

# Meeting

---

Meeting:	Land West of Stoney Stanton, Community Liaison Group Meeting 1		
Venue:	Elmesthorpe Village Hall	Date:	6pm, Tuesday 31 <sup>st</sup> May
Community Attendees:	Cat Bass, Elmesthorpe Stands Together (CB - EST) Jane Carroll, Stoney Stanton Action Group (JC - SSAG) John May, Sapcote resident (JM) Becky Roper, Elmesthorpe Stands Together (BR - EST) Sharon Scott, Sapcote resident (SS) Steve Walls, Stoney Stanton resident (SW) Father Andrew Hall, Vicar – Burbage and Aston Flamville (AH)		
Parish Representatives:	Ed Bryan, Aston Flamville (EB) Luke Cousin, Stoney Stanton (LC) Jack Feast, Sharnford (JF) Tony Greenwood, Elmesthorpe (TG) Vic Howell, Sapcote (VH) Noel Robinson, Burbage (NR) Sam Walsh, Croft (SW) Hannah Pickles, Croft (HP)		
Observer:	Councillor Maggie Wright (MW)		
Project Team Attendees:	Jenny Adams, Mather Jamie (JA) David Blackadder-Weinstein, Turley (DBW) Tom Collins, Mather Jamie (TC) Keith Fenwick, Pegasus (KF) Alice Jones, Turley (AJ) Simone Gobber, Barton Willmore now Stantec (SG) Dominic Scott, Barton Willmore now Stantec (DS)		

---

---

Sam Wilkinson, Barwood Land (SW)

Andrew Winnington, LCC (AW)

---

Did not attend Shirley Burnett, Earl Shilton

Paul Huddleston, Croft resident

Becky Poynor, Stoney Stanton Parish Council member

---

#### Proposed agenda

- Welcome
- Introductions
- Purpose of the meeting
- Terms of reference
- Local Plan process
- HNRFI
- October 2021 workshop
- New settlement identity development
- AOB / next steps

---

#### Notes

##### **Introduction**

1. DBW provided an introduction to the meeting and invited everyone to introduce themselves and their area of interest.
2. MW was invited to volunteer her thoughts on the formation of the CLG in her capacity as county councillor and observer.
3. MW stated that the district felt “under siege” with a number of large applications recently where the standard of engagement has often been poor.
4. MW cited the desire for the historic Fosse villages to stay as villages and maintain their identity.
5. Overdue infrastructure challenges/solutions cited in relation to future development, with a question about where funding would come from.
6. MW welcomed the initiation of the group and the sharing of information at an early stage.

---

## Notes

7. Members of the groups were then invited to share their general thoughts following MW's comments.
8. EB noted that traffic on the M69 had more than tripled in recent years with pollution a problem which would get worse with the HNRFI and closure of the M69 causing a nightmare for local roads.
9. JM noted that there is often limited engagement due to the perception that even when applications are refused by Blaby district Council (BDC) the decision is then overturned by inspectors and the development proceeds regardless. As a result, the boundary between Sapcote and Stoney Stanton keeps moving.
10. VH stated that Sapcote had doubled in size in the last decade and listed existing infrastructure issues such as narrow roads and challenges in recruiting new staff when new infrastructure is offered, e.g. GP surgery and library. It was also noted that Sapcote has an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.
11. SS stated that infrastructure is viewed as the most pressing issue and questioned whether the development is dependent on new motorway slip roads. There were concerns raised about the existing M69 junction and bypass options.
12. AH welcomed the invitation to help shape the plans for a new settlement and enquired whether the Fosse Villages Local Plan had been considered to date. Suggested Burbage is overrun with issues around parking and GPs with approximately 20,000 residents now.
13. LC commented on Stoney Stanton's infrastructure issues, such as the local school being overcrowded, the difficulty in obtaining a GP appointment, and traffic through the village. It was stated that infrastructure should be prioritised before houses are built, and that current villages should be invested in first, but questioned where the money would come from and whether local planning and development processes can be trusted.
14. HP asked what "protecting existing villages" means in practice.

### **Terms of Reference**

15. DBW read through the draft Terms of Reference, inviting members of the group to comment.
16. CB noted that the site plan is incorrect in relation to the distance between the proposed site and Elmhurst. The project team committed to updating it.
17. DBW proposed that the Chair and Vice-chair for the group be elected via a poll following the meeting. Role profiles for both will be circulate with the minutes.
18. TC clarified that the CLG is independent of BDC and has no formal role in acting on their behalf. Engagement with the CLG is not a substitute for engagement with BDC.

---

## Notes

19. LC enquired about the review process for minutes and whether they would be kept on the website for the duration of the project. It was also asked whether members would have access to the meeting minutes before they were made public.
20. DBW clarified that minutes would be distributed to members before being posted on the website. It was agreed that a follow-up email would be sent to members for approval before being posted to the website.
21. VH questioned whether parish councils could appoint a substitute member.
22. DBW confirmed that parish councils could appoint substitute members and that the project team would like to see each parish represented at each meeting.
23. JF questioned the timing of future meetings, pointing out that 6pm was not an appropriate start time for those who work outside of regular 9am – 5pm jobs.
24. DBW stated that timing issues would be addressed and discussed with group members in follow up communications.
25. JC enquired whether action groups could also appoint substitute members.
26. DBW confirmed he had discussed this with LC in advance of the meeting and that he was confident SSAG and EST would be consistently represented as they both had two members present already. DBW highlighted the importance of consistent representation to ensure all CLG members share the same knowledge as much as possible.
27. MW stated that it is critical that the appointed chair has no conflicts of interest and is as independent as possible, noting the presence of the engagement bodies represented at the meeting, some of whom will be statutory consultees in the future.
28. DBW stated that this would be addressed and that the Terms of Reference were currently in draft form.
29. LC questioned whether the 25-member limit was appropriate, emphasising the importance of ensuring that all groups and areas were represented.
30. DBW clarified that the figure was intended to refer to community members rather than the client team, and that the group size should also be considered in terms of management and meeting duration. It was noted that this is not the only forum for engagement, and that other groups will be able to participate outside of the CLG.
31. LC expressed concern about the lack of representation of young people and stated that this must be addressed.
32. DBW acknowledged that diversity was an agenda item to be addressed, that the members present have a better understanding of the local community, and that members can help encourage younger people to join the group.

---

## Notes

33. HP suggested that the 25-30 age group should be included as part of this, which DBW agreed. The definition of youth should not be prohibitively tight.
34. LC suggested that he approach local scout groups in order to reach out to older teens.
35. VH suggested that youth club leaders would be good representatives to relay concerns and feedback from younger generations to the group.
36. EB enquired whether teachers would be beneficial to approach due to their contact with young people, or if the council would approach them.
37. DBW reiterated that the CLG is not intended to be a replacement for consultations conducted by us or the BDC, but rather to serve as a forum for early engagement.

### **Local plan process and HNRFI**

38. KF provided an overview of the Local Plan process, highlighting relevant policy documents and housing needs for Leicester City and Leicestershire.
39. KF stated that as of 2022, BDC had a housing need for the period 2020-2036 of 11,000 new homes, some of which will come from existing allocations.
40. KF highlighted the decision to be made between strategic development sites and incremental growth of villages, referring back to the earlier question by HP about “protecting villages”.
41. Any new settlement on Land west of Stoney Stanton would deliver new homes during this period but also beyond 2036.
42. KF noted that any future planning application would be “plan-led” and likely part of a lengthy process. A new settlement is no way a done deal and consultation by BDC must come first. Some authorities want a planning application alongside the Local Plan process while others don’t.
43. KF noted that Fosse Villages Neighbourhood Plan (FVNP) holds full statutory weight of a development plan and ends in 2029, although the new Local Plan could force an update to the FVNP.
44. KF stated that the consortium group has objected to the HNRFI due to a lack of evidence, with concerns centred on highways, noise, air quality, drainage, and landscape.
45. LC stated that clarification was needed on whether the consortium was proceeding on the assumption that HNRFI would or would not proceed, and that this would have an impact on Stoney Stanton Parish Council’s position. Requested that the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Statement of Common Ground be shared.

---

## Notes

46. KF highlighted that the consortium's technical team was considering scenarios including and excluding the HNRFI.
47. CB stated that the group expects the consortium to be honest from the start and to be transparent about what can and can't be "fixed".
48. JF enquired if there were any studies that demonstrated when an area reaches saturation point.
49. KF mentioned that when the final proposals are produced, the consortium will need to show that capacity is available, and development is deliverable as part of the planning process.
50. SS sought clarification on the government's guidance regarding the 35% housing uplift and why BDC needs to get Leicester's overspill.
51. KF noted that there had been no government consultation on the 35% urban uplift figure.
52. VH stated that he believed the consortium representatives were being truthful in their presentation and thanked them, which was echoed by MW and AH.
53. AH enquired whether areas on the outskirts of Blaby, such as Hinckley and Bosworth, had been consulted, given the impact the proposals would have on these "cross-border" communities.
54. KF stated that senior planning officers from Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC) had been consulted, and that officers from HBBC collaborate with BDC officers.

## Workshop summary

55. DS provided a summary of the workshops held in October 2021 (see written summaries at [www.landwestofstoneystanton.co.uk/latest-news/](http://www.landwestofstoneystanton.co.uk/latest-news/), as well as the key themes that emerged from the early sessions.
56. DS noted that early discussions had focused on whether one larger or three smaller settlements would be proposed, and whether consideration of the character and history of all villages had been factored in.
57. DS pointed to the next stage of the design process being about "what is it and how does it fit into the landscape?"
58. CB asked if new transportation assessments would be conducted or if the HNRFI assessments would be used, which is important because it must be difficult to plan when the HNRFI info was so bad.
59. KF stated that the project team was conducting its own transportation modelling.

---

## Notes

60. SS enquired about the proposed housing quantity, noting the earlier figure of 5,000 houses was bigger than a village and asking whether it would be delivered in one or three villages.
61. DS agreed that “a village” should be similar in size to the existing villages.
62. DBW stated that this topic area should be discussed at the next CLG meeting.
63. MW remarked on the success of the Lubbethorpe development as a result of developers forward funding infrastructure prior to housing development/sales and inquired whether the consortium would do the same.
64. TC stated that because we are still in the early stages of the process, more work is required to determine the infrastructure requirements before any commitments can be made.
65. KF stated that delivery will be phased, and that while it is too early to say what infrastructure will be prioritised, some infrastructure will be available on day one.
66. DBW acknowledged that MW was seeking a precise answer to her question about funding but that the consortium could not give a commitment now to something which is yet to be identified.
67. LC requested that it be minuted that for now, the consortium’s answer to the question about forward funding was “no”.
68. DS said that he wanted the answer to be “yes” and that using examples of where it has worked in the past would help.
69. SS stated that the consortium should develop plans with the understanding that the HNRFI will not proceed, that it should be “quite a small settlement” and that funding should be prioritised.
70. DS highlighted that more work was still to be done on the scale and character of the existing villages and that as part of this work, the project team would be happy to arrange site tours with CLG members.
71. TG emphasised the critical importance of funding in new development, noting that only 600 houses have been sold in the Lubbethorpe new settlement in 4.5 years and that three of the four original developers have withdrawn from the scheme with the land owners having to “sell the family silver” to fund a new bridge across the motorway.
72. TG shared the cautionary tale of a place with an infant school but no shops and a GP surgery with no doctors having to be sealed off.

---

Notes

**New Settlement Identity Development**

73. DBW noted that the arrival of Elmesthorpe Parish staff and the advancing time meant the meeting would have to be adjourned before there was time to discuss this item which will be deferred until the next meeting.

**AOB**

74. DBW stated that the Terms of Reference will be updated and circulated for agreement following the meeting.
75. DS asked for any additional information on character, history or the scale of development be forwarded to the project team and suggested that infrastructure, scale and size should all be considered.
76. SS proposed that the topic of the next meeting should be infrastructure.
77. KF replied that the project team needs access to the county highways model before infrastructure can be discussed in detail.

**Next Steps**

78. Project team to update public-facing site plan to adjust labelling of Elmesthorpe
79. Role profiles for the chair and vice chair to be added to the Terms of Reference and circulated with the minutes
80. Minutes to be circulated to CLG members before being posted on the project website.
81. Project team to approach local youth group leaders to improve representation of younger demographics.
82. Leicester and Leicestershire Statement of Common Ground to be shared with CLG members.
83. Arrange site tour(s) for CLG members

**Contact**

Alice Jones/David Blackadder-Weinstein  
[contact@landwestofstoneystanton.co.uk](mailto:contact@landwestofstoneystanton.co.uk)