

CORE STRATEGY

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RELATING TO: SECTION 4 - DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE GROWTH: SOUTH CHARNWOOD - ALTERNATIVE DIRECTIONS FOR GROWTH

QUESTION 15: If you disagree with the preferred directions, please identify which alternative you would prefer.

QUESTION 16: Please explain your reasons for choosing one of the alternatives.

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN08 N W King	Close to A46 and M1	
RN09 Rothley Parish Council	<p>Anstey/Glenfield triangle.</p> <p>Accept the need for employment land. Should be situated on the Leicester side of the A46. The Anstey/Glenfield triangle is better suited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has good access to the M1 both north and south; • A site north of Birstall for commercial development will generate additional traffic on the A6/A46 junction which is already fully utilised – traffic queues past the Rothley/Cossington slip road at times • Direct access to the M1 is southbound only, at north of Birstall, unless turning off onto the A50 at the Anstey/Glenfield triangle to go north. 	
RN14 D Liggins	Glenfield is within urban area and could help reduce need for housing at Loughborough.	
RN15 M Birkinshaw	Clear break needed between Leicester City and Charnwood's adjoining settlements.	
RN23 A Rumsey	There should be no expansion anywhere.	
RN28 M S Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share development equally so no one village has to have all development and each faces some of the upheaval. There are already more buildings, work, traffic etc in Birstall. • Development would be more acceptable if small scale instead of joining all villages around Birstall into one mega industrial site. 	
RN37 Miss N L Sharpe (and on behalf of R Truslove, Ms A Sharp)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development must not harm Charnwood Forest, Bradgate Park or Beacon Hill • Concentrate development in the South East. 	
RN38 M Sadler	Make use of the A50/A46 junction for development which would provide good access to the M1.	
RN40 G & G Braybrook	Look more intently at brownfield sites for housing by using derelict industrial sites, Move existing smaller industrial sites at present in the middle of housing estates to larger established industrial estates and re-use for housing. Renovate empty houses.	
RN42 K E, D L & S Carnall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new development area in Charnwood Forest or Wymeswold Airfield would be better than adding to urban sprawl of Leicester and already overloaded roads and services – as in area east of Thurmaston and north of Hamilton. More development near Barkby would be really bad, lost in sprawl and loss of good agricultural land. Preferable to develop from scratch in a new area so services can be provided. • No longer any need to safeguard Forest area for access to mineral resources as much material used in Leicester is now imported from Europe, and lot of land useless for agriculture. 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN43 D Shuttlewood	Development at Anstey due to access to the A46 and M1 would eliminate a great deal of through traffic.	
RN171 Beeby Parish Meeting	In larger settlements of Anstey, East Gosgate, Rothley and Anstey. Suggest location north of Rothley adjacent to Wyevale Garden Centre.	
RN318 G B Stephenson	Relocate Birstall Golf Club and redeveloping the sites.	
RN338 R Singh	In larger settlements of Anstey, East Gosgate, Rothley and Anstey Larger settlements (Anstey, East Goscote) already have good services, infrastructure and transport for new housing development. These areas are not densely populated.	
RN349 A Aucott	1 st choice adjoining Glenfield. Suggestion to build along A46 ay Syston as an alternative.	
RN351 C Sweeney	1 st choice adjoining Glenfield Along Fosseyway Syston or Syston stretch A46. Build on existing communities, rather than digging up open countryside.	
RN352 C Sweeney	Along Fosseyway Syston or Syston stretch A46. Build on existing communities, rather than digging up open countryside.	
RN355 J Booth	1 st choice adjoining Glenfield. Glenfield has lost its village status and already seen as part of Leicester.	
RN408 E Goodson	1 st choice adjoining Glenfield. Land between A46 and other trunk roads could be utilised.	
RN409 L Tillen	1 st choice adjoining Glenfield Keep urban spread to a minimum, protect village identities to help local community activity.	
RN438 G Wilson	Should plan for a new settlement for 10,000 homes and a new community over 30 years rather than in fill and concentration.	
RN454 A Barnett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrate residential building in Glenfield area or larger settlements of Anstey, Rothley and East Goscote. Syston has many existing new housing developments or in the pipeline. • Concentrate building for employment purposes around A46. 	
RN456 Leicestershire County Council	Neither of the rejected options for the distribution of new greenfield development is consistent with the Structure Plan.	
RN467 Seagrave Parish Council	1 st choice adjoining Glenfield Glenfield has the facilities to absorb further development and easy access to Leicester.	
RN497 Thurmaston Action Group	<p>Land north of Birstall is more suitable for the allocation of employment land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to A6, A46 and M1; • Birstall has a growing population but a severe lack of employment land. There is also a lack of employment land in adjoining villages – Rothley, Mountsorrel, Swithland, Cossington, Woodhouse Eaves, Woodhouse and Anstey. 	
RN503 L & S Healey	Build elsewhere. Do not take the remaining little green area of Thurmaston.	
RN544 C M Osborn	Locate development in locations with better transport access such as the A6/A46 junction at Birstall, and next to the A46 at Glenfield.	
RN545 A Wells	<p>1st Choice: Glenfield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good existing road linkage to A46/M1. 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would expand and area that is already an urban/industrial area: • Mixing large areas of employment land with largely rural/light urban areas is a big mistake. Concentrate employment land in existing industrial areas and consider better public transport infrastructure. 	
RN608 J M Neal	Leave these options for comment by those most affected.	
RN611 P Raja	Because I know the area well.	
RN618 Birstall Parish Council	1 st choice adjoining Glenfield. Glenfield offers some residual capacity, as do Syston and East Goscote. Para 4.64 states requirement for more employment in Anstey and Syston.	
RN722 Anthony Aspbury Associates on behalf of W Davis Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest a higher proportion of housing should be directed to north Charnwood. Given there is likely to be increased housing in RSS review there is scope for further development, primarily housing, of a strategic scale in and on the edge of large urbanized service centres such as Rothley/ Mountsorrel. This would complement major strategic allocations by providing spatial and market choice and variety and help deliver affordable housing with shorter lead times to maintain supply once existing commitments fully taken up. This would be consistent with strategic planning objectives at all levels and with draft CS settlement hierarchy with Service Centres second. • Rothley/ Mountsorrel is a popular housing location with attractive character, good local facilities, convenient public transport access on A6 corridor. Large Rothley Lodge employment allocation enhances sustainability of settlements with good access to Loughborough and Leicester. • There should be site specific allocation south of Mountsorrel, east of Mountsorrel Lane to be secured by adding to bulleted locations at draft CP 3 iii) with scale to reflect RSS review and be above commitments, windfalls and small urban capacity sites and reflect capacity of site. • The scheme would be a limited urban extension of c 7 or 8 ha (200-250 dwellings in cluding affordable housing) astride and to north of an extension of Walton Way to Loughborough Road with structural planting on southern boundary. Balance of land southward to Rothley Brook would be donated to Parish Council as amenity land within defined management arrangements and with potential environmental enhancements by a commuted sum secured through planning agreement. Existing recreational facilities would be retained in situ and no ground remodeling needed as development retained north of the ridgeline. This would better retain local separation and retain best and most versatile farmland than previous scheme rejected by Boroughwide Local Plan Inquiry Inspector. There may be scope for wider traffic management measures and public transport improvements by contributions. 	
RN726 Fisher German on behalf of Rearsby Ltd	Area between existing Rearsby Business park and Rearsby bypass considered suitable for an extension contributing to local needs being close to workforce and services.	
RN728 R Youngs	1 st choice adjoining Glenfield. Adjoining Glenfield Leicester then Anstey/ east etc then Other - These are communities with existing facilities that could be strengthened by adding shops etc to reduce travel. Good bus links available.	
RN734 P J T Barnett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic in area already troubled by traffic rat running • Insufficient medical services, water supply etc • Existing development taking place in Syston • Excessive take up of Greenfield land. 	
RN735 R P & A E Tweddle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Anstey / Glenfield location appears to be more acceptable as Glenfield is already attached to Leicester and area has excellent roads and access to A46 and M1. 	
RN738	Future development better located in areas with better transport infrastructure, for example, Birstall A6/ A46 and Anstey/ Glenfield	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Barkby Parish Council RN739 Bell Cornwell Partnership on behalf of Merlion Capital Corporation	<p>areas accessible to outer ring road; or between Rearsby and the bypass.</p> <p>Promote 13.6ha of land outside the floodplain and lying south of Wyevale garden centre between the A6 and river Soar at Rothley well located to strategic employment and/or housing requirements and possibly in addition hotel and conference facilities.</p> <p>Majority of land is considered to be previously developed land currently only subject to countryside designation. Given the main road infrastructure, proximity within 400m of high frequency bus services, the Rothley Lodge development and garden centre most land in the vicinity is predominantly developed.</p> <p>Development would be consistent with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues 1 & 2 as provision of affordable housing is most likely through market housing sites and the amount of housing needed is likely to increase through the regional spatial strategy review and require release of additional land • Issue 5 because employment in this location close to the A6 would reduce traffic through settlements and replace employment lost in existing settlements (Issue 8 & 9) • Issues 18 & 19 as there are limited opportunities to expand in Rothley/ Mountsorrel area without harm to settlement identity and character. • In terms of the Vision this is generally supported but the Rothley/Mountsorrel area close to the A6 should be identified for appropriate growth if acceptable sites are available • Objectives SO3, SO4, & SO5, SO7, SO8, SO9, SO12, SO13, SO14, SO15 and SO17 are supported and development in this location can help achieve them. 	
RN796 T Stott	<p>There is an existing employment area at Rearsby which could be served from the new bypass. This area should be considered as an alternative to jumping the A46 North of Birstall.</p>	
RN800 Mather Jamie on behalf of Hamilton Trustees	<p>Housing growth should take place to the East and North East of the Hamilton area as comprehensive expansion of an existing and flourishing residential area.</p>	
RN802 T Higgins	<p>Thurmaston/North of Hamilton are more likely to serve Leicester City than to meet the needs of South Charnwood, so development north of Birstall is preferred along with development in the larger settlements and adjoining Glenfield/Leicester.</p>	
RN806 A Kay	<p>Adjoining Glenfield/Leicester is preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area North of Hamilton is the start of the very rural East Leicestershire area. Villages like Barkby and Beeby still have the feeling that they could be hundreds of miles from a major city. Further intrusion in this direction would have a major impact on this rural atmosphere, even if the land where the development takes place is not itself of outstanding landscape character. • Glenfield is already subject to considerable urban intrusion including the A46. 	
RN817 T Birkinshaw	<p>1st choice build on larger settlements: build on land between East Goscote and Rearsby and the new bypass; employment sites mainly.</p>	
RN825 G P Francis	<p>Improve barren and brownfield areas.</p>	
RN890 C Clegg	<p>Take into account the needs of local villages and communities. Creating large areas of employment/industry etc will have an adverse effect on current facilities.</p>	
RN891 A Cooper & JM Hornbuckle	<p>Sites for housing development could be provided north of Birstall on Butchers Lane:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Birstall is favoured by the Core Strategy for further development; • Satisfy Policy 10 relating to the retention of settlement identity; • Land falls outside areas liable to flooding; 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closer to existing and planned facilities than a large proportion of Birstall; • Carefully planned development would enable an area of separation to be maintained to ensure retention of the separate identities of settlements; • Strong physical boundaries. 	
RN892 A Cooper, MW Hornbuckle, LM Cooper (dec'd) & JM Hornbuckle	North of Thurmaston is appropriate for residential development: (specifically north of Barkby Thorpe Lane): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively level field and slopes away upwards towards surrounding fields; • Sequentially a good location for development; • Protect the purpose of the Green Wedge; • Provide a good rounding off opportunity for built development in that area; • Located close to facilities/services; • Railway line provides a logical and physical boundary to define future limits to development; • Railway noise could be mitigated with appropriate measures. 	
RN896 D Patel	1 st choice in larger settlements of Anstey, East Gosgate, Rothley and Syston. Glenfield and Leicester are under the influence of Leicester City Council.	
RN899 Langham Park Developments	1 st choice in larger settlements of Anstey, East Gosgate, Rothley and Syston. Opportunities exist for employment development on the A6 corridor south of Rothley and on the A46 corridor south east of Cossington (plans included with submission). Consider alternative land south of Cossington: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A highly accessible location for high quality employment land. • Employment land proposed East of Thurmaston as not sited within A6 or A46 corridor and so an inappropriate location for a large allocation of general employment land. 	
RN905 R Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve Anstey, Bradgate Park and Charnwood Forest. • Do not cross A46 at Birstall as this would cause visual intrusion into what is left of the Soar Valley. • Infill from Glenfield to A46 (in non-flooding areas). 	
RN908 M Dimitrov	Ticked larger settlements of Anstey, East Gosgate, Rothley and Syston. Larger villages – to provide larger settlements with more job opportunities and cheaper housing to keep young people in their home villages.	
RN911 J Barber, Woodcock Farms Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	1 st choice in larger settlements of Anstey, East Gosgate, Rothley and Syston. Distribute housing development around the Service Centres in South Charnwood including Rothley as North of Hamilton and East of Thurmaston will not be able to accommodate more than 485 dwellings due to highways constraints.	
RN917 Mr & Mrs Westwood	Do not agree that development should be bolted on to the East of Thurmaston but should be completely new settlements with new roads linked to motorway and other major roads and to have schools, doctors etc already in place. Concern is also raised about level of existing development in the Barkby and Syston areas and its impact upon the local highway network.	
RN1295 J Shields	1 st choice: adjoining Glenfield/Leicester – Development adjoining A46 and A50 transport routes and does not encroach on local villages.	
RN1346 A Johnston	Reconsider spreading more development around the larger and indeed smaller villages: Many villages are desirable places to live and people obviously want to live in them: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severely restricting development in such settlements is causing high house prices resulting in many young people born and 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p data-bbox="524 129 1451 161">bred in these villages having to move to places such as Syston to find accommodation;</p> <ul data-bbox="465 161 1872 288" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="465 161 1839 225">• Provision of more dwellings in such locations would help to save the village shop and pub and so making such settlements more sustainable <li data-bbox="465 225 1872 288">• Pushing more and more development into towns such as Syston is resulting in "town cramming" making the urban areas less attractive places in which to live. 	