



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA



23rd May 2021

Dear Mr Adwell,

**Re. Planning Application P/20/2380/2 - Representations
Outline Planning Permission for up to 150 Dwellings
Barkby Road, Queniborough, Leicestershire**

I am writing to highlight a number of representations made by my constituents in Queniborough, and nearby areas, in respect of the above application, in which they set out their concerns and objections to the application as currently proposed.

The application is for Outline Planning Permission for 150 houses off Barkby Road, Queniborough, together with new open space, landscaping/ drainage infrastructure, with other matters reserved.

By way of context, I do fully recognise and support the need for a supply of new housing that ensures we can continue to meet local demand for housing that is affordable, in the right place, and of the right type/ size, however I fear this application fails to meet that 'right place' test.

To address in turn the relevant planning considerations highlighted by my constituents to this application:-

This village, a small, rural village in character, with an historic centre and a strong sense of village community, has already seen significant new development in recent years, and continued further development, of such a scale, risks fundamentally altering the distinct character of this village, alongside the

Mr Mark Pickrell
Planning Department
Charnwood Borough Council
Southfields
Loughborough
Leicestershire LE11 2TN



pressure that local services, and the highway network, are under locally, which would be added to and exasperated were this development to proceed as proposed.

Queniborough already suffers from heavy traffic, with that traffic often backing up along Rearsby Road and Barkby Road at peak times. Despite the bus route that serves the village, people are predominantly reliant upon cars for transport, and there is nothing to suggest that anything other than this would remain the case for the new development. Coupled with the often heavy through traffic on Main Street, the additional vehicular traffic this development would generate would pose a significant challenge to the village, and one which the developers in their application do not appear to have a clear solution to.

Finally, in respect of local public services, Queniborough does not have a GP surgery, with local people signing on to the Practices in Syston. While very good practices, these are also seeing significant pressure on list numbers given the high level of new development in Syston itself, and in the wider area. Similarly, Queniborough's village school is also already at capacity. As above, I do not see within the application proposals that would be sufficient to fully mitigate the impacts of these additional pressures on local public services.

The local County Councillor, James Poland, in his representations, highlights the following point: *"Whilst all these things separately are factors as to why this application would be damaging to the village, taken together I think they demonstrate substantial harm to Queniborough. Therefore, despite the lack of a 5 year land supply, I believe this application should be refused."* I believe that many of those residents of Queniborough who have submitted representations share Cllr Poland's view, and would urge the Plans Committee to have heed to those strong community views in considering this application.

James Poland



Edward Argar MP