

	APPENDIX C	
	CONSULTATION CORRESPONDENCE SUMMARY	
Consultant	Comments	Response
EXTERNAL		
English Heritage	Re-evaluate number of housing units for the wider regeneration area.	LRC to consider.
	Refer to national policies PPG16 'Archaeology and planning', PPG3 'Housing', PPG17 'Sport, Open Space, Recreation'.	Include these references in SPG paragraphs 2.5 Archaeology– PPG19 7.2.2 Form & Scale of new Residential Development– PPG3. 8.3 Open Space– PPG17-
	Encouraged that heritage of both St George's N & S is reflected in SPG.	Good.
	Requirement for 'sympathetic' design and materials, particularly within the conservation area or in the proximity of historic buildings.	Included in SPG paragraph 7.2.1 Quality, Buildings and spaces.
	Reinforce that historic buildings to provide key focal points to the public realm and pedestrian hubs.	Include in SPG paragraph 7.2.3 Place, Heritage
	Recognise the importance of existing vistas. Three additional ones suggested added to map 9.	One vista already on map, two vistas added to map 9.
	Indicate areas where higher build will realise landmark/gateway opportunities.	Referred to key gateways and node on Map 9 in SPG paragraph 7.2.5 Density.
	Exampler Scheme: 6-storey south side of Erskin St will dominate Victorian Buildings on Humberstone Gate East.	South side of Erskin Street is in the CA and so any buildings will need CA consent to be demolished or extended. Not included Exemplar Scheme in

		SPG. Added reference to buildings heights in CA in SPG paragraph 7.2.1 Quality, Buildings and spaces.
--	--	---

	Exampler project is an opportunity to retain and reuse historic buildings and integrate them with well-designed modern architecture alongside.	See note above. Added wording to SPG paragraph 7.2.1 Quality, Buildings and spaces.
	Refer to English Heritage's guidance document 'Transport and the Historic Environment'.	Add this reference to SPG paragraph 7.1 Access and Movement.
	Relocation of traffic and buses may impact on historically important areas.	Transport Development Group to liaise with bus companies.
	Respect initiatives highlighting the de-cluttering of streets. (EH Save our Streets campaign)	Added to SPG paragraph 8.0 Public Realm.
	Siting of new trees should not affect the visual amenity of historic buildings.	Add to SPG paragraph 7.4.4 Trees.
	Document is generally a robust guidance note.	Good
Gately Wareing / Edmund Developments	SPG should acknowledge that the future viability of the "New Community" is based on the need to strike the right balance in housing mix provision. Details of mechanism missing from 7.2.3 and 9.2. Further consultation required on these details.	Added to SPG paragraph 2.6 Mix of Housing. Reference to a delivery mechanism for mixed use omitted.
	Request greater flexibility on height restriction in the Lee Circle area. Mentions 11 storey bocks currently being developed in Lee Circle area.	See English Heritages comments. Current development in Lee Circle is refurbishment of an existing building, which is 7 storeys with an additional upper floor set back. Current planning applications above this height are not being recommended for approval. Max. height adjacent the ring road changed to 8 storeys in SPG as in LRC Development Framework
CABE	No comment on New Development Plan. Will advice on design proposals, which arise.	O.K.
Environment Agency	No further comments. Welcome the requirement to use SUDS.	O.K.

Police Force Architectural Liaison Officer	Support the document. Add the need to consult with the Police.	Added to SPG paragraph 10.5 Police.
Leicester Civic Society	Mentions 'historic' theatre building on Gladstone Street. Wish to see Prince of Wales Public House (Wharf / Crafton St.) retained.	These are listed as buildings of local interest
	Supports proposal to include family housing but problem providing schools, play spaces etc. Providing 1700-2000 dwellings will require relocation of existing business. Cleared site bounded by Morledge, Burton, Nichols and Midland Streets good site for housing.	Play spaces: Local Plan policy. Schools etc: SPG paragraph 9.3 Developer Contributions. Local businesses are being kept informed by LRC.
	Lee Circle multi-storey car park has some 'historic' interest, as it was the first of its type in the country. It is now underused.	It is underused due to the area feeling unsafe due to the imposed circle and the building preventing any views through the area.
	Welcomes Wharf St bus way and a new crossing on St Matthew's Way for buses, cyclists and pedestrians.	Good.
	Welcomes proposals for tree planting on Belgrave Gate and asks for retention of the trees on the roundabout at the Charles St junction.	The quality of the trees on Belgrave roundabout and their retention will be accessed.
	Buildings in Upper Charles St, Belgrave Gate, Bedford St and Lee Circle are in the 'Art Deco' style.	We note there are buildings in the 'Art Deco' style and the Conservation Officer will consider them for inclusion on the list of buildings of local interest.
	Recommends that: Hannam Court Flats, Charles St; Salvation Army Citadel, Kildare St; and the Wyvern Centre, Clarence St; are included in the list of buildings of local interest.	The Conservation Officer will consider this.
B Waller & K F Hill. Local	Hope that regeneration will make this area an	Regeneration should help the area to be better

residents	exciting and pleasant place to live. Litter is a problem, area looks dilapidated, shop signs garish and lighting that adds no charm to the area.	cared for. The funding from the Liveability Project is intended to address these issues.
	BT building stands as a fortress, formidable and unfriendly.	The BT (Telereal) building (41 Wharf St S) is a good quality design with quality materials and is included in the CA.
	Lee Circle Car Park could be brick faced and a roof garden added.	The building prevents views into the area making it feel unsafe.
	More roof top gardens and where possible which are open to the public to view the city.	Add reference to private amenity space and roof gardens SPG paragraph 7.2.2 Form & Scale of new Residential Development.
	Area around Lee Circle should be laid with bricks, and have benches and trees.	The intention is for tree planting, good quality paving and street furniture in this area. SPG paragraph 8.0 Public Realm.
	Small artisans and craft shops could draw people to the area. There is a lack of family restaurants.	Belgrave Gate would be an ideal location for specialist shops and restaurants and the proposed improvements should attract these types of businesses.
	There are enough places of worship.	Community buildings will only be used for worship if required.
	Access to public transport is good but some buses have very noxious fumes.	Transport Development Group to liaise with bus companies.
	Consideration must be taken of the effect of noise from patrons and music from the local bars on residential areas. Also noise from service vehicles.	Covered in 7.4.1. This will be a planning consideration.
	There are problems with drunkenness and drug dealing in the area. Would like CCTV cameras covering the residential areas. Good lighting, tastefully done would help to make areas safer.	Reference to quality street lighting added to SPG paragraph 7.2.1 Quality, Public realm.

	Offer to participate in any groups to consider various ideas.	New Community Delivery Group (LRC, LCC et al) to set up a residents' forum when proposals come forward.
John Redfern	Sees no problem with physical layout.	Good.
	Look at Birmingham, which has inspirational street furniture, town squares, exciting architecture and preservation of good old buildings.	We can learn from these examples. .
	Suggests a 'green bridge' for the Wharf Street crossing over CRR, suitable only for pedestrians, cyclists, joggers and horses.	An at-grade crossing is proposed here to be convenient for pedestrians, cyclists, disabled people and pushchairs.
	Asks for something that will surprise and delight and we can feel proud of.	Added wording in SPG paragraph 7.2.1 Quality, Buildings and spaces.
J. Sanchez Taylor local resident email	Happy to see work to bring life to the city. Finds plans and architectural designs boring and unadventurous. New buildings could inspire and put Leicester on the map for being an innovative and modern city. Proposals are conservative and cheap.	As above.
	No mention of culture or sport so feels like a financial development rather than a community one.	Proposals for the Cultural Quarter mentioned. Wording to encourage leisure uses in SPG paragraphs 5.0 Vision & Aims, and 6.0 Mixed Use.
M. N. Clutten email	Superficial proposals. Omits the problem of buses. Buses are needed but should be kept away from a landscaped city centre as it will be ruined by dozens of them ploughing through it or standing with their engines running.	Transport Development Group to liaise with bus companies.
Public Questionnaire Replies	General support.	Good
	Request for facilities and needs for the disabled.	Needs for disabled people mentioned in SPG

		paragraphs 5.0 Vision & Aims, Mixed Use – Ease of Movement, 7.1 Access & Movement, 7.2.3 Place, Mixed Use. Added SPG paragraph 9.3 Access Housing.
--	--	--

	Concerns about traffic congestion and pollution (buses).	Transport Development Group to liaise with bus companies.
	Concerns about public safety in the area.	SPG paragraphs 7.2.1 Quality, Public Space, 7.2.2 Form and Scale of new Residential Development, 7.2.3 Place, Mixed Use, 7.2.5 Vitality refer to improving public safety in the area.
GOEM	Clarify wording re Local Plan.	Amended SPG paragraph headings 2.1 and 2.2
	Developer Contributions – refer to relevant sections 46 & 47 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004	Amended SPG paragraph 9.3 Developer Contributions.
	Should now be preparing Supplementary Planning Documents.	First report on the LRC Development Framework January 2004. The Development Framework is the base work for the SPG. Therefore this document will be adopted as SPG to the adopted local plan.
	Work undertaken on this SPG could be used as part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework.	Development Plans Group to note.
Leicester ‘Cycle-City’ Workshop	Most agreed the plans were vague and uninspiring.	Added wording to SPG paragraph 7.2.1 Quality, Buildings and spaces.
LRC New Community Delivery Group	SPG to identify the land for school/community uses.	Added wording to SPG paragraph 6.2 Key Infrastructure Interventions.
	More flexibility in the range of dwellings, specifying floor areas rather than bedroom numbers.	Added SPG paragraph 2.5 Mix of Housing.
	Refer to the medium rise ‘town house’ residential development.	Added reference to, medium rise perimeter block development as specified the New Community Development Framework, in SPG paragraph 7.2.2 Form and Scale of new Residential Development..
COUNCIL		

DEPARTMENTS/GROUPS		
Development Control	More specific guidance where taller buildings would be appropriate. And general guidance for building heights.	See response to EH.
	Clearer advice to the level of S106 contributions.	Amended paragraph 9.3 Developer Contributions
Housing Department	Draft SPG attractive, well set out and easy to navigate.	Good.
	Request early reference made to the need for a wide range of housing accommodation.	Reference in SPG paragraph 1.2 New Community Development Framework. Added SPG paragraph 2.5 Mix of Housing.
	Requested amendments/additions regarding family housing.	Added reference to family housing in SPG paragraphs 2.6 Mix of Housing, 5.0 Mixed Use, 7.2.3 Place, Mixed Use, and 9.1 Affordable Housing.
	Request consultation on mechanism for delivery of appropriate mixed use.	Reference to a delivery mechanism for mixed use omitted.
	Request removing reference on Map 10 to the regeneration of St Matthews Housing Estate.	Map 10 in SPG amended.
	Is there sufficient reference to secure the support services for the new community?	See 9.3 Developer Contributions. Other funding mechanisms will have to be sought but this is outside the scope of this SPG.
Pollution Control	Section 7.4.1 O.K.	
	Include a requirement for a traffic impact assessment where appropriate, which can be used to assess the impact on existing air quality and noise.	Added this requirement to SPG paragraph 10.1 Highways.
Transport Development Section	Has issue with 1) removing of buses from Humberstone Gate East and 2) reducing the intrusion of buses from Charles Street. Some	Transport Development Group to liaise with the bus companies.

	amendments to text and maps.	
--	------------------------------	--

Conservation Officer	Changes to wording regarding heritage.	Changed wording to SPG paragraph 7.2.3 Place, Heritage.
	Concern that the 'exemplar scheme' indicative plan appears to involve the demolition of several historic buildings in the CA. Document should ensure that new development is in addition to and not in place of, our built heritage. Mention new local plan policy on buildings of local interest in RCCLP BE08.	See response to EH.
	Queries advising developers to apply for a certificate of immunity from listing if planning approval will affect a building of local interest.	Removed from SPG.
Access Officer	Suggests reference is made to the Access Housing Standard H07 in RCLLP.	Added paragraph 9.3 Access Housing to SPG document, referring to policy H3b in adopted local plan.
Richard Riley, Urban Design	Request referring to Urban Design Groups compendium of chartered architects that have expressed interest in the regeneration of the city.	Added reference to compendium of chartered architects to SPG paragraph 7.2.1 Quality.
Public Art Officer	Requested reference to % for art policy.	Added to SPG paragraph 7.4.3 Art ,reference to policy IMP01 in RCLLP.
Development Plans	Need to be more up front about the family housing agenda.	Reference to family housing in SPG paragraph 1.2 New Community Development Framework. Added paragraph 2.5 Mix of housing to SPG document. Further references added - see response to Housing Dept.
	7.2.3 Mixed use. Delete reference to a delivery mechanism for mixed use.	Reference to delivery mechanism deleted from SPG document.
	Amend 9.3 Developer Contributions. Seek S106 to create an appropriate residential environment. Financial appraisals only needed where the	SPG paragraph 9.3 Developer Contributions amended as requested.

	developer claims they cannot meet all their obligations. Add re the tarrif – Jeevan Dhesi is looking at a city-wide tarrif approach following Govt guidance (April?).	
--	---	--