessary, supported for allocation by Inspector Stephens.

4.170 It is a small site, with an estimated contribution of 25 units, which I would favour, for the reasons given, in preference to any allocation with a construction period likely to extend beyond the plan life. Its inclusion would not be at the expense of the H/89(b) Barkby Lane, Syston site.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M4.26.

Modification No: M4.28 Policy H/1(l) Brook Street, Sileby

Objection

23/85 Cllr R Brown, Sileby Parish Council

Objection issue

- Site should be indicated on Proposals Map not as primarily residential but as partial residential.

Assessment

4.171 'Primarily residential' is the reserve designation in the plan for all land within the limits to development not otherwise designated. Because of uncertainty as to the implementation of a redevelopment scheme for housing, the modification would delete a specific allocation previously proposed.

4.172 In those circumstances, even though some element of mixed use may be put in place on the site, the reserve designation is appropriate and would not preclude use other than residential. The Council advise me that permission has been granted for housing development, of 95 dwellings.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M4.28.

Modification No: M4.33 Policy H/1(p) Barkby Lane, Syston (and suggested further change FC4.4)

Objections

33/100 Mr & Mrs T R Cox	150/380 Mr P E Ieiy
36/104 Mr & Mrs T E Constable	151/381 Ms M M Zoffo-Ieiy
79/156 Mr H M Knight, Birstall PC	152/382 Mr A R Pimm
92/275 Mr & Mrs F E & H M Wilkinson	153/383 Ms F R Pimm
129/330 Miss D J Lowe	154/384 Ms V Lord
135/335 Mr D A Shaw	155/385 Mr J W Parker
138/368 Mr W G Duncan	156/386 Ms S Parker
139/369 Mrs D A Duncan	157/387 Ms S J Bullock
140/370 Mr H E Mason	158/388 B Taylor
141/371 Ms C Mason	159/389 J Taylor
142/372 Mr B C Strong	160/390 Ms J McNulty
143/373 Ms S W Strong	161/391 Mr T M McNulty
144/374 Ms K E Hackett	162/392 Mr A J Calver
145/375 Mr D Hackett	163/393 Ms S A Calver
146/376 Ms P A Seditas	164/394 Ms P R Dakin
147/377 Mr C Seditas	165/395 Mr R W Dakin
148/378 Mr N P Setchell	166/396 Ms G D Asher
149/379 Ms T M Setchell	167/397 Mr T C Asher

Objection issues

- Inappropriate density specified and insufficient account taken of amenity value and wildlife interest of site.

Assessment

4.173 The modification would implement Inspector Stephens' recommendation, substantially, for allocation of this site, except in respect of density. The Council proposed some 35 dwellings, in deference to PPG 3, instead of the limit previously put forward of 10 units. The suggested further change figure is 15, giving a density of 11 houses per hectare.

4.174 The local objectors are concerned that the site should not be over-developed, whilst others stress the importance of achieving the optimum housing contribution, on PPG 3 advice. The Council's latest position is that to respect the spacious character of the surroundings, a lower density than PPG 3 would otherwise seek would be appropriate.

- 4.175 I treat that proposition with considerable caution: the advice in paras 54-56 of PPG 3 on designing for quality is to be read in the context of the PPG's aim, expressed in para 57, to avoid the inefficient use of land. It is not to be assumed that the interests of good design necessarily presuppose that only a low density scheme will be acceptable where the layout of adjoining land displays that feature.
- 4.176 Having inspected the site and surroundings, I have come to the conclusion that there is no overall prevailing character of development to which proposals for the site need conform. There are simply piecemeal lengths of developed frontage to Meadway, Melton Road and Barkby Lane which now partially fringe the site boundaries. The buildings are of different styles and, apparently, different ages.
- 4.177 Existing densities are in a sense quite accidental, reflecting no general theme applied throughout the locality, only the fact that the houses tend to have relatively limited frontage depth, fairly restricted separation between buildings, and long rear gardens. It is the last element which is thus the major determinant of overall density.
- 4.178 For the most part, moreover, it is those long rear gardens which distance the existing houses from the objection site, itself an open field of rectangular proportions with generally mature hedges marking its boundaries. It is in essence a self-contained area offering the opportunity for a well designed scheme without undue physical constraints. In particular, to impose a low density limit would be quite artificial and unnecessary.
- 4.179 In those circumstances the PPG 3 imperative to obtain the optimum housing contribution from the land holds good. The site could well make a further contribution, albeit modest in absolute terms, to providing some flexibility on the supply side, in addition to that which I have already identified.
- 4.180 On this score, the proposed modification is justified, along with the density figure of M4.13, not the suggested further change. In reaching that judgement, I take into account the lack of support from the Council for the proposition that the site is of significant wildlife interest, which might be prejudiced by development.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M4.33.

Modification No: M4.36 Policy H/1(s) Swifts Close, Wymeswold (and suggested further changes FC4.6 and FC4.6a)

Objections
See Appendix A

Objection issues

- Appropriate line for limits to development - whether it should be so drawn as to facilitate new residential development on village periphery.

Assessment

- 4.181 M4.36 responds to Inspector Stephens' recommendation against proposed housing allocation H/1(s) by deleting it and also proposing, at least by reference to the

relevant plan, that the development limit should be drawn so as to exclude all the H/1(s) site from the settlement. That would produce a limit tightly drawn at the outermost settlement edge as represented by dwelling curtilage boundaries, more so than the line of the consultation draft, prior to its extension in the deposit version to accommodate the H/1(s) allocation.

4.182 Suggested further change FC4.6 seeks to satisfy Mr Smallman's objection by pushing out the limit, on the basis that, in the words of the Council's formal response -

"A modest alteration to the limits to development so as to follow broadly existing curtilages could provide for about 15 homes including some affordable housing to meet the needs of the village, for which there is no other viable delivery mechanism, and facilitate improvements to the Conservation Area through the removal of an electricity sub-station, without offending the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector's objection to development on rising land to the south of Swifts Close."

4.183 Further change FC4.6a would straighten the line at the eastern end of the disputed section, augmenting by an extra 0.22 ha or so the area of land of some 0.37 ha put within the settlement by FC4.6.

4.184 There is the difficulty that whilst the Council's intentions are plainly that this area should be regarded as a housing site, no allocation is proposed. It is a misinterpretation of the plan, as I have indicated elsewhere, to assume that to extend the limits of development necessarily makes land available for housing development.

4.185 In itself, the issue of where to define the limit should be decided by an assessment of physical characteristics including the distribution of development and the nature of the setting, at the interface between built form and adjoining countryside. The aim should be to distinguish the one from the other, and thus to provide a sensible and enduring boundary.

4.186 To get to that stage, I must first deal with the suggested merits of using the subject land for a housing scheme. I find no quantitative need, in the light of my recommendations for new allocations. Qualitatively, the case for improving the distribution of housing throughout the Borough by further provision locally is met by my support for the Wysall Lane site.

4.187 Though larger, I consider that to be a better site which could be more easily assimilated into the existing village form, without harmful impact on its character and appearance. Any southern extension of the village hereabouts, even if not to the extent rejected by my colleague Inspector, would represent an obvious and harmful encroachment upon the countryside, in my judgement.

4.188 And as a site likely to produce 40 dwellings or more, it would also offer an equally good, if not better, opportunity for the Council to seek to obtain some affordable housing.

4.189 The remaining suggested advantage, whereby the Conservation Area would be enhanced by the removal of the electricity substation, I find quite illusory. My inspection showed the structure in question to be a well established and completely innocuous feature of the street scene.

4.190 If the Council had been able to define for me, as an element in the character of the Conservation Area, that it is made up uniformly of well designed and compatible buildings in a comprehensive harmonious layout, in which this service utility

strikes an exceptional and jarring note, it might have been different. However, that was not the case.

- 4.191 In the absence of any justification for the housing scheme, it remains only to consider, on the criteria I have detailed, where to draw the line for the development limit. I find the Council's preference is, in this context, quite arbitrary, in that it seeks to add areas of land, described in the main as paddocks, which are readily distinguishable from the more limited immediate surroundings of the dwellings they serve, which properly justify description as gardens or domestic curtilages.
- 4.192 Although the added areas may, in some cases at least, be used by neighbouring householders, the character of their use is unlike that usually associated with a garden. Generally, by reason of size and lack overall of horticultural attention or any form of intensive use, these added areas relate more obviously to the adjoining countryside than to any residential use. Accordingly, I favour their exclusion from the limits to development for Wymeswold.
- 4.193 I shall recommend accordingly. For the avoidance of doubt, in view of the apparent inconsistency between the text of the proposed modification and what appears to me to be plan M4.36, it is the plan indication of the limits to development which I favour. In other words, the line should follow the northern boundary of what would have been housing allocation H/1(s), except where the plan shows it to diverge slightly at the rear of the electricity substation.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M4.36.

Modification No: M4.38 Policy H/2 Density, and related matters

Objections

13/48	Mrs J Noon, CPRE – Charnwood District
13/57	Mrs J Noon, CPRE – Charnwood District
96/282	Mr I A Moss, House Builders Federation
44/151	Mr C Packman, GOEM
44/400	Mr C Packman, GOEM
101/299	Mr I MacDonald, Syston Town Council
227/63	Charnwood Road Properties Ltd

Objection issues

- Policy aim valid, but not reflected in the proposed greenfield allocations.
- No targets set for recycling of previously developed land.
- Policy should expressly take account of factors influencing achievable densities.
- Syston not capable of accommodating development on scale proposed

Assessment

- 4.194 I appreciate the CPRE's concern that plan allocations should reflect PPG 3's density expectations, which inform the drafting of the proposed Policy. That is not really an objection to Policy H/2, as proposed to be modified, but raises issues

- which can conveniently be dealt with here, as can GOEM's reservations about projected densities on certain allocated sites.
- 4.195 To argue that the plan does not meet the aims of PPG 3 as to making the best use of land, on the strength of the densities indicated, is, in my view, a somewhat misplaced criticism. The proposed allocations represent, to some extent, a compromise. That, I consider, is necessarily the case: they reflect the PPG's late and effectively only partial influence on plan preparation.
- 4.196 Where a major policy change of this kind is introduced, during the emergence of a local plan, it is difficult to embody its principles as fundamentally as if they had guided the strategy from the outset of the plan preparation.
- 4.197 I think it would be relatively straightforward, in the case of one site, at Barkby Lane, to provide a higher density scheme, and I have so recommended. However, a complete reassessment of all the green node sites would not be a feasible exercise for me to undertake. My judgement is that the proposed allocations, with the additions I recommend, are the best reasonably achievable at this stage to meet the Borough housing requirement, taking due account of PPG 3's aims and other relevant considerations.
- 4.198 It might be that on review the more comprehensive approach which should then be possible will enable improved targeting of urban land and, where appropriate, site selection outside the urban areas which pays particular attention to the question of suitability for development at high density. For now, no further action is called for on these objections.
- 4.199 This discussion sets a context for dealing with Syston Town Council's objection to what is regarded as the potential over-development of the town, because of the large Barkby Road allocation. I make the general comment that the imperative to find sufficient land for housing, at optimum densities, may well mean change, not all of which can be universally beneficial. A balance may have to be struck.
- 4.200 On the specific points raised, my visits to Syston gave me a picture of the town as very busy during the working day, with traffic movements and general activity. Granted that, it is for the county highway authority to be satisfied that the road network has sufficient capacity to carry the extra traffic, taking into account the feasibility of use of all available modes of transport. I have no evidence of the likelihood of any overriding difficulties in this respect.
- 4.201 As to recreational facilities and other public services generally, again no responsible provider maintains any objection, and that includes the matter of possible flooding. It is of course the case, as the Council point out, that contributions can, and I am sure will, be sought from prospective developers, where significant extra burdens might be placed on existing facilities.
- 4.202 In those circumstances, I conclude that the allocations planned for Syston are necessary and appropriate. That includes the further contribution locally towards the strategic housing requirement which I have identified and recommended.
- 4.203 The timing of the introduction of PPG 3 into the plan preparation process also has to be borne in mind in considering the objectors' criticism of the lack of targets set out in the plan for the recycling of previously developed land, and of the suggested inadequacy of the Council's aims, in this respect.

- 4.204 To an extent, the first of those points is met by the textual addition proposed by FC4.2, explaining that the revised plan strategy presupposes that 42% of the strategic housing requirement would be provided on brownfield sites. That, I accept though, is only a commentary and not a defined policy target.
- 4.205 As to whether in any event it would represent a proper target, I stress again my view that the changing policy background over the time of emergence of the plan cannot be ignored. Much of the plan preparation preceded PPG 3's definition of a national target of providing 60% of new housing on brownfield sites by 2008. If ever that is going to be attainable locally, it can only, in my view, happen as a consequence of a very fundamental review of plan strategy probably not just in the local plan process but at a higher policy level.
- 4.206 I do not consider more can be expected for the moment. Indeed my view of the need to make further greenfield allocations is based on a judgment that the Council's current assessment of realisable urban capacity is over-optimistic, as I have already indicated. Hence the calculation of 42% brownfield use may not be validated.
- 4.207 In the absence of updated information, I make no detailed comment on the specifics of objection 227/63, proposing the identification of the Clarke Rubicon site at Shepshed as an urban housing allocation. I note simply the Council's response to this further change objection, relying on the Inquiry Inspector's conclusion that the E/8 employment land designation should remain.
- 4.208 The HBF objection highlights another consequence of what has inevitably been an ad hoc response to PPG 3. Properly to secure its expectations, many factors have to play their part, as the objector stresses, including the setting of suitable development control standards, particularly in the key areas of space about dwellings and highway standards.
- 4.209 The Council advise me that these matters are under consideration, and that meanwhile their current guidance on space standards is to be used less prescriptively than hitherto. The important thing is that the right standards should be set, not that the Policy should for now be diluted by discursive reference to factors which may prevent the optimum achievement of its aims. As proposed to be modified, Policy H/2 is to be supported.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M4.38.

5. CHAPTER 5 – EMPLOYMENT AND BUSINESS

Modification No: M5.3 Policy E/1 Planning Criteria for Employment Development

Objection

44/153 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

Objection issues

- Policy fails to reflect PPG 13 guidance that major generators of travel demand should be focused in city, towns and district centres and near to major public transport interchanges.
- Policy fails to reflect PPG 13 guidance that B1 uses should be located on sites, which are, or will be, easily accessible by public transport, walking and cycling.

Assessment

- 5.1 The objection is misconceived, in that the Policy deals, not with the location and distribution of employment land, but with the physical attributes of the site and surroundings which must be present, or provided, to ensure an acceptable standard of development. In this respect, I find the requirements of the Policy, as proposed to be modified, appropriate and complete.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M5.3.

Modifications No: M5.5 Policy E/5 New Employment Areas, and M5.6, M5.7, M5.8, M5.10, M5.12 and M5.13, (and suggested further changes FC5.1 and FC5.2)

Objections

44/154 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

44/155 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

44/156 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

44/157 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

44/158 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

44/160 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

44/161 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

Objection issues

- Policy fails to reflect PPG13 guidance that major generators of travel demand should be focused in city, towns and district centres and near to major public transport interchanges.
- Policy fails to reflect PPG13 guidance that B1 uses should be located on sites, which are, or will be, easily accessible by public transport, walking and cycling.

Assessment

- 5.2 The Council acknowledge that the supporting text to the relevant Policies could usefully be expanded to explain more fully how the allocated employment sites

conform with the general thrust of transport policy set out in PPG 13, and how car usage might be controlled.

- 5.3 My judgement is that the two suggested further changes meet the objection, the one in clarifying that the distribution of sites is such as to offer good public transport accessibility and job opportunities well related to local residential areas, and the other in stressing the commitment to weight the transport modal split away from car use.
- 5.4 With those changes, the proposed modifications are acceptable.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modifications M5.5, M5.6, M5.7, M5.8, M5.10, M5.12 and M5.13, subject to the incorporation of suggested further changes FC5.1 and FC5.2.

Modification: No M5.9 Policy E/A Future Use of Dishley Grange, Derby Road, Loughborough (and suggested further change FC5.3)

Objection

44/165 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

Objection to Suggested Further Change

131/11 Mr E Goodyer

Objection issues

- Policy should not, as worded, require an applicant to demonstrate the acceptability of development proposed, and not to satisfaction of other parties.
- The suggested further change inappropriately removes the obligation to consult the County Director of Museums. His input, and that of others, is important in view of potential archaeological interest of this site.

Assessment

- 5.5 In response to the GOEM objection, I think the Council are right to remove from the Policy the onus wrongly placed on the applicant, and the formal need to consult others before the Council might decide.
- 5.6 I am, however, impressed with Mr Goodyer's appreciation of the history of the area and of the probable relationship of Dishley Grange with neighbouring land. It would be unfortunate if development were to prejudice the opportunity for further research to be carried out, or even preservation of significant physical indicators, if possible.
- 5.7 A suitable addition to the supporting text indicating the Council's commitment in this respect, including the carrying out of appropriate consultations prior to granting any permission, would be justified, and would not offend the principle of the GOEM objection.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M5.9, with the incorporation of suggested further change FC5.3 and an addition to the Policy supporting text as indicated.

Modification No: M5.11 Policy E/5(e) Gaddesby Lane, Rearsby (and suggested further change FC5.4)

Objections

44/159 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

123/323 Mr R C Reynolds

Objection to suggested further change

230/70 Mr J P Deakin, Fisher German

Objection issues

- The GOEM objection is in the same terms as that lodged for other new employment land allocations, dealt with above.
- Plan allocation no longer needed as occupier has relocated, and site is unsuitable for continued industrial use.
- As an important employment source, site's viability should continue to be protected by safeguarding possibility of expansion, contrary to suggested further change.

Assessment

5.8 It is clear that this proposed allocation was to provide for the expansion requirements of an established enterprise, which merited particular attention. That need has now gone, and I agree that the site has deficiencies, by current standards, which make it inappropriate to give policy encouragement to the expansion of a business use here. In particular, accessibility by public transport is limited, and likely to continue to be so.

5.9 For these reasons, I support the suggested further change.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified by the deletion of Policy E/5(e).

Modification No: M5.15 Policy E/6 Control of Employment Use in PEAs and employment land allocations (and suggested further change FC5.5)

Objection

44/162 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

Objection to suggested further change

280/131 Cooper Bussmann

Objection issues

- The GOEM objection is in the same terms as that lodged for new employment land allocations, dealt with above.
- Suggested further change could frustrate future proposals for investment in the employment sector and should not be implemented.

Assessment

- 5.10 The draft Policy is a relatively limited measure indicating, mainly, how amenity and traffic safety considerations will be applied, in assessing applications for B1, B2 and B8 development in existing and allocated business areas. The only other, additional, policy criterion specified is that B8 use may be rejected where this would provide insufficient jobs where they are needed.
- 5.11 The role of the Policy is therefore such that the GOEM objection to the modification could quite properly be rejected, as misplaced, for the same reason as in the case of some other Policies in this Chapter, including Policy E/1, the subject of proposed modification M5.3.
- 5.12 Instead, the Council suggest a further change which in my view has the effect of raising quite new and different policy considerations and which would turn E/6 into a Policy with a very enlarged scope, beyond the original intention.
- 5.13 The new criterion put forward for addition to the Policy plainly has the authority of PPG 13 behind it, but it raises major issues which I think require more systematic attention than can easily be accommodated in the manner suggested.
- 5.14 The difficulty centres on the interaction between the relative freedom conferred by the Use Classes Order for changes of use within Part B, on the one hand, and, on the other, PPG 13's imperative to create more sustainable travel patterns in connection with business and employment uses.
- 5.15 The position adopted in the suggested new supporting text to the Policy, that "offices which are high traffic generating uses should be located in, or close to town or district centres, where there is a range of transport options etc..." is challenging.
- 5.16 That might well be justified, in terms of PPG 13, but it is likely to lead to anomalies, or even a perception of arbitrary application, in the case of existing business areas, dependent on what in this context might be the accident of whether or not permission is required for a proposed change.
- 5.17 If, too, an attempt is to be made to single out B8 uses for suitable location, in relation to the Borough's road pattern, as the text indicates, that might also be laudable, but to be done in any sort of comprehensive way requires appropriate attention at allocations stage, in the planning process.
- 5.18 The Cooper Bussman objection raises legitimate issues which merit due consideration, again as part of a systematic assessment of how needs should best be met, taking into account not simply PPG 13 but all relevant considerations.
- 5.19 My judgement is that the ad hoc formulation of policy likely to be generated by application of the new criterion on a case by case basis would be unsound and inadequate. It would be preferable to address the issue as part of the local plan review in due course.
- 5.20 I am conscious that the proposed E/5 allocations are the product of evaluation of their merits which has already been carried out. However, what is now proposed is the addition of a criterion aimed at achieving a more sophisticated distribution of sites, with particular reference to suitability for different kinds of business use.

5.21 I do not consider it appropriate to work towards that end simply through the operation of the development control process. For now, the proposed modification should suffice, without the suggested further change.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M5.16.

Modification No: M5.17 Policy E/8 Safeguarding Employment Land and Buildings, and Modification No: M5.19 addition of PEA designation to land at Cossington

Objections

9/352 Mr L Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd

44/163 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

44/164 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

Objection issues

- Insufficient regard paid to the need to protect small employment sites, urban capacity study's targeting of older industrial sites would lead to employment generating uses being squeezed out in favour of more remunerative housing development, and creating reverse commuting from town to outskirts to work.
- The GOEM objections are in the same terms as that lodged for new employment land allocations, dealt with above.

Assessment

- 5.22 I find there is some point in Mr Dobson's warning about the potential dangers of what would represent an over-zealous application of PPG 3, seeking to identify and earmark an excess of redevelopment sites in present or past industrial use to avoid alternative greenfield housing allocations. The question is one of balance.
- 5.23 That said, I do not have the material before me to examine the issue in detail, and I have reservations as to whether it would be proper for me to do so, in the context of considering the relevant proposed modification.
- 5.24 E/8 is drafted as a general, safeguarding policy, with particular, limited, circumstances in which an alternative use might be regarded as acceptable. There might be merit in a more sophisticated policy framework regulating what kind of resources should be retained and what might be released, but that would be for the review stage.
- 5.25 I add only that my recommendation in Chapter 4 for additional greenfield housing allocations, partly to remedy what I consider an over-optimistic reliance by the Council on urban housing capacity, helps to meet the objection. Amongst the consequences would be an impact on the enhanced return generated by housing redevelopment over continuing an existing employment generating use.
- 5.26 Similarly, the GOEM objection, both in relation to E/8 and the supplemental reference to the Cossington site, is misplaced. It would be inappropriate to repeat here the philosophy of PPG 13, which can be articulated elsewhere in the Plan, as I have recommended.

5.27 On this basis, the Policy modification can be approved. And the proposed designation is uncontroversial.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modifications M5.17 and M5.19.

6. CHAPTER 6 – RURAL LAND AND ECONOMY

Modification No: M6.19 Policy CT/16 Extensions to Existing Rural Dwellings (and suggested further change FC6.3)

Objection

41/124 Mr C Yeates, W S Yeates Plc

Objection to suggested further change

41/60 Mr C Yeates, W S Yeates Plc

Objection issues

- Modified Policy not well drafted and improperly introduces concept that an extension of more than 50% of original floor area will automatically be unacceptable, without proof of harm. Suggested further change does not meet the objection.

Assessment

6.1 I agree with the objector's criticisms of the drafting of the Policy, and his contention that it should not seek to preclude proper consideration, on the merits, of any development proposal. At the inquiry, he indicated that those concerns would be met by the adoption of the modification, instead of the suggested further change, with a small addition to the supporting text. The statement that -

"A proposal to extend a dwelling by more than 50% of its original floor area is likely to be considered a disproportionate addition and will be resisted accordingly"

might be amended, it was suggested, by the addition of "if so" before "will be resisted accordingly". This revised arrangement was acceptable to the Council.

- 6.2 My judgement, however, is that the Policy the subject of the modification would remain unsatisfactory with this addition to the text. The wording of the relevant paragraph is not the happiest, but the first sentence starts by expressing the intention not to permit "a disproportionate increase" in size. The second sentence explains that "such extensions can be visually very damaging", then, finally, the third sentence indicates, in the terms set out above, that an addition of more than 50% is likely to be considered disproportionate and resisted accordingly. Plainly that indicates that apprehended visual impact is the reason for objecting to disproportionate additions.
- 6.3 If such is the case, it makes entirely superfluous the inclusion of a separate criterion in the Policy itself that there should not be a disproportionate increase in size (criterion (iii)) in addition to another intended to address visual impact (criterion (ii)). That is in circumstances where all the criteria have to be met, on the Policy wording.
- 6.4 A logical inference is that criterion (iii) must be seeking to deal with something else, and the Council's response when I raised the point was to stress the importance of protecting the Borough's countryside areas from a proliferation of development, particularly the specially designated areas.

- 6.5 I read the text's intention to take into account earlier extensions, namely those carried out since 1 July 1948, as a supporting indication of the conclusion I draw in the circumstances that something in the nature of a "blanket ban" is in effect proposed to minimise what might be regarded as unnecessary development in the countryside.
- 6.6 It might be argued that a case exists for applying control in that form, on the basis that incremental development causes harm cumulatively, even if the individual example is inoffensive. At very least, however, even if this were justified, the position should be spelt out clearly in one or more Policies, and in this respect the modified CT/16 falls short of what is required.
- 6.7 In any event, if such a Policy were to be contemplated, there might well be a case for doing no more than singling out particular areas for such special protection, rather than applying it relatively indiscriminately to all the countryside.
- 6.8 My judgement is that the modified CT/16 goes well beyond the original draft version in the control it seeks to exercise, and does so in a poorly articulated and questionable way. PPG 7 does not predicate the exercise of such a degree of control.
- 6.9 I note that in the original there is some differentiation of the position regarding areas of special character, and, on the evidence, that appears to be sufficient. It has not been demonstrated to me that the wording of the draft is in fact inadequate or defective.
- 6.10 In all the circumstances, that is accordingly the version which has my support.

Recommendation - I recommend no modification to the plan.

Modification No: M6.20 Policy CT/18 Safeguarding Agricultural Land (and suggested further change FC6.4)

Objections

40/123 Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands) Ltd

44/181 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

Objection issues

- Policy places too much emphasis on protecting agricultural land.
- Requirement that development should not compromise farm viability and structure might inappropriately preclude an acceptable diversification initiative.

Assessment

- 6.11 As to Miller's general objection, I consider the Policy properly reflects the advice in PPG 7, paras 2.16-2.20, to avoid the loss to development, where possible, of the best and more versatile agricultural land. It would, of course, have to be read as one strand of applicable guidance, when considering a development proposal, and other policies, national and local, might also have to be brought into play.
- 6.12 That would be so even without any express reference to the potential relevance of other factors in the Policy. However, the saving from its restrictive effect for

proposals where “there is an overriding need for the development” clearly introduces the prospect of the balancing exercise which is so often necessary in these cases, between what might be conflicting policy aims. The Policy can operate within that overall framework, and it is, in my judgement, unobjectionable on that score.

- 6.13 GOEM’s concern is a proper one, which I consider is adequately met by the suggested addition of the reference to Policy CT/10. The combined application of both Policies would enable the decision maker to sanction a scheme, otherwise acceptable from a policy standpoint, which nonetheless might alter an individual “farm viability and structure”.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M6.20, with the incorporation of suggested further change FC6.4.

Modification No: M6.21 Policy CT/A Intensive Livestock Units (and suggested further change FC6.5)

Objections

44/170 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

62/220 Ms K Devonport, Countryside Agency

Objection issues

- Criterion (ii) improperly restricts development within 400 m of a dwelling, though the GPDO recognises this possibility, subject to planning application.
- Criterion (vii) introduces an unnecessary and unjustified restriction, related to ownership, which may hinder rural diversification and preclude development causing no harm of the kind contemplated by the Policy.

Assessment

- 6.14 Put simply, I agree with the objectors’ criticisms; the criteria in question are misplaced, for the reasons offered. The Council’s suggestion to delete them recognises the position. Subject to that, I support the Policy.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M6.21, with the incorporation of suggested further change FC6.5.

7. CHAPTER 7 – TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Modification No: M7.11 Policy TR/7 Transport Standards for New Development (and suggested further change FC7.1)

Objection

44/172 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

Objection issue

- Policy fails to reflect PPG 13 guidance that major generators of travel demand should be focused in city, town and district centres and near to major public transport interchanges.

Assessment

7.1 The objection is properly recognised by the Council's suggested further change, which would strengthen the Policy to make it a prerequisite that traffic generating development should be in an urban location, with public transport accessibility. With that change, the Policy can be commended.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M7.11, with the incorporation of suggested further change FC7.1.

Modification No: M7.15 Policy TR/12 Safeguarding Areas for New Railway Stations

Objections

7/6	Mr G Beeby	83/266	Mr and Mrs Brewer
8/5	Mrs C Beeby	85/268	Ms J Gillett
10/7	Mr N L Lee	88/271	Mr T E Clarke
14/27	Ms C Adcock	89/272	Mr G Hickling
15/28	Mr A C Adcock	94/277	Mr J H Coombes
22/80	Mr K C Creasey	95/278	Mrs S M Green
28/92	Miss R J Arnott	103/301	Ms B Brutnall
50/190	Mrs J Warner	104/302	Mr L D Wright
53/193	Mr and Mrs Jones	107/305	CIr R Jenkins
54/194	Mr R E Neal	111/309	Mr J Malpus
55/195	Mr D Everitt	116/316	Mr A Brewster
57/197	Mr S Farrell	121/321	Mr & Mrs Brewer
58/198	Ms S Farrell	122/322	Mrs Allen East Goscote PC
80/263	Mr G Gillett	125/325	Mr J V Munroe
82/265	Mr B Fox	345/403	Mr R Hegarty

Objection issues

- Safeguarded site unsuitable, on various counts, and other options preferable, like more central village location or deletion of scheme.

Assessment

- 7.2 The proposed safeguarding of the Broome Lane site results from acceptance by the Council of Inspector Stephens' recommendation that only one potential location for a new East Goscote station should be firmly identified. Of the two candidate sites which have been canvassed, the Council refer to the central location, near the recreation ground and industrial estate as widely agreed to be more acceptable in planning terms.
- 7.3 The current LTP, at para 5.8.2, lists the provision of a local station at East Goscote as an aspiration in an Action Plan for the period 2006-2011, to be covered by the next LTP. The Council's evidence is that only the much cheaper option at Broome Lane might be feasible, for implementation in the relevant timescale.
- 7.4 I agree with those objectors who express the view that if all that can be achieved is a station at Broome Lane, then it would be better not to spend the money at all.
- 7.5 It is a laudable aim to encourage commuters from the area to take a train into Leicester from a local station, rather than drive there. A conveniently located station, accessible from much of the village on foot or by cycle, would be a considerable incentive towards this transport modal shift.
- 7.6 Broome Lane, however, in its relatively isolated location right at an extremity of the village and outside the well planned circulation system within the settlement core, would not be so attractive.
- 7.7 It would entail, at very least, a greater dependence on car use for the first stage of the journey, getting from home to the station, for much of the target market, and the risk then of the view being taken that a journey started by car might just as well be followed through to its conclusion in the same way.
- 7.8 In itself, parking at the proposed location would be a potential problem. Either provision would be made, to the possible detriment of countryside restraint policy, or not, in which case the fears of nearby residents as to possible congestion and harm to amenity might well be realised.
- 7.9 As to neighbour amenity, the close proximity of the station would expose the affected residents to the consequences of increased activity which the station would generate. Moving a platform or platforms to the opposite side of Broome Lane would not, in my judgement, ameliorate the position much.
- 7.10 A central location in the village, as previously contemplated, would have none of these disadvantages. I acknowledge that cost must be a consideration, but there seems to me no urgency which might justify elevating that out of proportion, as a relevant factor.
- 7.11 There is really no certainty that the scheme will qualify for funding by inclusion in the next LTP round. It is part of a more major enterprise for a new suburban rail service serving Leicester and Melton, and intermediate stations. All that can be said with accuracy is that the scheme is not within the current LTP. Whether it gets into the next is another matter.
- 7.12 In all those circumstances, I think it would be misleading, potentially harmful, and inappropriate to identify the Broome Lane site, as proposed. Whether there is a feasible alternative candidate, likely to be required within a realistic timescale,

was not a matter which was canvassed in any detail before me. It must therefore remain a matter for the Council to decide whether any other plan reservation would be justified, at this stage.

Recommendation - I make no recommendation, save that the Proposals Map be not modified in accordance with plan M7.15.

Modification No: M7.32 Policy TR/21 Parking Provision in New Development (and suggested further change FC7.2)

Objections

44/174 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

44/182 Mr C Packman, Government Office for the East Midlands

Objections to Suggested Further Change 7.2

23/128 Mrs B Burton, Sileby Parish Council

169/1 Mr R J Clay, Cyclists Touring Club

176/10 Mr P Connolly, Leicester City Council

Objection issues

- Parking standards, which were not deposited, not consistent with PPG 13.
- Detailed criticisms of standards in further change objections, and preference expressed to retain them as supplementary guidance, pending county-wide review.

Assessment

- 7.13 The key issue is what status should be given in the plan to the county highway authority's parking standards, to signal their relevance as a development control tool in Charnwood. The difficulty arises that, as used to be conventional, they specify minimum provision to be made in various development categories, and this approach has of course become outdated by the advice of PPG 13. A review is under way, and in time will no doubt inform Charnwood's planning decisions.
- 7.14 How to formalise the present position was canvassed by Inspector Stephens and the modification puts forward Policy TR/21 in the form recommended by him, to meet the situation. I agree that what he described as a compromise framework - to set out the present standards in an Appendix to the plan, making it clear in TR/21 that they represent maximum levels as a starting point for assessment - is the happiest solution.
- 7.15 The GOEM objection appears not to take full account of the basis of the proposed Policy framework, but the drafting alterations of the suggested change resolve any residual doubt about the altered role proposed for the county parking standards, in Charnwood, and as to the significance of PPG 13. They make a suitable addition to the Policy.
- 7.16 Similarly, the Leicester City objection proposes a status for the parking standards - as supplementary guidance - which was expressly rejected by my colleague Inspector, on the basis that they are of such importance in development control as to merit inclusion in the plan. In present circumstances, and on the clearly indicated altered basis on which they will operate, pending the outcome of the

county review, I agree. In that light, the suggested inconsistencies with current practice in Leicester are not of significance.

- 7.17 The detailed points made by Sibley PC and the CTC are better considered in the context of the review of standards, because of the interim nature of the proposed arrangement, and so it would be inappropriate for me to comment any further on them.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M7.32, with the incorporation of suggested further change FC7.2.

8. CHAPTER 8 - [no contents]

- 8.1 I take the opportunity to introduce this heading, purely to maintain conformity between my report and the Chapters of the draft plan. I was not asked to consider any objections to relevant modifications.
-

9. CHAPTER 9 – RECREATION AND TOURISM

Modification No: M4.32 Policy RT/B Recreation Land, Lanes Close, Sileby

Objections

23/86 Cllr R Brown, Sileby Parish Council
61/205 Mr T Macken

Objection issues

- No immediate connection to the only acceptable site access, from Lanes Close. Policy gives tacit agreement to Seagrave Road residential development.

Assessment

- 9.1 The Policy the subject of the proposed modification is linked to the Seagrave Road candidate development site in that the intention has been that the residential developer would provide also the recreational facilities on the adjoining land.
- 9.2 The preference of the county highway authority is that vehicular access should be taken from Lanes Close, across intervening land between the head of that cul-de-sac and the recreation site.
- 9.3 I have recommended elsewhere that I do not favour the residential allocation of the site in question, either on a firm or contingent basis. Clearly, in those circumstances, M4.32's recreational allocation could not be taken as giving any support for the residential development of the adjoining land.
- 9.4 Despite, however, what might have been the factor prompting the allocation, the Council still consider it can be justified, as a freestanding element, on the ground of recreational need in the village, irrespective of the fact that the previously planned new residential development might not be proceeding.
- 9.5 Whether the allocation could, practically, be implemented without the housing scheme going ahead is another matter; it is suggested there might be insuperable ownership difficulties. However, the Council's preference is for the land to be designated, and I agree that there is a case for doing so, even granted the uncertainties as to feasibility of implementation of what is proposed.
- 9.6 I have no reason to dissent from Inspector Stephens, who accepted [report para 4.340] that to do so would address Sileby's longstanding deficiency of recreational provision. And access by way of Lanes Close, if it could be realised, would be satisfactory, in my judgement, in traffic terms. I shall recommend accordingly.

Recommendation - I recommend that the plan be modified in accordance with proposed modification M4.32.

Modification No: M9.6 Policy RT/7 Safeguarding Existing Recreation Land and Buildings (and suggested further change FC9.2)

Objection

102/300 Mr M P Tedd

Objection issue

- Safeguarding appropriate since site in active use as part of recreation ground and upgraded facilities recently provided.

Assessment

- 9.7 The proposed modification, to remove the site from the safeguarded area, was intended to facilitate an alternative use, in circumstances which had the support of Inspector Stephens.
- 9.8 That scheme is not to proceed, and, as the objector points out, the land is now incorporated into the village recreation ground, providing tennis courts and play facilities. There is no reason to remove the designation, and the suggested further change would appropriately maintain it.

Recommendation - I recommend no modification to the plan.

THIS PAGE IS BLANK

APPENDIX A - SWIFTS CLOSE OBJECTIONS

Objections	203/38	Mrs R Keating
9/350 Mr L A Dobson Shire Properties Ltd	204/39	Mr R Keating
21/97 Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd	205/40	S M Howitt
63/227 Mr M Smallman Del Rosa Developments Ltd	206/41	R G Howitt
Objections to Suggested Further Change 4.6	207/42	Mr R Davis
13/121 Mrs J Noon CPRE – Charnwood District	208/43	K Humphrey
21/154 Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd	209/44	Mrs M A Gorse
169/153 L A Dobson	210/45	Mrs G Yeldham
170/2 Mr W V Gorse	211/46	Mrs S Parslow
171/3 M H Lingard	212/47	Miss R M James
172/4 J D Lingard	213/48	S Beaumont
173/5 Mr Scott	214/49	T P Beaumont
174/8 Executors of Mr T Hubbard	215/50	Ms H Dale
175/9 Miss H D Shields and P Williams	216/51	Mr I Perry
178/13 Mr Barton	217/52	Ms C Forman
179/14 Ms R Barney	218/53	W G Forman
180/15 Mr S Barney	219/54	Ms G Austin-Jones
181/16 Mr R Pitman	220/55	Mr D Jones
182/17 Mrs S Pitman	221/56	Mrs C Charley
183/18 Ms G M Sheppard	222/57	Mr J R Charley
184/19 B S Sheppard	223/58	Miss C A Hallam
185/20 J R Clarke	224/59	Mrs F Hallam
186/21 Mr A Sutton	225/61	Ms P Wootton
187/22 Ms J Kirk	226/62	Mr W Wootton
188/23 Mr R Kirk	228/64	Ms J Ling
189/24 Mr D Sewell	229/66	D P Ryan
190/25 Mrs A Sutton	230/69	Mr J P Deakin Fisher German
191/26 Mr & Mrs Chesterton	231/71	Ms J Gant
192/27 Mr P Chesterton	232/72	Ms M Folwell
193/28 Miss L & Miss F A Simpson	233/73	Mr L Gant
194/29 Mr D Wild	234/74	Ms A Ellerton
195/30 Ms A Wild	235/75	Mr M Ellerton
196/31 Mr P Holton	236/76	Ms A Smith
197/32 Mr L A James	237/77	Mr B Smith
198/33 Mr K W James	238/78	Ms K M Lewitt
199/34 Mr D E Yeldham	239/79	Mrs S Jalland
200/35 Mrs S J Bate	240/80	Mr I Jalland
201/36 Mr T Bate	241/81	D M Rowley
202/37 Mrs J Barlow	242/82	J V Skirrow
	243/83	Mrs B M Skirrow
	244/84	Dr K Parslow
	245/85	M E Rowley
	246/86	Mr J Hill
	247/87	Ms M Hill
	248/88	K Barratt

249/89	S Barratt	298/149	J Hammond
250/90	F Margerison	299/150	J Collington
251/91	R & A Holmes	300/151	Mrs V Westcott
252/92	Ms E Smith	301/152	Wymeswold Parish Council
253/93	Mr M A Willett	302/157	Mr J G Harrison
254/94	Ms A Price	303/158	Ms B S Harrison
255/95	Mr J Rawling	304/159	Mrs J Applebee
256/96	Mrs K W King	305/160	Ms G Rogerson
257/97	Ms P Baker	306/161	Mr D Wilcock
258/98	Mr R Baker	307/162	Ms R Wilcock
259/99	C J Keeling	308/163	Miss R Lamb
260/100	Ms C Robinson	309/164	Mrs R E Tattersall
261/101	Mr M Robinson	310/165	Mr M Tattersall
262/102	Mr D Cook	311/166	A S Lamb
263/103	Mrs A Cook	312/167	Mrs B Lamb
264/104	Mr A Jones	313/168	M J Etridge
265/105	Ms K Jones	314/169	Mrs S Graham
266/106	Ms G M Cartwright	315/170	Mrs K Nightingale
267/107	Ms M Roberts	316/171	Mr C T C Nightingale
268/108	Mr M Roberts	317/172	Ms M Le Fevre-Smith
269/109	Ms J Rogerson	318/173	Mr A Le Fevre- Smith.
270/110	Mr D Rogerson		Objections to Amendment to Suggested Further Change 4.6a
271/111	Ms T Royston	9/153	Shire Properties Ltd
272/112	Mr J Hibbett	13/121	Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District
273/113	Ms R Hibbett	21/154	Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd
274/114	Mr D Cartwright	170/2	Mr W V Gorse
275/115	Mr C Michaelides	171/3	M H Lingard
276/116	Mrs H Michaelides	172/4	J D Lingard
277/117	Dr E A Wallace	175/9	Miss H D Shields and Miss O Williams
278/118	Ms S Crinage	178/13	P Barton
279/119	P R Hutchinson	179/14	R Barney
281/132	R Evans	185/20	J R Clarke
282/133	P Evans	186/21	Mr A Sutton
283/134	Mr S Frankland	187/22	Mrs J Kirk
284/135	Mr G Rogerson	188/23	Mr R Kirk
285/136	Ms L Willatts	189/24	D Sewell
286/137	Mr M Willatts	190/25	Mrs A Sutton
287/138	Mrs P Freshfield	191/26	Mr J & Mrs B Chesterton
288/139	R Freshfield	193/28	Miss J L & Miss F A Simpson
289/140	Ms M Dawkins	194/29	A Wild
290/141	Mr S Dawkins	196/31	Mr P Holton
291/142	Mrs M Keogh	197/32	L J James
292/143	Mr J A Keogh	198/33	K W James
293/144	Mr P Davies		
294/145	Mrs V Hammond		
295/146	Mr T Partrick		
296/147	Ms J Davies		
297/148	C Collington		

199/34	Mr D E Yeldham	281/132	R Evans
200/35	Mrs S J Bate	282/133	P Evans
201/36	Mr T Bate	287/138	Ms P Freshfield
203/38	Mrs R W Keating	288/139	Mr R Freshfield
204/39	Mr R Keating	294/145	Mrs V M Hammond
205/40	S M Howitt	296/147	Ms J Davies
206/41	R G Howitt	300/151	Mrs V Westcott
209/44	Mrs M Gorse	301/152	Mrs P Hubbard Wymeswold Parish Council
210/45	Mrs G Yeldham	302/157	Mr J G Harrison
211/46	Ms S Parslow	303/158	Mrs B S Harrison
214/49	T P Beaumont	309/169	R E Tattersall
219/54	Ms G Austin-Jones	313/168	M J Etridge
220/55	Mr D Jones	314/169	Mrs S Graham
221/56	C Charley	319/174	R Bardon
222/57	Mr J Charley	320/175	Mrs W Hallam
223/58	Miss C A Hallam	321/176	Mr J E Hammond
224/59	Mrs F Hallam	322/177	Mrs J Thomas
232/72	Ms M Folwell	323/178	Ms E Phillips
234/74	Ms A Ellerton	324/179	Mr S Cowper
235/75	Mr M Ellerton	325/180	D E Keene
236/76	Mrs A Smith	326/181	Mrs S Fossey
241/81	Mr D M Rowley	327/182	Mr M Fossey
242/82	J V Skirrow	328/183	Ms H Straw
243/83	Ms B M Skirrow	329/184	Mr S Smith
244/84	Dr K Parslow	330/185	R M Wright
245/85	Mrs M E Rowley	331/186	R Cammack
246/86	Mr J T Hill	332/187	S Cammack
247/87	Ms M Hill	333/188	N F and S Bryan-Peach
248/88	K Barratt	334/189	Mr G Black
249/89	Ms S Barratt	335/190	Miss S Kirk
256/96	Mrs K W King	336/191	Mr P Davies
257/97	Ms P Baker	337/192	C J Kirk
260/100	Mr Robinson	338/193	Mrs M E Leivers
261/101	Mrs Robinson	339/194	Mrs M C Giblett
264/104	K J Jones	340/195	Mrs A Dorrington
265/105	Mr M A Jones	341/196	Mr R J Dorrington
267/107	Ms M Roberts	342/197	G J Brown
268/108	Mr M Roberts	343/198	G Aitchison
277/117	Dr E Wallace	344/199	Mr & Mrs Middleditch
278/118	Mrs S Crinage		
279/119	Mr P Hutchinson		

APPENDIX B - INQUIRY PROGRAMME

DAY 1 Tues 9 April 2002 STRATEGY	Opening of Inquiry by Inspector, Mr J.M. Turner Council Brief Opening Statement M6.19: CT/16, Extension to Existing Rural Dwellings 41/124 – Gouldens for Mr C. Yeates	Cont.
DAY 2 Wed 10 April 2002 STRATEGY	Inspector's Recommendation 2.183: ST/2, Armston Road, Quorn 120/320 – Mr J. Deakin, Fisher German for Mr D.K. Johar and Company	Cont.
DAY 3 Thurs 11 April 2002	Housing Round Table	Cont.
DAY 4 Mon 15 April 2002 ENVIRONMENT HOUSING SITE	Inspector's Recommendation 4.1205: H/75, Land at Little Haw Farm, Tickow Lane, Shepshed 78/260 – Mr J. Coleman for William Davis Ltd	Cont.
DAY 5 Tues 16 April 2002 HOUSING SITES	Inspector's Recommendation 4.1331: H/89, Barkby Lane/Barkby Thorpe Lane, Syston 16/29, 16/30, 16/32 – Mr R. Gough, Gough Planning Services for Geo Wimpey Strat Ltd	
DAY 6 Wed 17 April 2002 HOUSING SITES	M4.16: H/1(b), Cotes Road/Willow Road, Barrow on Soar 100/293, 100/296 – Mr A. Bateman, RPS Chapman Warren for David Wilson Estates 40/120, 40/121 – Mr A. Bateman, RPS Chapman Warren for Miller Homes	M4.15: H/1(a), North of Bradgate Road, Anstey 100/293, 100/294 - Mr A. Bateman, RPS Chapman Warren for David Wilson Estates
DAY 7 Thurs 18 April 2002 HOUSING SITE	M4.31: H/1(o), Seagrave Road, Sileby 34/106, 34/107 – Mr A. Jones, Stoneleigh Planning Partnership for Crest	Cont.
DAY 8 Mon 22 April 2002 HOUSING SITE	M4.13: H/1, New Housing Allocations, Greenfield Sites 46/185 - Mr R. Dunnett, Stoneleigh Planning Partnership for Bryant Homes	Cont.
DAY 9 Tues 23 April 2002 HOUSING SITES	M4.18: H/1(d), Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds 77/252 - Ms J. Gardner, Smith Stuart Reynolds for Alfred McAlpine Devts Limited	M4.21: H/1(g), Hazel Road and Manor Road, Loughborough 76/246 – Mr P. Conneally for Local Residents
DAY 10 Wed 24 April 2002 TRANSPORT RURAL LAND AND ECONOMY	M7.15: TR/12, Safeguarding Areas for New Railway Stations 122/322 –Mr J. Malpus for East Goscote PC 107/305 – Cllr R. Jenkins M4.13: H/1, New Housing Allocations, Greenfields Sites 101/299 – Mr T. Greatorex for Syston TC	Cont.
DAY 11 Thurs 25 April 2002 HOUSING SITES	Inspector's Recommendation 4.1345: H/92, Wysall Lane, Wymeswold 9/351 – Shire Properties Limited M4.36: H/1(s), Swifts Close, Wymeswold 9/350 – Shire Properties Limited FC4.06,FC4.06a: ST/2, Limits to Development, Swifts Close, Wymeswold 298/149 – Mr J Hammond 301/152 – Councillor Chris Keeling for Wymeswold Parish Council	Cont.

APPENDIX C - APPEARANCES

Mr Roger Giles of Counsel, 5 Fountain Court, Birmingham appeared for the Council. His witnesses were:-

Mr P Wilkinson BA MCD MA MRTPI FRTPI, Managing Director, Landmark Planning Ltd
Mr Guy Longley BSc DipTP DipUD MRTPI, Principal Local Plans Officer
Mr Philip Delaney BA DipURP MRTPI, Senior Local Plans Officer
Miss Rachel Bland BA(Hons) DipTP, Planning Assistant
Mr Anthony Herrington BSc MCD MRTPI, Transport Policy Co-ordinator

Appearances for objectors were as follows:

ISSUE - M6.19: CT/16 - EXTENSION TO EXISTING RURAL DWELLINGS
41/124 – GOULDENS FOR MR C. YEATES
FOR MR C YEATES
Mr David Cooper LLB(Hons) Solicitor, Gouldens, 10 Old Bailey, London

ISSUE - INSPECTORS' RECOMENDATION 2.183: ST/2 – ARMSTON ROAD, QUORN
120/320 – FISHER GERMAN FOR MR D.K. JOHAR AND COMPANY
FOR MR JOHAR AND COMPANY
Mr John Deakin, Fisher German, The Grange, 80 Tamworth Road, Ashby
de la Zouch, Leicestershire
Legal Representative:
Mr Clive Newberry QC, Chambers of Robin Purchas QC, 2 Harcourt
Buildings, Temple, London

ISSUE - HOUSING GENERAL SESSION
FOR COATS PLC
Mr Jason Tait BA(Hons) MRTPI, Shoosmiths Solicitors, Lock House,
Castle Meadow Road, Nottingham
FOR WIMPEY HOMES (EAST MIDLANDS) LTD
Ms Felicity Jane Gardner BA(Hons) MRTPI, Smith Stuart Reynolds,
Cottage Farm, Sywell, Northampton
FOR CPRE
Mr Michael Brooks BSc CENG DipTP, Community & Regional Planning
Services, 76 High Street, Clophill, Bedford
FOR WILLIAM DAVIS LTD
Mr John Coleman DipTP MRTPI, Forest Field, Forest Road, Loughborough
FOR BRYANT HOMES LTD
Mr Richard Dunnett BA(Hons) MRTPI, Stoneleigh Planning Partnership,
Kingsley House, 63 Holly Walk, Leamington Spa
FOR CREST NICHOLSON RESIDENTIAL (MIDLANDS) LTD
Mr Alasdair Jones BA MRTPI, Stoneleigh Planning Partnership, Kingsley
House, 63 Holly Walk, Leamington Spa
FOR SYSTON TOWN COUNCIL
Councillor A. Greatorex
FOR WIMPEY HOMES HOLDINGS
Mr Anthony Asbury BA MRTPI, 34 Carlton Business Centre, Carlton,
Nottingham
FOR HOUSEBUILDERS' FEDERATION
Mr James McConnell BA MSc MRTPI, The House Builders' Federation,
56-64 Leonard Street, London
FOR HALLAM LAND MANAGEMENT LTD
Mr Richard Walters, Hallam Land Management Ltd, 4 St Andrews House,
Vernon Street, Derby
FOR MILLER HOMES AND DAVID WILSON ESTATES
Mr A Bateman BA (Hons) TP MRICS MRTPI MIMgt, RPS, Milford
House, 260 Lichfield Road, Sutton Coldfield

- ISSUE - INSPECTOR'S RECOMENDATION 4.1205: H/75 – LAND AT LITTLE HAW FARM, TICKOW LANE, SHEPSHED
78/260 – WILLIAM DAVIS LIMITED
FOR WILLIAM DAVIS
Legal Representative:
Mr J. Cahill, 5 Fountain Court Chambers, Birmingham
He called:
Mr J. Coleman DipTP MRTPI, William Davis Ltd, Forest Field, Forest Road, Loughborough
- ISSUE - INSPECTOR'S RECOMENDATION 4.1331: H/89 - BARKBY LANE/BARKBY THORPE LANE, SYSTON
16/29, 16/30, 16/32 – GOUGH PLANNING SERVICES FOR GEORGE WIMPEY STRATEGIC LAND
FOR GEORGE WIMPEY STRATEGIC LAND
Mr Richard Gough Dip TP MRTPI, Gough Planning Services, Suite 2 Trevithick House, Stafford Park 4, Telford
- ISSUES - M4.16: H/1(B) - COTES ROAD/WILLOW ROAD, BARROW ON SOAR
100/296 – RPS CHAPMAN WARREN FOR DAVID WILSON ESTATES
40/119, 40/120, 40/121 –RPS CHAPMAN WARREN FOR MILLER HOMES
M4.15: H/1(A) - NORTH OF BRADGATE ROAD, ANSTEY
100/294 - RPS CHAPMAN WARREN FOR DAVID WILSON ESTATES
FOR MILLER HOMES AND DAVID WILSON ESTATES
Legal Representative:
Mr J Edmond BA (Hons) Legal Associate of the RTPI Member of the Law Society Planning Panel, Marron Solicitors, 1 Meridian South, Meridian Business Park, Leicester
He called:
Mr A Bateman BA (Hons) TP MRICS MRTPI MIMgt, RPS, Milford House, 260 Lichfield Road, Sutton Coldfield
- ISSUE - M4.31: H/1(O) - SEAGRAVE ROAD, SILEBY
34/101, 34/103, 34/105, 34/106, 34/107 – STONELEIGH PLANNING PARTNERSHIP FOR CREST RESIDENTIAL (MIDLANDS) LIMITED
FOR CREST RESIDENTIAL (MIDLANDS) LIMITED
Legal Representative:
Mr Ian Dove, Counsel
He called:
Mr Alasdair Jones BA MRTPI, Stoneleigh Planning Partnership, Kingsley House, 63 Holly Walk, Leamington Spa
- ISSUE - M4.13: H/1 - NEW HOUSING ALLOCATIONS, GREENFIELD SITES
46/185 - STONELEIGH PLANNING PARTNERSHIP FOR BRYANT HOMES
FOR BRYANT HOMES
Legal Representative:
Ms Morag Thomson, Solicitor, Marrons Solicitors, 1 Meridian South, Meridian Business Park, Leicester
She called:
Mr Richard Dunnett BA(Hons) MRTPI, Stoneleigh Planning Partnership, Kingsley House, 63 Holly Walk, Leamington Spa
- ISSUE - M4.18: H/1(D) - BROOK STREET, BURTON ON THE WOLDS
77/252 - SMITH STUART REYNOLDS FOR WIMPEY HOMES EAST MIDLANDS LTD (FORMERLY ALFRED McALPINE DEVELOPMENTS LTD)
FOR WIMPEY HOMES EAST MIDLANDS LTD
Legal Representative:
Mr Peter Goatley, Barrister at Law, 5 Fountain Court, Birmingham
He called:
Ms Felicity Jane Gardner BA(Hons) MRTPI, Smith Stuart Reynolds, Cottage Farm, Sywell, Northampton

- ISSUE - M4.21: H/1(g), HAZEL ROAD AND MANOR ROAD, LOUGHBOROUGH
FOR LOCAL RESIDENTS
Mr P.T. Conneally
- ISSUE - M7.15: TR/12 - SAFEGUARDING AREAS FOR NEW RAILWAY STATIONS
122/322 - EAST GOSCOTE PARISH COUNCIL
107/305 – COUNCILLOR R. JENKINS
FOR EAST GOSCOTE PARISH COUNCIL
Mr John Malpus
COUNCILLOR R. JENKINS
- ISSUE - M4.13: H/1 - NEW HOUSING ALLOCATIONS, GREENFIELDS SITES
101/299 –SYSTON TOWN COUNCIL
FOR SYSTON TOWN COUNCIL
Councillor A. Greatorex
- ISSUE - INSPECTOR'S RECOMENDATION 4.1345: H/92 - WYSALL LANE,
WYMESWOLD
9/351 – SHIRE PROPERTIES LIMITED
M4.36: H/1(S) - SWIFTS CLOSE, WYMESWOLD
9/350 – SHIRE PROPERTIES LIMITED
298/149 – MR J. HAMMOND
301/152 – WYMESWOLD PARISH COUNCIL
FOR SHIRE PROPERTIES
Legal Representative:
Mr Christopher Cockrane QC
He called:
Mr Anthony Aspbury BA MRTPI, 34 Carlton Business Centre, Carlton,
Nottingham
MR J. HAMMOND
FOR WYMESWOLD PARISH COUNCIL
Councillor Chris Keeling

APPENDIX D - DOCUMENTS

Council core documents

CD/1	Technical Report 1: Areas of particularly Attractive Countryside
CD/2	Technical Report 2: Local Separation Policy
CD/3	Technical Report 3: Assessment of Green Wedges
CD/4	Technical Report 4/4A: Assessment of Potential Development Sites
CD/5	Technical Report 5: Windfall Housing Sites
CD/6	Technical Report 6: Assessment of the Landscape of the Valley of the River Soar
CD/7	Sustainability and the Impact of Major Development Options Sept 1995 (including plan of proposed development site)
CD/8	Deposit Draft Borough of Charnwood Local Plan, Written Statement (June 1996)
CD/9	Supplementary Planning Guidance (June 1996)
CD/10	Response to the Housing Round Table
CD/11	Borough of Charnwood Local Plan: Inspector's Report, July 2000 (Vols 1-3 & Appendices)
CD/12	Report to Cabinet- Borough of Charnwood Local Plan: Consideration of Inspector's Report and Proposed Modifications, 8 th March 2001 (Minute 437) Report to Cabinet- Borough of Charnwood Local Plan: Consideration of Inspector's Report and Proposed Modifications 29 th March 2001 (Minute 466) Minutes of Council Meeting, 10 th April 2001 (Minute 144)
CD/13	Environmental Appraisal of Proposed Modifications, Feb 2001
CD/14	Statement of Decisions and Reasons on Inspector's Report and Proposed Modifications, ay 2001 Technical Report 7 Residential Land Availability March 2000 Technical Report 8 Assessment of Urban Capacity Technical Report 9 Analysis of Production on Large Sites
CD/15	Report to Cabinet: Borough of Charnwood Local Plan, Consideration of Representations on Proposed Modifications, 18 th October 2001 (Minute 162)
CD/16	Statement of Suggested Further Changes, Response to Representations on Proposed Modifications, November 2001
CD/17	Housing Land Monitoring Report April 2000-March 2001, 18 th October 2001 (Minute 178)
CD/18	Housing Land Monitoring Report April 2001-September 2001 6 th December 2001 (Minute 225)
CD/19	Report to Cabinet: Borough of Charnwood Local Plan, Consideration of Representations on Suggested Further Changes, 14th February 2002
CD/20	Proposed Amendment to Suggested Further Change FC4.6: Limits to Development, Wymeswold
CD/21	Environmental Appraisal of Deposit Version of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan, August 1997, David Tyldesley and Associates

CD/22	<i>[BLANK]</i>
CD/23	Minute of Planning Committee, 14 th August 1997
CD/24	Report to Planning Committee, 5 th June 1997, Consideration of Objections and Representations Received in Response to Deposit Draft Plan- Strategy, Population and Housing
TOPIC PAPERS	
TP/1	Housing Land, including update of Housing Land Supply to November 2001
TP/2	Housing Round Table Position Statement
COUNTY COUNCIL DOCUMENTS	
LCC/1	Leicestershire Structure Plan 1991-2006 The Written Statement
LCC/2	Leicestershire Structure Plan 1991-2006 Explanatory Memorandum

Objectors' proofs of evidence:

REF	OBJECTOR(S)	MODIFICATION/POLICY
P/128/329/1 P/128/329/2	Coats plc	M4.3 – H/A: New Housing Allocations, Previously Developed Sites
P/13/47,13/48,13/49, 13/57/1	CPRE	M4.3 – H/A: New Housing Allocations, Previously Developed Sites M4.13 – H/1: New Housing Allocations, Greenfield Sites M4.14 – H/B: Supplementary Housing Allocations M4.38 – H/2: Density
P/77/250,77/251,77/252/1	Wimpey Homes plc	M4.3 – H/A: New Housing Allocations, Previously Developed Sites M4.13 – H/1: New Housing Allocations, Greenfield Sites M4.18 – H/1(d): Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds
P/78/260/1 P/78/260/2	William Davis Ltd	Inspector's Recommendation 4.1205 - H/75: Land at Little Haw Farm, Tickow Lane, Shepshed
P/120/320/1 P/120/320/2	Mr & Mrs D.K. Johar	Inspector's Recommendation 2.183 – ST/2: Armston Road, Quorn Comments on Evidence Produced by John Herrington Associates on Behalf of Quorn Residents
P/101/299/1	Syston Town Council	M4.13 – H/1: New Housing Allocations, Greenfield Sites
P/16/29,16/30,16/32/1	George Wimpey Strategic Land	Inspector's Recommendation 4.1331 – H/89: Barkby Lane/Barkby Thorpe Lane, Syston
P/122/322/1	East Goscote Parish Council	M7.15 – TR/12: Safeguarding Areas for New Railway Stations
P/9/350,9/351/1	Shire Properties Limited	Inspector's Recommendation 4.1345 – H/92: Wysall Lane, Wymeswold M4.36 – H/1(s): Swifts Close, Wymeswold FC4.6 – Limits to Development Adjoining Swifts Close and Brook Street, Wymeswold

CHARNWOOD LP PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS - INSPECTOR'S REPORT - APPENDICES

REF	OBJECTOR(S)	MODIFICATION/POLICY
P/34/106,34/107/1 P/34/106,34/107/2	Crest Residential (Midlands) Limited	M4.31 – H/1(o): Seagrave Road, Sileby
P46/185/1	Bryant Homes Limited	M4.13 – H/1: New Hsg Greenfield Sites
P100/293,100/294/1	David Wilson Estates Limited	M4.15 – H/1(a): North of Bradgate Road, Anstey
P/100/293,100/296,40/120,40/121/1	David Wilson Estates Limited and Miller Homes (East Midlands) Ltd	M4.16 – H/1(b): Cotes Road/Willow Road, Barrow on Soar
P/2/2,6/4,13/53,20/91, 26/89,27/90,30/94,38/112,64/22 8,65/230,66/231, 67/232,68/233,73/238, 76/246,87/270,20/79, 64/229,76/247/1	Mr P.T. Conneally on behalf of Local Residents	M4.21 – H/1(g): South of Hazel Road and Manor Road, Loughborough (Extension at Park Grange Farm)

Council's proofs of evidence:

REF	OBJECTOR(S)	MODIFICATION/POLICY
P/CBC/120/320/1	Mr D K Johar & Company	Inspector's Recommendation 2.183 - ST/2: Land at Armston Road, Quorn
P/CBC/128/329/1	Coats plc	M4.3 – H/A: Land at Factory Street, Shepshed
P/CBC/34/106,34/107, 34/123/1	Crest Nicholson Residential (Midlands) Limited	M4.14,M4.31,FC4.5 – H/B, H/1(o): Supplementary Site Allocation, Land at Seagrave Road, Sileby
P/CBC/100/293,100/294, 40/120,40/121/1	David Wilson Estates & Miller Homes	M4.14 – H/B: Supplementary Site Allocation, Cotes Road/Willow Road, Barrow upon Soar
P/CBC/46/185/1	Bryant Homes Limited	M4.13 – Land at Pear Tree Lane, Loughborough
P/CBC/77/250,77/95,77/251/1	Wimpey Homes (East Midlands) Limited	M4.3,M4.13,M4.18 – H/1(d): Land at Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds
P/CBC/78/260/1	William Davis Limited	Inspector's Recommendation 4.1205 - H/75: Land at Little Haw Farm, Tickow Lane, Shepshed
P/CBC/101/299/1	Syston Town Council	M4.13 – H/1(q): Land at Barkby Road, Syston
P/CBC/100/293,100/294/1	David Wilson Estates	M4.15 – H/1(a): Land at Bradgate Road, Anstey
P/CBC/7/6,8/5,10/7,14/27, 15/28,22/80,28/92,50/190, 53/193,54/194,55/195, 57/197,58/198,80/263, 82/265,83/266,85/268, 88/271,89/272,94/277, 95/278,103/301,104/302, 107/305,111/309,116/316, 121/321,122/322,125/325/1	Local Residents; East Goscote Parish Council	M7.15 – TR/12: Safeguarding Areas for New Railway Stations (East Goscote)
P/CBC/2/2,6/4,13/53,20/91, 26/89,27/90,30/94,38/112, 64/228,65/230,66/231, 67/232,68/233,73/238, 76/246,87/270,20/79,64/229, 76/247/1 P/CBC/2/2,6/4,13/53,20/91, 26/89,27/90,30/94,38/112, 64/228,65/230,66/231, 67/232,68/233,73/238, 76/246,87/270,20/79,64/229, 76/247/2	Mr Conneally and Various Local Residents; CPRE	M4.21,M4.13 – H/1(g): Land at Park Grange Farm, Loughborough
P/CBC/16/29-33/1	George Wimpey Strategic Land	Inspector's Recommendation - H/89: Land at Barkby Lane/Barkby Thorpe Lane, Syston
P/CBC/9/351/1	Shire Properties Limited	Inspector's Recommendation 4.1354: Land at Wysall Lane, Wymeswold
P/CBC/9/350/1	Shire Properties Limited	M4.36,FC4.6,FC4.6A – H/1(s): Land at Swifts Close, Wymeswold

Objectors' written representations submissions:

REF	OBJECTOR	MODIFICATION/POLICY
WR/67/232/1	Mr A. Potts	M4.21 – H/1(g): South of Hazel Road and Manor Road, Loughborough (Extension at Park Grange Farm)
WR/119/319	Mr A.J.P. Pochin	M4.25 – H/1(i): Land to the South of the A607 and North of Gaddesby Lane, Rearsby
WR/131/11/1	Mr E. Goodyer	FC5.3 – Future Use of Dishley Grange Farmstead

Council's written representations responses:

REF	OBJECTOR(S)	MODIFICATION/POLICY
WR/CBC/119/319	Mr A.J.P. Pochin	M4.25 – H/1(i): Land to the South of the A607 and North of Gaddesby Lane, Rearsby
WR/CBC/140/116,100/289/1	Miller Homes(East Midlands) Ltd and David Wilson Estates	M3.58 – EV/E: Percent for Art
WR/CBC/102/300/1	Mr M P Tedd	M9.06 – RT/7: Recreation Land, Hollow Road, Anstey
WR/CBC/44/153-162,44/165, 131/11,280/131/1	GOEM; Mr E Goodyer; Cooper Bussman	M5.3,M5.5,M5.6,M5.7,M5.8,M5.9,M5.10,M5.11,M5.12,M5.13,M5.15,M5.17,M5.19, FC5.3,FC5.5 – E/1,E/5,E/6 & E/8
WR/CBC/23/82,23/83/1	Cllr Brown for Sileby Parish Council	M4.14 & M4.28 – H/B & H/1(o): Land at Seagrave Road, Sileby
WR/CBC/23/85/1	Cllr Brown for Sileby Parish Council	M4.28 – H/1(l): Land at Brook Street, Sileby
WR/CBC/41/124,41/60/1	Mr C Yeates	M6.19,FC6.3 – CT/16: Extension to Existing Rural Dwellings
WR/CBC/13/57,96/282/1	CPRE; HBF	M4.38 – H/2: Density
WR/CBC/23/86,34/108/1	Cllr Brown for Sileby Parish Council; Mr T Macken	M4.32 – RT/B: Recreation Land, Lanes Close, Sileby
WR/CBC/44/174,44/182/1, 23/128,169/1,176/10/1	GOEM; Sileby PC; CTC; Leicester City Council	M7.32,FC7.02 – TR/21: Parking Provision in New Development
WR/CBC/33/100 36/104 92/275 129/330 135/335 138/368 139/369 140/370 141/371 142/372 143/373 144/374 145/375 146/376 147/377 148/378 149/379 150/380 151/381 152/382 153/383 154/384 155/385 156/386 157/387 158/388 159/389 160/390 161/391 162/392 163/393 164/394 165/395 166/396 167/397/1	Local Residents	M4.33 – H/1(p): Land at Barkby Lane, Syston
WR/CBC/44/172/1	GOEM	M7.11 – TR/7: Transport Standards in New Development
WR/CBC/37/110/1	Environment Agency	M3.44 – EV/34: Design of Flood Alleviation Measures
WR/CBC/40/123,44/181/1	Miller Homes (East Midlands) Ltd; GOEM	M6.20 – CT/18: Safeguarding Agricultural Land
WR/CBC/44/170,62/220/1	GOEM; Countryside Agency	M6.21 – CT/A: Intensive Livestock Units
WR/CBC/44/150/1	GOEM	M3.43 – EV/33: Protection of Washland
WR/CBC/44/165,131/11/1	GOEM; Mr E. Goodyer	M5.9,FC5.3 – E/A: Land at Dishley grange Farmstead
WR/CBC/44/159,123/323/1	GOEM; Mr R. Reynolds	M5.11 – E5/(e): Recreation Land, Gaddesby Lane, Rearsby

Housing round table submissions:

REF	PARTICIPANT
TP/1 TP/2	Charnwood Borough Council
HRT/128/1	Shoosmiths Solicitors for Coats plc
HRT/13/1&2	Community & Regional Planning Services for CPRE
HRT/39/1	Hallam Land Management Limited
HRT/96/1	House Builders' Federation
HRT/78/1	William Davis Limited
HRT/77/1&2	Smith Stuart Reynolds for Wimpey Homes (East Midlands) Limited
HRT/46/1	Stoneleigh Planning for Bryant Homes Limited
HRT/34/1	Stoneleigh Planning for Crest Nicholson Residential (Midlands) Limited
HRT/100/40/1	RPS Chapman Warren for David Wilson Estates Limited and Miller Homes (East Midlands) Limited
HRT/101/1	Syston Town Council

APPENDIX E – OBJECTIONS LIST

leading zeros added to Council numbers for sort purposes

002/002	Mr & Mrs Ralph
003/338	Mr S Perret
006/004	Mr M R Easom
007/006	Mr G Beeby
008/005	Mrs C Beeby
009/153	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
009/340	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
009/341	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
009/342	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
009/343	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
009/344	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
009/345	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
009/346	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
009/347	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
009/349	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
009/350	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
009/351	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
009/352	Mr L A Dobson, Shire Properties Ltd
010/007	Mr N L Lee
013/048	Mrs J Noon, CPRE - Charnwood District
013/053	Mrs J Noon, CPRE - Charnwood District
013/057	Mrs J Noon, CPRE - Charnwood District
013/121	Mrs J Noon, CPRE - Charnwood District
014/027	Ms C Adcock
015/028	Mr A C Adcock
016/029	Mr M Parkhouse, Geo Wimpey Strategic Land
016/030	Mr M Parkhouse, Geo Wimpey Strategic Land
016/031	Mr M Parkhouse, Geo Wimpey Strategic Land
016/032	Mr M Parkhouse, Geo Wimpey Strategic Land
016/033	Mr M Parkhouse, Geo Wimpey Strategic Land
017/075	Mr T R Brown
020/079	Mr S Higginson
020/091	Mr S Higginson
021/095	Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd
021/096	Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd
021/097	Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd
021/154	Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd
021/353	Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd
022/080	Mr K C Creasey
023/082	Cllr R Brown, Sileby Parish Council
023/083	Cllr R Brown, Sileby Parish Council
023/085	Cllr R Brown, Sileby Parish Council
023/086	Cllr R Brown, Sileby Parish Council

023/128	Mrs B Burton, Sileby Parish Council
026/089	Mr S Timmins
027/090	Mrs C Timmins
028/092	Miss R J Arnott
030/094	Mrs J Stewart
033/100	Mr & Mrs T R Cox
034/101	Crest Nicholson (Residential) Ltd
034/103	Crest Nicholson (Residential) Ltd
034/105	Crest Nicholson (Residential) Ltd
034/106	Crest Nicholson (Residential) Ltd
034/107	Crest Nicholson (Residential) Ltd
036/104	Mr & Mrs T E Constable
037/110	Mr G Platts, Environment Agency
038/112	Mr P Fines
039/399	Mr R Walters, Hallam Land Management
040/010	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands)
040/116	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands)
040/117	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands)
040/118	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands)
040/119	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands)
040/120	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands)
040/121	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands)
040/123	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands)
040/125	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands)
040/126	Mr R M Hepwood, Miller Homes (East Midlands)
041/060	Mr C Yeates, W S Yeates Plc
041/124	Mr C Yeates, W S Yeates Plc
044/150	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/151	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/152	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/153	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/154	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/155	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/156	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/157	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/158	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/159	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/160	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/161	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/162	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/164	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/165	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/170	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/174	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/181	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/182	Mr C Packman, GOEM
044/354	Mr C Packman, GOEM

044/400	Mr C Packman, GOEM
046/127	Bryant Homes
046/183	Bryant Homes
046/184	Bryant Homes
046/185	Bryant Homes
046/186	Bryant Homes
050/190	Mrs J Warner
053/193	Mr and Mrs Jones
054/194	Mr R E Neal
055/195	Mr D Everitt
057/197	Mr S Farrell
058/198	Ms S Farrell
061/205	Mr T Macken
062/220	Ms K Devonport, Countryside Agency
063/227	Mr M Smallman Del Rosa Developments Ltd
064/228	Mr T P Conneally BSc.
065/230	Mr E D Hancock
066/231	Ms Z Connelly
067/232	Mr A C Potts
068/233	Mrs T Hancock
073/238	Mr L J Rixon
076/246	Mrs S Rasaiah BSc. DipTP MRTPI
077/249	Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd
077/250	Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd
077/251	Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd
077/252	Alfred McAlpine Developments
078/260	Mr J Coleman, William Davis Limited
079/156	Mr H M Knight, Birstall PC
080/263	Mr G Gillett
082/265	Mr B Fox
083/266	Mr and Mrs Brewer
085/268	Ms J Gillett
087/270	Mrs L J Rixon
088/271	Mr T E Clarke
089/272	Mr G Hickling
092/275	Mr & Mrs F E & H M Wilkinson
094/277	Mr J H Coombes
095/278	Mrs S M Green
096/155	Mr I A Moss, House Builders Federation
096/279	Mr I A Moss, House Builders Federation
096/280	Mr I A Moss, House Builders Federation
096/281	Mr I A Moss, House Builders Federation
096/282	Mr I A Moss, House Builders Federation
098/286	Mr R A Wall
100/065	David Wilson Estates
100/067	Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson Estates
100/289	Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson Estates

100/290	Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson Estates
100/291	Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson Estates
100/292	Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson Estates
100/293	Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson Estates
100/294	Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson Estates
100/296	Mr I Althorpe, David Wilson Estates
101/299	Mr I MacDonald, Syston Town Council
102/300	Mr M P Tedd
103/301	Ms B Brutnall
104/302	Mr L D Wright
107/305	Cllr R Jenkins
111/309	Mr J Malpus
116/316	Mr A Brewster
119/319	Mr A J P Pochin
120/320	Mr D K Johar and Company
121/321	Mr & Mrs Brewer
122/322	Mrs Allen East Goscote Parish Council
123/323	Mr R C Reynolds
125/325	Mr J V Munroe
128/329	Coats Plc
129/330	Miss D J Lowe
131/011	Mr E Goodyer
135/335	Mr D A Shaw
138/368	Mr W G Duncan
139/369	Mrs D A Duncan
140/370	Mr H E Mason
141/371	Ms C Mason
142/372	Mr B C Strong
143/373	Ms S W Strong
144/374	Ms K E Hackett
145/375	Mr D Hackett
146/376	Ms P A Seditas
147/377	Mr C Seditas
148/378	Mr N P Setchell
149/379	Ms T M Setchell
150/380	Mr P E Iey
151/381	Ms M M Zoffo-Iey
152/382	Mr A R Pimm
154/384	Ms V Lord
155/385	Mr J W Parker
156/386	Ms S Parker
157/387	Ms S J Bullock
158/388	B Taylor
159/389	J Taylor
160/390	Ms J McNulty
161/391	Mr T M McNulty
162/392	Mr A J Calver

163/393	Ms S A Calver
164/394	Ms P R Dakin
165/395	Mr R W Dakin
166/396	Ms G D Asher
167/397	Mr T C Asher
169/001	Mr R J Clay, Cyclists Touring Club
169/153	L A Dobson
170/002	Mr W V Gorse
171/003	M H Lingard
172/004	J D Lingard
173/005	Mr Scott
174/008	Executors of Mr T Hubbard
175/009	Miss H D Shields and Miss O Williams
176/010	Mr P Connolly, Leicester City Council
178/013	Mr Barton
179/014	R Barney
180/015	Mr S Barney
181/016	Mr R Pitman
182/017	Mrs S Pitman
183/018	Ms G M Sheppard
184/019	B S Sheppard
185/020	J R Clarke
186/021	Mr A Sutton
187/022	Ms J Kirk
188/023	Mr R Kirk
189/024	D Sewell
190/025	Mrs A Sutton
191/026	Mr J & Mrs B Chesterton
192/027	Mr P Chesterton
193/028	Miss J L & Miss F A Simpson
194/029	A Wild
195/030	Ms A Wild
196/031	Mr P Holton
197/032	Mr L A James
198/033	Mr K W James
199/034	Mr D E Yeldham
200/035	Mrs S J Bate
201/036	Mr T Bate
202/037	Mrs J Barlow
203/038	Mrs R W Keating
204/039	Mr R Keating
205/040	S M Howitt
206/041	R G Howitt
207/042	Mr R Davis
208/043	K Humphrey
209/044	Mrs M A Gorse
210/045	Mrs G Yeldham

211/046	Ms S Parslow
212/047	Miss R M James
213/048	S Beaumont
214/049	T P Beaumont
215/050	Ms H Dale
216/051	Mr I Perry
217/052	Ms C Forman
218/053	W G Forman
219/054	Ms G Austin-Jones
220/055	Mr D Jones
221/056	Mrs C Charley
222/057	Mr J R Charley
223/058	Miss C A Hallam
224/059	Mrs F Hallam
225/061	Ms P Wootton
226/062	Mr W Wootton
227/063	Charnwood Road Properties Ltd
228/064	Ms J Ling
229/066	D P Ryan
230/069	Mr J P Deakin, Fisher German
230/070	Mr J P Deakin, Fisher German
231/071	Ms J Gant
232/072	Ms M Folwell
233/073	Mr L Gant
234/074	Ms A Ellerton
235/075	Mr M Ellerton
236/076	Ms A Smith
237/077	Mr B Smith
238/078	Ms K M Lewitt
239/079	Mrs S Jalland
240/080	Mr I Jalland
241/081	Mr D M Rowley
242/082	J V Skirrow
243/083	Ms B M Skirrow
244/084	Dr K Parslow
245/085	Mrs M E Rowley
246/086	Mr J T Hill
247/087	Ms M Hill
248/088	K Barratt
249/089	Ms S Barratt
250/090	F Margerison
251/091	R & A Holmes
252/092	Ms E Smith
253/093	Mr M A Willett
254/094	Ms A Price
255/095	Mr J Rawling
256/096	Mrs K W King

257/097	Ms P Baker
258/098	Mr R Baker
259/099	C J Keeling
260/100	Ms C Robinson
261/101	Mrs Robinson
262/102	Mr D Cook
263/103	Mrs A Cook
264/104	Mr A Jones
265/105	Ms K Jones
266/106	Ms G M Cartwright
267/107	Ms M Roberts
268/108	Mr M Roberts
269/109	Ms J Rogerson
270/110	Mr D Rogerson
271/111	Ms T Royston
272/112	Mr J Hibbett
273/113	Ms R Hibbett
274/114	Mr D Cartwright
275/115	Mr C Michaelides
276/116	Mrs H Michaelides
277/117	Dr E A Wallace
278/118	Mrs S Crinage
279/119	Mr P Hutchinson
280/131	Cooper Bussmann
281/132	R Evans
282/133	P Evans
283/134	Mr S Frankland
284/135	Mr G Rogerson
285/136	Ms L Willatts
286/137	Mr M Willatts
287/138	Ms P Freshfield
288/139	Mr R Freshfield
289/140	Ms M Dawkins
290/141	Mr S Dawkins
291/142	Mrs M Keogh
292/143	Mr J A Keogh
293/144	Mr P Davies
294/145	Mrs V M Hammond
295/146	Mr T Partrick
296/147	Ms J Davies
297/148	C Collington
298/149	J Hammond
299/150	J Collington
300/151	Mrs V Westcott
301/152	Mrs P Hubbard Wymeswold Parish Council
302/157	Mr J G Harrison
303/158	Ms B S Harrison

304/159	Mrs J Applebee
305/160	Ms G Rogerson
306/161	Mr D Wilcock
307/162	Ms R Wilcock
308/163	Miss R Lamb
309/164	Mrs R E Tattersall
309/169	R E Tattersall
310/165	Mr M Tattersall
311/166	A S Lamb
312/167	Mrs B Lamb
313/168	M J Etridge
314/169	Mrs S Graham
315/170	Mrs K Nightingale
316/171	Mr C T C Nightingale
317/172	Ms M Le Fevre-Smith
318/173	Mr A Le Fevre- Smith.
319/174	R Bardon
320/175	Mrs W Hallam
321/176	Mr J E Hammond
322/177	Mrs J Thomas
323/178	Ms E Phillips
324/179	Mr S Cowper
325/180	D E Keene
326/181	Mrs S Fossey
327/182	Mr M Fossey
328/183	Ms H Straw
329/184	Mr S Smith
330/185	R M Wright
331/186	R Cammack
332/187	S Cammack
333/188	N F and S Bryan-Peach
334/189	Mr G Black
335/190	Miss S Kirk
336/191	Mr P Davies
337/192	C J Kirk
338/193	Mrs M E Leivers
339/194	Mrs M C Giblett
340/195	Mrs A Dorrington
341/196	Mr R J Dorrington
342/197	G J Brown
343/198	G Aitchison
344/199	Mr & Mrs Middleditch
345/403	Mr R Hegarty