

Meeting:	Land West of Stoney Stanton, Community Liaison Group Meeting 4		
Venue:	Stoney Stanton Village Hall	Date:	24 January 2023, 7pm
Community Attendees:	Cat Bass, Elmesthorpe Stands Together (CB) Steve Walls, Stoney Stanton Action Group (SW) Becky Roper, Elmesthorpe Stands Together (BR) Sharon Scott, Sapcote resident (SS) Jane Carol, Stoney Stanton Action Group (JC)		
Parish Representatives:	Luke Cousin, Stoney Stanton (LC) Vic Howell, Sapcote (VH) Noel Robinson, Burbage (NR) Paul Holyman, Thurlaston (PH) Alec Knight, Huncote (AK) Stuart Bacon, Huncote (SB)		
Observer	Cllr Maggie Wright (MW)		
Project Team Attendees:	David Blackadder-Weinstein, Turley (DBW) Jenny Adams, Mather Jamie (JA) Keith Fenwick, Pegasus (KF) Alice Jones, Turley (AJ) Sam Wilkinson, Barwood Land (SW) Beth Entwistle, Barwood Land (BE) Dominic Scott, Barton Willmore now Stantec (DS) Brian Plumb, RPS (BP)		

## Agenda

- Welcome, introduction (to new members)
- Chair /Vice Chair update
- HNRFI update

- LURB/NPPF update
  - Meet the transport planner
  - CLG Meeting 5: topic of discussion
  - AOB
- 

#### CLG 4 Minutes

##### **Introduction**

1. DBW began the meeting by thanking members for joining the fourth CLG meeting and inviting everyone to introduce/reintroduce themselves.
2. DBW invited the chair and vice chair to introduce themselves to new members and provide any relevant updates since the previous meeting.

##### **Chair and Vice Chair updates**

3. SS and BR welcomed new members to the group.
4. BR noted that the potential new settlement identity survey had been shared on social media in order to encourage members of the wider community to contribute.

##### **HNRFI update**

5. KF noted that the HNRFI application was intended to be submitted on Friday 13<sup>th</sup> January 2023 however, no submission had yet been made and no further information has been posted on Blaby District Council's (BDC) website.
6. It was noted that when the application is submitted, the Planning Inspectorate will have up to 28 days to decide whether the application meets the standards required for acceptance.
7. MW confirmed her understanding that the application had not been submitted and that BDC had been informed that the submission has been delayed due to ongoing discussions with the landowner.
8. BR asked for clarification regarding the timing of the Acceptance stage.
9. KF confirmed that the Acceptance stage begins once the application is submitted.

##### **LURB and NPPF update**

10. KF provided an update on the NPPF, stating that the government is consulting on changes to the planning system and how it is managed. It was noted that some of the more significant changes concern how the government should deliver housing in large areas of greenbelt, but that the greenbelt is not an issue in Blaby.
11. SS enquired whether green wedges were included in the green belt.

---

#### CLG 4 Minutes

12. KF confirmed that they were not. It was stated that Leicestershire authorities had undertaken work regarding Leicester City's housing capacity and that the need was not met in the city. It was mentioned that the NPPF consultation is open until March 2023.
13. DBW noted that much noise had been made in Westminster about housing targets in the NPPF being advisory when in fact they already are only advisory under the current system.
14. SS stated that Leicester had 4,700 vacant properties according to the Levelling Up Report.
15. KF stated that the information is known and addressed in strategies coming forward and that Leicester can meet some but not all of its need within its own boundaries. This is reflected in the Statement of Common Ground, which is largely agreed by Leicestershire authorities.
16. SS enquired whether Leicester City would consider vacant properties before rural areas.
17. MW mentioned that Leicester City Council's Local Plan is currently open for public comment, and that such questions would be appropriate to submit.

#### **Meet the transport planner**

##### **Introduction to Brian Plumb – Project team transport consultant**

18. BP introduced himself as the transport planner for the consortium, citing his previous experience in the local area including the New Lubbethorpe development which is of a similar scale to the proposed Land West of Stoney Stanton site.
19. It was stated that the highways strategy process entails data collection, assessing background traffic flows, and assessing the impact of growth on the network in order to understand the development impact and subsequent mitigation required.
20. It was emphasised that because the project is still in its early stages, there is no finalised information to provide at this time, and specific measures will be discussed in due course.
21. BP stated that traffic data from Junction 21 of the M1 to Junction 1 of the M69 was included in the data collection process, and that other junctions would be considered as well.
22. The project's work is being carried out alongside other assessments related to the Local Plan, and it should be noted that Leicestershire's Pan Regional Transport Model (PRTM) is being used for this.
23. BP mentioned that work is being carried out to consider what Blaby District Council's (BDC) planned growth will do to the wider network, which includes the Hinckley

---

#### CLG 4 Minutes

Road new junction in the centre of Stoney Stanton and Sapcote Road/Long Street capacity during peak hours.

24. It was stated that the PRTM, as well as the Local Plan work and the project's own traffic data, will be used as part of the project's assessment work to consider how traffic movements will change beyond the Local Plan period.
25. In relation to the HNRFI, it was noted that the Consortium made representations during the Tritax consultation regarding the impact on Stoney Stanton and Sapcote.
26. The Consortium feels the Tritax data misrepresents traffic changes. It was stated that the Consortium neither supports nor opposes the HNRFI in principle
27. The project's highways assessments will be conducted to both include and exclude the HNRFI as long as uncertainty around it's permission remains.
28. The Consortium will be working with a variety of authorities, including Leicestershire County Council (LCC) as the Highways Authority, National Highways, BDC, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, and Warwickshire County Council as neighbouring authorities. This will be an iterative process to discuss various mitigation options which will be considered and discussed on an ongoing basis as the project and road use evolves.
29. As a starting point, the south-facing sliproads at junction 2 of the M69 have been considered as well as the connection between Station Road, Hinckley Road and Broughton Road.
30. It was noted that the project has the potential to provide a new link between Broughton Road and Hinckley Road.
31. BP stated that the Consortium is not considering a link to the A47, as proposed by the HNRFI proposals, but will look at network changes in that area. It was noted that as soon as south-facing slip roads are introduced, the impact on movement patterns will change, making access to and from the M69 easier and less impactful on villages like Burbage.

#### **Questions from CLG members**

32. SS questioned how the connection to Broughton Road would be established and whether it would pass through the Stoney Cove car park, noting the hairpin bend.
33. BP stated that it was possible to deliver the connection without crossing Stoney Cove car park and that the delivery of the link road had been assessed and that the link road could be mostly delivered using land already owned by Parker Strategic Land and LCC.
34. LC questioned whether the consortium was claiming that future highway infrastructure would have no negative impact on people using the land and that it

---

CLG 4 Minutes

was impossible to build a road through green fields without causing a negative impact.

35. BP stated that highways infrastructure would involve development on green space but the improvements would have a compensatory effect through improved traffic flows in the surrounding area.
36. LC requested clarification on how the impact of highway infrastructure would be measured in terms of the environment, health, and the welfare of local residents.
37. BP stated that as part of the planning process, an Environmental Impact Assessment would be conducted to determine the impact of proposals on the environment and existing community.
38. KF noted that a Health Impact Assessment would also be undertaken.
39. LC enquired whether the new road would pass through the memorial garden.
40. BP stated that the consortium was still in the early stages of investigating alignment options and was not yet able to confirm the detailed route proposed.
41. LC expressed concern that local residents would be unable to understand how the link road connecting Broughton Road to Hinckley Road could be built without negatively impacting the nature of the villages and the surrounding area, particularly the green separation between Stoney Stanton and Sapcote.
42. BP stated that even if these proposals and the associated link roads were not built, there would still be congestion problems at the existing junctions which are already operating at capacity.
43. SS stated that the proposed link road would increase traffic and the only place for it to cross would be opposite Stoney Cove junction, around a hairpin bend.
44. BP stated that LCC would enforce certain road standards. Detail highways design cannot be provided at this early stage. At this point, a corridor has been identified, and further detail will be considered in the future.
45. SS stated that the proposed corridor would not protect the villages and would create a road through the green wedge, increasing traffic.
46. LC asked what would happen if the identified corridor was found to be unfeasible. Is there an alternative?
47. BP stated that any identified option would need to be thoroughly examined and consulted on, and the purpose of engaging on highways matters at this early stage is to outline our initial thoughts and identify issues the team may not have considered in full.
48. MW stated that the existing road problems are well known, and that adding c.5000 homes would exacerbate the situation. Existing pinchpoints, such as Huncote Bridge

---

#### CLG 4 Minutes

and Potters Marston being used as a rat run, were noted, and it was felt that it was difficult to see how this development could alleviate the problems that local residents are already experiencing, particularly if the HNRFI goes ahead.

49. MW stated that she understood the principle and strategy outlined by BP, but that common sense and local knowledge indicated that the proposition would be detrimental.
50. BP stated that the Consortium would consider, review, and assess all rat running in order to determine what could be delivered to deter inappropriate traffic movements.
51. MW stated that the problem is physical barriers, such as Sapcote hairpin bend, Huncote bridge, and Croft Quarry, and that no matter what mitigation is proposed, it is unclear how traffic could be physically avoided unless such barriers are physically removed.
52. BP acknowledged that rat running would always exist. However, taking away pinchpoints would increase traffic.
53. PH noted the map area shown (in relation to the presentation slides) covered an area of approximately three miles and asked why the wider area hadn't been considered.
54. DBW stated that the slides shown did not present new information, were intended to aid discussion, and that other highway junctions outside of the area shown are being considered.
55. PH questioned the improvements to Junction 21 of the M1 and the mitigation measures proposed
56. BP stated that measures had been implemented from the M1 to accommodate the New Lubbesthorpe development, including additional lanes in either direction along Lubbesthorpe Way. Improvements to the A47 Ratby road junction, as well as along Beggars Lane and Desford crossroads, were highlighted as examples of how traffic mitigation measures are being implemented.
57. SS stated that Junction 21 should be reconfigured and that mitigation measures will have no effect on congestion.
58. DBW clarified that, as previously stated at the first CLG meeting, the goal of the CLG is to engage with the local community as early in the process as possible in order to share our initial ideas and be appropriately challenged.
59. It was reiterated that the Consortium would need to provide evidenced plans following discussions with various statutory authorities in order to receive any allocation or future planning permission.

---

CLG 4 Minutes

60. BP stated that the Consortium is required to demonstrate safe and suitable access without having a significant impact on the highways network and that all comments received would be considered.
61. SS questioned whether the proposed link road was suggested because it used LCC land and would therefore be approved.
62. BP stated that any future planning applications would be submitted to BDC for approval, with LCC responsible only for highways. It was outlined that the consortium was reviewing all options and that traffic modelling would cover a larger area, including Lutterworth, Rugby, Hinckley, and Countesthorpe, to assess traffic changes.
63. SB stated that traffic accidents cause congestion around junctions, so if there is an issue, people will find a way around, which may require mitigation.
64. BP stated that assessments would take into account peak hours as well as the robustness of each of these scenarios, such as the capacity of specific junctions. It was noted, for example, that if the proposed Whetstone Pastures Garden Village is included in the Local Plan, this will be considered in future assessments, and that this was an iterative process that would need to be monitored and reassessed.
65. SS queried who would fund the mitigation measures, noting that LCC has withdrawn the budget for Junction 2 of the M69.
66. BP stated that LCC would not fund onsite mitigation and that the developers would be responsible for it.
67. VH questioned whether scenarios such as HGV incidents on the A5 or M69 would be accounted for.
68. BP stated that, while it would be impossible to investigate every possible scenario, situations such as major roadworks on the A5 necessitating a diversionary route would be considered. It was mentioned that the assessment process investigates junction capacity and whether the junctions are resilient enough.
69. SS stated that the proposals lacked detail and noted the failed Housing Infrastructure Fund bid from LCC and issues associated with Junction 21.
70. BP stated that various options will be considered but the concern about the current proposal was understood.
71. BP mentioned the 5-year moratorium on smart motorways on the M1 to emphasise that mitigation measures were constantly monitored and, if necessary, amended.
72. CB asked where the potential link road to Huncote would be and whether the Calor gas lorries would be removed from the village centre and Co-op roundabout pinchpoint. It was noted that the single-track access/egress to the Calor site was problematic.

---

CLG 4 Minutes

73. BP noted that this was being considered and there was the potential to reduce the impact of Calor Gas lorry movements on the village.
74. CB asked whether a weight limit would be implemented.
75. BP stated that there is the potential for an environmental weight limit to be implemented.
76. DBW reiterated that the Consortium can only make proposals for land that it owns, controls, or has a realistic opportunity to own/control.
77. MW presented a strategic perspective, noting that this scheme's construction would coincide with a number of other developments in the surrounding area, including the HNRFI and potential new solar farms, all of which would take up significant amounts of green wedge and agricultural land. This would result in a large number of construction vehicles, with a resulting impact on the surrounding area. Given the similar timeframes, it was suggested that developers collaborate to manage the potential impact of feasibly 20 years of ongoing construction.
78. BP stated that the Consortium would be required to consider all committed development and applications that are likely to be delivered concurrently with this scheme.
79. It was noted that construction traffic varies depending on the nature of each individual development, and that all proposals would use the PRTM model to assess the impact.
80. BP stated that any news settlement delivery would be phased and that not all construction traffic for the entire development would be loaded onto the highway network at once.
81. SB asked when the phasing strategy would be made public.
82. BP stated that the phasing strategy would be included in the first outline planning application and that it may need to be adjusted as the scheme progresses.
83. DBW stated that several planning applications would be required, including at least one Outline Planning Application to agree on the principle of development, followed by Reserved Matters applications to confirm the details of development phases.
84. It was emphasised that each application would take into account the highways context at the time and that behavioural changes in transport use were likely to occur, for example, car use could decrease.
85. LC suggested that decreasing car use was less likely in rural areas.
86. BP stated that it is critical to understand that we will review the phasing within the first application, as well as the proposed mitigation measures, which will change over time.



---

CLG 4 Minutes

87. BR stated that the A47 will remain busy as a main access route to supermarkets and other amenities, and that new occupants are likely to use Elmesthorpe to access these facilities. It was noted that this route is used by farm vehicles and equestrians.
88. BP noted that all road users and likely desirable trips would need to be considered.
89. JC noted that the HNRFI's proposed A47 link road also connected to the A46 and M1, and that people would use it to avoid traffic elsewhere.
90. BP noted that Elmesthorpe will be considered in relation to assessing traffic patterns
91. BR noted that walking and cycling routes must also be considered.
92. BP stated that such considerations would be taken into account, particularly in terms of connecting the new secondary school to the surrounding villages.
93. SB asked if a map highlighting available land for potential highway mitigation routes could be created.
94. DBW stated that the Consortium would take this suggestion away and share land ownership details at the appropriate time. In the meantime most information is available via the land registry and other publicly available sources.
95. It was mentioned that during the second CLG meeting, members had previously highlighted key pinchpoints and potential routes, and that this would not be the last time the group discussed highways issues.
96. SS requested clarification on the opening of the slip roads.
97. BP noted that the majority of car trips would originate at the M69 interchange, with much traffic heading south from there.
98. VH enquired whether the consortium was aware of the development at Aston Firs for c.340 homes and the impact on traffic movements.
99. BP stated that the consortium would investigate that development and that growth within Hinckley would be considered.
100. DBW noted that all permitted developments would need be considered during future application submissions.
101. BP reminded CLG members that smaller scale developments do not provide significant infrastructure improvements, whereas larger scale developments, such as the news settlement proposed, do.
102. MW stated that CLG members would like to preserve the identity of their respective villages, and that the proposed link road, which would cut through the Memorial and playing fields, is a cruel proposition, especially given the family connections for

---

#### CLG 4 Minutes

residents who have lived here for generations. It was asked if an alternate route would be considered.

103. BP stated that the Consortium would consider this feedback and other mitigation options.
104. LC noted that the bypass proposed by the HNRFI proposals was rejected due to a lack of popularity among residents, and stated that, if the consortium's proposals to mitigate the new development were not well received, another solution could be required.
105. SS asked how new residents would access Hinckley and whether the development could be scaled back to c.1200 homes in order to preserve the villages' integrity.
106. DBW stated that the Consortium is promoting the site for inclusion in BDC's Local Plan, and they will ultimately decide how many homes will be needed/built.
107. It was noted that everything must be done to protect the integrity of the villages, and that if this development does not proceed, there would likely be a number of bolt-on developments without proper consideration of existing residents or infrastructure provision.
108. NR mentioned that Burbage had seen several developments without any infrastructure or proper community engagement and consultation such as this CLG.
109. NR expressed support for BDC's strategy of planning larger-scale development, which delivers significant infrastructure, and the importance of parishes having an opportunity to engage as part of this process..
110. MW stated that a number of authorities are progressing their Local Plans and that there is an unmet need for 35,000 homes in Leicester City, which will be shared across the districts.
111. MW noted that if authorities are unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, developers can capitalise on this with unwanted bolt-on developments wherever they wish. Strategic planning and infrastructure delivery are thus critical, and BDC will likely consider sites such as the proposed as part of a strong Local Plan.
112. BP stated that these comments would be considered, and that the Consortium would continue to work with local residents and stakeholders in the future.

#### **Transport and placemaking**

113. DS provided an overview of the modes of travel proposed, stating that considerations should begin with pedestrian footpaths, cycleways, and bridleways, followed by public transportation and private vehicles.
114. It was acknowledged that public transport is currently almost non-existent, which is important to consider and improve.

---

#### CLG 4 Minutes

115. DS stated that the design of new streets and places should incorporate active travel, including cycling policies, while also ensuring the site is future proofed, for example, by providing EV charging points and mobility hubs.
116. PH emphasised the current dangers associated with cycling on the surrounding roads and predicted that no improvements would be made to existing roads to make cycling safer and more attractive.
117. DS stated that these issues will be addressed as part of the strategy, and that measures such as green corridors will be implemented to enable cycling adjacent to but not on existing roads.
118. PH believed that an urban rather than rural strategy was being described, which was not appropriate for this site.
119. DS responded that the strategy was being developed from the ground up and that the opportunity to address existing issues was being offered.

#### **Design character**

120. JC inquired when CLG members would be able to discuss the style and design of new homes to meet the local population's needs, such as retirement homes, new affordable starter homes, and healthcare.
121. DS stated that this discussion would take place once the local character and needs were fully understood, and that it would take place in due course.
122. Traditionally, developers ask consultants to conduct character studies, but by collaborating with the community at this early stage, the Consortium will be able to better understand local perspectives.
123. KF mentioned that the latest version of the NPPF specifically mentions housing and care homes.

#### **CLG Meeting 5: Topic of discussion**

124. DBW asked the group what the next meeting topic should be and whether it was appropriate to discuss the HNRFI application at the next meeting.
125. BR enquired whether community services, the proposed employment area, and housing types could be discussed, as well as why the initial concept of three or four individual settlements had been replaced by a single settlement proposal.
126. SS asked whether open spaces could be discussed.

#### **General discussion/AOB**

127. MW enquired whether retirement living, including independent living with a community hub, could be considered.

---

#### CLG 4 Minutes

128. LC requested that the consortium provide a summary of their responses to discussions and feedback from previous meetings, so that parish representatives could report on progress.
129. DBW suggested that a 'you said, we listened' document could be produced to address this.
130. JA highlighted that an education consultant had been commissioned in direct response to feedback from the previous meeting with regard to education requirements.
131. MW questioned why the concept of individual settlements as Fosse villages had been made redundant.
132. DS stated that this was still being considered and that we are doing additional work to understand the identity of the area, but that the number of new homes allocated by BDC would have a significant impact on how this concept would operate.
133. DBW noted that the new settlement identity survey provided an opportunity to participate in such discussions rather than later in the planning process when irreversible decisions may have already been taken.

#### Next Steps

134. Minutes to be circulated to CLG members before being posted on the project website along with the slide deck.
135. New settlement identity survey remains open until March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2023. Link: <https://freeonlinesurveys.com/s/ADAovz5R>
136. The Consortium will create a 'You said, we listened' summary document outlining how the feedback received during CLG meetings has been addressed.
137. CLG 5 to be arranged for the end of March 2023 and the topics of discussion will include: the HNRFI and responses to CLG member priorities.