



Charnwood Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Issues & Alternative Strategies
Summary of Workshop Sessions

September 2007

CORE STRATEGY ISSUES AND ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES

KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS

Introduction

As part of on-going consultation on the Charnwood Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Charnwood Borough Council undertook a number of consultation workshops with key stakeholders. This paper provides a summary of these workshops.

The Borough Council consulted in February 2006 on the Core Strategy Preferred Options. To take into account new proposals published in the Draft Regional Plan for the East Midlands in September 2006, we intend to undertake a second preferred options consultation next year.

To inform the second preferred options consultation we are looking again at all alternative options to meet these new housing requirements. To help us as we put together options and alternatives for this further round of public consultation we have engaged with key groups and organisations during September 2007, to make sure we have identified and considered all reasonable alternative approaches to meeting our future development needs.

Workshops

A number of workshop events were held to discuss the issues and alternative strategies for the future development of the Borough. The events were run by officers from the Planning Policy Section.

We held two workshop events for Parish Councils, local interest groups, statutory organisations, developers and members of the Local Strategic Partnership forum. These were evening events held in north Charnwood on 19th September and in south Charnwood on 25th September 2007. In total more than 110 people attended these two workshops.

A paper was circulated ahead of the workshops, which aimed to investigate broad alternative strategies that could mean different local choices being made about appropriate locations for future development within the national and regional policy framework. Four examples of alternative strategies were outlined in the paper, which intentionally presented quite distinct solutions so that the different locational implications can be highlighted. It was emphasised that it is likely that the final preferred strategy will involve a combination of different elements of these and other strategies. The four strategies were:

- Strategy 1 - A Priority for Regeneration;
- Strategy 2 - A Priority for Safeguarding Environmental Features;
- Strategy 3 - A Priority for Economic Growth;
- Strategy 4 – A Priority for Local Needs.

The evening sessions themselves consisted of a brief presentation and workshop exercises considering these four alternative strategies and the locational implications of different strategies.

As well as these two events we held a number of workshops and meetings with specific groups:

- Young People Workshops at Burleigh, Wreake and Longslade Colleges
- Workshop with parents involved with Surestart
- Meeting with the Gypsy and Traveller Liaison group
- Workshop with community members at the Ram Krishna Centre

These workshops were run by officers from the Council's Planning Policy Team with help from County Council officers and staff at the Ram Krishna Centre. At these events time was also spent considering the positive and negative aspects of major new development. The four alternative strategies were explained by officers at the sessions themselves and consideration given to the locational implications of the strategies most preferred.

This paper summarises all of these events and the comments made by stakeholders.

South Charnwood Workshop – Wednesday 19th September 2007

Elizabeth Park Sports and Community Centre, Thurmaston 7pm – 9pm

Guy Longley, Head of Planning Policy welcomed everyone to the workshop on the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and made a short presentation about national, regional and local planning issues and about the process of preparing the Core Strategy.

This presentation was followed by two workshops. The first workshop explored the key issues for Charnwood and the good and bad aspects of each of the four alternative strategies and considered whether there are any other alternative strategies. During the break we asked everyone to vote on the alternative strategies, including those identified during the first workshops. The second workshop then considered the locational implications of the alternatives with the most votes. The workshops and voting are summarised below.

The event finished with an opportunity to ask questions and an outline of what will happen next.

Key Issues for Charnwood

Group 1

- No building on countryside
- Don't want development in our back yard
- Concern about identity of villages
- Potential for a new settlement
- A46 should be the boundary
- Good concept: mixed communities – services, houses, jobs etc

Group 2

- Lack of transport infrastructure: roads and public transport
- Lack of capacity in schools “bursting at seams”
- Inadequate policing, healthcare, services (libraries)
- Employment opportunities
- Lack of affordable housing
- Charnwood Forest good for recreation
- Various types of housing needed
- Better play areas needed for children
- Attractive place to live
- Close to Three Cities

Group 3

- Problems of cohesion in Thurmaston
- Roads split village
- Lack of facilities
- Highway infrastructure issues linked to Hamilton Growth
- Identity issues is new development Hamilton or Thurmaston
- Need to work with City
- Lack of larger housing and housing for elderly – housing mix
- Traffic issues in rural villages

Group 4

- Need transport infrastructure for growth
- Need for affordable homes
- Need single storey/smaller households for the elderly and specialist homes for disabled
- Need larger homes for people to move onto to release smaller homes
- Too many flats because of density requirements and empty
- Retaining green open space close
- Separation and identity of villages
- Schooling
- Need for infrastructure generally: e.g. health, sports facilities, education provision
- Highways criteria: estates onto roads
- Need car parking spaces including space for visitors
- Homes for young people and families, too many flats
- Environmentally friendly homes
- Beauty of Charnwood area needs protecting
- Running not managing the Forest

Good and Bad Aspects of Four Alternative Strategies

A Priority for Regeneration		
Group	Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses cohesion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applies to Loughborough • Difficult to target poorer communities
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wider range of jobs, helps people in need of work • Able to get wider benefits for local communities • Help integrate public transport 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not help problems in rural areas
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to quality jobs in Leicester 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue of low quality jobs • Impact on quality of life, needs careful planning
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrating on bringing forward facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of understanding of needs of rural villages • Considering all needs required • Key consideration is infrastructure • Mountsorrel – getting a lot already eg. Soar Valley Centre • Need jobs not homes in these areas and small villages even worse

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding it – realism • Greenspaces lost • Infrastructure for employment • Not prioritising rural communities
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

A Priority for Economic Growth		
Group	Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More jobs and opportunities • More self-sufficient • More efficient services: buses etc • Reduce 'brain drain' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • More development • Noise and pollution • Boom/bust
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain graduates in local area • Better transport links enabling people to get to jobs in Loughborough etc • Might be able to fund more infrastructure before development is built 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More environmental damage • Too much Greenfield development could add to flooding problems
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of existing infrastructure • Private sector funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Council tax in Thurmaston • More employment would not help
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balance of homes and jobs • Business investment encouraged 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Villages as dormitories • Bad for reducing travel to work • Will local people be employed? • Infrastructure first • Funding it • Leicester gets benefit • Lack of links to Loughborough • Impractical to encourage walking/cycling to centre

A Priority for Safeguarding Environmental Features		
Group	Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less damage to countryside and biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrating development in existing areas
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguards best parts of the Borough e.g. Charnwood Forest • Provide more open space, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Might reduce flooding risk • Higher density development could have harmful landscape

	recreation areas in developments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield development ok if in sustainable location 	impact
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguards best features • Tourism income • Community benefit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No recognition of scope for balance
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoiding flood zones • Retain and develop identity of settlements • Wildlife corridors a priority <p><u>All Strategies</u></p> <p>Q: Do we need so many homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are we utilising current stock? • Where is the evidence? • Is there an alternative approach? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need realistic flood plains • Concerns that proposals not taking account flooding • Need <u>genuine</u> consultation • Concerns about implication of Regional Park and Charnwood Forest • Would it mean can deliver Regional Plan requirements

A Priority for Local Needs		
Group	Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater opportunity for local people to comment on development • Strengthens Service Centres • More diverse communities • Stimulate communities – mixed house types 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some pressure groups may push development elsewhere/promote parochialism • Mismatch of densities of houses. There could be building at higher densities in villages which may not be in character • Change nature of communities. Group acknowledged that this was the flip side of having more diverse communities • Not enough contribution for facilities etc. This was based on the fact that development would not be of a suitable size to support facilities.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More development in villages can help sustain communities • Better mix and spread of jobs - could encourage more commuting • Less need to travel for jobs etc. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helps people live in villages where they grew up 	
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All communities help meet needs • Villages can accommodate sensitive growth • Villages need some growth to support services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could impact on conservation interests
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need affordable homes <u>in</u> all villages • Self sufficiency of villages: environment issues • Spreads the pain to all villages • Dispersed development better • Needs to be ring-fenced for local community • Could be an opportunity to maintain village character 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is going to build affordable homes? • Loss to market of affordable homes • How to get to jobs • Is affordable housing really affordable? • Less money for other infrastructure if more affordable homes • Need Government funding and is this realistic?

Other Alternative Strategies

Group 1

Do nothing

Group 2

Strategy combining the best bits of the different options discussed

Key elements: Urban concentration with rural survival, improvements to all types of transport e.g. use Great Central Railway for school distances and a good mix of jobs.

Group 3

Brownfield in City and Wymeswold Airfield

Or

Spread development evenly

Group 4

A priority for existing settlements and population - Pro-rata distribution

Or

A priority for high quality development – Design, Green elements, Good insulation, Gardens for families

Voting Results

Strategy	Votes
A Priority for Safeguarding Environmental Features	24
A Priority for Local Needs	15
A Priority for High Quality Development	14
A Priority for Regeneration	10
A Priority for Economic Growth	4
A Priority for Brownfield	4
A Priority for Urban Concentration with Rural Survival	1
A Priority for Doing Nothing	0

Spatial Implications of Preferred Strategies

A Priority for Regeneration

Possible Distribution:

- 2,500 dwellings and 25 ha of employment – east of Loughborough at Cotes
- 4,000 dwellings and 25 ha of employment - east of Thurmaston

Notes:

- More than just built development – parks, safe environment
- Redevelop in existing built up areas
- Need new station for buses
- Some agreement for spreading development to service centres
- Early discussion focussed on whether there was need for a large new settlement of 8000 dwellings. This was ruled out in favour of smaller developments
- Mention was made that blue cards did not state the number of libraries in each settlement. Representative from the library service indicated that tackling issues of learning and social exclusion was a very important aspect of their work.
- There was little consensus in the group for a particular option. The above distribution of development represents a close vote over a number of options.
- Some time of the overall discussion was spent discussing the need for the number of houses. It was questioned what proportion was due to immigration from other regions or countries. Officers explained that the requirement for houses was set out in the regional plan.

A Priority for Local Needs

Possible Distribution:

- 1,000 dwellings - west of Shepshed
- 25 ha employment – south of A512 Shepshed
- 1,000 dwellings – west of Loughborough, north of A512
- 50 ha Science Park – west Loughborough, south of A512
- 2,000 dwellings and 12.5 ha employment at Wymeswold Airfield
- 2,000 dwellings distributed amongst Service Centres and Other Settlements.
- 1,000 dwellings and 12.5 ha employment - south of Barkby Thorpe/east of Hamilton

Notes:

- Recognition there should still be an urban focus with significant developments in vicinity of Leicester, Loughborough and Shepshed,
- Development near Leicester should be an extension to Hamilton rather than to Thurmaston
- It was agreed that the optimal location for the Science Park is next to Loughborough University, although concerns were raised about the impact on the woods adjacent. Considered housing close to Science Park might be more sustainable and help fund infrastructure.
- Housing and employment growth at Shepshed would help regenerate town and support improved services and facilities.
- Allowing growth of some service centres and other settlements would help meet local needs and address deficits in infrastructure, services and facilities. Suggested this might be equivalent to 20% of housing stock in Service Centres and 10% in Other Settlements. A specific suggestion: 100 houses north of Sileby might help secure much needed recreation land.

A Priority for High Quality Development

Possible Distribution:

- 4,000 dwellings and 25 ha employment – east of Loughborough at Wymeswold Airfield
- 2,000 dwellings - west of Loughborough
- 50 ha Science Park - south of A512 Loughborough
- 25 ha employment - north of Birstall
- 1,000 dwellings – south of Syston
- 3,500 dwellings – east of Thurmaston/north of Hamilton

Notes:

- There was discussion about the potential for development at Wymeswold Airfield because it is a brownfield site. It was suggested that major development there would need to have bus routes to it. Concerns were raised about the impact on other settlements if development exceeded the capacity of the airfield itself. Concerns were also raised about the distance from the motorway and access arrangements.
- Overall it was felt that it would be better to develop on Wymeswold Airfield than a greenfield site, although it was noted that not all greenfield sites are necessarily better in environmental terms than brownfield. It was also agreed that to achieve high quality development it would be better to develop a large self contained area with new schools and health centres.
- It was agreed that some housing development should be located close to the university west of Loughborough, outside Garendon Park and should include a link road. It was agreed that the Science Park should be located adjacent to Loughborough University and that it should make the most of the attractive setting of this area to achieve high quality development.
- It was agreed that there should be more employment in Birstall area to balance the large number of houses built there.
- Residents from Thurmaston want to avoid merging with the city further as they have concerns about becoming part of the City Council area and they want to be part of Charnwood Borough.
- It was agreed that it was important for people's quality of life that they have a sense of community. It was suggested that Thurmaston is currently made up of three communities and it would be better if any new community had a separate feel to it, to help create a sense of community.

A Priority for Safeguarding Environmental Features

Notes:

- as there was no overall agreement amongst participants it was agreed not to record suggested development locations;
- there was discussion around the implications of possible locations, the scale of remaining housing provision and the capacity of particular locations to accommodate growth;
- concerns were raised that there was not enough land east of Thurmaston to accommodate development in the region of 4,000 homes;
- there were discussions about the potential for development on Wymeswold Airfield and views were expressed that there was scope to accommodate development in this location;
- there were questions raised about possible funding sources and whether it was necessary to rely on developer funding to provide supporting infrastructure;

- participants agreed that the safeguarding of the Charnwood Forest was a critical issue but that also it provided opportunities in terms of tourism and recreation potential;
- there were also views expressed that land to the east of Thurmaston, forming part of High Leicestershire was also an attractive landscape that should be safeguarded;
- a number of participants felt that there was a need to spread development more to meet needs of various communities;
- views were expressed that in south Charnwood; Anstey, Birstall and Thurmaston; should all accommodate some development.

North Charnwood Workshop - Tuesday 25th September 2007

Mountfields House, Loughborough 7.30pm – 9.30pm

Dave Hankin, Director of Development welcomed everyone to the workshop on the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and made a short presentation about national, regional and local planning issues and about the process of preparing the Core Strategy.

This presentation was followed by two workshops. The first workshop explored the good and bad aspects of each of the four alternative strategies and considered whether there are any other alternative strategies. During the break we asked everyone to vote on the alternative strategies, including those identified during the first workshops. The second workshop then considered the locational implications of the alternatives with the most votes. The workshops and voting are summarised below.

The event finished with an opportunity to ask questions and an outline of what will happen next.

Good and Bad Aspects of Four Alternative Strategies

A Priority for Regeneration		
Group	Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• More facilities for all people;• Cleaning up brownfield land;• Reducing crime.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• May gentrify areas;• Facilities might not be provided in other areas.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Affordable homes where needed;• Good mix;• Opportunity to mix housing and employment;• Shops/community centres important aspect;• Transport infrastructure – bus corridors, new linkages;• Need strong design plan;• Need integrated parking.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dormitory areas;• Loss of employment;• Lack of variety in building styles;• Density issue – “people living in rabbit huts”.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure affordable controlled housing to buy/let;• Put more employment sites here;• Achieve infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Puts more pressure on services and infrastructure;• These might not be best locations for employment development;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to traffic problems.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment; • Small scale industry; • New community facilities to engage people; • Depends on vision; • If it brings inward investment; • Potential access to funding; • If it delivers social housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure on stretched facilities; • Indiscriminate development e.g. Student housing; • Traffic congestion.

A Priority for Economic Growth		
Group	Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More jobs; • Attract investment; • Attract retailers? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are jobs relevant to local people/unemployed; • Dormitory towns/suburbs; • Encourages traffic; • Imbalance of jobs and homes in centre of town causing commuting and congestion; • Jobs not next to homes; • Difficult to promote strategy as people are mobile, cannot make people live near to where they work.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment linked to university; • Encourages diversity; • Benefits of having a university compared to other market towns; • Opportunity to have a broad focus on employment types; • Opportunity to build purpose built student dwellings; • Opportunity not to see stagnate; • All settlements could benefit from opportunity for more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliance on university and vulnerable to Government funding criteria; • Too many eggs in one basket; • Jobs for all skills needed; • Competition for housing between residents and students; • Families discouraged for settling in area; • Focus too much on the 3 big cities; • Do we want Loughborough to be

	companies like Astra Zenica.	<p>a big city?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much of a focus on Loughborough; • Quality rather than prosperity should be the focus; • Road congestion;
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attract good investment into area and infrastructure; • Retain skilled workforce; • Take advantage of locational advantage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Might not get infrastructure; • Loss of environmental assets.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If it delivers <u>local</u> jobs and <u>local</u> wealth; • Cash in on knowledge base; • Can be good for small business. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Override environment injury to forest and river valley; • Over burden infrastructure – roads.

A Priority for Safeguarding Environmental Features		
Group	Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoids flooding; • Avoids loss of wildlife; • Keeps parks; • Free public access; • Settlement separation; • Maintain good quality of life. • High density/low density? (Some debate as to which would be better. Low density better living environment and more in character with settlements, but agreement that this would involve the use of more greenfield land) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport constraints; • Increase distances travelled; • Put pressure on existing infrastructure.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eco-villages could be provided by developers; • Wildlife/ecological value of area; • Woodlands; • Opportunity to get people to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection or nothing can work against aims.

	<p>other parks, away from Bradgate Park;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to define and develop policies for Charnwood Forest; • Development can facilitate opening up of areas for recreation/wildlife/ ecology; • Can communities cope? 	
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguards environmental assets; • Maximum use of brownfield land; • Attract more people to live here. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High density development may be harmful to environment; • Less attractive sites for investment/development; • Increased congestion as people travel more and less employment in villages.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes the most of our green heritage; • Challenge to incorporate green wildlife space; • Innovative solutions – high density housing; • Settlement identity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No green belt in Leicestershire!

A Priority for Local Needs		
Group	Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May support schools/shops; • My fund rural transport; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loose funding for infrastructure facilities; • Increase car based transport; • Cannot require high standards in design – (eco homes). (Developments would be of a smaller scale and may be too costly to require for small scale developments).
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High levels of need for rented accommodation; • Revitalised villages could improve the Borough but have to avoid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about affordable social rented housing destroying communities; • No facilities would be provided

	<p>over-doing it;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important part is the provision of facilities and transport; • Housing for disabled as well as affordable housing needed; • Better quality of life for residents in larger developments because provision would be made for more facilities, whereas smaller developments haven't got facilities; 	<p>on smaller developments;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a sustainable strategy; • Key question is: How large would development need to be to get facilities?
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May help achieve better housing choices (bungalows), specialist accommodation; • May attract better services for residents; • Better balance of communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wider harm to environment for development; • Dilute scope for real planning gains.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads to smaller schools; • Responsive to community and delivers affordable housing; • Should consider rural centre for local needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More transport; • Dilution of contributions; • Risk of countryside erosion.

Other Alternative Strategies

Group 1

- Need to think about more quality development
- Strategy taking out Shepshed from Loughborough as part of 'Sub regional centre'
- Strategy looking beyond Charnwood boundaries using infrastructure outside Borough
- Strategy focussed on capacity of Junction 23 of M1 – not impinge on the capacity of this junction of M1

Group 2

A Priority for green and eco-friendly development

- Need to imagine what the Borough will be like in 20 years in terms of the impacts of traffic and peak oil.
- Greener issues/environmental concerns
- Could allocate some development to Loughborough and the villages but also create a new settlement as an eco-village:

- Brand new village, not necessarily in the middle of nowhere
- Would help encourage cohesion between new people
- Could incorporate renewable energy and greener development for example using roofs for green planting
- Zero carbon development
- Homes and communities could come together around communications e.g. railway and buses to enhance accessibility
- Higher densities but not sky scrapers as higher density is more sustainable
- Protecting villages

Group 3

A balanced strategy of all four themes.

Voting Results

Strategy	Votes
A Priority for Green & Eco-Friendly Development	28
A Priority for Regeneration	13
A Priority for Safeguarding Environmental Features	13
A Priority for Economic Growth	10
A Priority for Local Needs	10
Take Shepshed out of Definition of Sub-Regional Centre	4
A Balanced Strategy of <u>all</u> for Four Themes	2
Strategy Looking Beyond Charnwood Boundaries Using Infrastructure Outside Borough	2
Focussed on Capacity of J23 of M1 – not Impinge on the Capacity of this Junction of M1	0

Spatial Implications of Preferred Strategies

A Priority for Regeneration

Distribution:

- 2000 dwellings and 25ha of employment land - east of Loughborough at Cotes
- 4000 dwellings and 25ha of employment land - east of Thurmaston/south of Syston

Notes:

- Much of the earlier discussion was focussed around the question of whether development can help to regenerate areas of relative deprivation. Parts of the group initially felt that development would be of little benefit. Examples of the new south Loughborough development was given as an example of how development has failed to tackle problems in the Shelthorpe area. However in answer to the facilitator's question of whether a regeneration strategy should locate development away from deprived neighbourhoods or close to them, there was a general feeling it would be of some benefit to locate it close to more deprived neighbourhoods.
- There was some feeling within the group that development could be located in the flood plain.
- There was little consensus for a particular option, and the selected option was selected through a fairly close vote. Within the group there were 6 votes for East Loughborough and 4 votes for south west Loughborough. For the south there were 7 votes for Thurmaston.

A Priority for Economic Growth

Distribution:

- 8000 dwellings - west of A46 and south of A6006 in The Wolds
- 4000 dwellings – west and north of Loughborough
- 50ha Science Park - west of Loughborough, south of A512
- 500 dwellings and 25ha of employment land – south of Loughborough towards Quorn
- 500 dwellings - east of Barrow upon Soar
- 500 dwellings - south/east of Sileby
- 500 dwellings - north of Mountsorrel
- 500 dwellings - north of Rothley
- 500 dwellings - south of Syston
- 1000 dwellings and 25ha of employment land - north of Birstall/Wanlip

A Priority for Safeguarding Environmental Features

Distribution:

- 25 ha of employment land - south of Shepshed, south of A512
- 50 ha Science Park - west of Loughborough, south of A512
- 1,000 dwellings - east Loughborough, within the urban area
- 6,000 dwellings and 25 ha of employment - Wymeswold Airfield

OR

- 8,000 dwellings and 50 ha of employment - west of A46 and south of A6006 around Six Hills in The Wolds

Notes:

- The Group wished to see minimal release of Greenfield land for development. The priority should be reuse and redevelopment of brownfield land. Many members of the Group considered it would not be possible to accommodate major housing development around south, west or north Loughborough or around Shepshed.
- Wymeswold airfield was considered the only significant brownfield site likely to be available. Development in this location would have good road access to Loughborough, Nottingham and Leicester. Development could be designed to minimise harm to existing communities and the environment including provision of road infrastructure through the Soar valley.
- The optimal location for the Science Park was accepted by the majority of the Group as being west of Loughborough between the University and the M1
- New employment land on the A512 at Shepshed would aid regeneration of the town
- If the scale of development were increased then it would need to be located in a place suitable for a new town. The only possible location in the north of the Borough appeared to be adjacent to the A46, A6006 at Six Hills with ready access to the road network.

A Priority for Green and Eco-Friendly Development

Distribution:

- 6,000 dwellings and 25ha of employment – east of Loughborough at Cotes
- 1, 500 dwellings - Wymeswold Airfield
- 1,000 dwellings - north east of Thurmaston/south of Syston
- 2,000 dwellings - north of Birstall, north of the A46/west of the A6
- 25ha of employment land - north of Sileby
- 500 dwellings - south of Rearsby
- 500 dwellings - south of East Goscote
- 500 dwellings - south of Queniborough
- 500 dwellings - south of Rothley

Notes:

- There was discussion about Wymeswold Airfield and concerns were expressed about it being in an unsustainable location but that it had the advantage of being a large brownfield site. Rearsby Airfield was also suggested.
- It was suggested that the opportunity for eco-friendly development should be maximised through large scale development. There was most support for this being beyond the floodplain to the east of Loughborough.

- Concerns were expressed about impact of the development on flooding in other areas and about the access. Concerns were also expressed that new residents would need to travel through Loughborough to get to the motorway or there would need to be relief road.
- It was agreed that there would need to be sustainable transport within the development not just roads. It was felt that development to the east of the town would mean the railway station becomes more central to the town. Concerns were raised about the impact of the Parkway station proposals on Loughborough station.
- It was agreed employment should be located with major housing development.
- It was suggested that development west of the town would involve less road infrastructure, would open up of a Country Park and be close to the university and science park. Concerns were raised about the damage to Garendon Park. Concerns were also raised about attracting people from elsewhere because of location next to the motorway, rather than catering for local people.
- It was felt Thurmaston and Birstall were good locations as they are close to existing jobs and public transport.
- Some development elsewhere was felt to be needed to bring about improvements in infrastructure e.g. the need for better public transport in Rearsby area, but this may need to be less than 500 dwellings.

Young People Workshops - Wednesday 26th September 2007

Burleigh College, Loughborough

A workshop was held with a class of 26 students aged 14-15 years during their Personal Development period at Burleigh College. The workshop was run by officers from the Borough Council's Planning Policy Team and supported by a lecturer from the college and Trevor Wise from Leicestershire Youth Service.

To start the session the class was split into two groups and asked to place the names of the villages and towns on a map of the Borough to get them thinking about the Borough and in particular the settlement pattern.

We then introduced and explained the four alternative strategies and asked the class to use two sticky dots to vote for their preferred strategies. The results are below:

Voting for Alternative Strategies

Strategy	Votes
A Priority for Safeguarding Environmental Features	28
A Priority for Economic Growth	7
A Priority for Regeneration	4
A Priority for Local Needs	2

A Priority for Safeguarding Environmental Features was the most popular strategy. The class explained that they had concerns about losing the separation between places for example between Loughborough, Shepshed and Hathern.

Spatial Implications of Preferred Strategies

As the most favoured strategy both groups considered the locational implications of a strategy which prioritises safeguarding environmental features.

The groups were asked to use blocks to show where they think development should be located in Charnwood to ensure that environmental features are safeguarded. The results of this are shown below.

A Priority for Safeguarding Environmental Features

Group 1

- 2,000 dwellings - west of Shepshed
- 25 ha of employment land – at Hathern
- 2,000 dwellings - west of Loughborough, north of A512
- 2,000 dwellings – south of Loughborough, towards Quorn

- 25 ha of employment land - west of Mountsorrel
- 50ha of employment land - north of Birstall, west of A6 and north of A46
- 500 dwellings - east of Birstall/west of Thurmaston
- 500 dwellings - north of Thurmaston

Group 2

- 4,000 dwellings - west of Shepshed
- 1,000 dwellings – at Wymeswold Airfield
- 4,000 dwellings - west of A46 and north of A6006 in North Wolds
- 2,000 dwellings – within Leicester City on sites of closed down factory

Comments

- There were some questions about why some many new homes were needed and the factors involved in household growth were discussed.
- There was general concern about the impact development would have on existing residents.
- Overall it was felt that development should come with a health centre, hospital, shops, dentist, buses and trains, where possible.

Young People Workshops – Thursday 27th September 2007

Wreake College, Syston

A workshop was held at Wreake College with 10 students aged 12-16 years from a selection of classes, in the college meeting room during one of their lessons. The workshop was run by officers from the Borough Council's Planning Policy Team and supported by Trevor Wise from Leicestershire Youth Service.

To start the session the group were asked to place the names of the villages and towns on a map of the Borough to get them thinking about the Borough and in particular the settlement pattern. We then asked the group what were the good and bad aspects of living in Charnwood and of major new development.

Good and Bad Aspects of Living in Charnwood

Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parks;• Swimming Pool;• Shops;• Buses;• Walking at Watermead.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• East Goscote is boring;• Too green;• No bus to Beaumont Leys;• Only limited buses to Hamilton;• Buses are expensive;• Don't feel safe;• People hanging around drinking

Good and Bad Aspects of Major New Development

Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meet new people;• New facilities for new and existing residents;• Too much green anyway;• More buses;• All weather football/tennis/basketball courts as a trade off for having the development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Couldn't play football on area;• Loss of countryside;• More traffic;• Destroying animal habitats;• Could lose a place people like;• More people trying to use swimming pool, parks and football pitches.

Voting Results

We then introduced and explained the four alternative strategies and asked the class to use two sticky dots to vote for their preferred strategies. The results are below:

A Priority for Regeneration was the most preferred strategy as there is a need for more health centres, nursing homes, jobs, parks and cheaper housing for people living in the area.

Strategy	Votes
A Priority for Regeneration	6
A Priority for Local Needs	5
A Priority for Safeguarding Environmental Features	3
A Priority for Economic Growth	2

Spatial Implications of Preferred Strategy

As the most favoured strategy the group considered the locational implications of a strategy which prioritises regeneration.

The group was asked to use blocks to show where they think development should be located in Charnwood to ensure that regeneration is achieved. The results of this are shown below.

A Priority for Regeneration

- 4,000 dwellings – west of Loughborough, south of A512
- 1,000 dwellings - east of Thurmaston
- 2,000 dwellings - west of South Croxton, north of Beeby

Comments

- It was agreed that flooding would be a problem for any development near the river east of Loughborough.
- Development should include schools and shops.

How should we consult people?

At the end of the session we asked the young people about how they think we should consult young people and parents when we do our consultation next year.

Consulting Young People	Consulting Parents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Villages and parks on a Saturday when people are out • Youth Clubs eg. East Goscote, Syston • Colleges/schools • Not in canteen/school grounds • No emails because people are worried about viruses • Not posters • During school time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notices on trees • Leaflets - from school or through post • Not emails • Better at College • Surveys through letterbox • Parents at school/college in evenings.

Young People Workshops – Thursday 27th September 2007

Longslade College, Birstall

A workshop was held at Longslade College with 12 students aged 14-18 years selected from a number of classes, in the Old Music Room during one of their periods. The workshop was run by officers from the Borough Council's Planning Policy Team and supported by Trevor Wise from Leicestershire Youth Service.

To start the session the group were asked to place the names of the villages and towns on a map of the Borough to get them thinking about the Borough and in particular the settlement pattern. We then asked the group what sort of homes they would like to have in the future, what are the good and bad aspects of living in Charnwood and what are the good and bad aspects of major new development.

What sort of home would you like to have in the future?

- Start with flat apartment
- Cheaper
- Other Young people
- Costs - split between
- Town Centre nearby
- Attractive, near river
- Near University
- London
- Rent with a few people in a house

Good and Bad Aspects of Living in Charnwood

Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Buses• Countryside (but ruined by roads and development)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not enough Youth Centres• Glenfield is boring• Only hourly buses• No evening bus (Thurcaston)• Ruined by roads and development

Good and Bad Aspects of Major New Development

Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Brings More:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Schools- Shops- Services• Necessary for population growth• Buy to let speculating	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Joining places up• Loss of countryside• More youths, noise and trouble• Loss of services to houses• Construction noise• More noise and pollution• Buy to let speculating

Voting Results

We then introduced and explained the four alternative strategies and asked the class to use two sticky dots to vote for their preferred strategies. The results are below:

Strategy	Votes
A Priority for Safeguarding Environmental Features	8
A Priority for Regeneration	7
A Priority for Local Needs	3
A Priority for Economic Growth	2

A Priority for Safeguarding Environmental Features and a Priority for Regeneration were the most preferred strategies.

The group were concerned about keeping development away from Bradgate Park. They want to see the park and footpaths protected. They also wanted to avoid joining places up.

The group wanted to see development bring improvements in health and the availability of jobs. They felt development should be located as close to city as possible for example around Birstall and Syston, where there are fields that are not used for anything and that development should cater for the needs of students at the universities in Leicester City.

Spatial Implications of Preferred Strategies

The group considered the locational implications of a strategy which prioritises regeneration following a second vote between the two most favoured strategies.

The group was asked to use blocks to show where they think development should be located in Charnwood to ensure that regeneration is achieved. The results of this are shown below.

A Priority for Regeneration

- 2000 dwellings – west of Shepshed
- 4000 dwellings – west of Loughborough/south of Hathern
- 1000 dwellings – north of Birstall
- 500 dwellings – north of Syston/south of East Goscote

Comments

- Farmland that is not being used should be used for development
- There was concerns about destroying the setting of Barkby if there was development at Thurmaston/south of Syston

- The group considered expanding the bigger villages in the Soar Valley as they are good places to live.
- It was suggested that we should not worry about joining up villages if it is housing for the benefit of society as a whole
- There was a discussion about how we plan beyond the 20 years considering now. There was a suggestion that a new settlement between Queniborough and Barkby should be considered. It was agreed that it would be better to place development on the edge of the city or town than further away.
- It was agreed that the outskirts of Shepshed would be a good location as it is close to services and has no impact on smaller villages.
- It was agreed that west of Loughborough would be a good location as long as development was kept out of the parkland. There were concerns about the floodplain to the east of the town and the effect of development on Quorn to the south of the town.

How should we consult people?

At the end of the session we asked the young people about how they think we should consult young people and parents when we do our consultation next year.

Consulting Young People	Consulting Parents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internet- “The Jitty” • At college like this session • Could hold in the main hall and invite more students • Evenings bad for getting young people to attend events because of getting buses home • Holiday time not a good time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hate receiving information through the letterbox • Ask parents to attend a session in the evening to hear about the workshops with students during the day • Not online • Could advertise • At parents evening

Workshop with Community Members at Ram Krishna Centre
Loughborough - Friday 28th September 2007

A workshop was held at the Ram Krishna Centre with 10 community members. The workshop was run by officers from the Borough Council's Planning Policy Team and supported by staff from the Ram Krishna Centre.

To start the session the group were asked what the good and bad aspects of living in Charnwood are and what the good and bad aspects of major new development are.

Good and Bad Aspects of Living in Charnwood

Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everything within walking distance • Temple 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No proper bus routes through the housing areas linking to community facilities, nurseries etc

Good and Bad Aspects of Major New Development

Good Aspects	Bad Aspects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building houses on factory sites • Should include open space in housing schemes • Affordable Housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of open space/trees/play areas in town centre, east Loughborough (Lemyngton/Hastings Wards) if the development is south or west of Loughborough • Developing east of river valley may be too far away to help east Loughborough. • All houses might be occupied by students • Harm to nature, green areas • Not close to existing houses • Needs to be 'bigger' homes not just one bedroom

Spatial Implications of Preferred Strategies

The group was asked to use blocks to show where they think development should be located in Charnwood to ensure that regeneration is achieved. The results of this are shown below.

Voting Results

Q: If need to build new houses, where is the best place to build around Loughborough?

Locations	Votes	Comments
East of Loughborough	0	This would be 30 minutes walk along a narrow road, not as near the town
South of Loughborough	6	This would be nearer town and Tesco's
West of Loughborough	2	This would be near Loughborough University, there would need to be a bus service
South West of Loughborough	0	This is a bad idea as it would be too near Charnwood Forest
Wymeswold Airfield	0	This would be separated from the town by the flood area, this could stop all traffic and buses if there is a flood.

How should we consult with you in the future?

It was agreed that there are a number of events run through the centre that provide the best opportunity to meet with black and minority ethnic groups. The details of these events were provided to officers.

Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Meeting - Wednesday 4th September 2007

Bosworth College, Desford

Leicestershire Gypsy Council Liaison Group Minutes

First discussed the outcome of the needs assessment and looked at the requirements up to 2011 for of the each districts in Leicestershire.

There is now a three month discussion period and a regional debate over who should provide these sites, in front of an Inspector. Richard and Claire explained that they were still waiting for the Inspector's report and in the process of developing a core strategy. Charnwood has no official – council or private – sites at the moment.

One of the issues is whether there should be a more even spread of site provision/plots between districts...this seems to be the same old issue of avoiding making provision, slowing the process down and also is unnecessary – the Needs Assessment exercise – while not perfect – has established where the needs are and people have stated where they want to be – so why are these facts not accepted and worked on? Most agreed that there was a need for transit as well as permanent sites.

There was fierce debate and many people expressed how tired they are of being ignored, and frustrated at their basic needs being sidelined and how they have little faith in real progress or change for the better. Planning applications are too drawn out.

Richard and Claire indicated that we were likely to see some decisions made about site provision from February 2008 and that they thought this was progress – slow as it was – and that they recognized the planning system in the UK was very difficult.

They asked how we could identify land for good sites – not near tips, pylons, motorways, toxic waster, but near facilities – shops schools, surgeries, public transport routes and also more support for the elderly in the community were vital. It was pointed out that there was all this information is in a draft 80 page document describing ideal site design, management, and facilities needed – produced by the Government department for Communities and Local Government as a draft consultation document in May this year.

Other Comments Noted by Officers

Sites must be run by owners, as would be better managed in terms of tidiness and less trouble.

It was highlighted that there are many different needs. Gypsy and Traveller needs just as different, varied as settled community. Not enough is done for elderly people for example. Settled community has sheltered accommodation for elderly and there should be something similar for the travelling community.

It was agreed that sites should be near to bus services and near to shopping centres. They should have natural boundaries and should not be windswept. They should be safe.

Surestart Workshop – Tuesday 11th September 2007

Shelthorpe Primary School, Loughborough

A workshop was held at Shelthorpe Primary School with three parents and three Surestart staff including a nutritionist. Sure Start is a government programme offering a range of early learning, health and family services to children living in disadvantaged areas and their parents. The workshop was run by officers from the Borough Council's Planning Policy Team.

Exercise 1 – What are the Benefits and Problems of Development

We asked the group to imagine that a major new development of 4-5,000 houses and associated employment, shops and services was to be built near where they live on the edge of Loughborough. We asked what would be the benefits and problems of such a development.

Benefits

- More homes, particularly affordable homes;
- More shops nearby;
- New groups such as Sure Start might be set up in new community buildings;
- Job opportunities, particularly interested in jobs with flexible hours;
- New good school nearby.

Problems

- Crowded town centre, already difficult getting a pram around town on market day.

Other Comments

- They were not concerned about towns and villages merging together or loss of greenfield land or countryside.

Exercise 2 – Alternative Strategies for Charnwood

We spent a few minutes explaining each of the four alternative strategies. We outlined the issue that each strategy is prioritising and how planning might be able to help to tackle that issue.

It was agreed that the strategies which prioritise regeneration and local needs were the preferred strategies.

Exercise 3 – Location Implications of Strategies

We asked the group to consider the locational implications of the strategies they had chosen on a map of the Borough using blocks to represent homes and jobs. We asked them to place the blocks where they wanted to see future development based on their preferred strategies.

Distribution

- 2,000 between Quorn and Loughborough
- 2,000 between Loughborough and Hathern
- 1,500 at Anstey
- 1,500 at Queniborough

Comments

- It was agreed that there is a need for affordable housing for local people in need. Concerns were raised about how people can get into affordable housing. Often housing that is called affordable is still expensive and out the range of families with two incomes. Where affordable housing is provided it is taken straight away. It was felt that the Council would be sensible to build 100% affordable housing to reduce its back log.
- It was felt that there is a lack of access to shops selling fresh fruit and vegetable locally.
- It was highlighted that parents shop locally, walking or getting a bus into town or to tesco. They go to Asda in Thurmaston by car when they can get there, as the food is cheaper from there, but this was only for a large shop ever now and again.
- It was agreed that it would be good if development included new play areas both indoor and outdoor for children.
- The group wanted to see the development between Quorn and Loughborough so that they could access the new affordable housing that would be built. It was felt this would help connect the rural areas to the town.
- Concerns were raised about the problems of flooding east of Loughborough. When asked about building beyond the floodplain concerns were expressed about the development being too far away from the edge of Loughborough so would be a new town without connection to Loughborough. It was felt that development to link Quorn and Hathern to Loughborough would be a good idea, as they would benefit from closer access to services in Loughborough. It was agreed that it is better to add development to towns that are already doing well rather than building a new place.
- Concerns were raised about the loss of nice countryside if developed west of Loughborough.
- Concerns that there are high prices around Thurmaston, and development in this area will just be high priced new housing.
- It was felt that Hamilton has had enough development.
- There was question about how many facilities are in Syston and Queniborough. It was agreed to locate development at Queniborough to support wider services.