

Charnwood Borough Council

Borough of Charnwood Local Plan – Deposit Draft 1996

STATEMENT OF DECISIONS AND REASONS ON OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED FURTHER MODIFICATIONS AND PROPOSED ADDITIONAL MODIFICATIONS

Introduction

This document sets out Charnwood Borough Council's response to the objections made in respect of the Proposed Further Modifications to the Deposit Draft Borough of Charnwood Local Plan, and the resultant Proposed Additional Modifications.

The Borough of Charnwood Local Plan was placed on deposit for public consultation in October 1996. A public local inquiry into objections to the Deposit Draft Plan was held during 1998 and the Inspectors Report received in 2000. Proposed Modifications to the Deposit Draft Plan were published for consultation in 2001.

A second inquiry was held in April 2002 into objections to these Proposed Modifications. Before the Modifications Inquiry the Council advanced Pre-Inquiry Changes to the Plan. All those representations on the Proposed Modifications and Pre-Inquiry Changes, which in the Council's view, raised new issues not considered at the 1st Inquiry were submitted to the Modifications Inquiry Inspector. The Council considered the Modifications Inquiry Inspector's recommendations and approved a Statement of Decisions and Reasons on each of these recommendations and proposed some Further Modifications to the Deposit Draft Local Plan. These Proposed Further Modifications were published for consultation in January 2003.

The Council has considered the objections made in respect of the Proposed Further Modifications and as a result approved:

- a statement of decisions and reasons with respect to the objections made to the Proposed Further Modifications, and
- some Proposed Additional Modifications to the Plan.

For ease of reference these are contained together in this document. The Proposed Additional Modifications are now advertised for public consultation for a period of six weeks

Other Related Documents

This document should be read in conjunction with:

- Statement and Decisions and Reasons on the Modifications Inspector's Report and Proposed Further Modifications (dated January 2003);
- Inspector's Report on Proposed Modifications (dated August 2002);
- Statement of Decisions and Reasons on Inspector's Report and Proposed Modifications (dated May 2001);
- Inspector's Report (dated July 2000);
- Deposit Draft Borough of Charnwood Local Plan (dated June 1996).

How to Use the Document

This document is divided into four main sections:

1. Summary of the Borough Council's Decisions on the Objections to Proposed Further Modifications;
2. List of the Modifications Inspector's Recommendations which the Council has rejected;
3. Statement of Decisions and Reasons on Objections to Proposed Further Modifications and Proposed Additional Modifications;
4. Technical Amendments.

The main sections follow the order of subject chapters, policies and paragraphs as they appear in the Deposit Draft Borough of Charnwood Local Plan.

1. Summary of the Borough Council's Decisions on the Objections to the Proposed Further Modifications

A list of the Council's decisions in response to each objections to the Proposed Further Modifications.

To find the Council's response on a particular policy or issue look for the reference in Column 1 and read across to find the Council's decision in Column 2. The relevant additional modification number(s) is in Column 3.

2. List of Rejected Recommendations

As a result of its decision in response to the objections to the Proposed Modifications, the Council now proposes to reject the Modifications Inspector's recommendation in relation to land at Armston Road, Quorn.

3. Statement of Decisions and Reasons on the Objections to Proposed Further Modifications and Proposed Additional Modifications

This section sets out in detail for each issue:

- the objections to particular Proposed Further Modifications or to the Council's decision not to accept a recommendation of the Modifications Inspector;
- the Council's decision and reason for that decision;
- where relevant, the Proposed Additional Modification is given.

For each Proposed Further Modification where representations were received the format is:

<i>Summary of Objection</i>	A summary of each objection or supporting representation relating to the Proposed Further Modification.
<i>CBC Decision</i>	The Council's decision on the objection(s) to the relevant Proposed Further Modification.
<i>Reason</i>	The Council's reason for its decision and for any Proposed Additional Modification to the Deposit Draft Plan.
<i>Proposed Additional Modification</i>	The Council's Proposed Additional Modification to the Deposit Draft Plan. The 'AM' number is the unique reference for the Proposed Additional Modification. The boxed text details how the plan is proposed to be additionally modified. Where appropriate, cross references are made to other related Proposed Additional Modifications, and any plan(s) showing the amendments to the Proposals Map. In all cases new text is shown as <u>underlined</u> while text to be deleted is struck through .

4. Technical Amendments

These are factual updates and consequential changes.

How to Object to or Support the Proposed Additional Modifications

The Proposed Additional Modifications have been placed on deposit for public consultation for six weeks. During the consultation period you may object to or support:-

- any of the Proposed Additional Modifications as detailed in Section 3 (denoted by an 'AM' number);
- the Council's decision not to accept the Modifications Inspector's recommendation in relation to land at Armston Road, Quorn.

This is not an opportunity to raise new objections to the Deposit Draft Plan, the original Proposed Modifications (May 2001) or the Proposed Further Modifications (January 2003).

To assist in the effective handling of your representation(s), you are strongly advised to submit them on the standard representation forms. Please use one form for each matter you wish to make comment on.

The form for making a representation, together with a Guidance Note on how to fill it out, is available from the Local Plans section. These are also available from the Council's website at www.charnwoodbc.gov.uk

The completed form should be sent to: Jerry Bullock, Head of Legal and Democratic Services, Borough of Charnwood, Southfields, Loughborough, Leics, LE11 2TN **before 7th November 2003.**

For further information or assistance please contact the Local Plans section at:

Charnwood Borough Council
Southfields
Loughborough LE11 2TN

Tel: 01509 634763 or 01509 634927

Email: localplans@charnwoodbc.gov.uk

If you would like this document or the representation form in your language or to obtain copies in Braille, on audio tape or large print, please contact the Local Plans section (tel 01509 634763 / 01509 634927, email localplans@charnwoodbc.gov.uk)

Summary of the Borough Council's Decisions on Objections to Proposed Further Modifications

1. SUMMARY OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL'S DECISIONS ON OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED FURTHER MODIFICATIONS

Representations on Proposed Further Modifications:	CBC Decision	Proposed Additional Modification
CHAPTER 2: STRATEGY		
FM 2.1 ST/2: Armston Road, Quorn (29 objections, 22 supports)	Reject the Modifications Inspector's recommendation, and Propose Additional Modification	AM 2.1 To withdraw the published Proposed Further Modification affecting land at Armston Road, Quorn in order to keep the land outside the limits to development and within the Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside
CHAPTER 3: ENVIRONMENT		
FM 3.1 EV/34 Design of Flood Alleviation Measures (1 support)	No Modification	None
FM 3.2 EV/F: Demolition of Listed Buildings (1 support)	No Modification	None
CHAPTER 4: POPULATION AND HOUSING		
FM 4.1 H/A New Housing Allocations on Previously Developed Land (1 objection, 1 support)	No Modification	None
FM 4.2 H/1 New Housing Provision (2 objections, 1 support)	<u>No Modification</u> (Technical amendment required to reasoned justification to reflect updated housing supply position)	None

Summary of the Borough Council's Decisions on Objections to Proposed Further Modifications

Representations on Proposed Further Modifications:	CBC Decision	Proposed Additional Modification
<p>FM 4.3 Policy H/1 New Housing Allocations on Greenfield Sites. (4 objections, 6 supports)</p>	<p>Propose Additional Modifications (Technical amendments are required to reflect current status on sites and to amend the reasoned justification for sites to reflect increased densities.)</p>	<p>AM 4.1 Include land at Peartree Lane, Loughborough, increase sites to 30 dwellings per hectare and update build expectations on sites in the remainder of the Plan period to 2006.</p> <p>AM 4.2 Insert new policy and reasoned justification and amend Proposals Map to allocate land at Peartree Lane, Loughborough for housing development and associated structural landscaping and open space, remove the site from Green Wedge and include it within the limits to development.</p> <p>AM 4.3 Amend Policy H/3 to include a target for the negotiation of affordable housing on the new allocation at Peartree Lane, Loughborough and amend targets on sites as a result of increased densities.</p>
<p>FM 4.4 H/1 (b) Land between Cotes Road and Willow Road, Barrow-upon-Soar (5 objections, 1 support)</p>	<p>No Modification</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>FM 4.5 H/1 (a) Land North of Bradgate Road, Anstey (16 objections)</p>	<p>Propose Additional Modification</p>	<p>See AM 4.1 Modify Policy H/1 to reflect PPG3 density requirements.</p>

Summary of the Borough Council's Decisions on Objections to Proposed Further Modifications

Representations on Proposed Further Modifications:	CBC Decision	Proposed Additional Modification
FM 4.6 H/1 (d) Land at Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds (13 objections, 1 support)	Propose Additional Modification	See AM 4.1 Modify Policy H/1 to reflect PPG3 density requirements.
FM 4.7 H/75 Land at Little Haw Farm, Shepshed (2 objections, 1 support)	Propose Additional Modification	See AM 4.1 Modify Policy H/1 to reflect PPG3 density requirements.
FM 4.8 H/89 (b) Land East of 19 Barkby Lane, Syston (40 objections, 1 support)	<u>Propose Additional Modification</u>	See AM 4.1 Modify Policy H/1 to reflect PPG3 density requirements.
FM 4.9 H/92 Land at Wysall Lane, Wymeswold (3 objections)	Propose Additional Modification	See AM 4.1 Modify Policy H/1 to reflect PPG3 density requirements.
FM 4.10 H/1 (o) Land at Seagrave Road, Sileby (3 supports)	No Modification	None
FM 4.11 H/3 General Guidance on Provision for Affordable Housing (1 objection)	Propose Additional Modification	See AM 4.3 Amend Policy H/3 to include a target for the negotiation of affordable housing at Peartree Lane, Loughborough and amend targets on other sites as a result of increased densities.
FM4.12 Government Guidance (2 objections)	Propose Additional Modification	AM 4.4 Modify paragraph 4.5 of the reasoned justification to reflect advice in RPG8 and PPG3.
FM 4.13 H/1(p) Barkby Lane, Syston (1 objection)	No Modification	None

Summary of the Borough Council's Decisions on Objections to Proposed Further Modifications

Representations on Proposed Further Modifications:	CBC Decision	Proposed Additional Modification
	(Technical amendment required to reflect the fact that development has commenced on this site)	
CHAPTER 5: EMPLOYMENT AND BUSINESS		
FM 5.2 E/A Future Use of Dishley Grange, Derby Road, Loughborough. (3 objections)	No modification	None
CHAPTER 6: RURAL LAND AND ECONOMY		
FM 6.2 CT/9: Environmental Improvement of the Countryside, Green Wedges and Areas of Local Separation. (1 objection)	No modification	None
CHAPTER 7: TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT		
FM 7.2 TR/12 Safeguarding Areas for New Railway Stations. (1 objection)	No modification	None
FM 7.3 TR/21 Parking Provision in New Development. (2 objections, 1 support)	No modification (Technical amendment required to make it clear that the standards will be applied as maxima)	None

Summary of the Borough Council's Decisions on Objections to Proposed Further Modifications

Representations on Proposed Further Modifications:	CBC Decision	Proposed Additional Modification
CHAPTER 8: CENTRAL AREAS AND SHOPPING		
FM 8.1 Shopping Policies CA/1 Acceptable Uses in District Centres, CA/10 Acceptable Uses in District Centres and CA/14 Use of Upper Floors (1 objection)	No modification (Technical amendment required to describe the sequential approach as set out in PPG6)	None

2. LIST OF REJECTED RECOMMENDATIONS

The following list highlights the Modifications Inquiry Inspector’s recommendations which the Borough Council proposes to reject. It provides a quick reference to the rejected recommendations. It is not a comprehensive resume of the Inspector’s recommendations, the Council’s decisions and the Proposed Additional Modifications. Reference should be made to the following sections of this document for the full details of the Council’s decisions and reasons in respect of the objections to the Proposed Further Modifications and the resultant Proposed Additional Modifications.

Policy No	<u>Modifications Inspector’s Recommendation</u>	CBC Decision	Proposed Additional Modification
<u>CHAPTER 2: STRATEGY</u>			
ST/2 Armston Road, Quorn	<i>I recommend that the plan be modified by the inclusion within the limits to development, instead of within the Charnwood Forest APAC, of the land shaded grey in Appendix 1 to document P/CBC/120/320/1.</i>	<u>Reject</u>	AM 2.1

CHAPTER 2: Strategy

FM2.1 Policy ST/2: Armston Road, Quorn

OBJECTIONS:

1/113 W G Dunn

Part of countryside and APAC. Would affect TPO's and impact on wildlife habitats including badger setts. Development would be against government guidance.

4/151 Mrs K Paterson Quorndon Parish Council

Object. Quorn Park is rare example of traditional parkland area and should be preserved. Will be precedent for further development.

5/111 Mr A Johnson

Recent vote showed a majority against a proposal for an adjoining development. This proves the strength of feeling. Inspector's findings conflict with previous appeal decisions.

25/95 Mr R T Wall

Land is part of Quorn House Park and part of APAC. Would lead to pressure on remaining parts of Quorn House Park. Local people have voted against further development in Quorn House Park. Development would affect a number of trees and cause loss of wildlife.

32/104 Mrs R Allison

Would erode Quorn Park and damage trees and wildlife. The change is a result of a mistake. The village has voted against this development. The Structure Plan prohibits this development.

35/68 P E Waistell

Majority of village against further development in Quorn Park. Would cause loss of amenity through loss of trees.

52/161 Mr & Mrs J A Key

Site is on edge of parkland and part of APAC. Development would harm wildlife habitats for badgers and foxes. Would be contrary to recent vote by Quorn residents against development in Quorn House Park. Would affect TPO'd trees. Would be against government guidelines as site not brownfield.

71/116 Mr N Chambers

Character of site is predominantly woodland and does not preclude it from forming part of the wider Quorn Park and part of the APAC. Decision is inconsistent with 2 S78 appeal decisions.

84/115 Mr & Mrs JE & M Holt

Majority of local people against this development. Is part of APAC and of great significance for wildlife. Site should remain outside limits and within APAC.

86/114 Dr C J P Shipway

Recent vote indicated a overwhelming rejection of development in this location. Two Inspectors have rejected plans for development in this location because of the impact on the APAC.

97/159 Mr D Slater

Inspector was unreasonable in not considering all evidence. Two S78 Inspectors rejected proposals to develop site. The Inspector acted unreasonably in not considering these Inspectors' conclusions.

Designation is a local issue- it has no significance in terms of housing land supply and is contrary to PPG3. Local people should have say. New information available is that in a recent vote Quorn residents apposed development in Quorn House Park.

Council voted unanimously to exclude site from limits. It is perverse to accept Inspector's decision that weakens the control of development on the site.

105/137 Mr I Fowlds

Site is APAC and outside limits to development. Will affect TPO'd trees and wildlife habitats. Will result in loss of mature parkland. Two appeal decisions have rejected development. Will encourage further development outside limits. Quorn villagers have voted against development in Quorn Park.

106/160 Mr R T Pritchard

Part of APAC. Original change to plan went through without consultation and on the basis of major errors. Development has been rejected by two S78 Inspectors and by a unanimous vote of Council. Public were not allowed to make representations at the Modifications Inquiry.

Quorn residents have voted against development in Quorn Park.

Quorn Park is significant part of Quorn's history and heritage.

112/117 Ms H Fish

Unacceptable for Inspector not to consider previous application appeal decisions. Site is not significant to meet building targets and is contrary to PPG3. Trees and wildlife would be damaged. Site is part of APAC as defined in the Structure Plan.

115/110 Ms M A Willett

Previous development proposals have been refused on this site. The site is outside the limits within the APAC. It is an important habitat for wildlife including badgers. Development would be contrary to PPG3. Villagers have voted against development in Quorn Park.

117/158 Mr B Price

Should be retained as greenfield site. Majority of villagers have voted against development in Quorn Park. Two Inspectors have rejected proposals to develop. Will affect TPO'd trees. Council voted previously not to include this land.

137/92 Mr P A Chamberlin

Residents have voted against development in Quorn House Park and Charnwood Borough Council members voted unanimously to exclude site from limits. It is a local issue that should be decided at local level. Site is APAC. Other local plan and strategic policies protect site. Inspector was unreasonable in ignoring views of S78 appeals. Inspector incorrect in his assessment of site and dismissed PPG3 guidance. Site is greenfield windfall and should not be developed in advance of brownfield sites. Inspector failed to take account of historic nature of site. Site is used by badgers. Development would conflict with TPO on site. Initial consultation unsatisfactory.

Withdraw modification to leave site outside limits in APAC.

392/69 C W Edwards

Quorn Park should be preserved in its entirety. Overwhelming local support for this point of view.

399/76 J Speight

Land is parkland. This is local issue and Quorn residents have voted against development. APAC status should not be changed. Development would damage protected trees. Should take account of S.78 appeal decisions.

400/96 Mr J Key

Site is countryside and part of APAC. Development would affect trees covered by a TPO and wildlife habitats including badger setts. Would be against government policy to encourage brownfield development.

404/103 Mr & Mrs T P & B Jones

Area is APAC and should be maintained and is a buffer between the village and Quarry.

410/112 A Aylett

Site is countryside and part of APAC. Development would cause harm to trees and flora and fauna. It is a location used by badgers. 2 Inspectors concluded site unsuitable for development.

411/118 Barrass Family

Significant part of APAC in sensitive location for wildlife including badgers. Formal vote opposed by 10:1 development here. Would open floodgates for further development in the parkland.

412/119 Mr & Mrs Stewart

Want to keep area as quiet area. Majority of residents voted against development in Quorn House Park.

414/122 Mr A Plater

Would mean development in APAC. Account should have been taken of previous Inspectors decisions on two planning applications. 91% of Quorn residents who voted on a proposal in another part of the park rejected any development in the Park. Local views should be taken into account.

415/123 M J Lear

No local objection in 1997 because local residents were not aware of the proposal. Residents have voted that there should be no development in Quorn Park. Borough Council voted to exclude the site from the village in 2001. Site is within APAC. Will add to pressure for further development in Park.

418/146 Mr A Perkins

Formal vote has shown majority of Quorn residents against development in Quorn Park. Would affect trees. Does not conform with government aims of increasing affordable housing. Two appeal decisions showed site is part of Quorn Park and important for wildlife.

419/147 Dr G Perkins

Formal vote has shown majority of Quorn residents against development in Quorn Park. Would affect trees. Does not conform with government aims of increasing affordable housing. Two appeal decisions showed site is part of Quorn Park and important for wildlife.

421/152 H Shacklock

Part of APAC. Appeal Inspectors have already rejected site. Will cause damage to wildlife including badgers. Quorn villagers have voted against development in Quorn Park. Should be declared an area of outstanding natural beauty.

SUPPORTS

230/52 Mr J P Deakin Fisher German

Inspector's reasons for recommending in favour of Mr Johar were extremely detailed showing he had fully assessed the merits of the site and arguments put forward by objectors. These arguments were based on private property interests. I fully commend the Inspector's reasoning and the case he provides for including the site within the limits to development.

120/46 Mr D K Johar Johar & Company

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

373/39 Ms A Chapman

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

374/40 H K Chaggar

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

375/41 V Chaggar

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

376/42 R S Chaggar

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

377/43 B S Chaggar

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

378/44 T S Maini

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

379/45 P Maini

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

380/47 M Johar

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

381/48 T R Johar

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

382/49 S K Johar

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

383/50 Mr R Khandhia

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

384/51 Mr C J Hewitt

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

385/60 Ms S Gill

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

386/61 Mr D Singh Gill

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

387/62 Mr R W Boulton

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

405/105 Mr R Galey

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

406/106 Mr J S Chaggar

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

407/107 Ms S Chaggar

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

408/108 Mr S Chaggar

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

409/109 Mr V Chaggar.

Support Proposed Further Modification to include land south of 7 Armston Road within the limits to development, for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report at paras 2.1 to 2.10.

CBC Decision

Additional Modification required to withdraw Proposed Further Modification FM2.1 affecting land at Armston Road, Quorn in order to keep the land outside the Limits to Development and within the Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside.

Reason

The objections and statements of support in relation to the Proposed Further Modification are noted.

The issue before the Council is one of value judgement. In publishing Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan in May 2001 the Council considered that the land in question should remain outside the Limits to Development for the village. Following consideration of the Modifications Inspector's report the Council had accepted that the limits should be re-drawn to include the land within the settlement limits in accordance with the Modifications Inspector's recommendation.

In the light of representations received on this Proposed Further Modification the Council has reconsidered its position and its response to the Modifications Inspector's report.

Having considered the representations received and the Modifications Inspector's reasoning as set out in paras 2.1-2.10 of his report, the Council is of the view that the land does form part of the wider parkland of Quorn House Park and should be afforded the same protection as the wider parkland. The site is part of the rural setting to Quorn and is important in forming part of the landscape setting to the settlement edge. The post and rail fence does not separate the land visually from the wider parkland to the south.

Whilst inclusion of the site within the limits to development does not necessarily mean that development would follow, it would mean that any proposals to develop the site would be harder to resist. Development on the land would have a damaging impact on the appearance and character of the Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside and the countryside setting of Quorn. This was the conclusion of two Section 78 Inspector's in dismissing appeals against the Council's decision to refuse planning permission to erect one dwelling on the site.

Accordingly the site should remain outside the limits to development and within the Charnwood Forest Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside.

Additional Modification

AM2.1

Withdraw Proposed Further Modification FM2.1 published in January 2003 affecting land south of 7 Armston Road, Quorn, in order that the land remains outside the Limits to Development and within the Charnwood Forest Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside.

CHAPTER 3: Environment

FM3.1 Policy EV/34: Design of Flood Alleviation Measures

SUPPORT

37/31 Mr G Platts Environment Agency

Policy is in accordance with Agency's suggestion.

CBC Decision

Support noted.

FM3.2 Policy EV/F: Demolition of Listed Buildings

SUPPORT

358/17 Mr C Read (Chairman) Loughborough & District Civic Trust

Support modification which produces a strong and clear policy.

CBC Decision

Support noted.

CHAPTER 4: Population & Housing

FM4.1: Policy H/A New Housing Allocations on Previously Developed Land

OBJECTION

21/139 George Wimpey East Midlands Ltd

Concerned that Council has rejected Inspector's recommendation to split site at Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds between policies H/A and H/1. Important that classification of a significant part of site as brownfield is recognised. Inclusion within H/A would emphasise part of site previously developed.

SUPPORT

13/77 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Supports allocation of Coats Viyella factory site. Is valuable contribution to housing land supply and an efficient use of previously developed land.

CBC Decision

No additional modification.

Reason

The Council accepts that a proportion of the allocated site at Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds consists of previously developed land. The Inspector noted that about a third of the site represents previously developed land. The decision to include the whole site under Policy H/1 was for the purposes of clarity so that a single policy for the site could be presented which established the relevant criteria to guide development. It is considered that this remains the case and that to split the site between Policy H/A and H/1 would be confusing. This does not alter the fact that a proportion of the site involves development on previously developed land.

FM4.2: New Housing Provision

OBJECTION

13/78 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

The small site windfall allowance is conservative and inadequate. Figure should be increased to minimum of 324. Additional urban capacity is pitifully low and without justification. Balance to be found is therefore too high. Support position that general flexibility allowance should not be included and view that small greenfield should not be favoured because of deliverability. Council should reject these sites.

46/53 Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd

Proposed Further Modification does not reflect uncertainties and misgivings expressed by Inspector at paras 4.1-4.52. Of particular concern is rejection of Inspector's recommendation of an allowance for flexibility.

Should be flexibility allowance of 10% on balance of 2862 dwellings. This would lead to a requirement for 1578 not 1288 dwellings. It is noted that there is a mathematical error at para 4.15- dwellings to be found should be 1291 not 1288.

SUPPORT

21/140 George Wimpey East Midlands Ltd

Supports further modification. It is agreed that there is an outstanding balance of approximately 1,288 dwellings which have been identified in policies H/A and H/1.

CBC Decision

No additional modification. Technical amendment required to reasoned justification to reflect updated housing land supply position.

Reason

The appropriate scale of the small site allowance and urban capacity was considered in some detail by the Inspector through a Housing Round Table session attended by various developer interests, the CPRE and others. The Inspector concluded that the small site figure adequately reflects the advice in PPG3.

On urban capacity sites the Inspector considered that the Council's conclusions were highly speculative and he did not accept the Council's suggestion that consideration should be given to "pipeline" sites. The updated housing land supply position confirms a number of the assumptions on urban capacity potential which were presented to but rejected by the Modifications Inquiry Inspector. All of the 'pipeline' sites identified at the Housing Round Table session in April 2002 now have planning permission, as do fourteen of the seventeen Urban Capacity sites. Development has commenced on a number of these sites. In addition eleven new, previously unidentified brownfield sites now have the benefit of planning permission. These sites are incorporated as commitments in the updated housing land supply position. However, the updated position has also illustrated the uncertainties in this potential source of supply which were of particular concern to the Modifications Inspector. Proposals for the development of managed student accommodation will mean that a number of the sites may not now be released for general market housing.

It is therefore considered that care should be taken not to overestimate the likely contribution from this source. There is inevitably a degree of uncertainty in relation to this area of housing land supply with brownfield sites subject to competing pressure from other urban uses. In Loughborough this includes pressure for the development of student housing.

An additional urban capacity allowance of 100 dwellings reasonably reflects the potential and uncertainties of this source of supply over the remainder of the plan period. Analysis of the take up of sites identified in the original Urban Capacity Study prepared to inform the Proposed Modifications (Technical Report 8) would generally support this figure. From a base date of March 2000 this study identified 17 potential sites with a total capacity of 637 dwellings. In the three

years to March 2003 these sites have generated 71 completions- a 3.7% annual build rate against the original stock. Applying this take up rate to the currently identified potential urban capacity sites would imply approximately 90 completions in a 3 year period. The assumed additional urban capacity potential of 100 dwellings is therefore considered a realistic estimate of the likely contribution from this source in the remainder of the plan period.

Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd express concern that the Council has rejected the Inspector's recommendation for a flexibility allowance. The Council does not consider a general flexibility allowance is consistent with "plan, monitor and manage" as outlined in PPG3. The Council has allowed for the uncertainties on sites identified through the Housing Round Table session and has reviewed its assumptions on delivery from existing commitments, local plan allocations and urban capacity sites on the basis of current information. The objector's suggestion would represent a further allowance for flexibility in addition to the allowances the Council has already made. This would be inappropriate.

FM4.3: Policy H/1, New Housing Allocations on Greenfield Sites

OBJECTION

13/79 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Object to inclusion of sites H/1(a), H/1(b), H/1(d), H/75, H/89(b) and H/92. These greenfield sites not needed for Council to meet its obligation to make provision for sufficient housing. It is not duty of Council to ensure completions, nor is it within it's power.

Object to densities of less than 30 dwells on allocated sites.

Plan is mutually inconsistent. Para 4.134 no longer reflects the position as set out in the Further Modifications.

Delete the greenfield sites referred to and increase densities on those remaining. Accept completion of Structure Plan allocation may not be achieved- not for reasons for which Charnwood can be faulted. Adopt plan and review in spirit of plan, monitor and manage. If achieve increased provision should de-allocate least sustainable greenfield sites in line with para 38 of PPG3.

44/125 Mr C Packman Government Office for the East Midlands

Inspector does not appear to have considered earlier objections to policies H/1(j) Cossington Lane, Rothley and H/1(k) Moscow Lane, Shepshed. Not clear from policies why these greenfield sites show net densities of less than 30 dwellings. PPG3 indicates that the inefficient use of land should be avoided.

44/126 Mr C Packman Government Office for the East Midlands

As permission has been given for site at Barkby Lane, Syston (H/1(p)) identification of site as allocation is unnecessary and confusing. Delete site and show as commitment.

44/127 Mr C Packman Government Office for the East Midlands

In allocating five non-urban greenfield sites at a net density of less than 22 dwells per hectare, revised policy fails to take account of:

1. The Inspectors recommendation that preference should be given to an urban extension at Peartree Lane, Loughborough and that higher densities would be desirable on recommended sites;
2. The strategic priority given to new housing development in and around Loughborough and to maximising housing density in the adopted and emerging Structure Plan;
3. National planning guidance in PPG3 that lpa's should avoid developments which make inefficient use of land and that urban extensions are most sustainable option after re-use of previously developed land.

Council would not appear to have assessed the potential and suitability of these proposed allocations against PPG3 para 31 nor the extent to which sites meet guidance on creating sustainable residential environments set out in paras 46-71 of the PPG.

Council is proposing new development that would appear to conflict with key aspects of national and strategic planning guidance, rather than seeking to concentrate development on more sustainable sites. Even without allocation of Peartree Lane, which would reduce the need for development on small Greenfield sites, adoption of higher densities would enable same provision to be met on 30% less land.

Should review potential and suitability of additional sites identified and at Peartree Lane and allocate those that would meet the need for housing in the most sustainable way in accordance with PPG3.

44/133 Mr C Packman Government Office for the East Midlands

Proposed Further Modifications fail to allocate site at Peartree Lane, Loughborough, contrary to recommendations of Inspector. According to his report site could, notwithstanding Council's green wedge concerns, provide a sustainable urban extension, as indicated in para 67 of PPG3, as it is likely to represent the most sustainable option after the re-use of previously developed urban land.

No consideration appears to have been given to relative priority of site in accordance with paras 30-31 of PPG3, nor the scope to create a sustainable residential environment in this urban fringe location.

Review relative suitability of site and scope for creating sustainable residential environment in accordance with PPG3

46/54 Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd

Remain concerned as to Borough Council's application of PPG3 search sequence as regards greenfield sites. Clear from Inspector's conclusions that further site selection should follow PPG3 search sequence. Proposed Further Modifications fail to do this.

Evidence to Inquiry showed Peartree Lane site an urban edge site with good sustainability credentials. Inspector agreed as did previous Inspector. Despite this, Council persists in proposing greenfield sites which are of a lower order in search sequence.

Council has twice put forward its argument as to the effect of the Peartree Lane development on the Green Wedge and in each case Inspectors have not accepted Council's case.

Peartree Lane site should be allocated in plan.

431/169 Enigma Holdings Ltd

Object to allocation of new greenfield sites for housing. Client's site on Britannia Way, Thurmaston, represents a preferable location for residential development in sequential terms given its previously developed status and location within a sustainable urban area. In accordance with Government advice contained in PPG3 site should be given consideration as a residential site in advance of identifying new greenfield allocations.

SUPPORT

13/88 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Supports exclusion of site at Peartree Lane, Loughborough from allocations. Although as urban extension has greater elements of sustainability than other sites proposed, the green wedge makes a vital policy contribution to the maintenance of the separation between Loughborough and Hathern.

21/141 George Wimpey East Midlands Ltd

Welcomes decision to accept Inspector's recommendation in relation to land at Brook Street Burton on the Wolds. Although concern expressed that the previously developed part of site should be identified in H/A, the allocation of entire site in H/1 is supported.

Welcomes the recognition that site will deliver before 2006

25/93 Mr R T Wall

See representation on FM4.6

40/149 Mrs P Money Miller Homes (East Midlands) Ltd

Supports allocation of site H/1(b) land at Cotes Road/ Willow Road, Barrow Upon Soar.

100/102 Mr I Althorpe David Wilson Estates

Support allocation of land at Bradgate Road, Anstey and Cotes Road/ Willow Road, Barrow Upon Soar. We confirm that the stated housing requirement from sites is achievable in timescales envisaged.

358/16 Mr C Read (Chairman) Loughborough & District Civic Trust

Supports decision to reject Inspector's recommendation to allocate site at Peartree Lane. It is important to retain the Loughborough/ Hathern Green Wedge. Vehicular access via Wain Drive is wholly inadequate and there should be no access from the A6.

CBC Decision

Additional modifications required to:

1. Include land at Peartree Lane, Loughborough as a housing allocation under Policy H/1;

2. Increase densities on sites at Bradgate Road, Anstey, Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds, Little Haw Farm, Shepshed, Barkby Lane, Syston, and Wysall Lane, Wymeswold to 30 dwellings per hectare in accordance with PPG3;
3. Amend Policy H/3 on affordable housing to reflect increased product on sites.

Technical amendments are required to reflect current status on sites and to amend reasoned justification for sites to reflect increased densities.

Reason

The objections to the Further Modification to Policy H/1 relate to two main issues:

- the Council's application of the PPG3 search sequence and its rejection of the Inspector's recommendation to allocate the site at Peartree Lane, Loughborough; and
- the justification for low density development proposed on certain sites.

GO-EM's objections in relation to the site at Peartree Lane are noted. It is accepted that in the context of the PPG3 search sequence the site represents a sustainable option after the re-use of previously developed land. The Council's concerns relate to the impact of development on the green wedge. However, in view of the comments of the Local Plan Inquiry and Modifications Inquiry Inspectors, it is accepted that these concerns do not provide sufficient justification to overlook the contribution this urban extension can make to strategic housing requirements. As an urban extension the site represents a sustainable development option, is well served by public transport and links into the existing cycleway network in the town. It can also be developed at densities in line with PPG3 requirements.

The CPRE argue that there is no need for additional greenfield allocations and that it is not necessary for the Council to seek to ensure completion of the required number of dwellings in the plan period and that it should be accepted that the strategic target may not be met. The first Inquiry Inspector considered the issue of whether it was sufficient for the Council to make "provision" for sufficient housing. He concluded that the Council needed to ensure, so far as it was able, that the required number of houses were built in the plan period. The 2003 Budget Statement has confirmed the Government's overriding policy objective in relation to housing is that local planning authorities should deliver agreed housing numbers. It would be contrary to national policy guidance for the Council to plan for under provision.

In considering these objections it is important that the plan's housing land supply position reflects the most up to date information available. PPG3 requires local planning authorities to closely monitor the uptake of both previously developed and greenfield sites, but emphasises that there should not be unreal expectations of the developability of particular sites. The housing land supply position has therefore been rolled forward. The information on large site commitments includes sites at Harrowgate Drive, Wanlip, Maxwell Drive and Park Grange Farm, Loughborough and 12 Brook Street, Sileby which were the subject of Council resolutions to grant planning permission subject to section 106 agreements. These agreements have now been completed and the decisions issued. The updated housing land supply position is as follows:

Strategic Housing Requirement:	8,350
Less:	
Completions	6,034
Balance to be found	2,316
Less:	
Expected completions small –3yrs x 65	195
Expected completions on committed large sites - allowing for discounting to reflect realistic build rates	1,570
Additional Urban Capacity allowance	100
Balance to be found:	451

There are outstanding brownfield allocations at Empress Road, Loughborough, Nottingham Road, Barrow upon Soar, and Churchside/ Forest Street, Shepshed which will provide some 100 dwellings. After allowing for development on remaining brownfield allocations, including the brownfield element at Brook Street Burton on the Wolds, to ensure that the required number of dwellings are constructed by 2006 there remains a need to allocate the pool of greenfield sites as recommended by the Modifications Inspector, including the site at Peartree Lane, Loughborough.

In terms of the issue of density, the Modifications Inquiry Inspector considered a number of objections on this issue, including those from GO-EM and set out his conclusions at paras 4.194-4.209 of his report. The comments of GO-EM are noted and it is accepted that the greenfield allocations should reflect densities set out in PPG3.

Development on a number of the allocated sites will extend beyond 2006 and when fully developed will accommodate a greater number of dwellings than the “Balance to be Found” in the land supply table above. The Council have considered the weight to be attached to the competing interests of ensuring housing provision can be achieved within the plan period and the aim of reducing greenfield land take. The Modifications Inspector acknowledged this overspill as a necessary consequence of additional greenfield allocations required to meet the strategic target. The published Proposed Modifications indicated that development on the two strategic housing sites at Loughborough and Birstall and green node sites at Barrow Upon Soar and Syston would extend beyond 2006. The additional greenfield sites have been supported for allocation by both Local Plan Inspectors. The majority involve development in sustainable locations in accordance with strategic guidance. The potential for developers to progress these key sites should not be restricted by phasing. In order that the developers involved can plan for the provision of the necessary infrastructure which is associated with these developments, it is important that there should be a commitment to the delivery of these sites in total. Two sites at Burton on the Wolds and Wymeswold are required to meet identified rural housing needs whilst at the same time contributing to the strategic housing requirement.

For the land at Britannia Way, Thurmaston, promoted by Enigma Holdings, it is not considered that this site represents a suitable residential opportunity. It forms part of a large block of land currently in active employment use, albeit with some vacancies, with good access to the highway network. It is not considered that the evidence submitted by the objector is sufficient to demonstrate that the land and buildings are no longer suitable for continued employment uses. The release of part of the wider site for housing could introduce potential conflicts between new residential properties and the existing industrial uses. It is therefore considered that the site should remain safeguarded under Policy E/8.

GO-EM’s comments on site H/1(p) are also noted. This site is included as a commitment in the rolled forward housing land supply position along with other allocations with planning permission.

Additional Modification	AM4.1
<p>Further Amend Policy H/1, as amended by Proposed Modification M4.13 and Proposed Further Modification FM4.3, to include land at Peartree Lane, Loughborough, increase densities on sites to 30 dwellings per hectare and update build expectations on sites in the remainder of the plan period to 2006. Replace paras 4.21-4.30 of the Reasoned Justification. Factual update required to delete as allocations sites that are included as commitments in the updated housing land supply position.</p>	

POLICY H/1

	Net Residential Area		Approx No of Dwellings to 2006	Balance after 2006	TOTAL Approx	Net Density	
	ha	(acres)				ha	(acres)
H/1(a) Land north of Bradgate Road, Anstey	3.3	8.1	60 30	70	60 100	18 30	8 12
H/1(b) Land between Cotes Road and Willow Road, Barrow Upon Soar	12	29.7	125 60	235 300	360	30	12
H/1(d) Land at Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds	1.6	4.0	45 42	6	45 48	28 30	11 12
H/1(g) Land south of Hazel Road/ Manor Road, Loughborough	29.4	72.6	225	655	880	30	12
H/35 Land at Peartree Lane, Loughborough	3.3	9	30	70	100	30	12
H/1(h) Land at Meynell Road, Quorn	0.8	2.0	30		30	38	15
H/1(j) Land between Loughboro Rd and Cossington Lane, Rothley	1	2.5	25		25	25	10
H/1(k) Land at Moscow Lane, Shepshed	2.3	5.7	60		60	26	11
H/75 Little Haw Farm, Shepshed	1.7	4.2	40 30	20	40 50	24 30	10 12
H/1(p) Land at Barkby Lane, Syston	1.4	3.5	15		15	11	4
H/89(b) Land East of 19 Barkby Lane, Syston	2.7	6.7	60 30	50	60 80	22 30	9 12
H/1(q) Land at Barkby Road, Syston	11.3	27.9	210 88	130 252	340	30	12

	Net Residential Area		Approx No of Dwellings to 2006	Balance after 2006	TOTAL Approx	Net Density	
	ha	(acres)				ha	(acres)
H/1(r) Land north of Harrowgate Drive and west of the A6, Wanlip	27	66.7	140	760	-900	33	13
H/92 Land at Wysall Lane, Wymeswold	2.3	5.7	45 30	40	45 70	19 30	8 12
TOTAL	97 39	-240 97.3	-1080 370	-1780 808	-2860 1178	-29 30	12

The development site selection process has been guided by the approved strategy for the location of development in Charnwood set out at paragraph 2.58. It has been further informed by the thorough examination of development possibilities afforded by the preparation of the report “Sustainability and the Impact of Major Development Options“ and guidance in PPG3 on the sequential approach to development. A further influential factor has been the findings of the Borough Council’s Housing Needs Study which, when combined with details of the distribution of the existing stock of rented housing, has provided the most effective tool to date in identifying the relative needs of communities across the Borough for the provision of affordable housing.

The Deposit Draft plan allocated the bulk of the housing requirement in two sites adjacent respectively to the urban areas of Loughborough and Greater Leicester in accordance with the strategic aims of the Structure Plan which seeks to reinforce urban concentration. Planning permission for these strategic sites has now been granted. Both sites derive considerable advantage from the extension of existing good quality public transport services already operating within the urban areas offering residents access to genuine transport choice. Located at either end of the bus based transport choice corridor between Leicester and Loughborough, the two sites in tandem have secured related investment in improvements to the transport system which should help to deliver an attractive bus link with competitive journey times advantageous to existing users and all communities lining the route. The potential for the encouragement in a modal shift to buses is unparalleled in the Borough. The development north of Birstall involves a mixed use development including housing, employment, shopping, leisure and educational facilities which fully accords with national policy guidance.

The remaining allocated Greenfield sites provide for a mix of development opportunities on urban edge sites, at nodes within good public transport choice corridors and also provide for identified rural housing needs. Allocations at Loughborough and Shepshed are in accord with the aims of the Structure Plan which seeks to direct most development to the main urban areas.

The allocations at Barrow upon Soar and Syston represent sustainable development opportunities by virtue of their location in relation to established stations on the rail based transport choice corridor and proximity to District Centres with a wide range of local services and facilities. Because of their access to good public transport and a wide range of local services and facilities, these settlements represent the most sustainable locations for further development in the Borough outside the main urban areas. The site at Barrow Upon Soar will secure the provision of a perimeter road between Cotes Road and Nottingham Road. This will provide environmental and highway safety benefits by distributing local traffic and relieving congestion in the village centre. The developments at Syston will provide elements of affordable housing provision in an area of identified need.

Allocations in Wymeswold and Burton on the Wolds, outside the urban areas and transport choice corridors, account for approximately 9% of the housing allocation. These allocations are directed in part towards the enablement of elements of affordable housing to address demonstrable local needs but also make an important contribution to the achievement of the strategic housing requirement.

In combination the 9 sites allocated provide for a wide range and choice of new housing opportunities across the Borough, well related to existing or proposed employment areas. For the most part areas of particular importance to the preservation of the rural landscape or by virtue of their role in safeguarding the physical separation of settlements, are retained. A degree of compromise in some areas is inevitable but in all cases the site selection exercise must be informed by a synthesis of all relevant material in which no single factor can be permitted to become the determining factor.

An assessment of the likely contribution from each site in the remainder of the plan period up to 2006 has been made on the basis of an assessment of past build rates on large sites, and discussions with developer interests. This assessment suggests that on a number of sites an element of the proposed development will take place beyond the current plan period. This is a function of the expected build rates for the sites. The Modifications Inquiry Inspector acknowledged this overspill as a necessary consequence of additional greenfield allocations he identified as being required to enable the strategic target to be met. The additional greenfield sites are sites that have been supported for allocation by both Local Plan Inspectors. They involve development in sustainable locations in accordance with strategic guidance. The potential for the developers to progress these key sites should not be restricted by phasing. It is important that there is commitment to the delivery of these sites in total so that the developers involved can plan for the necessary infrastructure associated with these major developments.

Monitoring will take place on an annual basis and will be published as Housing Land Availability reports looking at planning permissions and completions on sites, identifying progress on urban capacity and Greenfield housing sites.

In line with PPG3 the densities proposed for the allocated sites seek to make the best use of the available land. For the previously developed sites within Loughborough, higher densities have been assumed to reflect their location within the urban area. For the purposes of the Plan and the calculation of housing land supply, densities of around 30 dwellings per hectare have been assumed in accordance with PPG3.

The following paragraphs set out in further detail the measures required to minimise the impact of the development of the allocated sites upon the landscape, infrastructure and local amenities. The policy guidance differentiates between those matters which are requirements and any planning obligations which may be sought. The aim is to achieve new developments which contribute to a balanced mix of land uses, sustain the range of community needs and minimise any adverse off-site impact upon amenities, facilities and infrastructure. The site-specific matters need to be considered together with other general requirements for recreation space, landscaping and affordable housing. The Borough Council may seek to negotiate legal agreement(s) with landowner/developer interests and any other body as appropriate to secure necessary provisions at the appropriate stage of a site's development.

Additional Modification

AM4.2

Insert new policy and reasoned justification and amend Proposals Map to allocate land at Peartree Lane, Loughborough for housing development and associated structural landscaping and open space, remove site from green wedge and include it within limits to development (see Plan AM4.2)

LAND AT PEARTREE LANE, LOUGHBOROUGH

POLICY H/35

Planning permission for residential development of land at Peartree Lane, Loughborough will be granted provided the following criteria are met:

- (i) vehicular access is taken from the A6, or alternatively Wain Drive;
- (ii) if access is taken from Wain Drive, highway improvements will be required to the junction of Barsby Drive with Warwick Way to incorporate a right turn lane and provision made for traffic management measures along Barsby Drive and Braddon Road;
- (iii) the provision of routes for cyclists and pedestrians within the development area linking into adjacent existing and planned footpath network, and from the Gorse Covert open space to a suitably designed junction with the A6 at Peartree Lane;
- (iv) the provision of 4.6 hectares of structural landscaping including public open space extending from the existing Gorse Covert open space up to Peartree Lane, and a substantial landscaped buffer to a minimum depth of 20 metres along Peartree Lane;
- (v) the provision of a substantial landscaped buffer to a minimum depth of 20 metres on the site's northern boundary with the A6, incorporating suitable acoustic screening; and
- (vi) provision is made for additional school places generated by the development to be assessed in detail in consultation with the Director of Education, Leicestershire County Council and the local planning authority.

In addition, the Borough Council will seek to negotiate reasonably related contributions towards:

- (a) improved provision for bus services accessible from the development;
- (b) provision for the extension of the footpath/ bridleway at Peartree Lane northwards and the provision of a safe crossing facility on the realigned A6 for pedestrians and cyclists;
- (c) the provision of a footpath/ cycleway southwards through the Gorse Covert area of open space to Maxwell Drive.

(see also in particular Policies ST/3, H/1, H/3)

This site adjoins the Loughborough urban area and is close to the A6 with its existing regular bus services and segregated cycleway linking into the town centre. It is also close to the proposed employment allocation at Dishley Grange. It therefore enjoys a number of strategic locational advantages.

Because of the sloping nature of the site and its relationship with the Green Wedge to the north-west, any development will need to be sensitively planned. There is the opportunity through careful design and layout to provide a well designed landscaped edge to the town. The allocation proposes development on the lower lying land below the 55 metre contour, substantial planting along the A6 frontage and along Peartree Lane, and the extension of the existing open space network from Gorse Covert to Peartree Lane. In combination this will provide a strong landscape definition for the northern edge of the town and assimilate the proposed

housing development in what is a sensitive location, and will help meet the informal recreational needs arising from the development. Landscaping along the A6 site boundary will need to incorporate suitable acoustic screening.

Ideally vehicular access to the site should be taken from the A6. If this is not feasible the development will need to be accessed from the existing residential network via Wain Drive. In this case improvements to the junction of Barsby Drive with Warwick Way to incorporate a right turning lane will be required along with traffic calming along Barsby Drive and Braddon Way in order to accommodate the additional traffic arising from the development.

The development will result in the capacity of the local school being exceeded if additional accommodation is not provided. Contributions to additional school places will therefore be sought.

The site is well located with easy access to the A6 corridor close to existing bus services along Braddon Road. Contributions may be negotiated from the development to improve the provision for buses serving the site.

It is important that there is easy access from the site for pedestrians and cyclists to nearby shopping and employment opportunities. The extension of the pedestrian cycle route through Gorse Covert northwards past the site to the realigned A6, including a safe crossing facility will provide a key route between the main industrial areas off Derby Road, Gorse Covert and the main schools and residential areas.

Additional Modification	AM4.3
Amend Policy H/3 to include a target for the negotiation of affordable housing on the new allocation at Peartree Lane, Loughborough and amend targets on sites as a result of increased densities.	

H/1(a) Land North of Bradgate Road, Anstey	approximately 10 <u>15</u> dwells
H/75 Land at Little Haw Farm, Shepshed	approximately 6 <u>8</u> dwells
H/89(b) Land at Barkby Lane, Syston	approximately 9 <u>12</u> dwells
H/92 Land at Wysall Lane, Wymeswold	approximately 10 <u>15</u> dwells
<u>H/35 Land at Peartree Lane, Loughborough</u>	<u>approximately 15 dwells</u>

FM4.4: Policy H/1(b), Land between Cotes Road and Willow Road, Barrow upon Soar

OBJECTIONS

13/80 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Not convinced that it is necessary to bring forward this greenfield site.

46/55 Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd

Object to allocation of any green node or rural housing site in advance of allocation of site at Peartree Lane. PPG3 search sequence not being followed as lower order greenfield sites are being proposed for allocation in preference to Peartree Lane.

Site at Peartree Lane should be allocated.

100/100 Mr I Althorpe David Wilson Estates

Support reinstatement of site and wording changes subject to following comment. Consideration is being given to integrating the link road within the housing area rather than along the development edge. This will provide design benefits and access to open space. The alignment of the road should be deleted from the Proposals Map.

350/6 Ms L Middleton

Will add to pressure on local services and roads. Parking provision at or near station is essential and should be reinstated. Retain as supplementary site on a smaller scale.

420/150 Mr S Thorpe

Will add to traffic and overload school. Will be loss of playing space. Should build play area instead.

SUPPORT

40/148 Mrs P Money Miller Homes (East Midlands) Ltd

Supports changes to Policy H/1(b) land at Cotes Road/ Willow Road, Barrow Upon Soar.

CBC Decision:

No additional modification.

Reason:

Both the Local Plan Inquiry and Modifications Inspector considered it was necessary to release this site in order to meet the strategic housing requirement to 2006. On the basis of the updated housing land supply position this site is needed as one of the pool of greenfield sites, including the site at Peartree Lane, to enable the strategic housing requirement to be met.

The original Inspector considered local resident concerns about increased pressure on services and concluded that the policy appropriately sought to negotiate contributions from the developers to address these concerns.

Reference to improved off-road parking at the station is retained in sub-clause a). The wording of the clause provides the flexibility for the Council to negotiate contributions to improve links to the station should the provision of off-street parking prove unachievable. This amended wording was supported by the Modifications Inspector.

The issue of the link road was a matter considered by the original Inspector. He supported the Council's justification for a perimeter road.

FM4.5: Policy H/1(a): Land North of Bradgate Road, Anstey

OBJECTION

13/81 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Not convinced that it is necessary to bring forward this greenfield site. If it is to survive the same number of dwellings can be developed on a smaller area or the density increased to allow greenfield savings elsewhere. Proposed density is well below PPG3 guidance.

44/128 Mr C Packman Government Office for the East Midlands

Density proposed represents an inefficient use of land contrary to PPG3. No consideration appears to have been given to relative priority of site in accordance with paras 30-31 of PPG3, nor the scope for higher density.

Review site's suitability and scope for creating sustainable residential environment.

46/56 Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd

Object to allocation of any green node or rural housing site in advance of allocation of site at Peartree Lane. PPG3 search sequence not being followed as lower order greenfield sites are being proposed for allocation in preference to Peartree Lane.

Site at Peartree Lane should be allocated.

100/101 Mr I Althorpe David Wilson Estates

Support reinstatement of site and accept detailed wording changes. We confirm that a satisfactory form of access is achievable without involvement of third party land.

For Anstey it would be sensible for policy to be flexible to allow a density consistent with planning policy guidance. An increase to 30 dwellings per hectare or 90 houses in total could be achieved without compromising highway safety, landscape quality or residential amenity.

For the Bradgate Road site, Proposals Map depiction of areas for development and structural landscaping is open to misinterpretation and there is an inconsistency with the Proposals Map and the net site area referred to in Policy H/1. This needs to be clarified.

346/1 Mr R Dexter

Anstey has fulfilled its quota of requirements for building. This greenfield site should be safeguarded. Will impact on schools and health facilities.

349/5 Mr & Mrs J R Loveridge

Will add to traffic problems and associated pollution. Local facilities will be overloaded. Assess impact of existing development before site is allowed.

351/7 Mr & Mrs E D Ross

Land part of Bradgate Park estate and should not be developed. No need for site to be developed because of recent brownfield developments.

368/34 Dr J H Earl

Should be cessation of further expansion by outward growth. Allocation should be moved away from Bradgate Road and Link Road houses. Development could be accommodated on bridle way in centre of site.

Development on nearby land in the City will create 600 houses. As people prefer village shopping this will exacerbate traffic problems and increase pressure on village services.

388/63 Mrs J K Atkins Anstey Parish Council

The area shown on the Proposals Map is 5 hectares, not 3.3 hectares as indicated in Policy H/1. If adopted the site area should be reduced to 2- 2.3 hectares.

During 2001-2003 121 dwellings were approved or proposed on brownfield sites in village- over 25% of the total brownfield expectation for the whole Borough. This reduces the need for provision of housing on greenfield sites. No need for site to be allocated.

389/64 S & M D Finnemore

Would destroy ancient hedgerows and reduce privacy of adjoining properties. Housing allocation for Anstey met by developments on brownfield sites. No justification for further greenfield development.

393/70 Ms D Edwards

Amenities of existing residents should be safeguarded. Impact on traffic and local facilities should be evaluated prior to any further building. Access from Bradgate Road not suitable.

Should be landscaping to southern/ eastern boundary a new surgery and better road links prior to development. An alternative access should be found.

394/71 Mr N J Edwards

Will cause loss of privacy. No healthcare provision for new homes. Density proposed too great. Need for new housing met by development on Cropston Road. Will cause loss of valuable open space of wildlife interest. Access onto Bradgate Road is hazardous. Delete proposal. If not reduce density to provide for 13 houses and provide substantial southern landscaping. Provide additional health facilities and re-think access to site.

396/73 J E, S M & N H Pell

Access to site is dangerous. No trees or hedgerows should be lost and bridleway should not be re-routed. Will be drainage problems due to sloping nature of site.

416/124 Mr & Mrs Norton

Increased traffic will cause excessive noise and ecological pollution. Will be loss of privacy for our property. Development of Anstey Wallpaper factory should remove need for this development. Bradgate Park and its surroundings should be protected.

417/138 Mr & Mrs G & I Keeling

Development of Anstey Wallpaper site and farm site meets need for more housebuilding. Will add to pressure on health facilities and schools. Will result in loss of privacy for residents on Bradgate Road. Number of houses proposed too great. There will be loss of open space and damage to wildlife. The block planting will not benefit existing residents. Will create traffic hazard.

432/171 Anstey Residents Action Group

Anstey has already supplied more dwellings than the Council requires. We cannot see any possible justification for the inclusion of H/1a at this time. If developed it will cause great disruption in village, including parking problems in village and delays and congestion on local roads.

CBC Decision

Modify Policy H/1 to reflect PPG3 density requirements (see Additional Modification AM4.1)

Reason

The suitability and need for this greenfield allocation were considered by the first Inquiry Inspector and also the Modifications Inspector and both considered it an appropriate site for allocation. The two Inspectors also considered the issue of the site size and density.

The first Inquiry Inspector considered the principle of developing this site including specific consideration of the issues of broad landscape setting, ecological and wildlife impact, highways and access, site area and density and locational advantages of the site. He concluded that development on the site was reasonably related to the form and scale of the host settlement and would not be materially intrusive.

The Modifications Inspector considered the priority of the site in terms of the PPG3 search sequence. He judged that the site is a very good green node candidate for allocation. The issue of impact on local services and facilities was considered by the original Inspector. He noted that the policy, including proposed amendments, would seek to secure contributions to educational and recreational facilities in the village.

In terms of site size and density, the first Inquiry Inspector considered that the site area should be increased to provide for a net developable area of 3.3 hectares. This would provide the necessary flexibility to accommodate existing hedgerows extending through the site and ensure a development which respects the amenities of adjoining properties. The Modifications Inspector noted the possible constraints on the site's capacity but concluded that it would be better if by suitable redesign it proved possible to increase the density on the site.

Policy H/1 identifies this 3.3 hectares as the net area available after allowing for landscape buffer strips within the site needed to safeguard hedgerows and the amenities of adjoining properties. The Proposals map shows the area of land available for development incorporating this within site structural planting and is therefore larger than the 3.3 hectare net developable area referred in Policy H/1.

GO-EM's objections in relation to the density of development proposed are noted. The limitation of 60 dwellings on the site reflected the concerns of the Highway Authority. Discussions between the developer and the Highway Authority in relation to the planning application on the site have indicated that development in excess of 60 dwellings may be acceptable in highway terms. For the purposes of the local plan there is therefore little justification to seek to limit the development below PPG3 densities. On a site of 3.3 hectares this would provide a development of approximately 100 dwellings. The precise scale of development that would be acceptable in highway terms can be addressed through consideration of a detailed planning application for the site. The plan should therefore be modified to indicate development at PPG3 densities.

The original Inspector considered that development on this scale would be broadly in keeping with the size of the settlement. Brownfield opportunities have come forward in Anstey and these are reflected in the housing land supply position. However, there remains a need for greenfield development and this site makes an important contribution to meeting the strategic requirement. It is a site supported by both Inspectors, the Modifications Inspector concluding that it represented a very good green node development opportunity.

Additional Modification

See AM4.1

FM4.6 Policy H/1(d): Land at Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds

OBJECTION

13/82 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Site least sustainable of sites proposed by developers. It is far from any transport choice corridor and the density falls short of the PPG3 recommendation. Affordable housing needs can be met through exceptions policies.

Delete site or limit it to the previously developed part at 30 dwellings per hectare.

25/94 Mr R T Wall

Restricted access via Brook Street/ Seymour Road will be problematic. Development of greenfield site contradicts national policy. Further residential development not necessary. Burton lacks necessary services to serve extra population. Increased traffic generated would be contrary to government policies to discourage car use. Would damage rural character of edge of village and loss of Orchard would remove valuable amenity open space.

44/129 Mr C Packman Government Office for the East Midlands

Site represents inefficient use of land contrary to PPG3. No consideration appears to have been given to relative priority of site in accordance with paras 30-31 of PPG3, nor the scope for higher density. Review site's suitability and scope for creating sustainable residential environment.

46/57 Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd

Object to allocation of any green node or rural housing site in advance of allocation of site at Peartree Lane. PPG3 search sequence not being followed as lower order greenfield sites are being proposed for allocation in preference to Peartree Lane. Site at Peartree Lane should be allocated.

348/3 Mr M J Oakland

The policy does not address the need to prevent increased flood risk to existing properties. Only pedestrian access to site should be permitted from Brook Street. Criterion v) is no longer prohibitive. Policy should be modified to address these concerns.

356/13 Mr K W Davies Burton on the Wolds, Cotes & Prestwold P C

Sole access to the site should be from Melton Road as Brook Street/ Seymour Road too narrow. The plan should ensure that the landscaping is provided as this is often not the case.

References to "Main Street" incorrect- should read "Melton Road". Clause v) does not safeguard all of the steeply sloping part of site from development- this extends further eastwards. Amend clause i) to read "sole vehicular access". Amend clause v) to read "36-48 Melton Road". Amend clause ii) to provide landscaping from the commencement of the development.

367/30 Mr & Mrs C J & J A Ward

No space on Brook Street to accommodate cars from development. Landscape buffer should be between site and existing properties on Brook Street/ Somerset Close. Safeguarding land opposite 36-38a Brook Street should also apply to 15-23 Brook Street. All access should be via Main Street. There should be firm assurances that additional drainage measures are installed to take water away from Brook Street. Local school and Barrow Health Centre already overstretched.

390/65 Mr C J Ward & Dr J A Wishart

Will increase flood risk on Brook Street. Access to site along Seymour Road is poor. Development on greenfield land contrary to Government policy. Village does not have infrastructure to support development.

There should be no development of orchard opposite 15-23 Brook Street and reduced housing density on rest of site. This could be developed as village amenity including play area.

398/75 Mr W J O Howe

Will add to flooding problems from Brook. Access to site from adjoining narrow roads will be a hazard. Should not build on Orchard land opposite 15-23 Brook Street as is greenfield and sloping land and is important for wildlife.

422/153 Mr J Morgan

Will increase flooding. Contary to government policy to resist development on greenfield land. Will increase traffic on narrow roads.

427/162 Mr T Smith

Development on largely greenfield site in rural location with few amenities poorly served by public transport seriously contravenes environmental requirements. Village has few amenities so development will add to car use contrary to government policy. Last housing needs survey identified a need for only 3 affordable houses.

Grounds for omitting development on sloping land apply to 15-23 Brook Street. Development would dominate houses. This part of site could be used for childrens play. Brook Street/ Seymour Road are not suitable to provide access to the site.

**428/163 Ms & Dr J & T A Blackshaw & Kijkstra Burton on the Wolds
Pre-School Playgroup**

Change from "requirement" to "criteria" seems to weaken policy. Will add to traffic problems in village. Will mean Brook Street cannot be used for children's play. Affordable housing should be integrated within the development. Part of Orchard should be retained in the site to provide recreational facilities for the village. Will add to flood risk. Restriction on development should extend along all the sloping part of the site fronting Brook Street. Possible site contamination on site should be investigated. Additional school provision should not impinge on play areas. Pre-school play Committee should be consulted.

429/164 Mr A R Perrott

Concerned about development on the Orchard. This part of Brook Street is safe play area. Will increase traffic problems. All access to the site should be from Melton Road. Affordable housing should be incorporated within the development and the Orchard retained as open space.

SUPPORT

21/142 George Wimpey East Midlands Ltd

Welcomes Further Modification. Concern that wording of policy does not allow a flexible interpretation to be made in preparing detailed design.

First Inspector indicated that hedgerows should be retained where appropriate and that detailed application would consider the need for the 20m landscaped buffer in its entirety. This flexibility is not reflected in the policy. Other matters including the pond and the location of the open space, which may be more appropriately located in the centre of the site, should be matters for the detailed application. Requested that when detailed application is considered a flexible approach will be adopted where appropriate.

CBC Decision

Additional modification to Policy H/1 to provide a development at PPG3 densities (see AM4.1)

Reason

The suitability and need for this greenfield allocation were considered by the first Inquiry Inspector and also the Modifications Inspector and both considered it an appropriate site for allocation. The Modifications Inspector concluded that this site, at least a third of which is brownfield, would help to sustain the local community and provide for a range of housing to meet local needs. In this respect it reflects the guidance on rural housing provision at paras 69-71 of PPG3. It would also make an important contribution to meeting the strategic housing requirement. GO-EM's concerns on density are noted. A marginal increase in the site product is appropriate to reflect PPG3 densities.

Resident concerns in relation to access to the site, and the impact of development on the sloping land fronting Brook Street were considered by the first Inquiry Inspector. He concluded that these were matters for the Council to address in relation to a detailed application for development. In his view the policy provides the appropriate context for that consideration. The policy seeks to

safeguard the residential amenities of properties on Brook Street that could be most directly affected by development on the sloping part of the site. It is not considered that the limited frontage development to Brook Street would have a unacceptable impact on Brook Street/ Seymour Road. The Highway Authority has not objected to the proposal. Likewise issues of surface water drainage were considered by the Inspector and he concluded that there appeared to be no grounds to reject the site on this basis.

The policy indicates that additional school places would need to be provided. This is appropriately a matter for the Education Authority, consultation with other groups on this issue is not necessary.

The concerns expressed by George Wimpey East Midlands are noted. It is not the Council's intention that the 20 metre landscaped buffer should be applied without regard to the site characteristics. This point was discussed at the first Inquiry and the Inspector concluded that it would be inappropriate for him to modify the 20 metre figure or seek to refine it in detail. The precise nature and extent of landscaping and the appropriate design and location of open space within the site are matters that can be addressed in the context of a detailed planning application for the site. The Inspector also considered the treatment of the ponds area would also appropriately fall to be considered at the development control stage.

The need for a technical amendment to correct the policy to refer to Melton Road rather than Main Street/ Brook Street is accepted. The reference to "criteria" reflects a recommendation of the original Inspector to ensure consistency in policy wording and to reflect the fact that the policy includes both requirements and matters for negotiation with the developer.

Additional Modification

See AM4.1

FM4.7: Policy H/75: Land at Little Haw Farm, Shepshed

OBJECTION

13/83 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Not convinced that site is necessary. If it is to survive the same number of dwellings can be developed on a smaller site area or the density increased to save greenfield land elsewhere. Proposed density is below PPG3 guidance.

44/130 Mr C Packman Government Office for the East Midlands

Site represents inefficient use of land contrary to PPG3. No consideration appears to have been given to relative priority of site in accordance with paras 30-31 of PPG3, nor the scope for higher density. Not clear why landscape features and character of surrounding area warrant a low density.

Review site's suitability and scope for creating sustainable residential environment.

SUPPORT

78/33 Mr J Coleman William Davis Ltd

Land at Little Haw Farm is a sustainable urban edge site which can positively assist in ensuring the Borough meets its housing requirements in the plan period.

CBC Decision

Additional modification required to increase density on site in accordance with PPG3. (see AM4.1).

Reason

The Modifications Inspector considered this site was a suitable urban edge site which could be relied upon to make a definite and significant contribution towards meeting the strategic housing requirement. The updated housing land supply position confirms the need for additional greenfield site allocations as recommended by the Inspector.

GO-EM's concerns in relation to the density of development proposed are noted and it is accepted that the capacity of the site should reflect PPG3 density requirements.

Additional Modification

See AM4.1

FM4.8: Policy H/89(b): Land East of 19 Barkby Lane, Syston

OBJECTION

13/84 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Site will damage green wedge. Not convinced that site is necessary. If it is to survive then same number of dwellings can be developed on a smaller site area or the density increased to save greenfield land elsewhere. Proposed density is below PPG3 guidance.

44/131 Mr C Packman Government Office for the East Midlands

Site represents inefficient use of land contrary to PPG3. No consideration appears to have been given to relative priority of site in accordance with paras 30-31 of PPG3, nor the scope for higher density.

Review site's suitability and scope for creating sustainable residential environment.

46/58 Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd

Object to allocation of any green node or rural housing site in advance of allocation of site at Peartree Lane. PPG3 search sequence not being followed as lower order greenfield sites are being proposed for allocation in preference to Peartree Lane.

Site at Peartree Lane should be allocated.

101/67 Mr I Macdonald Syston Town Council

Is a valuable area of separation between Syston and Thurmaston. The rural aspect will be destroyed. Location too far from primary schools and town centre and no safe cycle routes. Barkby Lane is too narrow with dangerous railway bridge. The density proposed is inappropriate.

If, despite objection site is allocated it is requested that:

1. Provision is made for improvements to railway bridge and junction leading to Barkby Thorpe;
2. Provision is made for cyclists;
3. Provision is made for pedestrian crossing facilities at Melton Road/ Barkby Lane junction;
4. Number of dwellings should be reduced to respect neighbouring densities;
5. Contributions are sought for traffic management along Melton Road;
6. Contributions are sought for improved community and recreational facilities.

135/32 Mr D A Shaw

Development would be out of character with area and rural aspect will be destroyed. Low-density development accepted on the adjacent site should apply in this case. Barkby Lane cannot cope with additional traffic and access will be dangerous. The railway is a danger to children. The site is too far from Syston Town Centre and primary schools. Roads in Syston are unsafe for cyclists. Site should be reinstated as green wedge.

150/165 Mr P E Iley

Will destroy green wedge and rural aspect and encourage further applications. Roads will be unable to cope with development and are unsafe for cycling. Will be out of keeping with the character of the locality. Schools are too far away to allow walking. Ideally should be no development. If not reduce number of houses.

151/166 Ms M M Zoffo-Iley

Will destroy green wedge and rural aspect and encourage further applications. Roads will be unable to cope with development and are unsafe for cycling. Will be out of keeping with the character of the locality. Schools are too far away to allow walking. Ideally should be no development. If not reduce number of houses.

156/20 Mrs S Parker

Site is green wedge and home to wildlife. Would be out of character with area. Will add to pressure on schools and health facilities. Site is too far from town centre and will encourage car use. If development does go ahead, wildlife should be retained, a landscape buffer provided and development restricted to single storey.

157/4 Mrs S J Bullock

Site is too far from Syston centre and schools. Will encourage car use. Development will not be in keeping with surroundings. Will add to flooding. Separation between Syston and Thurmaston and Barkby should not be eroded. Retain site as green wedge, if not develop for a maximum of 20 dwellings.

162/12 Mr A J Calver

The additional 60 houses will create traffic chaos. Will merge Syston with Thurmaston. Schools and medical facilities will be stretched. Will impact on local ecology.

164/27 Mrs P R Dakin

Site will suffer noise from the railway. Concerned that strengthening of western hedge will affect rights to light and privacy. Main living room window overlooks site and is close to site boundary. If permission is granted should be grass verge and tree planting alongside hedge. There should be no 3-storey units.

165/28 Mr R W Dakin

Strengthening of western hedge could have an effect on light and privacy. Will have damaging effect on wildlife. Site will suffer noise nuisance from railway. Site entrance onto Barkby Lane unsuitable, and Barkby village will be badly affected by traffic. Will add to pressure on health facilities and schools. Should build on brownfield sites first.

347/2 Mrs J Chapple

Site too far from local amenities and road is inadequate for additional traffic. Schools and health facilities will not be able to cope. The green belt between Syston and Barkby should not be spoilt. Brownfield sites should be developed first. Additional traffic will be a health hazard.

352/8 D Martin

Rural aspect will be destroyed. Site too far from town centre- will increase car use.

353/9 G Bown

Existing services are overstretched. Development will add to traffic problems. Additional schools and doctors surgeries should be built.

354/10 Mr S Chetwyn

Greenbelt will be lost and will create additional traffic and pollution and will impact on local services. Will damage local wildlife. Access to site dangerous.

355/11 Mr & Ms Allsop & Townsend

Site too far from town centre and local schools. Will encourage car use on inadequate roads. Roads in Syston not safe for cyclists. Rural aspect will be destroyed. Separation between Syston and Thurmaston should not be eroded.

357/15 Cllr D Houseman

Object- site is part of Green Wedge. Proposal involves excessive density that does not respect the locality. Proposal would stretch Syston's social, economic and environmental infrastructure to breaking point. Syston has had significant growth with no service improvement. Health care services are not being increased in line with development. Syston Health Centre cannot cope with further growth. If development does take place, where boundaries of the proposed development face existing dwellings, to prevent being over dominant, they should be restricted to a maximum of two storeys and where they are close to bungalows at 18 and 21 The Meadway restricted to bungalows. Should also take into account that 17 & 19 The Meadway are bungalows. Where boundaries face existing dwellings should be substantial landscaped buffers. Any associated facilities to serve site should be well away from existing dwellings. Development should be sympathetic to wildlife, include an archaeological survey and address historical drainage problems. Condition v) should be more detailed and condition b) should refer to health care facilities. Cycleways should be incorporated in any scheme.

359/19 Mrs F Barber

Location too far from town centre and schools and will encourage car use. Roads are a danger to cyclists. Rural aspect and separation between Syston and Thurmaston will be destroyed. 60 houses not in keeping with area. Proximity to railway will create a danger. Delete site or reduce number of units proposed.

360/21 Ms H Disney

Will add to traffic congestion and destroy beauty of Barkby Lane.

361/22 L V G Parris

Will add to traffic problems on Barkby Lane. Will add to pressure on local schools and health facilities and join Syston with Thurmaston. Reduce housing to a minimum and reserve for young people.

363/24 Mr D Pickett

Roads in Syston are unsafe for cyclists. Rural aspect of Barkby Lane will be destroyed and separation between Syston and Thurmaston lost.

364/25 Mrs D Sleath

Agree with concerns of ward Councillors. Doctors surgery is stretched and street cleaning/ repairs not being undertaken. Extra people will swamp remaining facilities. Is a failure to provide public transport and extra recreation facilities. Brownfield sites should be used instead.

365/26 Mrs K Carter

Schools are already overcrowded. Not enough facilities at present. Will be noise nuisance from railway and will cause traffic congestion. More parking space is required and another pre-school.

366/29 Mrs F S Greatorex

Land provides separation between Syston and Thurmaston. Rural aspect will be lost. Roads are not suitable and site too far from schools and town centre. Proposed density is inappropriate.

369/35 Mrs Robson

Will increase pressure on local facilities. Primary schools too far away. Country lanes will be damaged by heavy traffic.

370/36 Mr & Mrs P & L Jinks

This greenfield site not needed. Not enough schools or medical facilities. Will add to pollution and affect wildlife.

371/37 Mr G Lilley

Too far from town centre, schools and health centre. Will add to traffic on inadequate road system. Site should remain rural greenbelt. Local facilities overstretched already.

372/38 A & N Drew

Will cause an unacceptable addition to traffic in area. Local amenities and road network would need to be improved.

391/66 F E Wilkinson

Development too large and will add to traffic problems on Barkby Lane. Schools are not close to site and local doctors cannot cope with present population. Proximity to railway will present a danger. Would spoil rural area and cause the merging of Syston and Thurmaston.

395/72 Mrs A C Taylor

Will destroy rural aspect. Local facilities are overloaded and schools are too far away. Will add to traffic problems. If objections are not accepted should be a reduction in number of houses proposed.

397/74 Mr D R West

Rural aspect will be destroyed. Will add to flooding and traffic problems.

402/98 B W Austin

Local facilities and roads will not be able to cope. Traffic problems will be exacerbated once the Asda store is open.

403/99 F M Austin

Will add traffic to a busy road. The junction with Melton Road is unsuitable. Separation between Syston and Thurmaston should not be eroded.

413/120 Mr G Chapman

Town infrastructure cannot cope with such rapid growth- will impact on parking, health facilities and schools. Will add to flooding problems. Will create traffic problems on Melton Road. Will damage local wildlife.

423/154 Mrs V Jarman

Site is greenbelt and separation between Syston and Thurmaston should not be eroded. Will damage wildlife. No more houses necessary in Syston. Will add to pressure on schools. Will cause traffic hazard on country lane. Site too far from village centre and will overload car parks in town centre. Roads not safe for cyclists.

424/155 Mr & Mrs P & J Hood

Will cause loss of greenfield site and add to traffic problems. Will overload local facilities and increase pollution on Melton Road.

425/156 Mrs L Walker

Site too far from town centre and schools. Will encourage car use on inadequate roads. Roads are dangerous for cyclists. Will be loss of rural aspect and separation between Syston and Thurmaston.

426/157 Mr & Mrs J & V Cobb

Will be loss of green wedge. Not enough facilities to cope with this development. Roads are inadequate. Will add to light pollution.

430/167 Mrs R Foster

Too far from Syston town centre. Will create traffic hazard. Schools too far away and will be overloaded. The rural aspect will be destroyed. Land should remain green wedge.

SUPPORT

362/23 Mr P Seddon

Supports proposal. Does not accept objectors' arguments. Roads are adequate and a secondary school is on the doorstep. Syston is not rural and not much separation is left anyway. More houses in Syston might bring it alive as a town.

CBC Decision

Additional modification required to increase density on site in accordance with PPG3 (see AM4.1)

Reason

The suitability and need for this greenfield allocation was considered by the first Inquiry Inspector and also the Modifications Inspector and both considered it an appropriate site for allocation.

The first Inquiry Inspector considered the principle of developing this site including specific consideration of the issues of the Green Wedge separating Syston and Thurmaston, rural landscape, loss of agricultural land, traffic and the highway network, railway noise and locational advantages of the site. He concluded that there was a reasonable justification for allocation of this site for residential purposes and the resulting amendment to the boundary of the Green Wedge.

The Modifications Inspector agreed with this assessment concluding that the land could be developed without material harm to the Green Wedge strategy.

The criteria set out in the policy seek to address a number of resident concerns. The policy indicates that the development of the site is subject to provision being made for highway improvements to the junction of Barkby Lane with Melton Road, a landscaped buffer and suitable acoustic screening alongside the railway line, houses with windows facing the railway line to be provided with suitable sound insulation and additional school places generated by the development to be assessed in detail with the Education Authority.

In addition, the policy makes provision for the Borough Council to negotiate reasonably related contributions to traffic management measures and improved community and recreational facilities in the town which would be worsened by the increase in the population arising from this development. The reference to community and recreational facilities is non-specific and therefore the Council could seek to negotiate reasonable contributions to improved health care facilities directly related to this development. Issues of detail, such as the impact on wildlife and drainage and strengthening the hedgerows will be considered at the planning application stage.

To meet the strategic housing requirement up to 2006 there is need for this site to be allocated in accordance with the recommendation of the Modifications Inspector. This conclusion takes account of the updated housing land supply position, expected build rates on committed and allocated sites and the relative priority of sites in accordance with the search sequence set out in paragraphs 30-31 of PPG3. GO-EM's objection in relation to the density proposed for the site is noted. It is accepted that there are no exceptional environmental or other constraints which would justify low density development in this location. In order for the site to meet the minimum density requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare set out in PPG3, it is proposed to increase to site capacity to approximately 80 dwellings for the purposes of Policy H/1.

Additional Modification

See AM4.1

FM4.9: Policy H/92, Land at Wysall Lane, Wymeswold

OBJECTION

13/85 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Site the least sustainable of all sites proposed by developers or the Council. Unnecessary incursion into countryside and untidy extension of a compact settlement. Site not necessary. If it is to survive then same number of dwellings can be developed on a smaller site area or the density increased to save greenfield land elsewhere. Proposed density is below PPG3 guidance. Affordable housing needs could be met through exceptions policies.

44/132 Mr C Packman Government Office for the East Midlands

Site represents inefficient use of land contrary to PPG3. No consideration appears to have been given to relative priority of site in accordance with paras 30-31 of PPG3, nor the scope for higher density.

Review sites suitability and scope for creating sustainable residential environment.

46/59 Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd

Object to allocation of any green node or rural housing site in advance of allocation of site at Peartree Lane. PPG3 search sequence not being followed as lower order greenfield sites are being proposed for allocation in preference to Peartree Lane.

Site at Peartree Lane should be allocated.

CBC Decision:

Additional modification required to increase density on site in accordance with PPG3. (see AM4.1).

Reason

The suitability and need for this greenfield allocation was considered by the first Inquiry Inspector and also the Modifications Inspector and both considered it an appropriate site for allocation. The Modifications Inspector concluded that this site would help to sustain the local community and provide for a range of housing to meet local needs. In this respect it reflects the guidance on rural housing provision at paras 69-71 of PPG3. To meet the strategic housing requirement up to 2006 there is need for this site to be allocated in accordance with the recommendation of the Modifications Inspector. GO-EM's concerns on density are noted. An increase in the site product is appropriate to reflect PPG3 densities.

Additional Modification

See AM4.1

FM4.10: Policy H/1(o): Land at Seagrave Road, Sileby

SUPPORT

13/86 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Supports deletion of this site.

17/121 Mr T R Brown

Support deletion of site at Seagrave Road, Sileby.

23/168 Sileby Parish Council

Support deletion of site.

CBC Decision:

Support noted.

FM4.11: Policy H/3: General Guidance on Provision for Affordable Housing

OBJECTION

13/87 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Development of greenfield sites should not be justified by any need to secure affordable housing. Housing needs survey out of date. Rural needs can be met by exceptions policies.

Delete references to greenfield sites we propose for deletion. If they are to survive the number of affordable units should increase with any increase in site product.

CBC Decision:

Additional modification required to reflect changes to brownfield and greenfield allocations (see Additional Modification AM4.3).

Reason

PPG3 emphasises that local planning authorities should plan to meet the needs of whole community, including the need for affordable housing. In planning for rural housing paras 69-71 of PPG3 indicate that provision may be appropriate in order to sustain local services or to provide for affordable housing. The policy needs to be amended to reflect the additional modification to the housing allocations.

Additional Modification

See AM4.3

FM4.12: Government Guidance

OBJECTION

79/91 Mr H Knight Birstall Parish Council

Need further amendment to reflect advice in RPG8 on future affordable housing provision and PPG3 para 13 on meeting needs of specific groups. Should also refer to paras 57 and 58 in terms of making best use of land.

Add text to refer to PPG3 and RPG8 guidance on meeting needs including affordable housing.

401/97 Mr C Clarke

Inclusion of key government objective that everyone should have the opportunity of a decent home is supported. Reference should be made to PPG3 para 13 to provide for a range of needs for different sizes and types of housing across all tenures, and of making the best use of land. Reference should also be made to RPG8 guidance on the provision of affordable housing as a proportion of total housing provision.

Additional text suggested.

CBC Decision

Additional modification to reasoned justification.

Reason:

The comments of the objectors are accepted. Paragraph 4.5 could usefully be expanded to refer to these aspects of PPG3 and RPG8.

Additional Modification

AM4.4

Amend para 4.5 of the reasoned justification as follows:

PPG3 'Housing' (March 2000) provides the guiding principles for considering housing within the planning system. It sets out the key Government objective that everyone should have the opportunity of a decent home. The PPG indicates that local planning authorities should plan to meet the needs of the whole community, including those in affordable housing needs and provide wider housing opportunity and choice and a better mix in the size, type and location of housing. Regional Planning Guidance (RPG8) highlights a substantial need for additional affordable housing in the East Midlands which should be redressed at the local level in the light of local housing needs surveys. PPG3 also advises local planning authorities to avoid developments which make inefficient use of land (less than 30 dwellings per hectare). ~~It~~ promotes the re-use of previously developed land.....

FM4.13: Policy H/1(p), Land at Barkby Lane, Syston

OBJECTION

13/89 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Objects to low density proposed for this site. Agree with Inspector that PPG3 densities could be achieved on this site. Site is highly sustainable being close to village centre, bus services and railway station. Site should be increased to 30 dwellings per hectare.

CBC Decision

Technical amendment required to reflect the fact that development has commenced on this site.

Reason

This site has now been granted planning permission and is now included as a housing commitment. The site should no longer be identified as an allocation.

CHAPTER 5: Employment & Business

FM5.2: Policy E/A, Future Use of Dishley Grange, Derby Road, Loughborough

OBJECTION

42/144 Dr A Simmonds Leicestershire County Council

Wording not clear. Reword as follows:

"Dishley Grange Farm is a site of important archaeological interest and any development should allow wherever possible for the preservation in situ of significant remains. If this can not be achieved archaeological remains should be recorded in accordance with Policy EV/2. In considering applications for development which could affect these archaeological interests, the Borough Council will liaise with English Heritage and Leicestershire County Council Heritage Services."

131/90 Mr E Goodyer

Proposal fails to encompass all land that the Inspector considered required archaeological investigation and protection. Site should be extended as follows:

North to River Soar- historical relationships with monastic lands of Normanton on Soar evidenced by historic maps, present day footpaths and ferry link to Normanton Church;

South to A6: current boundary indicated in Further Modification. Extension to Garendon Park should be considered;

West to Dishley/Hathern boundary: evidence of ridge and furrow. Also concern that strip of land by access road will come under pressure for residential development. This should be included in the site. Protection of the site would be better served by relocation of access road;

East to Blackbrook: much of land developed so evidence lost. Some evidence of ridge and furrow in fields. Dishley pool may have originally been fishponds for Monastic Order. Issue can be resolved by requesting clarification from Inspector.

358/18 Mr C Read (Chairman) Loughborough & District Civic Trust

Supports modification which clearly defines extent of this important historical site and welcomes the statement regarding the future use of the Farmstead. Liaison should not be limited to English Heritage and Leicestershire Museums Service. Should also liaise with Civic Trust, Loughborough Archaeological Society and Bakewell Society.

CBC Decision

No additional modifications.

Reason

It is considered that the addition to the reasoned justification adequately sets out the intention to safeguard the archaeological interests on the site. The Plan should be read as a whole. There is no need to repeat the requirements of Policy EV/2.

The objections before the Modifications Inspector related to the wording of policy E/A, which as originally framed, incorrectly placed the onus on the applicant to demonstrate the acceptability of the proposal in consultation with other parties. The Inspector supported the Council's proposed change to address this issue.

Policy E/A is a positive policy which seeks to promote the establishment of a recreation/ leisure/ tourism/ education facility utilising the Dishley Grange farmstead. The Further Modification identifies the site to which the policy would apply.

Concerns about the impact of the employment allocation E/5(c) on archaeological interests were addressed by the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector. He concluded that the setting of the listed building and the importance of the ancient monument would be protected by the proposed arrangement of land uses, and that the archaeological policies of the Plan would allow features of interest to be protected or recorded. He also agreed that the treatment of the farmstead as a separate entity under Policy E/A was the best way to safeguard its special interest for the community in the long term. This remains the case. Policy EV/2 provides adequate safeguards for any archaeological interests within the wider area identified by Mr Goodyer.

It is not necessary to refer to liaison with other bodies in the reasoned justification. Liaison with English Heritage and Leicestershire County Council Heritage Services will ensure that the Council is apprised of the archaeological implications in relation to the implementation of Policy E/A.

CHAPTER 6: Rural Land & Economy

FM6.2: Policy CT/9, Environmental Improvement of the Countryside, Green Wedges & Areas of Local Separation

OBJECTION

44/134 Mr C Packman Government Office for the East Midlands

Inspector does not appear to have considered our earlier objection to this policy. Countryside Priority Area should be reviewed in light of presumption against local countryside designations in PPG7.

CBC Decision:

No additional modification.

Reason:

In exercising its discretion to hold a second inquiry into new issues, the Borough Council did not refer this objection to the Inspector for his consideration. In response to the earlier objection it was noted that, notwithstanding the guidance in PPG7, this policy was supported by the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector. The review of this and other local designations will be a matter for the review of the Local Plan.

CHAPTER 7: Transport & Traffic Management

FM7.2: Policy TR/12, Safeguarding Areas for New Railway Stations

OBJECTION

42/145 Dr A Simmonds Leicestershire County Council

Reservation for station should not be deleted as there is a danger that site will be developed for other purposes and opportunity to provide station will be lost.

CBC Decision:

No additional modification.

Reason:

The evidence before the Inspector indicated that the provision of a station at East Goscote was unlikely until after the end of the plan period. He concludes that it would be misleading, potentially harmful, and inappropriate to identify the Broome Lane site. This is a matter that can be re-addressed in the review of the plan. The potential locations for the station are the subject of other policies (countryside and recreation land safeguarding) which mean that development that would prejudice the opportunity to provide a station in the future is highly unlikely.

FM7.3: Policy TR/21: Parking Provision in New Development

OBJECTION

44/135 Mr C Packman Government Office for the East Midlands

Maximum parking standards do not comply with PPG13 Annex D and PPG3.

SUPPORT

433/170 Shepshed Town Council

Support vehicle parking standards for new development item 10 class C3- dwelling houses.

CBC Decision:

No additional modification.

Reason:

This objection was considered in relation to objections to the original Proposed Modifications. It was concluded that it would be inappropriate to amend the parking standards in the Plan in advance of wider county-wide review of parking standards. Policy TR/21 and the reasoned justification make it clear that the standards will be applied as maxima. For the purposes of clarity a technical amendment would be appropriate to correct the wording in the standards where it appears to conflict with this position.

357/14 Cllr D Houseman

Should be no restrictions to on-street parking outside small A1/A2/A3 uses. To maintain vitality and viability of small towns and villages easy access to shops is essential. Will benefit elderly, disabled and busy parents and will contribute to highway safety by slowing traffic.

CBC Decision:

No additional modification.

Reason:

The objector's concerns about easy access to shops in smaller settlements are noted. The introduction to the Parking Standards does indicate that one of the objectives of the standards is to minimise the use of the carriageway for parking as half of all pedestrian accidents and a quarter of all vehicle accidents involve the presence of parked vehicles. By ensuring adequate levels of off-street parking in new developments, one of the aims of the standards is to minimise the use of the carriageway for parking in the interests of highway safety.

However, the parking standards themselves would not restrict on street parking and the Council as local planning authority does not have the powers to do so. The implementation of on-street parking restrictions in the interests of highway safety would be matter for consideration by the County Council as Highway Authority.

CHAPTER 8: Central Areas & Shopping

FM8.1 Shopping Policies CA/1, CA/10 & CA/14

OBJECTION

44/136 Mr C Packman Government Office for the East Midlands

Inspector does not appear to have considered earlier objection. Reasoned justification should indicate how the sequential approach should be applied in accordance with para 1.9 of PPG6 and Ministerial statement of 11 February 1999.

Criterion ii) of policy should set out in full the sequential approach in para 1.10 of PPG6.

CBC Decision:

No additional modification.

Reason:

In exercising its discretion to hold a second inquiry into new issues, the Borough Council did not refer this objection to the Inspector for his consideration. It is accepted that a technical amendment to the reasoned justification would be appropriate to describe the sequential approach as set out in PPG6. With the addition to the reasoned justification it is not considered necessary to describe the sequential approach in clause ii) itself.

CHAPTER 3 ENVIRONMENT

POLICY EV/35 ACCESS TO WATERCOURSES FOR MAINTENANCE

Amend Policy EV/35 to read "...within 8 metres of the landward toe of a flood bank".

Reason:

For clarification.

POLICY EV/40 GROUNDWATER PROTECTION

Amend reasoned justification to replace "ground-water" with "groundwater" and "the former National Rivers Authority" with "Environment Agency".

Reason:

Factual correction.

CHAPTER 4 POPULATION AND HOUSING

PARAS 4.14-4.19

Revise paras 4.14- 4.19 to read as follows:

4.14 The Structure Plan requires about 8,350 dwellings to be constructed in Charnwood between 1991 and 2006. This level of provision acknowledges that environmental constraints limit the ability of the Borough to meet its projected natural population increase. Provision is made for 1500 dwellings, which would have been needed to meet natural increase requirements within Charnwood, to be accommodated in other Districts.

4.15 A substantial proportion of the overall requirement of 8,350 dwellings has already been provided for:

	DWELLINGS
Strategic Housing Requirements 1991 to 2006	8,350
Less:	
Completions 1991 to March 2003	6,034
Balance to be found	2,316
Less:	
Expected completions on small sites (less than 0.4ha) (3 x 65)	195
Expected completions on committed large sites	1,570
Additional urban capacity	100
Therefore the Plan needs to provide:	451

Since 1991 some 6,034 dwellings have been completed on a variety of sites throughout the Borough. A realistic assessment of the likely contribution from large site commitments suggests that this source will provide a further 1,570 dwellings up to 2006.

In identifying sites to meet housing requirements, PPG3 requires local planning authorities to make an allowance for windfalls. These are previously developed sites, large or small, which unexpectedly become available. Structure Plan Housing Policy 4 indicates that an allowance should be made for unidentified sites when making provision for housing requirements so that the need to release further greenfield sites is minimised. The Council has made an allowance for the contribution from small sites of less than 10 dwellings. Based on an assessment of past trends and future potential an allowance of 65 dwellings per year on small sites for the remainder of the Plan period is made.

A review of urban capacity has also been undertaken in relation to sites in excess of 10 dwellings. This has taken account of planning applications awaiting determination on a range of brownfield sites. The assessment of housing land supply allows for an additional urban capacity of 100 dwellings to be built in the remainder of the plan period.

After taking account of these various factors there remains an outstanding balance of 451 dwellings to be found. This requirement is met through the allocation of a range of previously developed and greenfield sites.

Reason

Update to housing land supply information.

Policy H/A New Housing Allocations on Previously Developed Land

Delete following sites from Policy H/A

		Net Residential Area		Approx No of Dwellings to 2006	Net Density Approx	
		Ha	(acres)		Ha	(acres)
H/1(c)	Land off Nottingham Road, Barrow Upon Soar	1.0	2.5	30	30	12
H/1(f)	Land at Empress Road, Loughborough	0.6	1.5	30	50	20
H/A(iii)	Garages off Alan Moss Road, Loughborough	0.5	1.1	15	30	13
H/A(ix)	Rear 17-19 Leicester Road, Mountsorrel	0.9	2.2	25	30	12
H/A(x)	Former Factory Churchside/ Forest Street, Shepshed	1.0	2.4	40	40	16
H/A(xiii)	Former Coats Viyella Factory, Factory Street, Shepshed	1.0	2.4	50	50	21
H/A(xi)	Land rear 55 Wolsey Way, Syston	0.7	1.8	20	30	11
	TOTAL	5.7 2.6	14 6.4	210 100	37 38	15

(See also in particular Policies ST/3, EV/A, EV/7, EV/20, EV/25, EV/43, H/2, H/3, H/5, H/14, TR/7, TR/21, RT/3, RT/4, RT/5, RT/6, RT/7, RT/8, RT/9)

Reason:

Update to reflect current status on sites.

POLICY H/1(d) LAND AT BROOK STREET, BURTON ON THE WOLDS

Amend sub-clause (i) to read "Melton Road"

Reason:

Factual correction.

POLICY H/1(g) LAND SOUTH OF HAZEL ROAD/ MANOR ROAD, LOUGHBOROUGH

Delete Policy H/1(g) and reasoned justification. Amend Proposals Map to show site as housing commitment, delete distributor road, with structural landscaping to be implemented as part of planning consent subject to Policy EV/21.

Reason:

Update to reflect status of site as a commitment.

POLICY H/1(p) LAND AT BARKBY LANE, SYSTON

Delete Policy H/1(p) and reasoned justification. Amend proposals map to delete allocation.

Reason:

Update to reflect status of site as commitment.

POLICY H/1(r), LAND AT HARROWGATE DRIVE, BIRSTALL

Delete Policy H/1(r) and reasoned justification. Amend proposals map to show site as housing commitment.

Reason:

Update to reflect status of site as a commitment.

POLICY H/75 LAND AT LITTLE HAW FARM, SHEPSHED

Amend reasoned justification to delete third paragraph and replace with:

The density of development on the site should maximise the site's locational advantages while maintaining its important landscape features. It will also be important to ensure that the proposed dwellings and existing properties close to the site will not suffer a loss of amenity through overlooking and an unacceptable sense of enclosure or degree of overshadowing. Policy H/1 indicates a development of some 50 dwellings at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare in accordance with PPG3 density standards.

Reason:

To update text to reflect additional modifications to Policy H/1 on density.

H/89(b) LAND EAST OF BARKBY LANE, SYSTON

Amend reasoned justification to replace first sentence of paragraph 2 with:

With suitable landscaping and acoustic screening to the railway line, it is considered that a development of some 80 dwellings would be appropriate on this site in accordance with PPG3 density standards.

Reason:

To update text to reflect additional modifications to Policy H/1 on density.

H/92 LAND AT WYSALL LANE, WYMESWOLD

Replace reasoned justification with:

Wymeswold is one of the larger rural settlements in the Wolds area where some limited housing growth would be appropriate to help serve and sustain the Wolds communities. New housing development in the village would offer the prospect of securing an element of affordable housing to meet pressing local housing need, assist in providing choice in housing location across the Plan area, and contribute to the strategic housing requirement for the period to 2006. A site of some 2.3 hectares on either side of Wysall Lane is allocated for about 70 dwellings in accordance with PPG3 density standards.

Reason:

To update text to reflect additional modifications to Policy H/1 on density.

CHAPTER 7: TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

POLICY TR/6

Delete clause ii) and reasoned justification to remove reference to a local distributor road between the Epinal Way extension and the Fairmeadows development.

Reason:

Update to reflect status of South Loughborough housing site as commitment.

POLICY TR/21 PARKING PROVISION IN NEW DEVELOPMENT

Amend parking standards to remove reference to minimum standards to ensure consistency with Policy TR/21:

As far as possible, the following maximum parking standards have been related to the land uses in the Use Classes Order 1987.

Stores below 300 sq.m.	A minimum of 2 spaces up to 100 sq.m. 1 car space per each addition 100 sq.m. thereafter.
Offices	One car space per 35 sq.m. Minimum provision 2 spaces
Public Houses and licensed clubs	There shall be 1 customer car space per 3 sq.m of public area (excluding services, lobbies, toilets, cloakrooms, etc.). In addition, staff parking will be required at the rate of 1 car space for each residential member of staff, plus 1 car space per 40 sq.m. of public area for non-residential staff. There shall be an absolute minimum provision of 20 car spaces. Space shall be provided for loading and unloading of service and delivery vehicles clear of the public highway.
Offices	One car space per 25 sq.m. Minimum provision of two spaces.
Dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms	Minimum 3 spaces.
Dwellings with 3 or less bedrooms	Minimum 2 spaces.
Schools	One car space per member of teaching staff plus three additional spaces. Where a community wing is to be provided for daytime use a minimum of 5 additional spaces shall be provided. Provision for access to hard surfaced play areas will be required to provide additional parking for 'out of hours' functions.
Golf Courses	Minimum of 100 spaces per 18 hole course. Other sizes of course will be considered on their merits, not pro-rata to the above.

Reason:

For the purposes of clarity and to avoid confusion between the policy wording and the standards.

CHAPTER 8 CENTRAL AREAS AND SHOPPING

Policy CA/1

Insert after first sentence of 3rd paragraph of reasoned justification to Policy CA/1:

....a sequential approach has been applied in selecting the location of the site. Developers will need to demonstrate that all town centre options have been thoroughly assessed before less central sites are considered for development for key town centre uses. The first preference should be for town centre sites, followed by edge-of-centre sites, district and local centres and only then out-of-centre sites in locations accessible by a choice of means of transport.

Reason:

To describe the sequential approach as set out in PPG6.