

APPENDIX A

**PART 1 –
Formal Respondents**

**Representations received in writing by people and organisations that
have provided their name and address.**

--

STATUTORY BODIES

British Waterways

In principle, BW supports the vision for Waterside and role of the Waterside SPD as set out in sections 2.02 and 2.03

No change to SPD

Waterside Strategy Reference Section 9.02.01

The issues proposed to be addressed within the strategy could place extra burdens upon BW and therefore the public purse in relation to ongoing management and maintenance costs. The proposals included within this publication could impact upon drainage, surface water discharges, bridge crossings and other ancillary property rights over BW estates. Any flood risk alleviation schemes need to take of its impact on navigation, water levels and velocity.

In relation to bridge crossings BW needs to be involved at an early stage in relation to the channel width and headroom together with the overall appearance.

No change to SPD

BW need to review the proposal to remove the bridge at the confluence with the Old River Soar and the main navigable channel as this could affect bank erosion.

Discuss at future meeting

BW needs to assess the proposal to dredge and reopen the culverted section of the Old Mill Stream of the grand Union Canal in order to assess the impact on the navigation channel, flows and potential situation.

Discuss at future meeting

With reference to the provision of cantilevered walkways on the “off-side”. Whilst it will depend on the siting of any walkway in relation to the channel and character of the area, we would generally discourage their provision.

BW needs to address the causes of low boat movements within the city. A full assessment of all mooring locations proposed will have to be undertaken in order to assess their suitability. The navigation width and lock approach may be restrictive in relation to on line mooring, particularly in relation to proposals in the North lock area. The provision of emergent vegetation in the navigation will have to be considered in terms of its impact on navigation and character of the waterway in the area.

Discuss at future meeting

For example there appears to be a conflict in terms of proposals for

No change to SPD

emergent vegetation and moorings in the same location in the North Lock area. This will need to be resolved.

The preparation of a Waterside Strategy should be informed by a Waterspace Strategy developed by BW as a planning and design tool.

Planning Obligations

As a statutory consultee for planning applications, BW would welcome the opportunity to engage with the Council in the refinement of planning obligation policies included within the SPD, in the interests of securing joined up working across the public sector.

As part of Section 5.00 the Planning Obligations Strategy for the Waterside area needs to explicitly state that:

“1. The navigable waterway infrastructure, facilities and environs including towing path is an integral part of the public realm infrastructure.

2. The improvement of the navigable waterway infrastructure, facilities and environs including towing path and contributions to their long term maintenance will be the highest priority for planning obligations for waterside development sites within the waterside area.”

BW supports in principle the Developer Contribution Priority Zones (Diagram 23) but requests that the whole of the navigable waterway frontages are included as waterway priority.

It is of great importance to the principle of sustainable development that the planning obligation strategy contained in the SPD for Waterside area fully recognises that the burdens and liabilities that may be imposed by development and that any measures to minimise or mitigate them are properly funded. Such a strategy will also need to be flexible enough to recognise that the need for improvements or increased maintenance may be remote from the development that require such measures to be implemented.

Therefore, British Waterways requests that:

1. The Council enters into early dialogue with BW as the organisation

A waterspace strategy is only one component of a Waterside Strategy (which primarily considers BW's interests in the waterway) discuss at future meeting

Discuss at future meeting

Agreed. Insert additional text as shown but delete “highest” from point 2.

Agreed

Agreed

charged with the management of the navigable waterways, regarding planning obligations for waterside sites (and other sites remote from the waterside but which nonetheless benefit from the waterside). For example, to secure the proper provision of any improvements or facilities for the waterway and for the proper application of any financial contribution paid by a developer in respect of them. Therefore, British Waterways needs to be explicitly referred to as a consultation body in paragraph 13.14, particularly during the early stages of pre-application discussions and in respect of unilateral undertakings. This approach should alleviate potential difficulties later in the process causing unnecessary delay in issuing planning decisions.

2. Maintenance costs referred to under "Quality of Public Open Space" within section 5.06 should explicitly refer to commuted sums on waterside development sites. These contributions should be collected through the common pot for the maintenance of navigable waterway environs including the towing path as an integral part of the public realm infrastructure.

The Council advises on how the litter clearance issue intends to be addressed, as it is not clear in section 13.04.33 how the request for S106 contributions for litter clearance will sit with the tariff.

General and Detailed Matters

1. There are direct and indirect references to the canal being an unsafe environment. British Waterways are not aware of an increased level of crime on the cut. The emphasis should be on making people aware of the dangers of water, not that the canal itself is unsafe. British Waterways requests that these references are re-worded. For example:

a) British Waterways is of the view that the wording in section 13.04.34 should be made more positive and strongly suggest that the phrase "*reinforcing the City's reputation as a 'no go area'*" should be deleted.

b) The first paragraph of section 13.04.23 relating to the river and canal corridor. British Waterways considers that the term "*environmental quality*" should be replaced by the term "*nature conservation value*" and the phrase "*sterile, harsh and empty*" is removed, as British Waterways can demonstrate that the towing path, water quality, visitor numbers in Birmingham and Nottingham have greatly improved as a result of regeneration activity.

Agreed. Add "British Waterways" to 13.14 Other Requirements under heading "Boating and the navigation".

Agreed. Add "...including the waterway corridor and towpath"

Agreed. Add in sentence "...subject to a minimum contribution of £500 per annum, to be met out of the common pot"

Leave in references to unsafe environment, except for specific reference below.

0.

Delete sentence "if boats do not stay in the city" ?????

Delete sentence "In other cities, for example Birmingham..."

Leave in term "environmental quality"

2. There seems to be a discrepancy in relation to section 6.04.3, which refers to the water network only being considered for leisure use, as too many locks would disrupt regular timetables. In section 13.04.35 however there is reference to the possibility of waterbuses, which require timetables. British Waterways suggests that there may be the possibility for waterbuses given that there is unlocked water between North Lock and Freeman's Lock. Additionally the lock numbers are not necessarily a barrier to economic freight movement. The potential for the transport of construction materials and demolition waste by water in consultation with British Waterways should not be ruled out.

Delete reference in 6.04.3 completely and leave in 13.04.35

3. Suggest that in section 8.02 the term "resolving" is replaced by "managing" in the following paragraph:

'All appropriate forms of water-related leisure and recreational activities will be encouraged, including fishing and boating, subject to impact on wildlife, achieving necessary agreements with land owners and resolving conflicts between uses and environmental issues'.

Amend as shown

As it is likely to be more appropriate and successful in sustainability terms to manage conflicting uses and interests in accordance with DETR publication "Waterways for Tomorrow" (June 2000).

4. In section 13.04.1 paragraph 4, British Waterways suggests that the paragraph is replaced with:

"... until 1960, when freight activity declined. In 1968 the navigation through Leicester was classified as a 'cruising waterway' to be principally available for cruising, fishing and other recreational purposes".

Paragraph 4, amend as shown

5. Paragraph 3 of section 13.04.22 refers to waterways and the built environment. We suggest that the paragraph is replaced with:

"The traditional approach of viewing proposals from land to the water has resulted in the underutilisation of inland waterways, characterised by development turning its back to the water or only using the waterways as a setting or visual backdrop for development. This approach has failed to integrate the waterspace or attract benefit from the added value of the waterspace. It is therefore crucial to treat the waterway as a 'multifunctional space as well as an artery; look from the waterway outwards and not just from the land to water and treat the waterway as an integral part of its

Insert after paragraph 3 with additional text as shown

<p>English Heritage (Stephen Bowyer)</p>	<p><i>corridor.”</i></p> <p>6. Section 13.04.32 relates to dredging. We suggest that it is more accurate to state that: <i>“Dredging is commonly undertaken to aid navigation, flood flows or in special cases to remove contaminated sediment. Should any proposal affect siltation patterns then the implications for navigation and flood flows will need to be considered along with any additional dredging requirements.”</i></p> <p>Section 9.02.01 makes reference to British Waterways’ encouragement, whilst we offer general support we do not believe that we have explicitly encouraged this approach at this stage.</p> <p>EH. It is clear that a comprehensive urban design strategy has steered the production of this document, based on a good understanding of what is here, and what needs to be here to regenerate a dramatically under-used area of the city. As a result, the proposals create a legible, exciting urban grain, reconnect the area with its surrounding contexts, and provide a sense of place and destination to an area which has failed to realise the potential of its component qualities.</p> <p>We particularly welcome the restoration of Highcross Street as a key linear route, and the exciting staging points along the way: the enhanced crossing of Vaughan Way, with its landmark on the northern landing point; the brief stopping point opposite All Saints Church. The treatment of Northgates is exceptional: this was a key entry point to the Roman and Medieval City, and a focal meeting point of routes. This has been reflected in the excitement of the building scale along Northgate Street (in contrast to the quieter character of Highcross Street) and the junction of key routes (not only the north-south, and east-west, but Great Central Street to the south west, and the new, angled, pedestrian routes to the canal basin and the commercial core).</p> <p>The SPD’s merits lie not only in the treatment of access and connectivity but in the destination points that these reach and the character of the different areas. The contrast of the vitality of the new development around the basin with the more subtle blending of historic and new development in Frog Island should prove exciting; the harder environment closer to the city centre which</p>	<p>Insert additional text as shown here</p> <p>Delete reference to BW “encouragement and replacement with general support”</p> <p>General changes suggested:</p> <p>Para 13.07 – The first paragraph is repeated under Buildings of Interest <u>Remove repeated text</u></p> <p>Some listed buildings are not shown coloured on Indicative Layout Plan <u>Add these to plan</u></p> <p>Contact List now out of date <u>Amend Contact List</u></p>
---	--	---

then gradually softens through the western streets with their greater number of trees, ultimately to the green open space of Rally Park will add to the diversity of experience and also the legibility of the relative areas.

Understanding that you are working to a tight deadline to disseminate this document to wider public consultation, we appreciate that some of the following comments cannot be incorporated at this stage. Indeed, some of them would benefit from more concerted dialogue which might be more appropriate as part of that wider consultation process anyway.

1. A clear boundary indicating the extent of the SPD must be included and should also be shown on the overall plan at the rear of the document. This is important as it establishes for anyone using the document exactly which areas are affected by its contents.

2. With regard to that, we would recommend that the parcel plans for St Nicholas Place and Cathedral Square are omitted from the document. We appreciate the value of overlapping areas to show the connectivity between places, however insufficient study has been carried out to be able to intimate confidently development initiatives in these areas. This also applies to the overall plan at the rear (for example where an inappropriate building is shown as intruding into St Nicholas Place); we wonder if a more 'broad brush' approach to the diagram could be adopted to show the importance of connectivity without being prescriptive.

3. The proposals for St Augustine's Reach do not seem to share the quality of consideration evident throughout the rest of the document: the large development blocks perpendicular to the river and the severance of the communities along Tudor Road, will create obstacles rather than permeability. Whilst we agree that the southern end of Rally Park does need enhancement, this needs further thought and we would be happy to pursue it with you through the consultation period.

4. Similarly, the inclusion of private dwellings on Soar Island seems to be detrimental rather than an enhancement. Whilst we would not necessarily oppose building on the island at all costs, this should have a solely public role so that the island continues to function for the benefit of all.

1. Agreed
Amend plan

2. Agreed
Amend plan

3. The plan has changed since this comment was made. Concerns have been addressed.
No further change

4. The site is currently occupied by a cement batching plant, and therefore does not function

5. We would encourage the hard urban edge to the canal and so would recommend the omission of the green space to the north side of the canal as it turns towards Abbey Park.

6. Trees: we would reiterate that these need to be strategically located (and shown as such in any illustrative material) so as to preserve the harder grain of the city centre and not obscure some of the very views we are aiming to open-up, and used to soften the environment as the visitor moves away from the centre. On a point of detail, the appendix reference to trees should also include the protection measures for trees within conservation areas.

7. On building typology, we would recommend that the approach to taller buildings is not so prescriptive as to insist on podiums and set-backs: this could preclude some very exciting approaches to architecture in the area and miss the opportunity for a variety of experiences for visitors (who may otherwise perceive, at low level, merely a uniformity of building height).

8. Car parking: although a ratio of 1 per unit for spaces is mentioned, subsequent requirements establish that these should not interrupt prominent facades, should be concealed within perimeter blocks etc. Our query is merely whether these aspirations are viably compatible.

9. Appendices: The information contained in the appendices appears to be of the nature of background study which will have informed the approaches within the SPD. You will need to be confident therefore that the aspirations and conclusions drawn from that are clearly elicited in the main body of the SPD text. The appendix reference to ecology is a case in point, but an example only: are the conclusions from the 'study' clear enough in the text of the SPD so that developers coming to the document for the first time will have a clear indication of what is expected of them, wherever their site is in the regeneration area. One way of achieving this might be by drawing the conclusions from the 'study' element in the easy-reference development parcel sheets (and cross-referencing them).

Staying on the Ecology appendix, we are unclear by what is meant by paragraph 9.16 and the removal of the bridge at the confluence of the river and canalised river: surely we are trying to encourage permeability and access, and no reasons are given for its removal.

for the benefit of the majority of the public. The proposals will achieve a considerable increase in benefit and public access. It may be possible to secure some public use of the building but it would be overly-prescriptive and unrealistic to require the whole building to be solely for this function, especially due to limited vehicular access and servicing opportunities.

No change to SPD

5. Agreed **Plan amended**

6. Agreed.

Plan amended. Need for City Council to prepare Landscape Strategy for Waterside added to text. Appendix text amended to give appropriate protection to trees in Conservation Areas.

7. Agreed

Text amended

8. Where possible, this ratio will be sought, but the requirement for good design may sometimes mean that this is not achievable.

No change to SPD

9. Agreed.

The final document will include cross referencing, and key points in Appendices will also be incorporated in the main text.

**GOEM
(Government Office
for the East Midlands)**

With regard to the heritage section in the appendices, we understand that this has been reordered to run more clearly, and that Highcross Street has been given greater prominence in the section on the High Street Conservation Area. A minor point of detail, but it might be better to rephrase that St Nicholas church has been “undermined” by the Central Ring Road, as it might cause unnecessary consternation.

Conclusion

Although the foregoing ‘comments’ read as longer than the initial praise for the merits of the SPD, we would like to reinforce our positive welcome of an excellent document. It appears a practical and deliverable plan to reinvigorate this important, albeit less than cherished, part of Leicester.

Clearly some more work is required before all the elements will be delivered on the ground (for example, the potential for archaeology in this area means that careful prior investigation work will be required prior to the establishment of the marina and some of the major development schemes, especially in the more sensitive areas). We look forward to working with you on these in the near future, and also look forward to the implementation of an exciting and integrated plan.

(GOEM) Local Plan Policy

PPS12 paragraph 2.43 states that SPD must be clearly cross-referenced to policies in the Local Plan. The SPD refers to saved Policy ST1 of the adopted local plan as the policy that it supplements, at section 4.01, but reference is also made within the SPD to policies in the Replacement Local Plan (RLP). It would be desirable to ensure that the SPD has a clear cross reference to both the adopted Local Plan policy and emergent policy in the RLP. If the SPD is only related to the saved Policy ST1, it will lose its policy hook when that policy is superseded on adoption of the Replacement Local Plan.

Section 4.03 of the draft document sets out the intended Replacement Local Plan policy for the Waterside. However, as worded, it is slightly different to the policy contained in the Council’s proposed modifications of May 2005 and should be amended to accord with this earlier document.

The proposals do not require or intend the removal of the bridge.

Text to be amended to clarify this position

Agreed.

**Text to be amended to remove
“undermined” and replace with
“compromised”.**

Support noted.

4.01 *Add to end of 2nd para* “It is anticipated that the Replacement Local Plan will be adopted early in 2006. The Replacement Local Plan contains policy PS07 – Waterside, which this SPD draws on. When the Replacement Local Plan (1996-2016) is adopted it will replace the Adopted Local Plan (1991-2001). It

Section 4.05 relating to the Replacement Local Plan policy BE18 (Renewable Energy) also appears to go further than the policy set out in the earlier proposed modifications as it looks to incorporate a minimum energy demand by on-site renewable energy provision. Again this should be amended to fully reflect the earlier modification. The Council should also revisit the policies set out in Section 13.01 to ensure they fully accord with the proposed modifications of May 2005.

Diagram 3 'Waterside' SPD Area

We note the Waterside boundary in diagram 3 of the draft SPD differs from that shown as modification number M02/6 in the proposed modifications to the proposals map of May 2005. Why is this?

Planning Obligations

Since the drafting of the SPD, ODPM Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations has been published, which replaces DOE Circular 1/97. The new Circular covers improvements to the current system but indicates that further reforms will be brought forward. It reiterates the tests that must be met where planning obligations are sought and you should ensure that these tests govern the approach set out in Section 5 of the SPD. I would also draw your attention to the guidance on pooled contributions in paragraphs B21-B24 of the Circular.

The aim of pooling contributions to ensure an equitable sharing of costs across the development area is supported. To achieve this, the planning obligations system that you introduce should be able to respond to changing market conditions and be based on a clear and transparent methodology. In the latter respect, the unit basis system appears easier to understand than the floorspace basis system, from the information given in the worked example in Section 13.0.3. It would also be helpful to give more certainty in respect of maintenance costs and your attention is drawn to the guidance in paragraphs B18-B20 of the Circular in relation to the maintenance of assets intended for wider public use.

is therefore expected that during 2006 the Waterside Supplementary Planning Document will become supplementary to the Replacement Local Plan (1996-2016). Policy references in this SPD are those published in the Replacement Local Plan Proposed Modifications May 2005

Delete 3^d para.

Amend Section 4.03 accordingly.

4.05 BE18 replace with:

"Planning permission will only be granted for major developments that realise their potential for meeting their energy requirements from renewable sources. Further guidance on inclusion of renewable energy measures within developments is contained in the Council SPD 'Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency', which is due to be adopted in November 2005."

Amend SPD plan accordingly

Retain all of 5.01 except 5th para – "The aim is to fund and deliver this strategic PR&I...."

5.02 General Principles

"The general principles relating to planning obligations are set out in Government Circular 5/2005 'Planning Obligations' The document is issued by Government as current guidance and indicates that further reforms maybe introduced following the Barker Review recommendations. Circular 5/2005 reiterates the key policy tests on planning obligations from the previous circular on this subject, namely that planning

Sustainability Appraisal of the draft Leicester New Waterside SPD

The Sustainability Appraisal should include an appraisal of options, even if this is restricted to testing the SPD proposals and the 'do-nothing' option against the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Framework, in accordance with the

obligations should be; relevant to planning, necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, reasonable related in scale and kind, and reasonable in all other respects.

Circular 5/2005 introduced new guidance on two areas that are pertinent to this SPD: Pooled Contributions (Circ 5/2005 paragraphs B21-B24) and Formulae and Standard Charges (paragraphs B31-B35).

The Waterside SPD Consultation Draft (July 2005) contained consultation options around a pooled contribution system based on a standard charge to address the delivery issues identified above in section 5.01. The approach taken by the Council in drawing up the contribution framework was consistent with advice given in Circular 5/2005.

Responses to the consultation on these proposals indicated broad support for the objectives of this approach; i.e. that it should improve transparency, reduce delay and increase certainty for developers whilst providing the conditions for the Council and its partners to implement a coherent approach for funding and delivering the infrastructure required to serve the many individual potential development schemes in the area. However, consultees identified a need for a more sophisticated approach to determining the standard charge than that proposed. The Council has agreed to undertake further research and progress this issue separately. Details of a standard charge mechanism will be published for consultation early in 2006.

<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>guidance in the ODPM consultation paper on Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks. The reference on page 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal report assumes that the SPD would be preferable to the 'without SPD' option, but should be evidenced.</p> <p>Appendix A includes reference to documents that have now been superseded, for example RSS8 has replaced RPG8 (April 2003), and the relevant plans and programmes should be updated in future work.</p> <p>Statement of SPD Matters The statement fails to make any reference to the Replacement Local Plan.</p> <p>EA. Biodiversity The SPD Draft appears to have taken into account the majority of the preliminary biodiversity comments. However, we still wish to see the inclusion of specific river corridor enhancements. Section 6.04.02 states "the creation of biodiversity features and enhancing or management of existing features will also be a planning obligation". This should include 'on and off-line biodiversity features', in particular the creation of those that naturalise the river corridor. Where opportunities arise, the removal of artificial banks and creation of in-channel features such as berms, vegetated side-margins, backwaters and bays for fish refuge is to be encouraged.</p> <p>Sections 'Concept' and 'Appendix 13.04.2' discuss the evolution of the area as an important ecological corridor arising from a lack of disturbance. It is essential that as large an area as possible is retained in order to ensure the continuity of the features of interest that are already established. Reasons for access to the river include appreciation and observation of the natural environment, flora and fauna. It is essential that a balance is achieved that leaves areas of high wildlife value undisturbed by access/recreation.</p> <p>Appendix 13.04.23 discusses the protection of the 'active' wildlife corridor, which the Agency encourage along with the need for assessment of the impact of development close to the watercourse.</p>	<p>In the interim, the Council proposes to continue with proposals for a pooled contribution system in the area – 'The Common Pot', based on negotiated contributions. The following sections contain guidance on the scale and range of works that will be funded through the common pot. Developers and landowners should use this information as a guide to the likely level and nature of contribution that will be sought."</p> <p>Retain paras' 5.03-to-5.06. Delete section 5.07</p> <p>The following statement is required to include 'not delivering the outputs set out at 4.02' as a starting point. <i>"without the SPD the scale and extent of objectives to be secured through comprehensive redevelopment of the area set out at section 4.02 of the draft document would not be achieved"</i>.</p> <p>Agreed <u>SPD to be amended</u></p> <p>The statement did not reference the RLP, but at this stage no action is required to remedy this. GOEM are satisfied that as long as the SPD text makes clear that the document will be supplementary to the RLP when it is adopted (which we have done), and that this point is made clear in any further official notices i.e. the notice of adoption, that will acceptable. Agreed.</p>
----------------------------------	--	--

Ecological assessment should be carried out prior to the commencement of any dredging works (Appendix 13.04.32).

It should be stressed that results of the natural processes that have improved the river corridor (Section 13.05.2) must be retained and enhanced and where possible allowed to continue in conjunction with proposed enhancements as part of this development.

Appendix 13.05.3 and 13.05.6 refers to 'fairy fern' (*Azolla filiculoides*). It should be noted that this is a highly invasive plant. The dense cover reduces the light beneath the surface killing submerged plants and fish. The plant can be sucked into water intakes blocking pumps and filters, and can mat together to form floating rafts, causing flow problems and obstructions to weirs and locks, creating a flood risk. For more information please refer to <http://www.nercwallingford.ac.uk/research/capm/pdf%20files/22%20Azolla%20filiculoides.pdf>

Similarly *Elodea canadensis* is also classed as an invasive species, known to compete with, and outgrow many native species.

<http://www.nercwallingford.ac.uk/research/capm/pdf%20files/7%20Canadian%20pondweed.pdf>

Appendix 13.05.5 refers to protected species. Any area which may be affected must be subject to a full ecological assessment, including bats, wolverine, nesting/breeding birds, otter and crayfish.

Although weirs have the benefit of oxygenating a water body, they are considered to be an ecological barrier, preventing the movement of naturally migratory species, in particularly fish. The Agency encourages the opening of the currently culverted watercourse in addition to the removal of features to allow the reconnection of the two main channels within the site.

The Agency encourages the restriction of 'excessive tidiness' which often results in detrimental damage to biodiversity (Appendix 13.05.7).

Water Resources

The filling of the proposed Canal Basin for mooring boats and the basin link

Amend text to include "on and off-line biodiversity features, in particular the creation of those that naturalise the river corridor. Where opportunities arise, the removal of artificial banks and creation of in-channel features such as berms, vegetated side-margins, backwaters and bays for fish refuge is to be encouraged."

Biodiversity Plan to be added to document, to identify existing habitats and opportunities for enhancement.

Agreed. The SPD seeks to achieve an appropriate balance between protection/enhancement and regeneration of the area. Involvement in the formulation of development proposals and the determination of planning applications will give further opportunity to ensure this.

No further change to SPD

Agreed.

Add to text

The SPD seeks to balance retention and enhancement with the regeneration of the area.

No further change to SPD

Noted.

No change to SPD

<p>The Countryside Agency</p> <p>English Nature</p>	<p>may require an Abstraction Licence from the Agency in accordance with Section 24 of the Water Resources Act 1991. The River Soar catchment is open to abstraction subject to a local level restriction.</p> <p>Flood Risk Management Frog Island redevelopment: Proposals for flood risk management, including compensation for loss of floodplain will need to be discussed with the Environment Agency.</p> <p>13.06 Flooding, Also 13.04.31: The Agency recommend that the wording "buildings that require access in times of extreme flooding" is changed to "buildings that need to remain operational in times of extreme flooding."</p> <p>It is relevant within this document to state that the Agency has just completed the River Soar Strategy, which considers available options to manage flood risk over the next 50 years. We have recently commissioned the extension of this study to examine flood risk options for the Leicester Area including upstream tributaries. It is hoped that Leicester City Council and Environment Agency will be working together to ensure that flood risk is appropriately managed.</p> <p>CA. On the basis of the information supplied, and given the predominantly urban nature of the borough, the Countryside Agency is of the opinion that the plan or programme which is the subject of this consultation is not likely to result in significant effects on our interests in landscape and access i.e. area covered by the plan or programme contains no nationally designated landscapes or national trails.</p> <p>EN. English Nature is extremely concerned that the Sustainability Appraisal for this SPD has, in Section 7 – Appraisal, determined that this SPD could have a positive or a negative impact depending on how it is implemented upon the SA objective “To maintain and enhance the area’s Biodiversity” and that the comments and overall assessment states that “The proposed new recreational facilities all feel quite hard and artificial, and the SPD does not mention the need to preserve existing pockets of biodiversity, mature trees</p>	<p>Agreed. <u>Amend text to include these.</u></p> <p>Noted. Opportunities to enhance ecology with be balanced with the need to regenerate the area. <u>No change to SPD</u></p> <p>Noted. <u>No change</u></p> <p>Noted. <u>No change</u></p> <p>Agreed. <u>Amend text</u></p> <p>Agreed.</p>
---	--	---

etc.”

When this is broken down in Appendix C, a better picture is not painted, the only SPD Sections that predict a positive outcome for biodiversity are 8.09 - Ecology and Biodiversity and 13.05 – Biodiversity River Soar/Grand Union Canal and these are restricted in the area to which they relate, to the river and canal corridor, ignoring the rest of the SPD area. At best, other sections of the SPD which have been identified as influencing biodiversity, have been rated as either “likely to have a neutral impact, or positive impacts would balance out negative impacts” or “could have a positive or a negative impact depending on how it is implemented”.

In view of this English Nature feels that the protection of the existing biodiversity resource and opportunities to enhance that resource cannot be identified from this SPD, across the whole of the area relating to this SPD, not just the narrow river and canal corridors identified. In its present form English Nature can not assume this document will enhance and protect the biodiversity resource, as is a requirement of Policy 28 of RSS8 and PPS9 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.

It is English Nature’s concern that although there is an in depth discussion concerning the biodiversity of the river and the canal corridors in Section of 8.09 and Appendix 13.05 of the SPD, these seem to be relatively isolated from the proposals put forward in the SPD, with regard to individual character zones. Why have the recommendations made in Appendix 13.05 not been added to each appropriate Character Zone? Doing this would not only ensure that these recommendations receive a higher profile, but it would also help to ensure that conflicts of interest do not occur. For instance, all the points listed below may sit hand in glove with each other, or they may not, however they seem very disjointed and potentially conflicting, in particular biodiversity and the hydro power station.

Dredge and re-open culverted sections of old millstream to create some open water habitats and prevent drying out (13.05 Biodiversity Section 9 Summary of recommendations).

Protect mill-race from pollution sources and excessive public disturbance (13.05 Biodiversity Section 9 Summary of recommendations).

The Old Mill Race connects the high level canal with the lower river,

Add to text

Noted.

The SPD proposals include the significant improvement of Rally Park and the creation of new green spaces in addition to hard urban spaces, to achieve a careful balance to meet the wide range of needs of visitors and residents. All areas will be subject to detailed design, in line with a comprehensive Landscape Strategy.

No change to SPD

It is agreed that there is a need to preserve existing pockets of biodiversity and mature trees etc., as far as possible, balanced against the needs to regenerate the area.

Amend text to ensure this is adequately covered.

The existing biodiversity and quality of the

straddled by the North Mill building and smaller structures. Combined, these define a composition of value, but obscure much of the Race. Designs for the area will explore the relative merits of restoration and retention, but will all retain the Mill and Race as defining elements in the area (9.02.2 FROG ISLAND).

The Urban structure is designed to exploit and reveal the river, canal and Mill Race, and expose and respect the retained Industrial Buildings (9.02.2 FROG ISLAND).

The SPD has already proposed the establishment of a public icon building beside the Old Mill Race to the north of this point, (9.02.7 RALLY PARK)

Hydro power: Use existing mill race to drive new hydro power station; use power in development; (extracted from the Sustainability Appraisal, page 72, Suggested changes to the SPD from the initial appraisal)

There are likely to be other issues, which have similar conflicts within the SPD document, which should be identified and resolved. For example: "In the East Midlands region, the mortar of old walls represent one of the few remaining habitats for many species of fern, since their natural habitats, damp and shady banks and cliffs, are very rare in this region. Crumbling lime-rich mortar favours ferns, which do not seem to like modern formulations of mortar. Old blue-brick walls, especially those associated with the former Great Central Railway, are often colonised. Re-pointing of walls can therefore be very destructive."

13.05 Biodiversity Section 9 Summary of recommendations states "Ensure that all developments that could impact on protected species (bats and kingfishers) submit a full bat survey alongside a planning application." This should be reworded so that it does not restrict itself to bat surveys, bats and kingfishers.

Section 8.02 Amenity Spaces – It is worrying that in diagram 18 of the SPD, ecology has been segregated off from amenity sites other than those along the river and canal corridors. With some imaginative design, Amenity Spaces of all types will be able to contribute towards the enhancement of the biodiversity resource of the SPD area.

Appendix 13.06 refers to flood plain compensation, yet makes no mention of the importance of provision for biodiversity and the achievement of

natural environments are key assets within Waterside. The SPD seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity, as far as possible. However, this has to be balanced with the need to regenerate the area. The SPD will provide officers with the ability to be able to consider and incorporate the detailed biodiversity issues throughout the planning and development processes.

Text within the main body of the SPD will be reinforced to stress this.

Plans and text that refer to Character Zones are to be amended to include references to recommendations in Appendix 13.05

<p>East Midlands Regional Assembly</p> <p>Leicestershire Constabulary</p>	<p>biodiversity action plan targets, which should be considered when designing flood alleviation schemes in line with Policy 34 of RSS8.</p> <p>The provision of formal and informal green space for people and wildlife in urban areas is recognised as an important element in combating social exclusion, developing stronger communities and providing positive health benefits by promoting exercise.</p> <p>If appropriate alterations are made to it, this document should be able to provide opportunities for biodiversity enhancement and protection through its ability to influence imaginative design.</p> <p>EMRA. I would like to take the opportunity to let you know that EMRA is of the view that these documents are to a particularly high standard. I can confirm that the SPD and accompanying sustainability appraisal have particular accordance with the first regional core objective to address social inclusion through the regeneration of disadvantaged areas. The comprehensive nature of the documents means general conformity with all Regional Core Objectives (as set out in Policy 1 of RSS8) and the relevant specific topic based priorities can be confirmed.</p> <p>LC. 4.07 Housing. Our objectives</p> <p>It should be the objective of the local authority to promote physically secure dwellings. Whilst elements to ensure safe communities are embodied within the text of the document and specifically referred to at 13.13, I would ask that you consider adding the following paragraph within 4.07 perhaps following the listed Local Plan objectives.</p> <p><i>To promote crime resistant design, developers are encouraged to take on board the physical security standards given in the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) Secured by Design (SBD) New Homes Accreditation Scheme.</i></p> <p>Reference is made within the document particularly within section 10.06 to providing active frontages where principle rooms overlook the street scene, a concept that I support. In section 10.07 building forms are required to be positioned to the back edge of pavement. I assume that 'building forms' include hard boundary conditions such as low</p>	<p>Regeneration of the area will undoubtedly necessitate repairs and change. Some loss is therefore inevitable even though the GCR viaduct is constructed if cement based mortar as opposed to lime based mortar. However, the SPD will seek to minimise disruption and avoid unnecessary wherever possible.</p> <p><u>No further change</u></p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p><u>Text to be amended</u></p> <p>It is agreed that whilst the river and canal corridors are a focus for ecology, all amenity sites and spaces will contribute towards biodiversity, and this is an intention of the SPD.</p> <p><u>Text and Diagram 18 to be amended and reinforced to reflect this.</u></p> <p>Agreed</p> <p><u>Text to be amended</u></p>
--	--	--

walls with railings as independent research has shown that in the case of residential development, occupants prefer a defensible zone to be provided between the face of a dwelling house and the public realm. If the guidance requires that the building face should be set at the back edge of pavement, then 10.06 and 10.07 may be in conflict with 8.10 where to avoid the effects of pollution on habitable (principle) rooms facing the street, buildings should preferably be set back.

Set backs behind an appropriately designed boundary condition can also help narrow streets with high buildings to alleviate any canyon effect that can instil a fear of crime and in addition, can provide elevational modelling to long terrace runs without recourse to unprotected recesses.

It should be noted that if the building line is set to the back edge of pavement, the face of the building becomes the defensible line. In this situation, it is essential that window and door components are security tested and certified British Standard components (the inclusion of the recommendation at 4.07 above would help to satisfy this requirement).

The guidance should be amended to clarify these anomalies.

Section 10.09

Any multi-storey car park should be designed and constructed to achieve the British Parking Association Park Mark award.

13.13 Community Safety

Although I have no objections to the first part of the paragraph as presented, the design principles should be altered and expanded using the definitions as given in *Safer Places – The Planning System and Crime Prevention (ODPM 2004)*.

Access and movement: places with well-defined routes, spaces and entrances that provide for convenient movement without compromising security

Structure: places that are structured so that different uses do not cause conflict

Surveillance: places where all publicly accessible spaces are overlooked

Ownership: places that promote a sense of ownership, respect, territorial responsibility and community

Physical Protection: places that include necessary, well-designed security features

Activity: places where the level of human activity is appropriate to the

Support noted.

Agreed.

Text to be amended to include suggestion

Section 10.07 refers to mixed use areas, where commercial uses rather than residential at ground level will generally be sought. Therefore this conflict will not generally arise.

No change

location and creates a reduced risk of crime and a sense of safety at all times
Management and maintenance: places that are designed with management and maintenance in mind, to discourage crime in the present and the future.

13.16 Contacts – Other Agencies. Add *Leicestershire Constabulary Stewart Bradshaw, Architectural Liaison Officer 0116 2482723*

Re: Sustainability appraisal of the SPD for Leicester Waterside

Table 2. Policies, plans, programmes and environmental protection objectives reviewed.

National Level

Add

Safer Places – The Planning System and Crime Prevention: Companion Guide to PPS1

Table 3. Sustainability issues/problems and implications for the SPD

Should not *Crime and Disorder* be added to the **issue/problem** column with appropriate wording and recorded crime statistics/profile given in the **Explanation and implication for the SPD** column, (if this is accepted, you can contact me if a crime profile of the area under consideration is required).

APPENDIX A – Draft PPS1

Add

Promoting communities which are inclusive, healthy, safe and crime free, whilst respecting the diverse needs of the communities, (including woman, young and elderly people, people with disabilities and black and minority ethnic groups).

P59, last section 8.05, 8.06 etc

Add

The mixed uses should help to improve *community* safety, and.....

P60, middle section 8.07, 4.07 last paragraph in comments and overall assessment.

A mix of type and affordability, occupancy and tenure pattern should be provided evenly distributed throughout a residential development. This will provide guardianship through increased surveillance and community control and thereby reduce the potential for crime and disorder.

Agreed

Add to text

Agreed

Add to text

Agreed

Add to text

In addition, if high value and low cost housing is separated, residents within the low cost areas may well feel stigmatised, which can lead to a feeling of social exclusion and may give rise to crime and anti-social behaviour. This would be particularly so if there is visual distinction through inferior design and use of materials.

PPG3-2000 p7 para 10 states

'Local planning authorities should encourage the development of mixed and balanced communities: they should ensure that new housing developments help to secure a better social mix by avoiding the creation of housing of similar characteristics.'

Page 65 Section 9.02.6 City Centre

I would agree with the remarks concerning the proposed crossing of Vaughan Way.

It is hard to see how the required degree of connectivity and necessary level of pedestrian safety whilst still allowing for the road to function as designed, can be achieved with a crossing at 'grade'.

Page 71 Access/movement

Excessive permeability particularly within residential development and if inappropriately designed can provide potential escape routes for criminals or those intent upon anti-social behaviour.

Blaby District Council

BDC has no comments to make on this consultation.

Noted

No change to SPD

Agreed

Incorporate into SPD

Agreed

Incorporate into SPD

The SPD seeks to ensure overall integration and the creation of mixed and balanced communities.

High quality design and materials will be required throughout the whole of Waterside, regardless of uses or tenures. There will be no visual distinction between tenures.

No change to SPD

Agreed. This is a requirement of the SPD.

<p>Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service</p>	<p>LF&RS The fire service is increasingly looking to use “open water” for fire fighting water supplies. “Pump sites” amount to no more than an area of hard standing, immediately adjacent to the open water, capable of providing access to and taking the weight of a fire engine.</p> <p>LF&RS therefore, request that the SPD includes text which encourages developer consultation with LF&RS for developments in close proximity to open water and allow for the provision of pumping sites when these developments are designed and built.</p>	<p><u>No change to SPD</u></p>
<p>Housing Corporation</p>	<p>HC 1) We welcome the production of an SPD for the area as a means of guiding developers / stakeholders to deliver high quality developments in the area. I understand that there will be consultation sessions with developers and it would be useful to get feedback from these.</p> <p>2) At this stage , our main comments relate to the proposed Housing Section that was provided to me by David Beale.</p> <p>3) The work being undertaken by English Partnerships (Kate Reid) on the housing market for flats in the City hopefully will provide some input into this document.</p> <p>4) We welcome the inclusion of affordable housing in the brief and note the desire to provide 3 bed and larger homes to address housing needs. No doubt this will be within the overall context of providing mixed and balanced communities throughout the area. Also that the housing mix has regard to overall child densities with respect to the likely facilities and nature of the area i.e. that the overall vision seeks to create a sustainable community for the long term within the context of the area.</p> <p>5) We note the intention to define high and low value areas in order to reduce risk and improve the viability of regenerating the area.</p> <p>We do have concerns with the possible outcomes of this approach in that the affordable housing will be provided in the lower value areas and this could exceed the 30% to off set the non - provision in the higher value areas. This does not achieve a balance and mix of housing within the overall area.</p>	<p>Excellent pedestrian connectivity in this location will be fundamentally important to the success of Waterside. This has yet to be designed and will be subject to further research and negotiations. Officers will, through this work, seek to achieve the best possible benefits, ease, safety and attractiveness for pedestrians and cyclists moving between the City Centre and Waterside.</p> <p><u>No change to SPD</u></p> <p>High degrees of pedestrian permeability are essential if Waterside is to function effectively and be fully integrated with the wider City. All aspects of design will be required to reduce crime and the fear of crime through high levels of surveillance, observation and activity, amongst other initiatives.</p> <p><u>No change to SPD</u></p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p><u>Text to be added to incorporate this, and possible locations identified on plans.</u></p>

<p>STAKEHOLDERS AND THEIR AGENTS</p>	<p>There may be the opportunity to consider the type and tenure of affordable housing that can be included in the higher value areas and at the same time not completely jeopardise the economic viability of the scheme (s). For example providing some form of low cost housing for first time buyers - I would refer you to the ODPM's consultation paper on Low Cost Housing Products issued in June 2005.</p> <p>We would certainly want to discuss this point further with you and other partners.</p> <p>6) In terms of the 'tariff' the draft states that for scheme(s) with an affordable housing element that the tariff will be reduced.</p> <p>Our view on the tariff is that it should not apply to the affordable housing.</p> <p>7) In relation to the availability of Housing Corporation funding, our understanding is that for LRC intervention areas (which includes the Waterside) the initial 15% will be without grant (subject to an economic development appraisal) and that funding could be considered to achieve above the 15% towards the overall 30%.</p> <p>I would refer you to the Housing Corporation's recently published pre - prospectus ' The National Affordable Housing Programme 2006 08' This is available through our website :</p> <p>www.housingcorp.gov.uk <http://www.housingcorp.gov.uk/></p> <p>The document sets out the principles and key requirements for our funding, you will note that we will be able to fund non - RSLs (e.g. developers) that meet our pre - qualification criteria. The document on pages 16 - 17 explains our approach to Section 106 sites that you may find helpful.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The findings of the work being undertaken by English Partnerships will influence development across the LRC area. Appropriate mechanisms for disseminating the work are being progressed separately from the SPD. The SPD has been written to be robust and to address the need for variations in density and unit size, so does not need to be amended to accommodate this.</p> <p>The section of the SPD, which deals with this point, is to be removed and progressed separately as it is linked to the section on planning obligations.</p>
---	---	---

<p>Leicester Regeneration Company</p>	<p>LRC wholeheartedly supports the physical proposals put forward in the draft SPD, building as they do on the draft Development Framework put forward by LRC earlier this year. The Board believes there is a role for LRC working with landowners and developers to facilitate the preparation of the “mini Master Plans” envisaged by the Development Parcels approach. To this end a strategy will need to be developed by LRC/LCC to secure principal landowner involvement.</p> <p>A question that was raised regarding the physical proposals was the flexibility of the guidance to respond to changes in density over time as market forces demand. Does the guidance make the best use of the area in terms of density of development to secure private sector interest and to drive out the level of contributions required to meet the strategic infrastructure and public realm demands?</p> <p>The LRC Board is, however, concerned at the current proposals surrounding the suggested s.106 “tariff” approach. The Board acknowledges that a more systematic approach to S.106 contributions from development is needed if the extensive public realm and infrastructure changes required for Waterside are to be delivered, but considers further investigation and research is needed in order to put forward a proposal that is clear, transparent, fair and robust.</p> <p>As you know, there are many different approaches to S.106 formulated standard charges coming to light across the country including Milton Keynes, Corby, Leeds, Swindon and the Olympic Village etc. The Board has proposed that LRC assist the Council in investigating these and other possible solutions to help formulate the approach to be taken in Leicester.</p> <p>Given the complexity but relative compactness of the Waterside area, coupled with the Development Parcel approach of the draft SPD, it may be appropriate to consider adopting some form of matrix system to determining the s.106 contributions from individual developments. This approach would enable LCC to profile the regeneration of the area over a 10-20 year period and secure delivery of the relevant infrastructure and public realm as the area develops.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Text relating to affordable housing and planning obligations will be removed from the SPD pending further discussion with a range of stakeholders including the Housing Corporation.</p> <p>This reflects the adopted policy on affordable housing in the LRC, which will be applied in Waterside.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Support noted. LCC and LRC will continue to work together, with landowners and</p>
--	---	---

**Blueprint –
(Igloo Regeneration)**

In the meantime it is suggested that the draft SPD be adopted without the proposed “tariff” and associated references in the draft document. LRC consider the costed and prioritised shopping list of strategic infrastructure and public realm works required for Waterside should be included in the adopted document to act as a guide for developers and an interim tool for Development Control in negotiating s.106 contributions.

The Board has also requested LRC and LCC officers to investigate further the available sources of funding for up front bank rolling/gap funding of the strategic infrastructure and public realm provision. There is a general acknowledgement that getting the environment and linkages right are a vital prerequisite to successful and high quality regeneration.

Other issues raised by LRC Board included the need for a reference in the document to relocations and how these are to be approached and prioritised by LRC and LCC. The regeneration of Waterside will inevitably displace a significant number of businesses and LCC are therefore requested to check the draft SPD’s wording and approach on the relocation issue. The ultimate goal for LRC and LCC remains a net gain in jobs as a key output of regeneration activity.

On the basis of the above comments the LRC Board agree to the adoption of the physical proposals of the SPD allied to the costed and prioritised s.106 shopping list and reserve the detailed nature of a s.106 formulated standard charge for subsequent determination following further research work.

**Blueprint – SPD SECTION 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Housing mix**

The document refers to different component areas which suggests differentiation between housing tenures leading to potential segregation rather than an integrated mixed community living in Waterside. Left to its own devices ‘the market’ would deliver that approach and it is therefore disappointing that the SPD does not actively seek to encourage or influence a more integrated mix.

developers, in relation to “Mini-Masterplans”.

Changes will be required to the SPD over time, to ensure it responds to changes in demands, market forces and deliverability. Research on these issues is continuing and further work and detailed guidance will be undertaken to ensure the proposals are appropriate and adequate to deliver high quality development and the delivery of essential infrastructure and public realm. **No change to the SPD at this stage.**

The approach (and therefore text) relating to Developers Contributions is to be amended to reflect on-going research and negotiations. See response under GOEM

Text relating to Developers Contributions to be amended. See section under GOEM comments.

Transport and Access

Has a partial pedestrianisation of High Cross Street been considered? By potentially opening the street to local traffic at certain times i.e. in the evening or on Sundays? This may help sustain the smaller scale local businesses which will hopefully emerge in Waterside and assist supervision and security particularly after dark.

SECTION 4 - POLICY

We are again pleased to note that the SPD recognises the need for a comprehensive approach – a fragmented and piecemeal approach risks mediocrity and regeneration failure. However elsewhere the document refers to the use of CPO and it is difficult to see how some of the aspirations will be achieved without it, particularly in the early phases. Cross subsidy between uses will be difficult to achieve unless each block or scheme provides a mix of uses. The predominance of residential being promoted may create possibilities for lower value uses to be included but this will need to flow through to the price paid for land. Single ownership of key parcels possibly through CPO will be needed to support a strong planning framework.

Section 4.02 Local Plan Modifications

This refers to the delivery of new schools and health centres which are clearly essential to support a sustainable neighbourhood in Waterside – is it envisaged that the Common Pot will help fund these or are there likely to be other sources of funding available?

Agreed.

Text to be amended to more fully address the issue of relocations.

The SPD requires overall integration of housing mix and tenures throughout Waterside, and the creation of a balanced community and neighbourhood. The majority of the wider Waterside area will include housing of many different types and tenures, and there will be no areas that are entirely affordable housing. The need for mixed and integrated housing has to be carefully balanced against the need to attract high value private housing, to meet wider objectives. The form and layout of the development seeks to achieve this careful

Section 4.03 Waterside Policy

Will development proposals also be required to include a market assessment/justification for the uses proposed? Has the SPD or the original Masterplan Framework for Waterside examined the potential economic case and impact of such large scale residential development in Waterside as a whole?

Open Space

There is a need for proper assessment of open space requirements of Waterside and its relationship to the rest of the City Centre rather than a blanket adoption of policies. What is any open space to be used for? where should it be? how large? Each scheme/block or even mini masterplan area shouldn't necessarily have to provide open space within it, but be well connected to other spaces. The SPD should provide the public realm framework which specific development proposals should respond to. This will strengthen the inevitable argument which will inevitably come from land owners whose site becomes a bit of green space rather than a valuable development parcel.

balance. Research into affordable housing delivery is continuing, and the approach to this in Waterside will reflect this.

The detailed approach to the delivery of affordable housing in Waterside is to be removed from the SPD and dealt with separately. See also response under xxxxxxxx

The degree of possible or desirable pedestrianisation has yet to be determined, as this will be subject to further highways and transportation research. However, it is agreed that an appropriate degree of traffic can assist as stated, or will be required for the functioning of the area, and this will be taken into consideration when determining details of proposals for High Cross Street and other roads.

No change to SPD other than general statement that all highway proposals will be subject to further research and studies, and therefore possible change.

Support noted. It is agreed that CPO may be required in some cases and this approach is supported where necessary. However, the Council with it's partners will seek to achieve regeneration through negotiation as far as possible.

No change to SPD

The document doesn't seem to make reference to links to existing spaces - Abbey Park and St Margaret's Pastures – have they been assessed in context of overall masterplan?

4.04 Traffic Impact and Parking

What is the impact of the proposed Shires multi storey car park – visually and from an accessibility point of view? Will visitors to Waterside use it? Will it add or detract from pedestrian experience? How is it connected to Waterside? Will it be open 24 hours a day? It should be designed to make access for pedestrians easy into Waterside even if the developers of the Shires will be concerned about customer 'leakage'

4.05 Sustainable Development

Is it intended that CHP/district heating will be provided through the Common Pot? Each block or site is likely to be too small to support CHP on its own. Someone (maybe public sector) may need to lead as it will require up front investment.

There is no reference to other sustainability criteria e.g. Energy targets, encouraging reductions in car usage, Car schemes etc.

It is envisaged that the 'Common Pot' will help to fund these services and facilities. However, the Council and its partners will also pursue other sources of funding.

The LRC Masterplan and its research identified the need for significant, high quality residential accommodation and environments. Additional research into the economic case for residential development in Leicester and Waterside has recently been undertaken. The results of this research will feed into the nature and extent of residential development, both in the context of Waterside and the wider city regeneration. The SPD will have to change over time to respond to improving knowledge and changing circumstances and markets.

No change to SPD at this stage, other than a general statement to this effect.

Agreed. This has been the comprehensive approach adopted for Waterside. The Indicative Plan illustrates a balanced range and distribution of both hard and soft open space, to meet the needs of both visitors and residents, building upon and linking to the network and provision of open spaces that already exists, in particular Rally Park, Abbey Park, Castle Gardens, and the River and Canal Corridors. The actual size, location, nature and facilities provided will be determined by many factors, including the amount of people the space has to serve, the nature and needs of that population, the nature of surrounding uses etc. It will also be determined by ownership,

4.06 Historic Environment

We are pleased to note that the SPD recognises the important of retaining of buildings of character even if not listed. Retention of the existing built fabric of Waterside, were appropriate, will add to its interest.

4.07 Housing

Again referred to earlier but there is a risk that the definition of 'Exceptional' and singling out of the waterfront area will create segregation and not a balanced or mixed community. The market would just do this if left alone and therefore the SPD should guide development proposals to ensure a better balance. Maybe some less well affluent residents of Leicester may like to live near the water.

If we are to avoid cherry picking and a more balanced spread of land values across Waterside then the 'Tariff' needs to be weighted to equalise values otherwise there is no benefit of a comprehensive approach.

The SPD actively encourages high value housing – is this what is needed? Will this be tested through further market/demand research?

SECTION 5 - PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

It is recognised that the proposals for a system of Tariffs is still at an early stage and requires more consideration of the appropriate mechanisms and calculations which would be applied to any developments coming forward. However our initial views are concerned with how this will be successfully applied particularly in the early phases were value creation is still an issue

deliverability, presence of archaeology or other factors and economic viability. The SPD sets out the framework, as suggested, for the major public realm and infrastructure, and the priorities and potential sources for funding, which is intended to form the basis of negotiations and bids for funding. The briefs for Development Parcels also set out the site or parcel specific requirements for open space.

No change to SPD

The form and layout of development, and the proposed provision and network of pedestrian and cycle routes, create links to existing spaces, to provide valuable facilities for new and existing users of Waterside and the wider area, and to ensure fuller and more beneficial use is made of those spaces. Opportunities will also be sought in the future, to extend and further improve links to the wider network, but are outside the scope of this SPD.

Amend text to specifically refer to objective to create links with existing open spaces, as far as possible within the remit of this regeneration area and SPD

The provision of the proposed car park will be an asset for Waterside as well as visitors to the City Centre, and the ease, safety and attractiveness of the pedestrian routes between the car park and Waterside (in particular the commercial areas) have been important in the planning of routes, the nature of development along those routes and the degree of over-looking development. **No change to SPD**

The SPD requires the allocation of a site for CH

and were the scale of potential contribution is limited i.e. the Common Pot has not yet built up to a sufficient level.

The proposals don't appear to recognise that initially existing use values and thus land owners aspirations on receipts are likely to be higher than development value. This is before allowing for abnormal costs (likely to be significant on some sites – flood risks, contamination etc) and s106/tariff contributions – There is therefore a likelihood that initial schemes will find it less viable to be able to contribute than those which follow and may even require gap funding from the public sector and pressure will come on the delivery of high quality design.

There will certainly be a need for some of the main public realm elements to be provided up front to create an environment which will help value creation and will thus need to be cash flowed until the Common Pot can repay the initial expenditure.

5.06 – The Common Pot

We would question why some of the items listed should be paid for from the Waterside 'Pot' - the first three Highway Interventions in particular are city wide benefits. Why should Waterside pay? Will the City Council contribute? Will The Shires redevelopment also contribute as it will benefit from the 5. additional investment in Waterside.

The proposal to consider an Estate Management Company to manage public realm within Waterside is welcomed.

5.07 – Calculation of Contributions

Whilst it is acknowledged that this requires more detailed consideration the outline proposal doesn't recognise potential differences between sites/parcels of land, the existing use values, owners position (relocations/aspirations), constraints etc. There will be instances where common collaboration between different owners and developers will not work in practice particularly if land has been acquired by speculators. Where there are such diverse ownerships and aspirations, then CPO may well be the only workable solution to achieving comprehensive development.

The level of contributions will be a key issue for owners and developers.

plant, in order to facilitate CHP in the Waterside area. It also requires the protection of way leaves and provision to be made for incorporation of the necessary pipework. The provider of CHP will pursue the actual location of the site and provide a set of proposals outside of this SPD process. It is intended that part of the cost of the general basic infrastructure for CHP should be met through the 'Common Pot', but the SPD requires that developers will provide CHP/Community Heating unless this is impractical.

Energy targets are referred to in 13.12.2. A key objective for the regeneration of Waterside is to reduce car usage and encourage walking and cycling, through the nature and form of development and the provision of good links and routes. The Leicester Better Buildings Officer will seek to achieve a sustainable approach to all development, through the early consideration of proposals.

No change to SPD

Support noted

See comments above under Housing Mix.

This factor is being considered as part of the research into Developer Contributions.

Inevitably the actual developments brought forward will be different from the assumptions made in any 'mock' appraisal – yet it is recognised that some mechanism needs to be agreed which ensures the contributions made are sufficient to provide the level of quality needed in Waterside and the general approach is supported by Blueprint.

A contribution per unit basis is unlikely to work – as small units will pay the same as larger ones. Floor area would be more equitable but would need to be weighted as many of the larger properties provided are likely to be part of the affordable housing provision. A percentage of value has advantages as the higher value developments will pay more and it would enable contributions to track growth in value which the other two methods couldn't unless reviewed on a frequent basis, say bi-annually.

Different methods are being used in other regeneration areas, for example Holbeck Urban Village in Leeds is applying a contribution towards the common public realm works based on floor area (per m2) which is then variable depending on type of use and reduced or exempted for existing buildings brought back into use. Also no contribution is required from affordable residential provided. To meet the total public realm budget it is still expected that public funds will be needed to top up the private sector contributions.

Developers contributing in Waterside will be entitled to be given assurances and undertakings from the public sector that the Pot is being spent appropriately and for the benefit of Waterside.

Clearly there is still more work to do on this aspect and we would welcome a further opportunity to comment in due course.

SECTION 6 - CONCEPT

6.04.2 and 6.04.3

These seem to contain conflicting statements – i.e. that the backs of industrial buildings have helped create and maintain habitats yet the inaccessibility to water has limited boat numbers due to an unsafe environment. What there be any priority given as development proposals come forward? Development in Waterside should balance the need for

The research for the LRC Masterplan identified this as an important requirement for Leicester. This has recently been further tested through research. The results of that research, and on-going discussions will further inform the approach to housing provision.

No further change to SPD

The situation regarding Planning Obligations, Developers Contributions and the Common Pot is set out under the response to GOEM (see above).

increased public accessibility to the River and Canal with ecology conservation.

Diagram 7

This should also show the potential for the area around the lock system at the Grand Union Canal/Northgate Street as a mixed use hub.

SECTION 7 - URBAN STRUCTURE

7.02.1 Planning and Design principles The document assumes that residential demand will regenerate this part of the City. Whilst we share the City's aspirations and belief in the area, has a full assessment been made of the potential market? English Partnerships have recently commissioned a study into residential demand city wide and this will hopefully support the scale of residential proposed. However a hardening residential market will affect delivery and may bring pressure (misguidedly in our view) on quality standards.

The importance of connections from and to Waterside are recognised and should not be underestimated. The need for legibility of the route to the city centre, the quality of the pedestrian experience into the retail core and the

Shires redevelopment, the visual links and the creation of super crossings to overcome the barrier of Vaughan Way will all be essential ingredients.

SECTION 8 - URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK

8.01.1 – Vehicular Movement

Although balanced against the need for a more pedestrian friendly environment, has the impact of redirecting traffic away from commercial/retail frontages been considered - i.e. a reduction in passing trade?

Could High Cross Street allow some vehicular access, particularly at night and on Sundays, when bus services are reduced and when pedestrianised streets can become dead unless sufficient activity and vibrancy is created. This could help safety and sustainability of commercial/business uses.

8.01.3 – River Crossing

Care must be taken in ensuring that any new road crossing does not create another barrier to pedestrian movement.

8.02 – Amenity Spaces

As with earlier comments it is essential that public realm and open spaces are of a scale, location and suitability for Waterside in context with the other existing parks and open spaces in the area.

8.05 and Diagram 21 – Land Use Structure

Whilst recognising that this shows the predominant uses, the SPD should note and emphasise the need for a mix of uses and not appear to be too rigidly zoned. The framework should allow for organic growth of mixed uses in Waterside.

Such conflicts are inevitable. One of the roles of the SOD is to manage these, for example by increasing access and safety for boat users whilst protecting and enhancing biodiversity and habitats as far as reasonably possible. There will need to be a balance between protection of existing and the need for change. All development proposals will be considered on their particular merits and the unique circumstances that prevail. In some cases, protection of an important natural environment may be given priority, in other cases (where no suitable alternative options exist) the need to provide access may be considered to be more important for the wider benefit of the area.

No change to SPD

Agreed. The Development Parcel Brief (12.03, Dev Parcel 3) identifies this as an activity focus, with a small public space with A3, activity and mixed uses. The proposals remove the adjacent vehicular route, to facilitate greater pedestrian access and enjoyment. Diagram 7 is conceptual and is not intended to communicate this level of detail.

8.07 Affordable housing.

Again earlier comments regarding segregation apply here.

8.08 Mixed uses – diagram 24

Waterside Basin

This is too prescriptive as there may be other uses and a mix that would be suitable. The stated 80% limit on retail/mixed use frontage will not create a significant residential presence although in our view this may be appropriate in any event as there should be a greater degree of commercial/active uses in this location at street level.

SECTION 9.0 - PLACE MAKING

9.02.1

The basin will be needed early to create the quality of environment – funding for this will clearly be an issue.

Urban Structure

Visitors will also arrive from the south end of Waterside therefore the connections with the City Centre are just as important.

The document doesn't appear to mention the importance of connections to and from the west in terms of integrating the existing communities on the other side of the River and providing access to Waterside's facilities.

No change to SPD

The SPD seeks to achieve an appropriate and high quality urban form, including key infrastructure and public realm, to support a mix of appropriate uses. The details of the extent and mix of the housing will be further refined and determined by on-going research, including the EP study, and decisions will have to be taken based on the outcome of the research, in discussions with partners and stakeholders. However, it is generally agreed that high quality is essential and cannot be compromised, and this will be an important consideration. **No change to SPD**

Agreed

No change to SPD

The extent to which traffic is allowed or prohibited will be determined through on-going highway studies and the preparation of development proposals. It is agreed that passing traffic, or the ability to park nearby can sometimes be critical for some commercial uses and can (if controlled properly) bring benefit for pedestrian safety etc. Access for servicing etc. will also be important. Each area or street will be considered in more detail at the

9.02.2 Frog Island

The Waterside should be accessible not closed off with development backing on or by limiting access to private frontages. A balance will however need to be struck with ecology conservation.

9.02.3 All Saints

There is a concern about how the Shires and the Shires multi storey car park will relate to Waterside and New Walk extension – do the Shires redevelopment proposals have any frontage onto the Waterside area? If not it will act as a barrier. How easy is access between the two?

SECTION 10 - BUILDING TYPOLOGY

10.01

Commercial/Retail should be concentrated along Northgate Street and particularly at the 'hub' at the intersection of Soar Lane/Northgate/Sanvey Gate/High Cross Street.

10.03 – Unity

next stage, to ensure that an appropriate degree of pedestrianisation/vehicular access is achieved.

No change to SPD

Agreed.

The design of bridges must take account of this important requirement.

No change to SPD

Agreed. See comments above.

The SPD requires an appropriate mix of uses, to ensure sustainability and appropriate levels of activity throughout the day, evenings and weekends. The proposals are for guidance, to ensure compatibility of uses, the achievement of critical mass, appropriate distribution etc. of the predominant uses, but will be able to allow for flexibility where this would create a positive contribution and no significant negative impact.

No change to SPD

See earlier comments above.

This degree of prescription is necessary for several reasons:

so that sufficient critical mass is created, for the sustainability and success of commercial uses to concentrate activity along key pedestrian routes, along which we are seeking to

Proposals should also examine local context and justify their setting.

10.05 Facades and Diagram 28

Designs should be encouraged to create vertical rather than just horizontal variety to break up block scales and create interest.

10.06 Active Frontages

Residential streets – if the mix is predominantly apartments there will be limited opportunities to provide front doors less than 15 metres apart. Ground and first floor town houses with apartments above can be used as a mechanism to create a residential presence at ground floor

The SPD should encourage the development of a hierarchy of streets from primary, secondary, local - down to courtyards within schemes. Careful thought is needed on block sizes to avoid large scale 'Super blocks' with little permeability. Good permeability should be encouraged using squares and spaces to create interest.

10.07 Flexibility

Stand alone commercial may well be acceptable if designed appropriately, taking into account the context and setting.

Building scale should be high on edges of blocks, lessening towards the

encourage pedestrian links, especially between Waterside and the City Centre
to discourage commercial uses (other than local neighbourhood facilities) in areas where are seeking to protect quiet residential amenity or tranquillity,

to protect areas required for employment

No change to SPD

Agreed.

No change to SPD

Agreed. The SPD seeks to improve these.

No change to SPD

Integrating the existing communities and providing access to facilities provided within Waterside are key objectives of the SPD. They appear in the Introduction (2.01) under Community Identity and Integration, under the Vision for Waterside and the Role of the Waterside SPD. These objectives were fundamental in determining the form and layout of development (especially access to community facilities) and the location of public realm and infrastructure, in particular pedestrian links and access to recreational space. The need to improve positions for existing communities runs throughout the document.

No change to SPD

See Plan for Development Parcel 5, 12.05
Proposals for this area create high levels of

centre and around public spaces and squares to achieve the right proportions.

10.09 Car parking

No specific references to sustainability issues - car schemes/pooling, electric cars, cycle parking etc.

Any parking in a multi storey arrangement should be wrapped with residential and or/commercial uses to avoid dead frontages.

SECTION 11 - DELIVERY STRATEGY

11.01 – Development Parcels

As stated earlier CPO will be essential to resolve the extent of fragmentation of ownership, to prevent piecemeal development and ensure delivery of quality.

Public Open Space should be examined across the whole of Waterside and its context in the City. It should be well located, of the right scale and relate to surrounding buildings.

The delivery of the new Basin, Multi storey car parking and area based energy schemes/CHP will need to be considered further.

11.02 - Mini masterplans

Further consideration will be needed on how these will be successfully achieved in practice given the likely disparate objectives/aspirations of adjoining landowners and developers particularly if 'property speculators' increase their activity in the area. Clearly a piecemeal approach will not secure the aspirations set out in the SPD and again the use of CPO to assemble the more complex and key development areas will be an essential tool.

Applications will also need to consider other key aspects, for instance parking and vehicular and pedestrian movement, sustainability measures, CHP etc which will only be deliverable on a larger scale. Applications should

access, including a key pedestrian link for the existing communities in Woodgate All buildings will be required to face the water. An appropriate balance between public access, private space and the protection of ecology will be achieved through the detailed consideration of development proposals.

No change to SPD

Proposals for the Shires expansion and the regeneration of Waterside are being progressed to ensure maximum compatibility and cross-benefit. The Shires proposals have a presence onto Vaughan Way and Highcross Street, and are being designed to facilitate and encourage pedestrian movement across Vaughan Way and between Waterside and the City Centre. This has been an important requirement of both projects.

No change to SPD

Agreed. This is one of the important commercial links and hubs, as it will encourage people to move between Waterside and the City Centre.

No change to SPD

Agreed. 10.03 requires design to reflect the local character, contextual influences and aesthetics of each Character Zone.

No change to SPD

Agreed. This is addressed under Façade Middle Zone, within 10.05, and Diagram 28, and will be required through responding to local

also be clear on proposals to address sustainability and provide a justification of uses.

SECTION 12 - DEVELOPMENT BRIEFS

Area 1

Not clear what the reference to defensible space means in relation to the creation of active 24 hour mixed use streets which by their vary nature need to present accessible and active frontages. Buildings which are set back would not be appropriate for the type of lively, mixed, dense urban neighbourhood aspired to across Waterside.

Area 6

Refers to it being a landmark location but then suggests low rise buildings.

Area 11

Care will be needed in not creating another barrier in designing the proposed bridge and its setting in relation to adjoining uses and pedestrian movement

Area 14

Provision should be made for the potential of possibility of smaller scale offices (own front door type) along the frontages.

Area 15

character. However, the text at the beginning of 10.05 could be misleading.

Text to be amended to encourage a vertical rather than horizontal emphasis, where this is appropriate.

There are very few areas where apartments only will exist on both sides of residential streets, so it should generally be possible to achieve this requirement. Where this is not possible applicants may be required to examine the possibility of incorporating other forms of housing that do provide this.

Amend text in 10.06 to refer to this

Agreed. The Indicative Plan and the content of the SPD has been developed to address these requirements.

No change to SPD

‘Stand alone’ developments refer to ‘shed-like’ buildings, usually of low density, poorly integrated into the built form and disruptive to the grain, street frontages and activity. For these reasons these are not suited to Waterside and would be directed to more appropriate parts of the City.

No change to SPD

This could be overly prescriptive and inappropriate in some locations. Scale should relate to the unique circumstances of each site within its particular location and the context of its Character Zone.

No change to SPD

**Indigo Planning.
Representing
Westbridge Living**

The intersection of Soar Lane, Northgate Street, Sanvey Gate and High Cross Street is a very important hub which could present a lively mix of mainly commercial uses and act as a key attractor for those living, working and visiting waterside – it will be a key visual connector from the main retail area and visual and high quality physical links are crucial.

Area 16
Ditto above

Area 19
This is hugely important for Waterside and demands a very considered approach to creating the right linkages to the City Centre and particularly how The Shires addresses Waterside. If it turns its back, then pedestrians will not be encouraged to make the journey into Waterside. The crossing of Vaughan Way needs to be of very high quality, creating wide ‘super crossings’ where pedestrian priority is paramount.

Indigo. It is acknowledged that the latest Circular does encourage the use of standard changes and pooled contributions. However, the approach put forward in the SPD is somewhat formulaic and prescriptive. It would be more encouraging to developers (and therefore to the delivery of future development), if the SPD emphasized the need to deal with each proposal on its particular merits and that negotiations on contributions for specific sites will remain a key part in the overall process.
In situations where a landowner is providing land to assist in the delivery of one of the Council’s projects, such as land for the new road crossing, then the policy needs to take account of this. The SPD should indicate that this type of contribution would substitute the need to contribute to other public realm and infrastructure costs, based on the value of the land contribution.

8.00 Urban Design Framework
8.04 Storey Heights and Diagram 20 Whilst the ‘tall, medium and high rise’ definitions in the SPD might be acceptable for the general Waterside area, the policy needs to set out more clearly a justification for taller buildings (e.g. approximately 30 storeys) in certain areas, such as at No.1 Westbridge, Bath

Agreed.
Amend text to encourage this

Agreed. This is included with 10.09
No change to SPD

See earlier response

Agreed. See earlier response.

Agreed.
No change to SPD

Agreed. Further work is being undertaken to address this issue, to ensure they achieve their objective of comprehensive development.
No change to SPD

Agreed.
Expand the list of issues to be covered by the Mini Masterplans

Lane. The SPD needs a more comprehensive urban design rationale to identify the locations where taller buildings would be appropriate in their urban context. The SPD needs to set out some of this work more clearly, such as analysis of opportunities and constraints, historic setting, natural topography, urban form and character, streetscape, views, landmark areas and settings, transport/connections, open space, land use, etc. This would then provide a firm policy basis to provide the necessary support for a taller building as part of the planning application process.

Residential Mix and Diagram 21

Our client is supportive of the general policy approach in the Waterside regeneration area, which promotes a residential mix of unit sizes. It is recognized and acknowledged that No.1 Westbridge is seen as appropriate for apartments and therefore family housing would be accommodated elsewhere in the SPD area. Affordable housing - although this is currently set at 30%, allowance should be made for circumstances where off site provision is appropriate. A reduced amount might also be appropriate for reasons of viability, which might also need to be off-site.

Area 12: Bath Lane

The section that deals with this development area should include a firmer policy basis and justification for taller buildings of approximately 30 storeys. It should also explain that due to its prominent location with views from the arterial road into City, this site currently forms a gateway location to Leicester and that a tall building in this location could work with or without the new bridge.

The planning obligations requirements for any proposals at this site should also be applied flexibly as it includes land, which the Council considers appropriate for a new bridge crossing into Leicester.

As these streets will provide 24 hour access the design of buildings fronting onto them will need to address security of private space, to prevent unauthorised access and anti-social behaviour at less busy times, especially at night. Buildings along these routes will be required to provide high levels of activity and natural surveillance and observation. Buildings will only be set back if they can adequately achieve these requirements.

Amend text to clarify

Low rise buildings can also be effective in landmark locations. It is not always appropriate or desirable to have a tall building. Sometimes it is preferable to create a landmark only within a local area rather than from a distance. Sometimes the local environment or structure of the area is not appropriate for a tall building. This location is important, as it marks the split between the River and the Canal, which only needs to be communicated at a local level.

No change to SPD

Agreed.

No change to SPD

It is agreed that smaller scale offices (own front door type) would be beneficial within Waterside, to create daytime activity and trade for commercial uses.

Text with SPD to be amended to encourage these, of appropriate sizes in appropriate locations.

Agreed.

<p>Donaldsons Representing Shires GB (Hammerson Hermes)</p>	<p>Although the SPD currently supports a residential-led scheme in this area, it could be appropriate for other uses, such as offices or hotel and this should be reflected in the document.</p> <p>D. It is extremely encouraging to see Local Plan policies (in particular Policy PS07: Waterside) being implemented through this draft SPD and we support further investment within the City Centre and the concept of high quality residential development within the Waterside area.</p> <p>We also welcome the key objectives of the draft SPD which seek to restore Leicester as a place where people want to live and do business, providing a housing and commercial offer set within a high quality, attractive environment. In particular, we support the desire to:</p> <p>“ensure full integration with the wider City and City Centre developments and initiatives, in particular the Shires retail expansion and new multi-storey car park and the extension to New Walk”.</p> <p>We therefore support the wider benefits the SPD seeks to deliver. However, we do have some concerns at this early stage and these are outlined in detail below.</p> <p><u>Land Uses</u></p> <p>We note that the draft SPD proposes a new mixed-use quarter, led by residential development (3,500 homes) but with substantial amounts of workspace, retail and A3 leisure uses (28,000 sq m). Section 8.08: Mixed Uses outlines a number of locations where mixed uses will be appropriate, including Waterside Basin, Northgate, Blackfriars, St Augustine’s and the New Walk extension.</p> <p>The SPD does note that major retail development is incompatible with the characteristics of the Waterside area which are being promoted and also contrary to Policy R01 of the Replacement Local Plan. Similarly, the SPD comments that proposals for leisure development must complement the predominantly residential proposals for the area and that large stand alone</p>	<p><u>No change to SPD</u></p> <p>Agreed <u>No change to SPD</u></p> <p>Agreed. The SPD requires this. <u>No change to SPD</u></p> <p>The approach to Developers Contributions is addressed under the GOEM response above.</p> <p>The SPD sets out the framework for development, and on the basis of research that has been undertaken to date, identifies three areas as being ‘gateways’ to Waterside and therefore suitable as areas of search for taller</p>
--	---	--

retail or leisure developments will not be acceptable.

However, an overall 'cap' on the total amount of retail or leisure floorspace (for the avoidance of doubt meaning Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and D2) is not provided within the SPD area to support the objective of providing only small scale and complimentary retail development. The SPD also does not safeguard against the proliferation of a large number of small retail developments in one location which would also threaten the vitality and viability of the shopping core.

You will be aware that Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centre sets out the sequential approach to retail and leisure development and states that consideration should be given to locations in the following order:

First, locations in appropriate existing centres where suitable sites or buildings for conversion are, or are likely to become, available within the development plan document period, taking account of an appropriate scale of development in relation to the role and function of the centre; and then Edge-of-centre locations, with preference given to sites that are or will be well-connected to the centre; and then Out-of-centre sites, with preference given to sites which are or will be well served by a choice of means of transport and which are close to the centre and have a high likelihood of forming links with the centre.

Policy R01 of the Replacement Local Plan – Modifications (May 2005) also seeks to apply a sequential approach to retail development and states that:

“Outside the existing shopping centres shown on the Proposals Map, planning permission for major new retail development will not be granted unless it can be demonstrated that there is a need for the development, and that there are no suitable and available sites or buildings in the following locations, where appropriate to the catchment that the development seeks to serve:

firstly within the Central Shopping Core; followed by sites on the edge of the Central Shopping Core; then within the Town Shopping Cores; on the edge of the Town Shopping Cores; within the district centres or within the local

elements. Further work is required to establish exact locations, necessary heights and the level of impact (negative and positive) and is outside the scope and timescale of the production of this SPD. The onus will be on applicants proposing taller buildings within these areas of search to demonstrate the appropriateness of their proposals in all these respects, but further work to inform this will be undertaken by the City Council.

Expand text in SPD to provide further clarification regarding taller buildings.

Support noted.
Further work is being undertaken to determine how affordable housing is to be provided within Waterside.

Changes are to be made to the SPD in this respect

The Development Brief (12.00) for Area 12 states that the site will become a significant and highly visible City Gateway announcing Waterside, requiring a high quality structure that could include a taller element. Due to its location, it will be important to long-distance views, with or without the road bridge.

Amend text to reflect the fact that the site is important for announcing Waterside, with or without the road bridge.

centres providing the proposed development is appropriate to the scale and function of the centre ...”

Policy at both national and local level therefore clearly guides retail development towards town centres and specifically the Central Shopping Core before other edge or out of centre locations. Proposed major retail and leisure development within the Waterside area would therefore be contrary to both national and local policy which seeks to direct development to the Central Shopping Core.

We also have strong concerns that any significant retail development within the Waterside area could harm the viability of the new Shires development.

Therefore as outlined above, we support the proposed high quality residential development of the Waterside area. However, we object to retail and leisure development over and above dispersed and small-scale retail units for local use.

We also request greater clarification as to the overall level of retail and leisure floorspace within the SPD area and reserve the right to make further representations following receipt of this information.

Transport and Access

The draft SPD identifies that the proposed highway layout associated with the regeneration of the Waterside area is to be introduced in three separate phases. These are described as follows:

Phase 1 – Vaughan Way / Highcross Street – This involves a possible improvement to the Vaughan Way / Highcross Street junction. This junction improvement, combined with proposals to create a bus only link on Highcross Street between its junctions with Sanvey Gate and Vaughan Way, forms the Phase 1 Waterside highway improvements.

Phase 2 - A50 Traffic onto the A6 Corridor - The second phase involves dedicating the A50 between ‘Frog Island’ and Vaughan Way for bus and local access only. In order to achieve this, existing A50 traffic would be diverted onto the A6 and as a result traffic flows on the A6 corridor would increase significantly in both directions of travel.

Planning Obligations and Developer Contributions are addressed under the response to GOEMs comments above.

No further change to SPD

If the road bridge goes ahead in this location, this area could be appropriate for hotel or other commercial uses of an appropriate size.

Amend text to reflect this

Support noted

Para 1 - **Amend the Executive Summary to delete the reference to 28000 m² of floorspace for combined workspace, retail and A3 and to make it clearer the nature of uses which will be acceptable.**

Phase 3 - Provision of a New River Crossing – The third phase involves the provision of a new river crossing at St. Augustine and the introduction of a gyratory system to release the northern side of St. Nicholas Circle to the benefit of the extension of the city centre in that area.

The following comments have been prepared following consultation with transport consultants acting on behalf of the John Lewis Partnership (JLP), who also have a key stakeholder interest within Leicester City Centre. However, we understand that JLP will also be making a separate representation with regard to transport and access.

There is a general concern that insufficient background work has been undertaken to examine the transport implications as a result of the Waterside regeneration proposals. Future development delivered within the framework of the proposed SPD could result in major impacts on existing transport infrastructure in this area of the City. This view is supported by the findings of recent detailed traffic capacity assessment work undertaken to examine the traffic implications of the Phase 1 Waterside highway modifications, as discussed below.

It is therefore considered that the SPD should be underpinned by supporting evidence demonstrating these effects and identifying appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that the regeneration of this area will not have an adverse impact on the safe and efficient operation of the local highway network.

Specific comments on each phase of the proposed Waterside highway improvements are presented as follows.

Phase 1 – Vaughan Way / Highcross Street

Phase 1 of the Waterside regeneration proposals comprises the provision of highway improvements to restrict vehicular access on Highcross Street between its junctions with Vaughan Way and Sanvey Gate to buses and essential local access only.

Waterman Civils Limited (WCL) was commissioned by LCC to undertake an assessment of the traffic effects of implementing Phase 1 since it would

Para 3 - Only local facilities are intended for the 'local' centre in the Blackfriars area and small scale facilities around the basin. Para. 8.08 sets a limit on the size of units which are clearly consistent with a localized retail role. There is no question of retail competing with the Central Shopping Core.

Reference is also made to 3500 homes of mixed type, tenure and affordability. Whilst the nature of the eventual catchment population is not yet known, the potential total population suggests up to 1000 m² of A1 and A3 or A4 or A5 uses could be accommodated in a 'local' centre in the Blackfriars area. **Amend text to state that up to 1000 m² of local shops will be sought.**

A greater emphasis on A3/A4 units and specialist shops (but not a major out-of-town retail destination) with some element of local shopping will be made in the proposed basin and the Northgate shopping street. It is difficult to be precise about what may be acceptable in quantitative terms. **Amend text to make it clearer what is trying to be achieved in this area.**

result in the transfer of traffic that currently uses Highcross Street onto adjacent routes. The results of the assessment indicate that Phase 1 would have a significant adverse effect on the efficient operation of the highway network in the vicinity of the new Shires development. Specifically it would result in the following junctions failing on traffic capacity grounds:

Sanvey Gate/Burgess Street
Sanvey Gate/St. Margaret's Way
St. Margaret's Way/Vaughan Way
Vaughan Way/Causeway Lane
Vaughan Way/Shires West Car Park Egress

The assessment that has been undertaken is considered to represent the most optimistic scenario since no allowance for increased traffic activity due to the Waterside development has been assumed. However, even with this 'best case' traffic generation assumption the findings demonstrate that the existing highway network in the vicinity of the new Shires development would not be capable of accommodating the resultant changes in traffic patterns.

The assessment undertaken by WCL therefore demonstrates that the Phase 1 proposal would have a significant effect on existing traffic capacity at the junctions listed above and demonstrates that the proposal therefore does not work operationally. In this respect we look forward to discussing alternative options for this junction with the City Council.

We also request additional information on the process and timing of securing bus only movement so we can fully understand the implications this may have on the Section 278 Highway Works for the new Shires development.

Phase 2 - A50 Traffic onto the A6 Corridor

The Phase 2 highway improvements remove all through traffic movements from the A50 corridor and divert it onto the A6 corridor. The addition of further traffic through the already congested A6 junctions into the City would further exacerbate the problems described under Phase 1. In addition, any 'new' traffic activity generated by the Waterside area would further compound anticipated local traffic capacity problems.

One of the consequences for this is the currently stated need to utilise

Burgess Street for through traffic movements due to the difficulties in accommodating increased turning movements at the A6 St Margaret's Way / Vaughan Way junction.

As you are aware the new multi-storey car park (MSCP) approved as part of the new Shires development will be accessed off Burgess Street. We remain very concerned that any increase in the use of Burgess Street would be incompatible with the efficient operation of the MSCP. The use of Burgess Street as a through route in this manner will, in our opinion, overload this road and adjacent junctions to the detriment of all users and is therefore not a proposal that we could support.

It should also be noted that the new MSCP is intended to serve the Waterside area as well as the new Shires development and hence any proposals that impact on the efficient operation of the new MSCP will be to the detriment of both developments and of course the rest of the City Centre, visitors to which will undoubtedly use the new MSCP.

We are also uncertain as to the transport and environmental benefits to be gained from relocating traffic from the A50 onto the A6 corridor particularly when having regard to the new residential development on land between Burgess Street and St Margaret's Way. It would appear that the proposals simply shift traffic-related problems from the Frog Island area to Burgess Street / St Margaret's Way.

We note that in previous correspondence between Leicester Regeneration Company (LRC) and Hammerson (dated 5 May 2005) the LRC confirmed that further detailed evaluation work would be undertaken by the LRC and we request that this information is provided.

Phase 3 - Provision of a New River Crossing

It is considered that the provision of a new river crossing is a LRC aspiration only, is subject to massive funding requirements and is unlikely to be delivered in practice due to the significant costs involved. As a result, any benefits that Phase 3 may offer are unlikely to be realised and the longer-term operation of Phases 1 and 2 should therefore be assessed against this background.

The highway proposals included in the SPD are indicative only, based on information available during its formulation. However, further city wide highways research is currently being undertaken and the results of these studies will inform changes within the Waterside area, to ensure the efficient operation of the city wide and local highway networks. Development proposals contained within the SPD may be required to change as a result of the highway research.

Text to be added to SPD to clarify this position.

We also have serious concerns regarding the effects of the indicated Phase 3 improvements on visitors to the new Shires development and the retail centre of Leicester.

In particular we are concerned that egress from the Shires roof top car park to the north and north-east will become truncated because it will not be possible to make a 'U'-turn at St Nicholas' Circle. Instead, a longer detour via Narborough Road North and the new river crossing would have to be made.

We therefore have major concerns in principle to this proposed Phase and we believe that the Council needs to undertake significant further assessment and capacity analysis.

The Development Contribution Tariff

The draft SPD proposes a plan for investment in public realm improvements, infrastructure and community facilities.

It is important to note that Circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations' states that obligations should be relevant, necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the proposal under consideration and fair and reasonable to the scale of the development.

We therefore support the Council's commitment to ensure that the above key tests are met and will therefore negotiate individual obligations with developers as they bring schemes forward.

Circular 05/2005 also encourages local planning authorities to employ standard formulae and charges to speed up negotiations and to ensure a more predictable process with greater certainty for developers.

Taking on board Circular 05/2003, the SPD includes a 'tariff' of developer contributions. This is calculated both to meet needs and to allow project viability at current and projected costs and will be applied to residential units and commercial / leisure floorspace.

In principle, we therefore understand and support the proposal for a tariff-based system.

The SPD proposes two basis of tariff for comment. These are:

Unit base – a £ rate per residential unit and an accompanying £ rate per sq m of commercial / leisure floorspace;

Floorspace base – a £ rate per sq m of residential floorspace and an accompanying £ rate per sq m of commercial / leisure floorspace.

It is important to note that the appropriate method for calculating contributions will depend on the individual proposal and site and we therefore suggest that both of the above options are suitable and that the appropriate method of calculation should be agreed on a site by site basis.

The SPD also states that a baseline assessment of the Waterside's current open market land value was undertaken and compared to an overall residual appraisal to establish the development land value of the Waterside after having made allowance for a reasonable developers return. The SPD concludes that these calculations resulted in an uplift in land value between the before and after calculations and a proportion of this uplift has been identified as a reasonable contribution to the 'common pot' for public realm and infrastructure provision across the Waterside area.

Whilst we agree with the principle of potential up-lift in value it is important to note that initial development within the Waterside area will be at greater risk and with lower returns than development further down the line. We therefore suggest that this should be taken into account for sites coming forward at the start of the regeneration process.

Compulsory Purchase

We note that the 'pilot project' area is a target for public sector investment, to assemble sufficient land, possibly backed by Compulsory Purchase. We also note that a key aim of the draft SPD is to support and underpin potential future CPOs to overcome any impediments to comprehensive regeneration.

We acknowledge that the use of compulsory purchase powers may be necessary to ensure comprehensive development, however, we request further information on the extent of the 'pilot project' area and the proposed boundary of this site and also further information about other potential CPOs

<p>John Lewis Pts</p>	<p>within the SPD area. Following receipt of this information, we reserve the right to comment further.</p> <p>JLP. We have some serious concerns which relate to the impact that the proposal will have on the immediate infrastructure and transport, the details of which are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The removal of the vehicular traffic from the A50 between Sanvey Gate and Vaughan Way. 2. The A50 is a major radial road providing access to the city centre. It supports a considerable traffic demand in the region of approximately 1,200 vehicles per hour at peak times. 3. The SPD gives no indication of how this traffic will be re-routed and accommodated with a reasonable level of service on other parts of the road network. We find the SPD inadequate in this regard. 4. National guidance (PPS 12 Local Development Frameworks) is that local development documents must be soundly based in terms of their content and the process by which they are produced, based upon robust and credible evidence. 5. On the basis that we feel the SPD fails this test, we will oppose the planning until such time as it can be demonstrated that the traffic generated by the proposal, together with the traffic displaced by the downgrading of the A50, can be accommodated in a satisfactory manner which does not prejudice other developments in the city centre. 6. I understand that LCC and LRC jointly appointed consultants to undertake a comprehensive transport study of the city centre and immediate adjoining areas; the Leicester City Centre Access Study (LCCAS) the purpose being to coordinate the implementation of improved transport infrastructure for the city centre. The SPD does not report on the LCCAS nor have the traffic consultants, White Young and Green, provided information to help understand the impact of the proposals. 7. It is our Transport consultants opinion that the Waterside proposals would overload the following parts of the road network and create delays and congestion at:- St Margaret's Way/Vaughan Way junction St Margaret's Way/Sanvey junction Vaughan Way/Burgess Street junction 8. We would like assurance that the impact of traffic from Waterside has 	<p>The approach to Developers Contributions and Planning Obligations is set out within the response to GOEMs comments above.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
------------------------------	---	--

**Innes England
Representing
Kirby & West**

**Living Choice
Investments ltd
And
4G (Holdings) ltd
(Mr J Singh)
Both of Global House
61 Great central St**

**Architects LE1
(Michael Collins)**

been sufficiently examined at Vaughan Way and the Shires West car park egress and at Vaughan Way and Causeway Lane.

I believe that the majority of these points were put to the LRC in March of this year by Hammerson as part of the consultation on the Waterside Draft Development Framework. It is therefore disappointing that they do not appear to have been addressed.

As I have previously stated, broadly we are pleased to see a desire for the Waterside area to be regenerated and upgraded, but until we can be provided with evidence or practicable solutions to the road and infrastructure proposals, we must object in the strongest possible terms to the transportation proposals contained within the Supplementary Planning Document.

K & W Concerns raised about the proposal to build a link road and bridge from St Augustine's to Bath Lane. The position of the road takes up a large proportion of K & W's land, which is essential to their operation in the city.

LCI & 4G. "We confirm our extreme concerns at the outline proposals that clearly affect our holdings that are the major sites in the area"

(No sites referred to)

A meeting is requested at the earliest opportunity.

LE1. 1.0 Area 13 Slater Street

1.1 We consider the suggested access road from the A50 alongside the river to be totally unacceptable in urban design and land use terms.

1.2 We understand that there is a proposal to restrict the height of buildings fronting the river to between 3 and 5 storeys which again we object to for the same reasons as 1.1

1.3 We do not consider that the responsibility for the mini master plans should be the developers. It is our opinion that the framework for the individual areas should be resolved by the Urban Design Team and their

<p>The Bow Bridge Group</p> <p>David H. Wooton 161 Anstey Lane (Land owner in Dev' Parcel 6)</p>	<p>consultants.</p> <p>1.4 We do not consider that the cost of providing additional vehicular access to Area 13 should be borne solely by the developers in that area. It is quite clear from the documentation that with the downgrading of the A50 there will be significant advantage to the waterside generally with the provision of alternative routes and these costs should be wider spread.</p> <p>2.0 Area 5 Frog Island/Area 6 Old Mill Race</p> <p>2.1 A detailed master plan for this area should be produced by the Urban Design Team and their consultants to enable these sites to be brought forward.</p> <p>2.2 We consider the height restriction to be unreasonable.</p> <p>BBG. Awaiting delayed response.</p> <p>DW. "Concerned about by what procedure the various landowners can be brought together to consider the plans and negotiate as <i>one body</i> which must be of benefit to all involved. To conclude may I emphasise some method of communication between landowners and lease holders in Parcel 6."</p> <p>Reference to pedestrian crossing of Vaughan Way. "I believe it will be a shame to have this weak link between two excellent developments i.e. the shires and the Waterside. My thoughts instantly turn to road safety."</p> <p>Verbal suggestion at exhibition. In order to overcome road safety issues, physical, economic and cultural connectivity between the City Centre and Waterside, could the SPD master plan incorporate an extension of the Southgates Underpass? This would stretch just beyond the Highcross Street/Vaughan Way junction to create a primarily pedestrian zone over the underpass between and including the south side of St Nicholas Circle and Highcross Street? This would facilitate an easy and attractive pedestrian link between Waterside and the city centre.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>Paul Ginns Ginns Brothers Limited. Owners of Great Central House, GCS.</p> <p>GROUPS & SOCIETIES</p> <p>Woodgate Residents Association (Geoff Forse)</p>	<p>It would also enable buses, emergency vehicles and taxis to cross directly from lower Highcross Street to upper Highcross Street.</p> <p>GB. “We note the proposed road from the canal bridge to Vaughan Way, and which skirts the Roman Wall site and the Sikh Temple is planned to remove a section of the front of our building. On examining the plan we can see no reason why this should be so when a small deviation of a few metres northwards would towards the Central Station would avoid this. This building is a substantial Victorian construction, which I believe, would convert well to flats whilst still retaining its original façade and general appearance and is too valuable to be lost. We believe that the appearance of this parcel of land (DP No 19) would not be adversely affected by the retention of this building.”</p> <p>WRA With specific reference to development Parcels 7, 27 and 25. “The housing should not be of a high density, should be family use, be affordable and where possible to be two stories high so it does not block the light.” Higher density housing is acceptable on the south east part of the Russell’s site as this was further away from the current housing and therefore would not cause any blockage of light or people overlooking gardens etc.” The family housing should be nearer the existing housing along Repton Street.</p> <p>“The new housing should blend in with the existing housing.”</p> <p>“Those living on Repton Street preferred the two storey housing facing them.” (As opposed to new housing being side-on to facilitate filtered views through of the river corridor from existing upper storey windows.)</p>	<p>These concerns will be addressed as part of the further work on the Access Study and subsequent highway requirements. <u>SPD to be amended to reflect this</u></p>
--	---	---

“The access to the development must not be via the existing side roads but by another entrance/exit.”

“The potential problem of people working or using the city centre or Waterside area and using the area as a car park and walking into town needs to be addressed. This is already a problem but with the pedestrian bridge over the river, which will shorten walking time to town, this could become more of a problem.”

With the influx of more people into the area the need for additional services must be taken into consideration. This is particularly the case with doctors, dentists, schooling and youth services.

“Road safety needs to be looked at as Woodgate has a school, park and an adventure playground in the area. Road safety issues therefore need to be taken into account including potential traffic calming measures and a reduction in speed limit in the area.

<p>Leicester Access Forum (John Burrows)</p>	<p>Awaiting delayed response.</p>	
<p>Leicester Civic Society (John Burrows)</p>	<p>Awaiting delayed response.</p>	
<p>Leicestershire Angling Federation (John C Essex)</p>	<p>What provision is being made for angling within the confines of new Waterside development? If angling is not compatible then what alternative provisions are being made? If the above were true it would seem sensible to compensate the angling club that controls the fishing for loss of amenity.</p>	
<p>LOCAL RESIDENTS</p> <p>BM Postlethwaite 260 Tudor Road</p> <p>Mrs D Lee 79 Bonchurch St</p>	<p>BMP. “The plan looks marvellous. It will smarten up the area.”</p> <p>DL.“There is nothing on the plans to replace the existing adventure playground this side of the river as this doesn’t just serve the Woodgate area.</p>	<p>The provision of new roads and other alterations to the highway network are at this stage indicative only and will be subject to further studies, research and design work. Wherever possible, we would seek to achieve these in locations that minimise disruption, in particular the loss of good buildings. In all cases, landowners and property occupiers would be consulted.</p> <p><u>No change to SPD</u></p>

<p>Geoff Forse 92 Marshall Street</p> <p>Mr C Ford 6 Rugby Street</p>	<p>There are no more roads planned to help the congested existing ones. Bonchurch Street serves as a local school run and a rat run.</p> <p>Could the builders build the new houses of red brick to blend with the houses already here, as it has been done on surrounding sites.” (New development next to Sainsbury’s on Fosse Road North) “The inside could be modern as you like. Most cities are slavishly following the same design buildings. You have a blank canvas make it scream Leicester so people will want to stop. Don’t miss this opportunity!!!”</p> <p>GF. “I do not believe diverting traffic via St Mathews Way and Abbey gate will work. A different system needs to be looked at.” The new housing along Repton Street should be maximum 3 stories high except on SE corner of Russell’s Foundry. Close to housing should only be 2 storey”.</p> <p>CF. “I am disgusted with it. At Woodgate residents meeting with developers and City Council in February residents wanted no more than 2 storeys. But artist’s impression showed new residential development of 3 and 4 storeys high. At the public meeting on 26th July it became apparent that the proposed buildings will be between 3 to 5 and 5 to 8 storeys high. Adding to this 3 to 5 storeys in the car park at the back of my house. Which will all have a disastrous effect on the surrounding terraced housing, which will be totally overshadowed and dwarfed by this insensitive development. I feel that my quality of life will be permanently damaged by this development.”</p>	<p>The SPD requires development in these areas to take adequate account of existing residential properties (this is also governed and controlled by Planning legislation and guidance). This can be achieved through careful design, even in the case of apartments. The height of development closest to the existing properties will be restricted, with the ability to step up as development moves away from these. The plans will be made more explicit in this respect.</p> <p>New development will be required to respond to the context and character of its local environment, but will not necessarily be required to look like the existing housing, as this would be overly-prescriptive.</p> <p>New development will be required to demonstrate that it takes adequate account of the existing properties and their occupiers. There could be several different development forms that achieve this (the plan included in the SPD is indicative only). New development will also be required to improve pedestrian access throughout the area, and views of the water. All of these needs will have to be balanced to achieve appropriate built form. Nearby residents will have the opportunity to comment on development proposals that affect their interests.</p> <p>Access has yet to be determined, as changes to the highway network will be subject to wider studies, to ensure efficiency, maximise benefit</p>
---	---	---

Karen Rene
352 Fosse Road
North

KR. “And what will happen to the wildlife: Swans, ducks, moorhens, etc? Another of their habitats invaded by people? Not to mention oil spillage/rubbish in the water.”

Elizabeth Rollings
59 Dunton Street

ER. “Parking – we have 1 car (In a household of 5) + find it difficult to park near our home. With the increased accommodation what solutions do you have to offer? We already are aware that people, during the working week Mon-Saturday park outside our houses + walk into the city to shop or work etc, + some even parking up + catching the bus. Help is needed.

With the new improved Waterside + the few Council houses in the area, will the Council be selling of to housing associations or private landlords. If that is to happen will our rents increase to the cost of the newly improved area? We have been here for 20 years and as things stand have no opportunity to afford more rent.

Will the River Soar/canal be cleaned up properly or will it be left to the company's own conscience to do so?
The plans look lovely, but what about the ordinary person who has lived here for a long time, will it all be positive?”

and minimise negative impacts.

This will be addressed as part of the highway studies

Agreed. Development within Waterside must provide facilities to serve the growing population. However, these can only be provided as the population emerges. It is intended that the proposals within the SPD will not only serve and benefit the new population but will also benefit existing residents. Indeed, this is an important objective of the SPD, and pedestrian links and the location of facilities has been determined to encourage this.

Agreed. The proposals within Waterside seek to achieve safer, more direct and more attractive pedestrian and cycle links between the Woodgate area, community services, amenities and facilities within Waterside and the City Centre.

Plan and text to be amended to provide clarity regarding the heights of new development in the vicinity of existing residential properties, limiting this to 2-3 storeys, rather than 3-5.

<p>Louise Lubkavski 62 Balfour Street</p>	<p>LL. "I think the plans look great! I cycle along the canal every day on my way to work and back, and would welcome a proper cycleway and more amenities.</p>	<p>The SPD encourages active use of the water space as far as possible. Angling in appropriate locations is considered to be a positive aspect of Waterside, encouraging use of the water itself. However, this must be balanced against other requirements and conflicts, and will not be possible in all locations. Wherever possible though this will be encouraged. It is suggested that the Angling Club discuss their requirements with the City Council, to identify possible locations, so that their interests and requirements can be taken into account.</p>
<p>Mr DJ Aldridge 95 Warwick Street</p>	<p>DJA. "I am greatly in favour of the Waterside Regeneration, being in my middle fifties, and loving all the wildlife, it will benefit the Green Policies of Leicester. I am for everything for the environment, as I love fishing. I have one major concern, to encourage more boats and tourism I suggest you dredge all along the canals and River Soar, as there is not a lot of depth, which would cause problems for the boating people. The main areas being from opposite the city football stadium to Swans Nest Weir Abbey meadows, it is full of silt. Dredging it will attract more wildlife and clean the water quality up."</p>	<p><u>No change to SPD</u></p>
<p>Mr D Wilkinson 27 Marshall Street</p>	<p>DW. A very impressive and well thought through plan. Once this project has been completed, the area concerned will be one of the best in the country. However, I would have preferred less apartment style houses to attract higher taxpayers, and a better balance of affordable houses, especially for key workers.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Margaret Lacey 62 Henly Road</p>	<p>ML. "Please allow new waterside footpaths adequate width (6' minimum) for couples to pass safely (and cyclists).</p>	<p>The adventure playground is an important local facility, that will serve both existing and new residents, and the proposals seek to retain and if possible improve this. However, the text for Area 7 and Area 8 Development Briefs need to refer to this. It may be possible to seek contributions towards improving this facility through Developers Contributions.</p> <p><u>Amend text to incorporate the requirement to retain and improve the adventure playground as part of the Rally Park improvements</u></p> <p>Changes to the highway network will be</p>

<p>CITY & COUNTY RESIDENTS</p> <p>Mrs J Gilbert 39 Overdale Rd Knighton</p> <p>Mr C Hall 59 Richmond Rd Aylestone</p> <p>Jayan Laxman</p>	<p>No more huge oppressive buildings close to the riverside such as the West Bridge Wharf.</p> <p>Please consider public safety and security when enlarging “The Rally” area.</p> <p>Not enough leisure open landscaped space beside waterside.”</p> <p>JG. “The Waterside Plan looks exciting, futuristic and an asset to Leicester. Unfortunately our city centre especially Humberstone Gate is an embarrassment. How can we attract thriving businesses, quality tourists and citizens of Leicester into an area, which resembles a tacky seaside front funfair? Come on Leicester surely you can do better!”</p> <p>CH. “Making the most of Leicester’s assets eg history and waterside can only be a good thing. I hope the waterside will look bright and attractive, not overcrowded. With lots of greenery and well designed buildings. Developers with a good track record should be encouraged, good designs like the LCB Depot and Waterloo House on Tigers Way, would be ideal. Paving like that on New Walk would look nice. A 5* hotel would be nice with gardens leading to the waterside, as Leicester hotels are mainly cheap, small or budget.”</p>	<p>determined through further research and studies.</p> <p><u>No change to SPD</u></p> <p>New development will be required to respond to its local context and Character Zone, and be appropriate for Leicester. However, there may be other ways of achieving this than through the use of red brick. The requirements cannot be unduly prescriptive or limiting. But must be reasonable. <u>No change to SPD</u></p> <p>Changes to the highways network will be subject to further research and studies. Development in close proximity to existing residential properties in these areas will be limited to 2-3 storeys, stepping as it moves away. See earlier comments above.</p> <p><u>Text and plans to be amended to clarify this position</u></p> <p>New development will be required to adequately take account of existing residential properties and their occupiers. (Planning regulations and guidance will also control this). Development in close proximity of these properties will be restricted to 2-3 storeys, stepping up as it moves away. The proposals contained within the SPD seek to provide many benefits for the existing residents throughout the Woodgate and Tudor Road areas. An appropriate level of development must be achieved otherwise sites will not be brought forward for regeneration and it will not be possible to achieve the wider benefits.</p> <p><u>Text and plans to be amended to clarify the</u></p>
---	--	--

13 Stafford St
Belgrave

Martin Wright
1 Pinewood Close, B'
Leys
Leicester

JL. "I think it is brilliant, that the Council is planning ways of improving the city. Leicester will soon be a cool & vibrant city with lots to offer, with the new Walkers stadium and Shires Extension and even the new student accommodations.

I am a student that has been born & bred in Leicester, and I am very much proud of my city, and 100% back the plans & developments to one of the best & largest cities in the East Midlands."

MW. I couldn't agree more with the broad thrust of what is proposed. In particular I am pleased with the bringing together and promoting of some of Leicester's historic past. Some years ago I commented on the 'Leicester Quarters' proposal and recommended such a Heritage vision. Is there not an opportunity being missed here to at least create a permanent museum/exhibition of Leicester that especially ties the elements found in this area together, so that residents and visitors have a starting point from which they can then go on and discover the various gems we have?

In my comments all those years ago I stated that one of the major problems we have is creating the physical link between the City Centre and the Heritage area. By this I mean the obstruction of the ring road and chiefly St Nicholas Circle. Both in the City Core and the Waterside documents this view is echoed yet I cannot see any firm steps to tackle this issue. In fact in the Waterside document it states that Vaughan Way, the Southgates underpass and the King Richards Road will remain as current.

My belief then, as now, is that St Nicholas Circle is a huge millstone in promoting the heritage of our City. If we are to build this area into a national tourist attraction the pedestrian must come first and we must seek to connect such valued sites as Jewry Wall and Castle Park.

It seems to me that many of the proposals, current and past, see the car as a demon. I take the view that cars are a necessary evil and the plans should work with them. I've seen in other Cities where huge developments have taken place and new roads are used as the framework and from which the environment is improved. This is a major development and yet the volumes

position regarding heights of buildings close to existing housing

The SPD seeks to protect wildlife as far as possible, and seize opportunities to further enhance this, but this has to be balanced against the need to regenerate a run-down post-industrial area. The new uses proposed for the area will be required to contribute towards cleaning up the waterways. Pollution levels will be significantly improved from when the area was used for industrial purposes.

No change to SPD

Parking for the new Waterside development will either be provided within Waterside itself or within the proposed Shires car park. Measures to prevent commuters parking in residential areas will be considered as part of the wider highways studies and will be outside the scope of this SPD

No change to SPD

An objective of Waterside is to improve housing provision and choice within the area, including an appropriate amount of affordable housing to rent and buy. The increase in supply could possibly have a beneficial effect on rents. There is no intention to adversely affect existing provision in the wider area. However, concern is noted and comments will be passed to our Housing colleagues.

No change to SPD

Development in Waterside will be required to contribute towards the management and

of traffic using the area are not a sufficient priority and for all the comment on transport within the document the proposals are not bold and lack courage. The Waterside proposals have a massive opportunity to improve and make a statement on road traffic in Leicester.

My suggestions curtail road provision where required but also provide addition roads where it is necessary to achieve the overall objective. I feel a great opportunity was lost when the Evesham Road extension was cancelled and particularly when the City Challenge did not raise to the challenge of diverting traffic along the river corridor away from Narborough Road. We will not get visitors, new residents or businesses to come to Leicester if the infrastructure is a hindrance. From my stance I see little or no effort being made in any of LRC proposals to tackle taking traffic from Belgrave Gate, as in the case of the Science Park, or the Ring Road as in the case of the City Core and Waterside proposals.

The plans to pedestrianise the Southern part of the A50 is great and to restrict the Northern part logical. St Margaret's Way should be the main access route from the North. I take that route when I approach the City. When I reach the junction with Vaughan Way because it's a ring road I have the option of turning left or right. What we should be doing is restricting access to the right, towards Southgates underpass, and encourage all traffic going North – South to turn left onto Burleys Way. If this area is to be such a focal point for both the City Core and Waterside developments then that's exactly what the road layout should facilitate. The road layout from Aylestone Road, Welford Road and London Road should be constructed to take the flow past the train station and Leicester Mercury offices onto St Matthews Way. It seems to me that although there are plans that link most of these areas there is no joined up thinking on the road layout and traffic flow.

I also suggested back then that a new river crossing was required further along the river to take the traffic away from St Nicholas Circle. Thankfully I see that such an idea is being considered, however, I feel to link the new crossing at Blackfriars achieves very little, this is primarily because:

The traffic simply goes back onto the ring road.

The crossing is too close to the existing route, which isn't being curtailed.

It takes traffic to the edge and not the core of the planned developments.

cleaning up of the River and Canal. This will be undertaken by the Council, not by individual land or property owners.

Support noted.

An important objective of the SPD is to achieve many benefits for the existing residents of the area.

No change to SPD

Support noted

Support noted.

Dredging can be both positive and negative, both for use and for wildlife. Careful consideration will be given to this, as set out in the SPD, to achieve an appropriate balance.

No change to SPD

Support noted.

It is important to achieve an appropriate mix of housing, to meet a number of different objectives. The SPD currently requires a mix of housing types and tenures, to achieve a balanced community, but further research is to be undertaken to ensure the correct approach is adopted.

No change to SPD

This will vary according to need, location and

I would propose that beyond West Bridge the traffic should be viewed as having reached its destination and access restricted to gaining entry to the Shires car park and City Centre local roads. By doing this St Nicholas Circle on the side of the Jewry Wall could be removed bar the access to the Holiday Inn car park. Two way traffic could be routed to the other side of St Nicholas Circle. The slip roads to Vaughan Way could remain, certainly to ease traffic coming out of the City but certainly the slip road coming up at the side of the Travel Lodge could be removed.

The proposed new river crossing should be moved further along to link up with Soar Lane/Sanvey Gate directly. This would bring traffic into the heart of the development and particularly the section earmarked for business use. I think the business element of the proposal is timid and understated. I know there is a planned office core planned for the area around the train station but it is restricted by available land. Even the office core proposals for Derby are 3 or 4 fold bigger than Leicester.

The use of Sanvey Gate would directly link into:
Taking traffic away from Vaughan Way.
Taking traffic away from the Heritage heart.
Dovetail into the pedestrianisation plans for the A50.

Provide the access that is hinted upon but not stated from St Margaret's Way.
Underline the commitment to the business and office elements.
Have a more iconic backdrop.

Going a stage further I would not be shy in taking the road all the way from St Augustine to the A50 at Woodgate along the Western side of the river. I'm sure the environmentalists would scream out loud at this. If we want a pleasant and prospering City center in which people can live, work and socialize the right decisions have to be made for the benefit of the whole of Leicester and not just those who are impacted by the Waterside development. I would call this road the A50 and route it across St Augustine, along Bow Lane under Bow Bridge, along Western Boulevard at the side of the river, along Mill Lane/Bonnars Lane to Oxford Street which I would make two way as most of the traffic would be going up Tigers/Waterloo Way. This

environment, and it will not always be possible to achieve this width. However, safe and attractive pedestrian routes, especially along the waterside are an important requirement of the SPD.

No change to SPD

The scale of buildings will be appropriate to their location, function and role. The SPD has been produced partly to be able to control the scale of development, and ensure it is appropriate.

No change to SPD

This will be a fundamental consideration, and one of the main requirements for improving the Park

No change to SPD

The proposed improvements to Rally park, other improvements to the Canal and River corridors and the provision of new spaces adjacent to existing and new areas of water will achieve a considerable increase.

No change to SPD

Support noted.

Support noted.

<p>Mr G Lees Helb Cottage, Enderby.</p> <p>Mr P Jones 2 Mansfield St Quorn</p>	<p>is a drive to make the Eastern side of the ring road the City Centre bypass and the Western side used for the new vision we have for that part of the City. This falls in line with the replacement of the Upperton Road viaduct and the plans to create better access from De Montfort University around The Magazine.</p> <p>My final point concerns the Great Central station. If Bow Bridge is to be saved because there is a likelihood that it will one day be used to carry steam locomotives has no thought been given to the routing of the line from Leicester North? I am no steam enthusiast, however, as simply a resident who wants the best for my City I can think of no single attraction that would stimulate the use of the Heritage area than having the Central line restored into its heart. I have thought about this for a number of years and believe it could be allied to an arena, conference/exhibition center, which the city sadly lacks.</p> <p>If there is one thing lacking in the proposals I would say it's a wow factor. There is nothing that says Leicester will be put on the map because of this either regionally or beyond. As pleased I am with it, it appears very bland and just another regeneration. It's all low key, there's nothing iconic or significant that when promoted for investment or once completed will symbolize the City or even make it stand out to Joe Public. That's an opportunity missed because it can be achieved more in this area of the LRC plan than any of the others.</p> <p>GL. "It all looks very chic, but casino should be taken out of High Cross Street and All Saints. The old Richard Roberts shop (Ex Coop) should be retained.</p> <p>PJ. "Any developments that bring the river / waterways closer to the heart of the city are to be welcomed. The river has too long been a neglected feature.</p>	<p>The SPD seeks to create a beautiful area for Leicester, with many high quality buildings and spaces.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>The SPD seeks to begin to integrate the heritage area and assets of the City, and promote these. Development will be required to respond to this, integrating and incorporating archaeology and historic buildings and environments. Further work is being pursued to promote Leicester's heritage, outside of but alongside this SPD.</p> <p><u>No change to SPD</u></p> <p>The SPD identifies the importance of removing the barriers that exist between the City Centre, the Heritage area and Waterside, and proposes the removal of most of the traffic from around St Nicholas Circle, to help facilitate much better pedestrian connectivity. The ability to do this, and the extent to which it can be achieved will be determined by further detailed studies.</p>
--	--	---

**PART 2 –
Issues**

I'm delighted that your proposals address this neglect."

Verbal representations made to LCC and LRC personnel staffing the Waterside SPD exhibition, and notes entered in the Customer Comments Book

However, it will continue to be a most important objective for regeneration in this area.

No change to SPD

Agreed. Adequate car access is essential if the City (and Waterside) is to perform effectively. However, it would be a mistake to over-provide for the car at the unnecessary expense of the pedestrian and cyclist. These requirements must be balanced against each other. To achieve wide ranging objectives, we must achieve a balance that provides adequate levels of car access whilst still creating an environment that will be highly attractive to pedestrians and cyclists. Opportunities to improve the highway network will be determined by current research and studies, to ensure efficiency of the city wide and local networks and the creation of appropriate environments.

No change to SPD

Comments noted and passed to Highways colleagues.

The proposal for the new road bridge will be subject to further studies and research, to assess appropriateness, need, benefits and other options for achieving the objectives. Comments noted and passed to Highways colleagues.

Comments noted.

Comments noted

This possibility has been pursued by others, and it is understood that it would be very difficult (if not impossible) to achieve due to land ownerships etc. However, the SPD requires the retention of the Great Central building, and it may be possible to use part or all of this as a tourist and heritage attraction, which would be a use and facility supported by the SPD.

The proposals in the SPD present several opportunities for the creation of a single or several wow factors. The Waterside environment is one of the finest and most

**AFFORDABLE
HOUSING**

Views on this issue were split into 2 contrasting schools of thought. Approximately 12 people recommended the inclusion of affordable housing, whilst an equal number predicted that including it would compromise the development of a quality housing area.

exciting city centre regeneration areas in the Country, and is unique to Leicester. It is widely believed that the creation of the boat basin, in the midst of such outstanding environments and high quality development will be truly significant for Leicester, as a visitor attraction for the region, the Nation and Europe.

No change to SPD

The casino already exists and is outside the boundary of the SPD. The SPD requires the retention of the ex Richard Roberts shop on Highcross Street.

No change to SPD

Support noted.

**TRANSPORT
PARKING**

/ TP

Please mend the bridge across the mile straight from Castle Gardens. At least 20 requests for this to happen.

Re-directing the A50 through traffic along Abbey Gate will not work. It will require huge investment and a lot of work to widen the road and rework the existing junctions, but this will all be a waste time and resources. As the route will not facilitate a direct or convenient link between Woodgate and St Margaret's Way. A new and more direct route for through traffic needs to be formed from the existing St Margaret's Way junction through the Premier Screw site to Woodgate. –

Andrew Scott owner of:
The Caravan Company,
70 St Margaret's Way,
Abbey Gate. Leicester. LE4 0BT

At least 10 residents from the Woodgate community enquired into whether it would be possible for the new pedestrian/cycle route on the west/north bank of the river to be extended under North bridge as opposed to taking over the A50 as a pedestrian crossing at grade.

The City Council and LRC should consider incorporating a suspended riverside walkway between the Welles Street pedestrian bridge crossing and the new marina area. – Mike Burton of Volker Stevin engineers, and who has personal experience of delivering such projects.

At least 20 residents from the Woodgate community expressed concerns about parking in the area. They are keen that as much on plot parking is provided as possible to proposed schemes, in order that residents of those schemes do not contribute to the on street parking problem.

The city centre needs car parks, the project will not work without allowing

This is outside the scope of the SPD, but comments passed to colleagues.

Changes to the highways network will be subject to further research and studies, and proposals may change depending on the outcome of these.

No change to SPD

This will be explored as part of detailed considerations and designs.

No change to SPD

It may be possible to provide suspended riverside walkways in some locations, but this will be subject to the ability to satisfy other, largely operational requirements. They will be considered as part of design proposals, where pedestrian connectivity is required.

No change to SPD

This issue is addressed above.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

cars to the city centre.

If the A50 is to be closed and traffic re-directed, take the opportunity to improve bus services. (NB service from NW city to DMU/hospital etc.)

Great if greater connections between Woodgate and river can be achieved.

Public transport facilities must be improved.

Pleased to see that people will be encouraged to leave their cars at home and walk, cycle or travel by bus more often.

Need to ensure more bus services to wider area.

Congestion charging will discourage people.

Need to be very careful about traffic flows disrupting ring road etc, otherwise the city centre can't function.

Good to see cycle routes / connections

Must have adequate levels of parking for housing.

CF

Need to keep the adventure playground on Rally Park

Need to make sure sport and community facilities are provided.

Need to create a pleasant environment for kids and elderly people – get the balance right.

This issue is addressed above.

The SPD seeks to improve bus provision and access in the area, especially along the A50
No change to SPD

Support noted for this objective.

Agreed. This is an objective of the SPD.

Support noted

Agreed. Greater numbers of people living and working in the area should encourage improved bus services. Bus companies will be encouraged in this respect.

This is outside the scope of the SPD, and will be subject to wider studies and research.

Agreed. This will be considered as part of the highways studies.

Support noted.

Agreed. The SPD addresses this.

Agreed. The SPD seeks to achieve this, and if possible improve the facility. See comment above.

Agreed. Development will be required to contribute towards these to meet the needs of the new population.

BUILDING DESIGN

BD

Local residents are keen for youth facilities to remain on Rally Park, such as the BMX track and the adventure playground. In addition many asked for further facilities to be provided such as a youth club. A youth club does meet once a week at the Woodgate Resource Centre, but this is a small venue. The youth club that used to meet at the Fosse neighbourhood Centre has closed down due to being incompatible with other uses in the building.

Need a city centre swimming pool and other sports / cultural buildings. Could they be accommodated here?

Need to introduce culture to the area, what about an art gallery or library?

Health care provision must be taken into account at this stage

At least 20 representations from local residents living on Repton Street and Bonchurch Street in Woodgate, requesting that new development opposite should not extend higher than 2 stories or the height of their existing terraced houses.

The shops and cafes should overhang the water just like the watershed in Bristol.

Agreed. The proposals seek to achieve this.

It is agreed that Rally Park is the appropriate location for such youth facilities. Development will be required to contribute towards the improvement of Rally Park and the provision of other community facilities, to meet the needs of the increased population.

Development will be required to contribute towards sports and cultural facilities. However a major swimming pool would have significant implications for traffic generation and parking, and would therefore be unlikely to be appropriate for Waterside.

These uses, depending on size and traffic generation, would be suitable uses for Waterside. There would however need to be a proven business case and funding for them.

Agreed. This will largely be determined by the growth in population and the rate at which it grows. A certain amount of population is required to justify and sustain the provision of health care. A possible location for health and community facilities, including an improved school has been identified within the SPD.

See earlier comments.

BUILDING USES

Criticism of Westbridge Wharf as being out of scale and character with the area and also being too stylised.

The development should be carried out in an architectural style that reflects the areas vernacular architecture.

Keep the best old buildings.

Must have high management/maintenance to ensure area is kept clean.

Need to prevent/deal with vandalism.

Need some really fantastic housing in lovely areas, not just social housing.

Only keep the best of the old buildings

Good to see so many old buildings kept.

Demolish old dirty rat infested buildings in favour of modern buildings.

Please do not overcrowd waterfront with high rise buildings like the “West Bridge Wharf” – most oppressive.

Images of Borneo Docks were well received as an indication of the sort of high density residential development could materialise in Waterside, especially in the Frog Island area

BU

A lot of interest has been expressed with regards to providing live/work units for artists and small businesses, especially in the Frog island area.

This can be considered as part of detailed design proposals.

See earlier comments.

Agreed. The SPD seeks to achieve development that responds to the character of the local area and that of Leicester.

The SPD requires the retention of Listed Buildings, and seeks the retention of other historic properties of merit.

Agreed. This is addressed by the SPD.

Agreed. This will be achieved through good management as required by the SPD. Good design should help to prevent vandalism.

Agreed.

See comment above.

Support noted.

Old buildings of merit should be retained, but the proposals will help to bring these back into use and ensure their proper maintenance.

See comments above.

Support noted

RIVER / CANAL

Take the opportunity to re-use mill buildings etc as workspace for leaving graduates in creative arts.

Caution over the number of 1 and 2 bed apartments.

Support noted

The city and Waterside need high quality development that creates highly desirable living environments.

Support noted

Needs offices in the area as well for “all day activity”.

Agreed.

Will there be an opportunity for local businesses to find space for small shops, bars and cafes. Will rents for the bar units be low enough for small / local business and not just the big chains?

Agreed.

Agreed. See earlier comment

Great to hear that there will be high quality café bars etc.

Local businesses will be encouraged. Big chains are more suited to the City Centre and should be discouraged through size and operational restrictions that will be imposed. Rents will be determined by the market.

Lets have better landscaping and thoughtful mixed use development, not as per Western Boulevard where prime waterside is overlooked by ugly office blocks resembling a prison! What a waste this was.

RC

Support noted.

“We love the boat basin it will make the river more interesting and be good for tourism.”

The SPD seeks to achieve this.

The boat basin area needs a launderette for public use but especially for use by the boating community. – A person who lives on a houseboat currently moored in Nottingham and who is critical of services for boaters in Leicester. Advising caution about the design of the new boat basin. – The basin in Market Harborough is too far away from the town centre. There is a culture clash between the boaters there and the residents of the surrounding apartments.

Support noted.

“Lets make the river sing”

The proposals seek to encourage boat use within and through the area, by the improvement of the area, increased safety and the provision of better facilities.

ENVIRONMENT

Opening up the potential of the river is a good idea.

Many people expressed delight at the Old Mill Stream being exposed, the North Mills being retained, restored and incorporated into the masterplan. (No objectors to this proposal)

Need to dredge river/canal more to facilitate boat and canoe movements.

The canal needs to be dredged and weeded to aid navigation of boats. The current situation puts people off taking boats through the city.

The river and canal are very dirty and need to be cleaned up/dredged.

Use the canal system for themed boat trips.

Dredge the canal as it badly silted and unusable in many areas.

Balance dredging with ecology / biodiversity protection / enhancement.

Please make towpaths broad enough for couples to pass without resorting to single file – currently dangerous – cyclists etc.

Please allow as much open space (green) as possible beside water with more seating areas And clean up Evan's Weir area.

E

Need better public open space in the city centre, its not just about new shops.

Remove all the shrubbery, mounds and some of the trees in Rally Park to open it up and make it safer. In stall more and better lighting into the Rally.

Need to make sure that the area does attract crime and looks good in the future.

The Rally needs the redevelopment proposals to change its image and stop it being a place for crime. Many local residents raised this as a serious issue.

Agreed!

Support noted.

Support noted.

See earlier comments.

See earlier comments.

See earlier comments.

The SPD supports the use of the River for boating.

See earlier comments.

See earlier comments.

See earlier comments.

See earlier comments.

Agreed. The SPD seeks to achieve this in Waterside.

**GENERAL
OBSERVATIONS**

Some called for better lighting and CCTV. The area is seen as particularly dangerous at night when, it is claimed that drug dealing is commonplace.

The ecology of the river, especially birdlife must be preserved.

Glad to see lots of green spaces and areas for café and bars.

Trees trees and more trees.

Great idea. I hope local wildlife like the swans nest have been taken into consideration. It will be nice to see new life where I live.

Please give priority to public safety and security.

GO

Look at Amiens, in northern France. RE: canalside buildings, cafes etc near university. Old buildings re-used. Do not compromise on the quality or the vision.

Fully support the proposals, hope they happen.

Looks really good.

Many people have asked if it possible for LCC or the LRC to demolish the Holiday Inn.

Despite being run down much of the riverside area is very beautiful and full of rustic charm. It is also a fantastic place for wildlife. Please don't turn this into a concrete gully (however smart) that loses the character of the place. You should think very carefully before demolishing any piece of building over 100 years old, and you should avoid "landscaping" of the green areas, which will remove wildlife habitats and replace it with non-mature trees.

Your plans on public display do not really give much of a feel for the

The SPD proposes changes to the Rally Park to make it safer and more attractive.

Agreed. See earlier comments.

See earlier comments.

Agreed. See earlier comments.

Support noted.

A Landscape Strategy will be produced to ensure the appropriate use of trees.

Support noted. See earlier comments.

This is an important objective of the SPD.

Support noted.

Support noted.

Support noted.

This is outside the immediate scope of this SPD, but enquiries will be made of the owners intentions and therefore opportunities for change in the future, so these can be taken into

character of your plans, so I think you need to do some more elaborations on it before anyone can really judge them. – Ms Welland

Whilst welcoming the new footbridge on Northgates, there is not any apparent provision for cyclists. Any plan ought to make this a priority consideration for all manner of reasons. – Mr Welland

Promote Jewry Wall and the castle. Two kings passed West Bridge in one day including King Richard, the last of the Plantagenats.

“Hope it doesn’t look poorly maintained too quickly.”

Excellent plans – very pleased if it happens.

Other LCC projects eg. Bede Island haven’t worked as well as proposed, they only serve those communities, and are not attractive to anyone else as a destination.

Demolish the Holiday Inn.

Very good proposals.

Leicester never delivers the projects it plans.

account.

Agreed. See earlier comments.

Further information can be made available to assist understanding.

The new footbridge will also accommodate cyclists. Cycle routes and connectivity are an important part of the SPD proposals.

The SPD seeks to better integrate these.

The proposals address the need for on-going and high levels of maintenance and management.

Support noted.

Comments noted.

See earlier comments.

Support noted.

Comments noted.

Large numbers of flats need to be managed properly so they don't become "scruffy" and unpleasant.

About time Leicester developed its waterfront.

Leicester should reflect its Roman history and legacy a lot more.

A very good project

Provide jobs and training for local people in construction.

Sounds fantastic.

Stop talking just do it.

Time for action.

Looks good, needs to be done.

Great idea but is it going to happen?

Public conveniences in Leicester are very poor. Will there be any in the new Waterside?

The two most commonly asked questions were:

1. When will it start?

2. How long will it take?

These questions were often followed up with scepticism over the Council's ability to deliver and lack of vision.