

CORE STRATEGY

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

QUESTION 14: To what extent would you agree with our preferred directions for growth in South Charnwood - North of Birstall?

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN09 Rothley Parish Council	Disagree with development North of Birstall.	
RN11 Thurmaston Parish Council	Land North of Birstall is suitable for employment development due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity of A6/A46 corridors • Lack of employment land in the Birstall and Rothley area 	
RN20 L Bates	Disagree Strongly. Very concerned about a 20 hectare site planned in the Rothley/ Birstall area. A huge development for the above area which will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have environmental consequences, • have implications for the already busy A46 and A6 • diminish the ever decreasing boundary between Rothley and Birstall. 	
RN32 G Leich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What happens North of Birstall is surely a question for Leicester City rather than Charnwood. Do not encourage more traffic up the A6. • To avoid further encroachment onto Thurmaston, Cropston, Cossington, Wanlip and Rothley from Birstall maintain very substantial Green Wedges. 	
RN36 M C Dolby	Disagree Strongly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People have paid high prices to live away from city centre and industrial estates. Now find them dumped on their own doorstep • People fed up with constant modernisation. 	
RN44 P C Hartshorn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The industrial development land figures look to be overstated. I cannot see the need for 20 hectares of employment land at North of Birstall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Over last 15 years almost all the industrial sites in Birstall and Rothley have remained vacant or redeveloped for housing; ~ New industrial units are being built near Watermead Park, Charnwood Edge and Rothley Lodge ~ There is land at the Ridgemere site, Syston and there are units available in Fowke Street , Rothley. • Land north of Birstall is prime agricultural land and in a more prominent and sensitive position than the land at Glenfield • The proposed development will considerably reduce the settlement separation between Birstall and Rothley. This is totally unacceptable. • More traffic will be created at A6/A46 junction and the consequences of the development at Hallamfields – 900 houses, fire station, school, industrial area, park and ride, service station- is unknown. • There is no provision to create a Green Wedge along the Soar Valley, even though this land is mainly floodplain, or between Birstall and Rothley. It seems unfair that the Green Wedge between Anstey and Glenfield is being protected. • Consider the consequences of developing on green land close to the river Soar. Further development will increase the problem caused by developing Hallamfields. 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN49 Mrs Lang	<p>The Land East of Thurmaston/North of Hamilton and small windfall sites will fulfil the needs up to 2021 for industrial land.</p> <p>Disagree Strongly. Development north of Birstall is spoiling rural feel of Birstall, Rothley and Thurstaston, making villages feel urban and enclosed. Increases in traffic in Birstall especially Greengate Lane.</p>	
RN60 G & P Allen	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not possible to support all the additional houses, warehouses etc. Utilities, drainage systems, landfill sites, roads cannot cope. • Things are bad enough now for example with all the traffic from development north of Birstall but more traffic and more people as proposed will make our lives a misery • Leave our countryside and wildlife alone. • Do not need any more traffic giving out CO2. • Fight the government's policies. The country is full. 	
RN94 L A Briers	<p>Disagree Strongly. Hobsons choice. Better to give correct location – NW Wanlip. Any other description of north of Birstall would attract opposition. Balancing Hallam Fields means NW Wanlip.</p>	
RN103 A Smith (Parish Councillor)	<p>Birstall has more going for it than Thurmaston. The new housing development is now in progress and would lend itself to industry as there is none at the moment. Access to the major road network for heavy goods vehicles would cause less impact on the village.</p>	
RN166 F A K Reece	<p>Disagree. Disagree with proposed employment site and vague descriptions of location. Concern at visual impact in area of natural beauty. Bentley's Roses location would be least objectionable.</p>	
RN277 P Scott	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birstall overdeveloped • Birstall is not Leicester and should not be treated as a suburb. • Nature of the community is changed • Unacceptable increase in traffic on the A6 • There is plenty of land within Leicester to use for industrial purposes. • Unhappy that most of the borough's developed seems focussed on Birstall and that Birstall has done its share and more • Loughborough is a town. Industry should be focussed there. • Unsure about the need for housing and industry • Green wedge between Anstey and Glenfield is important and so is the green wedge between Birstall and Rothley. • Concern that Birstall not considered by the Borough Council as part of the Charnwood Borough. 	
RN284 A C Wood	<p>Disagree. The development of Birstall will add considerable traffic and disruption to this area. Additional industrial building in this area is not needed in this area.</p>	
RN318 G B Stephenson	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western bypass is extremely noisy • Hallamfields development is blot on the landscape • Further development will destroy the Soar Valley which has diverse ecology and is a wonderful leisure facility 	
RN339 CPRE (Charnwood)	<p>Disagree. North of Birstall will create a conurbation along Soar Valley. A46 is natural boundary.</p>	
RN353	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Doyle/Stephenson	<p>North of Birstall is simply not acceptable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The whole of Wanlip will lose its identity. • To develop alongside A46 alongside the A46 corridor north of Birstall, but also Wanlip. • Wanlip and Birstall have suffered gravely because of Hallamfields and this should not be allowed to happen again. This was a prime example of mis-selling and mis information from the Council. • At meeting with village of Wanlip, Dave Hankin said that a maximum of 17ha north of Birstall- the Core Strategy says 20ha. • The Council's policies do not adequately protect the identity of Wanlip • The Borough Council should afford Wanlip the same consideration as it gives other villages in its Borough. • People in Wanlip received information on 20th March leaving only 11 days, too little time for villagers to consider the matter properly. 	
RN355 J Booth	<p>Disagree Strongly. Concern about local traffic problem with massive development already being built at Birstall. The strip alongside the A6 if developed further will have the effect of merging Rothley to Birstall, thus losing the distinctive nature of the two villages.</p>	
RN356 Wanlip Parish Meeting	<p>Disagree Strongly. Wanlip Parish Meeting is strongly opposed to development of 17 hectares of employment land to the north of Birstall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overwhelming majority of parishioners wish to preserve the identity of the village • Introduction of modern industrial buildings would introduce incongruous form into landscape • Industrial development will destroy views of high ground spinneys fundamental to the villages rural character • Existing situation of the villages being used as a rat run is expected to be made worse with proposals. • This would affect quality of life of parishioners through traffic and pollution • New development would need new junctions and likely to increase accidents • Proposals are on a site where Severn Trent proposed siting a facility but was deemed by Severn Trent and local resident to be unacceptable. • Increasing concern about development encroaching on areas of separation and seriously detract from rural aspects of the Soar Valley • It would appear that there are more logical areas for development East of Thurmaston • Land rises to the north of Birstall and is visible from some of the most beautiful parts of the county. • There are unlikely to be any employment benefits to the people of Wanlip • Development will affect natural habitats. 	
RN372 Anon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solution to congestion in Wanlip and Birstall is to immediately build 'Park and Ride' on A6 and to restrict the passage of vehicles along Rectory Road in Wanlip and Birstall. • Locating employment development next to Hallamfields does not necessarily mean residents from there would choose to be employed. (Still likely that people will choose to travel longer distances). • With trend to larger higher industrial buildings, new unit should be sited lowest level to the surrounding area. • Question raised why cannot disclose where a further 640 houses will be built on draft core policy on page 41 (think is referring to figure on page 42). • The volume of 500+ vehicles passing through Wanlip and Birstall will only increase dramatically. 	
RN456 Leicestershire County Council	<p>Support the preferred options for the development strategy. These are consistent with the sequential approach in the Structure Plan. However, it also makes strong representations that the proposal to locate 20 hectares of employment land north of Birstall is a cause for concern as it would extend the Leicestershire Urban Area beyond the defensible boundary of the A46.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	The County Council will need to be assured that the suitability of specific allocations, including those carried forward from the saved local plan are consistent with strategic guidance when the Allocations DPD is published for consultation.	
RN457 N Pratt	North of Birstall is OK but not beyond A46. The present industrial development north of A46 and east of A6 is on high ground, is much too prominent and will spoil the area. Other developments to east of A6 and alongside Rothley (Grange Park) are at least over the brow of the hill and less visible. As soon as the Birstall extension creeps north of A46 it will be the thin end of the wedge.	
RN477 P Moxon	Disagree Strongly. Loughborough will soon become a suburb of Leicester. Identity will be lost at Hathern, Quorn, Birstall and Rothley.	
RN501 A J Burgess	Object to development north of Birstall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough research has been done into the use of all land within city boundaries in general but Leicester specifically; • Loss of farm land will reduce our ability to provide food especially in a long term emergency where food cannot be imported; • Research the needs of the population in terms of water supply and sewage taking account of planned developments; • Consider increased traffic and the consequences on the A6 and the lives of the inhabitants. The impact of Hallam Fields being incomplete is unclear; • Warehouses will not provide vast numbers of jobs. This country needs manufacturing but north of Birstall is not a suitable location; • Concerned about a corridor of concrete along the Soar valley; • Erosion of the countryside is a very serious issue; • Need for housing and employment was based on an upturn in the economy and the evidence at present is not clear. 	
RN551 Holmes Antill on behalf of Palmer Tomkinson Trust	Agree Strongly. North of Birstall is a genuine strategic location for a major employment site in south Charnwood in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • its proximity to the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area • its position at the confluence of primary north/south and east west transport routes and high quality public transport services between Loughborough and Leicester • High profile, prestigious and accessible location • Opportunity to provide a large allocation to maximize contributions, confirm feasibility and deliver high quality design landscape and local benefits; • North west and north east quadrants are not subject to additional layers of policy protection eg. Areas of particularly attractive countryside, local landscape value, green wedges or areas of separation. • Reflects Structure Plan Policy EMP 2 and Regional Spatial Strategy objective and policies; QUELS and RELPs studies indicating a shortage of high quality land supply around Leicester; • Locationally it meets all the tests on scale, quality and location; it can make a major contribution to regional economic priorities; meets the strategic selection criteria; is a key location in the Charnwood context and an important interaction of the Soar Valley economic corridor and the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area • Continuing housing and population growth in the Soar valley needs to be matched by major job creation in accessible locations which can maximize sustainability. • Provision of green infrastructure will be aimed at ensuring net gain to meet the needs generated by growth. 	
RN613 P Chamberlin	Disagree. Development north of Birstall should not extend north of A46. If it does the identity of Birstall as a village will be lost.	
RN616 H D R Sharratt	Disagree. Developing north of Birstall means Quorn will eventually lose identity and merge with Birstall. Increased congestion along the A6 may trap Quorn residents in village at peak times.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN728 R Youngs	Neutral/disagree.	
RN741 GVA Grimley on behalf of Jelson Ltd	Neutral/ not sure.	
RN802 T Higgins	Agree. 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.	
RN814 N Booth	Disagree Strongly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is overdevelopment. The proposals seem to show that the Soar Valley between Leicester and Loughborough becoming one huge urban sprawl. • Disagree with the need to use greenfield land north of the A46 at Birstall for a few sheds, the targets for industrial land should be reduced/restricted to brownfield development. • North of the A46 is a line in the sand. Building on this land will destroy the whole rural character of the Soar Valley. 	
RN817 T Birkinshaw	Disagree. Concerned that the expansion North of Birstall will merge with Rothley and Mountsorrel (eg new industrial estate there. A46 is a good boundary.	
RN895 J Pearson	Disagree Strongly. Maintain good open space and countryside between Loughborough and the M1 and between Loughborough and Birstall.	
RN898 D Toone	Disagree Strongly. Object to introducing industrial areas North of Birstall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are already large areas of industry in Anstey, East Goscote and Syston; • Blight new housing currently being built; • People do not want to live next to industrial estates but near to trees and fields. 	
RN1346 A Johnston	Expansion north of Birstall should not be at a scale which results in coalescence with other settlements.	
RN08 N W King, RN13 D Ayres, RN14 D Liggins, RN16 M Hall, RN17 E Goodyer, RN19 C Emmet, RN21 P&E Coughlin, RN23 A Rumsey, RN24 J L Mitchell, RN26 D J Hourston, RN30 C F A Sutton, RN37 N L Sharpe, RN50 C Moon, RN52 P H Ball, RN54 P J Morrall JP, RN59 K R Senior, RN129 R Bowman,	Agree.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
<p> RN142 E E Jones, RN143 R Wym Jones, RN146 Y W Hannell, RN147 J Heath, Thrussington Parish Council, RN171 P A Bland, RN179 S Bradwell, RN197 R W Hill, RN293 B J Butler, RN324 N Richards, RN328 K Appleby, RN338 R Singh, RN345 A B Kidger, RN346 J R Cheshire, RN348 S J Tinning, RN354 C Leafe, RN360 C M Spencer, RN419 M Hall, RN420 A W Lacey, RN481 J Thompson, RN516 M West, RN543 S F Hobbs, RN609 S L Batson, RN611 P Raja, RN788 S Bullman, RN795 J Faulks, Normanton on Soar Parish Council, RN801 F F Rawson, Frank F Rawson on behalf of FFR Ultrasonics Ltd, RN806 A Kay, RN811 C T Watson, RN815 R A Parsons, RN821 L Emmitt, RN891 A Cooper & J M Hornbuckle, RN892 A Cooper, M W Hornbuckle & J M Hornbuckle, RN897 D Mear, RN900 Gill, RN901 K Canner, RN902 J & L Blyth, </p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN1293 J R Shephard, J & J Design on behalf of Loughborough Gospel Hall Trust		
RN06 D B Street, RN27 A M Clarke, RN39 A Gardner, RN48 J Lambert, Rearsby Parish Council, RN421 A Dalzell, RN542 G Hobbs, RN619 N Jones, Anstey Parish Council, RN720 J J Sutherland, RN790 P Froggatt, RN824 A Hubbard, The National Trust, RN893 F J Howgate, RN899 F Mitchell, Langham Park Developments, RN1295 J A Shields,	Agree Strongly.	
RN15 M Birkinshaw, RN56 A W G Ballentyne, RN335 P J Thrope, RN350 D Aucott, RN351 C Sweeney, RN408 E A Goodson, RN461 R Hoyland, RN608 J M Neal, RN614 E Harding, RN796 T Stott, RN800 A M Ward, Mather Jamie on behalf of Hamilton Trustees, RN896 D Patel, RN905 R J N Brown	Disagree.	
RN28 M S Smith, RN41 J Sutton, RN42 Carnall Family, RN97 A Davis, RN275 P S	Disagree Strongly.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Newman, RN337 N Porter, RN349 A Aucott, RN467 L Foster, Seagrave Parish Council, RN545 A Wells, RN618 H Knight, Birstall Parish Council, RN792 Popley Family, RN813 P Knott, RN904 A Corner		
RN18 M Bellatrix, RN25 M P Parker, RN31 G Brown, RN45 B A Fox, RN47 D Moore, RN57 F E Norburn, RN106 C W Askham, RN128 C J Keeling, RN294 D Ross, RN347 M J Hagger, RN361 P A Higgins, RN409 L Tillen, RN438 G H Wilson, RN465 D Baker, RN469 J Green, RN521 S James, Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Parkers of Leicester & 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, RN607 M	Neutral/Not Sure.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
<p>Lear, RN612 C Humphreys, RN615 R E Davies, St Michael of All Angels, RN617 C D R Sharratt, RN620 M Smallman, Del-Rosa Developments Ltd, RN621 T & C Malone, RN661 A C Johnson, RN712 C Potts, Hepher Dixon Ltd on behalf of Loughborough Golf & Hotel Development, RN714 L Needham, The Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group Committee, RN744 S Mitchell, RN791 R A Gough, Gough Planning Services on behalf of Revelan Group, RN793 L McGunnigle, RN794 N Browne, RN797 J Thompson, RN798 M Eagland, Peacock & 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 & D Kettle, RN804 A Irving, RN805 D F Bodicoat, RN808 D M Evans, RN812 A Millie,</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
<p>RN816 S Cuff, Nanpantan Residents' Network, RN818 A Radley, RN820 J E Mutton, Loughborough College, RN823 D E Sykes, RN890 C A Clegg, RN894 D Stott, RN907 R Hall, Andrew Martin Associates on behalf of Persimmon plc & William Davis Ltd, RN908 M C Dimitrov, RN910 G Lees, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Leicestershire County Council, RN911 N Harris, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Mr J Barber, RN912 A Kitchen, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Radleigh Homes & Messrs Clarke, RN918 T Bateman, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Wilson Bowden & David Wilson Homes, RN1294 R A Dickson, Groby Parish Council, RN1296 Joan Folkes,</p>		