

CORE STRATEGY

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RELATING TO: SECTION 4 - DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE GROWTH: SOUTH CHARNWOOD - DRFAT CORE POLICY 3**

QUESTION 17: To what extent do you agree or disagree with Draft Core Policy 3?

QUESTION 18: If you disagree, what changes would you suggest?

Respondents	Summary of Comments
<p>RN10 Leicester City Council</p>	<p>There is uncertainty about the scale of additional homes and jobs pending the RSS Review. The agreed scale of any urban extensions of Leicester will need to be phased 2011-16 and 2016-21 to avoid prejudicing urban regeneration strategy.</p> <p>Thurmaston option: Access to a 30ha employment site would be problematic. Not acceptable for a new link road to cut through green wedge and access via existing Hamilton Business park to Thurmaston Lane roundabout may require demolition of existing units. Need to commission work on impact using Central Leicestershire Traffic Model. Close proximity to committed housing at east Hamilton could have amenity implications and visual impact problems. Access is a key issue. Inspector's recommendations that green wedge land either side of Barkby Thorpe Road be reallocated for housing and employment were not accepted. Issues being reconsidered through LDF work.</p> <p>Hamilton option: Access is a key issue and further details of impact on highway network are needed. Need to commission work on impact using Central Leicestershire Traffic Model. The scope to link with East Hamilton scheme subject to planning application needs to be assessed. Flooding may be an issue. No concerns about compatibility with existing and planned housing at Hamilton. The impact on local facilities and Hamilton Centre needs investigation. The large anchor store may be able to cope.</p> <p>Anstey: Leicester Replacement Local Plan Inspector rejected any modification of green wedge boundaries in area east of Glenfrith Close/ Leicester Frith Farm because of the importance as a finger of open land reaching into Leicester from countryside and separating development on each side. Object to impact of development on separation and openness and likely further development pressures.</p> <p>The view of the Director of Regeneration and Culture is that substantially increased growth pressures are likely in the Leicester PUA following RSS review and that some urban extensions may be needed (unless very high densities can be achieved in the City). Of the options East of Thurmaston seems most desirable if it can be properly phased and proper connections to the highway secured. It could fit well with the intention to review green wedges in LDF.</p>
<p>RN15 M Birkinshaw</p>	<p>Neutral/Not Sure. Top priority should be re-use of brownfield sites. The government's imposed housing and employment targets should be rejected. Need locally determined targets.</p>
<p>RN23 A Rumsey</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree. No expansion wanted anywhere</p>
<p>RN49 Mrs Lang</p>	<p>Disagree Strongly.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I moved to a rural area to live in a rural area and not have it ruined by more development. Villages like Birstall have long</li> </ul> </p>

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>sustained bus services and local shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regenerate rundown areas of Leicester and release old factories for houses.</li> </ul>	
RN56 A W G Ballentyne	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimise spoiling of Greenfield sites by redeveloping unused land in the town for new homes in small parcels</li> <li>• As road infrastructure in Loughborough is scarcely able to handle existing traffic seems unwise to expand town.</li> </ul>	
RN98 J Hemborough	<p>Sileby is becoming a horrible place to live due to the amount of new housing being built and the traffic it creates. Why do you want to build more houses?:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sileby used to be a village but it is no longer;</li> <li>• Exercising horses is a problem and is unsafe in terms of cars overtaking and the cars pass too close on the roundabout at Albion Square;</li> <li>• Building on land where horses are kept;</li> <li>• The impact it is creating on the village;</li> <li>• Impact the new houses are creating on the roads, schools and doctors.</li> </ul> <p>Roundabouts are a waste of space as people do not realise to give way to the right. The roundabout on King Street, near the pet shop is too big and gets blocked by parked cars.</p>	
RN339 CPRE (Charnwood)	Disagree. Need statement about buffer zone and screening on Eastern Margin.	
RN345 A Kidger	Agree. South Charnwood proposals will require support from Leicester in terms of transport and schools.	
RN350 D Aucott	Disagree Strongly. Area is becoming swamped with housing and new housing will take up huge amounts of space. Fields are valuable for agriculture and leisure The roads surrounding this proposal are already gridlocked and will create more traffic in the villages	
RN438 G Wilson	Disagree with points (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), (xviii) and plan for a new town.	
RN456 Leicestershire County Council	<p>Detailed comments of the Director of Highways, Transportation and waste Management are as follows:</p> <p>The quantity of housing proposed is generally consistent with the Structure Plan and is supported.</p> <p>The proportion of new housing development on previously developed land equals the target set out in the Structure Plan, and is supported.</p> <p>The annual requirement used to calculate the total amount of employment land required is based on the quantities set out in the Structure Plan. The policy is therefore supported. However, the proposal to locate 20 hectares of employment north of the A46, north of Birstall is a cause for concern because it would extend the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area beyond the defensible boundary of the A46.</p> <p>The generalised directions for growth, as set out above, will allow for comprehensive planned development to take place on a phased basis to provide for the homes, jobs, transport and social and community needs of the population. This approach is consistent with the Structure Plan and is supported.</p> <p>Detailed comments of the Director of Highways, Transportation and Waste Management are as follows:</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Borough Council is following the appropriate approach to identify their preferred direction and scale of growth. However this will allocate substantial amounts of new development in areas where there are already considerable existing transport problems. The proposals will either require substantial investment in order to deliver transport solutions or compound the existing congestion.</li> <li>• At present little work has been completed to identify if there is an acceptable deliverable solution to the congestion, pollution and impact of heavy volumes of traffic that exist in and around Loughborough and in South Charnwood in settlements close to Leicester.</li> <li>• The proposals for South Charnwood are located in areas where there is little scope to deliver the necessary transport infrastructure to support such large scale proposals.</li> <li>• Further detailed assessments will be required to identify the scale of the impact and the necessary transport infrastructure improvements, which can be fully funded by the development.</li> </ul> <p>The County Council will need to be assured that polices on development and the transport system are consistent with strategic guidance when the General Development Control DPD is published for consultation.</p> <p>The existing network of libraries and mobile library service within Charnwood of significance and should be taken into account particularly in relation to Draft Core Policy 3: Development Strategy for South Charnwood Items vi and xiv.</p>	
RN460 Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome introduction of a flood management strategy for the River Soar and its tributaries. The Agency would support the Council in the preparation of Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, as advised in Draft PPS25. In particular, the Wood Book has significant impact on the development potential of the Town Centre and other parts of Loughborough and the Borough.</li> <li>• In considering sites for development it must be demonstrated through a flood risk sequential test that a site is sequentially preferred, and that a site at lower flood risk is not available for development.</li> </ul>	
RN467 Seagrave Parish Council	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>Disagree with parts (iii), (iv) and (xviii). Birstall and Thurmaston/Hamilton are already developed. Thurmaston/Hamilton would encroach on small villages eg. Barkby Thorpe</p>	
RN551 Holmes Antill on behalf of Palmer Tomkinson Trust	<p>Agree Strongly.</p> <p>Quantum of employment land north of Birstall should be flexible to enable site appraisal, infrastructure feasibility to be examined and to maximize economic development potential within relevant environmental parameters.</p>	
RN615 R E Davies on behalf of St Michael and All Angels, Thurmaston	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.53 The Thurmaston/Hamilton option would add to pressures on Barkby Thorpe Road. There is a lot of industrial land on Soar side of Thurmaston that could be redeveloped</li> <li>• 4.55 Hamilton and Thurmaston must not meet in an industrial sprawl</li> <li>• 4.57 Growth may be accepted but must be done with care. Fields behind June Avenue to Barkby Thorpe Rd and precious views over fields and Melton brook are places where children play safely and fine areas for walking.</li> <li>• 4.64iv) Where would 17ha employment area east of Thurmaston be located?</li> <li>• 4.64 v) Church wishes to be involved in development of green infrastructure</li> <li>• 4.64vi) Church can help support vitality and viability of the district centre as with the enhancement of the Soarside and gateway to Watermead. Could attract boaters using canal to stop and use local facilities helping bring in employment and tourism.</li> <li>• The growth option will expose the lack of leisure opportunities for young people. Thurmaston will be effectively divided into</li> </ul>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>three parts by the A46, the railway line and then Colby Drive unless links are provided. New area will need a community facility in order to reduce potential for disturbances especially late at night.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.64 xv) a railway station at the Auster industrial area could improve access to jobs and services for new development area. An alternative location could be Church Hill Rd combined with widening of bottleneck near railway.</li> <li>• Need for good sized family housing located to focus on village community. Church would welcome opportunity to work with developers from outset to help welcome new parishioners.</li> </ul>	
RN618 Birstall Parish Council	<p>Neutral/Not Sure. Birstall can only make modest contribution to target of 640 houses for small sites and previously developed land.</p>	
RN659 GOEM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extremely long policy, therefore lacks clarity of purpose. The attempt to set an overarching policy context for the remaining CS policies is unnecessary and results in excessive duplication and repetition. The key proposals for housing and employment land requirements and urban extensions, would sit better alone or combined with Policy 4. A number of detailed amendments suggested.</li> <li>• DCP3(iv) should not seek to retain key employment sites unless shown to be necessary in line with 2004 ODPM Guidance Note: Employment Land Reviews (also DCP12 (i)).</li> </ul>	
RN662 English Heritage	<p>iii) provides for 485 homes as first phase of a comprehensively planned urban extension close to two scheduled ancient monuments – a deserted medieval village and a roman villa. EH considers there could be an unacceptable impact on the setting of Hamilton deserted medieval village at the centre of an historic land unit entirely rural in character. Land to the south rises to the parish boundary running along the crest of a slope with a line of mature trees providing a visual barrier between the rural surrounds of Hamilton and Leicester's urban development. Development north of the tree line would be very dominant visually and have a seriously detrimental impact on the setting of the monument unlikely to be capable of mitigation.</p>	
RN726 Fisher German on behalf of Rearsby Ltd	<p>Disagree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed allocation for south Charnwood appears low in relation to modern user needs and geographical advantages of the area.</li> </ul>	
RN728 R Youngs	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>iii) Disagree with chosen location xiv) must include access by public transport xv) 'further improvement of transport interchange' is too vague. Must not include major roads xvi) smaller communities need services and facilities to survive sustainably, as do larger settlements on a larger scale xvii) no building in flood plains</p>	
RN734 P J T Barnett	<p>Scale and location of proposed housing and industrial developments fail to take account of.</p>	
RN739 Bell Cornwell Partnership on behalf of Merlion Capital Corporation	<p>Objections to DCP3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clause iv) proposes Greenfield land north of Birstall and Thurmaston. This ignores alternatives in locations known to be well located for employment and previously developed land</li> <li>• Clauses vi) &amp; vii) introduces effectively a further tier of higher order District Centres contrary to the settlement hierarchy in draft CP1. All Service Centres should be treated in the same way. There is no justification in the evidence available to separate out Anstey and Syston in this way.</li> </ul>	
RN741 GVA Grimley on behalf of Jelson Ltd	<p>Agree.</p>	
RN742 Redrow Homes	<p>Broadly support subject to timescale of 2006 and higher build rate equivalent to RSS Option 3B resulting in about 5180 dwellings on top of commitments and windfalls.. Hamilton location could support more than the proposed 485 dwellings proposed. Accept need</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN792 J Drummond Popley, C Drummond Popley, R J Drummond Popley	for green infrastructure/ integrated transport strategy etc. Disagree Strongly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building only on brownfield sites with more flats built rather than houses as the government states first time buyers like flats. These would take up less room than houses and would still satisfy most of the requirements.</li> <li>• There are many houses vacant within Charnwood that are not selling already. Any old council properties should be upgraded and any long term vacant industrial properties should be looked at as potential dwellings.</li> <li>• The remaining building plans could be relocated somewhere such as Lincolnshire where there is a need for housing, jobs and improvements to the infrastructure.</li> </ul>	
RN800 Mather Jamie on behalf of Hamilton Trustees	Disagree. The urban extensions within Charnwood but adjacent to housing areas within the Leicester City boundary are capable of taking significantly more housing numbers than in the draft policy.	
RN801 F F Rawson on behalf of FFR Ultrasonics Ltd	Disagree Strongly. Maintain green wedges. Consequently little scope for further green field development. It would be a disaster if the Soar Valley became a Leicester/Loughborough conurbations. Recent enormous factories at Rothley set a worrying precedent.	
RN812 A Millie	Disagree. Despite pressure from the ODPM and perhaps from GOEM, growth is not inevitable and not always desirable. Aim SO13 gives priority to be with previously developed land of which there is plenty in the wider East Midlands.	
RN817 T Birkinshaw	Disagree. Re-use of brownfield land should be main priority. Charnwood should not be assisting Leicester's role as one of 3 cities. Leicester has a very low target for houses for its population and is not carrying its fair share of the burden.	
RN824 National Trust	Agree. See Q12 response re-housing numbers overall; use of previously developed land; and density of new housing development.  The two paragraphs after point xviii) do not fit in here – they do not relate to Core Policy 3 alone but also apply to Core Policy 2. It is suggested that the first paragraph is inserted into Core Policy 2 as well as 3, with the location specific references to west and south Loughborough, north of Hamilton and east of Thurmaston edited accordingly.  The last paragraph is more in the nature of a statement than a Policy and is perhaps best taken out and incorporated into the supporting text.	
RN892 A Cooper, MW Hornbuckle, LM Cooper (dec'd) & JM Hornbuckle	Disagree Strongly. Land to north of Thurmaston would be more appropriate, close to services and facilities and has better physical boundaries than East of Thurmaston.	
RN896 D Patel	Disagree. Closer to Leicester and so under the influence of Leicester City Council. These communities deal with amenities and services in Leicester. If Charnwood Council invest then we need some return at least. Charnwood Council need to control and influence not Leicester City Council.	
RN899 Langham Park Developments	Disagree. Unclear how the Council has arrived at the employment requirement of 3.6 hectares per year for North Charnwood in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calculation of residual requirement and annualised rate for the period 2005 -2016;</li> <li>• Amount of land needed to be allocated (2005 -2026);</li> </ul>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inclusion of planning permissions.</li> </ul> <p>Consider that 59 hectares should be distributed to South Charnwood.</p> <p>Support inclusion of 20 hectares of employment land north of Birstall. Consider this should be located to the south of Rothley to west of A6.</p> <p>Object to location of 17 hectares of 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. Consider land south of Cossington as it is a highly accessible location for high quality employment land.</p> <p>Support locational strategy for employment development in South Charnwood and in particular the reference to the A6 and A46 in paragraph 4.54.</p>	
RN905 R Brown	Disagree. Agree but with restraints on paragraph 4.64 concerning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preserve Anstey, Bradgate Park and Charnwood Forest.</li> <li>Do not cross A46 at Birstall as this would cause visual intrusion into what is left of the Soar Valley.</li> <li>Infill from Glenfield to A46 (in non-flooding areas).</li> </ul>	
RN911 J Barber, Woodcock Farms  Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	Disagree. Consider that the housing requirement in South Charnwood is likely to be greater than estimated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to our concerns about their calculation.</li> <li>Implications of the housing land supply situation in Leicester City. The City, in its response to the Regional Plan's consultation document 'Options for Change', indicated that it would require the help of surrounding districts to meet its projected housing requirements under 2B. Through the Regional Plan this may have an impact on the development strategy for South Charnwood.</li> </ul> <p>Amend the document to direct additional housing to the surrounding Service Centres such as Rothley.</p>	
RN912 Radleigh Homes & Messers Clarke  Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	Disagree. Consider that the housing requirement in South Charnwood is likely to be greater than estimated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to our concerns about their calculation.</li> <li>Implications of the housing land supply situation in Leicester City. The City, in its response to the Regional Plan's consultation document 'Options for Change', indicated that it would require the help of surrounding districts to meet its projected housing requirements under 2B. Through the Regional Plan this may have an impact on the development strategy for South Charnwood.</li> </ul>	
RN918 Wilson Bowden and David Wilson Homes  Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	Agree. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the need to allocate new housing and employment to meet strategic requirements to assist Leicester as Principal Urban Area.</li> <li>Draft Core Policy 3 should be re-worded to 'Prioritise the re-use of previously developed land and buildings where these meet the principles of sustainable development and accord with the RSS strategy'. This to reflect the PPG3 guidance as per comments on Draft Core Policy 2.</li> <li>There is no longer any basis for using the housing requirement in the Structure Plan.</li> <li>Consider that the housing requirement in south Charnwood is likely to be greater than estimated due to concerns about their calculation</li> </ul>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The housing requirement should be up to 2026. Need to take into account new household projections.</li> <li>• Clarify sites 'identified for release' and give greater detail when the Submission document is published.</li> <li>• Concern raised about how figure for small sites and previously developed land have been calculated. Submission document will have to be more transparent as to how these have been calculated, and take into account PPG3 guidance.</li> <li>• Concern raised about how Core Strategy has calculated the employment land requirement. Alternative calculation has been included for period 2005 to 2026 based on annualised figures.</li> <li>• Concern about the justification for 3 hectares of employment land at Birstall and mention of the Charnwood Economic Strategy initially focussing on settlements including Thurmaston.</li> </ul>
<p>RN1293 Loughborough Gospel Hall Trust</p> <p>Agent: J &amp; J Design</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Support broad policy approach but object to omission of social considerations in terms of meeting the needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• of an ageing community;</li> <li>• for the moral and spiritual needs such as places of worship and cemeteries.</li> </ul>
<p>RN13 D Ayres, RN14 D Liggins, RN16 M Hall, RN17 E Goodyer, RN19 C Emmet, RN24 J L Mitchell, RN25 M P Parker, RN27 A M Clarke, RN31 G Brown, RN45 B A Fox, RN48 J Lambert, Rearsby Parish Council, RN50 C Moon, RN52 P H Ball, RN59 K R Senior, RN128 C J Keeling, RN142 E E Jones, RN143 R W Jones, RN146 Y W Hannell, RN147 J Heath, Thrussington Parish Council, RN179 S Bradwell, RN293 B J Butler, RN324 N Richards, RN328 K Appleby, RN346 J R Cheshire, RN348 S J Tinning, RN354 C Leafe, RN360 C M Spencer, RN374 J</p>	<p>Agree.</p>

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
<p>Wilson,  RN408 E A Goodson,  RN419 M Hall, RN420  A W Lacey, RN461 R  Hoyland, RN478 C J  Blanchard, RN481 J  Thompson, RN516 M  West, RN542 G  Hobbs, RN543 S F  Hobbs, RN604 E H  Sinclair Goulden,  RN607 M Lear,  RN611 P Raja, RN788  S Bullman, RN795 J  Faulks, Normanton on  Soar Parish Council,  RN811 C T Watson,  RN821 L Emmitt,  RN893 F J Howgate,  RN898 D C Toone,  RN900 Gill, RN901 K  Canner, RN908 M C  Dimitrov, RN910 G  Lees, Pegasus Planning  Group on behalf of  Leicestershire County  Council, RN1295 J A  Shields</p>		
<p>RN06 D B Street,  RN39 Arthur  Gardner, RN54 P J  Morrall JP, RN421 A  Dalzell, RN619 N  Jones, Anstey Parish  Council, RN720 J J  Sutherland</p>	<p>Agree Strongly.</p>	
<p>RN36 M C Dolby,  RN37 N L Sharpe,  RN42 Carnall Family,  RN171 P A Bland,  RN335 P J Thrope,  RN338 R Singh,</p>	<p>Disagree.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN355 J Booth, RN545 A Wells, RN613 P Chamberlin, RN617 C D R Sharratt, RN796 T Stott, RN802 T Higgins, RN815 R A Parsons, RN890 C A Clegg, RN895 J C Pearson, RN902 J & L Blyth		
RN08 N W King, RN20 L Bates, RN21 P&E Coughlin, RN28 M S Smith, RN47 D Moore, RN60 G & P Allen, RN94 L A Briers, RN275 P S Newman, RN277 P Scott, RN337 N Porter, RN349 A Aucott, RN351 C Sweeney, RN353 S J Doyle & R K Stephenson, RN361 P A Higgins, RN409 L Tillen, RN469 J Green, RN477 P Moxon, RN813 P Knott, RN814 N Booth, RN891 A Cooper & J M Hornbuckle	Disagree Strongly.	
RN26 D J Hourston, RN30 C F A Sutton, RN41 J Sutton, RN57 F E Norburn, RN106 C W Askham, RN129 R Bowman, RN166 F A E Reece, RN197 R W Hill, RN284 A C Wood, RN294 D Ross, RN347 M J	Neutral/Not Sure.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
<p>Hagger, RN356 I  Harrison, Wanlip  Parish Meeting, RN465  D Baker, RN521 S  James, Development  Land &amp; Planning  Consultants Ltd on  behalf of Parkers of  Leicester &amp; A J Paker,  RN546 K Davies,  Fisher German on  behalf of Mr  Rutherford, RN547 K  Davies, Fisher German  on behalf of Mr C J  Wells, RN548 K  Davies, Fisher German  on behalf of Mr D  Johar, RN603 R C  Jones, RN605 M  Flatman, RN608 J M  Neal, RN609 S L  Batson, RN612 CI  Humphreys, RN616 H  D Robinson Sharratt,  RN620 M Smallman,  Del-Rosa  Developments Ltd,  RN621 T &amp; C Malone,  RN661 A C Johnson,  RN712 C Potts,  Hepher Dixon Ltd on  behalf of  Loughborough Golf &amp;  Hotel Development,  RN714 L Needham,  The Garendon Park  Countryside  Protection Group  Committee, RN744 S  Mitchell, RN790 P  Froggatt, RN791 R A</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
<p>Gough, Gough  Planning Services on  behalf of Revelan  Group, RN793 L  McGunnigle, RN794 N  Browne, RN797 J  Thompson, RN798 M  Eagland, Peacock &amp;  Smith on behalf of  Wm Morrison  Supermarkets plc,  RN799 A H Olofsson,  RN803 J Wadcock,  Antony Aspbury  Associates Ltd on  behalf of GB Sanders,  GL Sanders, TD  Sanders &amp; D Kettle,  RN804 A Irving,  RN805 D F Bodicoat,  RN806 A Kay, RN808  D M Evans, RN816 S  Cuff, Nanpantan  Residents' Network,  RN818 A Radley,  RN820 J E Mutton,  Loughborough  College, RN822 F  Hitchinson, The  Woodland Trust,  RN823 D E Sykes,  RN894 D Stott,  RN897 D Mear,  RN904 A Corner,  RN907 R Hall,  Andrew Martin  Associates on behalf of  Persimmon plc &amp;  William Davis Ltd,  RN1294 R A Dickson,  Groby Parish Council,  RN1296 J Folkes</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	