

HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL
Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan – Submission Version
Consultation Statement
(Regulation 30(1)(d))

July 2013

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The following consultation report sets out how Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council has involved the community and key stakeholders in the preparation of the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (AAP).
- 1.2 The production of this AAP has been informed by the development of a Masterplan for Earl Shilton and Barwell sustainable urban extensions and their main settlement areas.
- 1.3 The programme of consultation identified below has followed best practice and adheres to the requirements of Regulation 30 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendments) Regulations 2008.
- 1.4 In addition the consultation programme stands in line with the Borough Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)¹. The SCI sets out the standards and arrangements for the consultation process including the range of techniques that can be used to inform, consult and involve the community. The programme of consultation has included both minimum consultation arrangements and further optional consultation methods.
- 1.5 This document is an update to the Consultation Statement published with the 'Consultation Draft' AAP (2010)².

Requirements of the Town and Country Local Development Regulations

- 1.6 At each stage of consulting on the AAP, the Council is required to prepare a 'Consultation Statement' in conformity with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.
- 1.7 This consultation statement is prepared in conformity with Regulation 30 (1)(d) which, in summary, requires that the authority publishes a statement (Consultation Statement) setting out:
 - The consultees the local planning authority invited to make representations under at the previous consultation stage (in this instance the Consultation Draft – 2010);
 - How the consultees were invited to make representations i.e. the methods used such as letters and the availability of documents;
 - A summary of the main matters and issues raised by the representations made in response to the Consultation Draft; and
 - How these representations have been taken into account;

¹ Statement of Community Involvement (HBBC, November 2006)

² 'Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan – Preferred Options, Consultation Statement' (2011)

2 PRE-COMMENCEMENT CONSULTATION

- 2.1 Consultation on the Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUE) and main settlement areas initially began in advance of the commencement of the Masterplanning process through a series of activities and events indicated below.
- 2.2 The approach to the engagement process was agreed with the Barwell and Earl Shilton Forward groups on Monday 21st July 2008 with outcomes required from the process agreed.
- 2.3 Activities and events in the settlements were carried out between July-September 2008, undertaken by Lanarca working with Earl Shilton Town Council, Barwell Parish Council, Hinckley & Bosworth Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) and Hinckley & Bosworth BC. The activities and events undertaken during this period are as follows;
- Egyptian Day - Earl Shilton - Information provision
 - Barwell Carnival - Information provision
 - Website updates on the process
 - Information boards on display
 - Citizens panel - letter and information pack distributed
 - Members briefing - verbal update provided
 - Strategic partner workshops undertaken
 - Press release distributed
 - Public exhibitions at Barwell and Earl Shilton
- 2.4 The findings of these activities and events are summarised in a 'Pre-masterplan Public Engagement Report' published in 2009³.
- 2.5 Following on from this report a stakeholder workshop was held on the 23rd July 2009 with the following objectives;
- Identify key stakeholders and their roles
 - Understand their aspirations and expectations in terms of outcomes and timescales.
 - Facilitate an information exchange to collate the existing knowledge of the area.
- 2.6 The conclusions of this workshop have informed the development of the 'Earl Shilton & Barwell AAP Consultation Strategy', preparation of the evidence base and Masterplan Brief.

Masterplanning

- 2.7 In November 2009 the Council published the Earl Shilton and Barwell AAP Consultation Strategy⁴. The strategy outlines the proposed approach to public and stakeholder engagement to be undertaken through the Masterplanning process, prior to incorporating the Masterplans into the AAP.

³ Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council Earl Shilton & Barwell Pre Masterplanning Engagement Report (Lanarca, January 2009)

⁴ Earl Shilton & Barwell Area Action Plan – Consultation Strategy (Capita Lovejoy, November 2009)

- 2.8 The Masterplan options document⁵ reports on the preparation of a series of spatial options for the regeneration of Earl Shilton and Barwell. These options were generated by the project team in collaboration between consultants and Council officers following the stakeholder workshop in July 2009 and the preparation of an extensive evidence base.
- 2.9 The evidence bases are identified in the Masterplan brief⁶ document which is a key document in informing the Masterplan Options document. This document identifies what the Masterplans are expected to deliver, any spatial or locational requirements of elements of the development, the infrastructure implications that need to be addressed, the site constraints to be considered and the potential opportunities to be embraced.
- 2.10 The evidence bases include the over-arching community, socio-economic and environmental strategies that apply to Earl Shilton and Barwell; local and national planning policy requirements and site specific studies undertaken by various parties.
- 2.11 The Masterplan options document was prepared through a series of consultation exercises on the preliminary Masterplan options. These preliminary Masterplan options were prepared by the project team and underwent a process of feasibility testing, principally through consultation with technical experts and key stakeholders which included:
- Leicestershire County Council Highways
 - Leicestershire County Council Education
 - Leicestershire County and Rutland Primary Care Trust
 - Severn Trent Water
 - Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council Planning Policy, Environmental Health and Green Spaces.
 - Landowner and Developer Forum
- 2.12 The Masterplan options document, once feasibility testing was complete, was presented to the public through public consultation exercises;
- Manned public exhibition in Barwell - 4th & 5th December 2009
 - Manned public exhibition in Earl Shilton - 11th & 12th December 2009
- 2.13 These events were publicised through a leaflet drop to every property in the two settlements, with posters in key locations and an article in the Borough Bulletin.
- 2.14 The exhibition material was posted on the Borough Council's website with a feedback form and displayed until 8th January 2010.

Informing the Area Action Plan

- 2.15 Following this consultation and in preparation of the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan, stakeholder design workshops were run between 2nd & 3rd March 2010. These workshops were attended by potential developers, Borough Council members and officers, local community representatives and key infrastructure and environment bodies.

⁵ Earl Shilton & Barwell – Site Analysis & Contextual Appraisal (Capita Lovejoy, December 2009)

⁶ Earl Shilton & Barwell – Masterplan Brief (Capita Lovejoy, November 2009)

- 2.16 The outcomes of these previous consultation activities and events informed the production of the Area Action Plan Preferred Options for Earl Shilton and Barwell settlement centres and SUEs.
- 2.17 This document was presented to the public through manned public exhibitions held in Barwell on the 8th & 9th of October 2010 and in Earl Shilton on the 15th & 16th of October 2010.
- 2.18 These events were publicised through posters in key locations, an article in the Borough Bulletin, on the local radio and direct emails and flyers to stakeholders.
- 2.19 The format and outcomes of the 2010 are summarised in a consultation summary⁷. The responses to these workshops, in some instances, altered the content of the document and in-turn informed the revised Area Action Plan Consultation Draft (November 2010).

⁷ Earl Shilton & Barwell Area Action Plan – Consultation Summary (Capita Lovejoy, November 2010)

3 EARL SHILTON AND BARWELL CONSULTATION DRAFT, NOVEMBER 2010 (REGULATION 25)

Consultation Process

- 3.1 The revised AAP setting out the preferred Masterplan options for the two SUEs – the Earl Shilton and Barwell Consultation Draft (November 2010), was published for consultation over a six week period from January 2011 until 18 February 2011.
- 3.2 Prior to consultation, the document was sent for comment to the following Council meetings:
- Local Development Framework Members Working Party, 25th November 2010
 - Planning Committee, 30th November 2010
 - Executive, 1st December 2010
- The document was formally approved at a full meeting of the Council on 7th December 2010.
- 3.3 The consultation was undertaken in conformity to Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local development) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 and the Council's SCI. The following consultation events and activities were undertaken during the consultation period, and in addition to the comments received, have informed the preparation of the 'Submission' plan:
- Letters were sent to all residents of Earl Shilton and Barwell and all relevant people on the consultation database informing them of the consultation on the AAP;
 - Letters to Parish Councillors;
 - Press release and press notice on the consultation to the Hinckley Times and Leicester Mercury and paced in Parish Council newsletters;
 - Letters distributed to all residential and business addresses in Earl Shilton and Barwell providing an invitation to consultation events, where to view the proposals and the opportunity to submit comments as part of they plan preparation process;
 - Manned public exhibition in Earl Shilton - 7th & 8th January 2011;
 - Manned public exhibition in Barwell - 14th & 15th January 2011;
 - Documents made available in main libraries Borough wide and the main Council offices; and
 - All documents (including background information and the questionnaire) were made available on the Borough Councils website.

The list of consultees is provided in Appendix 1.

Consultation Responses

- 3.4 The Council received written representations from a total of 80 respondents made up of:
- 41 from members of the public;
 - 16 representations from various organisations such as government agencies and service providers;
 - 12 responses from or on behalf of the development industry or land owners;
 - 4 representations from Parish or Town Councils;
 - 3 from individual Councillors;

- 3 responses from Local Authorities;
- 1 representation from a local community group; and

Furthermore, a total of 103 people signed into the public exhibitions at Earl Shilton and 70 at Barwell.

- 3.5 All written comments received are available to view on the Council's website⁸ and a summary of comments, whether and how they have informed the Submission Plan and the Councils responses to them are available in a separate document⁹.

Summary of key matters and issues arising from the consultation

- 3.6 A report of the key matters and issues and the Council's responses, including whether and how the comments have been considered in preparing the Submission AAP are provided in Appendix 2. However, to summarise a number of issues included:

- **Development strategy** – concern is raised over the principle of development at the two settlements and the direction of growth and brownfield sites should be used instead of greenfield
- **Highways matters** – proposed access arrangements; routing of highways schemes (linking to existing routes and new schemes); and concern over congestion and whether existing roads can accommodate the increased levels of traffic; not enough parking provision in existing settlements and new developments
- **Sustainable transport** – concerns are raised regarding the proposed bus routes; respondents have submitted suggestions to improve existing and proposed walking and cycling links
- **Employment** – respondents state that not enough consideration has been given to the provision of employment land and not enough provision is being made in line with the requirements set out in the Core Strategy
- **Impacts on existing district centres** – there is concern that the SUEs will result in adverse impacts upon existing settlement centres rather than contributing to regeneration and public realm improvements; existing business units should be used ahead of new ones; not enough consideration has been given to encouraging and delivering public realm improvements
- **Utilities** – there is concern that the existing utilities will not be able to accommodate the additional population growth and the AAP should specify how additional capacity is to be provided
- **Natural environment** – the impacts on wildlife sites have not been given enough consideration; not enough consideration has been given to the provision of new wildlife sites
- **Education** – there is concern there will not be enough capacity for secondary school pupils

⁸ http://www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/info/856/local_development_framework/439/earl_shilton_and_barwell_area_action_plan/2

⁹ Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan Consultation Draft – Summary of Matters and Issues

- **Health care** – concern that there will not be enough capacity at existing health care facilities to accommodate the additional population growth
- **Police** – concern that the Police will not have sufficient resources to serve the increased population
- **Strategic Infrastructure** – there is not sufficient provision of other community facilities; there is no infrastructure plan included within the AAP and no consideration of alternative funding streams to developer contributions; and concern that the infrastructure that is being proposed is not 'CIL compliant' nor deliverable

Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan – Pre-submission Consultation August 2013

- 3.7 A six week period of consultation on the Pre-submission Area Action Plan will be undertaken in conformity with the Council's Statement of Community. On completion of the Pre-submission AAP consultation, the Council will collate all responses and prepare the relevant material for the submission to the Secretary of State (SoS) for Examination in Public by a Planning Inspector.
- 3.8 The Pre-submission AAP is the version which will be submitted to the SoS and no changes will be made to the document itself. If the Council wishes to propose minor changes (such as factual / spelling correction) it is permitted to submit a schedule of proposed changes to the Inspector as part of the submission material. If 'main modifications' are required i.e. changes which relate to the soundness of the document, the Council will be required to consult on the proposed changes for a statutory 6-week period prior to submission.

Appendix 1: List of Consultees – Consultation Draft 2010

Specific Consultation Bodies

The specific consultation bodies are listed in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended) and relate to organisations responsible for services and utilities and infrastructure provision.

The primary list of consultation bodies is set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The list of organisations and groups below is a revised list to reflect the relevant bodies at the time of the consultation.

- Leicestershire County Council;
- Local Authorities adjoining the Borough;
- The Environment Agency;
- Highways Agency;
- English Heritage;
- Natural England;
- Network Rail;
- Leicestershire, County and Rutland Primary Care Trust;
- Relevant Water Authority;
- National Grid;
- Mobile Operators Association;
- Electricity, gas and telecoms undertakers;
- Parish Councils within and adjoining the Borough;
- Severn Trent Water.

Other consultees

The key principle is that the local authority should carry out public participation that is appropriate for the document being produced. The full list of the 'other' consultees is set out in the Council's Statement of community Involvement. The following are those from the initial list who were consulted on the AAP 'Consultation Draft'.

- Government departments or agencies that have large land holdings in the Borough
- Borough and County Councillors
- Residents within Earl Shilton and Barwell
- Voluntary Bodies
- Bodies representing the interests of
 - businesses within Earl Shilton and Barwell
 - various racial or ethnic groups
 - people with disabilities
 - young or older people
 - religious groups
- Developers, Agents and Landowners
- Schools and Colleges
- Transport Providers
- Charities
- Community groups including Parish Plan groups and Resident Associations
- Equal Opportunities groups
- Housing bodies and groups

- Sports bodies and groups
- Environmental bodies and groups
- Women's Group
- Other Special Interest Groups
- Design advice bodies
- Health providers
- Local Strategic Partnerships covering the Borough, namely Leicestershire Together and Hinckley and Bosworth Local Strategic Partnership.
- National Forest Company

Appendix 2: Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan – Consultation Draft (November 2010) summary of Matters and Issues

The purpose of this paper is to set out a summary of the main matters and issues raised in response to the Preferred Options version of the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (AAP), the Council's responses to them and how they have informed the preparation of the Submission version of the AAP. In addition to a summary of the comments received, the Council has also collated those which suggest specific changes to the plan.

Housing

General Comments

A number of respondents remain opposed to the principal of development of both SUEs. Comments received primarily from residents include:

- The report does not justify the level of housing and there is no immediate requirement for new houses.
- The additional housing will be of detriment to the District Centres for both Barwell and Earl Shilton.
- The development will result in adverse impacts on amenity, quality of life, the environment and detrimental affect on the value of properties.
- Whilst the document considers environmental impacts it does not acknowledge the impact upon Greenfield land and ignores using brownfield land. Disused factory and brownfield sites should be used before Greenfield land.
- The proposal to site so many houses / industry around Earl Shilton is about reducing the impact of housing requirements on other areas within the Borough. All areas within the borough should take their share of development and this includes the rural villages.

HBBC Response:

There is a requirement to plan for the future supply of housing through the planning system. The Core Strategy identifies the residual housing requirement for the Borough of 5046 dwellings over the period 2006 to 2026. In addition to the urban settlements of Hinckley, Earl Shilton, Barwell and Burbage, the Core Strategy makes provision for housing in a number of other rural areas as set out in Core Strategy Policies 8 (Key Rural Centres Relating to Leicester); 11 (Key Rural Centres Stand Alone); 12 (Rural Villages).

In determining the spatial direction for growth for the SUEs, the availability of previously developed sites for housing was considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. A review was undertaken as to the availability of brownfield land to accommodate the housing requirements for the Borough. It was concluded that there was (and remains) an insufficient supply of deliverable and developable sites within the previously developed category to meet future housing needs in the Borough. It was concluded that Greenfield land will need to be brought forward to accommodate a majority of

the growth in the Borough. A 'Direction for Growth' paper was prepared to appraise 7 broad options for housing growth in the Borough. A total of 8 areas to accommodate the growth were considered, from which the two allocations identified for the SUEs were chosen due to them having the least constraints to their development, but also the benefits associated with development providing a catalyst for the regeneration of their respective settlement centres.

The Core Strategy was subject to independent Examination and was subsequently adopted by the Borough Council in December 2009. The AAP does not re-determine the location of the growth but provides a development framework to guide the Council, developers and others investing in the future of Earl Shilton and Barwell to 2026. It also seeks to address the challenges of providing the additional infrastructure the settlements need to support the SUEs and the regeneration that the extensions could stimulate.

The additional housing, employment and supporting infrastructure will act as a catalyst for the regeneration of the existing centres. The expanded populations of the settlements will help to contribute to the regeneration of their centres, through increased spending potential, greater social and economic interaction which attracts additional investment.

Housing Tenure and Type

One respondent states that due to the very high proportion of social housing in the area the following types of development must be specifically excluded:

- Buildings exceeding two stories;
- Flats (where more than 5% of units approved); but
- Priority should be given to family homes (with green space and amenity).

HBBC Response:

Policy 16 of the Core Strategy includes a requirement for a mix of housing types and tenures to be provided on all sites of 10 or more dwellings and utilises the profile of new housing needed to meet household type projections. The profile is used as a starting point for housing mix and the specific needs of each submarket informed by the most up to date housing needs assessments and other local evidence.

The Council will apply Policy 15 (Affordable Housing) of the Core Strategy when considering proposals to assess the need and requirement for affordable housing and the tenure split. Specifically for the two SUEs, the policy states that the starting point for the level and on-site target for affordable housing in the SUEs is 20%. The policy does however state that, the Council may agree to accept commuted sums in lieu of on-site affordable housing.

Whilst the AAP requires a minimum number of dwellings to be provided on the site, the exact tenure and type will be determined at the detailed planning application stage, in conformity with policies of the AAP and other relevant

Housing Provision

Three respondents from the development industry state there will be a significant shortfall in housing provision as set out in the Core Strategy as a result of revised density requirements.

In response to the housing provision for Earl Shilton, Landmark Planning (51) state that a density of 35 dwellings per hectare (as opposed to 40 dph) will result in a shortfall of between 400 and 600 dwellings. The respondent comments that there is no indication of how or where this shortfall will be accommodated to ensure the required provision is delivered. The respondent also notes that the density for Barwell reduces from 40dph to 32dph and identifies four impacts associated with pressure on adjacent land uses as a result of this density:

- Adverse impacts on an already sensitive landscape due to additional land required for development
- The proposal will encroach towards Stapleton, undermining Stapleton's own character and identity
- The scale and shape of the Barwell SUE creates a long development area which, with some developments being up to 900m from the new local centre and even further from the existing district centre, further than a walkable distance, undermining the concept of sustainable extensions.
- Residents of the proposed SUE are more likely to journey to the supermarket on Barwell Lane, Hinckley as opposed to the Barwell centre undermining the intention to strengthen facilities to strengthen facilities in Barwell and the principles of sustainability.

One respondent suggests that the provision of new social housing should be located on public transport routes, offering residents easy access and contributing to making transport schemes viable.

Boyer Planning (72) has submitted land for consideration for development at Elmesthorpe Lane, Earl Shilton to make up for the perceived shortfall in housing provision. It is estimated the site could accommodate 350 to 400 new dwellings. The respondent requests that the Green Wedge review is considered in the AAP (rather than the Site Allocations DPD) and this site is excluded from the Green Wedge.

Whilst not directly related to the matter of the revised housing density, Walsingham Planning (56) state that the site occupied by The King William Public House situated on the south side of the Hollow to the east of its junction with Station Road in Earl Shilton has development potential and nominate it as a possible development site for residential and / or commercial use.

HBBC Response

Policy 16 of the Core Strategy states that proposals for new residential development in Earl Shilton and Barwell will be required to meet a minimum net density of at least 40 dwellings. In exceptional circumstances, where individual site characteristics dictate and are justified, a lower density may be acceptable.

During the preparation of the Core Strategy, the Council included an over-provision of 642 dwellings to act as a contingency should the SUEs not be able to accommodate the 4500 dwellings identified through Core Strategy policies 2 and 3. This over-provision will enable the Council to absorb the shortfall of 400 dwellings within the Earl Shilton SUE, as identified in this AAP.

The Council are not considering other development proposals outside of the SUEs. All site allocations to accommodate the residual housing requirement for the Borough will be allocated in the emerging Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD, the pre-submission version of which is due to be consulted in Autumn / Winter 2013.

Transport

Impacts of Road Borne Transport (including access and routing)

A majority of the residents who have responded are concerned with the potential impacts from an increase in traffic generated from the proposed development in the existing District Centres and surrounding area. Respondents state that the existing levels of traffic are already unacceptable and the area will not be able to accommodate the additional traffic, particularly on local roads through existing developments. Concerns primarily relate to:

- Exacerbating existing congestion;
- Concerns over safety, particularly on roads with little or no traffic; and
- Adverse impacts on amenity such as noise pollution, light pollution.

A number of concerns are set in the context of the existing network and the proposed routing set out in the masterplans for both of the SUEs, summarised below.

Earl Shilton

Residents are concerned with the impacts associated with the proposed access to Earl Shilton using Mill Lane as set out in Policy 16. There is also general concern about the routes connecting new development to Earl Shilton and the following existing or proposed routes:

- One resident questions whether Breach Lane and Fox Meadows will be able to sustain the increased traffic and there is general objection from residents to the use of Breach Lane other than for pedestrian access.

Respondents also question that if Breach Lane is used as access for public transport how will access be restricted to other vehicles.

- Adverse impacts upon the current levels of traffic and future increase in traffic upon Station Road. One respondent also suggests that the proposed road off Stapleton Lane, situated between the Showman's Ground and Cumberland Way is not a safe option. The respondent suggests that an alternative solution would be north of the Showground where visibility is better.
- Development at Mill Lane / Thurlaston Lane should only have access onto Clickers Way due to concerns of increased traffic on Mill Lane.
- Concern over increased traffic using Weaver Road connecting to the new road system.
- Increase in traffic on Church Street which residents state has seen a rise in traffic and congestion as a result of on-street parking and existing operations in the factory unit. The factory unit has a large amount of unused land around it which could be converted to car parking.
- One resident (46) suggests that it would be better to have the main access as near to the A47 as possible. It is stated that for traffic travelling to and from Leicester, this would avoid the need for traffic to run along Clickers Way and then doubling back. Furthermore it is considered that this would avoid an existing issue of buses running along Masefield Drive causing a bottle neck.
- Leicestershire County Council (LCC) (64) welcome the inclusion of Policy 16, acknowledging that no vehicular access should be provided to Breach Lane. In response to Appendix 3 (A3.1.4) is not in agreement to additional traffic, including public transport vehicles, using Breach Lane due to the constrained width and lack of visibility at the junction with Station Road. However, access through Fox Meadows is considered acceptable.

HBBC Response:

A Strategic Transport Assessment (STA) has been prepared, which considers the impact of the SUE proposals on the road network. The Assessment is supported by transport forecasts using the Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model (LLITM) and the Hinckley and Nuneaton Paramics Model. Highways measures are proposed through the STA, which aim to ensure that growth can be accommodated satisfactorily.

Barwell

LCC (64) are concerned with the cumulative impacts on the highway resulting from increased use of the Stapleton Lane accessing the Barwell Recycling and Household Waste Site (RHWS). The County request that any

improvements to Stapleton Lane take account of the requirements and associated demand arising from the use of the RHWS.

Concerns are raised as to the adverse impacts resulting from increased traffic generation on the following existing or proposed routes:

- The junction with Ashby Road when construction begins, the resident noting that the Hinckley Road is a major bus route. The respondent asks how this issue will be resolved.
- Barwell Parish Council (83) state that the narrow roads in and around Top Down will not cope with the extra traffic.
- A number of residents have raised concerns regarding the increase in traffic on what is considered to be the already busy A447 particularly on safety and congestion grounds. CPRE (60) note that the three road junctions with the A447 will require considerable improvement and question whether consideration has been given to diverting the A447 to the east of Stapleton, thereby removing heavy through traffic from the existing village centre.
- CPRE also comment that the junction of the western access road with the A447 will need to be more elaborate than the simple T junction shown and the junction with the proposed spine road will also need to be more elaborate than a simple T junction.
- One resident questions whether a roundabout will be provided at the A447 / Hinckley Road junction to accommodate the increased traffic on the A447.
- ESTC (81) have passed on concerns of parents taking children to Weavers Close School and St Peters School that pinch points within the vicinity of the schools will not be able to accommodate the increased traffic and a traffic management scheme should be put in place.
- One respondent (41) notes a number of existing issues associated with the 'Top Down' area of Barwell which it is requested are rectified prior to commencement of development such as narrow pavements on Stapleton Lane and on-street parking.
- One resident is concerned that the provision of narrow vehicular access to both district centres and adding traffic calming measures will restrict traffic flow.
- A small number of respondents suggest that a link to the M69 would be beneficial for residents and businesses.

HBBC Response:

A Strategic Transport Assessment (STA) has been prepared, which considers the impact of the proposals on the road network. The Assessment is supported by transport modelling using the Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model (LLITM) and the Hinckley and Nuneaton Paramics Model. Highways measures are proposed through the STA that will serve to provide the necessary capacity along the main strategic corridors for SUE generated traffic.

Car Parking

A small number of residents state that the provision of foot and cycle paths ignores the needs for those that wish to use the car and available parking, particularly for shopping and new residents are much less likely to use facilities by foot / cycle.

Whilst raising concerns over congestion in local roads and the District Centres, a number of residents consider there to be an insufficient number of parking spaces in the centres and to compliment the housing development, which it is stated will lead to a 'cluttered' look and parking on pavements, noting that this is obstructive. It is suggested that various traffic calming measures and parking restrictions should be provided to better manage car parking, vehicle access and congestion.

Conversely, one respondent questions whether the Council has considered barring parking from Chapel Street (Barwell), particularly on the hill approaching the village centre and the provision of a one way system incorporating Church Lane and Dovecote Way. The respondent also suggests utilising the parking area on the corner of Dovecote Way and 'The Common' for Chapel Street residents. It is also requested that consideration could also be given to reducing the speed limit in the "Top Town" area of Barwell.

In response to Figures D and F the County Council (64) are concerned about the illustrations appearing to show rear parking courts. The County state that in their experience, home occupiers are increasingly likely to ignore rear parking and park as close to the access of their homes as possible leading to on-street parking congestion to the detriment of pedestrians, cyclists and other road users, whilst rear parking courts remain unused, resulting in further disadvantages in terms of empty spaces and antisocial behaviour. The County recommend an approach on the basis of the criteria applied in the 'Building for Life' standard for well-designed homes and neighbourhoods.

HBBC Response:

The close integration between the proposed SUEs and the existing settlements of Earl Shilton and Barwell will provide excellent opportunities for journeys on foot, bicycle and by public transport. Notwithstanding the

emphasis on the promotion of sustainable travel, it is recognised that private car journeys will continue to account for a significant proportion of overall trips to and from the SUEs. This is recognised through the mitigation strategy contained in the Strategic Transport Assessment (STA).

The STA sets out the arrangements for car parking in the SUEs. The STA acknowledges that car parking will be integrated within the overall design that is convenient for users but does not become visually intrusive or dominate the streetscape. A range of car parking solutions will be explored when considering the detailed development proposals including on and off plot parking areas together with on-street parking.

The STA also acknowledges that vehicle parking (in the SUEs or as part of development in the existing centres) shall be provided in accordance with the parking standards adopted by Leicestershire County Council. In addition to identifying the required levels of parking within developments, the LCC guidance also contains advice on the design and layout of parking and servicing areas.

Detailed matters such as existing car parking provision and parking and access restrictions in the existing settlements are detailed matters to be considered by the Highways Authority when considering proposals for improvements to the public realm or the highways implications of detailed proposals in the SUEs.

The illustrative vignettes provide an indicative layout incorporating the principles of development in the areas identified. The vignettes state that the residential development layouts are indicative recognising that the detailed design and layout is still to be determined at the detailed planning application stage.

Highways Agency

In response to the Preferred Options AAP, the Highways Agency (HA) (65) identified the following issues:

- Concerned with the impacts upon the Strategic Highways Network notably the M1; M69 and particularly the impacts on the A5
- The HA considers that none of the transport matters referred to in the Inspector's report of the Core Strategy regarding have been addressed appropriately in the AAP
- The HA has not been involved with the preparation of an Infrastructure Plan (IP) and therefore the HA is unable to ascertain how the plan will address the need for improvements to the A5. The absence of an IP raises uncertainty over whether there is a reasonable prospect that necessary transport infrastructure can be delivered in a timely manner. The HA is also concerned that the draft AAP does not provide a timescale for when the IP will be produced.

- The HA has prepared an assessment of a number of options for addressing existing transport problems on the A5 and note they are keen to share this information to inform the AAP.

HBBC Response:

The Council has commissioned a Strategic Transport Assessment to identify a framework of transport measures required to support the development of the SUEs. The STA was informed by a two tier modelling process assessing the strategic (LLITM model) and local (Paramics model) impacts under the 'do-minimum' and 'do-something' (with and without mitigation). The strategic modelling assessed the key strategic movements between the SUEs and existing and planned development such as MIRA and the impacts upon the strategic highway network (SHN). The Paramics modelling focussed upon the impacts upon the local road network and relationship to the SHN, informing the range of mitigation schemes included in the Infrastructure Schedule.

The focus of the mitigation strategy is on the identification of improvement measures at key junctions along the primary highway corridors that are highlighted as displaying significant congestion in the existing and predicted traffic scenarios. The STA includes a Transport Infrastructure Implementation Plan which has informed the AAP Infrastructure Schedule. The Implementation Plan sets out the estimated costs of indicative schemes and the proportion contribution to be sought from the developers for respective SUEs.

Public Transport

Respondents are supportive of the principle of increasing the provision and accessibility to public transport, including improvements to existing facilities or, whilst not opposed to public transport, have concerns with the routing of schemes being proposed. Particularly, a number of residents are concerned with Breach Lane being used as a bus route due to concerns of adverse impacts on amenity and safety issues. There is also concern that once Breach Lane is opened up as a bus route, other vehicles will also access this route.

Other suggestions state that bus operators should be involved in informing the most suitable, viable bus routes and 'real-time' service information at bus stops would be beneficial and a tram network from the Hinckley station to cover Hinckley, Barwell and Earl Shilton should be provided.

HBBC Response:

As part of the overall movement strategy developed as part of the STA, a proposed Bus Strategy has been developed in consultation with LCC and following discussions with local operators. A key aim has been to ensure that good connectivity is achieved with the proposed housing and existing major employment areas and the existing facilities within Earl Shilton and Barwell settlement centres. Consideration has been given to the current level of service that is available to the existing settlements and how this can be

improved and expanded to the SUEs.

The southern access will necessitate extending Masefield Drive across Breach Lane and into the SUE. The detailed design of this connection (linked to a future detailed planning proposal) will need to ensure that vehicle movements between the access road and Breach Lane are prohibited, so as not to allow a connection between Breach Lane and the Bypass or between the SUE and Breach Lane.

The Infrastructure Schedule includes the need for investment into the provision of 'real-time' service information.

Walking and Cycling

Respondents recommend a number of small improvements to existing cycle and access routes could be delivered through the proposals, including:

- Improvement to the surface and drainage of Barwell Lane;
- Cycling restrictions removed between the end of The Barracks and Jersey Way as well as widening and improving footpaths to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians and enhance links to local amenities.

One respondent (78) suggests that the green strip that runs behind all the properties between Mill lane and Thurlaston Lane needs to be made into a cycle route and footpath for residents to have access to the village without using cars and walking along roads.

CPRE (60) suggest that opportunities should be sought to improve the cross linking of public footpaths 2-3 miles away from the settlement boundary. Furthermore, CPRE also suggest the following additional cycle routes:

- Existing bridleway T98 could be linked to the proposed spine road which would provide a safe off-road cycle route to the centre of Stapleton (added to Figures 6 & 7);
- Linking Earl Shilton with Stoney Stanton under the M69 at Barrow Hill Quarry; and
- A cross-country link between A447 and A47 using bridleway T76A.

Carlton PC (61) also support the provision of a cycle route connecting Dadlington Lane, Stapleton with the Barwell Action Area by way of the existing bridleway near the chapel at the east side of Stapleton which runs eastwards to within one small field of the proposed Barwell settlement boundary. The Parish Council state that this would be the only quiet link for cyclists from Barwell to the network of lanes around Shenton and the Battlefield Centre, and would also link to Sustrans route 52.

A suggestion has been submitted that encouragement should be given to enhancing the use of public space and footpath / bridle way provision, particularly access to the countryside. Specific reference is made to 'Clickers Way' (Earl Shilton) (top of the bank on both sides).

A number of residents are seeking the provision of a footpath and hedgerow bridleway between Mill Lane Thurlaston Lane. It is suggested that a footpath from Mill Lane – Thurlaston Lane needs to be highlighted as a new wide lit walkway and cycle route, ideally tree lined.

HBBC Response

The council welcomes suggestions for maximising and enhancing existing cycling and pedestrian routes or the provision of new routes and access points.

The pedestrian and cycle strategies in the STA set out a number of proposed routes and schemes which maximise the permeability and accessibility within and between the SUEs, district centres and surrounding networks.

The masterplan indicates a number of cycleways running through the SUEs, it should be noted that these are not the only places that cyclists will be encouraged to ride. The SUE will be fully permeable for cyclists creating an environment which actively promotes cycling as a mode choice.

It should be noted that the schemes referred to in the STA and footpaths and cycleways identified on the masterplans could be supplemented by further schemes when detailed proposals are considered at the planning application stage.

Employment and Retail

Provision of Employment Land

A number of residents state that not enough consideration has been given to industrial regeneration and employment in Earl Shilton in the AAP. It is commented that the area needs more industrial regeneration to support the level of housing growth. It is the view that the focus of the strategy should be to encourage business and enterprise first ahead of the additional housing.

Respondents from the development industry (Landmark Planning (51); JGP Property Ltd (47)) note that the AAP does not seek to make the necessary provision for employment land as specified in the Core Strategy (Policies 2 and 3) – resulting in a shortfall of 14.25ha. It is stated that there is no justification as to why the employment areas in both SUEs have been reduced. The respondents' request that any shortfall of employment provision not accommodated in the SUEs should either be reinstated or allocated elsewhere through the Site Allocations DPD.

One respondent (79), whilst acknowledging that B1 use should be more limited in order not to compete with the strategy for Hinckley Town Centre, suggests that some B1 provision should be made to provide a sustainable business ecosystem. The respondent concludes by suggesting that some

changes need to be made to Policy 21 and paragraph 8.3.10 to allow limited B1 use, rather than exclude it altogether.

A number of residents question why new development for employment use is being proposed when closed business premises in the area should be developed before green land is targeted.

Residents have also requested whether some limitation could be placed on the number of new takeaways in the existing centres and new developments.

HBBC Response:

The AAP does not detract from utilising existing employment land but makes provision for employment land required to support the growth in population likely to be generated from the SUEs.

The reduction in employment land provision reflects the evidence contained in the Earl Shilton and Barwell Employment Land Assessment (King Sturge, 2010) which was published alongside the 2011 consultation. The assessment undertakes a review of the requirement for employment land set out in the Core Strategy, estimating the market need for employment land from the population growth that is likely to be generated from the SUEs.

The Council has undertaken a review (employment Land and Premises Study) of all existing employment land within the two settlements and assessed their suitability for redevelopment. The AAP supports the retention of suitable sites for reuse of similar or alternative employment uses.

The proposals set out in the SUE development frameworks include the proposed allocation of land for employment uses, which will enable the development of business units that are fit for modern needs.

Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW)

A number of respondents have raised concerns over the pressure on existing capacity of the WWTW and whether the facility will be able to accommodate the increased population. Concerns are raised that the water and sewage drainage systems require significant upgrading or relocating and question how this is to be funded.

The Environment Agency (EA) (77) state that without further treatment capacity being provided and a review of consent limits, any additional foul flows to Earl Shilton (WWTW) generated by the SUEs could prevent Thurlaston Brook from achieving 'Good' ecological status. The EA request the authority liaises with Severn Trent Water to ensure that plans are in place to increase the capacity so that additional flows from the SUEs will not compromise the ability to comply with the Objectives of the Water Framework Directive.

Furthermore, in response to the alternative proposal to direct all flows to the Hinckley WWTW, the EA wish to ensure that there is no increase in flood risk (surface water or foul water) as a result of proposals to centralise sewage treatment. If a higher flow consent is required, the EA expect the volume of additional effluent discharged to Sketchley Brook to be quantified and compared with existing flows during a flood event on the watercourse. Any impacts will need to be fully mitigated. Similar concerns of conformity to the objectives of the Water Framework Directive are also raised.

HBBC Response:

The AAP has been prepared in consultation with Severn Trent Water (STW) to assess the development implications on the Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) in terms of capacity requirements and the sensitivity in proximity to proposed land uses. The Council have liaised with STW to ensure that the existing sewage treatment network will be able to accommodate the increased demand, through existing or the provision of additional capacity.

All utilities infrastructure is expected to be provided by the relevant infrastructure provider. STW have confirmed that for works such as the provision of additional treatment capacity, funding is provided by STW and for other infrastructure such as sewerage and water mains reinforcements and diversions, funding is usually sought by developers offset by STW through the requisitioning process. Other charges include infrastructure and connection charges levied on each property connected.

The Environment Agency will be consulted on all SUE development proposals to ensure detailed matters such as those referred above are considered by the applicant.

Waste Management

Leicestershire County Council (LCC - 64) state there is insufficient consideration given to waste management provision. LCC specifically refers to the following:

- In general, planning for waste and recycling storage and access should be integral to the design of the SUE.
- There will be insufficient capacity at the existing RHWS infrastructure with an estimated 16% increase in usage arising from the SUEs and the County are seeking developer contributions to accommodate this increase.
- There is no recognition of provision of 'bring banks' in the SUEs.

The EA (77) recommends that that an appraisal is undertaken of the existing waste management infrastructure that would serve the SUEs to determine:

- Whether sufficient capacity is available within existing waste management infrastructure to meet local waste management needs.

- Potential for expansion of existing facilities (such as the Civic Amenity site at Barwell) to accommodate additional waste from the SUEs, recognising that this could be an opportunity to improve or enhance existing facilities.
- A need for additional facilities, provision of which should be made through the AAP.

One respondent states that the Area Action Plan offers a good opportunity to relocate the recycling centre on Stapleton Lane to the proposed employment area in the southern part of the Barwell SUE. The recycling centre would then be situated in a more central location to serve residents of the Hinckley Urban Core.

HBBC Response:

The Borough Council has sought advice from Leicestershire County Council, as the Waste Disposal Authority, to establish the additional capacity requirements to accommodate the growth in waste arisings likely to be deposited at the Barwell Recycling and Household Waste Site (RHWS).

To accommodate the anticipated increase in waste generated from the population growth associated with the SUEs, the County Council will request developer contributions for the Barwell Civic Amenity Site to enable the County Council to maintain the same level of service to the residents of the additional dwellings which the development proposes.

The contributions sought would be used to provide for the additional capacity needed to accommodate the waste that would be generated by the proposed residential development at the Barwell Civic Amenity Site. The additional capacity could be provided by for example the purchase and installation of additional compaction equipment; the provision of additional containers; or by extending the number or size of storage areas/bays at the site; these allowing the site to handle the likely increased usage of the Barwell Civic Amenity site that would not otherwise arise except due to development of the SUEs.

The indicative financial contributions to be sought from the respective developers for the two SUEs to fund additional capacity at the RHWS are set out in the AAP Infrastructure Schedule.

Natural and Historic Environment

Natural Environment

Residents are concerned that there is no acknowledgment of the habitats which are considered to be under threat from the two SUEs. Some respondents have commented that no areas have been provided for such use in the development areas. One respondent suggests that local wildlife areas are also designated outside the immediate curtilages of both SUEs.

Natural England (58) recommends that a landscape and nature conservation management plan follows on from the AAP to ensure that the green infrastructure is managed and maintained in the future. The tree planting and landscaping proposed should use native plant material of local provenance as much as possible.

CPRE (60) note that in Section 6 there are remarkably few significant trees in the existing urban areas. The high probability of hotter summers suggests that the provision of shade will become a critical issue as time passes. It is suggested that more consideration should be given to the provision of large shade-providing specimen trees.

CPRE also have concerns whether the number of LEAPS being proposed is sustainable, i.e. regular inspection and maintenance will be expensive.

HBBC Response:

The Hinckley & Bosworth Biodiversity Assessment was published in March 2009. The aim of this assessment is to provide the Borough Council with information on the natural biodiversity assets within the Borough.

There are no statutory designated wildlife sites within the proposed sustainable urban extensions, but Little Fields Farm Meadow within the proposed Barwell SUE has been designated as a local wildlife site and will therefore be retained. In addition, the retention of existing hedgerows is a key element within the two SUE development frameworks. The Landowners and Developers have undertaken phase 1 habitat surveys to identify habitats and species of interest within the proposed SUEs. Specific surveys will be undertaken by developers within the appropriate seasons and where necessary, appropriate planning conditions relating to mitigation will be considered..

Historic Environment

One respondent states there is no identified potential for a heritage improvement area such as improvements to shop frontages.

English Heritage (45) comment that whilst the development framework appears to protect the setting of Barwell House Farm and stable wing (Grade II listed) with the provision of natural green space and a landscape buffer, there is concern that employment uses will not be the most sympathetic land use to ensure the protection of the setting of the buildings.

HBBC Response:

The AAP acknowledges the location and importance of Barwell House Farm, particularly to those following the Leicestershire Round Strategic Footpath and the landscape sensitivity of the area. The development framework identifies the diversion of the Leicestershire Round to the south of the

proposed employment land.

Education

A number of residents are concerned that although the new primary school in the area has been mentioned, the closure of the existing school has not, which is objected to. Residents are concerned that there will not be enough existing pupil capacity to serve the future population.

HBBC Response:

The Council has engaged with Leicestershire County Council, as the education authority, to identify the additional education provision required to support the pupil need likely to be generated from the SUEs taking into account existing capacity.

The AAP requires the provision of a primary school in each of the SUEs to serve the respective population, the indicative costs of which are provided in the AAP Infrastructure Schedule.

LCC have advised that there is currently insufficient capacity to accommodate the demand for secondary education likely to be generated by the SUEs. LCC have identified the likely number of places to be required and the associated costs for extending / remodelling of the existing High and upper Schools set out in the AAP Infrastructure Schedule.

Sport, Recreation and POS

Play and Open Space and Recreation

One respondent objects to development at Breach Lane / Clickers Way fields as this will result in adverse impacts upon the quality of life for residents as the area currently provides opportunity for off lead exercise for dogs. There is concern that no replacement area is being proposed.

Earl Shilton Town Council (ESTC) (81) request that developers consult with the Town Council prior to equipping formal play areas to ensure that the equipment to be installed is in accordance with the Council's requirements for Health and Safety standards and commonality of maintenance needs. ESTC seek clarification as to whether they will be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed green corridor connecting the extended green space to the WWTW. Furthermore, ESTC state that the 10 year S106 contributions are considered to be inadequate as inflation diminishes the value of the residual amounts (particularly for maintenance). This matter should be addressed when negotiating maintenance agreements.

Respondents from the development industry object to Policy 5 on the basis that the financial obligation, in respect of further green space remote from the Barwell SUE, is not justifiable. It is considered that because the SUE is already addressing the existing deficiencies in the quality of green space and play provision in Barwell, such a financial contribution would not satisfy the 'CIL tests'. This comment has also been applied to Policy 6, 'Overall Sports and Leisure Facilities' with regards to the provision of the new sport and leisure hub on land off the A47.

Sport England (59) welcome the provision of the LEAPS but question whether the number and distribution will be sustainable due to the potential cost of the regular inspection and maintenance.

Earl Shilton Town Council (81) request that additional recreational land be as closely associated with Weavers Springs as far as possible.

HBBC Response:

The development framework for both SUEs provides for a range of open space and outdoor recreational opportunities. This includes enhancing and extending the existing outdoor sports fields to Clickers Way, central to the Earl Shilton SUE.

The respective Parish Councils will be consulted on all detailed development proposals. Matters such as the maintenance responsibilities of the open space will be considered at the detailed planning application stage.

Detailed requirements for maintenance will be derived through s106 agreements linked to actual schemes promoted by the developer. A mechanism of indexation should be built into such agreements to take inflation into account.

The development frameworks for the SUEs set out the requirements for POS and Outdoor Sports provision, the indicative costs of which are set out in the Infrastructure Schedule contained in the pre-submission AAP. Detailed proposals for POS / Outdoor Sports provision will be assessed against the standards in Policy 19 of the Core Strategy.

Policy 6 has been revised to seek contributions towards new indoor sports and leisure facilities, on or off-site, to meet the demand likely to be generated from the SUEs.

The number of LEAPS has been identified in consultation with the Council's Public Spaces team who have identified the appropriate amount of provision and associated funding to support the maintenance for a period of 20 years.

The outdoor sports provision identified in the Earl Shilton development framework forms in part an extension to the Weavers Springs Recreation Ground. The provision of a new sports pavilion identified in the AAP Infrastructure Schedule, will be provided in this location to support the entire

function of the Recreation Ground.

Allotments

The ear marking of land for allotments should all be implicit in planning proposals.

HBBC Response:

The AAP identifies a number of areas of green space which could be used for the provision of allotments, considered through detailed proposals.

Sports Provision (Indoor and Outdoor)

Residents are concerned that the outdoor sports provision backing onto Boston Way play area (Barwell) will cause disturbance to local residents. These concerns should be addressed through the planning process.

Residents are concerned that the relocation of the Hinckley Leisure Centre will have an impact on the George Ward Centre.

Sport England (59) are concerned that there appears to be a gap regarding the evidence supporting the provision of sports infrastructure. To ensure the existing, and future, resident population are served by appropriate sporting provision, SE conclude that the Council needs to undertake an audit and assessment of the quantity, quality and accessibility of indoor and outdoor sports provision and then identify where investment is required. SE conclude that without this evidence base, it is unclear whether the sport related proposals within the AAP are robust or will deliver the intended opportunities to participate in sport.

HBBC Response:

A 'green buffer' of Natural Green Space is provided between residential properties and the outdoor sports provision located south-west of the Boston Way recreation area to minimise any disturbance to residents. Nevertheless the detailed proposals will consider the proximity and any potential disturbance to nearby properties.

The Council notes the concern raised by residents with regards to the potential impact on the George Ward Centre. Whilst the Council is seeking contributions towards new indoor sports facilities (including leisure centre), the facilities will be complementary to the George Ward Centre which will continue to provide a critical multi-functional community facility to support the function of the district centre which will benefit the existing and future local population.

To inform the requirement for the indoor and outdoor sports provision, the

Council has sought inputs from the its Cultural Services team to identify the capacity required to accommodate the need likely to be generated from the SUEs. The Infrastructure Schedule in the AAP identifies the contributions to be sought to fund additional indoor leisure facilities and on-site delivery of the play and open space provision.

District Centres and Community Facilities

Regeneration and Public Realm

There is concern by some respondents that the employment areas within the SUEs will not bring new businesses to the existing centres and existing businesses will migrate to the new facilities which could stunt the commercial and industrial growth of the area. Respondents state that whilst not unwelcome, it is difficult to envisage how the provision of additional retail in the SUEs would bring further retail business to the villages. Furthermore, new business development should be encouraged on existing business units which are closed, prior to developing Greenfield land.

A number of matters have been raised in response to ensuring that the development does not result in adverse impacts upon the existing centres and contributes to regeneration and improvements where possible.

The County Council (64) state that the Public Realm Strategy proposes to replace a large proportion of the carriageway and pavements in both Earl Shilton and Barwell which, given the amount of funding which will be required to build new junctions onto the bypass, will be unlikely to come from developer contributions. The County raises concern that this may place the onus on LCC highways to fund schemes in the town centre in order to attract people from the SUE into the town centre.

HBBC Response:

Additional employment land is designated to support the market need likely to be generated from the SUEs and compliment and contribute towards the overall needs of the local economy and regeneration of the existing settlements.

The provision of small Neighbourhood Centres within the SUEs and the policies underpinning their delivery compliment the regeneration (and related policies) of the Earl Shilton and Barwell District Centres.

The Public Realm Strategies are included in the AAP to provide an indicative framework to help shape the regeneration of the settlement centres over the plan period. The AAP Infrastructure Schedule identifies a range of highways schemes required to support the delivery of both SUEs as identified in the STA. Furthermore the Schedule identifies indicative costs of the of delivering the public realm strategy set out in the AAP and potential funding sources

such as the New Homes Bonus. The Schedule and the Implementation and Delivery Plan identify a number of key stakeholders who will contribute towards the successful regeneration of the two centres.

The following are specific comments relating to each settlement:

Barwell

A number of residents comment that the regeneration of Barwell High Street and village centre should be strongly considered in addition to investing in improvements which will encourage inward investment, such as improvements to shop frontages and private dwellings. Special attention should be given to the rejuvenation and promotion of a traditional High Street. It is requested that retailers should contribute to public realm improvements by improving existing frontages. Furthermore, new facilities should be provided within Barwell village centre to encourage users from the SUEs.

The County Council (64) suggest that further emphasis is required that the Public Realm Strategy for the Barwell centre is an indicative proposal. The County acknowledge that issue regarding drainage, lighting, traffic management and walking and cycling access need to be considered in greater detail as the schemes are progressed (see proposed changes to Figure 13).

HBBC Response

The purpose of the Public Realm Strategy is to provide a framework to shape and support the regeneration of Barwell. Policy in the AAP has been revised to encourage proposals within both settlement centres, which either realise the identified development opportunities, or new facilities which will contribute towards meeting the objectives of regeneration and improving the public realm of the centres.

The AAP Infrastructure Schedule identifies indicative costs of the of delivering the public realm strategy set out in the AAP and potential funding sources such as the New Homes Bonus. The Schedule and the Implementation and Delivery Plan identify a number of key stakeholders who will contribute towards the successful regeneration of the two centres.

The Council has revised the AAP to make it clear that the Public Realm Strategies for both SUEs are indicative and detailed matters will need to be addressed when devising proposals.

Earl Shilton

Concern over cumulative impacts of development between Mill Lane and Thurlaston Lane upon local facilities and amenity in conjunction with existing development at Breach Lane and Montgomery Gardens.

LCC (64) state there is no provision for meeting points or focal points to create new village centres.

Measures to improve highway safety, in particular for pedestrians is key to encouraging more people to use village centre facilities however provision is sought for a Village Centre car park or additional car parking provision in general which is considered to be a key priority.

HBBC Response:

References to proposed development between Mill Lane and Thurlaston Lane relate to planning application 10/00401/FUL for the development of 200 houses at land between Mill Lane, Thurlaston Lane and Clickers Way, Earl Shilton, Leicestershire. This application was refused planning permission by the Borough Council. The AAP provides a planning policy framework to support the Council in securing appropriate infrastructure requirements arising from the SUE.

The focus of the AAP is to improve the vitality and viability of the existing settlement centres. Provision is made within the development frameworks for both proposed SUEs for the development of Neighbourhood Centres. In addition, play and open space within the SUEs will provide focal points.

The Strategic Transport Assessment and associated policies within the AAP seek to ensure that the SUEs encourage travel by sustainable modes.

Health Care

Whilst support has been given to the provision of a medical centre, respondents have asked that sheltered housing, retirement home or care home be included in the proposals.

Although health facilities are being sought in the 'Community Hub', respondents request that opportunity sites in Barwell should be used in preference to remain consistent with Policy 22 and paragraph 8.3.15.

Furthermore, a request has been submitted that local health care providers consider improving the range of services offered at either of the surgeries in Barwell or the facilities in Hinckley, particularly for the provision of out-of-hours services to residents. Concern is also raised as to whether existing capacity at Barwell GP surgery will be able to accommodate the demand from the increased population growth.

HBBC Response:

The AAP does not prevent the delivery of sheltered housing, retirement homes or care homes within proposals to be submitted as planning applications to the Borough Council for development within the SUEs. These types of uses could be accommodated within the residential uses identified in the development.

The AAP is flexible to accommodate provision of new GP facilities in the SUEs or to seek appropriate developer contributions to enhance and increase capacity at the existing surgeries. The Council has consulted the PCT/CCG to identify how much capacity is required to support the SUEs.

Cemeteries

Whilst acknowledging that the space dedicated for cemetery use is adequate for the present size of the town ESTC (81) and some residents are concerned that there is insufficient land for cemeteries to accommodate the future population and no allowance has been made to accommodate this in the design of the SUE.

HBBC Response:

The Development Framework for Earl Shilton includes an extension to existing cemetery provision. Furthermore the open space provision could also accommodate further capacity if there is an identified need considered further at the detailed planning application stage.

Design

Development Considerations

One respondent states that the design, use of materials and energy production and consumption and the green areas for wildlife and the ear marking of land for allotments should all be implicit in planning proposals.

Natural England (58) recommends that “urban greening” measures should be incorporated into the design of new buildings such as green roofs and walls.

LCC (64) state there is an opportunity to deliver large scale and innovative environmental efficiency / renewable energy schemes to achieve the targets identified in Policy 24 of the Core Strategy.

In response to Appendices 3 and 4 (Figure Hi, ii, iii) the County also make the following comments:

- There is a need to consider the long term appearance and maintenance issues associated with timber cladding;
- Similarly maintenance considerations also apply to shrubbery in areas in front of dwellings; and
- Consideration will also need to be given to spaces that may attract anti-social behaviour.

HBBC Response:

The SUE development frameworks seek to ensure that the developments are delivered alongside an appropriate level of formal and informal open space. They also seek to retain existing hedgerows wherever possible. In addition, the Local Wildlife Site (Little Fields Farm Meadow) will continue to be protected.

Policy 24 of the Core Strategy requires new development in Earl Shilton and Barwell to meet appropriate standards in relation to sustainable design and technology. SUE developers will be required to meet these standards through detailed planning proposals. Furthermore, requirements of the Building Regulations will require new homes to be 'Zero Carbon' from 2016 onwards followed by non-domestic buildings from 2019.

The Borough Council is currently exploring the potential of renewable energy capacity provision in the Borough. Current evidence suggests that for larger – scale (District Heating) schemes to be considered feasible within the SUEs, a density of 45-50dph is required throughout the developments. Nevertheless, there is scope for consideration of micro-generation schemes such as solar or small-scale wind generation within detailed development proposals.

Specific on-site design considerations, for example the use of materials such as timber cladding will be considered at the detailed planning stage.

Maintenance requirements associated with incidental open space within the SUEs will be a consideration within s106 agreements associated with SUE developments.

Water Resources and Management

The Environment Agency (77) state there should be greater emphasis placed on sustainable water management within the AAP. The EA also request that surface water reduction (taking account of climate change) is taken into account in any rebuilding / redevelopment in the District Centres. Priority should be given to permeable surfacing under paving storage to reduce surface water run-off where paving is to be replaced, especially where ground levels are to be raised.

In response to the illustrative layout for Barwell, the EA suggest serious consideration is given to connecting the upstream and downstream sections

of the culverted watercourse that is currently buried under the existing recreation ground by constructing a new length of open watercourse around the recreation ground.

The EA state that whilst reference is made to 'sustainable homes' (Policies 12 & 20) this has not been defined. Furthermore, it is recommended that any new homes should, as a minimum, achieve the 'water efficiency component' of Level 3/4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes – this relates to a level of 105 litres per person per day. New homes built after 2017 should be required to meet Code Level 5 and 6 (including the water efficiency targets) as long as this does not compromise the ability to meet the zero carbon target.

The EA also recommend that for non-residential buildings, developers also demonstrate that they have considered water efficiency and conservation in the design and maintenance of the buildings. Where standards currently exist for a particular building type, it is recommended that developers aim for BREEAM Very Good or Excellent standards and that maximum points are scored on water.

HBBC Response:

The Implementation Plan in the AAP acknowledges the need for drainage strategies to be prepared at the planning application stage. The Implementation Plan also acknowledges that a flood risk assessment and assessment of the impact from the SUEs on the watercourses will be required including any potential mitigation strategies.

The requirement for meeting BREEAM standards is set out in Policy 24 of the Core Strategy.

Other Infrastructure Provision

LCC (64) state that there is no mention of other community facilities such as Church halls, scout huts, Age Concern. The County Council reaffirm that such facilities are as important as schools.

One respondent (79) suggests that further work is required to assess whether there will be sufficient internet capacity provided within the settlements and that Barwell and Earl Shilton are highlighted with telecommunications providers as key growth areas, both in residential and business terms.

HBBC Response:

The AAP identifies a Neighbourhood Centre for each SUE and supports the provision community facilities within them. The document does not preclude the development of any one facility however it will be for the applicant and the respective Parish Council's to identify the local need and most appropriate facilities which are considered will be of most benefit to the local population.

The Council has undertaken a review of all existing community facilities within the settlements. The AAP seeks to safeguard all community facilities and provides policy for their retention or the development of new facilities. Furthermore, a Community Buildings Audit was commissioned by Earl Shilton Council and Barwell Parish Council. This sought to review the suitability and identifying opportunities for investing and enhancing existing facilities to inform future decisions as to the uses and demand for existing and new community facilities.

The provision of appropriate telecommunications will be a detailed matter to be considered at the outline / detailed planning application stage. The applicant or utility companies will be expected to provide additional telecommunications infrastructure appropriate to serve the SUEs.

Funding and Delivery

There is an overriding concern, primarily from the development industry, that the document does not state upfront how the necessary infrastructure will be funded.

LCC (64) are concerned that the scale of replacement and new highways set out in the Public Realm Strategy will not be able to be entirely funded from developer contributions, which could place the onus on the County Council as the Highways Authority to contribute towards the funding of such schemes.

Developers are concerned that there is no recognition in the plan for potential contributions from other sources of funding, including growth point funding or infrastructure providers and this matter needs to be explored further through the infrastructure planning process.

Pegasus Planning Group (43); note that there is a disproportionate burden on development through the AAP to provide for infrastructure to support additional development in and around Hinckley. Other respondents from the development industry (JS Bloor Services Ltd (66) and How Planning LLP (75)) also note that there is insufficient evidence set out in the AAP to demonstrate that the contributions required will meet the CIL tests. Respondents are concerned that developer contributions identified throughout the policies in the AAP have not been satisfactorily assessed against the CIL tests. The respondents suggest that appropriate evidence should be provided so as not to put infrastructure delivery at risk. There is also concern that the AAP does not test the impact on viability of the developer contributions being sought.

A number of developers state that the timetable for the implementation for bringing the proposals forward has not been provided and should be included in the Publication version of the plan. Specifically, Barwood DS Ltd (76) suggests that a logistical phasing plan is provided to deliver the required infrastructure and road transport improvement works. It is suggested that this

should be in line with the growth/delivery of the projects in order not to financially overburden the project at key stages and potentially slow their delivery.

HBBC Response:

A key function of the AAP is to identify the likely infrastructure (either on-site or off-site) required to support the delivery and mitigate the impacts of the SUEs and provide a framework for the delivery of this infrastructure.

The Council has undertaken a significant amount of work to identify the likely infrastructure requirements as evident in the AAP Infrastructure Schedule. The Council have engaged with the relevant infrastructure and service providers to identify the indicative infrastructure or developers contributions to be sought to fund the necessary schemes to accommodate the population growth.

The Infrastructure Schedule identifies the potential key stakeholders and sources of funding to support the delivery of the Public Realm Strategy such as New Homes Bonus. The Borough Council recognises that the Strategy will require funding from a range of sources and it will be for the Borough Council and the respective Town / Parish Councils to prioritise how this funding is spent.

The Council has undertaken a Viability Assessment of the infrastructure requirements (Earl Shilton and Barwell AAP Viability and Deliverability Assessment) to ensure that the indicative costs of the infrastructure to be sought does not compromise the viability and therefore deliverability of the SUEs (in conformity with paragraph 173 of the NPPF). The assessment concludes that both SUEs, including delivery of the infrastructure set out in the Schedule are viable.

The Infrastructure requirements have been informed by the various infrastructure and service providers each using methodological calculations compliant with the CIL Regulations. Where developer contributions are sought to provide off-site infrastructure (such as indoor sports facilities) this is equivalent to the need likely to be generated from the delivery of the SUEs.

Indicative phasing periods are identified in the Infrastructure Schedule informed by the likely annual delivery of dwellings. It is acknowledged that these are indicative phasing periods and could vary subject to the detailed proposals and phasing plan agreed at the planning application stage in consultation with the infrastructure providers.

Policing

There is concern from some residents that the Police will not have sufficient resources available to serve the new developments.

The County Council (64) state that it is not clear how facilities for neighbourhood policing referred to in Policy 14 would fit with existing community houses currently funded by the Districts.

Whilst acknowledging that the requirements for facilities for neighbourhood policing within the community hub on both developments are included in Policies 14 and 22, the Leicestershire Constabulary (26) question whether the AAP should make reference that neighbourhood policing facilities are designed in accordance with Police standards.

HBBC Response:

The Leicestershire Constabulary were consulted on the 2010 consultation draft, who were satisfied that the requirements for neighbourhood policing facilities were included in the AAP as part of the Neighbourhood Centre. The respective policies in the Pre-submission AAP have been revised to seek equivalent developer contributions towards increasing capacity at the existing accommodation for neighbourhood policing if this is considered to be more viable and an efficient use of resources compared to providing new accommodation. Should a CIL compliant case be put forward for further policing infrastructure, this can be considered at the detailed planning application stage.

Natural Resources

How Planning LLP (75) raise concerns that the issue of minerals sterilisation has not been considered. The respondent states that given the potential for sterilisation of development land, this issue needs to be urgently investigated to ensure that the risks to the delivery of the SUE in line with phasing assumptions are minimised. It is requested that this is resolved prior to the Publication Version of the AAP.

HBBC Response:

The implementation plan of the Consultation and Pre-submission draft of the AAP acknowledges that the SUEs lie within Minerals Safeguarding Areas. Therefore further detailed assessments of the viability of the mineral resource will be undertaken at the planning application stage in conformity with policies MCS10, MDC8 and MDC9 of the Leicestershire Minerals Core Strategy Development Control Policies DPD.

Gypsy and Traveller Sites

Whilst welcoming the recognition that there is a need for additional pitches for Showmen, the Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group (42) and LCC (64) comment

that the Plan does not make reference to pitches for gypsies and travellers. The DGLG suggests there may be opportunities to provide new pitches within the development which could be considered as Affordable Housing and therefore funded through S106 obligations. The respondent also notes that the Core Strategy suggests that 25% of new pitches should be socially rented. LCC comment that additional G&T pitches should be allocated in the Plan.

One respondent (79) states it is imperative that suitable boundary treatment is located between the Travelling Show Persons' site and neighbouring residential properties, such as an embankment with vegetation designed and landscaped to prevent physical access, whilst maintaining a visually appealing outlook for residents on both sides of the boundary. Furthermore, it is stated that it would be prudent to allocate the 3 Travelling Show Persons pitches as identified in the 2007 GTA needs assessment in this location.

The respondent suggests that there is an opportunity to provide the Travelling Show Person site with sewage piping, being only located 250m NW of the existing pumping station.

HBBC Response

The Pre-submission AAP requires appropriate mitigation measures between the park and nearby residents to maintain the functionality of Carousel Park whilst protecting the amenity of residents. The Consultation Draft AAP allocated land within the development framework for Barwell to accommodate the three pitches identified in the 2007 GTAA. The Pre-submission AAP has been revised to allow for any potential revision to the number of pitches required for Showpeople in the emerging review of the GTAA due to be published in Autumn 2013.

The consideration of the provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches will be identified in the future Gypsy and Travellers Development Plan Document, preparation of which is currently programmed for Autumn 2013.

Green Infrastructure

A number of respondents (support the importance of retaining, but also where possible, enhancing existing Green Infrastructure (GI) assets. The respondents acknowledge that whilst the AAP identifies key assets such as ancient hedgerows and older trees, there is concern that such assets will not be retained. It is requested that existing tree lines between the SUEs and existing development will be retained and enhanced.

One respondent states that the 'Tweed corridor' (Barwell) as a whole provides an opportunity for a green thread to run through the development, and could be used to dovetail the new development with existing residences. Cumberland Way estate would like to see the Tweed tributary falling from

Kirkby Road to Stapleton Lane planted on both sides to provide an attractive boundary between the existing housing and new ones provided.

A request is submitted that the ancient meadow site identified as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) should be opened up for public access, whether by way of a permit system or otherwise. In particular its close proximity to the Community Focus and likely primary school could provide an opportune educational resource which will encourage children to interact with both nature and their heritage.

HBBC Response:

A key concept of the development frameworks is to maximise and enhance existing green space and green infrastructure to ensure a cohesive relationship to the existing settlements the masterplans encourage the provision of green spaces which benefit the new and existing population but also maximise and where possible, enhance links to similar or complimentary spaces.

Consultation Process

A number of respondents, particularly residents have questioned the validity and purpose of the consultation. Main points being raised include:

- The Comments and options are being ignored.
- It is considered that decisions have already been taken that the development will be built as land has been sold to developers.
- The consultation document does not state what feedback was provided from the previous consultation and that none of previous comments raised have been addressed.
- There is perceived to be a lack of information to publicise the document

HBBC Response:

The AAP is being prepared to shape the development of directions for growth identified within the Council's adopted Core Strategy. The consultation has been carried out in line with the requirements of the Town and County Planning Act 2004 and the Borough Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This has included Issues and Options Consultation during the preparation of Masterplans, which helped shape the policies contained within the Preferred Option AAP.

Further details on the consultation methods used to inform the preparation and the publication of the AAP are provided in the Regulation 30 Consultation Statement.

Summary of Responses received to the Developer's Exhibitions for the Barwell SUE Proposals – January 2012

In January of 2012 the Developer Consortium for the Barwell SUE undertook a pre-application consultation exercise which included 3 exhibitions attended by representatives of the consortium. The consultation formed part of the planning application process for Barwell. The Council received 30 written letters from members of the public, strongly objecting to the principle of development of the SUE providing a number of reasons for objecting. Whilst not being logged as duly made responses to the AAP, the Council has also considered the letters in preparing the Submission version of the Plan. The responses are summarised below.

Stapleton's Village Identity

Residents have significant concern regarding the coalescence of the two settlements of Stapleton and Barwell. Residents state that they like that Stapleton is a village and the atmosphere it has and strongly believe that with the development of the SUE, there would not be a clear distinction between Stapleton and Barwell. Residents state that because the proposed housing estate is only 500 metres from Stapleton's Parish church, the village will effectively become part of Barwell and it threatens Stapleton's identity as a village.

HBBC Response:

The Council recognises the concerns of the residents of Barwell, however the Council conclude that there is an appropriate distance between the proposed Barwell SUE and the village of Stapleton. Furthermore, the landscape assessment and design guidance acknowledges the sensitivity of the proximity of the SUE to Stapleton which will need to be considered through detailed proposals through appropriate density of development and measures to mitigate the visual impact of development.

Increased Traffic

Residents state that traffic is a major issue with the proposed SUE as there would undoubtedly be a sharp increase in the volume and speed of traffic within Stapleton. A number of concerns are raised:

The respondents note that the sharp bend at the Nag's Head is currently very dangerous and coupled with increased speeds would only be exacerbated with the increased traffic.

Residents consider that the inclusion of workplaces, such as warehousing, within the housing estate is absurd given that the only access will be directly from the A447. There is concern that the size of the vehicles serving warehouses will further exacerbate the traffic impacts. Furthermore, respondents state that the addition of a traffic island will only frustrate road users using the A447.

Residents are concerned with increased traffic on a number of popular routes: To Leicester on the A447 via Kirkby Mallory and Peckleton; and to Atherstone, Tamworth and Birmingham via Dadlington Lane and the Fenn Lanes to the A5 which are single track country lanes which will not be able to accommodate the additional traffic.

The comments note that grass verges are already ruined by too much traffic

It is considered that the reference to public transport connecting the SUE to Hinckley railway station is considered absurd as no buses go there. The bus station in Hinckley is 5-10 minutes walk from the railway station.

Concerns over safety issues due to increased volume and speed of traffic in Stapleton from both domestic and construction vehicles which could easily result in more accidents, as well as causing more issues for those crossing the main road to access either the church or chapel.

One resident notes that the proposal would render the potential for a Stapleton by-pass impossible

HBBC Response:

A Strategic Transport Assessment (STA) has been prepared, which considers the impact of the proposals on the road network. The Assessment is supported by transport modelling using the Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model (LLITM) and the Hinckley and Nuneaton Paramics Model. Highways measures are proposed through the STA that will serve to provide the necessary capacity along the main strategic corridors for SUE generated traffic.

Scale of Development

Residents consider that the proposals are out of scale with Barwell itself and the locality. It is considered that with an additional 2,500 houses the existing population of 8,750 could double. Barwell will be larger than Earl Shilton and Burbage and will completely dwarf Stapleton which has a population of 427 and less than 200 houses.

HBBC Response:

There is a requirement to plan for the future supply of housing through the planning system. The Core Strategy identifies the residual housing requirement for the Borough of 5046 dwellings over the period 2006 to 2026.

A 'Direction for Growth' paper was prepared to appraise 7 broad options for housing growth in the Borough. A total of 8 areas to accommodate the growth were considered, from which the two allocations identified for the SUEs were chosen due to them having the least constraints to their development, but also the benefits associated with development providing a catalyst for the

regeneration of their respective settlement centres.

Policy 16 of the Core Strategy states that proposals for new residential development in Earl Shilton and Barwell will be required to meet a minimum net density of at least 40 dwellings. In exceptional circumstances, where individual site characteristics dictate and are justified, a lower density may be acceptable.

Location

Residents consider that the proposed location and layout is such that it is simply a huge housing estate dumped onto good farming land. Respondents state that the Barwell SUE is over times larger than the Sketchley Brook site. Respondents refer to the Site analysis report (2009) and state that the study indicated that the SUE would be much smaller than now proposed and stated that the western boundary would not extend as far as the A447 Ashby Road.

Residents state that whilst it is understandable that Borough Councillors in Hinckley do not want this development in the town, it is not acceptable to locate it “somewhere else”. It is considered that the road system should dictate where housing and employment on this scale should be located as they need direct access to the major road system. Respondents state that there are more suitable sites adjacent to Normandy Way and Clickers Way and also adjacent to the A5. Another resident suggests the site of the old Ferry Pickering printing works on Coventry Road.

Residents question how the housing estate can be ‘sustainable’ when it is to be built on Greenfield agricultural land and not on a brownfield site. It is stated that the additional traffic imposed on the existing road system is also unsustainable.

HBBC Response:

The analysis report does not preclude the boundary of the Barwell SUE extending further if necessary. The extent of the boundary is necessary to deliver the required level of housing, employment and required infrastructure.

A ‘Direction for Growth’ paper was prepared to appraise 7 broad options for housing growth in the Borough. A total of 8 areas to accommodate the growth were considered, from which the two allocations identified for the SUEs were chosen due to them having the least constraints to their development, but also the benefits associated with development providing a catalyst for the regeneration of their respective settlement centres.

In conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the Council is required to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and the need to balance the three strands of sustainability – economic, social and environmental considerations. The principle of sustainable development has been fundamental in determining the location

and requirements for growth of the SUEs.

Flooding

The River Tweed is liable to flood and some of the proposed development is situated on a floodplain, a contradiction that houses should not be built on flood plains.

HBBC Response:

A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment informed the acceptability and suitability of the location of the SUE. As per the response under 'Water Resources and Management' above, flood risk assessments will be required to be submitted with detailed proposals to assess the potential impacts on and effects from possible flooding and identify any appropriate measures to mitigate any adverse impacts.

Localism

Residents make reference to the NPPF ensuring local communities have a more powerful role in determining the shape, location and scale of development in their areas. It is requested that residents see this at work and the Borough Council and Parish Council take note of the growing local opposition to Barwell West.

HBBC Response:

The Council has undertaken a number of consultations using a variety of methods to inform the preparation of the AAP. The Council has met and exceeded the consultation requirements as required by the Town and Country Planning Act (2004) and the requirements of the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. A summary of the consultations methods used is set out in the Council's 'Regulation 30 Consultation Statement'.

Other Matters

One resident states that the provision of burial grounds has not yet been mentioned.

One resident is concerned with the adverse impact on property prices in Stapleton as a result of increased provision in Barwell and the possible perception of Stapleton as an 'urban village' as opposed to a rural village location.

One resident is concerned that there is no provision for a new GP surgery in the proposals and there are no plans for a police station in an area with massive crime problems and anti-social behaviour.

HBBC Response:

The Development Framework for Barwell could accommodate any future requirement for the provision of new cemetery provision.

The issue regarding property prices is not a matter to be considered through the planning system. Nevertheless there is no evidence to suggest that the development of the Barwell SUE and associated regeneration of the District Centre will result in adverse impacts upon property prices.

The AAP seeks the provision of new facilities or financial contributions towards additional capacity for both GP surgeries and police requirements.