

**PLEASE NOTE
VENUE**



**CABINET
THURSDAY, 27TH NOVEMBER 2003 AT 6.00PM
IN THE CHARNWOOD CENTRE, SOUTHFIELDS, LOUGHBOROUGH**

To: Councillors Anthony, Feeney, Forrest, Hunt, (Leader), MacLeod,
Newton (Deputy Leader), Sharpe, Vincent and Wilson (Deputy Leader)
(for attention)

All other members of the Council
(for information)

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES
2. DISCLOSURES OF PERSONAL INTERESTS
3. MINUTES

PART 2 (RESERVED TO CABINET)

4. QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 27 (page 4)

Scrutiny Committees: Community Development and Health and Public Protection

PART 1 (RESERVED TO COUNCIL)

5. BOROUGH OF CHARNWOOD LOCAL PLAN – CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS ON ADDITIONAL MODIFICATIONS

Head of Planning Services' report circulated separately.

*Scrutiny Committee: Environment
Key Decision*

PART 2 (RESERVED TO CABINET)

6. RADAR KEYS
Head of Policy Unit's report attached. (page 5)
Scrutiny Committee: Community Development
7. URBAN CAPACITY STUDY FOR CHARNWOOD – APPOINTMENT OF CONSULTANTS
Head of Planning Services' report attached. (page 7)
Scrutiny Committee: Environment
8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS SCHEMES FOR QUORN (JUBILEE GARDENS) AND SYSTON (CENTRAL PARK)
Head of Planning Services' report attached. (page 13)
Scrutiny Committee: Environment
9. LEASE OF PROPERTIES AT SORREL COURT, MOUNTSORREL, TO CHARNWOOD AND NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE PRIMARY CARE TRUST
Head of Housing Services' report attached. (page 20)
Scrutiny Committee: Housing
10. LOCAL AUTHORITY SOCIAL HOUSING GRANT
Head of Housing Services' report attached. (page 22)
Scrutiny Committee: Health and Public Protection
Key Decision
11. EXEMPT INFORMATION
It is recommended that members of the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

12. EAST MIDLANDS HOTEL, LOUGHBOROUGH – USE AS TEMPORARY
ACCOMODATION FOR THE HOMELESS

Head of Housing Services' report circulated to councillors. (page 24)

*Scrutiny Committee: Housing
Key Decision*

13. COUNCIL'S WEBSITE – REDEVELOPMENT

Director of Resources' report circulated to councillors. (page 28)

Scrutiny Committee: Resources

CAB\1KC

CABINET – 27TH NOVEMBER 2003

ITEM 4 QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 27

Councillor Williams has given notice of the following questions that she wishes to ask the Leader under Council Procedure Rule 27:

“Is it possible to make Loughborough’s November Fair and all its facilities more accessible to disabled people?”

“Could more toilets be available for visitors to the November Fair?”

CABINET 27th November 2003

Report of Head of Planning Services

ITEM 5 BOROUGH OF CHARNWOOD LOCAL PLAN: CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS ON ADDITIONAL MODIFICATIONS

Purpose of Report

This report presents details of objections and supporting representations received in response to the Additional Modifications to the Deposit Draft Local Plan, which were published in September 2003 following the Council's consideration of objections to the Proposed Further Modifications (January 2003). The Council is now required to consider the representations received and to decide what further changes, if any, are required before the plan may proceed to adoption, and whether the Council should exercise its discretion to hold a further inquiry into objections received in relation to the published modifications.

Recommendation

It is recommended:

1. that the Statement of Decisions and Reasons in response to objections to the Additional Modifications as set out in Appendix 1 is approved and no further modifications are made to the plan;
2. that notice be given by local advertisement of the Statement of Decisions and Reasons and of the Council's intention to adopt the local plan subject to the published modifications and similar notices be served on any person who has objected to, or made a representation in respect of the plan;
3. that copies of the Statement of Decisions and Reasons be made available in the locations where the local plan was made available for inspection;
4. that the Council resolves to adopt the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan, subject to the published modifications and subject to no direction being received from the Secretary of State;
5. that, in the event of no direction being received from the Secretary of State, the requisite Notice of Adoption be published.

Reason

1-5 To comply with Regulations 27, 28, 30, 31 and 34 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Plans) (England) Regulations 1999.

Policy Context

The preparation of an up to date local plan to guide the development and use of land in the Borough is a statutory requirement. Policies in the local plan support a number of the Council's priorities as set out in the Corporate Plan: Charnwood Together. The Local Plan is an important part of the Council's wider aim for a more sustainable environment and will support Council priorities for increasing economic vitality in towns and villages, provision of cultural and leisure opportunities, and ensuring decent housing including affordable housing. Improvement in the Council's Development Control Service is a key objective of the Corporate Plan. The adoption of the Local Plan is critical to the delivery of these service improvements.

Background

At its meeting on the 26th June 2003 Cabinet considered a report on the representations that had been received on the Proposed Further Modifications to the plan, which were published in January 2003 in response to the report of the Modifications Inquiry Inspector.

The Council resolved to make 5 additional modifications to the plan to:

- restore the Deposit Plan designation to show land at Armston Road, Quorn as outside the limits to development and within the Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside (**AM2.1**);
- allocate land at Peartree Lane, Loughborough for the development of approximately 100 dwellings (**AM4.2**);
- increase the number of dwellings proposed on allocated housing sites at Anstey, Burton on the Wolds, Shephed, Barkby Lane, Syston and Wymeswold, (**AM4.1**) and increase their affordable housing targets where relevant (**AM4.3**);
- add references to Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 and Regional Planning Guidance to the text (**AM4.6**).

These additional modifications were published for consultation in September 2003.

The Next Stages

In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) Regulations 1999 the Council is now required to:

- consider all the objections received on the Additional Modifications and publish a statement of its decisions and reasons in response to these objections;
- consider whether the Council should exercise its discretion to hold a further inquiry into objections received in relation to the published modifications;
- decide whether any further modifications to the plan are necessary. If they are they must be published and made available for a further 6 week period of consultation;
- if the Council decides to adopt the plan without any further modification it must advertise its intention to do so. The First Secretary of State then has 28 days within which to decide whether he wishes to intervene;
- if there is no intervention from the First Secretary of State, the Council may then proceed to adopt the plan. There is a six week period from the date of adoption where interested parties can legally challenge the plan.

Representations Received

A total of 304 representations on the Proposed Additional Modifications have been received, made up of 174 objections and 130 statements of support. These objections are summarised at Appendix 1 along with a recommended response. Copies of the original objections have also been placed in the Members' Room. The main areas of objection are to:

- the restoration of the Deposit Plan Policy to show land at Armston Road, Quorn outside the Limits to Development and within the Charnwood Forest Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside;
- the allocation of land at Peartree Lane, Loughborough;
- the proposed increases in densities on sites.

No representations have been received in relation to AM4.5 which deals with a minor amendment to the reasoned justification.

Two representations have been received, from Syston Town Council and Ian Clarkson, which do not relate to the published additional modifications and therefore have not been accepted as duly made objections.

Before addressing more specifically the duly made objections received on each additional modification, there are some key points that should be considered in relation to the objections and the stage the plan has reached.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Members will not need reminding that the preparation of the plan has been a lengthy process. In its preparation the plan proposals and policies have been subject to intense scrutiny through five formal periods of public consultation and two public inquiries. There have been numerous opportunities for all parties to make representations on the plan. The two public inquiries have given objectors the opportunity to present their concerns to independent Inspectors.

The remaining issues that are subject to additional modification relate to the exclusion of land at Armston Road, Quorn from the limits to development for the village, the additional housing allocation at Peartree Lane, Loughborough, and the increased densities and associated affordable housing contributions on five existing housing allocations. Objections can now only relate to these additional modifications. Objectors cannot at this stage in the plan preparation process seek to re-open the debate on other aspects of the plan which are not the subject of any additional modification.

The allocation of land for housing to meet the strategic housing requirement to 2006 has been the main issue of contention throughout the preparation of the local plan. The sites proposed for allocation by the Council have been supported by one or both independent local plan inquiry inspectors. The Government Office for the East Midlands (GO-EM) on behalf of the First Secretary of State had raised some fundamental objections to the proposals for housing allocations presented by the Council in its Further Modifications document published in January this year-specifically in relation to the Council's failure to allocate land at Peartree Lane, Loughborough and its failure to apply PPG3 density standards on certain sites. The Additional Modifications sought to address these concerns. GO-EM have raised no objection to the published Additional Modifications.

The suitability in principle of the allocated sites for development has been established through what has been a lengthy plan preparation process. Having considered all the objections received, the Local Plan and Modifications Inquiry Inspectors concluded that these areas of land represent the best options for development in accordance with national and strategic planning policy guidance. It is clear from the previous objections from GO-EM that where sites are allocated, for the purposes of the plan, PPG3 densities should be applied in order to avoid the inefficient use of land.

The release of these sites is required to meet the Council's strategic housing requirements to 2006. Because of expected build rates development will extend

beyond 2006. There will be future housing requirements for the Borough beyond 2006 and these are set out in the Replacement Structure Plan. In establishing the likely future greenfield housing requirements the Replacement Structure Plan assumes that development will take place on current local plan allocations at PPG3 densities. If best use is not made of the allocated sites for housing, there is likely to be an increased need to release additional greenfield land to meet these future housing requirements. Development on the allocated sites at PPG3 densities will reduce the need to release additional greenfield land for housing in the longer term.

On the basis of the housing land supply position at March 2003 it was concluded that there was a need to release the allocated sites in order to ensure that the Council meets the strategic housing requirement by 2006. This reflected realistic assumptions on build rates and the likely contribution from sites within what remains of the plan period. The monitoring of housing land supply in the last quarter has not altered this position. The large site housing land supply position at September 2003 is set out at Appendix 2. A number of the previously identified 'pipeline' sites have been permitted or are subject to Council resolution to permit, subject to section 106 agreements. Whilst a number of additional sites are currently subject to planning applications for housing development, these have not yet been determined. The Modifications Inspector considered the appropriateness of the Council's urban capacity allowance and was clear that any assumed contribution from as yet undetermined applications on larger urban windfall sites would be highly speculative and would introduce an unacceptable degree of uncertainty into the calculation of housing land supply.

The additional urban capacity allowance that has been made remains a realistic assessment of the likely contribution from this source in terms of the delivery of **housing completions** in the remaining period to 2006. The unresolved legal challenges on some of the greenfield sites has meant slower than expected progress on these sites. This has made the housing land supply position all the more critical and has reinforced the need to release the allocated sites.

In considering the representations received and its likely response, the Council must be mindful of its primary responsibility to produce and adopt the local plan and the serious implications of further possible delay. The government remains committed to the plan-led system and a national performance indicator dealing with plan making has come into effect this year.

LAND AT ARMSTON ROAD, QUORN (AM2.1)

135 objections have been received in response to this Additional Modification. Some 121 representations have also been received supporting the Council's position on this issue. Members will recall that Council, at its meeting on the 30th June 2003, concluded that the land south of 7 Armston Road should remain outside the limits to development and within the Charnwood Forest Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside (Minute 19 refers).

The objectors contend that the Council should accept the recommendation of the Local Plan and Modifications Inquiry Inspectors and include the land within the limits to development.

The reasons why the Council reconsidered its position on this matter were set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons published in September. The issue is one of value judgement. In the Council's view the land does form part of the wider parkland of Quorn House Park, is part of the rural setting to Quorn and is important in forming

part of the landscape setting to the settlement edge, and should be afforded the same protection as the wider parkland. It is the Council's considered opinion that development on the land would have a damaging impact on the appearance and character of the Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside and the countryside setting of Quorn.

Council needs to consider the representations received on the Additional Modification, and decide whether its position on this matter needs to be reviewed. The representations received, both in support and objecting to the additional modification, restate the issues and arguments that have previously been considered by the Council in relation to this issue. The issue is a matter of planning judgement. If, having considered the objections received, the Council remains of the view, as a matter of planning judgement, that the land does form part of the Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside, no further changes to the plan are required.

INCREASED DENSITIES (AM4.1)

A number of objections have been received in relation to the proposed increase in densities on certain housing allocations. These changes were made in response to previous representations from the Government Office for the East Midlands (GO-EM) emphasising the need for the plan to reflect national guidance in PPG3 on residential densities. As already indicated GO-EM have raised no objection to the Additional Modifications.

Objectors raise concerns about the impact of increased densities on the local highway network and local services and the lack of any need for increased housing numbers to meet strategic housing requirements. Some objectors argue that rather than increase site capacities, PPG3 densities can be achieved by reducing allocated site areas which would save greenfield land release.

The reasons why the Council should seek to make the most efficient use of land proposed for allocation in the local plan have been dealt with above.

The principle of development on the allocated sites has been considered in some detail at two Local Plan Inquiries. For the sites where increases in densities are proposed both the Local Plan and Modifications Inspectors supported their allocation. In this respect the Inspectors have concluded that an area of land is suitable for development. The local plan identifies the appropriate scale of development that can be accommodated on the land in accordance with guidance on densities set out in PPG3. The plan can only identify the approximate number of dwellings that might be accommodated on a site. The precise scale of development on any site will be a matter to be considered in relation to a detailed planning application, where there may be good reason on highway or other grounds to limit the number of dwellings provided.

A representation has been received from Anthony Aspbury Associates on behalf of Shire Properties and Wimpey East Midlands Limited in relation to the allocated site at Wysall Lane, Wymeswold. They suggest an amendment to the net site area and site capacity to reflect the current planning application for the development of the site. The net site area is not subject to an additional modification, but the assumed density for the site has been amended to reflect PPG3 densities.

Contrary to the objector's contention, the site area does reflect the conclusions of the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector and evidence submitted to the Inquiry by the objector. The objector's assessment of the net site area does not reflect the correct definition of net residential density set out in PPG3. Their suggested change would in fact result in

a development at 24 dwellings per hectare, not 30 dwellings per hectare they suggest. Such a change would be likely to attract further objection from GO-EM, who have consistently objected to any allocations falling below PPG3 density standards. It is not necessary for the Local Plan to be amended to reflect what are, as yet, unresolved detailed matters for consideration at the planning application stage, particularly where such a change would be likely to attract further GO-EM objection.

With the exception of the site at Wysall Lane, Wymeswold, the County Council as Strategic Planning and Highway Authority have not objected to the proposed increases in densities on sites. They have raised no concerns about the highway implications of increased densities on sites at Anstey, Burton on the Wolds, Shepshed and Syston.

For the Wysall Lane site, the County Council have objected on the basis that the increased allocation would result in an excessive number of new dwellings in a settlement that is not a priority location as set out in the Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan as proposed to be adopted. They refer to concerns expressed by the Director of Highways, Transport and Waste Management in relation to the current planning application in terms of the highway impact of the development.

The County Council did not previously raise any concerns regarding the development of 45 dwellings in this location, either from the strategic planning or highway point of view. Their concerns must therefore relate to the implications arising from an increase of 25 dwellings on the site.

The allocation was supported by both Inquiry Inspectors and has not attracted an objection from GO-EM. The capacity of the site is a function of the application of national density guidelines as set out in PPG3. If the capacity of the site is constrained in highway terms, the County Council's concerns as Highway Authority can be addressed through the consideration of a detailed planning application. In view of this and the significant implications a change at this stage could have on the Council's ability to adopt the plan, it is not considered necessary or appropriate at this stage to amend the local plan allocation to address these concerns.

Syston Town Council, Queniborough Parish Council and 6 local residents have raised objections to the additional modification to increase the density of development on land east of 19 Barkby Lane, Syston to provide an additional 20 dwellings. This is the only additional modification affecting Syston to which objections can be made at this stage. It is not considered that the impact of the additional 20 dwellings that would result from the proposed density increase would have such a significant impact on either local highway conditions or air quality sufficient to justify a rejection of the modification. The Highway Authority have not objected to the proposed additional modification. Issues of air quality in the Syston area have been addressed in relation a current planning application for the development of the larger housing allocation at Barkby Road. For this proposal the Council's Environmental Health Officers have concluded that the predicted increase in air pollution attributable to a development of 340 houses would be minimal.

The larger allocation at Barkby Road, Syston is not subject to any additional modification. Consideration of the duly made objections to the published additional modifications does not provide the opportunity to re-open the debate on this site. Issues of possible increases in air pollution may well be a material consideration that can be taken into account in relation to any detailed planning application. As indicated above these issues have been addressed in relation to the planning

application for development of the Barkby Road site in consultation with the Council's Environmental Health Officers, who have undertaken a detailed analysis of the Air Quality Impact Assessment submitted by the applicants.

LAND AT PEARTREE LANE, LOUGHBOROUGH (AM4.2)

Three objections and 2 supporting representations have been received in relation to the proposed allocation of land at Peartree Lane. Objectors argue that there is no need to release this greenfield site to meet housing requirements due to the availability of previously developed sites. The Highways Agency have indicated that they would require a Transport Assessment prior to agreeing an access onto the A6 and would prefer access to the site to be taken from the local road network if possible.

Monitoring of housing land supply confirms that there remains a need to release this site in order to meet the Council's strategic housing requirement. Its release was supported by both Inspectors and it represents one of the most sustainable greenfield allocations identified in the plan. There have been no objections to its allocation from either GO-EM or the County Council as strategic planning authority.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING (AM4.4)

This additional modification proposes an increase in affordable housing targets on sites where increased densities are proposed. One objection and three supporting representations have been received. Holmes Antill have objected to the increased densities proposed on sites and to the allocation of the land at Peartree Lane and as a consequence of these objections argue that this modification should also be deleted. Objections to these other modifications have been dealt with above. It is considered perfectly reasonable to increase affordable housing targets on sites where increased densities are proposed and to seek an affordable housing contribution on the Peartree Lane site.

CONCLUSIONS

No further modifications to the plan are considered necessary in response to the objections received for the reasons outlined above and set out in the Draft Statement of Decisions and Reasons attached at Appendix 1.

On the issue of whether the Council should exercise its discretion to hold a further inquiry into the objections received on the published modifications to the plan, case law establishes that the Council should consider:

- whether the issues have been considered previously at the local plan or modifications inquiry;
- advice in paragraphs 86 to 88 of the DETR Code of Practice on Development Plans indicating that an inquiry into objections to proposed modifications will not normally be necessary where the matters raised have already been considered at a previous inquiry;
- the practical implications of a further public inquiry and whether it would provide any material benefit;
- the implications of the inevitable delay and the desirability of securing an adopted local plan;
- issues of fairness.

The local plan and modifications inquiry Inspectors considered the principle of development on the allocated sites, including the site at Peartree Lane, Loughborough, and the appropriate extent of the limits to development at Armston Road, Quorn. Consideration was also given to appropriate development densities. The requirement to seek to achieve densities in excess of 30 dwelling per hectare is enshrined in

national planning policy guidance. There would be little material benefit to the Council in holding an inquiry into objections to the published modifications necessary for the plan to conform with national planning policy guidance. A further inquiry would seriously frustrate the ability of the Council to secure an adopted local plan. Accordingly it is not considered necessary for the Council to hold a further inquiry into the objections on the additional modifications.

There has been no objection from GO-EM on the Additional Modifications which deal with the two aspects of maintaining allocated areas and increasing densities. GO-EM had both these aspects before them. The absence of an objection would suggest no breach of Government policy in this respect.

The Council should now proceed with the necessary statutory notices and publication of the Statement of Decisions and Reasons as set out at Appendix 1 in order that the plan may progress to adoption.

Scrutiny Committee: Environment

Key Decision: Yes

Background Papers: Modifications Inspector's Report (August 2002);
Statement of Decisions and Reasons and Proposed Further Modifications (January 2003);
Representations on Proposed Further Modifications;
Minutes of Cabinet 27th June 2003 (minute 34);
Minutes of Council 30th June 2003 (minute 19);
Minutes of Cabinet 21st August 2003 (minute 75);
Minutes of Council 15th September 2003 (minute 40);
Representations on Additional Modifications.

Officers to Contact: David Hankin, Head of Planning Services (01509 634761) email: dave.hankin@charnwoodbc.gov.uk
Guy Longley, Planning Policy Manager (01509 634763), email: guy.longley@charnwoodbc.gov.uk

CHAPTER 2: Strategy

AM2.1: Land at Armston Road, Quorn

OBJECTIONS

120/27 Mr Deepak Kumar Johar, Johar & Company

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

230/74 Mr J P Deakin Fisher German

Include land within the Limits to Development for the reasons set out by the Modifications Inspector. The Inspector's reasoning in paras 2.1-2.10 was flawless.

373/14 Miss Angela Chapman

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

374/129 Mrs Hardev Chaggar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

375/111 Mrs Valvinder Kaur Chaggar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

376/112 Mr Raghbir Singh Chaggar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

377/130 Mr Balbir Singh Chaggar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

378/56 Mr Tejbir Singh Maini

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000.

Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

379/55 Mrs Pikky Maini

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

380/25 Mrs Mala Johar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

381/26 Tilak R Johar

Objection due to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

382/68 Mrs Santosh Johar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

385/125 Mrs Sangeeta Gill

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

386/126 Mr Dalbir Singh Gill

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

387/160 Mr R W Boulton

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

406/156 Mr Jasbir Singh Chaggar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

407/157 Mrs Sharon Kaur Chaggar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

408/158 Mr Satbir Singh Chaggar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

409/159 Mrs Vijay Jasbir Chaggar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

437/13 Miss Louise Cox

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

438/15 Ms Sara Hill

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

439/16 Mrs Anita Chauhan

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

440/17 Miss Ellen Leslie

Objection due to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

441/18 Mrs Manisha Manek

Objection due to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

442/19 Miss Wendy Cooper

Objection due to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

443/20 Miss Anisa Lakha

Objection due to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

444/21 Mrs Sunita Makwana

Objection due to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

445/22 Mr Kamlesh Makwana

Objection due to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

446/23 Miss Amanda Morgan

Objection due to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and paragraph 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2 June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

452/38 Miss Salma Ismail

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

453/39 Mr Suresh Gohil

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

454/40 Mrs Gohil

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

455/41 Miss Naila Iqbal

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

456/42 Mrs Santosh Sama

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry

Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

457/43 Mrs Taruna Sama

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

458/44 Mr Maneesh Sama

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

459/45 Mr Bhiku Hindocha

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

460/46 Mrs Saroj Hindocha

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

461/47 Mr John F Roe

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

462/48 Mrs Kalpana Naik

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

463/49 Mr Naren Naik

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

464/50 Mrs Bimla Khosla

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

465/51 Mr Sat Khosla

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

466/52 Mr Jagdish Chauhan

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

467/53 Mr Vipool Vora

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

468/54 Mrs Sangeeta Vora

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

469/57 Mr Kamal Khosla

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

470/58 Mrs Rita Khosla

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

471/59 Miss Zenith Lee

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

472/60 Miss Michelle Kenyon

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

473/61 Mr Danny Singh Punia

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000.

Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

474/62 Mrs Sudesh Malhan

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

475/63 Mr M L Malhan

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

476/64 Mrs Deepa Hathiramani

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

477/65 Mr Nanak Hathiramani

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

478/66 Mr Azim Walters

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

479/67 Mr Indrawadan Chauhan

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

480/69 Mr Ismail Abba

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

481/70 Miss Debbie Egginton

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

482/71 Miss V Chandarana

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

483/72 Mr Kiran Mistry

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

499/97 Mr D P S Sandhu

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

500/98 Mr S Gasztowicz

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

501/99 Miss Sally Barnett

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

502/100 Mrs Darshna Thakkar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

503/101 Mr Vijay Thakkar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

504/102 Mr Sukhbir Maini

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

505/103 Mrs Davenderjit Maini

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000.

Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

506/104 Mr K Mamujee

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

507/105 Mrs F Mamujee

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

508/106 Miss Wendy Reid

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

509/107 Mr Ash Malhan

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

510/108 Mr Raju Vora

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

511/109 Mr B Ghelani

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

512/110 Mrs J Ghelani

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

513/113 Miss Anita Chaggar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

514/114 Mr Jay Pabari

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

515/115 Mrs Bubby Chande

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

516/116 Mr Jay Chande

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

517/117 Mr Mahesh Chadha

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

518/118 Mr Sanjay Khullar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

519/119 Mrs Sonia Khullar

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

520/120 Mr Rohit Khandia

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

521/121 Mrs Nisha Chandarana

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

522/122 Mr Bhavesh Chandarana

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

523/123 V Page-Franklin

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

524/124 Ms Sarah Foxon

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

525/127 Mr Nilesh Gokani

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

526/128 Mrs Nimisha Gokani

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

527/131 Mr Sukh Johal

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

528/132 Mrs Urveshi Johal

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

529/133 Mrs Ameeta Khosla

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

530/134 Mr Ajay Khosla

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

531/135 Mrs N K Sharma

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry

Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

532/136 Mr G K Sharma

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

533/137 Mr Avtar Kareer

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

534/138 Mr Ibrahim Ahmed

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

535/139 Mr Paramjit Walia

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

536/140 Mr Puneet Walia

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

537/141 Mr Nilesh Radia

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

538/142 Mr Sanjay Varma

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

539/143 Mrs Meena Varma

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

540/144 Mrs Kavita Nichani

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

541/145 Mr Sanjiv Nichani

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

542/146 Mrs Sarah Verma

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

543/147 Mr Michael Verma

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

544/148 Mr Sunil Vaith

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

545/149 Mrs Shilpa Vaith

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

546/150 Mr Amrit Roshan

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

547/151 Mr Mohammed Roshan

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

548/152 Mrs Meena Patel

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000.

Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

549/153 Mr Nainesh Patel

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

552/161 Mr Surinder Sharma

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

553/162 Mrs Vijay Sharma

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

560/173 Mrs Elaine Moss

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

561/174 Mr Ken Moss

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

562/175 Mr Jayant Shah

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

563/176 Mrs Kishori Shah

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

564/177 Mr J E Iliffe

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

565/178 Mr Laxman Pankhania

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

566/179 Mrs Pushpa Pankhania

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

625/255 Mr Sanjiv Kholi

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

626/256 Mr David J K Smith

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

627/257 Mrs Atika Kholi

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

628/258 Mr Graham Coley

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

630/260 Mrs Doreen Bircumshaw

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

631/261 Mr Neville Harris

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

632/262 Mr Derek E Bircumshaw

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000.

Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

633/263 Mr Alan Stephens

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

634/264 Mrs Jane Stephens

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

635/265 Mr Terry Weston

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

636/266 Mrs Sumanti Patel

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

661/307 Mr G Bodiwala

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

662/309 Mr J Smith

Object to the exclusion of land south of 7 Armston Road outside the limits to development, based on paras 2.1 to 2.10 of the Proposed Modifications Inquiry Inspectors Report and para 2.154 of the Inquiry Inspectors Report of 2nd June 2000. Plan should be modified to include land within the limits to development.

SUPPORTS

1/87 W G Dunn

The park should remain as it is, no further development.

4/168 Mrs Kathryn Paterson Quorndon Parish Council

Land forms part of parkland setting of Quorn House, it should be afforded same protection as the wider parkland. Should be designated as Charnwood Forest Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside (APAC).

5/85 Mr A Johnson

Support protection of site as it is part of Charnwood Forest APAC and no reasoned view given for abandoning this status.

13/278 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Support as site should remain outside limits to development and within Charnwood APAC, an important part of landscape setting of parkland of Quorn House Park. If included within the limits of development could set a precedent for further release.

25/217 Mr R T Wall

Part of Quorn House Park and within Charnwood Forest APAC so should be protected. Character of such green areas protected by planning policies encouraging development on brownfield not green. Development would affect mature protected trees, destroy important rural setting and adversely affect habitats and wildlife. Applications to develop site rejected twice by Planning Inspectorate. Majority of locals voted against development, supporting the Council's decision.

35/194 Mr P E Waistell

Attractive wooded area on village edge. Development would ruin Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside, adversely affect badgers and protected trees. Been parkland for centuries no reason why it should not remain so.

49/290 M J Lear

Local issue, village voted 10:1 against building. Fence has been erected incorporating more of the parkland, would effectively extend the limits further- neither acceptable. APACS are protected, this site is integral to such an area. Council members voted unanimously in 2001 to exclude site from limits to development and within APAC.

51/294 Miss H Shacklock

Site important for wildlife, part of Charnwood Forest APAC, Inspectors have commented on sensitivity of site, and that development would mean loss of rural character and attractive wooded area used by badgers, for very little gain in housing stock. Residents voted against development. If allowed would encourage applications on other parts of park, adversely affecting character of village.

52/287 Mrs A Key

Significant part of APAC, never been built on, of historic value. Many trees, which would be lost, and be detrimental to wildlife. Borough Councillors and villagers have voted, this should stand to be democratic.

69/197 Mr Andrew Wells

Should be seen as part of park, thus outside limits to development, within APAC. Any building would have negative effect on wildlife and trees. Measures been taken to make the land appear not part of the park, this should not be allowed to happen.

70/281 Ms M Gamble

Support as a woody damp area very important to the wildlife of the area, should be part of the park and APAC as it was and not included in the boundary for development.

71/229 Mr N Chambers

A local issue. In the past month a fence has been erected on boundary of 1.5 acres encroaching further into site covered by APAC. This land and that subject to contentious issue is in same ownership and requires further planning consideration.

Character of site is woodland and scrub contiguous to parkland forming APAC of some 140 acres. Disagree with inspectors statements that site is 'different character and appearance to the land south of it' and 'land in effect has become detached from parkland'. The wire fence is there to keep cattle out, the land has remained same for at least 26 years. In 2001 Section 78 inspector commented 'not convinced that the house could be built without encroaching on and causing harm to trees, in turn harming the appearance and character of the APAC'.

84/73 Mr J E Holt

Support the protection as the village is sensitive to development in Quorn Park. Development of this site for housing has no benefit to the community.

86/284 Dr C J P Shipway

Site is APAC. If development permitted then likely whole park will be developed. Villagers voted against development. Planning applications rejected by Council and Inspectorate, due to sensitivity of site and importance to wildlife. Most recent objection led by owner led to a consultation, which residents were not allowed to make representation; Inspector refused to consider comments of s.78 Inspectors, not very democratic of the Council.

97/207 Mr D Slater

Council made a full value judgement of all facts and representations through proposed modifications, resulting in this additional modification. Confirms commitment to countryside and APAC, and rural setting of Quorn. Reflects views of majority of residents, parish council, borough council, ward members, county councillor and views of two S78 appeal inspectors.

105/226 Mr I Fowlds

Site within APAC, outside limits to development, no reason to include within village envelope, where it will be under pressure from development. Development would result in loss of parkland, important trees (some with TPOs) and habitats, once gone cannot be replaced. Would detract from character, appearance and amenity of this countryside area. Not essential or of benefit to Quorn and majority of residents voted against development outside limits to development in adjacent Quorn Park. Applications for residential been refused by local authority and on 2 appeals. Issue of local importance for local residents to decide.

106/184 Mr R T Pritchard

Part of Quorn House parkland which existed for several years, part of heritage, and should not be lost for future generations. It should be protected as an APAC and kept outside limits to development. Development would spoil wooded nature of village, cause damage to protected trees and irreparable disruption to wildlife and set a precedent for development of other parts of the parkland against wishes of villagers as evident in the parish consultation.

108/32 Mr J R French

The land is APAC, part of Quorn House Park, subject to Tree Preservation Orders and is a habitat for wildlife and so should be protected from encroachment. Brownfield sites should be developed in preference to this greenfield one.

112/30 Ms H Fish

Support as the land is an area of interesting habitat and diversity, is traditionally part of Charnwood Forest APAC and should be protected from further planning proposals. It is not bounded by built development but gardens or conservation area.

115/96 Mrs M A Willett

The park is a valuable part of Quorn, any buildings would result in loss of the 400 year old place.

117/78 Mr B Price

Support as the site is within Charnwood Forest APAC, site forms part of landscape setting to Quorn and Quorn House Park, development would set a precedent. Retain attractive countryside and develop brownfield sites.

118/76 Mr G A J Hearn

Protect the sensitive site and APAC. Development would conflict with the Tree Preservation Orders and wildlife, including badgers, and have an adverse effect on the nature. Including site within the limits to development ignores the outcome of two independent inquiries and views of local residents which should take precedence. Development would set a precedent and encroach on a greenfield site.

137/280 Mr P A Chamberlin

Support as residents of Quorn voted overwhelmingly against development in Quorn. In 2001 Borough Council members voted unanimously to exclude site from limits to development. It is a local issue and should be decided at local level.

Site is within Charnwood Forest APAC so afforded protection by local and national guidance and other local plan and strategy policies protect the site. S78 Inspectors support the Council's recent decision. Modifications hearing and Inspector's report was totally unsatisfactory - refused to consider relevant sections of S78 inspectors report and incorrect in basing decision on 'a difference in character and appearance of the objection site from that open land south of it', and ignoring how the site had become detached from the parkland.

Council's view supported by PPG3- site is a greenfield windfall site and should not be developed in priority to less sensitive/brownfield sites. Quorn House Park is of special and historic importance to Quorn and the Borough. Development would be in conflict with mature parkland trees - some having tree preservation orders. Modifications Inspector confirmed his decision consistent with no development on the site - exactly what members concluded. Initial consultation regarding the proposed change to limits to development was totally unsatisfactory.

168/206 Residents of 7&10 Armston Road, 37,28,26,24,16,14 & 12 Paddock Close

8,9,10,22-25 Northage Close

Support as the modification conforms with adopted Structure Plan, Soar Valley Local Plan, Charnwood Local Plan Deposit Draft, Consultation Draft Review Leicestershire Structure Plan and PPG3 - windfall sites should not be developed in priority to brownfield sites. The site is indistinguishable from remainder of Quorn House Park and part of the landscape setting to this part of Quorn, it is sensitive in its function as a stepping stone between habitats and in its status as an APAC making the site appropriate for exclusion from the limits to development. The Inspector's original recommendation was justified by comments we believe to be incorrect and misleading and supported by a site plan now acknowledged to be incorrect. Also, important to emphasise that the local community are opposed to development in

Quorn House Park which is of special and historic importance to Quorn and the Borough and in 2001 Charnwood Borough Council members voted unanimously to exclude the site from the limits to development.

392/94 C W Edwards

The park has been the same for hundreds of years and associated with an important Quorn family and American Airborne Division, an indispensable part of the village's unique setting. Appalled at the prospect of it being eroded away.

400/288 Mr J Key

Part of APAC; lightly wooded, attracts animals - including badgers, not enhance the area; and land is countryside.

404/273 Mr & Mrs T P & B Jones

Local opinion in favour of keeping existing boundary of park. Further building in park may bring houses close to quarry. Existing south and west boundary of Northage Close is tolerable building line. Importance of wildlife and mature trees must be considered.

410/236 Ms Anita Aylett

Land should remain as part of APAC and preserved as supported by huge majority of residents, Borough Councillors and independent national planning inspectors. This important area of parkland, including trees and wildlife should remain to preserve Quorn's rural setting. Retaining the wooded character of the site is far more important than allowing unnecessary development out of character with the existing.

412/208 Mr LJC Stewart

Land is unspoilt and part of Quorn House Park - a magnificent natural open space, part of Britain's heritage and must not be ruined by development. If small part given permission, where will it end, vital to protect all, if lost it cannot be replaced.

414/79 Mr A Plater

Protect APAC from development which intrudes into Quorn Park in accord with wishes of great majority Quorn residents (and Borough Councillors) and proposal does not meet land use targets under PPG3.

415/291 D M Lear

Preserve APAC and Tree Preservation Orders from buildings. Previous vote against development should stand as democratic.

448/28 Mrs Patricia Blockley

Support as there is little countryside left in Quorn, Quorn House Park is a sensitive area including trees having preservation orders and a variety of wildlife.

449/29 C Blockley

Supports as Quorn House Park must be preserved to prevent loss of further trees and wildlife species and habitats. Further building would increase traffic and congestion in Quorn.

451/33 Ms A L French

Support due to protection of wildlife (badgers and deer) and trees – some subject to

tree preservation order.

485/77 Mrs L E Hearn

Support as this is an APAC on the natural border of the village, wildlife abounds in the area safe from human interference, the people of Quorn do not want another housing development or extension to the boundaries of the village.

486/80 Mrs M O Plater

Protect the parkland as any development would spoil the attractive character of the site.

487/81 Mrs Joan Corvera

Support as to develop this site, part of rural setting of Quorn, would desecrate peaceful, beautiful countryside I enjoy visiting and 2 independent inspectors highlighted the sensitivity of the site.

488/82 J I Plater

Development would intrude into the Park, which is an APAC, no justified reason to abandon this designation. The comments of the two inspectors have been ignored (Jones and Onn). Democratic decision of parish and borough councillors should not be ignored.

489/83 C E Plater

Preserve and maintain the site within APAC, uphold decision and wishes of residents, Parish and Borough Councillors and avoid interference with flora and fauna.

490/84 Mr M King

Site protected by APAC and so national and local planning guidance. If permission is given it would then allow more development to go ahead at a later date.

491/86 Ms Eileen Johnson

Support protection of this site as it is mature parkland part of the Charnwood Forest APAC, an important wildlife habitat and the local population have fought to protect the parkland for years through the planning inspectorate and a village survey voted against development.

492/88 H Dunn

Land previously designated as part of Charnwood Forest APAC, thus should be no consideration of any applications for buildings now or in the future.

493/89 T Dunn

The park should remain as it is now. No further changes should be made.

494/90 Ms J Hunt

Quorn residents, Planning Inspectorate and Charnwood Borough Councillors all object to this development which proposes to fell preserved trees, disturb badgers and other wildlife. No has been said to this large proposed house in what is now beautifully wooded countryside. Our children and future generations should have their heritage protected not gradually eroded for financial gain.

495/91 R W Simons

Support as proposed building is too large for the site and out of character with the area, damages the woodland habitat and abundant wildlife - badgers but decreasing bird numbers - and tranquility enjoyed by Quorn residents. Council decisions to refuse planning applications were upheld by Planning Inspectorate - this independent decision should be upheld.

496/92 Mrs A Kay

Encroachment lead to infringement, and trees and animals would decrease. Agree with arguments put forward by other residents.

497/93 D L Kay

Part of Charnwood Forest area and protected by Local Planning Advice. Development would result in loss of attractive rural area and trees for many, gain of accommodation would benefit so few. Support views of independent inspectors who emphasised importance of site to wildlife and rural character.

498/95 Mr P A Kelland

Support as the site is part of Charnwood Forest APAC, 2 previous applications to build rejected by Planning Inspectorate, and by huge majority of village residents, building of a single large house in such a sensitive area will affect animals and mature trees, is nothing to do with government housing targets. The democratic vote by residents and councillors should have been an end to the matter. I strongly feel my views as a local resident are being disregarded. Building of access and new traffic can only harm the residents of Armston Road and Whale Close.

550/154 Mrs Mary Holt

Support as the site is part of Charnwood APAC and should be protected, it has been parkland for hundreds of years, development of this area would have a disastrous effect on the environment, wildlife and the lives of the people of Quorn who voted by a huge majority against development.

554/164 Mrs J E Bowden

The parkland has been for hundreds of years, is important to wildlife, part of countryside, has Tree Preservation Orders and should be protected as part of rural setting of Quorn Site. Formal census in village magazine revealed majority voted against development.

555/165 J Pritchard

Support as Quorn House Park is an important part of Quorn's heritage and is designated as an APAC. The land should remain part of the parkland, be protected and be outside the Limits to Development. Any development would harm existing protected trees and disrupt wildlife.

556/169 Miss April Smith

Home and surroundings would be ruined if a large house was allowed. Ability to go into village in wheelchair would be at risk due to new roads and increased traffic. All voted, should take note.

557/170 Ms Hilary Kelland

Proposed building turned down by Parish Council, National Planning, Borough

Council and village residents. Value the beautiful country aspect and do not want to destroy this for future generations or ourselves.

558/171 Ms Janet Perkins

Should not include in development limit, it is an APAC and it is unnecessary to mar attractive area.

559/172 D Wilson

Support as land is part of Charnwood Forest APAC, outside the current development envelope and there is no justifiable reason to extend village envelope, visual amenity of trees and wildlife should be maintained. Local Planning Authority and 2 independent government appointed inspectors have twice refused permission for development. Development would result in loss of irreplaceable, ancient and attractive parkland, be of no benefit to village with its already overloaded infrastructure, school and medical practice and the loss of green breathing space

567/180 Mr Geoff Peace

Support as site is part of Charnwood Forest APAC and so protected by national and local planning guidance, no reasonable case, i.e. affordable housing for local young people, made for abandoning status, census in village voted by a huge majority against development of Quorn House Park, development for housing would mean loss of rural character for very little gain in terms of housing stock.

568/181 Ms Sheila Peace

Support as site is part of Charnwood Forest APAC and so protected by national and local planning guidance, no reasonable case, i.e. affordable housing for local young people, made for abandoning status, census in village voted by a huge majority against development of Quorn House Park, development for housing would mean loss of rural character for very little gain in terms of housing stock.

569/182 Ms Sheila Martin

Should not be included in village development plan, it is APAC and should be retained as such.

570/183 Mr David Martin

Should not be included in village development plan, it is APAC and should be retained as such.

571/185 Mr David B Ralph

Support as previous applications to build a house rejected by 2 inspectors. Such a large building (50 rooms) is not intended to be a dwelling - possibly hotel or other premises. Land is part of APAC with preserved trees and used by badgers. Local people and Borough Councillors voted against this building and 'Millennium Wood' project on this historic parkland.

572/186 Mr Martin Edwards

Losing parkland, trees and wildlife for important national reasons but this area should not be lost for personal gain. Support keeping this lovely natural area park free from development.

573/187 Ms Gillian Edwards

No further development on this site which is part of Quorn Park - very attractive natural woodland with several ancient trees with preservation orders and a badger sett. Allowing one 50 room house will pave the way for further unwanted development.

574/188 Mr Steve Edwards

Commercial development is not required or needed on Quorn Park. Destruction of ancient natural woodland is totally unnecessary.

575/189 Ms Carol Cotterill

Lovely natural area, an APAC should not be encroached on. Beautiful wildlife and trees should remain for future generations.

576/190 Mrs A M Catterall

Recognise need for affordable, but village has grown to maximum, facilities are stretched (school, doctor, shops) and cannot reasonably support more development. Parkland, trees and wildlife are protected and of significant history for elderly due to the American base stationed during WWII. Views of residents should not be disregarded by Inspectors, majority want it leaving as it is. Development is detrimental to village for monied few who want to live there.

577/191 Mr Gerald Fish

Support as the land is mature mixed woodland, part of Quorn Park, an APAC and an area of woodland habitat and biodiversity. Local residents oppose development in Quorn Park and planning applications refused by planning inspectors. Including the land within the Limits to Development gives the green light for development.

578/192 Ms Kate Wells

Part of ancient parkland and APAC, so protected by national and local planning guidelines. 2 planning applications been refused and appeals dismissed. Local residents voted in majority against development. The area is of rural character, has several protected trees, thus adds to village boundary. Development would mean loss of all this for little gain in housing stock.

579/195 Ms Susan Waistell

Support as damage to a rural area, inevitable felling of trees, subsequent damage to wildlife and their natural habitat. If this development goes ahead others may follow and Quorn become the size of Loughborough.

580/196 Mr Steven Cotterill

Support. Totally against building of any property/dwelling on beautiful parkland, would encroach upon APAC, a lovely area of natural beauty, wildlife and trees are beautiful and wish them to remain for future generations to enjoy.

586/209 Mrs A Stewart

Losing Quorn House Park to yet more development would be a great waste of another part of our countryside. We cannot manufacture more land so let's look after what we have.

587/210 Mrs Suzanne Batson

Support as voted against further development of Quorn House Park in village

census. Housing development in parkland areas benefits only the owner and takes up valuable land for profit. It does not help young families to afford homes in their own village or help to meet government housing targets; would harm a sensitive rural area and its wildlife and valuable woodland supposedly protected as a forest APAC whose guardians are, or should be, our local Parish and Borough Councils.

588/211 Mr R J Jackson MBE

Quorn census voted overwhelmingly against any development. It does not provide affordable housing and has no significant impact on government house build targets, steals valuable, irreplaceable woodland in environmentally sensitive areas, benefits only developer and 'self aggrandizement'. Site part of Charnwood Forest APAC.

589/212 Mr P A Honour

Support as site is part of APAC and so protected by national and local guidance, 2 planning applications already rejected by the Council; majority of Quorn residents are opposed to development of Quorn House Park.

590/213 Mrs A J Honour

Support as site is part of Charnwood Forest APAC so should not be developed on, Quorn residents voted by a huge majority against development on any of Quorn House Park land, concerned about effect on wildlife particularly badgers habitat and numerous parkland trees have preservation orders.

591/214 Mrs P L Thorpe

Site part of beautiful Charnwood Forest and should be left for people to enjoy in future.

592/215 Mr Martyn Capewell

Supports comments made by Residents of Armston Road, Paddock Close and Northage Close, Quorn (see representation 168/206).

593/216 E Robinson

Support as land is an important green area supporting its own ecosystem of flora and fauna, vital part of Charnwood Forest APAC, should be protected to preserve the environment, it has remained unchanged for 100s of years and should stay as part of our rural heritage.

594/218 Mrs M E K Wall

Part of Quorn House Park and within Charnwood Forest APAC and includes mature trees – no rationale to remove. Character of such green areas are protected by planning policies encouraging development on brownfield not green. Applications to develop site rejected twice by Planning Inspectorate. Excluding this site protects rest of Quorn House Park from development. Locals voted 10 to 1 majority against development, supports the decision made by the council. Development would affect mature protected trees, destroy important rural setting, adversely affect habitats and wildlife.

595/219 Mrs O Terry

Quorn slowly losing its identity as a village and further new buildings would accelerate this and cause the loss of irreplaceable parkland.

596/220 Mr Anthony Atkinson

Site has wildlife, particularly badgers and bats, is designated as an area of natural beauty protected by planning guidelines and tree preservation orders exist. Development rejected by 2 inspectors and majority of community voted against development which will not meet land use or government house building targets.

597/221 Ms Frances Atkinson

Site designated as an area of natural beauty protected by planning guidelines, home to numerous wildlife species, particularly badgers and bats, tree preservation orders exist. Majority of community voted against development, it was rejected by two inspectors and it would help to meet land use or government housebuilding targets

601/227 Ms Patricia Fowlds

Site within APAC, outside limits to development, no reason to include within village envelope, where it will be under pressure from development. Development would result in loss of parkland, important trees (some with TPOs) and habitats, once gone cannot be replaced; detract from character, appearance and amenity of this countryside area, not essential or of benefit to Quorn and majority of residents voted against development outside limits to development in adjacent Quorn Park. Applications for residential been refused by local authority and on 2 appeals. Issue of local importance for local residents to decide.

602/228 Mrs M J Hanford

Residents voted by a huge majority to include land within APAC and outside limits to development. Should be local choice, not decided by outside forces or by remote people.

603/230 Mrs W U James

Residents voted by a huge majority to include land within APAC and outside limits to development. Should be local choice, not decided by outside forces or by remote people.

604/232 Mr M Peyrebrume

Number of housing expansions have recently occurred in Quorn. Support retention of area as natural countryside as an essential part of retaining village's special character.

605/233 Mr Kevin Boyd

Land has always been part of Quorn House Park and should remain so as it is an area rich in mature woodland (under preservation orders) and wildlife - badgers, woodpeckers, the villagers of Quorn voted overwhelmingly in favour of maintaining this park, two planning inspectors refused permission to build on this plot and recommended it remains in the APAC. Acknowledge the need for further affordable housing in the Borough but this will not and cannot address usefully any of these issues.

606/234 Dr Jane L Walwyn

Part of Quorn House Park and APAC, haven for wildlife with many protected trees, and so should be protected from development. Villagers have voted consistently against development, supported by inspectors and council. Applications so far have been for a house that would not be in keeping with the surrounding homes.

607/235 Ms Jacqueline Gardner

Support as Quorn has witnessed a substantial amount of housing development over past 10 years, remaining country land is precious, parkland offers a vital setting for wildlife and a tree preservation area which should be guarded, the land is a safe haven for birds, squirrels and badgers. Further development would jeopardise this beautiful rural site which has been a valued country ground in Quorn for 100 years and would be a loss for the village.

608/237 Ms Jenny Aylett

Local view is predominantly against any development and is supported by planning inspector and borough council. Development will impact on APAC, important Quorn rural setting and the preserved trees and wildlife.

609/238 Ms Helen Aylett

Should remain as part of APAC, independent inspector supports this. Majority of residents are opposed to development, supported by borough councillors in democratic vote. Development would impact on badgers and trees that have preservation order.

610/239 Mr Jim Aylett

Should be protected as part of Charnwood Forest APAC, land has been parkland for hundreds of years and has tree preservation orders, it forms part of landscape setting at edge of village. This view is supported by independent inspectors and majority of residents voted against development of Quorn House Park.

611/240 Mr A Musson

Support as opposed to unnecessary desecration of this site of natural parkland important in forming a rural setting to the edge of the village.

612/241 Mrs S Musson

Support as wish to maintain the countryside and rural setting of Quorn and this would inevitably effect part of the landscape setting on the edge of the village.

613/242 Miss H Musson

Support as wish to maintain the countryside and rural setting of Quorn and this would inevitably effect part of the landscape setting on the edge of the village.

614/243 Mr Brian Porter

Development would mean important loss of rural character, parkland, trees and wildlife, eg. badgers for little gain. Residents and borough councillors support no development and represent a democratic process.

615/244 Ms Sheila Porter

Should remain as part of Quorn rural setting and parkland should be preserved as nature intended. A view held by majority of residents. New housing of type proposed not necessary.

616/245 Ms Fiona MacLellan

Support as area is part of APAC, is currently parkland and must remain so to maintain the rural setting of Quorn, and prevent trees and wildlife being disturbed for the reason of building an unnecessary living accommodation which will be out of

character with the surrounding area.

617/246 Miss S L Spencer

Support as land part of Charnwood Forest APAC, current tree preservation orders protect a number of trees, badgers use the land as a commuting route and feeding ground, land is parkland and has been for 100s of years forming part of the rural setting of Quorn and should be protected. Independent inspectors from the planning inspectorate supported the above views.

618/247 Mr Colin Cole

Borough council, independent inspectors and residents have stated site should be preserved in present state, for good of wildlife and residents. Ensures rural setting of Quorn is not further eroded for minimal gain to the community as a whole.

619/248 Miss Hilary Cole

Most residents feel the land should be preserved in character with surrounding parkland. Planned building is unnecessary and not in character with area. Trees and wildlife should not be disturbed as this will further violate natural surroundings.

620/249 Mr Daniel Cole

Support as the area should remain as parkland in character with the existing landscape to the edge of the village - the majority view of Quorn residents - and will ensure the preservation of trees and wildlife in the area.

621/250 Miss Hannah Cole

Support as the existing parkland should not be disturbed to make way for unnecessary development and trees and wildlife are more important than individual.

623/253 Ms Jane Barrass

Within countryside and part of APAC. Development would harm appearance and character of APAC. Badgers use site as feeding route.

624/254 Mr David Barrass

Part of Charnwood Forest APAC. The site is within the parkland and provides a wooded edge to Quorn. Development would harm trees, badgers and deer use the site, proposed building would be out of character with those surrounding and encroach on parkland providing floodgate for further development.

637/269 Rev'd H W Ketton Quorn Baptist Church

Infrastructure unable to support further building. Land has historical value - used by American Armed forces. Green belt being slowly eroded and soon be a conurbation to Loughborough not a village. Village life and community only sustainable when strict boundaries to village are imposed. More houses change character of village. Trees damaged as their roots do cover most of the land.

638/270 Ms Jane Hollingworth

Beautiful ancient open parkland.

640/274 J & D Mear

Maintain APAC. Do not want more development in Quorn. Primary school and doctors full, site part of rural setting, an important landscape protecting boundaries

of village, increase traffic in centre of already busy village.

641/275 Ms Aimee Farmer

Beautiful land which attracts wildlife due to trees and unspoilt land.

642/276 Mr William Hollingworth

Piecemeal development on Farnham estate should be prevented to preserve ancient parkland and woodland as essential haven for wildlife, which benefits community.

644/282 Mr Peter H Gamble

No building should be allowed on ancient parkland. Area has many mature trees, some of which would be lost if building was allowed.

645/283 Mr Robin S Perry

Support as proposed development will negatively impact on rural character and habitats in parkland driving out its wildlife, historical - especially second world war - associations within the parkland and to develop land would be insensitive, proposal flies in the face of view of village majority and raises questions about heeding village democracy.

646/285 Ms Alison Shipway

Support as land part of Quorn House Park, an APAC, important to wildlife with many mature attractive trees under tree preservation orders and must be protected from development and the rural character of the village kept for the future. A vote organised by the Parish Council showed a large number of villagers share this view.

647/286 Ms Jan Jansen

Part of APAC, should not be abandoned without good reason. May set precedent for housing within Quorn House gardens at rear of Paddock Close and Northage Close.

648/289 Mr & Mrs R M Andrews

Attractive lightly wooded area of parkland, used by badgers, and has numerous Tree Preservation Orders. Been parkland for hundreds of years and part of Charnwood Forest APAC, thus should be protected. Forms significant part of rural character of village. Majority of residents clearly stated that site should not be developed. A local planning issue, no connection with government housing targets, proposed building not intended as a normal private dwelling.

649/292 G A Whitacre

Support as housing would lead to reduced open countryside - fewer trees and reduced wildlife.

650/293 W A Whitacre

Support as housing development will mean fewer trees and reduced parkland for which Quorn is well known.

651/295 S Horner

Area of existing Charnwood Forest APAC. Local residents oppose further development in Quorn and detrimental effect on infrastructure (e.g. doctor, school), local environment, trees, wildlife, and drainage. Owe to future generations to protect environment and building on green belt land.

652/296 Ms Deana Smullen

Local villages should be kept as villages, not urban sprawl. Brownfield needs to be developed first, not precious countryside. Attack on local facilities which are already over stretched.

653/297 P Smith

Support as too much building on green sites - wildlife suffers, particularly attractive field where other land can be built on, no room in local schools/doctors.

654/298 Ms Denise Smith

Local support against this building outside of local plan. Effect on environment trees/animals. Thin edge of wedge re other green sites in villages. Keep it for our children.

655/299 Ms Tracy Royston

Support as harm caused to local environment - wildlife/trees, local facilities schools/doctors, particularly attractive countryside should be kept that way for our children, do not want any more green fields built on where other more worthy sites exist, huge support from councillors and local residents.

657/303 Mrs R Swales

Vote amongst villagers cannot be ignored, it is their village. Two planning applications have been rejected, more money is being wasted. Part of the countryside, flora and fauna would be lost. Already lost too much countryside in Borough.

659/305 Ms Gillian Clement

Important to wildlife and part of Charnwood Forest APAC. Large majority of village residents voted against development. Infrastructure (roads, schools, doctor) already straggling, additional housing will exacerbate this.

CBC Recommendation

No additional modification.

Reason

The reasons why the Council reconsidered its position on this matter were set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons published in September 2003. In the Council's view the land does form part of the wider parkland of Quorn House Park, is part of the rural setting to Quorn and is important in forming part of the landscape setting to the settlement edge, and should be afforded the same protection as the wider parkland.

The Council has considered the representations received and does not consider that they raise any issues that would justify the Council altering its position in relation to this issue. The issue is one of value judgement. It remains the Council's considered opinion that, as a matter of planning judgement, the land does form part of the wider parkland of Quorn House Park, is part of the rural setting to Quorn and is important in forming part of the landscape setting to the settlement edge, and accordingly should be afforded the same protection as the wider parkland.

Additional Modification:

None.

CHAPTER 4: Population & Housing

AM4.1 & AM4.2: Policy H/1 & H/35- Increased Densities on Allocated sites and Allocation of Land at Peartree Lane, Loughborough

OBJECTIONS

GENERAL

13/277 Mrs J Noon CPRE - Charnwood District

Increasing the densities overall without reducing greenfield allocations is fundamentally wrong, an inadequacy of the Plan and contrary to regional and national policy. Total overprovision exceeds 2500 dwellings. Sequential approach has not been taken into account when allocating greenfield sites. Additional urban capacity allowance is too low at 100 and fails to take account of the continuing planning approvals of housing development for E/8 sites not subject to safeguarding provisions. Policy does not address monitoring and managed release of housing sites to control overprovision and ensure preference is given to brownfield sites before greenfield. Unnecessary development in the countryside against Government policy to avoid housing developments which make inefficient use of land and provide more intensive housing in and around existing centres and close to good public transport nodes.

357/166 & 167 (AM4.1 & 4.2) Cllr D Houseman

If housing densities have to be increased because of Government directives, the use of allocations involving greenfield sites should be decreased. Land supply information used to determine where the balances of dwellings are proposed to be built is 7 months out of date. Many more brownfield sites have recently unexpectedly become available. The most up to date information makes it clear that the proposed increased densities and use of greenfield sites are unnecessary to meet the Council's strategic housing requirement.

656/300 & 301 (AM4.1 & 4.2) Holmes Antill

In view of plan period; significantly enhanced urban capacity which was unclear/unknown at the time of earlier evaluation; PPG3 advice on managed release of land, the additional allocation of land at Pear Tree Lane is unjustified.

The increased numbers of dwellings on sites at Anstey, Burton on the Wolds, Barkby Lane, Syston and Wymeswold is not justified by dwelling requirements or housing need; environmentally inappropriate in terms of local distinctiveness and character; a crude mathematical response which will have a harmful unsustainable effect.

Additional modifications should be withdrawn and review carried out in updated circumstances in line with government guidance and best practice.

LAND AT BRADGATE ROAD, ANSTEY (H/1(a))

368/163 Dr J H Earl

Note decision to remove land at Quorn due to quality of site. Anstey site would affect footpath to Bradgate House ruins of great historic importance ranking amongst the best footpaths in Midlands. This should be preserved and maintained. A single row of quality bungalows or houses would be out of sight from existing householders and those visiting Bradgate Park, would cause less destruction to habitats and solve access problems. No details are provided of noise or pollution

controls or details of design. Developments in City and on brownfield sites will meet demand for houses.

388/4 Mrs J K Atkins Anstey Parish Council

Continues to object to inclusion of site. Area of land is referred to as 3.3 ha but the maps show an area (excluding the landscaped strip) of 5.0 ha. If site is to be allocated plan should indicate a maximum net residential area of 3.3ha and 100 dwellings. Reduce site area to original allocation of 60 dwellings - no justification for increase. The number of dwellings on 'windfall sites' in Anstey will increase and so the need for greenfield sites is reduced .

393/267 Mrs D Edwards

Objects as increase from 60 to 100 dwellings will take Borough over the balance to be found. Will impact on roads - congestion and speeding. No detail of development entrance to ensure safety of traffic along the dangerous Bradgate Road, landscaping or how development will respect existing properties. Inspector's assessment of impact on local services outdated due to recent developments - GP surgery no longer takes new patients. No action has been taken to increase education, health or recreational facilities. Preservation of this rural landscape is crucial, area of outstanding natural beauty of historical importance. Will have negative impact upon the view and environment in and around park and ignores large developments close by - Bradgate Heights - not within Charnwood area. Brownfield sites are more suitable development areas. Anstey residents are being ignored due to distance from Loughborough and its position on Charnwood border.

394/268 Mr N J Edwards

Objects as increase from 60 to 100 dwellings will take Borough over the balance to be found. Will impact on roads - congestion and speeding. No detail of development entrance to ensure safety of traffic along the dangerous Bradgate Road, landscaping or how development will respect existing properties. Inspector's assessment of impact on local services outdated due to recent developments - GP surgery no longer takes new patients. No action has been taken to increase education, health or recreational facilities. Preservation of this rural landscape is crucial, area of outstanding natural beauty of historical importance. Will have negative impact upon the view and environment in and around park and ignores large developments close by - Bradgate Heights - not within Charnwood area. Brownfield sites are more suitable development areas. Anstey residents are being ignored due to distance from Loughborough and its position on Charnwood border.

396/204 J E & S M Pell

Likelihood of 100+ cars daily along Bradgate Road, on dangerous and busy road (bend, blind spot). Too many houses close to Bradgate Park. Retain trees and hedges. Drainage problems on site which slopes down to Bradgate/Link Road. Anstey already fulfilled obligations of housing under Plan.

417/271 Mr I P Keeling

Houses on Melody Mills, Cropston Road and on farm site meet needs for housing in area, any new build should be infill. Further development will create pressure on health care provisions - doctors and dentist full, schools, loss of privacy, higher than existing properties due to undulating nature of land, loss of open space and bridle footpath, impact on wildlife disastrous. Bradgate Road hazardous - speed limit exceeded and point of access is in a dip. Number of houses too great not in sympathy with houses surrounding. Proposed block planting not benefit existing properties nor shield new development. Refuse development, or at least reduce dwellings, block plant to preserve privacy, fund healthcare, extra school places and provide road calming measures and alternative access.

450/31 Mr John V Morfey

Local opposition to the current allocation for 60 dwellings due to the impact on the open space and footpath link to Bradgate Park, the visual impact from Bradgate Park and the limited visibility on Bradgate Road which is dangerous and would be worsened by an increase in dwellings. The area on the plan is notional and does not take account the topography of the site - no justification for increasing the numbers of houses, rather than reducing land-take. GOEM states in it objections 'adoption of higher densities would enable the same provision to be made on 30% less land'.

484/75 N Graham

Additional houses too intensive given proximity to Bradgate Road - exit will cause more problems of traffic in the village - and Bradgate Park. There is factory land and buildings within the village, within walking distance to shops and buses, which should be used.

581/199 Mr T W Humphrey

Additional 30 houses too intensive in rural area so close to Bradgate Park. Exit on Bradgate Road will increase traffic problems and pollution. Additional burden on amenities, particularly parking. Anstey has contributed well to housing on brownfield sites and more are planned, utilising redundant buildings, and are within walking distance of shops and buses.

582/200 Mr B Hatton

Additional 30 houses too intensive in rural area so close to Bradgate Park. Exit on Bradgate Road will increase traffic problems and pollution. Additional burden on amenities, particularly parking. Anstey has contributed well to housing on brownfield sites and more are planned, utilising redundant buildings, and are within walking distance of shops and buses.

599/224 Cllr J Sutherland

Object to increased number of dwellings from 60 to 100:

- enough dwellings were outlined in the Inspector's findings to satisfy requirements of current local plan. The extra dwellings would be surplus to those requirements;
- GOEM pointed out that 'adoption of higher densities would enable the same provision to be made on 30% less land'. So it is possible, at a density of 30, to reduce the size of this development from the current 3.3 hectares stated (and 5.2 hectares shown) down to 2 hectares, considerably lessening the impact of the greenfield development;
- Given likely build rate and that development will not start till 2004, the additional dwellings will not assist Charnwood to reach its targets for the number of houses built before 2006;
- Bradgate Road would struggle to accommodate the increase in traffic created by an additional 60 houses and so the traffic generated by 100 dwellings will place unacceptable pressure on this already busy road and considerably reduce road safety;

Anstey has already had a considerable number of new dwellings built within the village through the development of brownfield sites and this proposed development off Bradgate Road is too much. This along with 400 homes nearing completion just over the Parish boundary in Leicester City and the subsequent wish of patients and parents wanting to register with local schools and doctor's practice will place extra pressure on the existing infrastructure and services in Anstey.

600/225 Cllr J Bryant

Object to increased number of dwellings from 60 to 100:

- enough dwellings were outlined in the Inspector's findings to satisfy requirements of current local plan. The extra dwellings would be surplus to those requirements;
- GOEM pointed out that 'adoption of higher densities would enable the same provision to be made on 30% less land'. So it is possible, at a density of 30, to reduce the size of this

development from the current 3.3 hectares stated (and 5.2 hectares shown) down to 2 hectares, considerably lessening the impact of the greenfield development;

- Given likely build rate and that development will not start till 2004, the additional dwellings will not assist Charnwood to reach its targets for the number of houses built before 2006;
- Bradgate Road would struggle to accommodate the increase in traffic created by an additional 60 houses and so the traffic generated by 100 dwellings will place unacceptable pressure on this already busy road and considerably reduce road safety;

Anstey has already had a considerable number of new dwellings built within the village through the development of brownfield sites and this proposed development off Bradgate Road is too much.

639/272 Mrs G Keeling

Houses on Melody Mills, Cropston Road and on farm site meet needs for housing in area, any new build should be infill. Further development will create pressure on health care provisions - doctors and dentist full, schools, loss of privacy, loss of open space and bridle footpath, impact on wildlife disastrous. Bradgate Road hazardous - speed limit exceeded and point of access is in a dip. Number of houses too great not in sympathy with houses surrounding. Proposed block planting not benefit existing properties nor shield new development. Refuse development, or at least reduce dwellings, block plant to preserve privacy, fund healthcare, extra school places and provide road calming measures and alternative access.

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

12/222 Mr J Bantick

Increasing density to PPG3 levels, by 3 dwellings, is not marginal and will exacerbate the issues previously raised - increased run-off and 3 more families and at least 3 more cars in a village with a considerable traffic problem and poor amenities.

PEARTREE LANE, LOUGHBOROUGH (H/35)

622/252 Mr David Abbott Highways Agency

While the long-term responsibility of A6 lies with Leicestershire, being non-core route, the Highways Agency maintains it. Whilst individual decisions will need to be made in consultation with Leicestershire County Council, the Agency would require a Transport Assessment on impact of development on trunk road network, prior to agreeing access onto A6. Would prefer access taken from local road network if possible. There is a general presumption against creation of new access to trunk roads, particularly when alternative is feasible (DTLR Roads Circular 04/2001).

LITTLE HAW FARM, SHEPSHED (H/75)

585/203 Mrs L Needham

Trying to improve public transport is not realistic as Shepshed has become a commuter town, people travel by car for convenience not for the environment. Local employment has dramatically declined as factories have become housing developments. Tickow Lane widely used by community, a vital link to public rights of way, should be made safe from accidents by making it a quiet lane (20mph limit) and improve hedgerows and grass verges to support wildlife and continued local free leisure activities. Anson Road - our local road network is at breaking point as traffic levels increase as does congestion, noise and pollution on our main roads.

EAST OF 19 BARKBY LANE, SYSTON (H/89(b))

101/193 Mr I Macdonald Syston Town Council

Should be a significant landscaped gap between the development and the nearby railway - will be inadequate space for this should the 60 dwellings be increased to 80. Should be appropriate landscaping fronting the road between highway and development and steps taken to ensure existing hedge is maintained and existing flora and fauna continue to flourish. Site remote from play and recreation areas. Provision should be made on site- this will not be possible if the density is increased. Adjacent development is low in density and further development should be low density to preserve and foster the quasi-rural character of the area. Object to the incremental pollution effect caused by additional traffic generated by the development on Melton Road and further incremental volume effect on the inadequate lanes and junctions adjacent to the site.

164/5 Mrs P R Dakin

Increasing density will reduce space and increase number of cars on busy, narrow country lane, affect already overloaded doctors' surgeries and schools, and take away all character from the area.

165/6 Mr R W Dakin

Increasing density will reduce space and increase number of cars on busy, narrow country lane, affect already overloaded doctors' surgeries and schools, and take away all character from the area.

434/3 Mrs FM Richardson Queniborough Parish Council

Object to development as will greatly increase traffic through Queniborough. Increasing the number of dwellings will exacerbate the situation.

435/7 SJ Shield

Delete housing site as Syston cannot support additional housing and population - schools, doctors, town parking, pensioners services, policing of youth. Barkby Lane is unsuitable for additional traffic as it is too narrow.

436/8 DM & AE Shellard

Object as Syston cannot take additional transport as the infrastructure is not adequate. Schools, doctors, roads, drainage are all stretched to the limit.

551/155 M R Dakin

Object as development will affect narrow country lane, which has a pavement only on one side - cannot cope with 160 cars (plus 30 from development off Barkby Lane). Too close to railway bridge, which is narrow and has a bend in it, making it very dangerous - need to consider safety of residents. Will degrade the area, and cause problems on local amenities (school, health and the busy road).

424/308 Peter David Hood

Object as increased traffic in an area of already high (nitrogen dioxide) pollution for which action should be taken, erosion of Greenfield sites and attractive countryside, inappropriate density of housing for area. Would overwhelm Syston's road, education, services and infrastructure and unequal burden of housing association across local areas should be spread (including Quorn).

WYSALL LANE, WYMESWOLD (H/92)

42/205 Dr A Simmonds Leicestershire County Council

Although no previous objection has been made to the allocation of dwellings at Wymeswold, the increase from 45 to 70 dwellings in line with PPG3, now constitutes an excessive amount of new development in a settlement that falls low on the list of priority locations set out in Strategy Policy 2A of the Structure Plan (July 2003) as proposed to be adopted.

In a letter to the Borough Council relating to a planning application for 60 dwellings on this site, the Director of Highways, Transport and Waste Management expressed concerns that Wymeswold is a location not well related to employment, retail or leisure facilities and the opportunity for people to travel modes other than car is limited. Reference was also made to the increase in traffic flows that would result from the increase from 45 to 60 dwellings, leading to the view that 60 dwellings is rather an intensive development for Wysall Lane.

186/34 Mr A Sutton

Object as the site is not urban. Transport corridor is dangerous and overloaded - contrary to PPG13, narrow rural roads, lack of bus services. Site is elevated greenfield on the northern most edge of the village and would form an unnatural spur away from the compact settlement. 70-80 dwellings excessive and would severely impact on amenities, including school. Is contrary to the Village Design Statement which strives for small developments on brownfield in-fill sites. There are many ex-factory brownfield sites in and around Loughborough to meet the housing quota and density for the foreseeable future. Greenfield sites should be a last resort, only be used in cases of special need - Rural White Paper and PPG3.

301/12 Mrs L Willatts Wymeswold Parish Council

Object as the site is greenfield, remote on the northernmost edge of the village and would form an unnatural spur away from the compact settlement. Would result in Wymeswold contributing 5.5% of Borough housing allocation- a high percentage for a small village. Inclusion of site contrary to PPG13.

Greenfield sites should only be used as a last resort or in cases of special need. Density of 30-35 per hectare is inappropriate and uncharacteristic of Wymeswold's infill developments over the last 200 years. Has already been a 20% increase in housing over the last 20 years whilst village amenities - shops, pub and doctors - have decreased and primary school is operating at 20% over capacity. Lack of bus services, community, youth and general amenities leads to a car dominated community. Further development would exacerbate an overloaded and dangerous road network. There is a small need for affordable housing but there are less obtrusive and less elevated sites in the village where this could be achieved. Many ex-factory brownfield sites in and around Loughborough have provided ample opportunity to meet housing quota.

583/201 Mrs L Doe

2.5 and 3 storey houses with block garages out of character with the village. A6006 very busy road, Wysall Lane narrow country lane unsuitable for extra traffic. Primary school on opposite side of village will be a hazard. Shame to build houses on greenfield site, spoil Wymeswold as a whole, surely best to develop brownfield sites in more urban areas.

584/202 Mr N Smith

Site is greenfield on edge of village, development would stick out like a sore thumb, removing all natural beauty of Wymeswold. 70-80 houses, some 2.5 and 3 storey houses with block garages, would not blend in as village only has 430 houses. Greenfield should not be used when there are brownfield in Loughborough to meet housing quota. Wymeswold not right place to build with roads and facilities (doctors, school, shop, bus services) overloaded.

598/223 Ms Louise Deamer

Strong reservations already relating to including site, to permit more houses would be adding insult

to injury. Previous 60 houses amounted to 12% increase, this will increase to 15-20%, compounding previous arguments including: detrimental affect on countryside, increased traffic on already busy A6006, not a natural extension to village but a blot on landscape, and alter character of Wymeswold. Currently, Inspectors report/decision not binding and proposal should be rejected not increased, but if proceeded dwellings should be kept to a low number as possible and smaller amount of land released - houses from this are not required for current plan, but contribute to next plan period.

643/279 Mr Derek Mullan Wymeswold CE Primary School

Increase in dwellings requires more school places as school oversubscribed by 20 places (approx), and would be unable to manage increase in numbers.

658/304 Mrs A Smith

Infill creates little change, 70-80 houses in one block on side of village is overwhelming, unreasonable, unnecessary. Greenfield and should remain so, there are still brownfield sites to use. Amenities limited and inadequate for extra population, particularly school. Limited bus service thus rely on own transport, equates from 1-3 extra vehicles per house. Narrow country lane accessing site is inadequate. Increased volume of traffic cause serious problems, particularly with junction of A6006. 2.5 and 3 storey dwellings not characteristic, bear no resemblance to quiet country village.

660/306 Shire Properties Ltd & George Wimpey East Midlands

Support increase in density to a minimum 30 dwellings per hectare. However, it is considered that the net developable area for land at Wysall Lane, Wymeswold has been overestimated at 2.3 hectares and should be revised down to 1.8 hectares resulting in a capacity of 55 dwellings. This amendment will bring the allocation in line with findings of 2 local plan inquiry inspectors and the full planning application from George Wimpey East Midlands currently before the Council. Reduced area reflects a more sensitive approach to assimilation of this allocation - located partly in conservation area, on edge of village and on valley side and results in larger area of structural landscaping than assumed - whilst ensuring PPG3 density. Also consider scale of development more appropriate to size and character of Wymeswold, still securing the allocation to meet strategic housing requirement, sustaining the local community, meeting local, including affordable, housing need and reflecting reasonable expectations of the community.

SUPPORTS

37/9 & 10 (AM4.1 & 4.2) Mr G Platts Environment Agency

Site at Peartree Lane, Loughborough is not affected by any of the Agency's constraints and is therefore acceptable.

46/35 & 36 (AM4.1 & 4.2) Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd

Support the allocation of land at Peartree Lane, Loughborough and support Policy H/35. Concur with reasoning behind AM4.1. Discounting of existing completions reflects realistic build rates in line with PPG3 and 'Planning to Deliver- The Managed Release of Housing Sites'. The Company agrees that greenfield allocations are required to meet the identified shortfall and supports the allocation of land at Peartree Lane to meet this shortfall. Concur with Council's view that in the context of the PPG3 search sequence the site represents a sustainable option as an urban extension well served by public transport. The Company welcomes the support of GO-EM to the development of the site.

The Company can confirm that vehicular access meeting highway standards can be achieved off the A6 and/or Wain Drive.

100/231 Mr I Althorpe David Wilson Homes

Support increase in density to 30 dwellings per hectare on land at Bradgate Road, Anstey and Cotes Road, Barrow Upon Soar as will enable more effective use of the available land and encourage provision of a more diverse range of housing accommodation consistent with local and national policy. Consider the additional housing numbers can be achieved within the anticipated timescales. Both Anstey and Barrow possess an excellent community and transport base which will allow the extra housing to be readily assimilated. The sites incorporate generous open space allowances enabling increased densities to be provided without adverse consequences to existing development or the character and appearance of the adjoining countryside.

337/198 Mr C J Kirk

Support increased density for more houses at Wysall Lane, Wymeswold. Understand a number will be affordable dwellings when/if planning permission is granted.

CBC Recommendation

No additional modification.

Reason

General:

The principle of development for housing on the sites at Bradgate Road, Anstey, Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds, Little Haw Farm, Shepshed, East of 19 Barkby Lane, Syston and Wysall Lane, Wymeswold, is established. The issue under consideration for these sites is the proposed additional modification to increase densities to a minimum of 30 dwellings to the hectare in accordance with PPG3 and in response to representations from GO-EM.

The suitability in principle of the allocated sites for housing development, listed above, has been established through what has been a lengthy plan preparation process. Having considered all the objections received, the Local Plan and Modifications Inquiry Inspectors concluded that these areas of land represent the best options for development in accordance with national and strategic planning policy guidance. It is clear from the previous objections from GO-EM that where sites are allocated, for the purposes of the plan, PPG3 densities should be applied in order to avoid the inefficient use of land.

The release of these sites and the new site allocation at Pear Tree Lane, Loughborough is required to meet the Council's strategic housing requirements to 2006.

On the basis of the housing land supply position at March 2003 it was concluded that there was a need to release the allocated sites in order to ensure that the Council meets the strategic housing requirement by 2006. This takes account of realistic build rates. The monitoring of housing land supply in the last quarter has not altered this position. A number of the previously identified 'pipeline' sites have been permitted or are subject to Council resolution to permit, subject to section 106 agreements. Whilst a number of additional sites are currently subject to planning applications for housing development, these have not yet been determined. The Modifications Inspector considered the appropriateness of the Council's urban capacity allowance and was clear that any assumed contribution from as yet undetermined applications on larger urban windfall sites would be highly speculative and would introduce an unacceptable degree of uncertainty into the calculation of housing land supply.

The additional urban capacity allowance that has been made remains a realistic assessment of the likely contribution from this source in terms of the delivery of **housing completions** in the remaining period to 2006.

In recommending the allocation of specific sites, the Inspectors have concluded that an area of land is suitable for development. The local plan identifies the appropriate scale of development that can be accommodated on the land in accordance with guidance on densities set out in PPG3. The plan identifies the approximate number of dwellings that might be accommodated on a site. The precise scale of development on any site will be a matter to be considered in relation to a detailed planning application, where there may be good reason on highway or other grounds to limit the number of dwellings provided.

With the exception of the site at Wysall Lane, Wymeswold (which is discussed below), the County Council as Strategic Planning and Highway Authority have not objected to the proposed increases in densities on sites at Anstey, Burton on the Wolds, Shepshed and Syston.

In its Modifications published in May 2001, the Council had sought to apply a "reserve site" approach in order to manage the release of greenfield housing sites. The Modifications Inspector concluded that, given the limited period of the plan remaining, it would not be possible to manage land release in this way and that the most appropriate response would be to provide an extra pool of resources through further allocation.

GO-EM had previously expressed concern about the Council's application of the PPG3 search sequence because of its failure to allocate the site at Peartree Lane, Loughborough. They have raised no objection to the Additional Modifications in this respect. The Additional Modifications deal with the two aspects of maintaining allocated areas and increasing densities. GO-EM had both these aspects before them. The absence of an objection would suggest no breach of Government policy in this respect.

Land North of Bradgate Road, Anstey (H/1(a))

The principle of development on this allocated site has been considered in some detail - including broad landscape setting, ecological and wildlife impact, highways and access, impact on local services and facilities, site area and density and locational advantages of the site - at two Local Plan Inquiries resulting in a recommendation to include the site.

The additional modification relates to an increase in dwellings from 60 to 100 in line with government guidance set out in PPG3. Anstey Parish Council and others restate their previous objections to the extent of the allocation as shown on the Proposals Map. Issues of the appropriate extent of the site were considered by the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector and the Council's response to these previous objections is set out in its Statement of Decisions and Reasons published in September 2003.

The policy of the plan indicates that contributions will be sought towards additional school places and recreational facilities. These contributions will be commensurate with the increased scale of development proposed.

The sites at Glenfrith and Groby Road Hospitals over the boundary in Leicester were allocated for housing in the Leicester Local Plan adopted in 1994 and developer contributions from these sites would have been considered when planning applications on these sites were approved. It would be unreasonable to expect the development at Bradgate Road, Anstey to make contribution to local services and facilities in retrospect to meet requirements arising from developments close by.

Land at Brook Street, Burton on the Wolds (H/1(d))

The principle of development on this allocated site has also been considered in some detail - including access, impact of development on sloping land fronting Brook Street, surface water drainage, local housing and community needs- at two Local Plan Inquiries resulting in a recommendation to include the site.

The increase in site density by 3 dwellings reflects government guidance set out in PPG3 and it is not considered this increase would impact unacceptably on local services or highway conditions.

Pear Tree Lane, Loughborough (H/35)

Monitoring of housing land supply confirms that there remains a need to release this site in order to meet the Council's strategic housing requirement. Its release was supported by both Inspectors and it represents one of the most sustainable greenfield allocations identified in the plan. There have been no objections to its allocation from either GO-EM or the County Council as strategic planning or Highway Authority. In allocating the site the Council has accepted the Modifications Inspector's conclusions and has responded to the concerns of GO-EM that the site represents one of the more sustainable options for development in the Borough.

It is noted that the Highways Agency prefer access to the site to be taken from the local road network and that a Transport Assessment will be required relating to an access onto the A6. This is a matter to be considered when a detailed planning application is submitted.

Little Haw Lane, Shepshed (H/75)

The principle of development on this allocated site has been considered in some detail - including public transport services, impact on local countryside, impact on the local and wider highways network and traffic- at two Local Plan Inquiries resulting in a recommendation to include the site.

The additional modification relates to an increase in dwellings from 40 to 50 in line with government guidance set out in PPG3. There has been no objection to this increase from the County Council either as strategic planning or highway authority.

Land East of 19 Barkby Lane, Syston (H/89(b))

The principle of residential development on this allocated site has been considered previously - including although not limited to, impact on traffic and amenities, affect on character and opportunities on brownfield areas – at two Local Plan Inquiries resulting in a recommendation to include the site. Issues of landscaping and provision of open space, are matters of detail that can be dealt with at the planning application stage.

The additional modification relates to an increase in dwellings from 60 to 80 in line with government guidance set out in PPG3. There has been no objection to this increase from the County Council either as strategic planning or highway authority.

It is not considered that the additional 20 dwellings that would result from the proposed density increase would have such a significant impact on either local highway conditions or air quality sufficient to justify a rejection of the modification. Issues of air quality in the Syston area have been addressed in relation a current planning application for the development of a larger housing allocation at Barkby Road. For this proposal the Council's Environmental Health Officers have concluded that the predicted increase in air pollution attributable to a development of 340 houses would be minimal. In view of this evidence it is not considered that the impact of an additional 20 dwellings would be sufficient to justify a rejection of the additional modification to increase the density of development on this site in line with national guidance.

Land at Wysall Lane, Wymeswold (H/92)

The principle of residential development on this allocated site has been considered previously - including although not limited to, services, infrastructure, character, greenfield site – at two Local Plan Inquiries resulting in a recommendation to include the site.

The additional modification relates to an increase in dwellings from 45 to 70 in line with government guidance set out in PPG3.

Anthony Aspbury Associates contest that the site area of 2.3 hectares has been overestimated and should be 1.8 hectares, and therefore should accommodate 55 dwellings. Their justification is that it is a sensitive approach to the allocation is required whilst at the same time ensuring efficient use of land, in line with PPG3.

The Borough Council's proposed additional modification in relation to this site is in line with the Modification Inspector's recommendation and evidence submitted by the objector to that Inquiry. It is considered that the objector's assessment of the net site area does not reflect the definition of net residential density in PPG3. Their suggested change would result in a development at 24 dwellings per hectare, not 30 as they suggest. Such a change would likely attract further objection from GO-EM, who have consistently objected to any allocation falling below PPG3 density standards. It is not necessary for the Local Plan to be amended to reflect what are, as yet, unresolved detailed matters for consideration at the planning application stage.

In terms of the County Council objection to the increased density resulting in an excessive number of new dwellings in a settlement that is not a priority location. The allocation was supported by both Inquiry Inspectors and has not attracted an objection from GO-EM. The capacity of the site is a function of the application of national density guidelines as set out in PPG3. If the capacity of the site is constrained in highway terms, the County Council's concerns as Highway Authority can be addressed through the consideration of a detailed planning application.

Additional Modification:

None.

AM4.3: Policy H/3 General Guidance on Provision for Affordable Housing

OBJECTION

656/302 Holmes Antill

In view of plan period; significantly enhanced urban capacity which was unclear/unknown at the time of earlier evaluation; PPG3 advice on managed release of land. Additional allocation of land at Pear Tree Lane is unjustified. Anstey/Burton/Barkby Lane, Syston/Wymeswold. Increased numbers of dwellings on site as listed is: not justified by dwelling requirements or housing need; environmentally inappropriate in terms of local distinctiveness and character; a crude mathematical response which will have a harmful unsustainable effect. Additional modifications should be withdrawn and review carried out in updated circumstances in line with government guidance and best practice.

SUPPORT

37/11 Mr G Platts Environment Agency

Supports the efficient use of land by increasing the housing density.

46/37 Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd

Supports the affordable housing target of 15 dwellings to be an appropriate and reasonable contribution to the provision of additional units of affordable housing in Loughborough.

337/251 Mr C J Kirk

Fully support proposal for increase in affordable housing, there is a need for this particular type of housing in Wymeswold. Would prefer to see even more affordable housing (particularly for young) within village.

CBC Recommendation

No additional modification.

Reason

The issues relating to the principle of increased densities on the allocated sites at Anstey, Burton on the Wolds, Barkby Lane-Syston and Wymeswold and the allocation of Pear Tree Lane, Loughborough are considered under AM 4.1 and AM 4.2. It is considered perfectly reasonable to increase affordable housing targets on sites where increased densities are proposed and to seek an affordable housing contribution on the Peartree Lane site.

Additional Modification:

None.

AM4.4: Government Guidance

OBJECTION

None received.

SUPPORT

None received.

CBC Recommendation

Reason

There are no issues to consider.

Additional Modification:

None.

CABINET - 27TH NOVEMBER 2003

Report of the Head of Policy Unit

ITEM 6 RADAR KEYS

Purpose of the Report

To improve access to disabled toilet facilities across the Borough.

Recommendation(s)

1. To stop charging for RADAR keys
2. To keep all disabled toilets unlocked during daytime opening hours and only use RADAR locks outside normal opening hours.
3. To approve appropriate budget provisions to enable the 1. and 2. above to be carried out.

Reason(s)

1. To address complaints received by members of the public and ensure that disabled people have free access to toilet facilities.
2. To ensure that the Council is complying with Part III of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) 2004.

Policy Context

Within the Corporate Equalities Plan the Council gives a commitment to “providing high quality services in a fair and equitable way to all groups and individuals in the community” and to “providing its services in a manner which is fair and which does not lead to discrimination in the way that those services are delivered.”

Background

The Royal Association for Disability and Rehabilitation (RADAR) introduced the National Key Scheme (NKS) as an increasing number of local authorities felt they had to lock their toilets to counter vandalism and misuse and in order to reduce costs. The NKS has been adopted by over 400 local authorities and offers access to more than 6,000 toilets nationwide.

The Council currently operates 15 toilets with NKS locks across the borough. Keys can be purchased from the Council for £4.10, or directly from RADAR for £3.50.

Complaints have been received from members of the public who think that charging for RADAR keys is discriminating against people with a disability, as able-bodied

people do not have to pay to access toilet facilities. The Equalities Working Party has also raised queries over whether charging for RADAR keys will be legal when Part III of the DDA comes into force in 2004. Part III states that all physical barriers to services must be removed in order for people with disabilities to access them.

A legal opinion was sought from the Disability Rights Commission, it stated:
“If a toilet is kept locked then the service provider should ensure that access is available through a key holder. If not this would be treating a disabled person less favourably because of his disability, as he is unable to access a public toilet to the same extent as any other member of the public. If a disabled person has unsuccessfully tried to enter a disabled toilet then he may have a claim of disability discrimination against the provider of the toilet.”

A solution to this problem would be to provide RADAR keys free of charge to local disabled residents. This would require a resident to show some proof of their disability (e.g. a blue parking badge or a Disability Living Allowance payment book).

However, this solution may not meet the new requirements of the DDA, as the toilets would still not be accessible to the following people:

- 1) Local residents who are recently disabled and have not yet purchased a key
- 2) Disabled People who are visiting from other areas that do not operate the National Key Scheme
- 3) People with sporadic disabilities, which can cause them to be incapacitated for short periods of time, (e.g. some forms of gout or arthritis), for which they may have no proof of their disability in order to purchase a key

A report outlining all of the options available was taken to the Equalities Working Party on the 3rd of November 2003. Following a discussion at this meeting the Working Party would like to recommend that the Council adopt the following strategies:

- 1) To eradicate the charge for RADAR keys, (a fee would still be charged for replacement keys). With immediate effect this would result in a net cost (excluding administration and handling charges) of £258.30 per annum, to the Council.
- 2) To keep all disabled toilets unlocked during daytime opening hours and only use RADAR locks outside normal opening hours (to prevent vandalism and abuse). The estimated cost of installing a second ‘closure fixing’ to the door of each disabled toilet, (to retain the door in a closed position when the RADAR locks are disengaged), is £1,500, to be met from existing maintenance budgets.

Scrutiny Committee : Community Development
Key Decision: No

Background Papers: Joint Report of the Director of Performance Review,
Head of Policy, & Head of Property Services submitted
to the Equalities Working Party 3rd November 2003.
Disability Rights Act (1995) Amendment 2004.
Corporate Equalities Plan 2003.

Officer to Contact: S. Phipps (01509 634605)
steve.phipps@charnwoodbc.gov.uk

CABINET – 27th NOVEMBER 2003

Report of the Head of Planning Services

ITEM 7 URBAN CAPACITY STUDY FOR CHARNWOOD – APPOINTMENT OF CONSULTANTS

Purpose of Report

To gain Cabinet approval to appoint consultants to undertake an Urban Capacity Study for Charnwood Borough where the quotation to be accepted is not the lowest in accordance with Contracts Procedure Rules (Section 2iii).

Recommendation(s)

The Cabinet is recommended to appoint Baker Associates to undertake an urban capacity study for Charnwood Borough.

Reason(s)

To ensure that the Borough Council appoints consultants whose expertise and proven experience will provide the most comprehensive project which is value for money and provides the anticipated quality of outputs.

Policy Context

The urban capacity study will inform the preparation of the Local Development Framework for the Borough and, therefore, has implications for the Council's key strategic aims – particularly a prosperous and vibrant local economy, a sustainable environment and decent homes. In particular the study will assist in the delivery a key priority of the Corporate Plan: the encouragement of brownfield development over the development of “virgin” land.

Background

The Borough Council is commissioning a study to identify the available urban capacity within the Borough to make provision for future housing. The study will provide an independent view and will inform the preparation of the Local Development Framework for Charnwood. A copy of the brief supplied to potential consultants is attached as Appendix 1.

Selection

The brief set out the details that the consultants must address in their proposal. Selection has taken place on the basis of:

- (i) Expertise
- (ii) Proven Experience
- (iii) Value for Money
- (iv) Anticipated Quality of Output, including consideration of the proposed methodology

Four consultants submitted proposals to undertake this study. Their quotations, exclusive of VAT, are listed below:

- Baker Associates, £16,500
- Entec UK Ltd, £18,875*
- Landmark Planning, £12,000
- RPS Planning Transport and Environment. £18,450* (+£7,000)

* Additional costs appear to be payable above the quoted cost.

The Baker Associates submission stands out in terms of three of the above four criteria. It indicates that the personnel identified to undertake this study have a range of expertise to bring to the study including analysing the development potential and market viability of sites. The consultants have worked for Government Departments, Regional Planning Bodies and County and District Councils in relation to urban capacity and the assessment of local plan housing allocations and so have wide experience in this field. The methodology meets the Council's stated requirements and is clearly informed by the consultant's experience in this field.

However, the quotation submitted at £16,500 ex VAT (with an option to carry out additional work for £2,300, which is not expected to be taken up) is higher than the quotation submitted by Landmark Planning who have quoted £12,000 ex VAT with provision for additional work to be undertaken at hourly rates. The quotations from Entec and RPS appear to exceed £18,800 and do not appear to be fixed. It is considered that the proposal submitted by Landmark Planning does not demonstrate fully that it meets the requirements of the brief, particularly in terms of assessing the development potential and market viability of sites and in terms of involving and consulting with key stakeholders.

It is recommended that Baker Associates are appointed to undertake the urban capacity study based on their expertise, experience and the anticipated quality of outputs through which will be provided a comprehensive study delivering value for money.

Financial Implications

Budgetary provision, including contingencies, is made for consultancy to undertake work to prepare for the Local Development Framework.

Scrutiny Committee(s): Environment

Key Decision: No

Background Papers: None

Officer(s) to Contact: Gemma Hill (tel 01509 634927) (email gemma.hill@charnwoodbc.gov.uk)

Guy Longley, (tel 01509 634763 (email
guy.longley@charnwoodbc.gov.uk)

Brief for Urban Capacity Study (UCS) for Charnwood Borough

Purpose

The Borough Council is commissioning a study to identify the available urban capacity within the District to make provision for future housing. The study will inform the preparation of the Local Development Framework for the Borough of Charnwood.

Introduction and Background

The Borough Council is finalising the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan, expected to be adopted by April 2004, covering the period 1991-2006. During the Plan period there has been significant development on previously developed sites. Between 1991-2003 48% of housing development in Charnwood has been built on previously developed sites.

The Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan indicates, subject to Direction, that the Borough Council will make provision for 9,400 dwellings for the period 1996-2016. The emerging Structure Plan also sets out details of a sequential approach to site selection, housing allocations on Greenfield sites and housing density.

PPG3 'Housing' advises that in order to make the best use of the potential to recycle land and buildings the Borough Council must undertake an urban capacity study. Guidance for undertaking such studies is set out in the Government's good practice guide 'Tapping the Potential – Assessing Urban Housing Capacity: Towards Better Practice'.

Existing Urban Capacity Work

The Borough Council undertook an assessment of urban capacity to inform decisions about the scale of additional greenfield housing required in the light of the first Local Plan Inquiry Inspector's Report and a roll forward of the housing land supply position. A copy of 'Technical Report 8: Assessment of Urban Capacity' is attached. This built on work undertaken in association with Leicestershire County Council in the context of the Structure Plan review.

The Borough Council has also begun work on updating the assessment of urban capacity. This includes identifying settlements that can contribute to sustainable patterns of development and identifying large sites in those settlements which may contribute to the unconstrained yield. This work would form stage 1 and, for large sites, stage 2 of the Tapping the Potential approach. The appointed consultants will be expected to complete the assessment and to verify the list of sustainable settlements and identification of sites work undertaken.

Objectives of the Study

To identify the potential opportunities for providing new dwellings on previously developed land and buildings within (and immediately adjoining) the existing limits to development of identified settlements within the Borough over the period to 2016.

Study Outputs

To identify the potential opportunities this study will:

- Set out a clear and transparent methodology
- Involve and consult with key stakeholders at appropriate stages in the study
- Verify the identification of sustainable settlements
- Verify the unconstrained large sites (over 10 dwellings) based upon the category sources set out in 'Tapping the Potential' and establish the unconstrained yield
- Identify and advise on an appropriate allowance for small sites and other sources of capacity where a yardstick might be applied
- Advise on the extent to which any allowance should be made for the possible future redevelopment of existing employment or other sites currently in active use
- Establish the constrained yield for all sources through discounting measures including developability and market viability
- Provide an assessment of the realistic capacity to be derived from the identified potential including:
 - Identifying sites which can be confidently expected to come forward and thus be identified as allocations in the Local Development Framework
 - Identifying sites which may come forward but where it cannot be specifically identified in a Plan – such sites can form part of an allowance to predict provision
 - 'Small sites allowance'

Presentation

- The study will be presented as a report. 10 printed copies and an electronic version of the final report with an executive summary will be provided. The copyright will rest with the Borough Council;
- Presentation of results and key findings to the Borough Council.

Timescale

The final report will be completed by 29th February 2004.

Urban Capacity Study Requirements

The urban capacity study will be prepared in accordance with 'Tapping the Potential – Assessing Urban Housing Capacity: Towards Better Practice' which sets out 4 stages:

- Identifying capacity sources
- Surveying the capacity
- Assessing yield
- Discounting potential

The Borough Council has already undertaken work in relation to the first two stages. The consultants will be expected to verify, rather than repeat, this work by, for example, validating site identification in sample settlements. A settlement list as well as site details and maps of the identified unconstrained sites will be provided to the appointed consultants.

The study will take account of national, regional and local planning policy.

The urban capacity study will establish matters of fact only, together with the consultant's views on discounting.

The successful consultants will be required to work proactively with other participants in the development process in order to pool knowledge, skills and experience. Close working will be required to identify potential sites and to assess their capacity.

Method of Working

The study will be self-managed by the appointed consultants. The Borough Council will require regular progress meetings. Day to day liaison will be with Gemma Hill.

Experience

The successful consultants must demonstrate expertise and experience of similar studies undertaken elsewhere. An understanding of the components of housing land supply, the local housing market and the requirements of PPG3 will be essential as will be the ability to work to restrictive deadlines.

Selection of Consultants

In addition to the proposals set out below, consultants will be selected on the basis of their expertise, proven experience, value for money and anticipated quality of outputs. The Borough Council will award the project to the most comprehensive and competitive submission.

It is anticipated a selection will be made based upon written proposals and if necessary an interview.

Consultants will have indemnity cover appropriate for this study.

Payment

Payment will be made on the satisfactory completion of the work. Staged payments will be considered if required.

Proposal Submission

You are invited to submit a proposal that sets out:

- The methodology that will be used to prepare the study, including the approach to the verification of settlement and unconstrained large site selection;
- Details (name and CV) of the personnel who will be preparing the study;
- An outline of your experience in undertaking such studies;
- A statement regarding any potential conflicts of interest and the steps that will be taken to ensure that the study is fair, open and impartial;
- A programme of work setting out the timetable for the production of the report of the study and the steps to be taken to undertake the study;
- A specification of any information requirements;
- The total cost of the urban capacity study, indicating a breakdown of the various components.
- Please include 2 references of similar work undertaken in the East Midlands.

Please submit 5 copies of the proposal to Gemma Hill by 31st October 2003. The successful consultant will be notified by 14th November 2003.

Contacts

Gemma Hill
Principal Planning Officer
Manager

Guy Longley
Planning Policy Services

Charnwood Borough Council
Southfields Road
Loughborough
Leicestershire
LE11 2TN

01509 634927
gemma.hill@charnwoodbc.gov.uk

01509 634763
Guy.longley@charnwoodbc.gov.uk

CABINET – 27TH NOVEMBER 2003

Report of the Head of Planning Services

ITEM 8 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS SCHEMES FOR QUORN (JUBILEE GARDENS) AND SYSTON (CENTRAL PARK)

Purpose of the Report

To seek the Cabinet's approval for the inclusion of enhancement schemes prepared by Quorn Parish Council for Jubilee Gardens and by Syston Town Council for Central Park in the 2004/05 Environmental Improvements Programme.

Recommendations

The Cabinet is requested:

1. To confirm the inclusion of the initiatives by Quorn Parish Council (Jubilee Gardens) & Syston Town Council (Central Park) in the Environmental Improvements Programme for 2004/05.
2. To advance the schemes to Category 1 in the Capital Programme for 2004/05 and for the following funding provisions to be made:

a)	Jubilee Gardens, Church Lane, Quorn	£18,000
b)	Central Park, Syston	£10,000

Reasons

- 1 & 2. To enable the achievement of the schemes, which will contribute to the Council's Environmental Improvements Programme.

Policy Context

Although the schemes have been initiated and developed by Quorn Parish Council and Syston Town Council, their achievement will assist the following areas of interest to the Borough Council:

Strategic Aims:

- A prosperous and vibrant local economy
- A sustainable environment

Priorities:

- Increasing the economic vitality in our towns and villages.
- Improving our overall environmental performance.

Key Issues:

- Encouraging community engagement in the development of local environmental statements and initiatives.

- Conserving natural and built environments.

A Key Area for Improvement:

- To really celebrate, not only our strong local economy, but also our green and pleasant borough; improving parks, public places, sport, play, the arts and culture.

Background

A. JUBILEE GARDENS, CHURCH LANE, QUORN (see Appendix 1)

Quorn Parish Council has developed a master plan for environmental enhancements to improve existing open spaces between Church Lane and School Lane. The Council's aim is to create improved pedestrian links and provide facilities for events/quiet enjoyment, to encourage use by local people, community groups and schools. The local community has been consulted on the master plan and the detailed proposals for Jubilee Gardens, which have been prepared by a consultant commissioned by the Parish Council.

The Parish Council hopes to implement the proposals shown on their master plan over the next three years. Jubilee Gardens has been identified as the first phase for this project. A detailed scheme has been drawn up, which recently received planning permission from the Borough Council. The budget estimate for the scheme is £78,000. The Parish Council is now seeking partnership funding to realise the proposals. The following funding has been secured to date:

(i)	Quorn Parish Council	£20,000
(i)	Leicestershire County Council	
	Shire Grant	£10,000 (max)
	FLAG Grant	£25,000 (max)
	Village & Town Centre improvement budget	£5,000 (max)

The scheme is programmed to commence on site in December because a condition of the FLAG Grant requires its uptake by the end of February 2004. The Parish Council is left, however, with a funding shortfall of £18,000. The Parish Council has requested the Borough Council to consider the provision of the gap funding to enable the scheme to proceed.

Without funding from the Borough Council the scheme will need to be significantly amended to fit the reduced budget and there is a serious risk that it will not be able to go ahead. The changes to the design and, more critically, the delay that is likely to result in the programme could put the funding offers that the Parish Council has received from other sources at risk. This particularly relates to the £25,000 FLAG offer, which is conditional upon the grant being spent by the end of February 2004.

The Borough Council's Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP) has included an outline commitment to a scheme for Church Lane, Quorn since 1999 and was referred to in the Appendix to the item on the EIP that was considered by Cabinet at the meeting on 21st August 2003. The site is within the heart of the Quorn

Conservation Area and the scheme would help the Council to fulfil its duty, under Section 71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to formulate proposals for the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas.

B. CENTRAL PARK, SYSTON (see Appendix 2)

Syston Town Council has initiated an improvement scheme for Central Park. The detailed proposals, which have been prepared by a consultant commissioned by the Town Council, are designed to improve the existing open space to encourage use by local people, community groups and schools. The aims of the scheme include the provision of access for people of all abilities and the creation of improved pedestrian links within the park and between facilities in the town centre. The Town Council intends to include public art in the scheme and hopes to employ a community artist to create a 'people sun clock' (a sundial where a person's shadow indicates the time of the day) as a central feature.

The budget estimate for the scheme is £80,000. Syston Town Council has been successful with applications to the County Council for funding under the FLAG scheme (£25,000) and the County Council's 'Village and Town Centres Improvements' budget (£5,000). The Town Council has committed £20,000 to the works and is now exploring other funding sources for the shortfall of £30,000. A request has been made to the Borough Council for a contribution of £10,000 towards the shortfall. Without funding from the Borough Council the works proposed will need to be revised to fit the reduced budget. Alternatively the second phase of the scheme, which is planned for 2004/05, may need to be delayed to enable other possible sources of funding to be explored.

The Borough Council's EIP has included an outline commitment to carry out works in Syston town centre since 1999 and this was referred to in the Appendix to the item on the EIP that was considered by Cabinet at the meeting on 21st August 2003. The site is an important public space within the centre of the town but just outside the boundary of the Conservation Area.

In the case of Quorn and Syston the Borough Council is being asked to provide grant assistance to facilitate the achievement of projects that have been initiated and developed by the Parish/Town Councils. The responsibility for the achievement of both schemes and their future maintenance on completion will rest with the Parish /Town Councils. In the circumstances, it is not considered that Capital Project Appraisals are necessary for these projects.

Scrutiny Committee(s): Environment

Key Decision: No

Background Papers: Planning Committee Minutes 4th November 1999 (Review of the Environmental Improvements Programme).

Cabinet Minutes 21st August 2003 (Environmental Improvement Programme)

Officer(s) to Contact:

Martin Tincknell (01509) 634767
martin.tincknell@charnwoobc.gov.uk

U:\UCHS Brief.doc

CABINET – 27TH NOVEMBER 2003

Report of the Head of Housing Services

ITEM 9 LEASE OF PROPERTIES AT SORREL COURT, MOUNTSORREL,
TO CHARNWOOD AND NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE
PRIMARY CARE TRUST

Purpose of the report

To seek approval to lease two empty bedsits at Sorrel Court, Mountsorrel, to Charnwood and North West Leicestershire Primary Care Trust, for use as office accommodation.

Recommendation

That Cabinet agrees to lease nos. 28 and 29 Sorrel Court, Mountsorrel, to Charnwood and North West Leicestershire Primary Care Trust for the fixed term of two years at a nominal rent of £1 per year.

Reason

To assist the Primary Care Trust in its public health work, by making available accommodation that could not otherwise be let.

Policy Context

Working with Charnwood and North West Leicestershire Primary Care Trust on issues of public health is a stated objective within the Corporate Plan – ‘Charnwood Together’.

Background information

1. Officers from the Borough Council have been working closely with the Director of Public Health, from the Primary Care Trust, to explore ways of working in partnership to achieve common goals. The possible use of vacant and ‘difficult to let’ Council owned properties as office accommodation for a Public Health Team is one of the ideas which has emerged. The Primary Care Trust already has a similar arrangement in operation with North West Leicestershire District Council.
2. The Primary Care Trust will use the accommodation as an office base for the newly established Public Health Team, comprising 7 members of staff, whose work will focus generally on improving the health of people within Charnwood, with particular reference to matters such as diet, physical activity, substance misuse and smoking cessation.

3. The properties identified for this purpose have now been vacant for long periods, with very little potential of being let in the foreseeable future. Officers from Housing Services are satisfied that the proposed use will not cause any disruption to existing and neighbouring residents of Sorrel Court.

4. The Primary Care Trust has requested that only a nominal rent be charged for the properties. It is considered that this request is reasonable and reflects the Council's commitment to working in partnership with the Primary Care Trust. In addition, no rent is currently being received on these properties and any charge made will simply reduce the amount available for public health work by the Team who will make use of the accommodation.

Background Papers:	Briefing Note – ‘Development of Local Health Promotion Teams/ Public Health Teams – Head of Policy, August 2003.
Scrutiny Committee	Housing
Key decision	No
Officers to contact	Simon Folwell (01509 634670) simon.folwell@charnwoodbc.gov.uk

CABINET – 27TH NOVEMBER 2003

Report of the Head of Housing Services

ITEM 10 LOCAL AUTHORITY SOCIAL HOUSING GRANT PROGRAMME

Purpose of the report

To seek final approval to proceed with four schemes proposed for inclusion within the Council's Local Authority Social Housing Grant (LA SHG) programme.

Recommendation

Cabinet is requested to:

1. Agree to the allocation to Keynote Housing Group, for Gray's Court, being increased by £34,000.
2. Confirm that the following LA SHG funding proposals can proceed and be moved to Category One of the Capital Programme:
 - a) Boundary Road, Mountsorrel – Raglan Housing Association - £418,000
 - b) Gray's Court, Barrow Upon Soar – Keynote Housing Group - £338,000
 - c) Link Road, Anstey – Riverside Housing - £283,000
 - d) Wordsworth Road, Loughborough - £321,000

Reasons

1. To cover the cost of providing an additional unit as part of the scheme.
2. To allow the proposed schemes to proceed and ensure the take up of transitional funding, which is being made available by the Housing Corporation.

Policy Context

The provision of new affordable housing is a stated priority both within the Corporate Plan and the Council's Housing Strategy. In addition, the proposals are in line with the levels of planned expenditure as set out in the Housing Investment Programme (HIP).

Background Information

1. The four LA SHG schemes listed above all currently sit within the Future Schemes list of the Capital Programme. The schemes for Boundary Road, Gray's Court and Link Road, were given approval in principle by Cabinet in July (minute 41), subject to the completion of satisfactory Capital Appraisals. Approval for Wordsworth Road was given in October 2001 but

the scheme was moved to the Future Schemes list, as details of the scheme had not been finalised at that time.

2. Capital Appraisals for the three schemes noted above have now been completed and considered by the Capital Strategy Group. Copies of these appraisals are attached. A planning application is ready to be made for the proposed Wordsworth Road development, previous site access difficulties having now been overcome.
3. In relation to the proposal for Gray's Court, amendments to the scheme design since July have shown that an extra bungalow can be incorporated within the layout. A request is therefore being made to increase the LA SHG allocation by £34,000, to a total of £338,000.

Financial Implications

4. Currently, only committed schemes within the Capital Programme are matched by resources. For any additional schemes brought forward, such as those outlined above, resources will need to be found. This can only be achieved by either using resources identified for other schemes or utilising the Capital Works Reserve.
5. Following changes to the LA SHG funding regime earlier this year, the ODPM has agreed to provide transitional funding for the four schemes listed. This funding is intended to cover the investment income that will be foregone, by spending capital resources on LA SHG. This funding will equate to approximately £54,000.
6. The expenditure profile for the schemes is shown below:

Scheme	Expenditure 03/04	Expenditure 04/05	Total
Boundary Road	£334,000	£84,000	£418,000
Gray's Court	£270,000	£68,000	£338,000
Link Road	£226,000	£57,000	£283,000
Wordsworth Road	£257,000	£64,000	£321,000
Total	£1,087,000	£273,000	£1,360,000

Background Papers: Cabinet Minute 165 – 18th October 2001
 Cabinet Minute 41 – 10th July 2003
 Project files for the schemes listed - held by the Housing Strategy Team

Scrutiny Committee Housing

Key decision Yes

Officers to contact Simon Folwell (01509 634670)

simon.folwell@charnwoodbc.gov.uk