

Appendices C

Supplemental Issues and Options Consultation

Appendix C1 List of Consultees

Consultees: 800

11 O'Clock Group	14th Leicester Boys Brigade Company
Abington High School	Access Group
Action Homeless (Leicester) Ltd	Aerodrome Standards, Civil Aviation
Affordable Appliances	Age Concern
Age Concern	Age Concern
Age Concern (Leics. & Rutland)	Age Concern (Leics. & Rutland)
Age Concern (Luncheon Club)	Age Concern (Oadby And Wigston)
Age Concern Bhavic Group	Age Concern Oadby
Age Concern Wigston	Air Speed Taxis
Alexandra Beuchert	All Saints Church Of England Primary School
All Saints Thursday Senior Citizens Club	All Weather Windows & Conservatories
Allseasons Anglling Centre	Alpha Land & Planning
Amelia Hair Salon	Anand Group
Anchor Housing Trust	Andrew Bourne & Co
Andrew Granger & Co	Andrew Granger And Co
Andrew Martin Associates	Ann Kathryn Hairdressers
Apollo Cash & Carry	Architects LE1 LLP
Arriva Midlands	Asda Stores Ltd
Asian Arts Association	Asian Arts Association
Asian Arts Association	Asian Arts Association
Asian Families Support Group	Aylestone Lane Allotment Association
Barclays Bank Plc	Bargain Booze
Barratt East Midlands	Barry's Barbers Shop
Barton Willmore Planning	Barton Willmore Planning
Bassett Street Friendship Club	BBC East Midlands
BBC Leicester	Beauchamp College
Beauchamp College	Beauchamp Physically Handicapped Group
Beauchamp Tuesday Group	Bidwells Property Consultants
Birkett House School And Hostel	Birthdays Ltd
Blaby District Council	Blaby Parish Council
Bloor Homes	Boots The Chemist
Boots The Chemist	Bradford & Bingley Building Society
Branded Clothing	Brimble, Lea And Partners
British Gas	British Gas Connections Ltd
British Gas Pipelines Ltd	British Limbless Ex-Servicemen's Association
British Red Cross (Adult Activities)	British Red Cross Family Support Service
British Red Cross Wigston (Junior Activities)	British Red Cross Wigston (Youth Activities)
British Telecom (Leicester)	British Telecommunications Plc
British Waterways South East	Brockshill Primary School
Brookside County Primary School	Brookside Punjabi Club
Bryant Homes East Midlands Ltd	Bryant Homes East Midlands
Budworth Brown	Buildings Preservation Trust
Bushloe High School	Buy-Cycles
BWEA	Cafe Maromme
Calor Gas Ltd	Campaign For Real Ale
Cancer Research UK	Capricorn Hairdressing
Carol's Hairdressing	Carter Jonas Property Consultants
Castlemore	CBI East Midlands
Central Networks	Centre 88 Project & Mental Health Project
Cerebral Palsy Support Group	CGMS Consulting
Charnwood Borough Council	China Garden
Choice Videos	Chris Sharpe Motorcycles
Christina Louise	Church Commissioners

Church Commissioners For England	Citizens Advice Bureau
Civil Aviation Authority	Clarke Homes Limited
CLASP The Carers Centre	Cleaning Cupboard
Coffee Break	Coffee Pot Group
Commission For Architecture & The Built Environment	Commission For Racial Equality
Confederation Of British Industry	Connell Shakespear
Connells Residential Sales	Conservative Association
Coombes Bakers	Co-Operative Retail Services Ltd
Copyright Libraries Agency	Coral Racing
Corals	Costas Fish And Chip Shop
Council For British Archaeology	Council For British Archaeology
Council For Education Of Romany & Travellers	Countesthorpe Disabled Adults Group
Countesthorpe Parish Council	Countesthorpe Visually Impaired Group
Country Land & Business Association	Country Land & Business Association
CPRE (Leicestershire Group)	Cromwell Logistics
CT Planning	Cub Scouts
Curtis Weston Day Centre	David B Williamson
David Lock Associates	David Wilson Homes
Davis Hill Opticians	Davis Hill Opticians
DCLG	DEFRA
Defra	Del Rosa Developments
Denbydale Residents Group	Department For Education And Employment
Department For Education And Skills	Department For Trade And Industry
Department For Transport	Department Of Constitutional Affairs
Department Of Culture Media And Sport	Department Of Work And Pensions
Dept Of Transport (London)	Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
Development Land And Planning	Devplan UK
Dialogue	Diamond Knitwear Ltd
Diocese Of Leicester	Direct Carpet Supplies Ltd
Disability Right Commission	Divine Innovations
Dominos Pizza	Down's Parent & Toddler Group
Dr M D Glasse	DTZ Pieda Consulting
Dudrich (Holdings) Ltd	Early Bird Computers
East Midlands Ambulance Service	East Midlands Development Agency
East Midlands Electricity	East Midlands Public Health Group
East Midlands Regional Assembly	Edward Coles
Edward Garnier MP	Energy Watch Central
English Heritage	English Partnerships
Environment Agency	Epic Accessories
Equal Opportunities Commission	Equity Insurance Brokers
Eric Wright Carpets	ES Pipelines Ltd
Eskay Jewellers	ESP Networks Ltd
Essential Carpets & Beds	Evergreen (Oadby)
Evergreen (South Wigston)	Exquisite Displays
Eye Check	Fairfax Management Consultants
Fairfield Community Primary School	Fairfield Disabled Group
Fairfield Friendly Club	Fairfield Partially Sighted Group
Fairfield Tuesday Club	Fairfield Visually Handicapped Group
Farm Gate	Farmfoods
Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group	Federation Of Mosceua
Feel Good Factor	Fields In Trust
Fine Pine	First Leicester
First Leicester	Fisher Hargreaves Proctor
Five Winds Pine Shop	Floors To Go
Flower Company	Forbuoys (TM Retail)
Forestry Commission	Forestry Commission
Frail Elderly Group	Framptons

Frank The Barber	Free Church
Freight Transport Association	Friends Of The Earth
Friends Of The Earth	Friends Of The Earth (Leicester Forum Group)
Friends Of The Earth (London HQ)	Friends Of Willow Park
Friends, Families And Travellers	Fruitas Ltd
FWAG	Garry Burnside
Gartree High School	George Wimpey
Gifts & Jewellery Centre	Gifts And Jewellery Centre
Ginger Bread Cottage	Girl Venture Air Cadet Corps
Gladedale	Glen Craft Jewellers
Glen Gorse Golf Club	Glen Parva Parish Council
Glenmere Community Primary School	Global Utility Connections
Going Places	Gordon Davis Pharmacy
Gordon Davis Pharmacy	Gordon Smith Associates
Gough Planning Services	Government Office For The East Midlands
Granary Pets	Great Glen Group For The Disabled
Great Glen Parish Council	Greater Wigston Historical Society
Grevayne Properties Limited	GTC Pipelines Ltd
Guide Dogs For The Blind	Guiding Oadby And Wigston Division
Guthlaxton College	Guthlaxton College
Guthlaxton Young Peoples Centre	GVA Grimley
GVA Grimley	Gypsy And Traveller Law Reform Coalition
Gypsy Council	Hair Elite
Halifax Estate Agents	Halifax Estate Agents Ltd
Hallcross Dental Practice	Hampshires Bakery
Harborough District Council	Hardys And Hanson
Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy	Harrison Murray Ltd
Harrison Murray Surveyors	Hartnell Taylor Cook
Hayes & Barrajo Vets	Health And Safety Executive
Healthy Living	Heards Butchers
Hearing Impaired Pre-School Group	Heating & Bathroom Studio
Helping Hands Advice Centre	Henry Smith Hamylton (Opticians) Ltd
Henry Walker & Son	Hensons PVC Supplies
High Gain House	Highways Agency
Hinckley And Bosworth Borough Council	Hindu Religious And Cultural Society
HM Prison Service	HM Railway Inspectorate
Holland Park Amusements	Home Office
Honda 2000	House Builders Federation
House Builders Federation	Housing Corporation
HSBC Bank Plc	HSBC Plc
Hutchison 3G UK Limited	Iceland
Ilkeston Travel	Immaculate Conception Catholic Church
Impressions	In Home
In Line TV	Independent Pipelines Ltd
India Cottage	Indigo Planning Ltd
Institute Of Directors	Invicta Plastics
Irish Traveller Movement In Britain	ITV Central
ITV Central News East	J & G Cottage
J A Ball New Homes Limited	J P Voyle Shoes
J Sainsbury Plc	Jacobs Bakery Ltd
Jakin Pregnancy Care And Counselling	James Walker Estate Agents
Jasmine Court Social Club	Jeannes Fashions
Jelson Ltd	Jewel In The Crown
JH Antiques	John F Milner Bakers
John Hardy Antiques	John Rain
John Woods Hairdressers	Johnsons Dry Cleaners
Johnsons Fruitiars	Jones Day
K J Featherby & Son	Kilby Parish Council

La Croix Hair Design	Ladbroke Racing
Lancaster Bell Senior Citizens	Landmark Planning
Langmoor Primary School	Launde Primary School
Lawson-West LLP	Leicester & Rutland Sport
Leicester Airport	Leicester Cable Television
Leicester Cable Television	Leicester City Council
Leicester Fish Bar	Leicester Housing Association
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Mercury	Leicester Neighbourhood Watch Association
Leicester Racecourse	Leicester Racecourse
Leicester Shire Promotions Ltd	Leicester Tigers
Leicester Victims Of Crime Support Scheme	Leicestershire & Rutland Bat Group
Leicestershire & Rutland Playing Fields Association	Leicestershire Badger Group
Leicestershire Chamber Of Commerce	Leicestershire Chamber Of Commerce & Industry
Leicestershire Constabulary	Leicestershire Constabulary
Leicestershire County Council	Leicestershire County Council
Leicestershire County Council	Leicestershire Economic Partnership
Leicestershire Fire & Rescue Service	Leicestershire Learning & Skills Council
Leicestershire Records Office	Leicestershire Wildlife Trust
Leics And Rutland Facilities Consortium	Leics, Northants, Rutland Health Authority
Link Into Learning	Little Gems
Little Hill Primary School	Little Stretton Parish Council
Lloyds Pharmacy	Lloyds TSB
Lockhart Garratt	Lords Electrical
Loros	Los Amigos Pizzas
Lou Men's Hairdressers	Lovell Johns
Lucky House Chinese Takeaway	Lunn Poly
Magna Fish Bar	Magna Windows
Malcolm Judd & Partners	Malcolm Scott Consultants Ltd
Manor High Gujarati Club	Manor High School
Mario Hair Studio	Mark Jarvis Racing Service
Mark Jarvis Turf Accountants	Market Harborough Building Society
Marks And Spencers	Marquis Of Queensbury
Marrons Solicitors	Matthew Gough
Mazu Hairdressing	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd
Meadow Community Primary School	Meadows Estate Resident Association
Melton Borough Council	Mencap Head Office
Menphys Centre	Mercury News
Mercury News	Mercury News
Methodist Church	Midland Co-Op Travel
Midland Heart	Midland Screenprinters Ltd
Midlands Co-Op	Midlands Co-Operative Funeral Service
Midlands Co-Operative Society Ltd	Mike Hardy
Miller Homes Ltd	Mind
Ministry Of Defence	Minit Services
Mobile Phone Operators Association	Moghul Crown
Moments	Mono Consultants Ltd
Moon Salon Ltd	Moonlit Chemist
Moss Pharmacy	Mowlem Energy Ltd
Mr & Mrs A C Serjeant	Mr & Mrs Barlow
Mr & Mrs Fahey	Mr & Mrs J R Ward

Mr & Mrs Linsley	Mr & Mrs Moloney
Mr & Mrs P M Cooper	Mr & Mrs Rawson
Mr & Mrs Tebbutt	Mr A Baker
Mr A Hewitt	Mr A Newton
Mr B A Marlow	Mr B Marvin
Mr C Hames	Mr E Sewell
Mr E Stanger	Mr Hewitt
Mr J Moynan	Mr J Rumball
Mr K Rouse	Mr M Kanth
Mr N Samani	Mr P Freer
Mr P Lakin	Mr P Tyler
Mr R Ellis	Mr R Laycock
Mr R Zavery	Mr T Sumpter
Mrs E Spencer	Mrs P Burton
Mrs R Lee	Mrs S Wilkins
Mrs V Hill	Ms F Burgess
Ms K Aucott	Ms P Ward
Ms S Briars	Ms V Brown
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	National Disability Council
National Farmers Union	National Federation Of Women's Institutes
National Grid	National Grid
National Grid UK Gas Distribution	National Offender Management Service
National Playing Fields Association	National Travellers Action Group
National Westminster Plc	Natural England
Natural England	Network Rail
Network Rail	Network Rail
Neville Chadwick Photography	North West Leicestershire District Council
Northwood Residential Lettings	Norwich Property Trust
NTL	O2 (UK) Ltd
Oadby & Wigston Local Strategic Partnership	Oadby & Wigston Muslim Association
Oadby & Wigston Muslim Association	Oadby Angling
Oadby Brookside Women's Institute	Oadby Carpets
Oadby Civic Society	Oadby DIY LTD
Oadby Evangelical Free Church	Oadby Furnishers
Oadby Hindu Association	Oadby Travel Worldchoice
Office Of Government Commerce	Olive Tree Cyprus Taverna
Oliver's	On Yer Bike
Orange Personal Communication Services Ltd	Osbourne Office Stationers
OWBC Graham Norman	OWBC Gil Crisp
OWBC Steve Bruce	OWBC Nikki Heap
OWBC Anne Court	OWBC Jim Walker
OWBC Councillor Lesley Thornton	OWBC Clare Sharpe
OWBC Martin Clegg	OWBC Cllr LA Bentley
OWBC Cllr LM Broadley	OWBC Cllr M Griffiths
OWBC Cllr RI Sylvester	OWBC Cllr HE Loydall
OWBC Cllr SA Dickinson	OWBC Cllr EM Connell
OWBC Cllr PA Hings	OWBC Cllr MO Carrara
OWBC Cllr KMA Brown	OWBC Cllr JM Gore
OWBC Cllr L Eaton	OWBC Cllr JW Boyce
OWBC Cllr TS Biring	OWBC Cllr J Kaufman
OWBC Cllr CS Gore	OWBC Cllr CL Edmonston
OWBC Cllr J Vickerstaff	OWBC Cllr GA Boulter
OWBC Cllr SB Morris	OWBC Cllr GA Gamble
OWBC Cllr P Swift	OWBC Cllr MH Charlesworth
OWBC Cllr RER Morris	OWBC Cllr KJ Loydall
Owner/Occupier 52 Leicester Road Wigston Leicestershire LE18 1DR	Owner/Occupier 3 The Arcade Leicester Road Wigston Leicestershire

Owner/Occupier 4 Leicester RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 1DR	Owner/Occupier 53 Leicester RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 1NR
Owner/Occupier 76 The ParadeOadbyLeicesterLE2 5BF	Owner/Occupier 71 Long StreetWigstonLeicestershireLE18 2AJ
Owner/Occupier 22 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4SB	Owner/Occupier 3 Stoughton RoadOadbyLeicesterLE2 4DS
Owner/Occupier 3 Leicester RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 1NR	Owner/Occupier 34 Leicester RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 1DR
Owner/Occupier 47 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4PA	Owner/Occupier 33 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4PA
Owner/Occupier 95 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4PB	Owner/Occupier 51 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4PA
Owner/Occupier 89 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4PB	Owner/Occupier 9 The ArcadeLeicester RoadWigstonLeicestershire
Owner/Occupier 5 The ArcadeLeicester RoadWigstonLeicestershire	Owner/Occupier 50 Long StreetWigstonLeicestershireLE18 2AH
Owner/Occupier 9 - 11 Bell StreetWigstonLeicestershireLE18 1AD	Owner/Occupier 50E Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4SD
Owner/Occupier 39 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4PA	Owner/Occupier 37 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4PA
Owner/Occupier 48 Chestnut AvenueOadbyLeicesterLE2 5JG	Owner/Occupier 28 The ParadeOadbyLeicesterLE2 5BF
Owner/Occupier 11B Leicester RoadOadbyLeicesterLE2 5BD	Owner/Occupier 66 London RoadOadbyLeicesterLE2 5DH
Owner/Occupier 90 The ParadeOadbyLeicesterLE2 5BF	Owner/Occupier 52 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4SD
Owner/Occupier 73 The ParadeOadbyLeicesterLE2 5BB	Oxfam
Oxfam	P R M Wray
Parivar Group	Parkinson's Disease Society
Parkland Primary School	Peacock & Smith
Peacock & Smith	Pegasus Planning Group
Pegasus Planning Group	Pennywise Discount
Percy Lord & Son Ltd	Perfect Pizza
Persimmon Homes	Persimmon Homes
Pet Care	Peter Jackson Associates
Phillips & Powell Solicitors	PJ Leather Goods/Kimberley Blinds
Planning Issues	Pound World
Poundstretcher	Professional Dog Grooming
Profile Vision	Quadrant Pipelines Ltd
R F Brookes	R Jones Insurance Brokers Ltd
Radleigh Homes	Rail Freight Group
Railtrack Property	RE:Active Young Peoples Forum
Readings Hope & Mann	Red Carpets
Red Lantern Chinese Take AWAY	Redrow Homes Ltd
Remit	Retail Property Consultancy
Retreads 50+ Group	Rich & Carr Solicitors
Riverside Housing Association	Robinson's Jewellers
Roger Hairdressers	Roger Tym & Partners
Roshni Asian Women's Group	Route 55
Royal British Legion	Royal Mail Group (c/o Agent)
Royal Mail Property Holdings	Royal National Institute For The Blind
RPS Group	RSPB (Central England Offices)
Rural Community Council	Rural Housing Trust
Rutland County Council	Saffron Trees Action Group
Sai Superstores	Salsa Wrap
Sandwich	Sapphire & Steel
Savak Samaj	Savers Health And Beauty
Scottish Power Gas Ltd	Scotts Estate Agents
Scout Group	Scout Group Wigston

Severn Trent Water Limited	Sharpe Lanham Accountants Plc
Shoe Zone	Shoefayre Ltd
Sight On Sound Support Group	Sixth Sense Group
Skins And Needles	Skylar Ltd.
Skylark Ltd	Smith Stuart Reynolds
Society For Protection Of Ancient Buildings	Society For The Blind
Sol Homes	Someone Somewhere
South Leicestershire College	South Leicestershire Day Service
South Leicestershire Primary Care Trust	South Wigston Cycle Centre
South Wigston High School	South Wigston Methodist Ladies Circle
South Wigston URC	SP Gas Ltd
Special Needs Family Resource Centre	Special Needs Family Support Centre
Spencers Estate Agents	Spencers Estate Agents Ltd
Spice Of India	Spire Leicester Hospital
Sport England (East Midlands Region)	SSE Pipelines
SSE Pipelines Ltd	St Paul's Church
St Peter's Church	St. John Fisher RC Primary School
Stamford Homes	Stewart Ross Associates
Stonleigh Planning Partnership	Stoughton Parish Council
Strutt & Parker	Subway
Super Dry Cleaners	Swatlands
Sweet Tooth	T J Burgers & Alfa Kebabs
Talk About Group	Talk About Group
Tartan Cafe	Taylor Estate Agents
Tele 2 (UK)	Tesco
The Ankur Group	The Ankur Group
The Ankur Group	The Ankur Group
The Ankur Group	The Ankur Group
The Ankur Group	The Ankur Group
The Bed Place	The Barbers Shop
The British Library	The Black Dog Public House
The Coal Authority	The British Youth Council
The Environment Agency	The Crown Estate
The Fox Inn Public House	The Fairfield Partnership
The Gooseberry Bush Nursery	The Garden History Society
The Housing Corporation	The Gypsy Council
The Littman Partnership	The Inland Waterways Association
The National Trust	The National Trust
The Office Of Government Commerce	The New Inn Public House
The Planning Bureau Ltd	The Old Library Public House
The Retreat Beauty Salon	The Redfern Kirton Partnership
The Royal British Legion	The Robert Doughty Consultancy
The Theatres Trust	The Sikh Welfare And Cultural Society
The William Wyggeston Public House	The Three Bells Public House
Thresher Wine Merchants	The Woodland Trust
Time Display Screen Printers	Thythorn Field Community Primary School
T-Mobile (UK) Ltd	Tippetts Florist
Traveller Education Service	Transco
Travellers Advice Team	Travellers Advice Team
Trevor N Coleman	Travelling Family Services
Turley Associates Ltd	Tubs Taps & Tiles
University Of Leicester	University Hospitals Of Leicester NHS Trust
Video Box	Utility Grid Installations
VISTA	Vision Care Optical Ltd
Voluntary Action For Oadby & Wigston	Vodafone Ltd
Water Leys Primary School	Wans Kitchen Restaurant
Westleigh Development Ltd	Waterloo Housing Group
Wheelers And Shunters Club	Wheatcroft & Son
WI Leicestershire And Rutland	White Young Green Planning
	Wigston Balti House

Wigston Bathroom Centre	Wigston Chippy
Wigston Civic Society	Wigston Club For Young People
Wigston Co-Op Women's Group	Wigston DIY
Wigston Framework Knitters Museum	Wigston Gallery
Wigston Garage & MOT Centre	Wigston Gingerbread
Wigston Jewellers	Wigston Pharmacy
Wigston Pharmacy	Wiling & Able
Wilkinsons	William Davis Ltd
Wilson B Ragg	Winchester Snooker Club
Wistow & Newton Harcourt Parish Council	Womens National Commission
Woodland Grange Primary School	Woods Of Wigston
York And Cooper Opticians	Young Mum's Group
Yum Sing	



Borough of Oadby & Wigston

Directorate of Community Services

E-mail: forwardplans@oadby-wigston.gov.uk

Web Site: www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk

Please ask for: Forward Plans Team

Telephone: 0116 288 8961

Your ref:

Date: June 2007

Dear

Oadby and Wigston Local Development Framework Public Consultation

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council are undertaking an Issues and Options consultation on the following documents between Friday 29 June and Friday 10 August 2007:

- Core Strategy Development Plan Document
- Allocations Development Plan Document
- Oadby Town Centre Masterplan Area Action Plan
- Wigston Town Centre Masterplan Area Action Plan

The consultation documents, supporting information and further information on how to get involved including details of the roadshow and exhibition that will be touring the Borough between 29 June and 6 July can all be found on our website at www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk.

Our website also allows you to submit your comments online – I would encourage you to make use of this facility as it will help to speed up the process of considering your comments. Please note that all comments will be made public and published on our website.

Please note that all comments must be received by **4.15pm on Friday 10 August 2007**.

If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us by email at forwardplans@oadby-wigston.gov.uk or by using any of the numbers below.

Yours sincerely,

Adrian Thorpe
Forward Plans Manager

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council



PLANNING FOR SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES



Oadby and Wigston Borough Council have published brand new Masterplans for Oadby and Wigston Town Centres. These exciting and visionary plans will make the towns fit for the 21st Century by providing opportunities for more retail, office, residential and leisure development.

The Town Centre Masterplan goes out for consultation on Friday 9th November through to Friday 21st December 2007.

For the next six weeks you have the opportunity to speak out regarding the key issues that will shape the future of Oadby & Wigston Town Centres.

As part of the consultation, the Borough Council will be presenting the proposals through our *roadshow exhibition* where officers from the Council's Planning Department will be on-hand to tell you more and answer any questions.

Visit our Roadshow exhibition on the dates below – look out for our 'Big Silver Bus'...

Friday 30th November

10am to 12.30pm
1pm to 3pm

Bell Street, Wigston Town Centre
Chestnut Avenue, Oadby Town Centre

Saturday 1st December

10am to 12.30pm
1pm to 3pm

Chestnut Avenue, Oadby Town Centre
Bell Street, Wigston Town Centre

***Your Town Centres,
Your views,
Your Masterplans...***

envision
PLANNING OUR FUTURE

PR No:

25 June 2007

What do you want Oadby & Wigston to look like in 2021?



Where should we accommodate new development in the Borough? Where should we be directing growth? How can we regenerate our town centres? We need your views!

Oadby & Wigston Borough Council is preparing a new plan called a Local Development Framework (LDF) that will help to determine the best and most sustainable use for land and buildings in Oadby & Wigston up to 2021.

The LDF is a portfolio of documents that will form the Council's spatial planning policies for meeting the community's economic, environmental and social aims. The remit of the LDF covers a range of issues that directly affect people's lives including housing, the character of neighbourhoods, access and movement, health, education, employment, crime prevention, heritage, urban design, the environment, and parks.

For six weeks from the 29 June 2007 there will be an opportunity for you to speak out about the key issues that will shape the future of the Borough.

To kick start the consultation look out for our exhibition trailer where officers from the Borough Council will be available to tell you more and answer any questions:

Friday 29 June	12noon to 4pm	Outside HSBC Bank Chestnut Avenue Oadby Town Centre
----------------	---------------	---

Saturday 30 June	10am to 3pm	Outside Co-Op Bell Street, Wigston Town Centre
------------------	-------------	--

Monday 2 July	12noon to 4pm	Gloucester Crescent Shops South Wigston
Tuesday 3 July	10am to 1pm	Outside HSBC Bank Chestnut Avenue Oadby Town Centre
Tuesday 3 July	2pm to 5pm	Sainsbury's Car Park Glen Road Oadby
Wednesday 4 July	12noon to 4pm	Little Hill Shops Launceston Road Wigston
Thursday 5 July	2pm to 7pm	Tesco Car Park South Wigston
Friday 6 July	10am to 2pm	Outside Co-Op Bell Street, Wigston Town Centre

Copies of all the consultation documents can be viewed on the Council's website: www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk. Alternatively, hard copies are available to view at the Borough Council offices, local libraries or on request by calling 0116 288 8961.

Comments about any of the documents can be submitted in several ways:

Online: Forward Planning pages at www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk

Email: forwardplans@oadby-wigston.gov.uk

Post: Oadby & Wigston Borough Council, Council Offices, Station Road, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 2DR

The deadline for responses is Friday 10 August 2007.

Appendix C5 List of comments received and responses of Oadby and Wigston Borough Council

Respondent	Document Topic	Comment	Officer Response
Leicestershire Constabulary	Choices for Development Growth	Options: From a crime prevention perspective, the advantage of either option 4.3 or 4.2 is that a newly built free-standing settlement or single urban extension would allow for implementation of crime reduction design within a mixed and inclusive community.	Noted
Leicestershire Constabulary	Choices for Development Growth	Large new build development may also more easily attract developer contributions towards policing costs.	Noted
Leicestershire Constabulary	Choices for Development Growth	Perhaps the advantage of 4.3 over 4.2 is that the option would also allow for the removal of disused sites that have or may become a target for crime and vandalism. Arguably option 4.3 may also be easier to police than a new autonomous development which depending on its size and location may need a permanent police presence.	Noted
Leicestershire Constabulary	Choices for Development Growth	Options 4.4 and 4.5 may be acceptable from an operational policing perspective as incremental change is - suggest, initially more easily accommodated than for a new township but these options would limit the opportunity to introduce	Noted

		meaningful crime prevention through environmental design techniques which lowers the need for a police presence. These options would also seem to be the least favoured from a Council and Government perspective	
Leicestershire Constabulary	Choices for Development Growth	Overall 4.3 would therefore seem to be the favoured option.	Noted: Support for Option 4.3
Leicestershire Constabulary	Broad Locations	I have no observations to make in respect of the locations for development.	Noted
Environment Agency	Choices for Development Growth	Whilst the Agency would encourage that new development takes place on only Brownfield sites the major limitation to this is that the Borough would be unable to meet all of its housing allocations solely through brownfield sites. Should this result in a challenge against the Local Development Framework and the resulting unplanned release of Greenfield sites throughout the Borough the council and local community would have only limited input to this process. For this reason the Environment Agency would support Option 4.4 Redevelopment of Brownfield sites and several small sustainable urban extensions.	Noted: Support for Option 4.4
Environment Agency	Choices for Development Growth	Location for Greenfield development should be informed by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment currently being undertaken by the Borough. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has not yet been completed and as such it is difficult to have a preference for the location of development.	Agreed: Strategic Flood Risk Assessment had yet to be finalised at the time of consultation

Environment Agency	Broad Locations	Having examined the results as shown on the 5 pro-forma's Area A is the least preferred. At this time and with the information available we can not comment on the preference of the other four locations.	Noted: Objection to Site A
Environment Agency	SA	<i>It is noted that within the Sustainability Appraisal Appendix B – SA Objective 10 does not mention that parts of Site A are within an area of flood risk.</i>	<i>Comment relates to Sustainability Appraisal</i>
Oadby Civic Society		<i>Oadby Town Centre Scope for radical changes seems to be somewhat limited as the area is small but within itself it is possible to modernise with repaving the sidewalks, new lighting i.e. smaller up-to-date lamp posts and greater displays of flowers. Shop owners to be encouraged to upgrade the 1960 type shop fronts.</i>	<i>Comments not related to Core Strategy consultation</i>
Oadby Civic Society		<i>Parks A number of these should be upgraded to real parks and not just areas of greenery, with sports facilities on one side. Knighton Park in Leicester is a good example of colour</i>	<i>Comments not related to Core Strategy consultation</i>
Oadby Civic Society		Land and Housing Despite government pressure care in planning large estates is essential. Oadby should remain a pleasant, well laid township with careful infilling of well built houses with all the necessary schools and medical centres within reach. The use of garden land upon	Noted: In relation to questioning the need for building more houses. Targets for housing delivery are derived at RSS level and therefore there is a statutory requirement for the Council to plan to meet these targets.

		which to build more houses should be strictly limited. Also the need to build large numbers of houses is questionable.	
<i>Oadby Civic Society</i>		<i>Oadby Trading Estate This area has the air of tiredness with much brownfield land available or wasted. Wherever possible better use or updating is called for in the future. Some tree planting might help.</i>	<i>Comments not related to Core Strategy consultation</i>
<i>Oadby Civic Society</i>		<i>A6 Bypass Some thought might be given to the possibility of tree lining this road where it goes through the borough. The idea of putting trees down the centre seems to be fraught with traffic problems in the future.</i>	<i>Comments not related to Core Strategy consultation</i>
<i>Oadby Civic Society</i>		<i>Finally we were somewhat concerned with the ideas recently put forward for a one-way system or pedestrianising the Parade. Restriction of traffic flow through the area might be a better scheme. We look forward to some great ideas coming forward in the near future.</i>	<i>Comments not related to Core Strategy consultation</i>
RPS	General	Whilst the Supplemental Consultation Issues and Options makes reference to the broad locations for development growth for housing and employment, there is no specific definition of employment uses within the document. It is considered that a definition of employment should be included in order to provide clarity and a clear framework	Agreed: A definition of employment land will be included in subsequent documents.

		<p>for the authority</p> <p>“Employment land and buildings are considered to comprise uses within B1, B2 and B8 of the Use Classes Order and closely related sui generis (such as warehouse clubs, cash and carry businesses, builders merchants, haulage yards, bus garages and MOT testing stations), which are commonly found in industrial locations</p>	
Natural England	Choices for Development Growth & Broad Locations	<p>It is not appropriate for Natural England to support a particular location for growth. What is important is that growth in the district meets with the governments ideas about sustainable development. Within PPS1 the government includes environmental protection and prudent use of resources as 2 of the 4 themes of sustainable development. This means that plans should not only protect environmental assets such as protected sites, areas of BAP habitat and other open spaces but also enhance them. Natural England also advises that Biodiversity should be thought of as a resource so, again PPS1 points to the need to enhance Biodiversity and offset environmental damage. Therefore, in regards to the options in this additional consultation there needs to be an understanding of the relative importance in biodiversity terms of the areas of Greenfield and brownfield land which are being considered. This expectation from the</p>	<p>Noted: Reference to the need to consider PPS1 and PPS9 before making a final decision on locations and choices for growth</p>

		<p>government that decisions are made on the basis of up to date information is clear in PPS 9. If the plan is to protect and enhance the districts biodiversity, a requirement of government guidance, then this information will be needed. PPS9 acknowledges that previously developed land can have biodiversity value which should be taken into account when making decisions.</p>	
Natural England	Choices for Development Growth & Broad Locations	<p>The potential loss of brownfield sites should also be considered against the positive values that these brownfield sites might have as urban open spaces. We acknowledge that RSS8 sets a challenging target for use of previously developed land. We urge the planning authority to consider the quality of life contribution that good quality open spaces provide. The planning authority should consider how best it can achieve local, accessible green space for the residents of the district.</p>	Agreed: Green infrastructure is a key component of planning for sustainable communities
<i>Natural England</i>	<i>SA</i>	<p><i>We seek clarification on the basis of the assessments made for objective 9. Is there an assumption that development on Greenfield sites will have more of an impact on biodiversity on brownfield sites and on what basis is this assumption made.</i></p> <p><i>It is disappointing that there is no assessment of the impact of the various options on the provision of open/green space within the urban areas. The value</i></p>	<i>Comments relate to Sustainability Appraisal</i>

		<i>of access to open space within the urban area is not captured by the assessment. Open space can have health, community, ecological, and overall quality of life benefits which stretch across all of the sustainable development themes. It also can contribute to green infrastructure.</i>	
GOEM	Choices for Development Growth	Thank you for consulting the Government Office on the above named issues & options document that I found both clear and concise. Having considered the potential options for new development, it is in my view that the redevelopment of brownfield sites and one large sustainable urban extension previously identified as your Council's preferred choice in its Core Strategy document published in April 2006, remains both the most sustainable and suitable option	Noted: Support for Option 4.3
GOEM	General	I note your issues & options document says the Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan is a 'saved' policy document which will cease to be relevant either in September 2007 or at such time as the Regional Plan becomes adopted (paragraph 3.5). This statement is incorrect as the Structure Plan was not adopted until 7 March 2005 and therefore remains in force until at least the 7 March 2008, at which time the Regional Planning Body can apply to the Secretary of State to save either all or some of the policies until the Regional Spatial Strategy is adopted.	Noted: Error will be corrected in subsequent documents

LCC	General	The Structure Plan is saved until March 2008 and relevant policies will be saved beyond this date.	Noted: Error will be corrected in subsequent documents
LCC	Choices for Development Growth	<p>The housing allocation of 55 dwellings per year set out in the Regional Plan was based on information on housing supply available at the time. Updated information submitted to the Examination in Public by Oadby and Wigston Borough Council (see Table below) indicates that even with the annual provision of 90 dwellings per year promoted by the Borough, only a small amount of development (a total of 31 dwellings) would be required on greenfield land.</p> <p>Such a provision is consistent with the County Council's view that an urban extension adjoining Oadby and Wigston would not be sustainable because of the poor transport infrastructure to the south east of Leicester.</p>	Disagree: Document does not relate to SUEs adjoining the Borough, only sites within. However, confusion may have arisen regarding the Borough use of the term SUE which is not the same as the definition of same at RSS level. This will need to be rectified in subsequent documents.
LCC	Choices for Development Growth	It is acknowledged that most of the options set out in the consultation would only be required if the housing allocation to Oadby and Wigston were to be substantially above the 90 dwellings per year promoted by the Borough. It remains the County Council's position that such a higher level of provision would not be sustainable in this area	Noted
LCC	Choices for Development Growth	Secondly, if the Borough were to meet a minimum 60% brownfield development target, with 90 dwellings per year on brownfield land, no more than 60	Noted

		<p> dwellings per year, or a total of 1,500 dwellings to 2026, could be provided on greenfield land. It is considered that greenfield development of this scale could not be provided as a sustainable urban extension and the transport constraints remain.</p> <p>Comments on the Options should be understood within this context.</p>	
LCC	Choices for Development Growth	<p>In theory this could have an ideal balance of land uses as referred to above. In practice it is usually very hard to find a location that has good communications as well as being far enough from existing settlements to maintain their separate identity. This option can not be taken forward as it would need to be considered as part of a review of the RSS as it would not be in conformity with overall strategy of the plan of urban concentration. It could also be questioned whether there would be sufficient space to accommodate a new free standing settlement within the Borough, and because it would require a substantial number of dwellings, it could seriously undermine urban regeneration.</p>	Agreed
LCC	Choices for Development Growth	<p>Small SUEs are unlikely to marshal the comprehensive provision of infrastructure and would therefore be unlikely to be sustainable.</p>	Agreed
LCC	Choices for Development Growth	<p>Housing provision on brownfield sites could lead to employment and other facilities being required on greenfield</p>	Noted: Preference for option 4.5

		<p>sites. However, perhaps this together with infill is the most sensible option for O&W, offering the best opportunity to provide housing to meet genuine local needs, and it would generally be more in scale with Oadby and Wigston economically and socially. The core strategy would need to contain strong policies in order to ensure the coordinated provision and funding of the overall infrastructure (transportation or otherwise) required to mitigate the cumulative impacts of individual developments. Studies would need commissioning to determine the contribution “tariff”.</p>	
LCC	Choices for Development Growth	<p>This is not a feasible option, as brownfield development could not be resisted, and the Borough would still be under pressure to meet a 60% brownfield target.</p>	Agreed
LCC	Broad Locations	<p>Development in any of the locations identified is likely to trigger the need for additional school places. In addition, Harborough District Council abuts Areas C, D & E and has proposals proximate to D & E. It could also be the case that Blaby may have similar proposals that relate to areas A and B and any attempt to respond on the provision of related infrastructure really needs to take this wider spatial dimension into account. In some cases we have already been contacted by the landowners of proximate land in Harborough. Also the</p>	<p>Agreed: This is already being considered but at the time of this consultation could only consult on individual Borough options.</p>

		O&W proposals should take on board the City Council's requirements. In essence in responding purely to O&Ws proposals we are aware that it is but a partial response and the answers could be different if a broader spatial view was taken	
LCC	Broad Locations	<p>The flood risk associated with location A would be likely to rule out the use of this site. Location B and C would seem to be possibilities from the details in the document. Location D has a deficit of open space in the area.</p> <p>All of the areas under consideration will require a more thorough assessment. Of particular concern would be transport due to the problems associated with the Borough.</p>	Noted
LCC	Broad Locations	SUEs will need to be of sufficient scale to support the necessary range of social, economic and transportation infrastructure to stand any chance of being sustainable. There appears to be little scope in terms of land availability to accommodate a genuine SUE (around 4000 dwellings), with the possible exception of location B, off Newton Lane, which with its limited transportation access and its relative remoteness from existing employment and schools would appear very difficult to deliver. Location C would appear to have better road	Noted: Confusion may have arisen regarding the Borough use of the term SUE which is not the same as the definition of same at RSS level. This will need to be rectified in subsequent documents.

		connections. C, D and E are remote from existing employment and just about all existing social infrastructure. A and B are closer to existing facilities but it is questionable whether they are of sufficient scale and scope to be truly compatible with significant further housing provision in these areas	
LCC	General	<p>Due to the uncertainties of the outcome of the RSS EiP it is not easy to respond to this document at this time. The strategic context has also potentially changed since the Core Strategy was considered 2 years ago, with the draft proposals of the Regional Plan coming into the frame across the County.</p> <p>It is important to note for all LCC services, that the cumulative impact of development in one area across District and City boundaries could be problematic if dealt with in isolation and not by joint working from an early stage. A larger planning unit comprising part of Blaby, O&W, and part of Harborough, may need to be considered to ensure that growth is delivered effectively.</p>	Noted: this is currently being investigated
LCC	General	Traffic congestion has also become a major issue since LTP1 (2001-6) and tackling congestion is a priority in LTP2. Green measures alone are likely to be insufficient and will need to be accompanied by targeted road improvements. However, good planning	Noted

		can attempt to reduce the need to travel by ensuring that housing, employment, education and shopping are well related to one another. Ideally there should be jobs, schools and shops close enough to where people live such as to give them a fair chance of not having to make motorised trips, although it is acknowledged that many social and choice factors come into this as well.	
LCC	General	It would be helpful when considering the options to give an idea of the scale of brownfield / greenfield development that would take place under each. Perhaps shown as a % or split.	Agreed: This will be taken forward in further consultation
LCC	General	The brownfield element is consistent with policy, but there are concerns that convenient locally-available job opportunities can reduce as employment sites are re-used for housing.	Agreed
Pegasus	General	<p>This paragraph provides a very brief summary of the national planning policy background to sustainable locations by listing relevant documents. However no reference is made to the content of these documents. In the context of the location of residential development, the advice contained within PPS3 is particularly relevant and should inform the approach to site selection taken.</p> <p>Paragraph 36 of PPS3 states that the Government's policy is to ensure housing is developed in suitable locations which</p>	Noted

		<p>offer a range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. This should be achieved by making good use of land, existing infrastructure and available public and private investment to create mixed communities, prioritising the re-use of previously developed land.</p> <p>In addition, PPS3 provides specific guidance on how Local Development Documents should deal with housing. Paragraph 38 states that local planning authorities should set out criteria to be used for identifying broad locations and specific sites. Paragraphs 2.9 and 2.10 of PPS12 make clear that the Core Strategy document should set out a spatial vision and strategic objectives, incorporating the Regional Spatial Strategy's housing requirement and setting out broad locations for delivering the housing and other strategic development needs.</p> <p>Failure to demonstrate conformity with national planning policy advice and the emerging RSS will render the policy approach unsound, having regard to PPS12 paragraph 4.24 test iv.</p>	
Pegasus	General	<p>Suggested Change:</p> <p>The document should demonstrate compliance with relevant national</p>	<p>Disagree in part: All documents published for consultation are prepared in accordance with National guidance. However, it appears this is not explicit</p>

		planning policy guidance contained in PPS3, PPS6, PPS12 and PPG13	enough in the text although this felt unnecessary due to consultation being only at Issues and Options stage.
Pegasus	General	<p>These paragraphs seek to set out the strategic policy framework for Oadby and Wigston but there are a number of inaccuracies.</p> <p>Firstly, little reference is made to the development plan, which comprises the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy, RSS8, adopted 2005. In contrast to paragraph 3.4, Policies 2 and 3 of the adopted RSS8 provide the strategic policy framework for Oadby and Wigston. PPS12 makes clear that since the enactment of the 2004 Act, the Structure Plan is no longer part of the development plan but does however constitute a material consideration, particularly where there is a policy void. In the case of development location however, there is no such policy void and Policies 2 and 3 of the adopted RSS8 provide the strategic approach.</p> <p>Against the adopted RSS8 policy, emerging Policy 2 of the Draft Regional Plan holds some material weight as that document is now at an advanced stage of preparation. The Policy is in effect a hybrid of Policies 2 and 3 of the adopted RSS8 and has few material differences.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should therefore set out a criteria-based approach to the</p>	Disagree: All documents published for consultation are prepared in accordance with National guidance. However, it appears this is not explicit enough in the text although this felt unnecessary due to consultation being only at Issues and Options stage. In addition, the Issues and Options stage includes options that may not be considered sustainable by the Council but still have to be consulted.

		<p>selection of sites within Oadby and Wigston based on guidance within the adopted and emerging RSS. As with the RSS, it is appropriate for the Core Strategy to set out a priority based approach to the selection of sites for all forms of development.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the approach to the location of development set out in the Core Strategy Preferred Options should be revisited in the context of this consultation as it is far too simplistic. The approach also does not accord with RSS8 as it prioritises both the re-use of previously developed land and the protection of open areas over reducing the need to travel and promoting sustainable patterns of development. Indeed RSS8 makes it clear that all sites should be 'suitable' – that is accessible by walking and cycling and other non-car modes to town centres, employment, shops and services. In this context, greenfield sites on the edge of the urban area which incorporate appropriate new facilities and good accessibility are the next most sustainable option behind previously developed land with good access to facilities. The sequential approach set out in the Core Strategy Preferred Options paper does not reflect this priority order.</p> <p>Proposed Change</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Paragraph 3.2-3.5 should be amended to reflect the RSS8 Policies 2 and 3. In addition the policy should set out criteria for the assessment of site suitability, in accordance with the adopted RSS8 and Draft Regional Plan Policy 2.</p>	
Pegasus	General	<p>Paragraphs 3.6-3.8 are irrelevant to the current housing requirement, which should be calculated using the proportions set out in the Structure Plan on the basis of the adopted RSS8 plan period 2001-2021. Such an approach was set out in a letter from Keith Hill, Minister of State for Housing and Planning to the Chair of the West Midlands Regional Assembly, in July 2004, which made it clear that in determining District Council Housing figures, Structure Plan proportions should be applied to the RSS figures.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.7 refers to the 2005/06 Annual Monitoring Report housing trajectory. It states that the housing projections to 2016 are based on four sources of supply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaining allocations • Completions expected on sites that already have planning permission • Small site allowance • Windfall sites which the Borough Council expect to come forward for development before 2016 	Agreed

		<p>PPS3 sets out guidance on how local authorities should set out housing trajectories and plan for housing provision. Paragraphs 54 and 55 require that sites should be identified for at least ten years and this supply should not include a windfall allowance. Footnotes make clear that this also excludes a small site allowance. At 2006 the Borough therefore had a developable supply of 231 dwellings in PPS3 terms. A further 17 dwellings remain as an existing local plan allocation, however with this site having not come forward to date it should not be considered 'deliverable' in accordance with PPS3.</p> <p>Suggested Change</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.6-3.8 should be reviewed to assess the housing land supply situation in the context of RSS8 and the Draft Regional Plan and for the methodology to accord with advice in PPS3. The DPD should plan for growth for at least 15 years from the anticipated date of adoption in accordance with Paragraph 53 of PPS3. Paragraph 2.14 of PPS12 requires that the Core strategy should look ahead to the time horizon which is set out in the relevant Regional Spatial Strategy. By the time of the Core Strategy's adoption, this will be the now emerging Draft RSS, it is thus reasonable to plan to 2026 in accordance with the emerging RSS.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Pegasus	General	<p>Although meeting the Structure Plan housing requirement is no longer relevant, this section contains a number of statements of intent that do not accord with PPS3. As above, reliance on small site and windfall allowances conflicts directly with PPS3 advice.</p> <p>In accordance with PPS3 paragraph 59 the council should seek to allocate specific sites for development rather than apply a windfall allowance, particularly for the first 10 years of the plan. There are no exceptional circumstances in Oadby and Wigston that mean that sites cannot be identified.</p> <p>Without the small site and windfall trend based prediction the Borough is left with a significant residual requirement, both against the RSS8 and Draft Regional Plan period.</p>	Agreed
Pegasus	General	<p>Reference at paragraph 3.10 to the challenge of the proposed housing requirement in the Draft Regional Plan is important. Should such a challenge be successful, a significant residual requirement would result (see below). Accordingly, the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD preparation should be taken forward on the basis that the residual requirement is likely to require the release of greenfield land within the Borough.</p>	Agreed
Pegasus	General	Likely scale of required development	Noted

		<p>The consultation document confirms that the release of some greenfield land will be required in Oadby and Wigston to meet the housing requirement over the plan period. The scale of this requirement is relevant for consideration of the most appropriate option in respect of distribution.</p> <p>The Borough Council itself has raised objection to the proposed annual housing requirement set out in the Draft Regional Plan and has requested that this requirement should be at a level of 90 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>This Practise presented evidence at the Regional Spatial Strategy Examination in Public (Respondent numbers 755-762, 847 and 874) which clearly demonstrates that to be in line with the projected growth of the 2004 Household Projections a requirement of 105 dwellings per annum is required. Should this increase be incorporated into the Panel Report the Borough's residual requirement would increase but would still require land for less than 1,800 dwellings to 2026</p>	
Pegasus	Options for Development Growth	<p>New Free Standing Settlement</p> <p>The amount of land required to accommodate a free standing settlement of a size to be self contained could not be provided within the Oadby and Wigston administrative area. Neither</p>	Agreed

		does the residual requirement for Oadby and Wigston justify such an approach.	
Pegasus	Options for Development Growth	<p>Sustainable Urban Extensions only</p> <p>Policies 2 and 3 of RSS8, as well as national policy guidance prioritises the re-use of previously developed land. As such, this approach in isolation would not accord with relevant planning policy and should be rejected.</p>	Agreed
Pegasus	Options for Development Growth	<p>Redevelopment of Brownfield Sites and one large urban extension</p> <p>Since the period of public consultation on the Core Strategy Preferred Options in 2006, Leicestershire County Council has published its Sustainability Appraisal of Leicestershire Sustainable Urban Extensions. The document makes a number of important conclusions.</p> <p>It states that a settlement of 4,000-5,000 dwellings is required to support a secondary school, an important threshold in terms of self containment and sustainability. In the context of Oadby and Wigston it is clear that the emerging requirement would not be sufficient to deliver a large urban extension that could support new infrastructure and be relatively self contained.</p> <p>The Leicestershire Sustainability Appraisal considered greenfield land within Oadby and Wigston within 'areas</p>	Noted: Accept that the use of the term SUE is not the same as how it is used through the RSS. The Council mean a single site for all development needs rather than smaller urban fringe developments.

		<p>of search' PUA 3 and PUA 4. It assessed the suitability of these locations to accommodate a large urban extension to the wider Leicester Urban Area. These areas of search were not taken forward as possible locations for a Sustainable Urban Extension primarily because it was considered that SUEs in these locations would require significant new investment in infrastructure, particularly highways infrastructure.</p> <p>Having regard to the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal it is considered that one large sustainable urban extension would not be the optimum means of meeting sustainability objectives in the context of Oadby and Wigston as it would place significant strain on the infrastructure within just one area of the Borough. This would conflict with guidance within PPS3 paragraph 36 which requires that housing should be achieved by making effective use of existing infrastructure.</p>	
Pegasus	Options for Development Growth	<p>Redevelopment of Brownfield sites and several small sustainable urban extensions</p> <p>It is considered that rather than 'several small sustainable urban extensions and redevelopment of brownfield sites, the preferred approach should read 'redevelopment of brownfield sites and a few smaller urban extensions of a sustainable form'. 'Several' suggests</p>	Agreed and Noted: Preference for Option 3

		<p>many small developments. Such an approach would be unlikely to deliver an appropriate mix of housing type and tenure as within each site the range of housing would be more narrow. In addition, small sites of less than 100 dwellings would not be unlikely to deliver or support any new facilities or infrastructure.</p> <p>Rather, a few 'smaller' urban extensions of a sustainable form would be most appropriate for Oadby and Wigston.</p> <p>This approach would also be more advantageous than redevelopment of brownfield sites and one large sustainable urban extension. This is due to a number of reasons.</p> <p>Having regard to the infrastructure constraints south east and east of Leicester outlined above, particularly in relation to the strategic highway network, in selecting a few of smaller urban extensions, the Borough would be spreading the highways impact of localised trips. In relation to other infrastructure, such as schools and shops, there is a relatively even spread of provision in both Oadby and Wigston and the same principle applies, although of course the new development has the potential to support provision of expanded facilities in these locations. This approach would therefore make the</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>most effective use of existing infrastructure, in accordance with paragraph 36 of PPS3 and Policy 3 of RSS8.</p> <p>Secondly, such an approach would contribute to the government's goal of providing a variety of high quality housing, by facilitating a full range of market housing for all parts of the Borough, and not just one location (PPS3 paragraphs 24 and 25). Such an approach would also more effectively contribute to meeting the affordable housing needs of different parts of the Borough in a location close to where the need has arisen.</p> <p>Thirdly, by identifying several smaller sites, the Borough is less likely to experience delays or problems in housing supply as a result of the technical issues on one particular site or the commercial vagaries of one particular developer. This approach would therefore contribute to a more effective delivery of housing at the required rate.</p> <p>Preferred Option</p> <p>In the light of the foregoing it is therefore considered that the most appropriate approach for Oadby and Wigston is the 'Redevelopment of Brownfield sites and a few smaller urban extensions of a sustainable form.'</p>	
--	--	---	--

Pegasus	Broad Locations	<p>Broad locations of development growth</p> <p>Having regard to comments relating to section 4 above it is considered that Area of Search B is well placed to accommodate at least two smaller urban extensions of a sustainable form. Evidence to support this broad location will be submitted by this practise in due course.</p>	Noted: Support for Option B
Pegasus	Broad Locations	<p>In addition, consideration should be given to the potential of cross boundary working to knit development within the adjoining Harborough District, north of the A6 into the wider Leicester urban area by providing for residential development in a location between Areas of Search C and D.</p>	Agreed: This is currently being investigated
Pegasus	SA	<p><i>Although the overall approach to the sustainability appraisal has some merit, the matrix at Appendix B makes broad assumptions about locations that may not necessarily apply to individual developments in that location.</i></p> <p><i>In relation to Option B, objective 7 scores the option as moving away from the achievement of the objective. However development may not have a negative impact upon the stated features at all, and the way the development is treated may in fact provide opportunities to enhance and preserve habitats. In</i></p>	<i>Relates to Sustainability Appraisal</i>

		<p><i>summary, this score should be amended to "unknown".</i></p> <p><i>In relation to objective 9, there may in fact be an overall positive impact of urban extension development in terms of access to open space and the countryside.</i></p> <p><i>In relation to objective 16, any new residential development will place an additional burden on local education facilities. However much will depend on the size. A small development adjacent to an area of poor provision would have a negative impact on the achievement of this objective, however a large development in the same location may bring about the provision of additional facilities in this area, addressing an existing shortfall and improving access. In relation to option B therefore this should be scored as "unknown".</i></p> <p><i>In relation to objective 18 much of the achievement of this goal will depend on the timing of release of the particular greenfield site. The exact impact upon the achievement of these aims is therefore "unknown".</i></p>	
Pegasus	Choices for Development Growth	<p>Brownfield sites only</p> <p>The paragraph itself indicates that this approach would be unlikely to deliver the appropriate amount of housing to meet the emerging RSS requirement. PPS3</p>	Agreed

		<p>emphasises that local authorities should identify and allocate sites to meet their housing needs for at least 15 years. PPS3 also places an emphasis on sites being deliverable. An over-reliance on brownfield sites may hold up delivery.</p> <p>In addition not all brownfield site locations will necessarily be 'suitable' in PPS3 terms, nor serve the best interests of sustainability, a key aim of PPS1 and PPS3.</p> <p>This approach is therefore not in accordance with policy advice, having regard to the likely housing requirement.</p>	
Indigo	Broad Locations	<p>SSL support area of Search C as a location for a sustainable urban extension (SUE).</p> <p>Are of Search C is within close proximity to the existing SSL store and will therefore provide key shopping and service facilities for future residents.</p> <p>As part of the Allocations DPD the existing SSL store on Glen Road has been suggested as a neighbourhood centre and therefore this area may see future retail/commercial development to further support Area C as a SUE.</p>	Noted: Support for Option C
Indigo	Broad Locations	<p>SSL support Area of Search D as a location for a sustainable urban extension (SUE).</p>	Noted: Support for Options D

		<p>Area of Search D is within close proximity to the existing SSL store and will therefore provide key shopping and service facilities for future residents.</p> <p>As part of the Allocations DPD the existing SSL store on Glen Road has been suggested as a neighbourhood centre and therefore this area may see future retail/commercial development to further support Area D as a SUE.</p>	
Turleys for University of Leicester	Broad Locations	<p>The University of Leicester consider that Area E provides an appropriate location for development growth considering its proximity to existing facilities, services and public transport at Oadby town centre. University facilities are also located close by providing job opportunities and access to leisure and community facilities. Area E is a sustainable location which offers opportunities to link with and improve existing provision. Locating growth to the north-east of Oadby would support a number of Council objectives including the aim to encourage mixed-use development that integrates housing with employment, leisure and retail activity within the existing infrastructure. Copies of this consultation have been sent to: forwardplans@oadby-wigston.gov.uk</p>	Noted: Support for Option E
Woodland Trust	General	<p>We are concerned to read in the appendix that several of the areas of search listed are said to contain \"sites of importance for nature conservation\".</p>	Noted: Environmental factors would include ancient woodland and veteran trees. The Council's Phase 1 Habitat Survey lists all our veteran trees which is

		<p>We would like to see the criteria for determining areas of search for housing sites in Para 5.4 amended to stipulate that there should be no sites allocated which would result in loss of or damage to ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees.</p> <p>Ancient woodland (land that has been continually wooded since at least AD1600) is our richest habitat for wildlife being home to more species of conservation concern than any other habitat (supporting some 232 species as outlined in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan, 1994). Ancient woods form a unique link to the primeval wildwood habitat that covered most of lowland Britain following the last Ice Age. Ancient woodland sites are irreplaceable - the interactions between plants, animals, soils, climate and people are unique and have developed over hundreds of years.</p> <p>These eco-systems cannot be re-created and with only just over 2% of the land area in Great Britain covered by ancient woodland we cannot afford any more of this finite resource to be lost forever. In Leicestershire the situation is even worse, with only 0.84% of the land area covered by ancient woodland. It is therefore essential that what little remains of this irreplaceable habitat be protected from development.</p>	<p>the evidence base we would refer to when considering site suitability. There are no designated areas of ancient woodland currently in the Borough.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Such protection is strongly supported in national and regional planning policy.</p> <p>Central Government has made several commitments to better protection of ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Government's policy on ancient and native woodland states that "The existing area of ancient woodland should be maintained and there should be a net increase in the area of native woodland." It also states that "The cultural heritage associated with ancient woodland and veteran trees should be protected and conserved." (Keepers of time - A statement of policy for England's ancient and native woodland, 2005 , p10) - Planning Policy Statement 9 on Biodiversity and Geological Conservation clearly states: "Ancient woodland is a valuable biodiversity resource both for the diversity of species and for its longevity as woodland. Once lost it cannot be recreated. Local planning authorities should identify any areas of ancient 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>woodland in their areas that do not have statutory protection (e.g. as an SSSI). They should not grant planning permission for any developments that would result in its loss or deterioration...Aged or 'veteran' trees found outside ancient woodland are also particularly valuable for biodiversity and their loss should be avoided. Planning authorities should encourage the conservation of such trees as part of development proposals.'" (ODPM, PPS9, 2005, paragraph 10)</p> <p>Policy 29 of the draft East Midlands Regional Plan urges local authorities to ensure that ancient woodland and ancient trees are strongly protected: "Ancient semi-natural woodlands, veteran trees and other woodlands of acknowledged national and regional importance should be strongly protected by Local Development Frameworks".</p>	
Woodland Trust	Locations for Development Growth	In terms of the strategic options around appropriate locations for development, a combination of development within the existing built up areas of the Borough and limited greenfield extensions would appear to offer the most appropriate strategy and ensure conformity with the emerging Regional Plan for the East Midlands. Taking forward options 4.3 and	Noted: Support for Options 2 and 3

		4.4 offer opportunities for urban renewal during the early parts of the plan period, as well as flexibility about the scale of greenfield development required during the latter years.	
Woodland Trust	Locations for Development Growth	Options 4.2 (new free-standing settlement) and 4.6 (sustainable urban extension only) would not appear to conform with the emerging Regional Plan and are therefore considered inappropriate to be taken forward. Option 4.5 (brownfield only) may provide an appropriate strategy during the early years of the plan period. However, given potential capacity constraints and the need to provide flexibility to take account of an unknown amount of development required by the emerging Regional Plan, it is considered that options for greenfield development should be also be taken forward and explored at this stage.	Agreed
Harborough D C	Broad Locations	In terms of the broad locations for greenfield development, Options C, D and E are likely to have the most significant effect upon Harborough District. Each of the options would appear to offer potential opportunities for urban extension and should therefore be explored further.	Noted: Support to investigate Options C, D and E further
Harborough D C	Broad Locations	Option E has significant disadvantages in terms of the need to review the current green wedge and the impact of any potential development in this area upon the rural setting of Stoughton village and its current physical separation from the	Noted: Concerns regarding Option E

		built up area of the Leicester Principal Urban Area	
Harborough D C	Broad Locations	Option C appears to require access from land within Harborough District, and therefore would need joint planning with Harborough District Council. This relates to a potential direction for development within our District which has emerged from our LDF consultation. We note that this and other development options in Harborough District should be explored in conjunction with Oadby and Wigston Borough Council and Leicester City Council	Agreed
Harborough D C	General	Harborough District Council would certainly welcome the opportunity to work with you in the exploration of alternative options and in the collection of evidence to assess development options. Transport and accessibility assessments and green wedge reviews would appear to offer significant opportunities for joint working. We have no specific comment on the other aspects of the LDF consultation at present.	Noted
Highways Agency	General	The Highways Agency considers that new development within the Borough of Oadby & Wigston should look to achieve a balance of local housing and employment opportunities in order to discourage long distance commuting, particularly in relation to the M1/M69. There is potential for new development to	Noted

		increase traffic levels, with possible impacts on the M1/M69 and southern routes out of the Borough via the A50 and A6. However, given the overall scale of future development and the distance to the strategic road network, it is anticipated that traffic impacts on the trunk road network are likely to be relatively low	
Highways Agency	General	The Highways Agency supports initiatives that aim to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore the reference to Draft RSS Policy 2, and specifically those objectives aimed at reducing reliance on the private car, are supported. These guiding principles should be used to inform the preferred option	Noted
Highways Agency	Broad Locations	In terms of the five potential options for the broad location of new development in the Borough, measured support is offered for Option 3: the redevelopment of brownfield sites and several small sustainable urban extensions. This option has the benefit of being able to balance the competing needs of sustainability and development growth. Some of the broad locations for growth are reflected in the sites which have come forward as part of the Allocations DPD: Issues and Options Paper. The HA has provided observations on these potential allocation sites and that response should be read in conjunction with this submission	Noted: Support for Option 3

Highways Agency	Broad Locations	<p>The methodology employed in the CS for selecting broad areas for growth should ensure that development in the Borough as a whole complies with the aims set out in PPG13. No particular growth area site option is preferable in terms of distance from the SRN. However, the area to the south of South Wigston appears to have the best public transport network and therefore the best prospects for modal shift away from the private car, thus reducing trips and reducing the impact on the SRN. As the LDF and constituent DPDs are progressed towards the preferred options greater emphasis should be placed on the importance of a sound evidence base. In this respect transport and the linked objective of sustainable development should be fully considered and, in particular, be in accordance with the requirements of PPG 13, DfT Circular 02/2007 and DCLG / DfT 'Guidance on Transport Assessments' (March 2007).</p>	Noted: support for Option A
Highways Agency	Broad Locations	<p>The Highways Agency recognises that increased levels of development in the area will impact upon the trunk road network. The HA requests that it is consulted at the onset of each subsequent part of the LDF in order to comment on the most beneficial location for development ensuring the road safety and free flow of traffic upon the trunk road is maintained.</p>	Noted

Highways Agency	General	It remains to be seen whether the rate will be increased via the review of RSS, however, as stated above the housing figures are relatively modest overall, even with the potential increase, and are therefore unlikely to have a significant impact on the highway network. As well as making reference to RSS Policy 14, this section would also benefit from making reference to OWBC position within the Three Cities Sub-area of the RSS. OWBC should refer to the PTOLEMY Model which has been developed for the Three Cities Sub-area. As yet the model is still proceeding through the test phase but will be able to provide key baseline evidence in due course.	Noted
Highways Agency	General	For sustainable communities to be achieved, development needs to make the best and most efficient use of existing land, as reflected in national and regional policy. Therefore, policies regarding the location of development, particularly residential, should promote the use of previously developed land, minimise the need to travel and be accessible to employment, shops and other community facilities.	Agreed
Highways Agency	Choices for Development Growth	Creating a new free-standing development has the advantage that any new development could encompass all the necessary land uses to create a sustainable community. New homes, new employment developments and new	Agreed

		<p>retail developments would all complement each other and create a self-sustaining community, although it is questionable as to whether such a proposal in this location would be of an adequate size to accommodate these functions. In addition the development would be primarily in the Greenbelt and could be somewhat isolated from the rest of the Borough. Also, a new settlement may encourage unsustainable travel behaviour from outside the Borough and this may impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN).</p>	
Highways Agency	Choices for Development Growth	<p>The redevelopment of Brownfield sites and one large sustainable urban extension would have the benefit that the need for Greenfield land would be less than for a new settlement. The HA supports the use of Brownfield sites as these tend to be more accessible to the town centres in the Borough and therefore the opportunities for sustainable travel to and from these sites are greater than for a new settlement. The development of one large sustainable urban extension could result in a large proportion of the new development in the Borough being concentrated next to one of the towns. This could adversely impact the sustainability of the other towns. It is anticipated that the development of one large sustainable urban extension could impact on the SRN in the same way as</p>	Noted

		for a new settlement	
Highways Agency	Choices for Development Growth	The redevelopment of Brownfield sites and several small sustainable urban extensions is likely to be the premium option in terms of balancing the competing needs of sustainability and development growth. Use of brownfield sites should ensure that people live within accessible locations to public transport, employment opportunities and services, thus reducing trip-making potential. Also, several small scale urban extensions are likely to mean that sustainable travel is maximised between the towns in the Borough. Option 3 is therefore the preferred option	Noted Support for Option 3
Highways Agency	Choices for Development Growth	Using Brownfield or urban extension sites only is not likely to be a suitable approach, either in terms of sustainable travel or the need to develop land.	Noted
Highways Agency	General	In terms of compliance with PPG13, the location of new development is very important. Sites that have strong sustainable links, or sites that are capable of having strong sustainable links, should be allocated for development. The methodology employed in the DPD for allocating development growth areas should ensure that development in the Borough as a whole complies with the aims set out in PPG13	Noted
Highways Agency	Broad Locations	In terms of impact on the SRN, all of these areas are roughly equidistant from the SRN and therefore no particular site	Noted

		is preferable in terms of distance from the SRN. The area to the south of South Wigston (area A) appears to have the best public transport network and therefore the best prospects for modal shift away from the private car, thus reducing trips and reducing the impact on the SRN.	
Highways Agency	Broad Locations	The area to the south of Oadby (area C) appears to have a decent level of public transport provision and therefore offers some prospect for modal shift away from the private car.	Noted
Highways Agency	Broad Locations	The areas to the south east of Wigston (area B), to the southeast of Oadby (area D) and to the northeast of Oadby (area E) all appear to have average levels of public transport provision and would therefore currently have the lesser prospects for modal shift when compared to the other areas.	Noted
Highways Agency	Broad Locations	Without prejudice to the preceding paragraph, it should be noted that the HA will fully consider any planning applications that come forward in any of the areas. However, it is likely that the impact of development will be easier to mitigate in areas A and C due to the apparent quality of the public transport networks.	Noted: Support for Options A and C
<i>Highways Agency</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>It should be noted that the assessments appear to be non-technical subjective judgments and it is unclear whether they are based on evidence. In addition the</i>	<i>Comments in relation to Sustainability Appraisal</i>

		<p><i>added value in assessing the transport implications of the options is questionable when most of the outcomes are judged to be 'unknown'. In any event the SA conclusion identifies Option 1 as having a negative impact and therefore does not contradict the conclusions made overleaf about our preference for Option 3.</i></p>	
Smith Stuart Reynolds	Broad Locations	<p>We support the identification of location "C" as a broad location for growth adjoining the urban area to the south of Oadby, which encompasses our client's site at Cottage Farm, Oadby. The site's sustainability was previously detailed in the submission on behalf of Wheatcroft & Sons Ltd and Bloor Homes (Measham) Ltd in support of representations made to the previous Oadby and Wigston Core Strategy Preferred Options, which referred to numerous technical reports compiled with regard to the site. This submission highlighted the following about the site:</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</p> <p>Landscaping:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of the site will not affect the rural quality of the local landscape. - The site is not located within a designated Green Wedge. <p>Ecology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The development of the site 	Noted: Support for Option C

		<p>does not affect any protected species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are no statutory or non-statutory nature conservation designations on the site. <p>Drainage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is not at risk of extreme flooding or flooding from fluvial rivers. <p>Archaeology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No recorded archaeological finds pertain to the site. - A Geophysical report concludes little evidence of archaeological activity on the site. <p>TRANSPORTATION</p> <p>Infrastructure and Access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing Infrastructure currently has the capacity to be able to absorb additional development on the site. - The site has direct access to the A6 trunk road. <p>Cycling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is directly linked to an existing cycleway which runs through Oadby Town Centre. - All of Oadby is easily accessible 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>by cycle from the site.</p> <p>Pedestrian Linkages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is within walking distance of a number of day-to-day facilities including a Supermarket, Doctors Surgery, Schools and Oadby Town Centre. - Development on the site will improve access into the countryside through the incorporation of a current public right of way, which will be enhanced by new connections. <p>Public Transport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is directly accessible to a number of Public Transport linkages to Leicester and Oadby through its proximity to the Glen Road bus stop, which is near the site entrance. <p>Educational Facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is within close proximity of Glenmere and Brocks Hill Primary Schools, as well as being located within walking distance of Beauchamp Community College and Gartree High School. <p>MASTERPLAN PRINCIPLES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The inclusion of an area for 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>business uses (0.3ha) encourages mixed use development whilst also providing additional facilities and employment for the current community and encouraging their inclusion as part of the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A range of housing types and tenures will be provided in order to create a social mix and sustainable community - 1.8 hectares of Open Space will be incorporated, which exceeds the prescribed standards. - <p>In considering the above, the site at Cottage Farm, Oadby and its environs incorporate a range of sustainability criterion that is unrivalled by other broad locations of growth stated within the Core Strategy: Issues and Options. It is therefore requested that the Core Strategy identifies area "C" to the South of Oadby as a location for growth.</p>	
Smith Stuart Reynolds	General	<p>We object to the plan period of the Core Strategy, which identifies major development proposed in the Borough up to 2021, on the basis of soundness. Paragraph 53 of PPS3 states that Local Development Documents should 'enable continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years from the date of adoption'. With a plan period of up to 2021, this will only provide a housing land supply of 14</p>	<p>Agreed: Plan period will be amended to 2026 to accord with the RSS</p>

		<p>years. A number of Core Strategies have been found unsound or have been withdrawn due to a lack of housing land supply.</p> <p>It would seem logical for the plan period of the Local Development Framework (LDF) to coincide with the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS8). The emerging RSS8 covers the time period from 2006 to 2026, and the LDF should be in conformity with it. Otherwise, as outlined, the plan would be found unsound and will not coincide with housing figures set out in RSS8.</p> <p>We therefore request that the end date of the Plan is altered to 2026 in order to coincide with higher guidance.</p>	
Smith Stuart Reynolds	General	<p>We support the Borough of Oadby and Wigston's challenge to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS8) in relation to their proposed housing provision for the Borough during the plan period. We do not accept that the total potential for the Borough is 1,375 dwellings for the period 2001 – 2026 as this is well below the current annual build rate of 90 dwellings per annum, the current Structure plan requirement of 85 dwellings per annum, and is also substantially below the DCLG's projected growth in the number of households for the area. The proposed rate of only 55 dwellings per annum is lower than any of the options set out in the Review of the East Midlands Regional Plan 'Options for Change'</p>	Noted: Support for RSS challenge re housing numbers

		<p>document. Housing figures were as high as 280 dwellings per year in option 3A and an option below 90 dwellings per annum was not provided. The implications for such a low figure will be limited release of greenfield land, which will be required to accommodate growth up to 2026.</p> <p>In order to protect the economic vitality of the Borough and to ensure continued growth, the annual housing figure for Oadby and Wigston needs to be increased to a minimum of 100 dwellings per annum, in line with upwards trends in housing growth. We therefore agree that regional policy must change in order to accommodate the potential growth of Oadby and Wigston during the plan period.</p>	
Smith Stuart Reynolds	Choices for Development Growth	<p>We support the identification of Brownfield sites alongside Sustainable Urban Extensions as an appropriate 'Location for new development' within the Borough. This is the most sustainable option. However; we consider that the 'Locations for new development' listed in the Core Strategy: Issues and Options fail to acknowledge the potential for two medium sized allocations, as a compromise between option 4.3 (The redevelopment of brownfield sites and one large Sustainable Urban Extension) and 4.4 (The redevelopment of brownfield sites and several small Sustainable Urban Extensions).</p>	<p>Noted: Support for a compromise option between 4.3 and 4.4 e.g. 2 SUE sites of medium scale</p>

		<p>Brownfield development clearly accords with Government objectives but there is unlikely to be sufficient sites within the Borough, without seriously reducing the existing employment base to provide sufficient new dwellings, solely on Brownfield land during the LDF period. Rather than a single Sustainable Urban Extension, we consider that two medium-sized Sustainable Urban Extensions will be more appropriate, for instance one might be at Oadby and the other in Wigston. This accords with government policy set out in PPS3 in achieving a mix of housing types and tenures while offering a choice of locations. The development of Sustainable Urban Extensions will help preserve the suburban quality of the area while safeguarding potential employment land within the Urban Area, which has been lost in the past through residential Brownfield development. Creating Sustainable Urban Extensions will prevent the over-intensification of the urban area of Leicestershire, which will detract from the quality of Oadby and its neighbouring settlements.</p> <p>A medium Sustainable Urban Extension at Cottage Farm, Oadby will help provide a good solution in creating a mixed use community, without detracting from the character of Oadby. Sustainable Urban Extensions would normally require large</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>infrastructure provision; however this will not be required at Cottage Farm due to its location adjacent to the A6 and cycle network with various local facilities within walking distance. The site is readily available for development and no additional works such as decontamination and remediation will be required.</p> <p>We therefore consider that the identification of two medium-sized Sustainable Urban Extensions alongside the redevelopment of Brownfield sites is the most appropriate 'location for new development' within the Borough.</p>	
National Trust	Broad Locations	<p>Having regard to the analysis set out in the Consultation document, including within the Appendix, and the factors set out in the National Trust's response to the broad location of development, it is considered that the best options for further investigation for greenfield sites for development are C and D.</p> <p>The Trust particularly notes the important constraints in respect of the other options assessed in respect of landscape, heritage and flooding. The Borough is already dominated by urban development and has relatively few significant heritage assets. It is therefore important that impacts upon landscape character, especially where this is valued for its local distinctiveness, and the setting of important historic assets (as</p>	Noted: Support for Options C and D

		per Policies 27 and 31 in RSS), are given significant consideration in the assessment of appropriate locations for major new development.	
National Trust	SA	<i>In this context it is noted that the Sustainability Appraisal (page B2) considers that all five sites will have adverse impacts in terms of Objectives 8 and 9 (heritage assets and landscape). Whilst this is broadly true, and a concern, it appears to the Trust that some of options are 'less worse' than others in this respect. It would arguably have been preferable for the SA to at least have included some gradations of impact, e.g. elsewhere ++ and - - have been used to denote outcomes that are more likely to be severely negative or positive. On this basis the Trust would expect that Options C and D would perform better than the others.</i>	<i>Comments relate to Sustainability Appraisal</i>
National Trust	Choices for Development Growth	In order to best accord both with general planning policy as set out in PPS1 and with both Adopted and Draft RSS it is considered that the approach to identifying areas for growth should be based upon a 'brownfield sites first' solution. Exceptionally it may be discovered that a brownfield site has particular characteristics such that it would more beneficially be utilised in an alternative	Noted; support for Options 4.3 and 4.4 i.e. one or several SUE dependent on their suitability when judged against sustainability criteria

		<p>manner, e.g. if it was found to have particular biodiversity value. However, even then it will often be practicable not only to retain but also enhance that biodiversity asset whilst still accommodating new development on other parts of the site.</p> <p>Once brownfield opportunities have been exhausted, and assuming that sites for additional development still need to be identified, then sustainable urban extensions should be pursued in preference to general greenfield development.</p> <p>It is considered that the decision on whether or not this should be pursued as one single urban extension or a series of smaller ones should be informed by key sustainable development criteria, and in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The characteristics of the site that might be developed, e.g. landscape value, nearness to heritage assets and impact upon their settings; • The availability of public transport and quality of footpaths and cycle ways; • The avoidance of areas at risk of flooding; • The opportunity to create quality green spaces that will also greatly improve biodiversity; and • The ability of the new 	
--	--	--	--

		development, along with adjacent existing development, to support a reasonable range of local services including schools, convenience shops, a post office, and community facilities including sports pitches.	
The Theatres Trust		<p>The Theatres Trust is an Advisory Non-Departmental Public Body and a statutory consultee on planning applications that affect land on which there is a theatre and was established by The Theatres Trust Act 1976 'to promote the better protection of theatres'. This applies to all theatre buildings, old or new, and regardless of whether or not they are still in use as theatres, in other uses, or disused. Our main objective is to safeguard theatre use, or the potential for such use, but we also provide expert advice on design, conservation, property and planning matters to theatre operators, local authorities and official bodies.</p> <p>Due to the specific nature of the Trust's remit we are concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and would therefore expect to see matters dealing with cultural facilities.</p> <p>Core Strategy Supplementary Issues We have read the document but the issues raised for local development are broad and do not directly relate to our remit so we have no comment to make.</p>	Noted: No comments

Roger Tym and Partners		<p>How much development is required? Whilst the extent of housing (and to a lesser extent employment) development required in the Borough is largely to be set by the emerging Regional Plan, the following are relevant factors which should be considered comprehensively in preparation of the Core Strategy for the Borough.</p> <p>1) Firstly, the Core Strategy should cover the period to 2026, rather than 2021, as that is the period to which the new Regional Plan will apply.</p>	Agreed
Roger Tym and Partners	General	<p>2) Whilst the housing requirement for the Borough in the draft Regional Plan is only 55 dwellings per annum, it is our view that this is likely to increase significantly in the final version of the Regional Plan, based on the following circumstances:</p> <p>a) the Council itself argued at the recent Examination that the annual figure should be substantially higher, both to reflect the annual build rate of around 90 dwellings over recent years and to better meet its own housing needs especially for affordable housing;</p> <p>b) Oadby and Wigston</p>	Noted

		<p>forms part of the Leicester Primary Urban Area, which has been confirmed by the Government as one of the new Growth Points, along with Derby and Nottingham. This has resulted in the emerging Regional Plan proposing a higher than previously envisaged housing requirement for the Leicester Principal Urban Area of 44,500 dwellings between 2001 and 2026;</p> <p>c) Furthermore, the Housing Land Availability Assessment (HLAA) for the Leicester Principal Urban Area (prepared by this firm in association with Innes England in April 2007), concluded that one or more smaller sustainable urban extensions of around 500-1000 dwellings are required, over and above the identified brownfield capacity and the much larger urban extensions already proposed, in order to meet this requirement;</p> <p>d) The HLAA went on to</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>identify that the greenfield land adjoining the built up areas of Oadby and Wigston (together possibly with land within the adjoining Harborough district) is one of the locations suitable in principle to accommodate such a smaller sustainable urban extension or extensions, depending on the outcome of a detailed transport assessment and scope to undertake mitigation measures required. Such an urban extension or extensions in the Borough would of course represent development of a scale significantly over and above the currently proposed figure of 55 dwellings per annum;</p> <p>e) On 23rd July 2007 the Government issued its Green Paper on "Homes for the future: more affordable, more sustainable". A key element of the Green Paper is a new housing target for 2016 of</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>240,000 additional houses per year, resulting in 2 million homes by 2016 and 3 million homes by 2020. The Government is also clearly committed to speeding up the delivery of housing, as well as its quality, affordability and sustainability;</p> <p>f) It is also notable that the Regional Plan Examination has been adjourned to allow for comments from participants in relation to the Green Paper and its implications for the Regional Plan. Indeed, the Examination may reconvene in September to consider the Green Paper, which will undoubtedly have a bearing on the final recommendations of the Examination Panel;</p> <p>g) The Panel and ultimately the Secretary of State will also have to bear in mind the 2004 household projections which show increased future rates of household formation than were</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>h) allowed for when the draft Regional Plan was prepared; Finally, it is also pertinent that the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the East of England Regional Plan, published in December 2006, clearly state that all housing requirement figures are expressed as minimum figures and that Local Planning Authorities should seek to exceed them subject to sustainability considerations. The likelihood is that similar statements will be included in the final version of the East Midlands Regional Plan.</p>	
Roger Tym and Partners	General	<p>3) As a consequence of the above set of circumstances, the Council's Core Strategy should be adapted to reflect the likelihood of significantly increased housing requirements and the need for flexibility in both the location and rate of delivery of such housing</p>	Agreed
Roger Tym and Partners	Choices for Development Growth	<p>What are the most appropriate locations for new development in the Borough?</p>	Noted: Support for Options 4.3 and 4.4

		Of the options proposed for locating growth, the redevelopment of appropriate brownfield sites and with one or more sustainable urban extensions would represent the most sustainable form of development in our opinion. Whilst PPS3 requires brownfield sites to be prioritised, the Borough would be unable to accommodate even the currently proposed housing requirement solely on brownfield sites.	
Roger Tym and Partners	Broad Locations	Of the five greenfield areas of search listed, Area A appears to be quite heavily constrained by flooding and environmental designations and this is reflected in its relatively poor assessment within the Sustainability Appraisal	Noted
Roger Tym and Partners		Area E also appears relatively constrained by the Historic Landscape and Green Wedge designations and by current land-uses.	Noted
Roger Tym and Partners		Area D is currently partially allocated as a country park	Noted
Roger Tym and Partners		Area C is largely occupied by Glen Gorse golf course.	Noted
Roger Tym and Partners		Area B appears to offer the fewest constraints in that it has no significant environmental designations and its deliverability is not hampered by current land uses. As stated earlier, land north of Newton Lane is within our client's control and appears as part of a mixed use proposed allocation site, some 64 hectares in size and titled "Land north of Newton Lane, east of Wensleydale	Noted: Support for Area B

		<p>Road” in Appendix 3 to the Allocations DPD Issues and Options Paper. This land is within Area of Search B and as well as helping to meet the general housing requirements referred to above, its development would be of a sufficient scale and “critical mass” to create a sustainable community with the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Provision of a mixed use development including a range of housing types (including significant provision of affordable housing), employment floor space, a substantial area of public open space and other appropriate social and community infrastructure, facilities and services; ii) A sustainable location on a regular bus route and only 1.5km to the schools, shops, places of employment and other commercial and public services and facilities in Wigston; iii) Direct access to Newton Lane, which feeds nearby into the A5199, the main arterial route 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>iv) through Wigston into Leicester itself; Potential for a highly sustainable form of development embodying the latest innovations in sustainable construction, having full regard to the low/zero carbon and climate change agendas and the drive for higher quality in design and layouts; and</p> <p>v) Potential for early and accelerated delivery of development as appropriate in the light of current Government thinking and the emerging Regional Plan requirements.</p>	
Blaby District Council	Broad Locations	Blaby District Council does not wish to express a preference for the 'broad locations for development identified' in your document, again this is a matter for Oadby and Wigston Borough Council and their communities. However, the area around 'option A' appears to fall within the River Sence floodplain, I note that you have considered this as part of your evidence gathering.	Noted
Blaby District Council	General	<p>Housing numbers</p> <p>Blaby District Council support paragraph</p>	Noted: Support for Council's challenge to RSS re housing numbers

		3.10 of your draft Core Strategy in reinforcing a desire to provide an increase in housing numbers to assist meeting the housing needs of your Borough and the wider Housing Market Area, this is consistent with our joint representations on the Regional Plan.	
Blaby District Council	Choices for Development Growth	<p>Blaby District Council considers that the options for delivery of housing in the Borough of Oadby and Wigston are a matter for that Authority and its communities. Notwithstanding this, where options will clearly have adverse impacts on neighbouring areas, such impacts should be properly assessed and appropriate mitigation measures introduced.</p> <p>I appreciate that PPS3 encourages a range of options to be considered in the preparation of Core Strategies. However, the potential for a free-standing new settlement within the District of Oadby and Wigston would appear limited</p>	Agreed
Blaby District Council	Choices for Development Growth	<p>Whilst we are aware of Regional Plan representations promoting a 'Sustainable Urban Extension' adjacent to the A6 within your authority and Harborough District, the principle of this has not yet been established through the RSS. If the Panel support the provision of an SUE adjacent to the A6, the implications of this will need to be carefully assessed. This Council is likely to be concerned should this require major highway</p>	Noted

		infrastructure to be provided within the District of Blaby.	
British Waterways	Broad Locations	Concerning the core strategy, page 18 covers broad locations for development including areas of search. We note that area A straddles the canal and area B is to the north but relatively closer to the canal.	Noted
<i>British Waterways</i>	<i>SA</i>	<p><i>Issue 8 covers recreation and leisure facilities. It covers green wedges and we would like to see the canal corridor considered as a green corridor with appropriate leisure and recreation facilities developed and at certain points, the concentration of some more commercial development.</i></p> <p><i>Issue 9 discusses development in the countryside and we certainly support the option of ensuring development in the countryside is integrated into existing development and designed sympathetically to the surrounding countryside .Government policy, for instance PPS 1, supports this strongly. It is not really an option as doing the opposite is against most, if not all, planning policies</i></p>	<i>Comments relate to Sustainability Appraisal</i>
<i>British Waterways</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>In looking at the options of land uses that would be most appropriate within the countryside, we would support land extensive outdoor recreational uses such as mooring basins in appropriate locations including Kilby Bridge. Small</i>	<i>Comments relate to Issues and Options Paper from July 05</i>

		<i>scale developments for leisure by the canal or with close access to the canal would also be supported. Transport infrastructure (land use 10) would include the canal and its towpath and improvement of conditions for users of the water and the towpath is strongly supported. We strongly support the option in the core strategy of encouraging tourist related development adjacent to the Grand Union Canal at Kilby Bridge (p42).</i>	
<i>British Waterways</i>	NA	<i>Added at 25.10.07 Issue 10 considers what type of development is most appropriate for Kilby Bridge. We are pleased to see that tourism should be encouraged and the potential to encourage greater use of the Grand Union canal should be explored.</i>	<i>Comments relate to Issues and Options Paper from July 05</i>
English Heritage	Choices for Development Growth	English Heritage has no strong preferences regarding the distribution of development, although a mix of brownfield and greenfield development should be considered.	Noted: Support for mix of brownfield and greenfield development
English Heritage	Choices for Development Growth	However, in determining directions for growth, we advise that landscape and urban character, including how well development can be integrated into the existing settlement, as well as consideration of historic assets and their setting should be key determinants in identifying preferred locations of growth. We recommend that you consult the County Historic Environment Record to	Noted

		<p>identify any areas of significant undesignated archaeology. The County Council is currently undertaking an Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) and the priority is for the area around Leicester to be completed first. We recommend that you contact Richard Clark about the availability of the HLC for your district.</p> <p>It needs to be demonstrated as part of the evidence base that the choice of locations has been informed by this analysis and this is a factor in determining the soundness of the plan with reference to national policy guidance and the draft Regional Plan policies 26, 30 and 31. We understand that the CLG may now wish to see major strategic sites shown on the key diagram for the Core Strategy, rather than merely directions of growth and you may wish to seek clarification of this from GOEM.</p>	
English Heritage	SA	<p><i>There are a number of omissions that have been picked up in the SA regarding the potential impact on historic assets of the different options. These need to be incorporated into the General Assessment tables in the appendix. In particular, we would draw your attention to the importance of considering the impact of potential development areas on the setting of historic assets, as set out in PPG 15. In particular, for Area of Search D, the impact of development on the setting of Stretton Magna deserted</i></p>	<p><i>Comments relate to the Sustainability Appraisal</i></p>

		<p><i>village scheduled monument (No. 17080) and the 3 listed buildings at Great Stretton, including the Grade II* listed church of St Giles, needs to be properly assessed. Similarly, for Area of Search E, the impact on the setting of Stoughton moated grange scheduled monument (No. 17056) and the 11 listed buildings, at Stoughton including the Grade II* St Mary's church and churchyard cross (also scheduled No. 30227) needs to be assessed.</i></p>	
English Heritage	SA	<p><i>English Heritage is satisfied that the potential impacts of the broad locations of growth on the historic environment (SA Objective 8) have been identified in the matrices in Appendix B. However, the assessment of the landscape implications does not cover the potential impacts on landscape character, including historic landscape character. Also, the comments on the development options are very generalised (SA objective 8, page B6) and do not distinguish between the different effects that development might have on a brownfield as opposed to a greenfield site. The effect on townscape of brownfield development is briefly mentioned under SA objective 9; however, we would suggest that if it resulted in the loss of buildings such as pubs and former industrial buildings, as suggested in the main report, there could be a loss of local distinctiveness and buildings of local historic character.</i></p>	Comments relate to the Sustainability Appraisal

		<p><i>Clearly this could be mitigated by encouraging the reuse of redundant buildings.</i></p> <p><i>It is stated in the last paragraph on page 4 of the SA that the tables in Appendix B include recommendations for mitigation. While the tables identify effects, they do not seem to include mitigation measures. We propose that the main text of the SA should include recommendations, e.g. that the choice of locations for development is informed by the appraisal and that mitigation for the identified effects is set out.</i></p>	
Mr R J Carter	Choices for Development Growth	<p>The 'allocations' areas of the document are shown away from the 3 town centres mainly. If the countryside is to be a target for industry, houses and facility provision, the unique mix of the borough will become lopsided – i.e. very little countryside left in the area. The urban sprawl would leave us ever more liable to City takeover as a dormitory suburb.</p> <p>It is important therefore to retain open areas for community use e.g. land between Council offices and Central Ave. as close to town centres as possible: the example may provide Astroturf areas for team games together with bowls (out and indoor), badminton, tennis etc facilities</p>	Agreed: Very important to retain open areas in urban core for community use.
Mr R J Carter	General	It is also important that commerce/industry is provided integral with housing and retail areas. Walkable	Agreed

		distances to employment have historically enabled the three communities to thrive in the past. Factory replacement by housing should not therefore continue too far; Two Steeples site, Leicester Road, St George's in moat Street etc are examples of where commerce has or will disappear.	
Mr R J Carter	NA	<p><i>The separation of S Wigston and Magna by the railway could well benefit by building a new bridge at the N end of the 'railway triangle'. This has been suggested to County Council as providing a link for the community as well as the Fairfield and W Avenue industrial / commercial areas having alternative transport route.</i></p> <p><i>Coupled with this is the golden opportunity to extend Holmden Ave. through to Station Road if S. Leics College vacates its site. This planned route by the Wigston H.D.C. never reached fruition and the narrow thoroughfares (Manor St and Pullman Rd) have proved inadequate in the development of the sixty years since. Please ensure this provision of a vital artery is not sidelined again!</i></p>	<i>Noted: Although not related to this consultation</i>
Steven Gasztowicz	Broad Locations	<p>Location E is not suitable as a location for development.</p> <p>Land in this location is not only greenfield</p>	Noted: Objection to Option E

		<p>land outside the urban area but:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) It is in a location which would increase reliance on the private car. It is distant from all facilities. (b) Development of a large site in this location would adversely affect the character and setting of the nearby Hill Top and Meadowcourt Conservation Area by reason of generation of traffic through the conservation area, and the loss of the feeling of openness in the approach to the conservation area along Stoughton Road. The particular character and appearance of this conservation area (as set out in the Council's Appraisal of July 2005) needs to be considered and would be adversely affected. An area of this sort, and the impact on it, is not a factor in respect of other potential locations; (c) The roads in and around this part of Oadby would be wholly unsuited to 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>development in this location and major changes would be required to the road scene in and around it, including the conservation area which would be further damaging to its character and appearance (se e.g. para 7.7 of the Council's Conservation Area Appraisal of July 2007) together with increases in noise and pollution</p> <p>(d) It is the last area of countryside in the Borough in this direction extremely attractive visually and in terms of feel.</p>	
Sue and Pete Sheldrick	Broad Locations	<p>We object to the proposed housing development on the field behind Pochin Bridge Road and between the landfill because</p> <p>(a) we were assured by Wimpey that this land would NOT be built on, therefore devalue our houses</p> <p>(b) it is too close to the landfill which has methane outlets</p> <p>(c) it is designated park area according to plans at</p>	Noted: Objection to Option A. However, comments could also relate to Allocations site of former Wigston landfill

		<p>(d) Wigston Council offices drainage is awful - the field is a bog for most of the year</p> <p>(e) access would mean even more traffic on Pochins Bridge Road which is congested enough now with the 55 houses and the flats.</p> <p>Similarly, access would be difficult to any trade developments especially shops on the railway area. Who would use them?</p>	
Friends, Families and Travellers	General	<p>Friends, Families and Travellers would like to take the opportunity afforded by the current consultation s to comment on the issue of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation both in the allocations document and in the forthcoming core strategy documentation. FFT did not comment previously because the capacity to do so was not available.</p> <p>Circular 1/2006 lays out arrangements for planning for Gypsies and Travellers. It states in para 31 that Core Strategies should set out criteria for the location of sites which will be used to guide the allocation of sites but also to meet unexpected demand. Hence there will be a need for locational criteria in the core strategy even if identified need is met so that any future need or unexpected demand can be met.</p>	Agreed: Although should note that GTAA defines that 1 pitch is only for up to 3 caravans

		Oadby and Wigston, on the basis of the GTAA, has a small identified need for a single site comprising one pitch. A pitch comprises accommodation for one family which may require space for several caravans	
Friends, Families and Travellers	General	<p>Circular 1/2006 requires all planning authorities to translate the number of pitches into specific site allocations. We question whether investigation of appropriate locations (para 11.3 Allocations DPD) meets this requirement in full. In our view the core strategy and site allocations DPD should commit the council to identify a site which is deliverable – i.e. available, suitable and achievable (PPS 3 para 54) within Government's timeframe target (3-5 years). This will of course require investigation of the circumstances and preferences of the potential inhabitants. Decision will need to be met on the mode of delivery – is the site to be a privately owned one or one in the RSL sector?</p> <p>The GTAA provides clear evidence of a small need and there seems to be no reason to wait until the Draft RSS is finalised before identifying and allocating a site.</p> <p>FFT is not in a position to identify a site but we would refer you to the RTPi Good Practice Advice note No 4 which includes information on accommodation and site delivery. It states that 'a pragmatic</p>	Noted

		<p>approach is to move direct identification of a range of potentially suitable sites in consultation with Gypsy and Traveller Communities'. The GTAA contains also considerable information on locational matters from the perspective of Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In our view ongoing consultation and the development of positive relations between Gypsies and Travellers and local councils will be a key factor in ensuring that satisfactory accommodation is made available within a reasonable timeframe and we would encourage the Borough to engage with the local travellers involved.</p>	
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	General	As already stated, the Co-operative Group believes that reliance solely on the redevelopment of previously developed land and buildings will result in the Council being unable to meet the housing requirements set for the Borough in the draft East Midlands RSS, thereby failing to provide a supply of housing land for the next 15 years as required by PPS3. Should the East Midlands RSS Panel Report recommend an increase to Oadby & Wigston's annual housing allocation for the RSS plan period, this problem will be exacerbated	Agreed
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	Choices for Development Growth	The Co-operative Group consider that Option 4.5 would result in a failure to identify sufficient housing land for the RSS plan period and will conflict with	Noted: Objection to Option 4.5

		guidance in PPS3 and guidance evolving from the Housing Green Paper.	
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	Choices for Development Growth	The Co-operative Group does not consider that Option 4.6, the development of SUE sites only, is an appropriate strategy for development in the Borough since it would not conform with government guidance which seeks to locate 60% of all new development on previously developed land (PPS1 and PPS3 paragraph 41), and sets out a sequential approach to site selection	Agreed
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	General	Whilst it is government policy that LPA's must now identify specific deliverable sites for housing in the first 5 years and a further supply of sites/ broad locations for the following 10 years (according to PPS3), it is acknowledged that some of these sites will exist within the Borough in the form of previously developed land. The early stages of preparation of the Town Centre Area Action Plans for Oadby and Wigston are evidence of this.	Noted
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	Choices for Development Growth	The Co-operative Group's preferred options for 'Choices and Broad Locations for Development Growth' would be Option 4.3 and 4.4, dependant upon the conclusions of the East Midlands RSS Panel Report. We trust that the above representations on behalf of the Co-operative Group will be fully taken into account in your progression of the Supplemental Core Strategy DPD to Preferred Options stage	Noted: Support for Options 4.3 and 4.4

		and would like to remain fully involved in the process, including the receipt of a summary of the responses received.	
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	Broad Locations	<p>The Co-operative Group has submitted a masterplan to the East Midlands RSS EiP in April 2007 for a SUE to the south east of Leicester, as stated above. The EiP was adjourned in July 2007, pending publication of the Housing Green Paper and written submissions being received from participants on whether it would materially impact on the Panel's considerations. It is not therefore currently known when the Panel's Report may be published.</p> <p>Should the East Midlands RSS Panel Report recommend that land to the south east of Leicester is allocated for an alternative or additional SUE rather than the opportunity currently identified in paragraph 5.10 of the draft RSS, the Co-operative Group considers that the most appropriate strategy for future development in the Borough would be the redevelopment of brownfield sites and one large SUE.</p> <p>Oadby & Wigston Borough Council are aware of the Co-operative Group's aspirations to develop an exemplar SUE between the A6 and A47 at Oadby & Wigston and Harborough. The Co-operative Group considers that land in Area of Search D (adjacent to the urban area south east of Oadby) should be</p>	Noted: Support for Option D

		<p>allocated for this purpose. The Co-operative Group is certain that its proposal for a SUE to the south east of Leicester represents an opportunity to deliver an exemplary, low carbon development in accordance with the masterplan submitted to the draft East Midlands RSS Panel.</p>	
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	Choices for Development Growth	<p>However, the Co-operative Group understands that there is not a sufficient housing requirement to develop a large SUE entirely within the Borough of Oadby & Wigston, and hence, requests that Option 4.3 is amended to read:</p> <p>“This option follows a strategy of urban concentration as advocated at national and regional level, plus allocation of one large Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE), to accommodate any future development that cannot be accommodated on suitable and viable previously developed land. The SUE could adjoin the Borough boundary and also accommodate some or all of the housing and employment land allocated to an adjoining district”.</p> <p>The Co-operative Group considers that the allocation of land to the south east of Leicester for a large SUE in Area of Search D would deliver the advantages set out in the accompanying table to Option 4.3. For example, if the Co-operative Group brought forward its</p>	<p>Noted: A joint approach to future development planning is currently being investigated between the Council and Neighbouring authorities</p>

		<p>proposals for a SUE, it would develop the new link road between the A6 and A47 in advance of the substantial commencement of the development without public funding (which is unusual for a development of this scale). The Co-operative Group would also fund new education facilities, health facilities, utilities infrastructure, recreational opportunities and local shopping/ service facilities. Additionally, as the masterplan shows, access to the existing Oadby urban area would be maximised by extension of footpaths, bridleways and cycle ways to enable access to existing facilities there</p>	
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	General	<p>PPS3 (2206) and the recent Housing Green Paper state at paragraphs 54- 55 and Chapter 2 respectively that Local Planning Authorities should identify sufficient specific deliverable sites to deliver housing for the first 5 years and identify a future supply of specific developable sites for years 6-10, and where possible for years 11- 15 (or broad locations for years 11- 15 where specific sites are not possible). The Green Paper notes that the Government will produce new guidance to support LPA's in identifying land to deliver homes for the next 5-15 years.</p> <p>Whilst the Town Centre Area Action Plans for Oadby and Wigston are at an early stage of preparation, it is unlikely that there will be sufficient previously</p>	Noted

		<p>developed land within the urban area to meet the Borough's 15 year housing requirement. It seems inevitable therefore that there will be a need to allocate Greenfield land in the form of an SUE to meet future housing development needs. The Co-operative Groups proposals for a SUE include a proportion of previously developed land, constituting 7% of the total land area, although this lies outside the Borough of Oadby & Wigston.</p>	
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	General	<p>On behalf of our client, the Co-operative Group, please find below representations on the Supplemental Issues and Options Paper of the Core Strategy DPD. You will already be aware of the Co-operative Group's masterplan for a Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) to the south east of Leicester which formed a core document at the East Midlands RSS EiP (ref. HOU 53) and its Sustainability Appraisal (HOU54) (see enclosed).</p> <p>The Co-operative Group has a very substantial land interest to the south east of the city of Leicester, totalling approximately 1,663 hectares. The land is associated with the Co-operative Group's farming operations and remains in the organisation's ownership as a legacy of the past Co-operative Society activities. The Co-operative Group is promoting a vision for an exemplar SUE to the south east of Leicester, which will assist significantly in the growth identified</p>	Noted

		<p>for Leicester in the draft East Midlands RSS.</p> <p>The Co-operative Group is well placed to promote and implement an exemplar SUE by virtue of its values and principles as a consumer- owned business, and its demonstrable commitment to tackling climate change and the Group- wide resources and capabilities it is able to draw upon. In April 2007, Buckingham Palace announced that the Group had been awarded the Queen’s Award for Enterprise in the Sustainable Development ‘for its outstanding advance in embedding sustainability across its Group operations’.</p> <p>These representations, on behalf of the Co-operative Group on the Core Strategy Issues and Options Supplemental Consultation, comment on the sustainable location of development (Key Issue 1).</p>	
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	Choices for Development Growth	Should the RSS Panel Report recommend a number of smaller SUEs be located to the south east of Leicester directly adjacent to the Leicester PUA, as considered in the Leicester Principal Urban Area (PUA) Housing Land Availability Assessment (HLAA) (May 2007), the Co-operative Group considers that the most appropriate strategy for new development in the Borough is Option 4.4, the redevelopment of brownfield sites and several small SUEs	Noted: Support for Option 4.4 should RSS recommend a number of smaller SUEs in south-east Leicester

Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	Broad Locations	<p>The Co-operative Group considers that land in Area of Search D (adjacent to the urban area south east of Oadby) and land in the Area of Search E (adjacent to the urban area north east of Oadby) should be allocated for this purpose.</p> <p>The Leicester PUA HLAA concluded that even taking account of the two SUEs identified in the draft RSS (in Blaby and east of Thurmaston, Charnwood), additional land for housing is required to be identified within the rest of the PUA. The report sets out an assessment of growth options, one of which is a number of smaller SUEs, each of 500- 1000 dwellings. Sites for potential small SUEs are set out in the report, and these include locations in Zones 3 and 4. These zones are to the south east of Leicester, within the Borough of Oadby & Wigston, and include the Co- operative Group's land.</p> <p>Should this option be endorsed by the RSS Panel Report, the Co-operative Group considers that land in Areas of Search D & E should be allocated for small SUEs. Comments above on the insufficient capacity of previously developed land for a 15 year housing supply apply equally to this option, necessitating the release of Greenfield land.</p>	Noted Support for Options D and E
Leith Planning Ltd (1)	General	[With reference to paragraphs 1.4 and 1.10], The aspirations are commendable;	Disagree: Evidence base is an iterative process and at time of this consultation,

		<p>however, it is difficult to provide a considered responses on the above issues laid at paragraph 1.10 in circumstances where the Duty to Survey appears flawed as it relates to health care, the elderly and an ageing population. The Core Strategy fails to achieve the above objectives in that insufficient regard is paid to the matter of healthcare, the needs of the elderly and an ageing population.</p>	<p>work was also being undertaken on Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The needs of the elderly were previously raised in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document, in particular, proposed policy CS21. The Issues and Options stage is the platform by which evidence gaps can be highlighted.</p>
<p>Leith Planning Ltd (2)</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Concern is raised that the local authority are carrying out consultations on the siting of new development and appropriate locations when an urban capacity study appears to be out of date in circumstances where the Inspectors report into the Regional Spatial Strategy is yet to be published. Without the information it is premature to be consulting on the methodology, when the amount of land required remains unknown. This concern is raised once again when reviewing paragraph 4.5 which states that:</p> <p>“There is still some spare development capacity within the existing urban areas yet to be released/realised but the current estimates are not sufficient to meet the expected development targets up to 2021 and beyond.”</p> <p>Again, until the Inspector’s report in the</p>	<p>Disagree: Although it is accepted that it is difficult to plan without definitive figures from the RSS, local authorities are required by legislation to continue preparing their LDFs in accordance with the Local Development Scheme. In addition it should be acknowledged that the Issues and Options stage is a very broad and informal stage of consultation and therefore is unlikely to present definitive figures.</p>

		Regional Spatial Strategy is published and the target figures for housing and employment land published this conclusion is premature.	
Leith Planning Ltd (3)	General	<p>Given the progressive ageing of the local and national population, there is an ever increasing need for the provision of care and accommodation for the elderly and this needs to be given due consideration within the Local Development Framework. This issue cannot be considered in isolation of the position within the County and within adjacent authorities. There should be further survey work carried out in relation to the care of the elderly to expand on the evidence base and the background data collected to date. The need for nursing homes, extra-care housing and care of the elderly, over the plan period, once identified should then be translated into a policy framework that will address the identified need. Without this exercise it is difficult to see how the Council can meet their 'social' obligations under section 13 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which deals with a "survey of the area"; and states:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"13-(1) The local planning authority must keep under review the matters which may be expected to affect the development of there area or planning of its development.</p>	Agreed in part: Leicestershire districts are currently working together on a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and proposed Older Peoples Housing Aspirations study

		(2) These matters include- (a) the principle physical, economic, social and environment characteristics of the area of the authority”	
Leith Planning Ltd (4)	General	Whilst the local authority has carried out a number of surveys and reports, as detailed in Section 2, the Council has failed to give adequate consideration to the matters of health care, the needs of the elderly and an ageing population. We would advise that Shrewsbury Council withdrew their submission draft of the Core Strategy from the Secretary of State because of concerns raised by Leith Planning Ltd in relation to the duty to survey and a failure to have regard to the above considerations; which are a statutory obligation. This approach was reinforced in Stafford and Lichfield LDF documents which were found to be unsound due to a lack of an up to date evidence base.	Disagree: Reiterate that evidence gathering is an iterative process and the Issue and Options stage is the opportunity to highlight gaps. However, the Council are very aware of the needs of elderly residents and attempted to address this to some extent through the Core Strategy Preferred Options and draft policy CS21 knowing that we still needed to build on our anecdotal evidence at that time.
Leith Planning Ltd (5)	General	Concern is raised that the local authority are carrying out consultations on the siting of new development and appropriate locations when the Inspectors report into the Regional Spatial Strategy is yet to be published. Without this information it is premature to be consulting on the methodology when the amount of land required remains unknown.	Disagree: Although it is accepted that it is difficult to plan without definitive figures from the RSS, local authorities are required by legislation to continue preparing their LDFs in accordance with the Local Development Scheme. In addition it should be acknowledged that the Issues and Options stage is a very broad and informal stage of consultation and therefore is unlikely to present

			definitive figures.
Leith Planning Ltd (6)	General	There would appear to be insufficient consideration within the Issues and Options Papers or survey documentation available for easy viewing on the needs of the elderly, health care and matters relating to an ageing population.	Agreed in part: the Issues and Options stage is the platform for raising such issues.