

**APPENDIX A**

**SUMMARY OF RESPONSES**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Representations received in writing</b>	<b>Changes to draft SPD</b>
<p><b><u>Statutory Bodies</u></b></p> <p><b>Environment Agency</b></p>	<p>Flood Risk – 16.1</p> <p>The EA will rigorously apply the conditions set out in paragraph 16.1 - Flood Risk.</p> <p>The Agency is doubtful whether any large scale flood alleviation works to address flood risk in the future would be feasible without changing the flood profile.</p> <p>All proposed bridges over the river and any works with 8m of the top of the bank of the river will require the prior formal consent of the Agency in compliance with the WATER Resources Act 1991 (Section 109) and the Land Drainage byelaws.</p> <p>Climate Change predictions</p> <p>Land Contamination Comments</p> <p>The SPD includes a report by BWB Consulting titled ‘Environmental and Engineering Development Appraisal (November 2004) as an appendix.</p>	<p>Agreed. Include reference to Local Plan policy BE20, Flood Risk.</p> <p>Agreed. No change to text required.</p> <p>Agreed. Amend text to include this text.</p> <p>No change to text required.</p> <p>Delete report from SPD. Further discussion required.</p>

<p><b>Housing Corporation</b></p>	<p>The proposals include a tariff for planning obligations; this would not include affordable housing which would be provided in kind or on site</p> <p>The Housing Corporation as a funding agency for affordable housing has its own policy to determine the input of out grant on Section 106 sites. The policy is set out in the document 'The National Affordable Housing Programme 2006/08 Prospectus.</p> <p>Key aspects of the policy for paying grant on Section 106 sites:</p> <p>HC preference is for affordable housing in Section 106 sites to be delivered without grant input from the Housing Corporation</p> <p>For grant to be considered, we require early involvement in the negotiations over the content of the Section 106 Agreement as it relates to the affordable housing, in particular, the expectations about he availability of Corporation Grant. Our objective in negotiations will be that the site delivers more affordable housing or a different mix, which reflects the Governments approach to mixed communities, than would have been possible without the input of grant.</p>	<p>Section 5.0</p> <p>Discuss at future meetings. Will be dependent on outcomes of Member/Officer meetings regarding planning obligations for the key intervention areas.</p> <p>Agreed. This will be carried out as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>No change to text in SPD</p>
-----------------------------------	---	--

	<p>We will only fund Section 106 sites which integrate different tenures in a single site design, following the mixed communities principles. The approach does require us to be involved in discussions on such sites at an early stage to identify the need for grant and what the grant will deliver over and above what could have been provided without it.</p> <p>We would therefore welcome being involved in the future planning process for the overall area.</p> <p>We are aware of the Knight Frank report into housing for the Leicester City Centre. It would be useful to know if this report has been used to shape the draft SPD and future considerations of housing in the City Centre</p> <p>If Housing Corporation funding is sought then we would expect any scheme to comply with our funding requirements which include standards of quality, build such as Eco House standards as applicable at the time. Therefore, it may be useful to add this into the SPD under the affordable housing section</p> <p>As part of the early involvement in the master planning and site specific work we would be able to offer our input into construction (modern methods of construction options) design quality issues particularly for affordable housing.</p>	<p>Agreed. This will be carried out as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Change text to 16.9 – amend text as shown. Affordable homes with HC support should be expected to be built to ECO very high standard</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
--	---	--

<p><b>East Midlands Development Agency</b></p>	<p>EMDA welcome the SPD and support it as an approach to bringing together the key planning issues in a part of Leicester which is undergoing considerable regeneration activity. The Agency strongly supports the objectives of the SPD set out in chapter 3 of the document</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
	<p>EMDA is particularly supportive of the proposed Science and Technology Park. This is a project which supports all three key drivers of success and a significantly large number of the strands of activity of the Regional Economic Strategy 'Destination 2010'. The Science and Technology Park is a strategically significant project which would make a major contribution to the economic growth and development of Leicester City Council.</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
	<p>The Agency is directly involved in the development of the Science and Technology Park. EMDA is grant aiding the City Council to demolish the existing building. Abbey Meadows West area includes the former Depot site which is owned by the Agency.</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
	<p>The Abbey Meadows area comprises a substantial amount of brownfield land. The reuse and reclamation of previously developed sites is welcomed as it is in line with activities and targets set out in the site provision and development strand of the RES.</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
	<p>EMDA would encourage the City Council to ensure that the transport proposals for the area are brought forward in a sustainable way which will reduce the need to travel by car and the impacts of future developments on surrounding areas. We welcome the fact</p>	<p>Para 6.1 - The SPD seeks to upgrade the pedestrian/cycle network to improve access in and around the area. Para 6.0 - It is intended to provide a bus route through Riverside West.</p>

<p><b>British Waterways</b></p>	<p>that the importance of sustainable modes of transport is recognised by the SPD.</p> <p>We note that several areas within Abbey Meadows are identified as at risk of flooding in the Leicester Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. It must be ensured that appropriate measures are taken to minimise the risks from floods in any future developments in this area.</p> <p>5.0 Key Development Requirements and Planning Obligations 5.1 General Principles</p> <p>As part of the general principles relating to Planning Obligations we welcome that the City Council will seek to enter into legal agreements with private developers to secure contributions for undertaking the upgrading of the canal and riverside environment – including path widening/resurfacing and habitat creation. We will however need to assess the impact on navigation/flooding in relation to any ecological enhancement in this area.</p> <p>We strongly advise that the Council and BW, as owners of the towpath, need to resolve the issues relating to the provision of an elevated canal side route and connections to the towpath. Many areas of the towpath, particularly in the centre of Leicester have high volumes of traffic.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>Para. 16.1 Addresses the issue of Flood Risk No change to SPD</p> <p>Agreed. Will need to resolve issue with BW. Further discussion required.</p> <p>The provision of parallel, dedicated and, where appropriate, raised pedestrian and cycle routes along the Riverside is an established principle of Riverside development in the City. This is to reduce conflict of uses and create flood free routes and need not be in conflict with the BW Access Agreement.</p>
---------------------------------	--	---

	<p>We recognise that the towpath is well used but do not understand the conflicting messages being sent to us in respect of cycling access and connectivity to the canal advocated in the SPD and the non-cycling stance being put forward by the Councils Riverside Team in relation to the renewal of the multi-use licence</p> <p>5.2.2 Strategic Public Open Space and Play Area</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of towing paths upgrades and clean up in this section but believe it needs to be made clear that this relates to both river and canal side paths.</p> <p>5.2.4 Maintenance Costs</p> <p>This relates to the Council’s maintenance costs but does not address the issue of additional maintenance costs which could fall to British Waterways.</p> <p>7.0 Public Space</p> <p>It is inferred that the towpath is unsafe.</p> <p>7.7 Proposals for Waterside Centre Area of Wolsey Island</p> <p>The provision of additional boating facilities is welcomed in principle. BW need further details in relation to proposals before being able to comment on acceptability of uses.</p>	<p>Agreed. Amend text to refer to River and Canal paths.</p> <p>Agreed. Discuss at future meeting.</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Change text to include ‘perceived as’ unsafe.</p> <p>Agreed. No change to text required.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>8.0 Network of Interconnecting streets 8.2 Bridge Links</p> <p>BW will need to be involved at an early stage to establish the acceptability of the crossings and in relation to commercial considerations.</p> <p>11.0 Infrastructure – Primary Movement</p> <p>19. A full assessment of proposed mooring locations would have to be undertaken in order to assess their suitability.</p> <p>12.0 Spaces - Hard and Soft</p> <p>11. Refers to a ‘cycle way’ and ‘some through vehicles’</p> <p>12. We need to assess the impact on navigation/flooding in relation to any ecological enhancement in this area.</p> <p>16.0 Planning and Development Issues 16.3.1 Energy</p> <p>The Community Heating Pipeline is shown across the Canal. BW will require any pipe to pass beneath the Canal.</p>	<p>Agreed. No change to text required.</p> <p>Agreed. No change to text required.</p> <p>Agreed. Delete ‘some through vehicles’. Further discussion required on cycle routes as above.</p> <p>Agreed. No change to text required.</p> <p>Agreed. Change text and sketch as required to show pipe under canal. Further discussion on principles required.</p>
--	--	--





	<p>We recommend that the 10<sup>th</sup> bullet point in 5.1 should be expanded to highlight that provision for sports needs to be addressed under this heading. This is particularly important as the emphasis in the document as a whole appears to be on off-site sport provision</p> <p>5.2.4 Maintenance Costs</p> <p>We support the councils approach, as long term maintenance will be crucial to the sustained success of open space and recreational provision</p> <p>7.0 Public Open Space</p> <p>Sport England is not opposed to the proposals for John Ellis School, and the recognition for changing facilities is welcomed. However, the correct direction should be used across the whole of the regeneration area. This should show what is provided in the local area and what needs to be provided through the development process. There may be opportunities to make some provision within the site, especially for small scale facilities such as MUGA's etc. Also, there may be an opportunity to enhance provision at Abbey Park. Concentrating on John Ellis needs to be justified and other opportunities not overlooked.</p>	<p>As part of the development of the Science Park on the former John Ellis School, it is proposed to reinstate football pitches on the existing playing fields and provide changing facilities. It would be difficult to provide further on site sports facilities without adversely affecting the aspirations for Abbey Meadows. No change to SPD.</p> <p>Support noted</p> <p>7.0 - Amend as shown. Include - in addition to LAP and LEAP a NEAP (Neighbourhood Equipped Area) of play will be required to ensure that all ages are catered for. A NEAP area incorporating a MUGA (Multi-Use Games Area) should be included.</p>
--	--	--

<p><b>English Nature</b></p>	<p>English Nature is concerned that the sustainability appraisal does not adequately assess the impacts of the plan on natural environments and biodiversity.</p> <p>The extent of the bio-diversity enhancement is still unclear from the SPD. An indication of the size of the area to be created would allow better assessment of whether the end result is likely to be an enhancement in the natural assets and bio-diversity.</p> <p>We are supportive of the activities that improve the ecological condition of the canal and river but advise that there should be enhancement of other parts of the area covered by the SPD. It is important that there is no loss of all habitats affected. Areas such as allotments and derelict land are often important wildlife sites. The opportunities provided by ‘green roofs’ for mitigating loss of some habitats should be considered.</p> <p>Overall the SPD still seems to give biodiversity a very low profile and the plans to protect and enhance the natural environment assets and biodiversity are hidden in the report. It would be much easier to see the local authorities requirements under policy 28 of RSS8 and PPS9 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, to protect and</p>	<p>Disagree. There will be no loss or disturbance of habitats in the SINC (River Soar), which is the only designated site. No change to SPD</p> <p>Agreed – 7.1, 7.3 &amp; Diagrams Amend text to include details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of proposed new reed bank in canal</li> <li>• Proposed extent of John Ellis Wetland</li> <li>• Extent of new planting along river</li> </ul> <p>Discuss at future meeting. Allotments may be retained and managed (in part) as natural open space that enhances the riverside. No other loss of habitat is proposed by the SPD</p> <p>Disagree about low profile, but agree that plans may be hidden in report. Plans to be extracted and summarised.</p>
------------------------------	--	---

<p><b>The Chartered Institution of Waste Management</b></p> <p><b>Leicestershire Constabulary</b></p>	<p>enhance biodiversity had been met if there was a section within the plan that clearly identified the proposals.</p> <p>We are not currently in a position to respond.</p> <p>4.7 Housing</p> <p>Add – To promote good design ...in order to create high quality, safe and secure living environments</p> <p>Para 15.2, alter to:</p> <p>..compose high quality vistas</p> <p>Para 16.7, expand and rewrite as follows:</p> <p>Community Safety and Crime Prevention through planning and design</p> <p>This refers to providing a sustainable and healthy local environment with well designed public and green space and the creation of safe places through the adoption of designing out crime principles</p> <p>The creation of a safe environment for people who work and live in the site and move through the site to other destinations.</p>	<p>Amend as shown</p> <p>Amend as shown</p> <p>Agreed. Amend as shown</p>
---	---	---

	<p>New development should offer security to the public, in particular pedestrians and cyclists. This can be achieved through the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access and Movement</li> <li>• Structure</li> <li>• Surveillance</li> <li>• Ownership</li> <li>• Physical protection</li> <li>• Activity</li> <li>• Management and Maintenance</li> </ul> <p>Para 16.8.2 Traffic Pollution</p> <p>This may be in conflict with para. 16.7 where habital rooms to residential development are encouraged to overlook the street scene but may be subject to traffic pollution. Buildings should be set back.</p> <p>Para. 19 Contacts</p> <p>Add Leicestershire Constabulary/Architectural Liaison Officer</p>	<p>There are ways in addressing potential pollution problems for residential development. No change to SPD</p> <p>Amend as shown</p>
--	--	--

<p><b>Leicestershire County Council</b></p>	<p>Strategic Linkages with Ashton Green</p> <p>The SPD does not acknowledge any strategic link between the two proposals, nor does it recognise the need to develop a strategic approach to accommodating both developments. For example there is no recognition that Abbey Meadows will compliment and support a bus route along the A6.</p> <p>The document needs to be improved in terms of setting the Abbey Meadows development in a strategic context and recognising its strategic links with other developments</p> <p>Wider highways and Transportation impacts</p> <p>The document concentrate solely on the internal matters and access to the road network in the immediate locality. It fails to recognise the wider impacts of this very significant development. The A6 is a key access route into the city. Congestion problems within the city e.g. at A563/A6 “Redhill Circle”, A6/Beaumont Leys lane, A6/Abbey Park Road, A6/Sanvey Gate and A6/Inner Ring Road junctions will cause problems with the County, e.g. on the A6 through Birstall.</p> <p>The document will need to recognise the highways and transportation measures will be required much further a field than is currently envisaged.</p>	<p>Discuss at future meeting in relation to the Strategic Traffic Assessment for Abbey Meadows</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting.</p> <p>Agreed. No Change to SPD</p>
---	---	--

	<p>Public Transport: The A6 Abbey Lane and Abbey Park Road are key bus routes, used by services serving both the City and County. This document does not properly recognise their importance in this respect. This document fails to recognise the need for Abbey Meadows development to compliment existing initiatives in Birstall (park and ride) and other bus measures on the A6.</p> <p>Section 2.0 It is clear that this document provides the key steer to developers as they consider individual sites; It therefore needs to provide the proper strategic context.</p> <p>Section 3.0 This section should recognise the strategic links with Ashton Green</p> <p>Public Transport should have its own bullet point which recognises both strategic and more local issues. Furthermore, the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point talks about cross-river bridge linkages including for vehicular access, but this is not reflected in section 5.0 para 5.2.1</p> <p>Section 4.0, para 4.3. To minimise vehicle trips, small scale shops would be encouraged on the development</p> <p>Section 5.0 para 5.1 The bullet point on public transport should be strengthened</p> <p>Section 5.0 para 5.2.1 Needs to include strategic off site highway improvements to the wider network</p>	<p>3.0 refers to Public Transport serving the Abbey Meadows site. No change to SPD</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Agreed. SPD identifies areas for small scale shops to meet local needs. No change to SPD</p> <p>Amend as shown</p> <p>Amend as shown</p>
--	--	--

<p><b><u>Other Groups and Agencies</u></b></p> <p><b>Equal Opportunities Commission</b></p> <p><b>Disability Rights Commission</b></p>	<p>Section 6.0 The potential strategic role of the bus link through the site needs to be recognised and considered. Also what about public transport links between Wolsey Island and BUSM site and the Science Park and Riverside West?</p> <p>Careful consideration must be given to the site access onto the A6. This is an important route serving the City and County and congestion on this route will have significant implications on the routing of general traffic and on bus services. In 6.5, 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point consideration should also be given to including bus priority measures in key access junctions.</p> <p>We have no comments to make on the draft document</p> <p>Unable to comment on the SPD</p>	<p>6.6 identifies proposals for public transport links. No change to SPD</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p>
--	--	---

<p><b>Home Builders Federation</b></p>	<p>2.2 The text refers to the draft SPD being prepared in accordance with the Area Strategy Guidance. It is not clear whether this forms part of the Adopted Local Plan, or a Development Plan Document. The draft SPD will not be adopted as SPD until such time as the statutory document it relates, has itself been adopted.</p> <p>5.1 The statutory policy basis for any tariff per square metre of built development, and or number of residential units and bed space is extremely unclear. It would seem unlikely that all developments would be capable of paying such tariffs. Equally not all developers would be likely to sign up to such a requirement. Whilst a tariff system may work the approach for sites like this is problematic and likely to make delivery difficult.</p> <p>Any monies for planning gains and infrastructure must be sought in full accordance with national planning legislation, in particular Circular 5/05</p> <p>5.2.4 Maintenance payments for open spaces and highways/footways. With regards to open space payments, any demands will need to be in accordance with Adopted Local Plan standards and Circular 5/05. It is unclear as to why maintenance payments should be sought for highways and footways that are publicly adopted. These should be maintained and managed in the same way as all other public highways and footways.</p>	<p>Agreed. The SPD will form part of the Councils adopted local plan. Amend 2.2 as shown.</p> <p>The approach (and therefore text) relating to Developer Contributions is to be amended to reflect on-going research and negotiations.</p> <p>Agreed. No change to text</p> <p>Agreed. Change text as shown.</p>
--	---	--



	<p>16.9 The rules, regulations and procedures for delivery of affordable housing are currently in a state of great uncertainty at the moment. Traditional local authority social housing grant has long gone and with it, the degree of control LA's have over how many affordable units should be provided. All of this means that future approaches to the delivery of affordable housing will be very different to the way the system has operated previously.</p> <p>The availability of subsidy will also be a key factor in this and will require a cascade approach to provision rather than strictly adhering to traditional tenures if the provision of affordable housing is not to be stifled due to lack funding. The draft SPD should address this issue under the heading of public subsidy and should refer to the cascade mechanism to ensure that sites continue to come forward.</p> <p>ODPM Consultation paper ' Planning for Mixed Communities' (January 2005) also emphasises the importance of understanding prevailing housing market conditions when setting affordable housing requirement levels:</p> <p>10. In determining the amount of affordable housing to be sought on sites, local planning authorities should balance the need for affordable housing against the likely development potential of sites. This relationship may vary across the plan area. This will mean taking into account the implications of competing land uses and making realistic assumptions about levels of public subsidy likely to be available (based on priorities set out in the regional housing strategy and discussions with the Housing Corporation.</p>	<p>Discuss at future meetings</p> <p>Discuss at future meetings</p> <p>Discuss at future meetings</p> <p>Discuss at future meetings</p>
--	---	---

	<p>The document will need to make adequate reference to the importance of the availability of public funding. The above mentioned consultation paper makes specific comment on use of cascade or fallback mechanism where public funding is lacking:</p> <p>The text will also need to relate to any affordable housing requirement to other planning gains being sort by the local authority, or overall viability of individual development sites</p> <p>The same applies to tenure. Policy should not be prescriptive as the aim of the Council should be to meet the housing needs of all. There will be a whole host of reasons why it will not be possible to achieve the same affordable housing solution on two sites, not at least of which is the availability of funding. Tenure should not be determined solely by the level of need for social rented housing to meet the needs of the minority, so much as what is best planning solution for the site in terms of creating sustainable, mixed and balanced communities. The SPD should aim to meet a variety of housing need and should be responsive to the particular needs of each individual site.</p> <p>The Council will need to have regard to its Housing Market Assessment when negotiating affordable housing provision, as well as local site and surrounding area characteristics, other planning gain requirements, and the availability or not of grant funding.</p> <p>The development industry is vehemently opposed to open book accounting, which the text seems to imply it. Furthermore, there is no policy justification for the Council seeking to pursue such an approach wither at a national level or local level.</p>	<p>Agreed. No Change to text</p> <p>Discuss at future meetings</p> <p>Discuss at future meetings</p> <p>Agreed. No change to SPD</p> <p>Discuss at future meetings</p>
--	--	--

<p><b><u>Stakeholders and their Agents</u></b></p> <p><b>Leicester Regeneration Company</b></p>	<p><b>General</b></p> <p>1. The document contains some very important and helpful guidance but there needs to be a fair bit of editing to make the document more readable. As an example there is reference to cycle routes in section 8.3.1 and again in 8.6 and again in section 11 items 18 and 19. This all needs collating in one part of the document to give clear and comprehensive guidance on this issue. The same comment applies to vehicle parking, vehicle access and standards which appear in two or three parts of the document.</p> <p>2. Refers in several places to funding mechanisms which will be set up to share costs of public realm, pos etc., but doesn't say how, who, when or on what basis. Won't developers need this, and isn't important that the mechanism should be incorporated to give it the clout of SPD?</p> <p>3. Section 9 on density doesn't actually say anything. It sets out national guidance, but what is the guidance here? The bit after the comma at end of first para makes no sense at all. In fact the reference to anything over single storey being 75+ per hectare covers everything surely as no bungalows are being planned here?</p>	<p>Agreed. Text to be edited and amended to make document more readable</p> <p>Agreed. Discuss at future meetings</p> <p>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</p>
---	---	--

	<p><b>Specific points</b></p> <p>P 10 para 1.3 &amp; 1.4 This seriously under-states the strategic case for the whole project – economic diversification, graduate retention, exploitation of University science, uniqueness of this site in absence of any adjoining Universities, etc., and importance of high quality &amp; of public realm in achieving all this. If that isn't stated, it weakens the document if challenged, e.g. by planning appeal.</p> <p>2.2 need to be clear that this SPD will be a material consideration in planning apps and CPO.</p> <p>3.0 LRC has always quoted 45,000 sq m as the target floorspace for the Science Park</p> <p>4.3 Retail/leisure should also be complimentary to Science Park as well as housing- pub or restaurant, for example. - Generally Retail and leisure are stated to be for local use, otherwise the sequential test will be applied – However combine with the “vision” on the front cover “...Destinations delivering benefits for City and complementary to Science Park &amp; NSC. Appendix 1 Reference seems wrong</p>	<p>adequate to deliver high quality development and the delivery of essential infrastructure and public realm.</p> <p>Agreed. Change text as shown.</p> <p>Agreed. Change text as shown</p> <p>Agreed. Change text as shown</p> <p>Agreed. Change text as shown</p>
--	--	---

	<p>4.4.1 “<b>Every</b> effort <b>must</b> be made to retain and incorporate” – This is too strong for local interest buildings. – Sure we should try &amp; keep. The list seems too long also, Both Chimneys (I thought the “Wolsey” one was the best &amp; was the main landmark? The tower could prove quite difficult to re-use, 7 the riverside centre even rebuilt may be too far away to create the one leisure/retail environment hoped for.</p> <p>Rope walks buildings seem to cut site in half, Riverside cottages? The bus depot buildings are already to be demolished?</p> <p>4.4.2 Historic Buildings to be retained seems to include at Diagram 4 part of the Rocket Studio’s but I don’t think this has been allowed for in the master planning for the Island?</p> <p>4.4.3 What does all this mean?</p> <p>4.7 Affordable Housing requirements need to be checked. – Housing Policy – View Wolsey island (WI) + BUSM +Abbey Meadows residential offer as one area. Appendix 4 Ho 6 – Affordable Housing (AH) is @ 30% outside LRC area, - what is it meant to be inside LRC area, AM is all within the LRC area.</p>	<p>Disagree. Both the existing chimneys and water towers form important landmarks within the site. No change to text.</p> <p>Agreed. Change as shown.</p> <p>Agreed. Change as shown</p> <p>The relationship between new development and existing development. Amend text to clarify</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p>
--	--	---

	<p>4.11 Planning Applications/Permissions – Boston House lower density proposal is now approved? Should Morris Homes latest application be mentioned?</p> <p>5.0 ‘Contributions to support the cost of land assembly’??? Probably means for open space: This needs clarifying as the document seems confused on this point as it talks in one place about negotiated settlements on developer contributions and then refers to a tariff at a rate per sq m (but no figures given) elsewhere.</p> <p>5.1 Will this be overtaken by the new approach emanating from the LCC officer/member working group? Prioritising of need/works is needed.</p> <p>I think as with Waterside a reference to an aspiration for a tariff can be set out but caveat with need for further investigation and research as to its appropriateness here and the mechanism to be employed. - Repeat of reference to Public Art 1st+5<sup>th</sup> dot Developers should be able to provide the work in lieu of making contributions</p> <p>5.2.5 Repetition</p> <p>6.1 How is the formula for highway contributions intended to work?</p> <p>6.2 No U turn facility at the entrance to the Science Park as this will destroy the very Gateway desired elsewhere in the SPD. There is no mention of the desired bus link via the allotments to Abbey Park Road.</p>	<p>Only approved schemes can be mentioned. No Change to SPD</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Agreed. Amend text.</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting.</p> <p>Agreed. Further investigations are being carried out to see if a ‘U Turn’ can be implemented elsewhere on Abbey Lane.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Not sure how the view down the new access road into Science Park will create a view of the NSC without setting back the buildings on the serviced plots too far.</p> <p>6.3 Access to Wolsey Island-shouldn't this section be a bit more prescriptive in where the access needs to be-after all the frontage to Abbey Park Road is very limited therefore the options are likewise limited.</p> <p>6.4 BUSM should be expected to pay for the necessary bridge and associated road construction &amp; connection.</p> <p>7.0 Shared cost of open space provision across different ownerships on WI – Ideas to consider? Per acre/per unit/per square foot?</p> <p>7.1 WI – off site “improvement of contributory local open space and play facilities” – where and what is meant by this?</p> <p>7.3 POS on Science Park should include public art.</p> <p>7.7 Is the existing riverside location the best phase to “centre” a water &amp;/or leisure experience around? – Too far from water tower? Isn't such a thing likely to be more than a local destination? And appeal to the City and beyond? - Should it be closer to the Water tower/foot bridge? - Should it be on NSC side of the river? I don't understand why the existing AM road would be realigned to create a development plot within the floodplain?</p>	<p>Some set back of buildings will be required to allow better views to Space Centre to announce the Science Park. No change to SPD</p> <p>Agreed. Text amended as shown</p> <p>Agreed. Amend 6.4 as shown</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Agreed. Clarify 7.1 - Amend text</p> <p>Disagree. No Change to SPD. A Proposed Waterside Centre would fit well in well with the civic space proposed around the water tower, thus forming an important destination point on Wolsey Island. Discuss at future meeting.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>8.4 Are these the areas tested in ARUP’s strategic TA?</p> <p>9.0 Need to explain more clearly, suggest stat with the 75+ density, and then explain the lower density if single storey development is undertaken.</p> <p>11.0 Would this information be better combined with section 6?</p> <p>11. Item 2- Should residential on SP approach road really be to back of footpath? It’s going to be a v busy road, with SP and NSC visitors, and we should aim at a leafy sort of feel here – houses should be set back, or some gable-on to road.</p> <p>11.9 20m wide, Boulevard, say:</p> <table data-bbox="1016 836 1384 979"> <tr> <td>Carriageway</td> <td>7m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 Footpath</td> <td>2.1m = 4.2m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Centre area to road</td> <td><u>3.8m</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>15m</td> </tr> </table> <p>What are the other 5m for?? Or is it an open/”leafy” sort of feel?</p> <p><b>NB</b> I saw the section dwg “Diagram 10” later in section 13, wouldn’t this be better placed in the earlier section 6/11?</p> <p>11 Item 10 N-S 20m wide boulevard road?</p> <p>11.12 If we keep Wolsey Chimney, should we remove the other? Do we need both?</p>	Carriageway	7m	2 Footpath	2.1m = 4.2m	Centre area to road	<u>3.8m</u>	Total	15m	<p>TA has now been submitted. Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Agreed. Subject to further discussion.</p> <p>Agreed. Section 6 and 11 to be merged to make it more readable</p> <p>No change to SPD. Residential development at the back of pavement would provide active frontages and better surveillance onto the street, making the environment much safer.</p> <p>The 5 metres will be landscaping to create a ‘Boulevard’ feel. Clarify in SPD</p> <p>Agreed. Move to Section 6/11</p> <p>No Change to SPD</p> <p>Disagree. Both chimneys are important landmarks within the site. No change to text</p>
Carriageway	7m									
2 Footpath	2.1m = 4.2m									
Centre area to road	<u>3.8m</u>									
Total	15m									



	<p>11.13 Main civic sq. – The water tower could be a liability and could be too far from Riverside Centre to create one “experience”?  <b>NB.</b> Numbers on Diagram 7 do not stand out well enough in black &amp; white – this also applies to other plans. Numbers 4 and 14 have been transposed.</p> <p>There seems to be no mention in the text of the broken line notation, which seems to downgrade the present NSC access to a pedestrian priority zone. In vehicular terms, this severs John Ellis from the rest of the SP and is a mistake.</p> <p>12.9/10 These locations are for locals only, not Destinations for others outside the area. The size and distance between could be too great for economic development for a relatively small market. Perhaps a more reusable/looser interpretation should be considered, and allow the offer to appeal more widely?</p> <p>12.14 This is a huge open area, particularly if a lower (75+) density is implemented. I understand flood considerations here were minimal, if indeed there were any?</p> <p>12.17 I can’t see the Number 17 on the plan.</p> <p>13.6 Diagram 10? – A feature building on the tip of WI will balance the draw of the NSC Tour.  Compare statement of “Gateway Structures” at entrance of Boulevard with Morris Homes’ current application.</p>	<p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Disagree. This size of open space would serve a large wide area. Further discussions taking place with EA re: Flooding. No change to SPD.</p> <p>Agreed. Amend plan as shown.</p> <p>Agreed. Amend text to clarify.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Diagram 10 – Central Parking Zone? Shouldn't this be earlier, say section 11? Which itself should be closer to section 6.</p> <p>13.11 Modest structure, is it that good? Does the liability of upkeep outweigh the benefits of keeping?</p> <p>13.12 Perhaps the wharf should be a new construction? And if it attracts outsiders then the leisure and retail associated use could be more than just local?</p> <p>14 Land Use Plan-any changes proposed to reflect changed mix of uses to Ingleby site? - Diagram 13 – A1/A2/A3 seems way too large for local use only, or is it just to show acceptable locations for it, rather than suggesting the amount? Can't some of leisure/retail also support the NSC &amp; make it a more viable attraction?</p> <p>15 Massing and Storey Heights- I Don't understand the last sentence "highly visible facades aligning the river corridor, when the natural environment is to dominate" Isn't this Contradictory?</p> <p>We must recognise that 2/3 storey massing is likely to create viability problems, which will require public intervention/Gap Funding to bring Development forward.</p> <p>16.1 See my comments on flood risk above in 12.14.</p>	<p>Agreed. Move to different section</p> <p>Disagree. Water Tower important feature both visually and historically. No change to SPD.</p> <p>No Change to SPD</p> <p>Agreed. Land use plan to be revised to make it in accordance with Local Plan policies, and to make it clearer as to the size and type of uses that would be acceptable on the site.</p> <p>Agreed. Text amended to clarify. Getting right balance between the built and natural environment.</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p>
--	---	--

<p><b>Bestway (Wolsey Island)</b></p>	<p>16.2.2 The Leather bank 30m exclusion zone presumably only applies to BUSM side (E bank of canal), <b>Not WI side.</b> However it will have a major adverse affect on the development process both in terms of design but also ability to construct.</p> <p>16.9 Affordable Housing – Treat WI + BUSM + AM as a whole area. The council needs to prioritise the needs between Sec106/Affordable Housing etc.</p> <p>The stated vision for Abbey Meadows has at its heart an aspiration for the regeneration of an extensive area to the north-west of the city centre. The area includes a peninsula bounded by the Grand Union Canal and the River Soar known as Wolsey Island. A warehouse site in the ownership of Bestway is centrally located within this area.</p> <p>In general terms Bestway support the Leicester Regeneration Company's vision towards the regeneration this part of the city of Leicester.</p> <p>Regeneration of the Abbey Meadows area should make a major contribution to the future environmental quality and economic</p>	<p>Disagree. No change to SPD. Only applies to BUSM site and is unlikely to have significant impact on development proposals.</p> <p>Agreed. Discuss at future meeting.</p> <p>Support noted</p> <p>Support noted</p>
---------------------------------------	--	---

	<p>prosperity of the city as a whole. In other words, the initiatives signalled by the SPD will bring about benefits beyond the confines of the area to which the SPD applies.</p> <p>It is vital to the success of the strategy that a climate is created wherein development proposals will be brought forward in accordance with its underlying principles. This requires that the owners and occupiers of land within the regeneration area are provided with sufficient incentive to bring the vision to reality.</p> <p>The uses to which land and buildings may be put clearly directly affect value. This equally applies to the intensity of use and any other constraints which may be imposed. By way of example, the density at which residential development may take place and the proportion of affordable housing will have a direct bearing. Bestway are concerned that the imposition of onerous requirements and restrictions may have an inhibiting effect on the attractiveness of their site as a future development location within the context of the Vision in the following respects:</p>	<p>Agreed. No change to SPD</p>
--	---	---------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our client considers that the Bestway site and, by extension, others within Wolsey Island are capable of accommodating residential development at a density higher than that envisaged in the SPD and the recently adopted City of Leicester Local Plan (January 2006). This would be consistent with the objective of maximising the use of previously developed land and the principles of sustainability espoused in many strands of national planning guidance.</li> <li>• Considerable infrastructure costs are associated with the proposals for Wolsey Island, in the form of bridges, roadworks etc.</li> <li>• The Council is seeking to pursue an overall target of 30% new dwellings to be affordable within the regeneration area, which is recognised as a priority area.</li> </ul>	<p>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. Discuss at future meeting.</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p>
--	--	---

	<p>In all probability the effects of these requirements on potential returns will combine to ensure that development proposals in accordance with the Vision will prove unattractive to owners and occupiers and its laudable objectives will not come to fruition.</p> <p>The affordable housing policy contained in the adopted Local Plan (HO9) advises that the Strategic Regeneration Area is regarded as a priority investment area. Ironically, the affordable housing requirement is likely to prove instrumental in frustrating that very investment. Seeing the investment take place should be the priority and the affordable element a secondary consideration.</p> <p>A further concern arises in respect of the allocation of costs associated with the proposals embodied in the Vision, and in particular the costs of infrastructure. As we have noted, the benefits of the regeneration initiative will extend far beyond the area which it directly affects. They will be city - wide.</p>	<p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Consequently, our client regards it as inequitable that the full burden of bridge works and other costs associated with Wolsey Island should fall solely on themselves and the neighbouring landowners.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed 'Common Pot' for infrastructure, open space, community and social infrastructure will be imposed only on the landowners and stakeholders of the Abbey Meadows Vision.</p> <p>The regeneration of this area will provide benefits in terms of infrastructure etc. to the wider community, in terms of improving the local and regional economy and the urban environment of Leicester as a whole. By imposing these costs on just a few landowners/stakeholders, together with the requirements for a fairly low proposed density on the site and affordable housing, it is possible that these mechanisms will increase the danger of any scheme coming forward as the individual landowners, including</p>	<p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>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. Discuss at future meeting.</p>
--	--	--

<p><b>Sock Island Investments (Wolsey Island)</b></p>	<p>Bestways Limited may find that any scheme proposed is not viable.</p> <p>Status Architecture and Planning act for Sock Island Investments Limited, owners of the former Courtaulds/Wolsey site at the northern end of Abbey Meadows.</p> <p>We welcome the SPD and we share in the City Council’s vision for the area.</p> <p>The urban design principles in particular are to be commended as are the policies by providing “....a range and mix of housing type ...” – essential in providing a mixed, vibrant and more balanced community; and</p> <p>“...quality design to be achieved....” – so important as a long-term asset for Leicester.</p> <p>However we do have certain concerns and comments as follows:</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
---	---	----------------------



	<p>1. Density</p> <p>We believe that higher densities to those envisaged by the SPD would be more relevant in this area and would lead to an attractive and exciting development that this waterside location demands.</p> <p>Firstly, it means that the costly infrastructure and other Section 106 provisions are more likely to be met, i.e. we doubt whether any development would go ahead without it being high density.</p> <p>Secondly, and particularly on the northern tip, a higher density means more activity, a safer environment (in what otherwise could be a lonely place) and more people to support the local amenities around the water tower square.</p> <p>2. Diagram 13 “Land Use” shows a huge area of A1, A2 and A3 around and to the south of the water tower. We believe that allocating the ground and first floors to these uses around the water tower square would be more than enough to meet the “local needs” which paragraph 4.3 suggests that</p>	<p>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. Discuss at future meeting.</p> <p>Land use plan to be revised to make it in accordance with Local Plan policies, and to make it clearer as to the size and type of uses that would be acceptable on the site.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>it is for. The location, at the end of the island, is not suitable for anything that attracts traffic.</p> <p>3. Affordable Housing</p> <p>We are concerned that if LCC applies their 16.9 Affordable Housing policy then either <b>no</b> development will happen or it will not meet the Vision of the council. The LRC have identified enormous infrastructure costs and high quality design is essential. These <b>two</b> items must be met and a far more flexible approach to affordable housing is needed if Abbey Meadows is going to happen. Affordable housing must become a secondary consideration.</p> <p>On a related note, it is felt that the high infrastructure costs have a benefit to a much wider catchment area than Wolsey Peninsula alone. If the Council is not to be disappointed with the outcome of the Regeneration area then we feel a more creative approach needs to be adopted to the distribution of infrastructure expenses and the allocation of affordable housing.</p>	<p>Discuss at future meeting</p>
--	--	----------------------------------

	<p>4. Paragraph 7.4 “....all forms of family housing to have gardens 11m long...”.</p> <p>Whilst commendable in a traditionally British way this could stifle new concepts and ways of living.</p> <p>5. Paragraph 7.7 The Waterside Centre</p> <p>The SPD envisages some commercial development which goes against the grain of achieving a dream corridor for the river. It is suggested that a section of the Abbey Meadows road could be moved back to create a development plot. It is always unfortunately when continuity of the public realm is broken along a riverside. We would suggest building up would be preferable to building laterally. It is also in an area that floods which could mitigate against any development.</p> <p>Some low key redevelopment is however required to hopefully save the mooring/river access and encourage river-related activities.</p>	<p>Disagree. Adequate garden space should be provided for family housing. This distance would allow for satisfactory garden space and protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers. No change to SPD</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting. However, the City Council is of the opinion that the centre is compatible with what else is being proposed on this part of the site.</p>
--	--	---

<p><b>Blueprint</b></p>	<p>6. In the interests of good planning and achieving a sustainable development the SPD should be specific in its exploration of pedestrian links between Abbey Meadows and the city centre.</p> <p>The only options at present end at present at St.Margarets Way (not safe or pleasant) or Belgrave Road which is far from being a direct route.</p> <p>The desire line (in daylight hours) is through Abbey Park, although this ends at the canal. Continuing this pedestrian only route through to the city centre should be a future objection.</p> <p>Blueprint is a newly established public private regeneration company comprising a limited partnership between the East Midlands Development Agency (EMDA), English Partnerships (EP) and Igloo Regeneration Fund.</p> <p>At the outset I would confirm that Blueprint supports the principles behind the document in attempting to guide development, but we nevertheless hope that imaginative, innovative proposals that provide a high quality sustainable response will be encouraged. We share the City Council's concern that the Abbey Meadows area and in particular Wolsey Island, is brought forward in a comprehensive way and not by a series of fragmented and piecemeal, poor quality</p>	<p>Agreed. Strategically, the SPD aims to improve links between this site and the city centre, creating accessible and safe pedestrian/cycle routes. Amend text to emphasis this objective.</p> <p>Support noted</p>
-------------------------	---	--

	<p>developments that do not respond to the longer term aspirations.</p> <p>The successful regeneration of this area will be achieved over the long term and by providing high quality, sustainable well designed development which is not simply a standard market response to perceived residential demand as is currently being developed elsewhere in the City.</p> <p>The planning guidance for the site does not however appear to have been guided by any thorough market analysis and intelligence as to what form of development is most appropriate and we believe that this is a critical piece of work needed for the Council to be able to prevent proposals for inappropriate and poor quality development.</p> <p>Although we have some views on elements of the urban and building design approach set out in the SPD, we would expect to discuss these further with the City Council when we bring forward specific proposals. We do have however have some specific concerns on some of the key aspects of the Document which we would wish to highlight at this stage.</p> <p>These concerns are principally</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Highways and Infrastructure</li> <li>2. Operation and management of the ‘Common Pot’</li> <li>3. Approach to public realm and open space</li> <li>4. Density</li> </ol>	<p>Agreed. No change to SPD</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p>
--	--	---

	<p><b>Highways and Infrastructure</b></p> <p>There are a number of references in different sections of the document to the overall approach to highways and movement and specifically to the obligations to be placed on landowners to ensure infrastructure is available as and when required. Our main concern here is ensuring that no developer/landowner can delay or frustrate development of other sites on Wolsey Island given that the main development access needs to come through each parcel, starting from the frontage sites to Abbey Park Road. Our knowledge of the current s106 agreement in place for the MHT scheme does not impose timescales for delivery of the highways to adoptable standard to the boundary. We presume that the s278 agreement will rectify this and furthermore that the obligations on the other developments on the Abbey Park Road frontage will ensure robust legal and planning provisions to safeguard access and infrastructure for the rest of the peninsular within agreed timescales.</p> <p><b>Common Pot</b></p> <p>The application of the ‘common pot’ approach to the delivery of key infrastructure provision will need much more consideration to achieve a workable arrangement. The SPD does not really deal with this in much detail, it is not clear who will be responsible for operating and managing the ‘pot’ or who will be responsible for the delivery of some of the key elements listed - for example the three bridges mentioned, the works to the canal and riverside environment, education and community facilities which would be best delivered by the City Council in the</p>	<p>Agreed. Discuss at future meeting. The City Council would not want to frustrate development of other sites on Wolsey Island.</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p>
--	---	--

	<p>absence of there being one single ownership.</p> <p>Blueprint’s delivery model for regeneration projects would assist the delivery of these wider objectives through its acquisition of a substantial part of the peninsular, the adoption of a comprehensive development framework, site remediation and provision of the main infrastructure and a first ‘Exemplar’ phase undertaken by Blueprint. Subsequently other private sector developers would be re-introduced responding to a brief agreed between Blueprint, LCC and LRC to ensure that the best quality of development is delivered. Without this strategic approach, the operation of the common pot will be difficult to achieve and will rely on landowner agreements, some of whose objectives are not necessarily aligned. We therefore welcome further discussion on this issue with the City Council and LRC.</p> <p><b>Public Realm</b></p> <p>The document makes reference in 5.2.2 to a study of amenity space being underway and in Section 7 the need to agree the location, design, shape and size of open space with Leicester City Council and Environment Agency, yet the SPD is quite specific in later sections and on Diagram 8 about the location and suggested scale required. We presume however that the diagrams in the SPD are meant to be illustrative rather than prescriptive at this stage and we therefore trust that there will be further opportunities to comment.</p>	<p>Agreed. No change to SPD.</p> <p>There is some flexibility on terms of locations of open space etc. However, they should fit in with overall layout of the site to ensure good access and safety. Discuss at future meeting.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>This site has quite a unique environment, being close to the City centre but set in a tranquil, green environment. The River and Canal corridors and Abbey Park provide large areas of existing open space within easy reach. What is important is to ensure that connections to these areas are made safe and convenient for future residents, pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The application of standard ‘City wide’ open space quotas is not appropriate for what will be development of largely urban form, where open space and buildings should be planned together and thus relate to one another to create a high quality environment.</p> <p>Unless there are specific areas to be retained – i.e. the River and Canal corridors, then any public realm and the buildings which will enclose it should be designed together. The plans contained in the document appear to have identified some potential locations and scale of open space arbitrarily and also bear little resemblance to the previous Development Framework plan.</p> <p>Public Realm on Wolsey Island should be created through a hierarchy of spaces from inner private courtyards and garden areas, through publicly accessible but privately maintained public spaces to public squares and green spaces of a scale appropriate to create a sense of place, enclosure and security. They should be designed to the highest quality and have a specific use related to their surroundings. Public realm should relate not only to the buildings but also to the streets that surround them to ensure they are well connected to the areas they are intended to serve. Rather than applying blanket standard</p>	<p>Agreed. No change to SPD.</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting. The City Council is looking into the possibility of developing a public realm strategy for the whole of the site.</p>
--	---	--



	<p>criteria, an analysis of what each space is for, how it will be used and by who, should be carried out as part of the development design process. Public realm should be available to all, not segregated. In fact it might well be possible to better the quantum and quality of open space provided by adopting this approach.</p> <p>Section 7 refers to a differential burden of open space which will be addressed through a formula to allocate costs equitably. However this ignores a fundamental viability issue and will not work in isolation. It is not just the burden of the costs associated with the provision of the space itself but the loss of developable land which will create further viability problems. The indicative drawing (Diagram 8) indicates an area of open space which seems to be unrelated in size and location to the potential masterplan framework for the peninsular. It appears out of scale to what will be required as part of a wider public realm infrastructure. This area would have a major impact on the sites in which Blueprint have an interest and would affect their commercial viability.</p> <p>The existing use value of some of the existing industrial premises on Wolsey Island will in some cases be more than the development value, after allowing for all the add on/abnormal costs to deal with physical constraints - flood prevention, contamination etc and to achieve the wider aspirations – site wide infrastructure, affordable housing, etc. The additional burden of a loss of developable land will therefore affect viability and would result in land values below that which a landowner would seek to secure for its site and may therefore</p>	<p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p>
--	---	---

	<p>not be commercially deliverable.</p> <p>Unless there are specific areas to be retained – i.e. the River and Canal corridors, then any public realm and the buildings which will enclose it should be designed together. The plans contained in the document appear to have identified some potential locations and scale of open space arbitrarily and also bear little resemblance to the previous Development Framework plan.</p> <p><b>Density</b></p> <p>The issue of density needs to be much better informed. As mentioned above we would expect some further much more detailed analysis of the future market for urban/city centre residential in Leicester given the preponderance of one and two bedroom apartment developments being thrown up by the market. More analysis is needed as to what type of place Wolsey Island should become and that should inform any density targets. There will need to be a transition from the very dense and tall frontage developments which although included in the SPD area do not follow its principles and this needs careful design thought for the sites immediately behind.</p>	<p>Agreed. Discuss at future meeting.</p> <p>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. Discuss at future meeting.</p>
--	---	--

<p><b>Local Residents</b></p> <p>Yagnesh Pandya (GE Health Care Consultant)</p> <p>No Address Given</p>	<p>Traffic Impact &amp; Management - Currently Belgrave Rd and Holden Street, Abbey Park Road - A detailed assessment quantifying the increase and impact on these areas and roads needs to be addressed with respect to the increased Urban Environmental pollution and volume of Traffic.</p> <p>Please note that Holden Street is a residential street and not designed for 40 tonne Articulated lorries or as a Primary Route. A restriction to 7.5 tonnes vehicles would be welcomed as part and parcel of this development.</p> <p>Loughborough Road Connection - I object to Holden Street being used as a primary route to connect the new development. Holden Street has not been designed as a primary route. There has already been one pedestrian fatality on Holden Street and several near misses due to heavy traffic. Alternative and acceptable access arrangements should be provided for the new development.</p> <p>Environmental Impact Assessment - I would welcome a comprehensive document stating in detail (and not in generality, as it is now) on how this development affects the environment clearly state what mitigation is proposed and how the benefit from the</p>	<p>Proposed changes to the highway network will be subject to the outcomes of the Strategic TA and subsequent TA's submitted by developers. No changes to the SPD</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting. This will be subject to the outcomes of the submitted T.A.</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting. This will be subject to the outcomes of the submitted T.A.</p> <p>Agreed. This is being undertaken at the moment as part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment.</p>
---	---	--

<p>Tony Andrews 32 Silbury Road Leicester</p>	<p>mitigation is derived.</p> <p>Geotechnical Surveys - This will assist in determination of land contamination of the former heavy industry sites. Detailed Proposals for land reclamation should be included.</p> <p>A few hundred yards from the clock tower and you have got nothing to attract people to the City. Any new area that you build must have good links to the city centre, particularly for pedestrians. E.g. Brindley place Birmingham.</p> <p>One of the best links to Abbey Meadows area is through Abbey Park which should be made a complete open way at all times. All new areas need good pedestrian links from the City Centre with shops, eating places and bars. We cannot keep building in the City Centre only and need to spread out more. The extra tourism will create the supply for these outlets.</p>	<p>A strategic land contamination report has been prepared for the sites. Further site specific investigations may be required as part of any planning application. No change to SPD.</p> <p>Agreed. SPD seeks to improve links to and from the Abbey Meadows site. No change to SPD.</p> <p>Agreed as above.</p>
<p>Mrs Christine Hoyland C/O Park House, Abbey Park</p>	<p>Currently live on a boat and would like to express an interest on any moorings proposed as part of the development, as we would like to live near to work (Abbey Park)</p>	<p>One of the aspirations of the SPD is to provide permanent moorings. Comments noted. No change to SPD</p>
<p>Mr Robert Bouramp 34 upper Tichbourne Street, Leicester</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The maps shown on the leaflets are very hard to read. There are no road names or markers.</li> <li>• Proposed pedestrian/cycle bridge on canal is already there</li> </ul>	<p>The plans in the SPD will be amended to make them clearly.</p> <p>There are no suitable bridges at present to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists</p>

<p>Anne Graf 8 Welbeck Avenue Leicester</p> <p>Mattani Chandrashi VPL International 134 Marjorie Street Leicester</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lots of Factories will be lost</li> <li>• Big distances between river crossings</li>   <li>• Need to create pedestrian/cycle access all along east bank of canal, as well as west bank</li> <li>• Must restore pedestrian access across frontage of Waterside Centre and remove fencing, locked gates, etc, blocking access at present. This should be condition of any future development. Access should be allowed onto the riverside and not blocked</li> <li>• Am pleased to see plans for open space/amenity space in part of the former allotments on western riverside, and that built development will not be continuous along the entire river frontage on this site</li> <li>• Am pleased with plans for more pedestrian/cycle and road bridges on the river/canal</li> <li>• Would like to see the pedestrian/cycle bridges to Belgrave Hall and Church implemented in the near future</li> <li>• Plan Illustrations are confusing regarding the allotment site</li>   <li>• Questions the timescale for development</li> <li>• Afraid regeneration will adversely affect his business</li> </ul>	<p>The majority of factories are vacated and empty Noted. No change to SPD</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Agreed. This is one of the aspirations of the SPD. No change to SPD</p> <p>Support noted</p> <p>Support noted</p> <p>Agreed. Discuss at future meeting</p> <p>Agreed. Plans revised to make illustrations much clearer</p> <p>Development has started on part of the site. No change to SPD Noted. No change to SPD</p>
---	---	--

<p>Garry Bedford 38 Vann Walk Belgrave Leicester</p> <p>Andy Brooks 20 Middlesex Road Leicester</p> <p>Mr A Robert Hughes 33 Sudeley Avenue Leicester</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan is very positive, ambitious and welcomed</li> <li>• The corridor of the river and canal has been woefully neglected and a clear safe pathway from the city centre to Belgrave hall/Cross Corners/ St Peters Church and beyond would be welcomed</li> <li>• This part of the City has been neglected and the profile needs raising</li> <li>• Good mixed housing and quality, reasonably priced workspaces would help give this historic area a boost</li> <li>• Need to look at Birmingham for inspiration</li> </ul> <p>Objects to the proposed guidance. I suggest that the access, circulation and articulation of open space, needs further consideration as well as the location of built frontages that seem to have little relation to the riverside.</p> <p>Welcomes the general tone of the document and in particular I am pleased at the appreciation of the nature of the area in the past, especially the open areas and river and canal.</p>	<p>Support noted</p> <p>Agreed. Support noted. No change to SPD</p> <p>Agreed. No change to SPD</p> <p>Agreed. One of the main objectives of the SPD is to create a balanced community. No change to SPD</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Discuss at future meeting.</p> <p>Support noted</p>
---	--	---

	<p>Page 22 para 4.9 and page 23 para 4.10</p> <p>In light of the above pages it is imperative that the part of the allotments indicated on the plan as open space remain so and that the frontage to the river of the new buildings on the other part of the allotments remain as indicated on the plan. Please note that there is a variety of wildlife in this area and in particular a number of newts which can be found to the left of the first gate entrance into the allotments from Abbey Park Road.</p> <p>It is also good to see the plans for the Wolsey Tower and Waterside centre as the area needs leisure activities but it is also hoped that as far as possible the present high level of peace and tranquillity on the Space Centre side will be preserved.</p> <p>There are some serious concerns for local residents. Where new residential housing and businesses are concerned it is really important that adequate car and other vehicles parking be provided. At present some of the car firms already in the area are using the local residential streets for parking. Pavement parking on Abbey Lane from the post office towards Corporation Road is just one example.</p> <p>Also as indicated another car firm has applied for a new building on the new road to be built from Abbey Lane, this is not welcome as there are already enough of these uses in the area.</p>	<p>Discuss at future meeting. Allotments may be retained and managed (in part) as natural open space that enhances the riverside. No other loss of habitat is proposed by the SPD</p> <p>Agreed. No changes to SPD</p> <p>Adequate parking will be provided in line with Local Plan Standards and the adopted Vehicle Parking Standards SPG. The SPD also aims to improve Public Transport and pedestrian/cycle links to and from the site.</p> <p>Noted. However, this uses not contrary to Policy. No change to SPD.</p>
--	---	--

<p>Meeting of Economic Development and Planning Scrutiny Committee 21/06/06</p>	<p>It is disappointing that permission has been granted for first bus to move to Abbey Lane, despite objections from a large number of local residents. With a projected movement of 200 vehicles a day this will aggravate problems of congestion and pollution. The road surface on Abbey lane and on Corporation road is worn out which affects driving conditions. There have been a number of pedestrian accidents, some fatal, in the stretch of Abbey Lane from Abbey Park to Thurstaston Road</p> <p>Under 3.0 - 10<sup>th</sup> bullet point. Reference is made to development being highly accessible to the city centre on foot, by cycle, and public and private transport modes. This implies that the City Council are seeking to encourage private car use contrary to the aims of the Local Transport Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. No change to SPD</p> <p>Agreed. Amend text to clarify</p>
---	---	---



