

Thurmaston Liaison Group

18th December 2013 - 6pm at Roundhill Academy

Fourth Meeting

Attendees

- Cllr Brenda Seaton – Charnwood Borough Councillor
- Cllr Kate Knaggs – County Councillor and Thurmaston Parish Councillor
- Cllr Daniel Grimley – Charnwood Borough Councillor
- Ralph Raven – Thurmaston Parish Council
- Lynne Stewart, Duck Pond resident's representative
- Nick Toms, BABTAG
- David White – Team Rector – The Fosse Team of Churches
- Sue Buckingham - Queninborough Parish Council
- Geoff Mee – Leicester City Council
- Steve McDonald – Roundhill Academy
- Rob Gill - CEG
- Richard Wain - Hawksmoor
- Nick Baker - nlp
- Victoria Walker - Beattie

Apologies

- Rt Hon Stephen Dorrell MP
- Cllr Norman King
- Darren Gartside
- Owen Bentley
- Cllr Tom Bentley
- Cllr Ken Pacey

Outstanding action points

ACTION POINT – VW to clarify gap closure with WYG

Sign off of the minutes

NT raised OB's minutes query relating to whether the development considers existing transport issues in Barkby.

RG explained: The development will look at mitigating the transport movements arising from the proposed development and it will be the developer's responsibility to mitigate as each issue arises (i.e. in line with phased development.)

In terms of the transport modelling, this looks at existing traffic movements as well as all other developments with planning permission, whether these developments have started or not. There is also a factor included for general transport growth within the model. It was agreed that there would be a further discussion with the transport consultants when everyone has had an opportunity to review the TA which will be submitted with the application.

ACTION POINT – a further transport session to be organised when everyone has had chance to review the TA

ACTION POINT - It was agreed VW should upload the minutes to the website as the meeting has now approved them.

3. Planning submission overview

NB confirmed that we are very close to now finalising and submitting a planning application. There will be an on-going discussion on a whole range of topics with various organisations, including the liaison group. But we have now reached a stage that the main principles are now finalised, so an application can be submitted and we can continue to further discuss detailed elements post submission.

The applications will be submitted to both Local Authorities as the application site straddles both authority boundaries.

A presentation was circulated outlining the documents which will be submitted as part of the application. This will help to guide members as to which documents they can download for review.

The masterplan on the hand-out shows the scheme as it now stands. There have been a few refinements, including four key changes as follows:

- North eastern edge of the development against Barkby Lane - the built edge of the development has been pulled back from the Lane with a larger area of SUDS, community orchard and open space providing a larger green wedge between the development and villages. This also ensures no built development within any area at risk of flooding.
- The red line (extent of formal application boundary) has now been fixed. The overall area hasn't changed significantly but it now fixes the application area.
- The southern access has now been fixed and will be from the detailed element of the planning application.
- Public open space, including children's facilities, and other aspects have now been shown in terms of how they might be provided for in the scheme

Q) LS queried that the red line shown is not exactly the same as the Core Strategy diagram and excludes land to the North West.

A) NB – Yes. CEG has made representations to the Core Strategy. The Inspector will consider if all aspects of the Plan are sound and will consider if the north-west link in the plan needs to be included, for example for greater clarity within the Plan.

We now have more detail about those access points to help inform our red line plan.

Q) LS asked: If all the landowners had been contacted regarding access proposals.

A) RW explained: We have been liaising with landowners, the majority have been contacted. Agreements have not been reached with all of the landowners. All landowners will be notified about the application formally once submitted. This is an outline application and detailed issues would not be finalised until far later, particularly as the proposals start in the southern area of the site. It could be a few years before any detailed applications are prepared for the northern end of the site.

Q) SB raised the proposed 150 houses put forward by DWH and that there an objection from CEG. What weight will your objection have?

A) NB explained - This site is identified as an employment location in the Core Strategy. In our view that application is not a comprehensive approach for a sustainable urban extension. It doesn't allow for a well-planned scheme. The emerging local plan will have more weight as it moves through the consultation process.

This is our position but ultimately, the decision will be one for the local authority to make.

Q) LS: The landowner has said that if it is not residential it will not be developed. Can the Council CPO the land?

NB: A) that would be a decision for the Local Authority, but yes legally they do have CPO powers.

Q) SB asked: Is it not the case that any applications will be considered, in the absence of an adopted local plan, in the usual planning process? Are you saying it isn't sustainable and shouldn't be considered, would this therefore be the same in Queninborough for small applications there?

NB: A) 150 homes in a free standing development is not able to provide the facilities, transport improvements, health, education and other infrastructure a larger scheme can deliver. The CEG scheme is more sustainable than piecemeal developments on small sites. All applications would go through the usual planning process.

Q) KK: If these 150 homes get planning will it affect your plan?

NB: A) The masterplan is illustrative, it is an outline application. Only the southern access from Melton Brook south is in detail, so when the applications are determined this area and detail would be fixed. The balance of the site would be in outline, and an outline permission will set the broad principles including number of homes, amount of employment space, but exactly how that will look and be laid out would be fixed at the later stage of detailed planning (and subject to further consultation). As the build period is 15 years this is needed to allow flexibility to tweak and refine, and respond to any environmental changes for example.

Our wider masterplan starts in the south and allows transport improvements and the delivery of infrastructure to come forwards in line with the development.

A 150 scheme in isolation would not bring forward the wider transport improvements or infrastructure.

The CEG scheme has been designed following many design workshops and parameter plans. A lot of work has gone in to make this site work in the best way reflecting environment, ecology, transport, delivering of facilities etc... and ideally you would seek to bring forward a comprehensive development in a phased, comprehensive and sustainable way.

NB continued with the presentation: Landscaping can be addressed by planning conditions, but there might be a package of wider works through S106 contributions to areas outside of the red line, such as Hamilton Park. We are liaising with the City about investment to areas of the Park.

North of Melton Brook falls into the Charnwood area. This is the area of the outline application and the outline element of the description of development relates to this.

Q) LS: B1, C1 uses – what do these mean?

NB explained that the B-Class covers a range of employment uses including offices, light industrial, research and development. The use classes are broad, for example, B8 covers storage and distribution (warehousing), but we are not talking about delivering an Amazon warehouse. B8 also includes a small scale units which is why it has to be included into the overall outline application so that it can be discussed, debated and limits set and agreed through the planning process. We have included the full range of commercial types which might be acceptable. A maximum or minimum size of space for each commercial unit can be set within the planning permission.

ACTION POINT – VW to append the table clarifying these as a list in the minutes detailing what all of these mean.

Use Classes Guidance – This is taken from the Government’s Planning Portal website and the additional notes/examples are also from the Portal. This gives an indication of uses but, as noted, it is not an exhaustive list of all uses or activity within each Use Class:

Use Classes

The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) puts uses of land and buildings into various categories known as 'Use Classes'.

The following list gives an indication of the types of use which may fall within each use class. Please note that this is a guide only and it's for local planning authorities to determine, in the first instance, depending on the individual circumstances of each case, which use class a particular use falls into.

- **A1 Shops** - Shops, retail warehouses, hairdressers, undertakers, travel and ticket agencies, post offices (but not sorting offices), pet shops, sandwich bars, showrooms, domestic hire shops, dry cleaners, funeral directors and internet cafes.
- **A2 Financial and professional services** - Financial services such as banks and building societies, professional services (other than health and medical services) including estate and employment agencies and betting offices.
- **A3 Restaurants and cafés** - For the sale of food and drink for consumption on the premises - restaurants, snack bars and cafes.
- **A4 Drinking establishments** - Public houses, wine bars or other drinking establishments (but not night clubs).
- **A5 Hot food takeaways** - For the sale of hot food for consumption off the premises.

- **B1 Business** - Offices (other than those that fall within A2), research and development of products and processes, light industry appropriate in a residential area.
- **B2 General industrial** - Use for industrial process other than one falling within class B1 (excluding incineration purposes, chemical treatment or landfill or hazardous waste).
- **B8 Storage or distribution** - This class includes open air storage.

- **C1 Hotels** - Hotels, boarding and guest houses where no significant element of care is provided (excludes hostels).
- **C2 Residential institutions** - Residential care homes, hospitals, nursing homes, boarding schools, residential colleges and training centres.
- **C2A Secure Residential Institution** - Use for a provision of secure residential accommodation, including use as a prison, young offenders institution, detention centre, secure training centre, custody centre, short term holding centre, secure hospital, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks.
- **C3 Dwellings** - this class is formed of 3 parts:
 - C3(a) covers use by a single person or a family (a couple whether married or not, a person related to one another with members of the family of one of the couple to be treated as members of the family of the other), an employer and certain domestic employees (such as an au pair, nanny, nurse, governess, servant, chauffeur, gardener, secretary and personal assistant), a carer and the person receiving the care and a foster parent and foster child.
 - C3(b): up to six people living together as a single household and receiving care e.g. supported housing schemes such as those for people with learning disabilities or mental health problems.
 - C3(c) allows for groups of people (up to six) living together as a single household. This allows for those groupings that do not fall within the C4 HMO definition, but which fell within the previous C3 use class, to be provided for i.e. a small religious community may fall into this section as could a homeowner who is living with a lodger.

- **C4 Houses in multiple occupation** - small shared houses occupied by between three and six unrelated individuals, as their only or main residence, who share basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom.

- **D1 Non-residential institutions** - Clinics, health centres, crèches, day nurseries, day centres, schools, art galleries (other than for sale or hire), museums, libraries, halls, places of worship, church halls, law court. Non residential education and training centres.
- **D2 Assembly and leisure** - Cinemas, music and concert halls, bingo and dance halls (but not night clubs), swimming baths, skating rinks, gymnasiums or area for indoor or outdoor sports and recreations (except for motor sports, or where firearms are used).

- **Sui Generis** - Certain uses do not fall within any use class and are considered 'sui generis'. Such uses include: theatres, houses in multiple occupation, hostels providing no significant element of care, scrap yards. Petrol filling stations and shops selling and/or displaying motor vehicles. Retail warehouse clubs, nightclubs, launderettes, taxi businesses, amusement centres and casinos.

The Planning Application

You will be able to log onto Charnwood or Leicester's websites and download the documents or obtain them from the Council's offices. Some of those documents relate to the detailed application (southern access) and others are for the outline application.

It will include the following documents:

- **Covering Letters**
- **Application Forms including relevant Ownership/Agricultural Holding Certificate;**
- **Planning Application Drawings;**
- **Planning Summary Statement:** prepared by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners;
- **Planning Statement:** prepared by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners;
- **Design and Access Statement:** prepared by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners; this includes the illustrative masterplan and parameter plans for the proposed development;
- **Retail Assessment and Appendix:** prepared by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners;
- **Economic Statement:** prepared by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners;
- **Utilities and Wastewater Statement:** prepared by White Young Green;
- **Outline Energy Statement:** prepared by White Young Green;
- **Waste Management Strategy:** prepared by White Young Green;
- **Ground Conditions Statement:** prepared by White Young Green;
- **Sustainability Statement:** prepared by White Young Green;
- **Green Infrastructure Study:** prepared by Tyler Grange;
- **Landscape Framework Plan:** prepared by Tyler Grange;
- **Statement of Community Involvement:** prepared by Beattie Communications.

There is also an **Environmental Statement** which includes:

- **Volume 1: Non-Technical Summary**
- **Volume 2: Main Technical Studies:**
 - Chapter A: Introduction and Background (NLP);
 - Chapter B: Methodology and Scope (NLP);
 - Chapter C: Description of Site and Development (NLP);
 - Chapter D: Landscape and Visual Impact (Tyler Grange);
 - Chapter E: Ecology and Biodiversity (Baker Consultants);
 - Chapter F: Water Environment (Weetwood Services);
 - Chapter G: Transport (White Young Green and Steer Davies Gleave);
 - Chapter H: Air Quality (White Young Green);
 - Chapter I: Noise and Vibration (White Young Green);
 - Chapter J: Socio-Economic Impacts (NLP)
 - Chapter K: Heritage (CgMs);
 - Chapter L: Land Use and Agricultural Land Classification (Soil Environmental Services);
 - Chapter M: Cumulative and Residual Effects (NLP).
- **Volume 3: Appendices to the Main Technical Studies (including):**
 - Ecology Surveys
 - Flood Risk Assessment (Weetwood Services);
 - Transport Assessment (White Young Green);
 - Framework Travel Plan (Steer Davies Gleave);
 - Air Quality Assessment (White Young Green);
 - Historic Built Environment Appraisal (CgMs).

In terms of the phasing, the development is expected to come forward with the southern area first, and then be built out south to north. The phasing spreads out like a butterfly shape to incorporate the first District Centre at an early stage.

In terms of the phasing for the employment area, within the design and access statement we're anticipating this at phase three which is 7 – 10 years. This is in-line with the northern link. This would be in place before the final development.

Q) KK: Is there a restriction in terms of heights across the site?

NB: Q) Within the parameters these set specific heights for specific areas of the site. For example parts of the site are limited to two storey homes, other areas might be 2.5 or 3 storeys.

Q) LS: Have you now finalised how the green spaces will be managed?

RW: A) We have said there will be a separate meeting for green spaces management; we have furthered discussions with the Lands Trust, which is a body which looks to take on management of these types of areas as well as looking into Community Trusts. Charnwood needs to consider Governance. CEG is doing further work on this

RR: Q) Can the documents be downloaded once the application has been submitted

NB: A) Once it's validated you will be able to download them. Within the presentation there is a link to the website and VW will circulate the application number as soon as we know it so it's easy to download and review.

KK: Q) The reserve secondary school site is in phase two. Where will the children go to existing schools from phase one?

RW: A) As children now travel; it would be a mix of bus, foot, car, similar to how children access schools at the moment. As part of the transport plan we are looking to incorporate new bus services, pedestrian and cycle paths.

LS: Q) When does the primary school get delivered?

RG: A) This site has identified it will need up to three primary schools with six forms of entry. Within the socio economic chapter of the application there is detailed analysis of need and the likely number of pupils living in the new properties so we can forecast when they are required. Until the new school is required children will go to the existing primary schools. There will be financial education contributions from phase one to ensure that the first children on site can be accommodated in local schools and then the first school is built in line with the first trigger.

KK: Q) If a school is built, who is responsible for it?

RG: A) All new schools are now Academies. We are in discussion with the Step group for primary schools which is a local organisation as well as talking to the Schools Partnership Trust. We are also in discussion with Roundhill regarding the Academy at secondary level.

CEG agreed to provide copies of the Planning Application summary documents for Parish Offices to have available for parishioners to read.

ACTION POINT – VW to circulate the hard copies of the planning summary to each parish clerk.

LS: Q) Has any of the information given to the team at these Liaison meetings been reflected in the latest masterplan? I don't see evidence of SUDS in the Duck Pond area?

RG: A) Yes, there is far more information about SUDS in the application documentation.

RW added: The scale of the plan shown in the presentation is very small so this masterplan is not showing individual drainage systems working across the site. As we are starting the scheme in the south we can't yet provide the full detail of the drainage system in the north. Following the outline application there will be a series of reserved matters applications which each deal with their own transport, education, health and drainage issues for example; and these link into our overall strategy.

By having a comprehensive masterplan for the whole site we can look at water storage for the whole site, we can then plan a series of major ponds, underground tanks as well as smaller drainage solutions for individual areas. Unfortunately the masterplan shown in the presentation is for an outline scheme and is not large enough to show all of the detail across the site.

RG added: You can be assured that we are aware there is an issue in this area and that it is our intention to make the situation better not worse.

DG: Q) In terms of flood risk, the EA has put out updated guidance.

RG: A) Yes, a lot of the mapping has been updated following work that CEG's drainage consultants have undertaken through their own surveys. Our team is working to the latest statistics and flooding information.

RR: Q) Class C2 specialist housing for special needs, how many of these will be created within the overall scheme?

NB A) There is on-going discussions with Charnwood looking at the housing range. CEG is committed to providing a full mix of homes across the site and is looking at the balance of homes within each phase.

4. Planning Timetable

This remains an on-going process. There will be many further discussions and debate about the detail. There is a planning performance agreement in place, this sets out what is required for the application and also sets out an indicative timetable. It is expected that this application will go beyond the statutory application decision timeframes.

We recognise that the Core Strategy needs to move to the next stage before Charnwood is in a position to make a decision about the application. But we are aware that the Inspector will be looking to see deliverability of the SUEs and other strategic application. Therefore we expect to see both moving forwards together.

Our application will therefore support Charnwood's Local Plan process.

We can only provide an estimated timetable at this stage, summarised as follows:

December 2013	<i>Charnwood Core Strategy Submission</i> NEoL SUE Planning Application Submissions
January – March 2014	Ongoing Consultation and Discussions including Liaison Group Q&A Session
April 2014	<i>Charnwood Core Strategy Examination</i>
Summer – Autumn 2014	NEoL SUE Planning Applications – Determination First Reserved Matters Applications Submitted
Late 2014	<i>Charnwood Core Strategy Adopted</i>

KK: Q) What happens if the Plan is found to be unsound?

NB: A) The housing need doesn't go away if a Plan is found unsound. There are still thousands of people in both Charnwood and Leicester needing new homes. If a Plan is found unsound then the Inspector can make recommendations for where the Plan might need alterations.

There are a series of exploratory meetings between a Local Authority and the Inspector so usually any major issues are resolved before a Plan is submitted.

KK: Q) As you are starting in the south of the site, is there an immediate need for new homes?

RG: A) if you look at the national Government housing numbers, there is a need for 200,000 homes per year nationwide. There is also a pent-up shortfall as these numbers are not being delivered year on year. Housing is needed now both nationally and locally. Census data analysis is undertaken and we address this within our statement. The Council has also been undertaking further work on housing numbers. They have a number of technical documents as part of the Core Strategy which deals with immediate and future housing numbers. 790 units per year was the conclusion of these technical documents to meet Charnwood's needs.

One of the key principles is there is also a duty to co-operate between the local authorities so needs have been assessed across the wider area. Where a local authority can't meet its own needs, they have a legal duty to co-operate with the adjacent local authority to ensure that together they look at local needs.

GM: The City can't deliver all of the homes it needs and it has to work together. The City needs 20,000 homes and a number of sites have been identified in the Local Plan process.

Within the Planning Statement, the migration from Leicester City to Charnwood in the Census for 2011 showed 1810 people per year, whilst migration from Charnwood to Leicester was 860 people per year. This equates to a net in-migration to the Borough of 950 people. To meet this need the

Charnwood Local Plan Core Strategy suggests around 330 units per year within the Leicester PUA in Charnwood, not specifically within the NEoL SUE, are required. Across the Borough, the entire housing requirement is 790 per annum.

A debate took place regarding the ecological value of parts of the site and Hamilton Park. The Park actually has a low ecological value; some areas have improved due to lack of access. CEG's proposals actually set out improvements which include areas with little accessibility to manage ecology effectively and create areas of enhancement. Then there will be separate areas which encourage accessibility. In addition, biodiversity corridors will be created.

The masterplanning is based around a green wedge through the centre of the site which increases a green space, with strong ecological benefits for the area. There have been a lot of discussions with the city regarding what will be planted and when will it be planted. We are looking at early planting schemes so that by the time the road is completed the planting has had the opportunity to be further advanced than starting it after the road is completed.

DG: Q) Concerns have been raised regarding construction traffic going through some of the villages. Is this something which CEG can look at?

NB: A) Yes this is something we will be looking at. There would ultimately be a comprehensive Construction Management Plan which Parishes are consulted upon.

5. Date of Next Meeting

It was agreed that members would start to review the application documents and then submit requests for topics for the next meeting as well as submitting specific questions on the documents as you review them so that consultants can answer them at each meeting.

It was agreed that **Thursday 6th February 6pm at Roundhill College** was the date of the next meeting.