



Charnwood Borough Council  
Local Plan Examination

**Matter 6: Urban Area Policies, Site Selection,  
Sustainable Urban Extensions and Housing Site  
Allocations.**

**Hearing Statement**

June 2022



[gladman.co.uk](http://gladman.co.uk)



**Page intentionally left blank**

## MATTER 6: URBAN AREA POLICIES, SITE SELECTION, SUSTAINABLE URBAN EXTENSIONS AND HOUSING SITE ALLOCATIONS

### Issue 4 – Housing Allocations

2.1.1 The following sections are Gladman’s response to Issue 4 – Question 6.16 in respect of our land interests at Land South of Melton Road (HA45), Land off Melton Road (HA46), Land off Barnards Drive (HA53) and Land off Melton Road, East Goscote (HA60).

2.1.2 All four sites are the subject of live planning applications which are supported by a comprehensive suite of supporting technical studies to demonstrate all the sites are suitable, achievable, and deliverable. Where relevant, reference is made in the following sections to these technical documents.

2.1.3 As part of our Regulation 19 representation, we provided a Delivery & Technical Assessment for each site which should be read alongside this submission. We have endeavoured to keep this hearing statement as concise as possible.

#### **Land South of Melton Road, Barrow upon Soar (HA45)**

Has any planning permission been granted for residential development and if so, what are the details?

2.1.4 An outline planning application for up to 130 dwellings (LPA ref: P/21/0760/2) was validated in May 2021. There are no technical objections to the proposed development and Gladman are working proactively with the Council towards determination.

Is the proposed scale of housing development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?

2.1.5 Yes. The proposal comprises residential development of up to 130 dwellings with 2.82ha of open space and green infrastructure. The proposals can accommodate all necessary on-site infrastructure and can be adequately served by gas, electricity,

telecommunications and water supply/sewerage infrastructure, by extending the existing mains and utilities networks present within the areas adjoining the site.

- 2.1.6 There are no physical constraints which inhibit the development of the site, and the technical studies demonstrate the site's ability to accommodate up to 130 market and affordable dwellings.

Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in Policy DS1 and where relevant, does it take account of a made Neighbourhood Plan?

- 2.1.7 Yes. Service Centres such as Barrow upon Soar are recognised as playing an important role in providing sustainable solutions to housing growth and delivering local benefits. Service Centres are some of the most sustainable settlements in the Borough, only behind Loughborough and Shepshed in the adopted Spatial Hierarchy. The Settlement Hierarchy Assessment 2020 (EB/DS/3) details that Barrow upon Soar has all the essential and desirable services and facilities as well as access to employment opportunities, higher order services and a secondary school.

- 2.1.8 Proportionate growth at the service centres such as Barrow upon Soar is therefore justified and the allocation of market and affordable housing at this location is consistent with the development strategy in this regard.

- 2.1.9 The Barrow upon Soar Neighbourhood Plan (BUSNP) was 'made' in May 2018. The site proposals are not considered within the BUSNP and there are no policies which restrict development on the application site. The Neighbourhood Plan's policies have been carefully considered throughout the evolution of the site proposals and we consider that policies on design, dwelling mix, affordable housing, and biodiversity can be satisfied by the application submission for the site.

What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors: settlement separation and identity and landscape character; biodiversity, green infrastructure including public rights of way and agricultural land quality; heritage assets; the strategic and local highway network and other infrastructure including health facilities, education, and open space; air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.

- 2.1.10 The Landscape and Visual Assessment demonstrates that the effects of the development proposals would be restricted to a localised geographical area and would not result in substantial harm to landscape character within and beyond the site boundary.
- 2.1.11 The Ecological Assessment identifies that the site is not of high ecological value and that any loss of habitat associated with its development would not be significant and could be readily mitigated alongside the achievement of a net biodiversity gain. The proposed development can deliver net gains in biodiversity through the retention and enhancement of species-rich hedgerows and grassland, alongside habitat creation and incorporation of new bat roosting and bird nesting opportunities.
- 2.1.12 The site can be safely and suitably accessed by a priority-controlled junction from Melton Road. Pedestrian access will also be from the junction and footways are proposed to link the development with the existing pedestrian network. LCC considered in their response to the planning application (dated 14/01/2022) that the impacts of the development on highway safety would not be unacceptable, and when considered cumulatively with other developments, the impacts on the road network would not be severe.
- 2.1.13 The Heritage and Archaeology Report submitted with the planning application demonstrates that the development proposals will have no impact on the setting on any designated heritage assets.
- 2.1.14 The noise assessment and air quality assessment submitted alongside the current planning application for the site demonstrates that noise and air quality will not pose a constraint to the site's development. The Council's Environmental Protection department have confirmed that they have no objections to the current planning application for the site, subject to the imposition of conditions.
- 2.1.15 As outlined above, consultees have not identified any technical issues that would preclude the site's development, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions and developer obligations. The matter of primary school provision in Barrow upon Soar is discussed in more detail in our Matter 2 Hearing Statement.

Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

- 2.1.16 The sole development requirement set out in the Plan in respect of the site allocation is for development proposals to contribute to the reasonable costs of the provision of a new 1FE primary school in Barrow. As set out in detail in our Matter 2 statement, Gladman have engaged constructively with the Council, LCC and other Barrow upon Soar site promoters to agree the principles for delivering a new primary school in the settlement.

Is there evidence to indicate that the site can the site be developed without increasing the flood risk to people or property as required by the NPPF?

- 2.1.17 The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) details the whole of the site is situated in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at the lowest risk of fluvial flooding. It is also noted that there is a low risk of surface water flooding across most of the site.

- 2.1.18 Overall, the FRA further demonstrates that flood risk from identified sources can be mitigated to a negligible or low and acceptable standard through standard mitigation measures, moreover the proposals would not increase flood risk elsewhere. The Lead Local Flood Authority (response dated 13/08/2021) have confirmed that they have no objections to the current application proposals for the site subject to conditions.

#### **Land off Melton Road, Barrow upon Soar (HA46)**

Has any planning permission been granted for residential development and if so, what are the details?

- 2.1.19 An outline planning application for up to 135 dwellings (LPA ref: P/21/0759/2) was validated in May 2021. There are no technical objections to the proposed development from the Council's specialist officers and Gladman are working proactively with the Council towards determination.

Is the proposed scale of housing development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?

- 2.1.20 Yes. The proposal comprises residential development of up to 135 dwellings with 2.7ha of open space and green infrastructure. The development proposals can accommodate all necessary on-site infrastructure and can be adequately served by gas, electricity, telecommunications and water supply/sewerage infrastructure, by extending the existing mains and utilities networks present within the housing areas adjoining the site.
- 2.1.21 There are no physical constraints which inhibit the development of the site and the technical studies demonstrate the site's ability to accommodate up to 135 market and affordable dwellings.

Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in Policy DS1 and where relevant, does it take account of a made Neighbourhood Plan?

- 2.1.22 Yes. Service Centres such as Barrow upon Soar are recognised as playing an important role in providing sustainable solutions to housing growth and delivering local benefits. Service Centres are some of the most sustainable settlements in the Borough, only behind Loughborough and Shepshed in the adopted Spatial Hierarchy. The Settlement Hierarchy Assessment 2020 (EB/DS/3) details that Barrow upon Soar has all the essential and desirable services and facilities as well as access to employment opportunities, higher order services and a secondary school.
- 2.1.23 Proportionate growth at the service centres including Barrow upon Soar is therefore justified and the allocation of market and affordable housing at this location is therefore consistent with the development strategy in this regard.
- 2.1.24 The Barrow upon Soar Neighbourhood Plan (BUSNP) was 'made' in May 2018. The site proposals are not considered within the BUSNP and there are no policies which restrict development on the application site. The Neighbourhood Plan's policies have been carefully considered throughout the evolution of the site proposals and we consider that policies on design, dwelling mix, affordable housing, and biodiversity can be satisfied by the application submission for the site.

What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors: settlement separation and identity and landscape character; biodiversity, green

infrastructure including public rights of way and agricultural land quality; heritage assets; the strategic and local highway network and other infrastructure including health facilities, education, and open space; air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.

- 2.1.25 The Landscape and Visual Assessment demonstrates that the effects of the development proposals would be restricted to a localised geographical area and would not result in substantial harm to landscape character within and beyond the site boundary.
- 2.1.26 The proposed development can deliver net gains in biodiversity through the retention and enhancement of species-rich hedgerows and grassland, alongside habitat creation and incorporation of new bat roosting and bird nesting opportunities.
- 2.1.27 The site can be safely and suitably accessed by a ghost island priority-controlled junction from Melton Road. Pedestrian access will also be from the junction and footways are proposed to link the development with the existing pedestrian network. LCC considered in their response to the planning application (dated 14/01/2022) that the impacts of the development on highway safety would not be unacceptable, and when considered cumulatively with other developments, the impacts on the road network would not be severe.
- 2.1.28 The Heritage and Archaeology Report submitted with the planning application demonstrates that the development proposals will have no impact on the setting on any designated heritage assets.
- 2.1.29 The noise assessment and air quality assessment submitted alongside the current planning application for the site demonstrates that noise and air quality will not pose a constraint to the site's development. The Council's Environmental Protection department have confirmed that they have no objections to the current planning application for the site, subject to the imposition of conditions.
- 2.1.30 As outlined above, consultees have not identified any technical issues that would preclude the site's development, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions



and developer obligations. The matter of primary school provision in Barrow upon Soar is discussed in more detail in our Matter 2 Hearing Statement.

Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

2.1.31 The sole development requirement set out in the Plan in respect of the site allocation is for development proposals to contribute to the reasonable costs of the provision of a new 1FE primary school in Barrow. As set out in detail in our Matter 2 statement, Gladman have engaged constructively with the Council, LCC and other Barrow upon Soar site promoters to agree the principles for delivering a new primary school in the settlement.

2.1.32 A modification is required to increase the proposed number of homes from 120 dwellings to 135 dwellings. As demonstrated through Gladman's current planning application submission, 135 homes can be successfully accommodated on the site.

Is there evidence to indicate that the site can be developed without unacceptable harm to wildlife?

2.1.33 The Ecological Assessment considers that with the implementation of straightforward mitigation and precautionary measures as proposed, the development proposals are not anticipated to result in any significant residual negative effects to important ecological features.

Is there evidence to indicate that the site can the site be developed without increasing the flood risk to people or property as required by the NPPF?

2.1.34 Yes. The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) details the whole of the site is situated in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at the lowest risk of fluvial flooding. Overall, the FRA demonstrates that flood risk from identified sources can be mitigated to a negligible or low and acceptable standard through standard mitigation measures, moreover it would not increase flood risk elsewhere.

- 2.1.35 The Lead Local Flood Authority (response dated 03/08/2021) have confirmed that they have no objections to the current application proposals for the site subject to conditions.

**Land off Barnards Drive, Sileby (HA53)**

Has any planning permission been granted for residential development and if so, what are the details?

- 2.1.36 An outline planning application for up to 228 dwellings (LPA ref: P/21/0738/2) was validated in May 2021. There were no objections to the application proposals from the Council's specialist officers or other technical consultees and therefore the application was recommended for approval by the Case Officer.
- 2.1.37 Outline planning permission subject to the signing of a S106 Agreement was subsequently granted at Planning Committee on 01/12/2021. Gladman are currently in the process of advancing the accompanying S106 agreement through discussions with the Council and Leicestershire County Council.

Is the proposed scale of housing development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?

- 2.1.38 Yes. The proposal comprises residential development of up to 228 dwellings with 2.82ha of open space and green infrastructure. The development proposals can accommodate all necessary on-site infrastructure and can be adequately served by gas, electricity, telecommunications and water supply/sewerage infrastructure, by extending the existing mains and utilities networks present within the housing areas adjoining the site.
- 2.1.39 There are no physical constraints which inhibit the development of the site, and the technical studies demonstrate the site's ability to accommodate up to 228 market and affordable dwellings.

Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in Policy DS1 and where relevant, does it take account of a made Neighbourhood Plan?

- 2.1.40 Yes. Service Centres such as Sileby are recognised as playing an important role in providing sustainable solutions to housing growth and delivering local benefits. Service Centres are some of the most sustainable settlements in the Borough, only behind Loughborough and Shepshed in the adopted Spatial Hierarchy. The Settlement Hierarchy Assessment 2020 (EB/DS/3) details that Sileby has all the essential and desirable services and facilities as well as access to employment opportunities, higher order services, good transport connections to Leicester and Loughborough, and good access to secondary school provision.
- 2.1.41 Proportionate growth at the service centres including Sileby is therefore justified and the allocation of market and affordable housing at this location is therefore consistent with the development strategy in this regard.
- 2.1.42 It is acknowledged that the site is situated within the Sileby Neighbourhood Plan area. In this respect, the relationship between the application proposals and the Neighbourhood Plan's policies has been carefully considered throughout the evolution of the site proposals. The case officers report for the application has explained how the Neighbourhood Plan's policies on design, dwelling mix, affordable housing, and biodiversity can be satisfied by the application submission.

What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors: settlement separation and identity and landscape character; biodiversity, green infrastructure including public rights of way and agricultural land quality; heritage assets; the strategic and local highway network and other infrastructure including health facilities, education, and open space; air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.

- 2.1.43 The local highway authority has been consulted on the application proposals and have confirmed that the proposed site access arrangements from Barnards Drive are safe and suitable for the level of development proposed. The County Council's officers have also comprehensively assessed the effects of the proposals on junction capacity and performance in the wider settlement, concluding that they would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the operation of the local highway network when considered cumulatively with other developments.

- 2.1.44 The site is wholly located within Flood Zone 1 in respect of fluvial flooding. Overall, the FRA demonstrates that flood risk from identified sources can be mitigated to a negligible or low and acceptable level through standard mitigation measures. The Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority have identified that they do not object to the proposals on drainage and flooding grounds.
- 2.1.45 The development proposals include substantial areas of open space above local policy requirements, alongside new tree and hedgerow planting, which would result in benefits for biodiversity, achieve net biodiversity gains and promote healthy lifestyles and wellbeing. An agricultural land quality survey has been undertaken which details that all the land within the site is of Subgrade 3b and is therefore not best and most versatile agricultural land.
- 2.1.46 The Heritage and Archaeology Statement and Archaeological Geophysical Survey that have accompanied the current planning application for the site did not identify any significant archaeological features that would preclude its development. The development of the site would result in no harm to the setting of the Sileby Conservation Area, or any other designated heritage assets within it or the wider area.
- Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?
- 2.1.47 The sole development requirement set out in the Plan in respect of the site allocation is for development proposals to contribute to the reasonable costs of the provision of a 0.5FE extension of Cossington Primary School.
- 2.1.48 The S106 Agreement that is currently being advanced for Gladman's planning application submission contains an agreed a developer contribution and associated planning obligations towards the 0.5FE expansion of Cossington Primary School, to accommodate the additional primary school places anticipated to arise from the development of the site.

Is there evidence to indicate that the site can be developed without unacceptable harm to the landscape?

- 2.1.49 Yes. The supporting Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment demonstrated that the current application proposals for up to 228 dwellings could be successfully accommodated by the receiving landscape. New development would be situated immediately adjacent to existing built form and mirror residential development that has recently been completed or is under-construction to the north-west. Any development would be contained within the crest of the valley slope, limiting the site's visual envelope.
- 2.1.50 The case officer concluded that the effects of the proposed development would be relatively localised and of limited overall landscape impact. The overall long-term impact on the landscape character of Soar Valley would not be so significant as to change the overall character of the area or fail to comply with the guidelines for the landscape character appraisal.
- 2.1.51 Gladman therefore consider that it has been demonstrated that site can be developed without unacceptable harm to the landscape.

Is there evidence to indicate that the site can be developed without unacceptable harm to wildlife?

- 2.1.52 It is acknowledged that the site has been assessed as having the potential to provide habitats for bats, reptiles, and great crested newts (GCN). The results of the Ecological Appraisal prepared for Gladman's planning application submission describe how any impacts on these species could be adequately mitigated using appropriate construction methods and licensing, a lighting strategy, and the retention and enhancement of on-site tree and hedgerow planting. Moreover, the indicative layout makes provision for ecological enhancement measures to be incorporated into the scheme, including, amongst others the provision of an attenuation basin that will provide additional habitat for water based protected species.
- 2.1.53 The Borough Council's Senior Ecologist has confirmed that subject to mitigation which can be secured by planning obligations as part of any reserved matters application, the scheme overall could provide net gains in biodiversity.

**Land off Melton Road, East Goscote (HA60)**

Has any planning permission been granted for residential development and if so, what are the details?

2.1.54 An outline planning application for up to 270 dwellings (LPA ref: P/20/2383/2) was validated in March 2021. There were no objections to the application proposals from the Council's specialist officers or other technical consultees and therefore the application was recommended for approval by the Case Officer.

2.1.55 Planning permission subject to the signing of the S106 was granted at Planning Committee on 26/08/2021. Gladman are currently in the process of advancing the accompanying S106 agreement through discussions with the Council and Leicestershire County Council.

Is the proposed scale of housing development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?

2.1.56 Yes. The proposal comprises residential development of up to 270 dwellings with 9.56ha of open space and green infrastructure. The development proposals can accommodate all necessary on-site infrastructure and can be adequately served by gas, electricity, telecommunications, and water supply/sewerage infrastructure, by extending the existing mains and utilities networks present within the housing areas adjoining the site.

2.1.57 There are no physical constraints which inhibit the development of the site, and the technical studies demonstrate the site's ability to accommodate up to 270 market and affordable dwellings.

Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in Policy DS1 and where relevant, does it take account of a made Neighbourhood Plan?

2.1.58 Yes. Other Settlements such as East Goscote are recognised as playing an important role in providing housing in a variety of locations which improves the prospects for housing delivery whilst taking account of landscape and settlement identity constraints outlined in the overall vision and strategy.

2.1.59 As illustrated by the Council's Settlement Hierarchy Assessment (EB/DS/3), East Goscote represents one of the more sustainable settlements listed as "other settlements" in the settlement hierarchy. The village features a Primary School, Post Office, Library, Pharmacy and Food Store. The southwestern part of the village is also home to a large employment area and the settlement is served by regular bus services to Leicester (four buses per hour) and Melton Mowbray (Half hourly).

2.1.60 In this context, the level of growth directed to East Goscote is considered commensurate to the services and facilities available in the settlement. The allocation of market and affordable housing at site HA60 is therefore consistent with the development strategy in this regard.

2.1.61 There is no Neighbourhood Plan for East Goscote.

What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors: settlement separation and identity and landscape character; biodiversity, green infrastructure including public rights of way and agricultural land quality; heritage assets; the strategic and local highway network and other infrastructure including health facilities, education, and open space; air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.

2.1.62 The local highway authority has been consulted on the development proposals and have confirmed that the proposals can be safely accessed from Melton Road and would not have an unacceptable impact on the local highway network.

2.1.63 The Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority have reviewed the development proposals and identified that they do not object to the proposals on drainage, flooding or pollution grounds.

Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

2.1.64 Policy DS3 (HA60) requires development proposals for the site to restrict development to the western part of the site and maintain the physical and perceptual separation between East Goscote and Rearsby.

2.1.65 As highlighted in the planning application documentation and by the Case Officer in their Committee Report, care has been taken to put forward a site layout that respects the area of local separation designation. Appropriate separation would remain between the two settlements, and the open character of this land would be retained and reinforced. Having regard to these factors, the proposals are deemed to in compliance with the relevant policies of the Local Plan on this matter.

2.1.66 A modification is required to increase the proposed number of homes from 223 dwellings to 270 dwellings. As demonstrated through Gladman's planning application proposals, 270 homes can be successfully and sustainably accommodated on the site.

Is there evidence to indicate that the site can be developed within contamination constraints?

2.1.67 Yes. The topic of land contamination has been carefully assessed by the Council's Environmental Protection team and scrutinised in detail during the lifetime of Gladman's development proposals. It was also considered by a Planning Inspector during the course of a previous Public Inquiry (APP/X2410/W/18/14382). The conclusions of the assessments that have been undertaken of this issue are that the planning conditions imposed by the Council on Gladman's planning application submission (LPA ref: P/20/2383/2) are entirely appropriate and suitable in the circumstances to address this matter.

2.1.68 The application proposals have been purposefully designed to accommodate the route of the Thurcaston-Ashby Folville pipeline and its respective easements, which passes through the northern most part of the application boundary, adjacent to Melton Road. The Health and Safety Executive and Cadent were consulted during the development of Gladman's planning application and confirmed in their subsequent consultation response that the pipeline would not pose a constraint to development.



Is there evidence to indicate that the site can be developed without unacceptable harm to heritage assets?

- 2.1.69 Yes. The Built Heritage Assessment submitted with the recent planning application for the site demonstrates that the development proposals will cause no/negligible harm to the significance of any designated heritage assets, including Queniborough Conservation Area, Rearsby Conservation Area and the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary. The same assessment also concluded that the development of the site would only result in minor harm to the to the significance of The Grange, a Locally Listed Building.

Is there evidence to indicate that the site can be developed without unacceptable harm to the landscape?

- 2.1.70 Yes. Whilst the site is partially located within an area of local separation (ALS) between Rearsby and East Goscote, it is not covered by any specific landscape designations. As outlined above, the relationship between Gladman's development proposals and the ALS designation has been carefully considered by the Council's officers, as well as an Inspector in the aforementioned appeal.
- 2.1.71 In this respect, the only elements of development that would lie within the current extent of the ALS would be the proposed site access road and green infrastructure, with all 8ha of housing development located outside of the ALS. The extent of built development (the site access road) would extend no further eastwards than the current building line established by Broome Lane (on the northern side of Melton Road). On this basis, the Council and a previous appeal Inspector have confirmed that adequate separation would be maintained.
- 2.1.72 Whilst there would be some changes to the immediate appearance of the landscape through the construction of the formalised access road through the hedgerow that fronts Melton Road, and development of housing on an area of somewhat open undeveloped pasture, these effects overall would be relatively localised and of limited overall landscape impact.

- 2.1.73 When assessing landscape and visual matters and the subject of the ALS, the Council's Case Officer concluded that the overall long-term impact on the landscape character of The Wreake Valley Landscape Character Area (in which the site is located) would not be so significant as to change the overall character of the area or fail to comply with the guidelines of the landscape character appraisal. Furthermore, having regard for the distribution of the built and open areas shown on the submitted development framework plan, they considered that the proposal would significantly reduce the perceptible gap between East Goscote and Rearsby.
- 2.1.74 Gladman therefore consider that it has been demonstrated that site can be developed without unacceptable harm to the landscape.