

Student Housing Provision in Loughborough SPD

Statement of Consultation

October 2005

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004¹ it is a requirement to prepare and publish a Consultation Statement for a range of planning policy documents, including Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), to outline any initial consultation undertaken with key stakeholders and other bodies prior to formal public consultation.
- 1.2 This Consultation Statement describes the involvement of key stakeholders, the community, voluntary organisations and statutory consultees in the preparation of the Student Housing Provision in Loughborough SPD.
- 1.3 This statement details who the authority consulted in connection with the preparation of the SPD and how they were consulted. It presents a summary of the main issues raised in these consultations and explains how these issues have been addressed in the final consultation draft version of the SPD.
- 1.4 In preparing the Student Housing Provision SPD, the Borough Council engaged Atkins Consultants to develop options to address problems associated with the concentration of student let properties in parts of the town. In developing the options Atkins had discussions with key stakeholders including Loughborough University and College and local resident groups including Storer and Ashby Area Residents Association and Haydon Road residents group. They also had discussions with Nottingham and Leeds City Councils about their approaches to the student housing issue. These discussions informed the preparation of the draft options for consultation, providing information on student numbers, the experiences of other authorities and the concerns of local residents. The Consultant's report was considered by the Council's Scrutiny Commission on the 9th December 2004 and 11th January 2005 and Cabinet on the 16th December 2004 and 27th January 2005.
- 1.5 Consultation on the draft options was undertaken for a six week period between 10th February to 24th March 2005. Copies of the options document and/ or information about the consultation were sent to the groups and organisations listed at Appendix I. Copies of the documents were also available at the Borough Council offices, Southfields, Leicestershire County Council, Glenfield and local libraries. Three roadshow events were also held where Officers were available to explain the SPD and the various options. The roadshow events were:

St Peters Community Centre, Storer Road, Loughborough	Monday 21 st February 7.00pm
Town Hall, Market Place, Loughborough	Saturday 26 th February 12.00-2pm
Carillon Court Shopping Centre, Loughborough	Thursday 24 th February 12.00-2pm

- 1.6 A press release about the SPD consultation was published and copies of the documents and leaflet were available on the Council's Web site.

¹ Regulation 17(1)(b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

- 1.7 A leaflet summarising the options was circulated to households in Loughborough at the beginning of the consultation period. As feedback from local residents indicated that there had been problems with the circulation of the leaflet, officers undertook door to door leafleting in those areas most affected by problems of student housing concentration. It is acknowledged that the leafleting exercise was not as comprehensive as had been hoped. However, it is considered that the leafleting, in combination with the other publicity initiatives, ensured that there was good public awareness of the consultation exercise.
- 1.8 Some 319 responses to the consultation were received. A summary of the responses was presented to Cabinet on the 21st July 2005. Appendix 2 summarises the responses received. Having taken account of the responses, Cabinet concluded that Option 5 Threshold Approach represented the best option to tackle issues relating to student housing provision in Loughborough.
- 1.9 Following consideration of the responses received on the consultation on SPD options, the final version of the SPD has now been published for public comment. Representations should be submitted to the Council by the 28th October 2005.

Appendix I- List of Stakeholders Consulted on Draft SPD Options

CBC Councillors
Parish Councils in Charnwood
Action for a Better Charnwood
CPRE
Ashby Road Estates Community Association
British Gas Connections Ltd
British Gas Properties
British Telecom (Leicester)
British Telecommunications Plc
CABE
Charnwood Community Council
Charnwood Tree Trust
East Midlands Development Agency
English Heritage
English Nature
English Partnerships
Environment Agency
Gorse Covert Community Association
Hastings Residents Association
Highways Agency
Leicester & Rutland Wildlife Trust
Leicestershire County Council
Loughborough & District Civic Trust
Loughborough Archaeological & Historical Society
Loughborough Chamber of Trade & Commerce
Loughborough College
Loughborough Students Union
Loughborough University
Loughborough Urban Forum
Mariners Quay Residents Association
Mobile Phone Operators Association
Nanpantan Residents Group
National Grid Transco (Electricity)
National Grid Transco (Gas)
Powergen
Severn Trent Water Limited
St Peters Community Association
Storer and Ashby Residents Group
Storer Rd & Rosebery St Community Assoc
Transco Plc
Andrew Granger and Co
Belvoir Letting Agency
Castle Estates
Countrywide Residential Lettings
Cliffords Lettings and Property Service
Hamlets Property Lettings
Hartleys Lettings
Nicholas Humphreys
John German
Martin and Co
Connells
William H Brown
Bradford and Bingley Frank Innes
Freckletons
Haart

Halifax Estate Agents
Hetterley Associates
Moore and York
Sinclair Estates
Taylors Estate Agents
Your Move
Skyline Property Management
Lakha Accommodation
Merling Property Management
Parr Houses

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
RN: 56 S Hodgson	I	Not a problem	<p>The council should play amore active role in encouraging students to keep their yards and streets tidier. At present many students leave rubbish bags in front yards and on the public side walk, creating a health hazard.</p> <p>Restrictions on where students can live will not affect how students behave when out at night, which is the most serious issue affecting Loughborough residents. Restrictions like those proposed will only serve to widen the gap between students and residents and harm community relations. Students must be treated as Loughborough residents, regardless of how they come and go. Integrating, not excluding residents is the best solution to the student resident divide.</p>
RN: 92 J Harris	I	Not a problem	<p>Appalled and embarrassed at the treatment towards students in the Loughborough area. We have been recognized on the map because of these people and when the term breaks up Loughborough is a dead and silent place. Trade of business will go down and what is wrong with change. Be positive and not discriminative.</p> <p>I have lived in Loughborough all my life and have had no problems with students. They are the same as everyone else, a young couple or young friends living together. Effort and resources should be given to the problems, which effect us for example no rubbish collections and benefit fraud. The students bring money to the town and a good atmosphere to society. It is too late for a change back. The students should be backed and supported so we are not a shamed and biased town.</p>
RN: 156 J E Carruthers	I		<p>There is a conflict of interest – the university is growing and student numbers increasing. This is good for our country, for our society and for the economy of the town but the spread of student houses is also causing obvious social problems in the town. You list 2 things you cannot do so options 2, 3, 4 and 5 will create irritating bureaucracy and will not resolve the conflict of interests. Urge the university and college to provide more good quality purpose built accommodation both on the campus and in the town to attract students away from privately let homes.</p> <p>To say there is a formula of I in 10 student houses etc is muddled bureaucratic thinking.</p>
RN: 159 T W Millard	I	I in 10	<p>Restrict university road parking in areas adjacent the zone. Parking at Outwoods Drive/Forest Road makes this exit a hazard.</p>
RN: 175 M Merchant	I	Not a problem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tougher controls over new student blocks. • Tougher planning controls over extensions/conversions <p>The proposed ASHORE would create as many losers as winners. Buy to let properties has increased house prices, to the gain of the current residents. ASHORE would cause the prices to fall and they would lose out. I am in favour of tighter planning controls. However, parking facilities must be planned for when new developments come along. I would favour more action to tackle the problems, to reduce late night noise and antisocial behaviour. (not just move it to a different street). Some people are unhappy when their neighbourhood is populated by people of a different race or culture. Substitute the word 'Asian' for 'student' in your proposals and you can see how stupid it sounds.</p>
RN: 226	I	Not a	<p>Likes student neighbours. Dislikes old people who are always complaining.</p>

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
D Bentley		problem	More high rise student housing, but no car parking.
RN: 228 J O'Flynn	I	5+	<p>Students should sign a university code of conduct, which should be monitored by university funded wardens. We appear to have created a student version of racism Loughborough. Why do we discriminate against them?</p> <p>I have always lived in areas that include students who are not the same as other residents. Only a small minority spoil it for others. All the students I have lived near have been good neighbours. We could do with sorting out the attitude of some of the residents and dealing with their approach to the students. We could do with giving young teenagers something to do as they get bored and could be worse than any group of students.</p>
RN: 258 Anonymous	I	3 in 10	
RN: 259 Anonymous	I	3 in 10	
RN: 282 Anonymous	I	4 in 10	
RN: 283 Anonymous	I		<p>Develop in ASHORE in the area of student housing concentration. This should be in an area well placed for the university and the town centre. The most suitable location would be on the 'Golden Triangle' between Ashby Road and Derby Road.</p> <p>Question not helpful. If there are 50 residents in the street, there is likely to be a multiplicity of views.</p> <p>The ASHORE option would ensure students are concentrated in a worse control.</p> <p>Option 2 to 5 tries to dissolve the problem across the town, which is likely to result in more problems than benefits.</p> <p>Option 1 is preferred, but should include a discretionary licensing scheme.</p>
RN: 308 J, A & S Walker	I	Not a problem	<p>Concerned that the Council is increasingly responding in an inappropriate way to a growing intolerance to an important and welcome group in our community-young residents in full time higher education.</p> <p>This would be true of measures to control any other section of the community – the old, people of certain political persuasion, people with young families, or a particular ethnic background. It is discrimination for any group to think they have the right to dictate who can and who cannot live in their neighbourhood.</p> <p>The controls proposed will have very limited effect because it is not possible to control HIMO's with less than 6 residents. Other measures will be counter productive. We had a loft conversion to enable us to remain a family living in this community. Many current proposals would have made this less easy and increased the chances of the house becoming a student property.</p>

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			The current proposals are an inappropriate and probably ineffective response to a well organized but generally unrepresentative lobby group. The Council should support the rights of people of all kinds to live in all areas and not be swayed by what is politically expedient.
RN: 365 M Speight	2	5 in 10	Keep property and gardens to a good standard. Profiteers are not looking after properties and so they become run down. Students like to live in a community of students. The University should provide accommodation. If there is no University accommodation then the students should not be able to attend the course. Students pay inflated rents for slum accommodation which is not maintained or safe. The University should put some money back into the town and put the landlords out of business.
RN: 07 R D Davey	2	1 in 10	
RN: 11 R A Ure	2	1 in 10	
RN: 12 D Doughty	2	1 in 10	The University should build student accommodation on the campus.
RN: 14 J Mead	2	1 in 10	Apply pressure to landlords to improve outward appearance of properties – clear rubbish, decent curtains and clean front garden. This year’s students have not proved a problem on noise levels.
RN: 15 P Hoad	2	1 in 10	Ban students from bringing cars to the university (as has been done elsewhere eg. Cambridge) to release car parks to build residential blocks. 1 in 20. 1-Close pedestrian access from Coniston Crescent to the campus to discourage students from living on this estate. 2-University should accommodate all students on campus. 3-Prevent university from taking on more students. 4-Put pressure on Planning Inspectorate to change planning conditions and so ban students from occupying new houses. 5-Burleigh Court Conference Centre visitors park on Coniston Crescent claiming parking regulations do not apply to them – please attend to.
RN: 16 Smith	2	1 in 10	No anti-social noise after 10pm. Limit number of cars per household to 2. Increased students occupation is leading to rapid deterioration of the unadopted road and increased difficulty to park. There is also not enough room for large vehicles cutting through to Alan Moss Road to pass.
RN: 17 Clulow	2	1 in 10	Wrong that developers tell developers about house for sale before others. Our objection to the extension of the house over the road made no difference – it still was given permission to have more students in.
RN: 20 A Hollis	2		Stop all planning involving student housing until the action below is taken. University should cap student numbers at present level and build student accommodation on campus so that 85% are housed in

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			this way. Increase this percentage when future expansion continues. Canvass central Government for funds as they are so keen to increase further education continues.
RN: 54 P T Easton	2	1 in 10	Annual review of the ASHORE boundary, which should be street by street. Expansion of student numbers would suggest enlargement of the ASHORE. This depends on the definition of neighbourhood, and then which neighbourhood is in question.
RN: 59 Collin	2	1 in 10	A patrol to cut down on noisy students. There needs to be stricter noise controls and a cut out time, for example 23.00, where there are pensioners.
RN: 65 G Osborne	2	1 in 10	There are too many student properties on Beacon Road.
RN: 66 P McKenna	2	1 in 10	
RN: 67 D Hoult	2	2 in 10	
RN: 68 P Hutchinson	2	1 in 10	More development on campus There should be more checks made by the council to prevent private landlords profiting from students living in substandard accommodation.
RN: 77 G Cart	2	1 in 10	
RN: 78 G B Mercer	2	1 in 10	All property should be subject to council tax paid by the owner. 1:10 is more than enough bearing in mind there can be six in one house.
RN: 83 N H Haslett	2	1 in 10	
RN: 87 L Mayes	2	1 in 10	Build as much accommodation as possible on campus. The number of students coming to Loughborough University should be reduced. Local residents are already outnumbered, where we should be put first. Landlords should contribute towards paying council tax as students are exempt.
RN: 89 A Tosh	2	1 in 10	Lived here since 1987, where it was a quiet area. However, over the last few years it has become noisier. Woken by the students. They vandalise cars, phone boxes and litter the area.
RN: 90 A Roberts	2		Should be a greater involvement and activity of the police to deal with anti social behaviour of the minority groups and students. The university should make examples of these students by sending down.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			Rather depends on the area. Purpose built accommodation on university campus is no real problem. If within a residential area then 1:20 is probably too many.
RN: 91 I Beaumont	2	1 in 10	
RN: 97 L Joseph	2	1 in 10	
RN: 98 J P Scott	2	2 in 10	Avoid putting coloured stripes on the paper.
RN: 99 D Stensell	2	1 in 10	As far as possible additional student accommodation should be built on the university campus.
RN: 101 J M Lovegrove	2		Landlords should be made more responsible for the upkeep of student properties, especially as they do not pay Council tax. Loughborough is a town not a city and is already overwhelmed by the number of students. Wheelie bins have made things worse in this (Chester Close) area. Left on pavements they create danger for poorly sighted people especially those from the RNIB school and accommodation off William St.
RN: 102 P Ghent	2	2 in 10	Put pressure on the government to legislate to give local authorities more controls over buy to let. This might include amending the current threshold of 6 or less people in a property not needing permission. Current system invites greed and puts buying beyond the reach of first time buyers.
RN: 104 J Armitage	2		
RN: 112 J Hodgkinson	2		I feel sorry for students who do come to study and want to get on in life. The idle and destructive students should be sent back home. Less than 1 in 100 is more than reasonable for student houses in a neighbourhood. Loughborough used to be clean but since so much property let to students it has become an absolute disgrace. Student property owners pay no Council tax and nor do the students. Student property owners should pay more council tax than anyone else for letting properties get in such a state. No wonder so many people are leaving Loughborough. No one cares about Loughborough people.
RN: 113 C Hodgkinson	2		We know from personal experience what it is like when students move near to you, and what houses look like after a week of them being there. A terrible state and terrible noise.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			The University should accommodate the growing number of students on campus to free up more houses for Loughborough people. They should buy back the Advantica site and use it for students.
RN: 114 L J Watson	2	3 in 10	
RN: 117 J Smith	2	2 in 10	A percentage of landlords' income should be used as council tax.
RN: 129 R Wagg	2	2 in 10	Landlords must make sure students do recycling properly and have respect for their neighbours. Everyone should try and live harmoniously but young and old are being squeezed out of terraced housing. In (Garton Rd) area 90% of houses bought by private landlords and extensions are being built to house more students. This leads to smaller gardens and extra parking pressures, quite a lot without permits.
RN: 134 H Shephard	2	1 in 10	Discretionary licensing is a must to ensure our town is clean. Large group of student housing together results in concentration of people with noise pollution often lasting all night and parking problems because roads are overloaded with vehicles.
RN: 138 J Border	2	3 in 10	Would Option 2 also have a defined proportion of student properties? Parking seems to be addressed as a separate issue. Recent changes (residents parking scheme) have not helped residents park in their own street.
RN: 143 W Barrowcliffe	2	1 in 10	Stop students parking cars on grass verges turning them into muddy areas with mud making drives and paths dirty and slippery. Many students' cars are left parked up all week. Maximise use of University accommodation. Apparently about 200 bedspaces are currently empty. Landlords should keep gardens clean and ensure houses have curtains and look tidy. Impress on students that night time is for sleeping.
RN: 147 G Hall	2	2 in 10	Landlords to be made responsible for upkeep of gardens, drives, paintwork etc. Students living in residential areas need to comply with agreed noise levels.
RN: 149 A J Wainwright	2	4 in 10	Powers needed to make non-residents clean up with back and front gardens maintained and houses well decorated. Designated housing officer at university needed to control anti social behaviour by a minority of students. Need to remember many residents and their children will have been students.
RN: 152 K Bouazza-	2	2 in 10	Thank you for the positive action/consultancy. Recommend a 'Leeds' ASHORE to restrict the impact on the local population. Also when a house changes from a residential to a student let occupancy this invariably causes a problem of parking.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
Marouf			
RN: 155 S Heath	2	1 in 10	
RN: 160 L Wells	2	2 in 10	
RN: 161 J K Norbury	2	1 in 10	Is the cost of purpose built accommodation too high to attract students? Why can you not control properties with less than 6 students? Concerned by the appearance and loss of previously attractive gardens in houses that have been converted for student use. Not enough consideration given to extra cars etc caused by such conversions.
RN: 171 T Kirk	2	1 in 10	
RN: 172 K Boyes	2		Students are not neighbours and have no interest in making a connection with the neighbours next door. They move on in a fairly short space of time.
RN: 173 D Jewson	2	1 in 10	Well done for addressing the problem. Mappell House and the adjoining property have been up for sale. They are within a conservation area of lovely old Victorian houses. They should be used as family homes and definitely not converted to student accommodation.
RN: 177 J E & D F Fowler	2		ASHORE should apply to the whole town. A defined area allows anything to apply outside that boundary. The emphasis should be for student accommodation to be provided on campus. The effect of providing student housing in town increases the cost of housing that is currently suitable for first time buyers.
RN: 178 M Shaw	2	2 in 10	Obligation on landlords to have an element of good social behaviour as part of the housing contract. Perhaps the council could work with landlords to produce an agreed tenancy agreement. We live in Paget Street and suffer form frequent late night disturbances, litter strewn streets and wheelie bins, which make excellent toys for student drinks. High student densities destroy any sense of 'normal' community which is something I think students also want to be part of.
RN: 183 D Mower	2	2 in 10	It is nonsense if the law allows no control over properties with 6 or less students. William Street has 3/4 student houses in a row. This can mean 18 students unsupervised by parents, university wardens or landlords with increasing irresponsibility towards the environment and neighbourhood. The new refuse and recycling policy has been a disaster with rubbish and bins left in front gardens or on the pavement.
RN: 206 M Clarke	2	1 in 10	To let signs should be smaller and flush with the wall. The area has become over-populated leading to overflowing wheelie bins which are frequently not put out on correct day. Too many people and cars leading to squalor/slums.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
RN: 220 P Herbert	2	1 in 10	Students in semi-detached houses should be considerate towards neighbours and not play loud music and shout.
RN: 223 N Harris	2	2 in 10	It is too late for these questions in York Road. I am completely surrounded by student properties with few privately owned homes left. The main concern is lack of parking space, litter, wheelie bins and bags left at front doors.
RN: 229 J Saunders	2	1 in 10	Treat all private landlord properties as a business where they will have to pay council tax. Students should not be allowed to have a car whilst a student in Loughborough. This would solve the traffic congestion problem along residential streets where student cars clog up the streets, preventing residents and visitors to park outside or near to their properties.
RN: 237 R E Baker	2	1 in 10	The ratio of student houses should take into account parking space availability.
RN: 242 D G Attwood	2	1 in 10	The University should limit the number of students until they can accommodate them all, rather than residents of Loughborough giving up more houses each year.
RN: 244 K Smith	2	1 in 10	No students where there is housing for the elderly. Limit the number of cars per household in student accommodation. In Dean Street, students are parking outside old people's bungalows on the pavements making it dangerous for those with poor sight.
RN: 277 P Colledge	2	1 in 10	Discretionary licensing should be used to control parking as some properties have 4 or more cars causing problems for local residents plus their visitors. Need to build more student accommodation on campus. They have more green land than we do on the estate. The landlord should pay the council tax. The amount of student waste is double, if not triple the amount from a typical family accommodation.
RN: 278 L Micallef	2	1 in 10	
RN: 285 M E Murdock	2		Even 1 in 10 households is too many. Landlords of student properties should pay Council Tax and be responsible for upkeep to acceptable standards. The university should not increase student numbers until and unless accommodation can be provided on campus. There are already far too many family houses given over to students in the Holywell Drive area. Bags of rubbish in

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			<p>front of properties most of the time.</p> <p>Student house letting boards should require planning permission.</p> <p>If number of student houses increases Council Tax burden will fall on those who pay. Landlords making profits can afford to pay CT better than the majority of Loughborough residents.</p>
RN: 289 A Carter	2	1 in 10	<p>Discretionary licensing should also cover gardens. Distressing to view a pig sty at back and front.</p> <p>Over 1 in 10 student lets will reduce house value. 10% student houses in a street is plenty enough. I should prefer even fewer.</p>
RN: 292 B Feeney	2	3 in 10	<p>Student occupation has led to sever drop in number of local children attending Rosebery PS, and reduced the neighbourliness of the area. It is a ghost town in summer, parking is difficult.</p> <p>Discretionary licensing would be valuable as there are problems with maintenance of properties.</p>
RN: 295 L Tsang	2	1 in 10	<p>Moved from Paget St to live in quieter residential area. Brookfield Avenue has changed from a quiet cul de sac to having 5 student lets, including either side of us. Luckily we have no problems with students but did not move here to be amongst students.</p>
RN: 296 Sillett	2	1 in 10	<p>ASHORE to be extended to include Holywell Drive, Coniston Crescent and Derwent Drive areas of increasing student occupation.</p> <p>Cars and gardens are neglected. Black bags and wheelie bins left out for over a week, spilling contents.</p>
RN: 297 J H Smalley	2	1 in 10	<p>Vehicle management must be included in the scheme.</p> <p>Boundaries and gardens must be kept tidy and properties in good repair. We are totally behind the Civic Trust and Storer Road Residents Association on these issues.</p>
RN: 303 J Wenham	2	3 in 10	

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
RN: 316 A J Kowalski	2	2 in 10	Over half of the street is occupied by students, we do not want any more. The biggest problem is being able to drive along the road due to the student's inconsiderate parking. Also the noise. The university should try to accommodate a large proportion on campus by building new halls of residence on its 40 acres of land.
RN: 317 R Tilsley	2	1 in 10	I think 1:20 would be more reasonable. Already there are 9 student houses in Borrowdale Way, plus students occupying 2 detached houses. Students fail to comply with the advice on leaving bins/bags/boxes out for collection so we are constantly faced with rubbish. The problem would be simplified if the university built more accommodation on campus.
RN: 319 J F Wanstahl	2	2 in 10	Where a house frontage is only one car wide, permitted for parking should be restricted to one permit. When houses are divided into flats, this should not automatically allow 2 permits per flat. The Council needs to realize by their inactivity they have been responsible for destroying the community in most of central Loughborough. The most important aspect of these new rules is to enforce the maintenance of the property, especially front gardens. Ideally a rented property should have a maximum of 2 people in it unless there is someone over 30 living there too. Rented houses should have licenses which are restricted to 20%/30% of the housing stock, unless the property is a purpose built warden maintained property a minimum of 100 metres from any patrolled property.
RN: 323 Anonymous	2	1 in 10	
RN: 324 A Gimpel	2	1 in 10	The whole town should be considered an ASHORE. The boundaries of the ASHORE appear to be arbitrary. Why are Burton Street and Castledine Street included and not Beacon Road. Restricting the ASHORE to the defined area will transfer attention to other areas of town. Students have cars. The whole town needs to be considered otherwise in a few years the Borough will be forced into changing the boundaries. Already there are a number of student houses in Mayfield Drive. A potential building site is at the corner of Mayfield Drive and Park Road, which might attract student housing with few supporting facilities such as on site parking. The Borough should pursue the Government over the issue of multiple occupations. 6 students in a house is just as bad as 7. The proposals are attempting to deal with the situation by negative action, imposing control, limiting and licensing. Whatever is done, the impact will be minimal. Imagination is needed to change the whole dynamic. The situation is driven by government desire, for half the population to go to university. As a result students are a growing fraction of the towns population. They do not perceive any limit to the amount of money they have and landlords, property owners are taking advantage.
RN: 339 H Oakley	2	2 in 10	Provided all nine provisions are adhered to. Provided students are not concentrated only in one part of the town. Student parking needs attention. Local residents stand no chance when houses are occupied by students with more than one car.
RN: 343 Aulton	2	1 in 10	Extend ASHORE to include Brookfield Avenue, Outwoods Drive, Holt Drive and the surrounding area. These are close to Ashleigh Drive entrance to the campus, where there are a significant number of student houses in the area.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			Certain Roads are clearly residential in character, which must be protected. Student houses in Brookfield road are changing the character of the area. Landlords or students do not care about the appearance of their property, rubbish, gardens, curtains etc. The behaviour is not a problem. The houses are not designed for 5/6 cars creating parking problems, which affects my personal finances ie house prices.
RN: 352 R I Chapman	2	1 in 10	Area to the west of Fairmont Drive is being effected and should be included in the ASHORE zone.
RN: 353 G H Brooks	2	1 in 10	<p>The student population has not been so noticeable as recently, especially with the increase in bad students. Their behaviour is very anti social. The people of Loughborough have suffered enough with badly behaved students. The people of Loughborough will soon retaliate. The students are lodgers within Loughborough and should behave. The university should discipline them, where they should be housed on the campus. The university has plenty of ground available for accommodation and therefore can put the problem where it belongs.</p> <p>If student cars are taxed and insured then it is unfortunate that nothing can be done, as they have a right to park on the highway.</p> <p>Students are allowed reductions in shops. They own cars and spend their night in nightclubs, which is expensive. Not fair that their houses are exempt from council tax, when they enjoy the same services provided by CBC as the town people.</p>
RN: 04 C R Stubbs	3	1 in 10	
RN: 23 Trevor Parr Associates Ltd	3	4 in 10	Licensing would discriminate proportionately against bad landlords whilst not affecting good ones, as long as the cost of licensing was limited.
RN: 73 D Cozens	3	3 in 10	These options may encourage landlords to buy smaller properties rather than investing in purpose built properties that could be controlled creating more demand for first time buyers and family accommodation. The best way to deal with this issue is to provide more quality purpose built managed student accommodation, which would reduce the demand for rented properties that could be owner occupied. This would have to be done in conjunction with the university. More pressure should be put on the university to control the behaviour of the noisy ill-mannered students and help integrate them more with the local community. The university should take responsibility for long term planning ensuring there is enough accommodation before it

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			expands. The aim should be to have the equivalent percentage of student/non student for the whole of Loughborough to give a more even spread. The system will create more demand for properties that will house less than 6 students. Objections to the removal of permitted development rights.
RN: 76 M Beaken	3	1 in 10	Landlords purchasing properties with large gardens should be forced to either attend the gardens or pay a gardener. Parking is also another consideration. Outwoods Drive is a car park. Planning permission for extensions should only be given if sufficient parking off road is available.
RN: 107 N Dungworth	3	2 in 10	University should try and increase accommodation on campus especially given size has increased. More students should be encouraged to attend a University in their home area. Having studied in Leeds pre ASHORE and seen things from a student perspective it is important to have regulations to protect locals and provide good accommodation for students. I am sure students and their parents would prefer managed housing. I would like to see purpose built accommodation, preferably owned and controlled by the University for all 1 st year undergraduates and some 2 nd years with private rentals for 3 rd years and post graduates. There should be controls on bad landlords and poorly kept properties.
RN: 110 N Garton	3	1 in 10	I would sooner leave it at 1 in 20 houses.
RN: 145 T Birkinshaw	3	2 in 10	Probably Option 3, but Option 4a is a close 2 nd . 2 in 10 houses is a reasonable maximum. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about isolated student enclaves that are less than a whole street but are areas with significant clusters of student properties eg. end of Parklands Drive/Park Road. • Student properties tend to have more adults in them than 'normal' houses, possible more than double, so 20% student housing could be 33% of population, while 30% could be almost 50%. • Current licensing laws/binge-culture contribute to late night noise/anti-social behaviour. This is against the sustainability principles of LDFs.
RN: 182 A Odusamya	3		Perfect already. Student life on the community must not be affected. Should not really matter if ASHORE is defined.
RN: 263 A Siddle	3	2 in 10	The university should build more accommodation on campus, which would have the advantage that students would be close to all campus amenities and have a lower impact on the town residents. Could there be other suitable sites for development eg on Ashby Road.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			<p>The council should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby the university to consider more campus accommodation. The university has successfully attracted a large number of students to Loughborough. Should it not take on the responsibility to adequately house these students? Should I not take into account the huge impact on the local community? • Work with the university to identify sites for more purpose built managed student properties. • Bring together representatives from the university, council, residents and students to discuss the issues further. <p>Discretionary licensing to control untidiness in front gardens is a great idea. The new recycling policy introduced should be applauded for its environmental impact. Black wheelie bin are only emptied fortnightly. Student occupied houses may generate more refuse due to the number of adults there and particularly if recycling is not a high priority in that house. Areas with a high student density should have their rubbish collected weekly. The Council should distribute leaflets regarding refuse and recycling collections.</p> <p>Any new student accommodation purpose built or conversion of a townhouse should provide adequate parking. The Council could consider the impact on parking when landlords apply for extensions to existing houses.</p>
RN: 291 Girdler	3	1 in 10	ASHORE should be extended along Forest Road to include all housing. That is Kirkstone Dr, Loweswater etc. The student house opposite has changed from a 3 bed semi to a 6 room student let with another room in the garage.
RN: 301 S Charlish	3	1 in 10	The area covered by the ASHORE should be large enough to cover all areas at risk and then pressure the university to solve the problem using its own land.
RN: 304 R Wenham	3	3 in 10	Very important to introduce discretionary licensing to control tidiness of gardens and general upkeep of rented houses.
RN: 330 S Jain	3	2 in 10	
RN: 06 Hyde	4	1 in 10	Only university/college accredited accommodation should be rented to students. Strict enforcement measures must be in place.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			Permanent residents will move out of Loughborough if nothing is done.
RN: 08 S Matthews	4	3 in 10	Educate students in basic housekeeping when they occupy properties within the area.
RN: 10 P N R Cooley	4	1 in 10	Extension of student housing beyond ASHORE boundaries strictly supervised. Student housing has already extended to Derwent Drive, Coniston Crescent area. This should be controlled beyond acceptable limits. Residents are getting neighbours not to sell to people providing student accommodation.
RN: 43 J & D Allenby	4	1 in 10	All rented properties should have a strict code of standards to meet both inside and out. All gardens should be regularly maintained by the landlord.
RN: 50 L Cairns	4	2 in 10	
RN: 51 K D Mitchell	4		Landlord keep properties in adequate repair and introduce discretionary licensing to keep gardens clean and tidy. Ratio of 1:20 houses more appropriate. Consideration should be given to the type of houses, for example whether the house is a terraced, semi detached or detached dwelling. In addition, consideration should be given to the number of vehicles allowed per house.
RN: 58 P M & R Hunt	4	1 in 10	Fed up with the increase in student accommodation. There appears to be no control.
RN: 69 M & O Ellis	4	1 in 10	Gladstone Avenue does not appear in the ASHORE area, when the area has a large number of student houses. What will happen if ASHORE is restricted are we to be inundated with students? The whole town should be regulated. 1:10 houses is too large in any area. Surely we are not expected to accept that many?
RN: 72 K Figgitt	4	1 in 10	Plus option 2, new homes are not to become student properties. Students should be accommodated on campus. Routes home are continually disturbed. Parking is an issue in inner areas. Something needs to be done about the 6 students loophole.
RN: 86 A Atkins	4	1 in 10	
RN: 88 K Hunt	4	1 in 10	The University should purchase land adjacent to its main site and build accommodation there. This should generally be bounded by Forest Road. Other developments should be at Snells Nook Lane, or is that designated for even more university expansion?
RN: 111 V Nasehi	4	4 in 10	

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
RN: 115 S M Shephard	4	1 in 10	
RN: 118 H T Fearne	4	1 in 10	Strict controls on litter at properties and correct use of recycling and refuse system.
RN: 130 J A Hawley	4	2 in 10	
RN: 131 I Sadler & G Maffioli	4	2 in 10	Discretionary licensing should prevent the permanent display of letting boards on the front of properties. Has a survey been conducted of parking problems in student (terraced) housing areas? The greatest social pressures come from too many 3 car households on small streets. The result is parking on yellow lines, over dropped kerbs and blocked driveways preventing people getting cars out to go to work in the morning.
RN: 153 A Conway	4	1 in 10	The options suggested are OK as short term solutions. To reduce the problems being experienced by residents encourage the university to provide all student accommodation on the campus. The problem of high densities of students in any area have become obvious. Also, student accommodation is usually empty for lengthy periods each year which is not particularly desirable for areas of the town.
RN: 170 J H Morley	4	1 in 10	Landlords should pay community tax. Market stall holders have to pay for the use of the town centre. Parts of the town are saturated with student accommodation. The university should build more accommodation on the campus.
RN: 174 M Hull	4		Now you are finally addressing the problem. Don't lose the momentum and let things drag on. Cannot tick any of the boxes. Obviously you cannot condone any of the above. If you are the unlucky neighbour with a noisy element next door. Our town continues to disappear under the spreading lava from the university. We have all had pride in our university but no one could have foreseen the price the townsfolk would have to pay for growing success of this establishment. Greedy spectators spot the opportunity of increasing their wealth at the expense of townsfolk and family homes. It is sad to avoid walking down roads that have been reduced to scruffy student lets. A part of education should include citizenship. A service should be provided by landlords for cleaners and gardeners.
RN: 180 G E Wynne	4		
RN: 181 G West	4	2 in 10	
RN: 184 J Hunt	4	1 in 10	
RN: 202 D Firth	4	4 in 10	Help families and non-student groups to move into empty or non let houses. This year there are a lot of them. This will turn the tide quicker to the town becoming full of normal groups of people who live here all the time.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			6 in 10 normal residence will help to teach and control the students and leave enough people in town during student holidays so the town shops and pubs can have customers all year. Provide extra children's play areas in the town centre. Some of the noisy pubs could move nearer the university leaving the locals more space in the centre of town. Let us become more friendly with our neighbours.
RN: 217 P Allen	4	1 in 10	The university has brought more students into the town without any thought of accommodating them, where the real people of this town have had to bear the brunt of the filth and noise. The university has grown over the years only to make money. The residents on the poorer part of town suffer. Charnwood Borough Council, the police and the university just pay lip service to it. This used to be a lovely town to live in 30 years ago.
RN: 219 M Hyslop	4		I feel strongly about the upkeep of a property, particularly the removal of rubbish. Students do not appear interested in managing wheelie bins. I do not believe students have a place in residential areas. However, as they are here I suggest an official list of landlords, enabling unfortunate neighbours to protest about matters when they get out of hand. Student houses should have 2 wheelie bins. The university should provide more security and contact numbers more widely. Student parking regulations are ignored. Absentee landlords purchase family homes causing a shortage for local young people. The student population makes demand for security refuse collection, street cleaning etc. They take no responsibility for it. Future student accommodation should be on site.
RN: 225 D Ryan	4	3 in 10	Limit the number of residence parking permits given to a property. The limit should be beneficial to residents and students. Residents should not be surrounded by outsiders. Students could not be blamed for every problem.
RN: 230 G A Wivell	4	3 in 10	Accommodation for at least 500 students with parking provision should be built on land at the west of Kirkstone Drive. The recreation ground could be relocated elsewhere in the area. Kirkstone Road and Ashby Road should be linked, which would help to relieve the congestion on Forest Road, Epinal Way and Ashby Road.
RN: 231 J Dabrowska	4	1 in 10	
RN: 240 R A Davis	4	1 in 10	
RN: 243 D Bowler	4	1 in 10	Whatever plan to house students is taken, landlords should be made to keep the front gardens tidy and the whole property to look presentable.
RN: 246 Archer	4	1 in 10	No student accommodation in outer area. There have already been residential properties extended and let out for students. Further encroachment could spoil the character of the neighbourhood. Good neighbours are an invaluable asset. Temporary

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			residents do not feel any source of community responsibility.
RN: 254 B Wilford	4	1 in 10	Property owners should pay council tax on student houses. Cars should not be allowed reducing congestion and pollution. Bicycles should be used instead.
RN: 270 M Haim	4	2 in 10	
RN: 275 M Norris	4	1 in 10	Knightthopre Road should be included in the outer zone.
RN: 299 C Hanford	4	1 in 10	Most or all students should be kept on campus. People do not want all the mess and disturbance in their neighbourhood. Knightthorpe Road, Byron Street and Milton Street should be added to the restraint area.
RN: 312 D Chan	4	1 in 10	Make landlords/owners/university accountable/responsible for the maintenance/upkeep /antisocial behaviour in student lets, subject to hefty fines and some enforceable laws set by the Council.
RN: 314 M A Clarke	4	1 in 10	The situation in other area of the town should be monitored. I like Kirkland Drive/Westmoreland. Within 50 yards there are 10 student houses that I know of. These are easily identified as they have numerous cars parked and litter. Some have had extensions. The occupants seem incapable of understanding the new wheelie bin system, and they are left overflowing. My car has also been damaged three times.
RN: 318 J William & D Baxter	4	1 in 10	We have noticed Knightthorpe Road is on the boundary of the ASHORE and has been left outside of this area Knightthorpe Road should be included as there are increasing numbers of students moving into family properties in this area.
RN: 320 A Jackson	4	2 in 10	It is not the number but rather the antisocial behaviour, noise and litter left on the streets. We are at saturation point of unsustainable students in the town. They have no community spirit. In high-density areas during the summer, these areas are ghost towns. Do not put what works in a city of 1 million people, into a town of 60,000 people. It will not work.
RN: 351 J Ashurst	4	1 in 10	Student accommodation has made life for nearby residents intolerable, where none of the options will improve matters. Planning permission should be refused for further on campus accommodation with consideration given only for on campus student domestic accommodation. More effort must be put into accelerate the amendment of what we cannot do in an attempt to restore blighted streets back into general use. Only when the students have been removed can we consider the options. The problems must be rectified before further progress is considered.
RN: 355 V D Mitchell	4	1 in 10	Something has to be done to control the spread of student accommodation in Loughborough, particularly where property is not maintained to reasonable levels.
RN: 356	4	1 in 10	Landlords should be responsible for maintenance and appearance of properties they own. At present some rented properties

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
N Mitchell			give a rundown appearance of streets, which lowers the value of private property in the area.
RN: 364 A R Cave	4	1 in 10	
RN: 37 E Hawley	4a	1 in 10	
RN: 39 V Kinrade	4a	1 in 10	
RN: 40 N R Lad	4a	1 in 10	
RN: 52 M D Smith	4a	1 in 10	<p>The boundaries of the zones needs to be reviewed annually. which is in addition to the definition of the zones. The control over the upkeep and tidiness of the property. A definition of when student numbers are too high.</p> <p>Many student properties are occupied by 6 or less students, therefore powers to enforce restraint will only affect a small amount of properties. The information shows the percentage of student numbers but does not show the percentage of properties occupied by different numbers of students.</p>
RN: 57 P J Seamon	4a	1 in 10	The car situation needs to be examined as certain areas are becoming congested with cars. For example, a house with 6 students has 6 cars. Neighbours are constantly disturbed and cannot park their own cars and have their drives blocked.
RN: 63 P Nolan	4a	1 in 10	Extend the number of streets that restrict parking for university students.
RN: 64 J Taylor	4a	2 in 10	<p>Landlords have more control up to 6 students. The landlords need to be more accountable. They become rich quickly by letting poor accommodation in some cases to desperate students.</p> <p>Providing university controlled accommodation which is affordable may get some private landlords out. Pleased that the council is now trying to address this problem. The area will never be like it was 20 years ago, however this may sustain it for the future.</p>
RN: 75 M Bradley	4a		<p>Discretionary licensing should apply to all privately rented properties whether the tenants are students, or not.</p> <p>Dependant on the site and nature of the neighbourhood. The number of cars permitted in student housing needs to be limited.</p>
RN: 79 N R Canvin	4a	3 in 10	All students should be on campus.
RN: 108 Fenn	4a	3 in 10	<p>Increase ASHORE to cover Holt Drive, Outwoods Road, Outwoods Drive as these areas are very close to University and will see influx of students if suggested boundary is adopted.</p> <p>Should give more time for exhibitions (suggest all day Saturday) to give everyone chance to attend. Restricted times suggest we are not enthusiastic about having dialogue with the community.</p>

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
RN: 119 C R Moss	4a	1 in 10	<p>The "Outer Zone" should be extended to include the Holywell Drive area where numerous houses now being let to students- nearly 10% near the Derwent Drive and Coniston Drive entrance to the University.</p> <p>Licensing particularly important for student accommodation to control the maximum number of cars/ house (say 3) and ensure safety. All student houses to have a safety certificate with annual inspections with costs paid by property owner.</p>
RN: 120 V Candlish	4a	1 in 10	
RN: 136 O'Flynn	4a	2 in 10	<p>Need a register of private landlords with a contact number for each student property so landlords can be responsible for their tenants actions 24/7. Register to be accessible at the University or on the internet and funded by landlords charged a local tax.</p> <p>If a landlord is not able to deal with problem students he/she should not be allowed to buy any more properties.</p>
RN: 140 M Jose	4a	1 in 10	<p>Powers needed to compel landlords to maintain student properties in good order and decoration. Some look scruffy and are deteriorating.</p> <p>Could the University build more tower blocks for students? And would they get planning permission?</p>
RN: 141 M Howard	4a	1 in 10	<p>Add to Option 2 " Planning conditions on new houses to prevent occupation by students"</p> <p>Discretionary licensing should cover rear gardens too.</p> <p>Much of problem is caused by drunken, loud behaviour of students in transit.</p> <p>This is a good start- thank you.</p>
RN: 142 P Swain	4a	1 in 10	<p>Levy a tax, Council tax, on student accommodation at least a percentage of the full rate.</p> <p>University should, if it does not already, introduce a no car policy for students in halls of residence for first years.</p> <p>Loughborough is only one tenth the size of cities like Nottingham and Leeds and is being totally swamped by students. The town cannot accommodate any more.</p>
RN: 148 G M Neal	4a	2 in 10	<p>Regulate landlords and make them responsible for student tenant actions.</p> <p>Landlords should pay double or treble Council Tax and there should be local stamp duty on sale of investment properties.</p> <p>Residents blighted by student neighbours should receive compensation, for example, reduced Council Tax.</p>
RN: 154	4a	3 in 10	<p>Add to your scheme HMOs of 5 or more students. You have allowed communities to be devastated and destroyed. Sadly all the</p>

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
V M Evans			houses (now 70-80%) let to students in Frederick Street will not come under your scheme. So what happens to the remaining families here? Last autumn I had the most terrible time with the students living next door. I am disturbed every night during term time. We cannot move and need peace.
RN: 179 S D Meyrick	4a		
RN: 207 Swithenbank	4a	2 in 10	How many university and college students are housed on campus and is all the campus accommodation full? Is there any regulation of post graduate students?
RN: 218 S G Evans	4a		The higher numbers at Hollywell drive and Conisten Crescent have not been highlighted as an outer zone. Due to their close proximity to the university, there is a percentage of student lets higher than 10% from my front door. This is an oversight, which will be rectified. Kirkstone Drive also has a high number of student lets.
RN: 238 L Macfarlane	4a	2 in 10	
RN: 245 E G Pinks	4a	1 in 10	
RN: 248 H Webster	4a	2 in 10	Student properties should not be exempt from council tax and this should be amended so council tax or business tax is paid by the property owner. Limit the number of cars per house where restricted off road parking is an issue.
RN: 252 P Mills	4a	1 in 10	Robust plans for dealing with control of untidiness, poor upkeep of properties and antisocial behaviour in all properties which house students, including properties which house 6 or less.
RN: 253 J Ivins	4a	1 in 10	I think 1:10 is far too high and will distort the existing mix of residents in an area. 1:30 would be better. However, if the University wants more students why cannot they provide accommodation on campus? No room, no more students. The ratio of students to the town population is already too high, placing strains on town/gown relations, local traffic infrastructure, local sewerage, water infrastructure etc. The council should do everything in its power to stop student expansion. Why not explore the cost of providing sewerage to cater for the on campus expansion prohibitively expensive unless the university agrees to stop its expansion plans? There are too many students where I live. I feel sorry for the residents of Storer Road and the surrounding area.
RN: 255 D E Clarke	4a		1:10 is too many. It should be at least 1:50. 1:100 would be even better.
RN: 257 S Watts	4a	1 in 10	More control over noise from student houses. The residents parking scheme is continually abused, where the police do nothing. CBC must provide more traffic wardens. Street cleaning is non-existent. The collectors are leaving full bins on the street and ignoring recycling bags not left in houses.
RN: 267 M Charlesworth	4a	1 in 10	1:10 is still far too high a proportion in residential areas.
RN: 274 Nanpantan	4a		Areas outside the ASHORE should be assessed for the degree of risk of studentification over the next couple of years. Should prevent unacceptable growth.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
Residents' Ntwk			The area between Fairmont Drive and Snell's Nock Lane should be 1:50 houses or fewer, in order to preserve the residential character of the neighbourhood. I would term this area at risk from creeping studentification.
RN: 293 P Dexter	4a	2 in 10	We have lived happily in William St for 21 years and hope to stay for a while yet but litter and vandalism to our house and cars gets worse. Our daughter is at University at present and we understand the pros/cons of living in a University town. Tired of noise at night, burgers smeared on windows and wing mirrors pulled off cars. Many problems result from being on the route back to the campus from town at night.
RN: 298 J Davis	4a	2 in 10	I lived in Leeds and the main student area of Headingley was more of a ghetto for students and low income residents. Need to recognise Leeds is a city and not a town. Approach needs to be flexible but with controls of landlords and tenants.
RN: 306 A D Bailey	4a	2 in 10	<p>The scheme should not leave any unit /area completely surrounded by others that are more highly protected than itself. As an example St Marys Close with only 2 of 11 addresses occupied by students, could be left unprotected in a very studentified area. There may be a case for exceptions such as the town centre as more Printhouse style developments in an area of few residents might be deemed appropriate.</p> <p>A time delay should be included to manage predictability. Once a unit is protected it should remain so for 3 years even if student occupancy falls below the threshold in that time.</p> <p>To make the scheme manageable need to ensure it is not necessary to review every unit /area each year. Perhaps only units/ areas that are already controlled and those adjoining them will be reviewed each year. When planning applications are sought or local searches executed applicants should be informed that an area is adjacent to a controlled area and will be reviewed in the next round, so that controls might be introduced within a year – this would create a “being watched” zone that entirely surrounds the controlled area.</p>
RN: 313 G Merrick	4a	1 in 10	<p>Impose a system of licensing on all student properties so as to control the proportion of rented homes in the town.</p> <p>In the Nanpantan Ward there are increasing numbers of student properties, which is having an adverse effect on the area and is reducing the number of family homes available for purchase by families with young children.</p>
RN: 315 J Bassett	4a	2 in 10	I think option 4a is sufficient.
RN: 346 Anonymous	4a	3 in 10	Concerned about the restrictions on extending my property for the use for my family. Also the removal of PD rights to my house. Do these infringe my human rights? Long term family residents should not have their PD rights removed. This should apply only to landlords who are likely to rent to students.
RN: 358 B Dheer & Miss R Surch	4a	1 in 10	

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
RN: 13 K M Butcher	5	2 in 10	Parts of Loughborough have been overwhelmed by deteriorating premises due to student occupation.
RN: 19 R A Smithurst	5	1 in 10	Modern lifestyles of students and most mature adults are very different and do not mix. Until there is a level of respect, discipline and behaviour to allow individuals to live in harmony large groups of students or any group with an incompatible lifestyle should not be encouraged to live in normal residential areas. University should house students on campus and accept responsibility for policing student anti-social behaviour.
RN: 26 A Mayfield	5	1 in 10	Speeds Pingle has approx 50% landlord owned properties currently occupied by people working Loughborough and a few well behaved students. Concerned that will be let to students, rented properties are not maintained and rubbish is left lying around, families are moving out.
RN: 27 W Smith	5	1 in 10	Speeds Pingle was built for families and first time buyers with car parking for 2 cars per property. Approx 50% of properties are landlord owned and families are moving out. In general do not have a problem with noise and bad behaviour but litter, unkempt front gardens and generally untidy properties is not good. Not spotted a road sweeper in ten years, car parking is a problem due to high levels of occupancy and no traffic wardens to police it. The University does bring trade and good publicity to the town but the Council should insist that the University takes responsibility for the increasing student numbers by building accommodation on campus to ease the mounting problems.
RN: 28 A G Selby	5	1 in 10	This should address every part of Loughborough. The Council does very little to control this problem.
RN: 29 K Oxford	5	1 in 10	
RN: 30 M Whittam	5		Give a clear definition of 'managed' student accommodation - some agents purport to manage - and LURS. What constitutes a neighbourhood? How big/small houses. Out of 19 terrace villas on Radmoor Road, 14 are HMO with 5/6 students.
RN: 31 A Longburn	5		No extra students in the inner area.
RN: 32 C Shaw	5	2 in 10	Far too many students already in the area.
RN: 34 B A Marples	5		Option 5 offers the possibility of constant review. Take each case on its merits and protect certain areas from (further) development as student accommodation for social, economic and environmental reasons. The ASHORE approach leaves many areas unprotected. None of the proportions need apply. It depends on the type of property and location and generalisations are inappropriate.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			Removal/reduction of garden areas is unacceptable from an environmental point of view. Strictly control excessive development of properties for (student) letting. Constantly consult with the University with regard to its expansion plans so that it takes full responsibility for accommodation.
RN: 35 P Shone	5	2 in 10	Option 5 – adopting new procedures on a street by street basis in Loughborough and eventually Charnwood - with an annual review would be beneficial to all.
RN: 36 K Brewin	5	2 in 10	
RN: 38 G T Hawley	5	2 in 10	
RN: 41 J V Herring	5	2 in 10	
RN: 42 W Herring	5	2 in 10	
RN: 46 S Day	5	1 in 10	Park for children. In term time children cannot use park as up to 100 students play rugby, basketball, golf, football etc. Or can the children use college fields?
RN: 47 U Kellard	5	1 in 10	Students should not be allowed cars in town. Why had nobody at the meeting on Monday 15th February 2005 received this form?
RN: 48 G Evans	5	1 in 10	Consider the system operated by Cambridge University – university pay/university controls and no cars. Prefer option 5. When a street reaches the 20% saturation point, families start to move in great numbers eg Storer ward. We must bring families back into areas now unbalanced.
RN: 53 I White	5	1 in 10	Initially student housing helped to create diversity within the neighbourhood. However, with the massive increase recently in student housing this has had a negative impact, resulting in the loss of community feeling and diversity. This has resulted in people moving away from this area and due to this the town centre has become a place almost exclusively for young people in the evenings unlike other cities and towns. In addition, many pubs have become bars.
RN: 55 J Pierce	5	1 in 10	An obligation for the university to provide on campus accommodation for every new student. The town is already saturated with student housing. The council should know exactly the amount of student houses against the number of dwellings. The government subsidy for each student is taxpayer's money. A student house provides the landlord with between £8,000 - £10,000 of unearned money. Loughborough residents subsidise the landlords.
RN: 62 D M Williams	5	1 in 10	All students should be housed on campus and where there is no more room, there should be no more students. The entrance to the university from Epinal Way should be moved to Ashby roundabout.
RN: 71 Arguile	5		This is not acceptable at all where retired people live in a quiet cul de sac. Just because it is handy does not mean it has to be desecrated with bedlam student and young people doing their thing. Are you completely naive?

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			As explained no student housing is acceptable. We have been to meetings, so why don't you listen?
RN: 74 A Shepherd	5	1 in 10	<p>Legislation should be able to control properties for 6 or less students. These are commercial properties where there is no control over expansion of these businesses in residential areas.</p> <p>Car parking needs to be addressed. Some roads are being used for parking which will create a hazard. Further expansion of student accommodation should take place on campus. Restraining student housing in student in certain identified areas could merely push the purchase of properties for this purpose to other areas and Loughborough is already unbalanced and further expansion in the town will speed the exit of ordinary families.</p>
RN: 81 R I Porter	5		<p>Examination of all ways to control quality and quantity of student housing. A second university site would be ideal. Managed student accommodation should not be allowed in town. Publish a list of properties claiming student exemption, fiddling is going on. To drive up standards of student accommodation and fairness for all the Council must be more proactive and stop washing its hands of the problem. Agencies can solve the problem of landlord/student accommodation in Loughborough. Any policy the Council can come up with will help. The Council must ask itself these questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there the will to solve it. Does everyone sing from the same hymn sheet? • Have major developers had a special relationship with the Council that has not been in the interests of the community? <p>Over the last 40 years Loughborough has been planned badly. Development has been money driven. The Council, University and landlords can work together but it will need someone not connected to make it work.</p> <p>Aim for no student houses unless the owner lives with them, ensuring they pay council tax.</p>
RN: 84 Shaw	5	2 in 10	<p>University should manage and maintain the properties in town, not the private landlords. A reduction in the number of cars of both students and residents.</p> <p>The extent of the ASHORE is not wide enough. Beacon Road has 50% of the houses are occupied by students. They keep antisocial hours. Gardens are unkept with venom. Family housing is no place for undergraduate students. Warden controlled campus accommodation is the way forward.</p>
RN: 96 Youngs	5	1 in 10	Under 1:10 houses. On campus accommodation only, except for post graduates.
RN: 105 R Bowman	5	1 in 10	Wish to see controls of "To Let" signs and more restrictions on residents parking.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			<p>1 in 10 for the outer area and 2 in 10 for the inner area.</p> <p>Controls mentioned in options 2, 3, 4 & 4a should be considered for inclusion in option 5.</p> <p>Option 1 not suitable.</p>
RN: 106 R Hogg	5	2 in 10	How would the option be 'policed' and enforced? (with reference to permitted development.)
RN: 109 J Slevin	5	1 in 10	<p>Should examine approaches in similar sized towns (suggest Hatfield) and not big cities. An increase of 22% to town population each term has large impact on traffic and pedestrians.</p> <p>What contribution is made to Council tax by student property owners?</p> <p>What is College doing to increase numbers of students accommodated on campus? And in controlling intake in proportion with campus housing?</p>
RN: 116 M & C Allen	5	1 in 10	<p>Option 5 has the potential to protect all areas at risk. If a permanent boundary is drawn problems usually spread just outside the boundary. Who draws the lines?</p> <p>Student houses to be kept to a minimum so the permanent community can care and look after students as minority. Areas of restraint need to be quickly adopted to stop the increasing number of landlords extending into back gardens and roof spaces. Gardens are important to allow families to move back in. The University need to build on campus soon 6-7,000 bedspaces. No more in town.</p>
RN: 132 P M Scott	5	3 in 10	
RN: 135 B Dzudzewicz	5	1 in 10	<p>Fed up with the students – forcing families to leave, antisocial behaviour, late night noise, rubbish, vandalism.</p> <p>Arthur St 50% students, Frederick St 75%, William St 80%, Curzon St, Heathcoat St 80%, Caldwell St 90%.</p>
RN: 150 Haydon Road	5	1 in 10	Members of Haydon Road Resident's Association would like all student housing to be on campus.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
Residents Association			
RN: 151 M Calverley	5	1 in 10	Over the last 3 years the influx of students occupied houses on the Marlborough Place estate has escalated. In Robin Mews students outnumber residents. There is noise and games playing at anti-social hours, residents are moving away, parking problems due to the amount of cars brought onto the estate by students.
RN: 157 L Madge	5	3 in 10	Warden areas and fast response to complaints. Patrols or CCTV to limit anti-social behaviour and vandalism. The number of occupants per house is also an issue to consider. Landlords should be notified of problem student/households and expected to respond positively.
RN: 158 G McMahon	5	3 in 10	Students living in an area with larger numbers of permanent residents are more likely to respect neighbour way of life/property/area. Students living in areas with high numbers of students will live as if on campus like a 'holiday camp' creating more noise, rubbish and drunken vandalism. We experience this on Storer Road daily. Our current student neighbours are excellent but the general noise, damage/vomit in the street at night is not conducive to family life.
RN: 167 B Pressinger	5	2 in 10	Consider the approach of Cambridge University ie. Less cars, especially limits per 3 bed town house. The community should not face financial costs for implementation but landlords of student accommodation. If for health and safety reasons there was a stop on dining rooms being turned into bedrooms and if they are charged Council tax on that room you would have an immediate curb on the numbers of occupants, cars and rubbish. It is healthy having the students in town but a shame the majority do not know how to behave and too many per house.
RN: 168 RMeredith	5	2 in 10	The problem would be reduced if the University was to provide more accommodation for its undergraduates on campus. Every effort should be made to persuade the university to do this.
RN: 200 Carington Street Committee	5		This does not work. Everyone drives now so it works out 1 parking spot in front of the house. Where do the others park? Its mayhem. Carington Street is a private road and we do not want students to come here. Knightthorpe Road is mayhem with student cars etc They pull in and turn off the main road and someone will get killed. Paget Street, Leopold Street etc people cannot get access due cars being parked both sides of the street.
RN: 201 V Jobling	5	1 in 10	1 in 10 houses maximum.
RN: 203 J Middleton	5	4 in 10	All larger properties/old factories have been converted into housing and I have found it difficult to find premises in Loughborough for my manufacturing business. All residents should come to terms with living alongside students and the community. My family love living in Paget Street and support local facilities but there is no community and so we have considered moving. Too many students in an area spoils community spirit and divides people.
RN: 204	5	1 in 10	Have first hand experience of the negative effects of student occupation in a residential area and the conversion of properties to

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
J N Morehouse			accommodate 5 or 6 students (sometimes without planning permission) by absent landlords. A pleasant area becomes one where families no longer want to live. My preferred option is that the university should build on campus.
RN: 205 H Puttick	5	1 in 10	Gather information from Glasgow planning dept, on street designation rather than output areas, which has a policy of 1 in 20 student occupied houses per street. I feel very strongly that in a small town we should be able to be clear about demarcation and not cloud the issues for the public.
RN: 208 D Gibbs	5	2 in 10	Things have been allowed to slide too far already: degradation of the civic environment must be stopped. Loughborough civic planners have always taken a 'laissez faire' attitude to building development in the town. We've witnessed this since I first came to the town 40 years ago. Time for a change?
RN: 209 P Gibbs	5	2 in 10	Option 5 relates particularly well for my area but I feel option 4/4a would be best for the future of the town. I feel very sad that the Council have not been able or willing to support residents concerns, particularly in the Storer area, despite resident requests over more than 5 years.
RN: 211 S Walsh	5	3 in 10	Please look at parking. If you introduce residents parking make sure you can back it up with traffic wardens.
RN: 215 Charnwood Conservative Group	5		<p>The conservative group considers a reasonable number of student houses in any particular area should not exceed 20%. This will help to keep a more balanced community. Keeping the number of students low in any one area would help to respect the local residents' values, with the opportunity of maintaining local services and schools.</p> <p>Loughborough University and College contribute to making Loughborough the vibrant and thriving town it is. We want to encourage mixed and inclusive communities by avoiding the creation of large areas of similar housing. Option 5 is considered the best option which allows some control over the future growth of student accommodation that would cover Loughborough. It would give a clearer strategy to manage new student housing provision and the impact upon the town. It would be highly responsive to changes in new student settlement patterns so would never need to be overhauled. Option 5 could be applied to the whole of the Borough as it is cheaper to live outside of Loughborough and may result in students living outside of the town. When defining the area in option 5 a small cluster of streets should be used.</p>
RN: 221 A Strachan	5	1 in 10	If a student house has 6 adults occupying it and a non-student house 2 adults, then 1:10 houses will be made up of 25% of students which is high. All parts of Loughborough are at risk of studentification.
RN: 224 J Green	5	1 in 10	The whole town, including residential areas, is becoming flooded by students, which needs protection from being over developed for student accommodation. A restraint area should be applied. Landlords should be made responsible for occupants of their houses where they should pay council tax.
RN: 227 K Clarke	5	1 in 10	<p>A continual and unremitting campaign with national government to raise standards of housing. This should make Charnwood fireproof if there is local action in future.</p> <p>The problem is not students. The problem is population density in certain areas of town. High-density population causes</p>

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			<p>disease, noise and squalor. Students have inadequate toilet, bathing, hygiene and cooking facilities. Everything is carried out in one room. Such arrangements causes them to buy convenience food, which creates more rubbish. All authorities should have established policies to improve housing by reducing crowding. The students union should make the representations on behalf of their members</p> <p>The local authority needs to adopt a policy of minimum requirements for persons living in multiple occupancies. This should include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A bedroom with washbasins, shower and toilet en suite • A separate room for study and relaxation • Separate and adequate cooking facilities • Each of the above should have a minimum cubic capacity. <p>The policies should be reviewed and standards improved. We should show concerns for young people as they will look after mature citizens.</p>
RN: 236 Lakin	5	1 in 10	Keep student accommodation on campus and provide car parks for cars, not our roads.
RN: 239 R Hills	5	1 in 10	<p>Landlords of existing student houses should be responsible for upkeep and appearance of the exterior of their property and surrounding area and be held accountable. Landlords should be responsible for council tax and charge students rent accordingly if they choose to live off campus.</p> <p>Purpose built and managed student accommodation should be provided on campus. When student numbers make this impossible then student numbers at the university should be limited accordingly to the accommodation provided. Student numbers cannot be allowed to increase without limit.</p>
RN: 241 A Mercer	5	2 in 10	The residence parking area is a failure in Radmoor Road and Westfield Drive.
RN: 247 R B Scriven	5	1 in 10	
RN: 249 N Patel	5	1 in 10	
RN: 250 M E Kirby	5		None at all.
RN: 251	5	1 in 10	None.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
G T Hawley RN: 260 H Ramsden	5	1 in 10	Too many here now.
RN: 261 R A Leivers	5	1 in 10	
RN: 262 L & D Rose & Temple	5		<p>Planning conditions on new houses to prevent occupation by students.</p> <p>We live outside the ASHORE area and would suffer from a rise in student housing if the zone was introduced. Introductions of no university parking on Mountfields Drive, etc have created problems in Outwoods drive, where people now park making it hazardous. The same sort of thing would happen with student housing if the new zone is introduced.</p> <p>Outwoods Avenue is made up of 20% student housing. The house next door is a rented property and could potentially be let to students, meaning 30% of houses would be student properties. Students and local residents have different ways of life, which could cause conflict. The only way forward is for more properly managed student halls to be built on campus, where students are offered incentives to live here. Another possible solution would be for more town centre developments above shops or pubs, minimising the impact on residential areas and students would be close to town center facilities.</p>
RN: 265 D Carden	5	2 in 10	<p>The number of cars brought into town by students causes congestion from parking. The university is close enough to Loughborough without the use of a car.</p> <p>The council has a lack of involvement on the condition of student properties. Landlords make huge profits out of student lettings. They should have to maintain the exterior of such properties, thus preventing the street looking like a slum.</p>
RN: 269 P J & P A Clift	5		None of the above options are acceptable. Students can integrate into the neighbourhood, but appear to be better catered for on the university campus, where they can be with other students and noise and late nights would not have to be sorted out by students themselves.
RN: 271 J Moore	5	2 in 10	Controls and safety standards should be on smaller student houses including external maintenance of property and gardens.
RN: 272 S A Harrison	5	Not a problem	Why can't you leave the residential areas to the Loughborough residents and keep the students on campus.
RN: 273 J Robertson	5	1 in 10	I feel the Council are starting to consider the effects of the students and I am pleased a debate is being taken seriously at last. We do welcome students, and realise it is a minority that create the problems. We do not however want to see the community spirit go from our town. Some student houses are an eyesore and are neglected and make the streets and roads look a scruffy state. Bike riding on pavements is a menace. We have had near misses coming out of our own gate, weaving between the pedestrians.
RN: 279 M White	5	1 in 10	

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
RN: 280 V M Wilson	5	1 in 10	
RN: 281 D Allen	5	1 in 10	
RN: 284 Retired ex-member of University staff	5	1 in 10	<p>Loughborough University should be able to implement a scheme similar to Cambridge University. It would be relatively easy for the University to require all students to live in either University owned or approved accommodation. There are very sensible reasons why the University might wish to do this, besides helping student numbers in certain areas. There have been unfortunate tragedies at other institutions. If there are complaints from students or neighbours, the University could use the threat of withdrawing the license to ensure improvement.</p> <p>An inspection is carried out by the University to ensure accommodation meets the latest standards of health and safety. This inspection service would only license up to a certain proportion of houses in each street. Such a system could be introduced immediately with exemptions given to those streets with more than 25% of houses rented to students. It should be made clear to landowners that no further properties will be licensed in those streets until the number of such houses decreases to the approved level. To add a greater weight, such a policy could be introduced jointly with CBC.</p> <p>The Borough Council should restrict its activity to controlling the spread of possible student residences that house more than 6 students, blocks of flats and the siting of off campus halls of residence.</p> <p>If there is one home in the street where they are badly behaved, then one home is too many. However, if the students are well behaved and the house well managed and tidy in appearance then 1:10 should be ok.</p>
RN: 288 J M Partridge	5		<p>Planning conditions are needed on new houses to prevent occupation by students.</p> <p>1 in 20 student houses would be more than reasonable.</p>
RN: 290 M Morehouse	5	1 in 10	Criteria for the ASHORE should include how close and accessible an area is to the University. Our (Derwent Dr) area is just yards from the University and already over 15% student lets, yet is not in the ASHORE. Have all student properties been counted?
RN: 294 B Clough	5	1 in 10	<p>No further student properties/ extensions should be allowed in town. All students should be on campus or on sites at least 100 m away from a residential area.</p> <p>Student properties are generally less well kept than residential units, gardens at best unkept and many have refuse sacks in them. There is insufficient parking to cater for student cars.</p>
RN: 300 E Kerry	5		Wish to see Knightthorpe Road, Milton Street, and Byron Street in the restraint area.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			We do not want or need streets to be filled with students.
RN: 302 N Layton	5	1 in 10	
RN: 305 A Parsons	5	1 in 10	The current approach is resulting in the breakdown of a good relationship with the university and its students. We are proud of the University but not at a loss of normal home life.
RN: 307 R H Gillard	5	2 in 10	<p>Many streets in Loughborough have far more student occupied houses than is desirable. The Council should do its level best to encourage permanent residents to return to these areas as and when opportunities arise and in the meantime ameliorate as far as possible the adverse consequences of having student neighbours. Measures might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring private landlords keep properties and gardens in good repair and tidiness • adopt a draconian 24hr response policy to deal with excessive noise • adopt a zero tolerance policy of litter on streets, including wheelie bins • enforce residents parking schemes • not allow to let signs on houses or in gardens. Use small notices in windows <p>No obstacles on permanent residents selling to a private landlord in streets with already large number of student properties. If people have to sell to them to move then so be it.</p>
RN: 309 G Adams	5	2 in 10	<p>Agree with council taking action but it is far too late. The balance has swung too far to the detriment of local families wishing to live in the centre of Loughborough.</p> <p>Option 5 favoured but would support any measures to curb student numbers. 1 to 2 houses in 10 would be acceptable. More than this will cause problems from noise, car parking et al. Try getting young children to sleep on along summers night in our street (Westfield Drive) with 6/7 student houses playing music or gathering in gardens.</p> <p>Two student neighbours have gone for Easter leaving overfull wheelie bins, 10 black bin bags and 4 recycling bags for collection over next fortnight. Gardens are a disgrace with next doors laid with stones to accommodate numerous cars, incredibly loud at 1am. Such issues are annoying to local residents choosing to live in the area.</p> <p>The 54 bedroom accommodation block on Radmoor Road should not have been agreed on a site so small. How will the legal agreement be enforced to prevent students bringing cars? There is very little enforcement now with many students' cars parked for days without permits.</p>
RN: 322 Storer Ward	5	1 in 10	Landlords should be charged business rates for collection of refuse. They are running a business. Areas could be cleaned more regularly and charged to them directly, not passed onto tenants in their rents. This could be achieved by fixing fair rents, not fair rent = market rent, and enforcing these.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			All these option are too little too late. The council cannot do anything with less than 6 tenants. The majority of housing in this area is small terraced housing and therefore appears whatever option is chosen will be irrelevant. The Council already has powers to keep garden and properties to a reasonable standard, but these are not used.
RN: 325 R L Smith	5	1 in 10	
RN: 326 E Porter	5	1 in 10	If the house is used for students and not a family, then that's a change of use where they should be taxed accordingly. Student life styles are different because they are young. There are too many in such a small town among families and older people, which does not work. They should be on campus where there is plenty of land, which should be used better. Build more student accommodation and leave houses alone in the town for Loughborough families.
RN: 332 A Baxter	5	2 in 10	
RN: 333 L Porter	5	2 in 10	
RN: 334 C Humphreys	5	2 in 10	The boundary of the zones, in option 5, can move to reflect new developments or changes in the housing market. This could be given a measure of certainty by only allowing an area to be moved one level on the scale. Unless there is a significant amount of building on campus the changes would be new areas coming under controls rather than areas leaving. If a need for certainty, adding areas to the controlled zone could be automatic, the removal of areas from control could be done when the SDP is reviewed. On campus accommodation should be a priority. The SDP should state when applying for planning permission the presumption should be against new purpose build student accommodation in all areas except on campus. There should not be a differentiation between managed and unmanaged student accommodation due to problems of increased traffic, car parking, noise etc. All managed student accommodation should be included in the number of households used to define the boundaries of the areas. No managed student accommodation in areas where there is already an imbalance. I am against option 4, which is likely to further unbalance the community mix. Sites in the town centre should be flexible for accommodation. It should not be earmarked for student accommodations, which would be deserted in summer months.
RN: 335	5	1 in 10	The problem is that the houses are empty in the holidays.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
E M McCadghan			
RN: 336 M Portsmouth	5	2 in 10	
RN: 337 Knightthorpe Residents Association	5	1 in 10	Knightthorpe Road, Byron Street, Milton Street, Deane Street, Carrington Road, Albany Street, Tyler Avenue and Clifford Road should be included in the ASHORE outer zone. These areas will soon be swamped with students as they are close to the proposed outer zone and the university.
RN: 338 J Kearins	5	2 in 10	Accommodation provided on campus with responsibility for monitoring by council, police and university. Access restricted to main entrances. Existing use of land on the university is very poor, lots of green areas and two storey flats. More in the town than on their site. More students on controlled sites. More supervision of students such as the police and university. More control on student noise in lodgings. I have witnessed the effect when looking after elderly relatives on Ashby Road, clearing up sick every Saturday morning. I do not want any more students in my area.
RN: 340 A P Harvey	5	1 in 10	Sites should be allocated on campus. No new sites should be allocated in the town.
RN: 341 C Walker	5	1 in 10	Residents would like to see effective action regarding student housing from the planning department. The leaflet was not originally distributed to Westfield Drive. Photocopies posted through the door after consultation events had passed.
RN: 342 J Harrison	5	1 in 10	
RN: 345 F & E M Harrison	5	1 in 10	
RN: 347 J M Rees	5	3 in 10	
RN: 348 E B Rees	5	3 in 10	
RN: 350 E A Roberts	5	1 in 10	Options 4 and 4a do not prevent any large expansion of student occupancy in either existing zones or zones adjacent to the ASHORE. 1:10 is based on the fact that 2:10 means that normal residents will in 50% of cases on average be living next door to a student property. The Council and university should work together ensuring that, while the present proposals for building on campus

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			<p>facilities for the 2000 plus students are progressing, further accommodation is provided on campus for all subsequent additional students. The University has requested a large parcel of land with sympathetic consideration by the Council, which could be used for this purpose. If London is successful for its Olympic bid then Loughborough will undoubtedly be a major place for athletes, where good accommodation will be required to house them, which could be provided on university land and used by students afterwards. I am sure there will be objections.</p> <p>Cambridge has a partnership between the town and the university where student accommodation outside the colleges is controlled by a registration scheme in which students are required to live in approved accommodation. Some scheme like this could work in Loughborough.</p> <p>Leeds or Nottingham cannot provide on campus accommodation or accommodation adjacent to the teaching facilities like Loughborough.</p>
RN: 357 M E Block	5	2 in 10	
RN: 268 P Street	2 & 3	1 in 10	<p>Planning policy alone will not deter landlords. Student housing should be charged council tax. The landlords operate it as a business, therefore they should be liable, which would reduce the economic viability overtime.</p> <p>Where behaviour is inconsiderate this should be an issue. Community wardens should patrol the ASHORE areas nightly to deal with anti social behaviour, from 8-2.</p>
RN: 49 J Brooks	2 & 4	1 in 10	Give residents a contact number for complaints about late night noise and anti-social behaviour. The University should take action against repeat offenders.
RN: 176 W R Griffiths	2 & 4	3 in 10	
RN: 133 L Doherty	2 & 5	1 in 10	<p>ASHORE in some form should be applied across Loughborough apart from the campus and the University because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • give all permanent residents a genuine feeling that their needs come first • reduce the need for reviews and updates as different areas come under pressure for student housing • improved environment in all areas as licensing or other regulations applied to prevent poor upkeep, loss of gardens, removal of front walls, rubbish etc • send a strong message to the University that student levels should not increase beyond current levels as a town of Loughborough's size cannot absorb more • tighter controls could in the long term encourage a shift of students away from terraced houses, first time buyer and family homes into purpose built accommodation in the town centre or, preferably, the University campus • reinstall a sense of pride in Loughborough and support for the Borough Council both of which have taken a

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			<p>battering of late.</p> <p>The ASHORE as defined misses certain areas:</p> <p>Herrick Rd 16% student houses, but 26% at Beacon Rd end Lower Beacon Rd up to Beacon pub is 16%+ Woodlands Drive 10%+ Oliver Rd 15% Please include these streets in whatever scheme is adopted.</p>
RN: 82 C Johnson	2,3,4, 4a	1 in 10	<p>Much more responsibility by the university for the conduct of all students.</p> <p>Student houses all in one street could mean additional cars, greater noise levels and more rubbish and bins.</p>
RN: 09 K Lester	3 & 5	2 in 10	<p>The ASHORE boundary is not large enough and will push the problem into neighbouring areas. Include Knightthorpe Road, Toothill Road and adjacent streets.</p> <p>2 in 15 is better. Match future increases in student numbers with increased accommodation on campus or otherwise in specially built and managed facilities well distributed around all of Loughborough.</p>
RN: 05 M A Robinson	4 & 4a	3 in 10	Burleigh Road is surrounded by student houses. It is difficult to find a parking space close to home during term time despite resident parking tickets. Streets are cluttered with rubbish.
RN: 33 J Barker	4 & 4a	1 in 10	
RN: 45 P A Bassford	4 & 4a		
RN: 61 G Adams	4 & 4a		
RN: 186 S Church	4 & 4a		<p>Anti social behaviour from students in residential areas should carry with it heavy penalties for the landlord and students.</p> <p>Appearance of properties in residential areas should have as good appearance as the residents in that area and not lower the time of that area.</p>

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			<p>Totally agree with the Council that at long last they are trying to help its own residents in Loughborough. There a lot of people moving out of the town because of the number of students taking over and the anti social behaviour that goes along with it. A private landlord has purchased the property adjacent to ours where 5/6 students live. This is a quiet area not designated for students. We now suffer anti social behaviour, high noise levels, constant banging around of doors and stampeding up and down the stairs, drunkenness and up to 8 cars around our house. The state of the house is appalling. The only avenue left is to get the Police involved and serve an anti social behaviour order, which we would be prepared to do.</p> <p>Private landlords should not be allowed to purchase properties for students. Made it harder for the younger generation to purchase a house as it has pushed the house prices up. There will be no areas left to go soon where we can get way from the student community.</p> <p>What happens to our house? We are trying to sell our house, and are unable to with students living next door. Do we get compensation? Money has been spent on the house trying to enable us to sell it. We have even tried to sell to people who buy to let to students, however they tell us the property is too far out of town.</p>
RN: 321 J D & N Manton	4 & 4a	1 in 10	Residents of Hollywell Drive are appalled by the deterioration of the area caused by students. For example, front gate at number 66 looks like a slum, a wheelie bin has been stored there for a fortnight and is now surrounded by 15 bags of rubbish. This is not only a disgraceful, unsightly mess but constitutes a health hazard.
RN: 44 E Randon	4a & 5	1 in 10	
RN: 103 F O Myers	4a & 5	1 in 10	Wardens needed to monitor student behaviour especially in evenings, at night and weekends. They should have powers to warn students if their behaviour is causing nuisance and to take further action if required.
RN: 18 K Workman	None Stated	Not a Problem 4 in	Students no problem at all and they bring a lot of trade to town. Resent type of people who buy out these houses and exploit students with high rents and spend little on the houses they buy.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
		10	
RN: 21 J V Harris	None Stated		NIL houses in any town neighbourhood. Build student accommodation on the university campus.
RN: 22 L Walker	None Stated	1 in 10	Build more student accommodation in the University grounds. Only students over 21 years to live outside who should pay Council tax.
RN: 60 Anonymous	None Stated	1 in 10	No mention has been made regarding landlords providing off street parking to the houses let to students. Why is the university not made to build more accommodation on the campus?
RN: 70 R A Shooter	None Stated		Private property should be for families with children, not for students.
RN: 80 New Life Financial Planning	None Stated		Once an area is defined, the events within an area are well controlled. Outside the boundary the same problems arise. Difficulties about definitions and accusations of discrimination are likely to be leveled at the Council when making and moving these boundaries. A licensing system for all properties where students are able to see their property is up to an agreed standard. If below the standard then the students would be able to appeal to the LA for action against the landlord.
RN: 85 D Chew	None Stated		Restrict/control the number of properties occupied by students to no more than 10%/20% in one area. The university should pay the council tax that students cannot pay. More housing on the campus. A limit on the number of people who attend the university, rather than it continuing to expand. The university needs to stop expanding.
RN: 93 Charnwood & North West Leicestershire Primary Care Trust	None Stated		No expansions in the health center facilities on the campus site that is in line with the large increase in student numbers. This should be included in future development plans for the university. If this fails, then a major contribution will be required to expand local facilities.
RN: 94 William Davis Ltd	None Stated		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issue surrounding student housing is caused by unmanaged accommodation located in predominantly residential areas. • Provision of managed accommodation, on and off campus, has not kept pace with the growing demands of the university and as a consequence private landlords have filled this void by acquiring flats/houses and letting direct to students. • The options will prevent intensification of existing properties let to students. It will not address or reduce numbers in locations, which are already considered to be imbalanced. • The most effective solution is to increase the supply of well-managed student bed spaces on and off campus. Expansion of the university needs to be combined with identifying suitable sites in the town which will complements the University's effort and accelerate the provision of well managed bed spaces. • The supply of student accommodation should draw students out of residential areas, creating properties for single

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			occupancy use.
RN: 100 M Mordew	None Stated		No problems with the students. The students are quiet. The students add prosperity to Loughborough. If students lived next door this would not bother me. The majority of students are good fun, pleasant and friendly. It is just the people of Loughborough who seem to resent them. Live and let live and you can get on with everyone.
RN: 137 J Bentham	None Stated	1 in 10	Reduce the number of student lets already occupied. All accommodation should be on campus. Owners of student properties should pay business rate of Council tax.
RN: 139 Anonymous	None Stated		Students not wanted in Woodlands Drive.
RN: 162 English Nature	None Stated		The sustainability appraisal report indicates in Appendix 3 (page 18) that all 5 options may have some impact on biodiversity. It is recommended that the successful option is undertaken following the policies for biodiversity set out in the 'Leading in Design SPD'.
RN: 165 House Builders Federation	None Stated		Policy from the adopted Local Plan positively encourages student accommodation. Policy also states that the conversion of the property into flats will be granted provided proposals would not be harmful, particularly to residential amenities. It is queried whether the SPD is in accordance with the adopted local plan policies. It seems that it is trying to revise policy by SPD rather than through the planning process. Concern that the new SPD will result in severe restrictions in respect of the creation of new student accommodation in some localities. This will redirect development pressures onto other areas, which could increase land costs in such a way that would hinder land assembly and regeneration efforts.
RN: 195 Environment Agency	None Stated		A significant proportion of housing is situated in area of high flood risk. The issue of flood risk may impact on the insurance of properties, which, as a result of increased premiums, may alter the attraction of accommodations for students.
RN: 199 D Bradshaw	None Stated		Student houses are used as business premises by landlords. If student houses remains domestic then students should pay the full domestic council tax rates. If the properties are regarded as commercial, then the landlords should pay the full rates as if the house was used as a business property. This will generate more revenue for the borough and it will discourage the use of these houses as a way of generating income and not paying tax. This would therefore put onto the housing market small homes suitable for first time buyers at a sensible price, disperse the student population and return houses to residential dwellings,

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			<p>creating diversity in the town.</p> <p>The university can create its own accommodation. If students live off campus, then they must pay council tax.</p>
RN: 216 Herrick Road Area Residents Group	None Stated		Herrick and Beacon Road should be included within the ASHORE. The reaction that these roads had not been included was astonishment. It was estimated that Herrick Road, Beacon Road and Lower beacon Road, up to the pub, are made up of an estimated 16%, 26% and 17% of student houses respectively.
RN: 222 L Parmenter	None Stated		<p>Option 4a seems the least bad option, however this, and others, will simply drive the problem outside the ASHORE, creating a larger problem.</p> <p>Basic controls covering the whole of Loughborough are needed, otherwise certain areas will become ghettos.</p>
RN: 233 Sibley Parish Council	None Stated	1 in 10	<p>Councillors feel that none of the options are suitable, but state that Loughborough University is one of the main landowners in Loughborough and feel more should be done to create accommodation on site.</p> <p>More notice of submissions from local residents should be taken.</p>
RN: 234 Highways Agency	None Stated		<p>Creating accommodation for 2,800 students within the university campus will result in existing residential properties being brought back into more traditional use. The reversion to traditional residential use would in effect result in a large number of additional residential properties, with consequential increase in traffic growth.</p> <p>From a Highways Agency perspective a key ingredient is identifying and achieving the correct balance of demand for student housing with provision. This should minimise the need for student travel from outside the area and hence reduce the number of vehicles on the trunk road network.</p>
RN: 256 B James	None Stated		None of the options given seem right. Student housing should either be on campus or in certain areas specifically for students so they do not impinge on the general population. Student lifestyle is generally not compatible with the average non student so the populations are best kept separate. Mature and overseas students may be an exception.
RN: 266 Leicestershire Constabulary	None Stated		<p>There is a need to control off site student accommodation with the objective of creating a balanced community. The principle of zoning is the correct way forward. However frequently sites concerns consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher incidents of anti social behaviour, particularly at unsociable hours • Increased levels of crime and fear of crime
RN: 276	None Stated		The university should not increase student numbers until it builds enough accommodation on its own land to handle them. It is not

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
A Pagett			<p>acceptable to let private landlords and therefore private householders deal with the problems. The university is greedy and self-centred.</p> <p>Even 1:10 is far too high. The university should build purpose built student accommodation on campus, even if it means building tower blocks. The University is reaping the rewards of higher student population and the house owners of Loughborough are subsidising them.</p>
RN: 286 Leicestershire County Council	None Stated		The threshold of what constitutes a balanced community needs further exploration. The assumptions of "in the region of 25%" made on p8 of the Student Housing document are unconvincing.
RN: 331 G Spencer	None Stated		<p>Vocal opposition of student housing in the town comes from a small proportion of people, compared to the number of student residences across town. The majority of students are intelligent, pleasant and polite. No one with positive or neutral views are normally represented. Students are normally blamed for disruption in the town, however not all damage is done by them.</p> <p>Having students located within one area can be an advantage as they share the same age range and lifestyle.</p> <p>Students give the town vibrancy and life.</p> <p>Houses in student areas are normally well looked after.</p> <p>It is not only landlords who have invested in student properties, but local people.</p> <p>Thinning concentrated areas down is happening by osmosis as the choice of location migrates spontaneously.</p> <p>The program leaflets of response is a limited form of expression. Neighbourhood is not a deprived area. The parameters need to be broadened.</p> <p>First time buyers and young families normally prefer new build. Property prices in Loughborough appear to have risen with the rest of Britain.</p>
RN: 344 J Wills	None Stated		We live outside the zones and are aware of the problems, which may affect new family areas. I disagree with the options and I think all new student accommodation should be restricted until long term plans are fully explored. The obvious solution is purpose built accommodation on campus which will not disrupt long term residents in Loughborough and cause families to leave the area, which is currently happening as people are moving to Mountsorrel, Coalville etc due to prices.
RN: 349 Loughborough	None Stated		Support for the provision of student accommodation on campus, as well as on sites on or near to the town centre. Links made to the SPD on Loughborough University East Park.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
& District Civic Trust			<p>Concern over the number of students in Loughborough as a proportion of the population compared to most other cities. Given the size of Loughborough and the access around it, the whole town is accessible for students and potentially at risk from studentification.</p> <p>Special measures need to be adopted. No support for the ASHORE as it was too restrictive and could see students moving out of the controlled areas and dominating other areas. If the ASHORE is favoured, the boundaries need to be expanded.</p> <p>A zonal approach is favoured, with policies covering the whole of the town and applied when necessary.</p>
RN: 354 S Bullman	None Stated	2 in 10 & 3 in 10	<p>Option 5 is the only option that can respond to demographic changes as needed. It prevents pushing the issues across the border, as the border is drawn up to where there is a problem. This will also prevent having to go to public consultation every time the SPD map is revised. Two occupation levels need to be defined. Three categories correspond to green, orange and red. No risk/caution needed/out of balance. This will ensure that areas will not go from green, to red in one revision unless there has been an extraordinary rate of development, in which case this may be appropriate.</p> <p>Green - normally seek to permit Orange - automatically consider at Committee Red - ejected unless reasons for permitting are in evidence.</p> <p>All student housing should be included in the number of households used to define the boundaries of areas. Where more than 5 students are in occupation at any dwelling/unit, every 5 bed spaces counted as one house. This will enable current off campus student accommodation to fairly accounted in the traffic light designation.</p> <p>The SDP should state that large scale applications, over 1 dwelling, with student blocks should be presumed for rejection in all town areas except on campus. Any build on recognized development areas should be starter homes/low cost housing/other housing that can contribute to the government targets. Student housing does not contribute. Sites in the town should not be earmarked for student accommodation.</p> <p>Option 4 targets student accommodation in the Outer zone which is unacceptable as it would further imbalance the community.</p>
RN: 360 J R Barton	None Stated		<p>Why can't we control properties with 6 or less students in them as these are the houses, which seem to cause most nuisance to Loughborough's permanent residents, who pay council tax. I am sure a way could be found to control these student residences. I find it extremely difficult to believe that the outer zone have less than 25% student occupancy.</p>
RN: 361 GVA Grimley	None Stated		<p>The University acknowledges and understands the concerns by certain communities about the impact of student houses on the resident population. The university recognizes the need for a greater degree of control and introduction of policies, which deliver</p>

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005

Respondent	Preferred Option	Reasonable No of Student Properties.	Comments
			<p>better residential environments. It notes the limitations of the planning system and the powers soon to be available to the Council under the housing Act and considers these likely to benefit local communities.</p> <p>For the SPD to carry weight in planning decisions, it must be robust. Establishing a robust boundary will be difficult. There is insufficient information to enable the Council to judge what constitutes a reasonable number of student houses in a particular area. A judgment made on a proportional basis would be simplistic and the more factors taken account of, the more complex the calculation becomes. We urge the Council, therefore to explore all the alternatives before defining the optimum area of control.</p> <p>A robust set of policies/guidance should be put into a DPD rather than a SPD, which will carry more weight and be the subject of challenge and debate at the planning application stage. This would also achieve greater certainty.</p> <p>The SPD contains more information than is needed, which diverts the reader away from the salient points. This information will also be quickly out of date. The document should emphasise the point that the university is planning to increase the number of on campus bed spaces provided and that it will encourage provision of privately managed accommodation off campus. This will benefit local residents and local housing market, especially as the university's undergraduate population is not forecast to grow in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>If the SPD is to retain references to the specifics of on campus University development, it should not comment on the delivery of additional bed spaces by 2006/7. It is no longer possible for the University to complete this residential scheme in the timescale quoted, due to delays at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The University will engage in discussions about the provision of managed accommodation in town and agrees sites should be identified through the DPD. It would also welcome a discretionary licensing regime for HMOs and a landlord accreditation scheme.</p>
RN: 362 A Gimpel	None Stated		The zone outside the ASHORE should be defined as 10% student housing. If not it should be part of the inner or outer zone. This is why the town has to be looked at as a whole.

Appendix 2- Comments from Stakeholders on Draft SPD Options Consultation, February 2005