From: Barry Sandilands [redacted]
Sent: 16 August 2021 12:56
To: localplans@charnwood.gov.uk
Subject: Fwd: Proposed 90 New Houses in Thrussington, HA67 & HA68
Attachments: Proposed Development of 90 New houses in Thrussington.docx

Begin forwarded message:

From: Barry Sandilands [redacted]
Subject: Proposed 90 New Houses in Thrussington, HA67 & HA68
Date: 16 August 2021 at 12:37:38 BST
To: localplans@charwood.gov.uk
Cc: cllr.james.poland@charnwood.gov.uk, edward.argar.mp@parliament.uk

Dear Sir /Madam

Please find enclosed my letter of objections to the above proposals

Please confirm, by email , your receipt of my letter of objection

Many Thanks

Barry Sandilands

Local Plans
Charnwood Borough Council
Southfield Road
Loughborough
LE11 2TX

Mr B. J. Sandilands
[redacted]

16th August 2021

Dear Sir/Madam

Proposed Development of 90 New houses in Thrussington (HA67 and HA 68) as detailed in the New Charnwood Draft Local Plan.

I am writing to record my strong objections to the above proposed development as I consider it has not been thought through objectively and is based on a number of false assumptions making it UNSOUND, not suitable for Thrussington, and will increase dangers to Thrussington Residents and cause environmental harm.

Sustainability
Thrussington does not have public service buses meaning it should never have been included for consideration. The Draft Local Plan has sustainability at it's heart and Thrussington does not meet the Councils own criteria for the sustainability. The local store only provides a limited range of goods and weekly shopping must be undertaken in surrounding larger stores, by car as there is no bus service. The same applies to healthcare, the nearest being 6km away in Syston

Charnwoods' sustainability requirements and development strategy is to reduce car use and to increase the use of Public Transport in locations that provide access to jobs, services, and other facilities.
Thrussington does not have any major employers, services and facilities for local residents to travel to. The proposal effectively seems to be creating a dormitory village, which is surrounded by open countryside, forcing an approximate extra 180 cars to drive through the Village and its surrounding country roads network at least twice every day. That cannot be sustainable or environmentally sound.

Character
Thrussington is an historic nucleated settlement on lower ground adjacent to the River Wreake. Proposal HA68 will be on higher ground, much easier to see and thereby destroying the historic form of Settlement.
The neighbourhood plan of 2018 had a vision "to protect and enhance the character and identity of Thrussington "and any new residential developments should be within the settlement. Clearly this proposal completely ignores this. What is the value of having a Neighbourhood Plan, then completely ignoring it?
Again the Charnwood Housing Delivery Study states "new developments for other settlements (including Thrussington) should be within the settlement boundary. Why have a Housing Delivery Study and completely ignore it?

I understand that previous planning applications for both HA67 and HA68 have been refused on the basis that they were UNSOUND, But here we go again. Why?

Neighbourhood Plan 2018
This plan was written after extensive village consultation, time and effort by the villagers , and Charnwood Borough Officials. It was passed on referendum by the whole village and adopted in full by Charnwood Borough Council. Why go to all that effort, then completely ignore all the genuine work by all parties? Does this hard won Plan have no bearing on this draft proposal? What therefore is it's status?
Has the protection of the character, identity, historic features, biodiversity, traffic reduction and new development principles that this plan sought to enhance, just been thrown in the bin?

Traffic
I fully support the views expressed by Thrussington Parish Council which have been supported by photographic evidence. The Village highways are now choked all day with parked vehicles, effectively reducing every street to single lane traffic. The situation around The Green was exacerbated a few years ago by the planning permission to convert the Star Inn , which offers minimal off road private parking for guests, into a Bed & Breakfast establishment. This forces staff and resident guests to park on the highway. However the following considerations must also be highlighted
Essentially Thrussington with its nucleated form is a small village island surrounded on all sides by open fields and connected to other villages and the national road network by narrow roads, many in poor condition, with blind turns and visibility problems. Before we consider some detailed problems, basically as I have said before, all the 180 extra cars must leave and return to the village on one of four routes. (ignoring Old Gate Road, which I will consider later). All these four roads meet at the Green, which means much of the traffic will also go around the Green where the Parish Council have already highlighted congestion from parked cars
I believe that no serious consideration should be given to this proposal until a full detailed study of the LOCAL traffic implications has been completed

- **Seagrave Road** is a fast road with very poor vertical and horizontal alignments, and blind spots. It is used, irrespective of statute restrictions by HGV's. Only last year there was a fatal accident along this road. It provides access to the A46 Trunk Road. This junction with the A46 is the site of many RTA's, including fatal accidents. The necessary right turning movements (both Northbound and Southbound) crossing both carriageways are most dangerous. Unfortunately recent "improvements" by Highways England, have done little to slow traffic or increase safety, so many Thrussington residents now avoid this junction, thereby putting extra pressure on Ratcliffe Road the only other practical alternative. It does appear clear that Highways England in their re-design of the junction had no knowledge of the proposal to create an extra 180 cars living just one mile from this junction

- **Ratcliffe Road** is a very narrow road with a blind hairpin approximately halfway between the two villages. It is extremely narrow at the Thrussington end exacerbated by parked cars which effectively mean it is a single track road at this point. Currently it is rare to pass along this road without meeting an oncoming vehicle. It is the only practical alternative way to get to the A46. An extra 180 cars will choke this already poor pinch point.

- **Hoby Road** is again a narrow road with poor horizontal alignment and several blind bends. Cars using the road travel too fast, as evidenced by a recent Parish Council traffic survey and recent speed protections for the School. However these have done little to curb the speeds. Vehicles to and from HA67 will only make matters worse. Like many Schools there has been no considerations to accommodate parking during the morning and evening schools run. At such times there are many parked cars, turning movements by cars and pedestrians to and from the school given dangerous conflicts, which will increase if proposal HA67 goes ahead.

- **Rearsby Road** as its name implies gives access across the flood plain to Rearsby, and onto Syston Town for healthcare and shops. However not before crossing a blind single track bridge over the river Wreake which is poorly signed. An extra 180 cars will increase the existing conflicts.

- **Old Gate Road** leads from the village up a steep hill and finally joins the A46 southbound carriageway only. It is basically a farm track that has been surfaced and there is extensive evidence of substantial deterioration. It provides an alternative access to the A46 after a blind 90 degree bend. This junction is not grade separated and there are no acceleration or deceleration lanes on the A46 which makes this junction extremely dangerous to use. It only provides access to the Southbound carriageway. Currently, ignoring the farms at the extreme top of the road, there are 12 dwellings that use this road to access the Village. Proposal HA68 will add a further 60 dwellings needing to use this road, thereby increasing the potential traffic at this point some 600%. Further it is difficult to see how a distributor road serving 60 houses can be constructed at this point without demolishing some existing housing. Surely this is counter productive?

- **Highways Winter Maintenance.** Like the majority of villages in Leicestershire, Thrussington is not served well when it comes to winter highways maintenance. There is one Priority 2 route that goes along Hoby Road, turning left at The Green and after a short section of Rearsby Road, turns right into Ratcliffe Road and out of the Village. Unfortunately Priority 2 routes are only treated when the situation on Priority 1 routes across the County are under control. Effectively this means that all roads in Thrussington do not receive any precautionary treatments leaving them in a dangerous condition during winter frosts. Typically in England we can expect around 100 treatable frosts,

perhaps a few more every year. In approximate terms around one third of the year. At the bottom of Old Gate Road there is a steep hill as it joins Seagrave Road at the difficult “Y” junction that always has parked cars. At this junction there is a small grit store which, although is totally ineffective in dealing with icy roads in the whole Village, does give a clear message that this junction has long been considered a “danger” in the winter months. Proposal HA 68 will increase the dangers by 600%. This cannot be allowed.

Flooding

Thrussington has a long history of flooding as it so close to the River Wreake. Parts of the Village are recorded on the Environment Agency flooding maps. Rearsby Road, The Green, parts of Ratcliffe Road, Church Lane, & Back Lane are designated Flood Zone 2 category areas. In addition the area to the rear of houses numbers 24 to 31 The Green, and the stream that drains the field adjacent to the south of Seagrave Road (and immediately below the bottom of the Old Gate Road hill), are designated as a Flood Zone 3 (the highest category)

When Flooding in the Village does occur, there are reports from the lower areas , e.g. Back Lane, that there is raw sewage in the water. This would indicate that part, or all, of the existing sewerage system is a “combined” system that is carrying both foul water and rainwater run-off.

No 7 The Green, in effect one of the lowest houses in the Village has already been compensated TWICE by Severn Trent Water for raw sewerage in the garden during flooding

Given this current situation the proposals for HA67 and HA68 will only make matters worse. The dirty water and sewage effluent from 90 houses combined with run-off from the approximate 5.2 hectares of hard surfacing, roads, driveways and the houses will all be channelled into the existing system. Also, of course water from the hard surfacing will reach the sewerage system much quicker than the existing field run off, thereby increasing the likelihood of flooding right at the point that is already a Zone 3 area.

Again I say that no further serious consideration should be given to this proposal until a thorough investigation into the capacity of the existing sewerage has been completed.

Other Utilities

Just like capabilities of the existing sewers, investigations into all other utilities, water, gas, electricity, telephones and the like should be completed before any further serious considerations are given to these proposals

Comments on Appendix H Sustainability Report

HA67

- Access to Public Transport -NOT TRUE as there is no bus service in the Village
- Access to Healthcare – NOT TRUE no public transport

- Loss of Employment Land – NOT TRUE 5 or 6 small businesses operate on this land
- Access to Primary School -PARTLY TRUE, only applies to development near to Hoby Road
- Access to Leisure Facilities – NOT TRUE what leisure facilities?

HA68

- Access to Public transport – NOT TRUE as there is no bus service
- Access to Healthcare – NOT TRUE as there is no bus service
- Access to Primary School – NOT TRUE using public highways
- Access to Leisure Facilities – NOT TRUE – What leisure facilities?

Please keep me informed of all developments with these proposals.

Yours faithfully
Barry Sandilands B.Tech.(Hons) C.Eng. MICE. MIHT

Sent to
localplans@charnwood.gov.uk

copies to
cllr.james.poland@charnwood.gov.uk
Edward.argar.mp@parliament.uk