

Meeting:	Land West of Stoney Stanton, Community Liaison Group Meeting 5		
Venue:	Stoney Stanton Village Hall	Date:	14 June 2023, 7:15pm
Community Attendees:	Cat Bass, Elmesthorpe Stands Together (CB) Steve Walls, Stoney Stanton Action Group (SW) Becky Roper, Elmesthorpe resident (BR) Sharon Scott, Sapcote resident (SS)		
Parish Representatives:	Rebecca Bateman, Stoney Stanton (RB) Ed Bryan, Aston Flamville (EB) Noel Robinson, Burbage (NR) Alec Knight, Huncote (AK) Stuart Bacon, Huncote (SB)		
Apologies	Luke Cousin, Stoney Stanton Paul Holyman, Thurlaston Andrew Winnington, Leicestershire County Council		
Project Team Attendees:	David Blackadder-Weinstein, Turley (DBW) Jenny Adams, Mather Jamie (JA) Keith Fenwick, Pegasus (KF) Alice Jones, Turley (AJ) Beth Entwistle, Barwood Land (BE) Dominic Scott, Stantec (DS)		

Agenda

- Welcome
- Design presentation
- Breakout table discussions

Introduction

1. DBW began the meeting by thanking members for joining the fifth CLG meeting and noted that the previous meeting had been postponed due to the pre-election period ahead of May's Local Elections.
2. DBW stated that the project team would not be addressing the HNRFI directly during this meeting, and that the project team continues to plan for the new settlement as if the HNRFI will not be delivered.
3. It was stated that the purpose of the meeting was to demonstrate how the feedback received from CLG members since the first meeting in May 2022 has influenced the project team's latest design thinking.

Design presentation – DS, Urban Designer and Project Masterplanner

Slides 1 & 2

4. DS mentioned that this was the first of two design workshops, the first focusing on settlement structure and design and the second on highways and settlement identity.
5. DS began the presentation by recalling that the first public design discussions took place during the October 2021 workshops and that design work has been informed by responses gathered then, as well as regular feedback from the CLG and other stakeholders since, including feedback from the recent new settlement identity survey.
6. It was highlighted that the Fosse Common concept first arose in conversation with local councillors during the initial discussions in October 2021.
7. That Fosse Common concept has played a significant role in informing the concept framework, providing green separation and sustaining new and existing village separation.
8. The concept of one, two, or three villages was identified during this early workshop and continues to drive design development now after CLG feedback that a single new settlement could dwarf the existing Fosse villages.
9. It was highlighted that the Fosse Villages Neighbourhood Plan, historic analysis, and local knowledge all continue to inform design development alongside community feedback and engagement.
10. In terms of establishing a future settlement, four key aspects have been consistent throughout the feedback: spirit, rurality, character, and community.

Slide 3: Fosse Common Concept

CLG 5 Minutes

11. DS noted that the current villages had been placed onto a base plan to highlight the Fosse Common concept, which intends to provide separation between communities, provide large areas of publicly accessible greenspace, and serve as the social glue between existing and new villages in the Fosse family.

Slide 4: Fosse Villages

12. The new settlement(s) site encompasses 290 hectares, thereby providing the opportunity for three new Fosse villages.
13. DS indicated that the three new villages' nature and character should be derived from current local identity.
14. The cohesive identity of the new and existing villages will be considered by CLG members in future meetings, and in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan.

Slide 5: Create and Protect

15. The design will create strong permanent edges/fringes for the new and existing communities in order to define the extent of the built area and protect the Fosse Common and prevent unsuitable future development in perpetuity.
16. By defining the extent of built form in the design process now, it will enable the Fosse Common to be protected.

Slides 6 & 7: The Function of Fosse Common & Primary Functions

17. The Fosse Common's function is to maintain separation between villages, protect key views and deliver usable public open spaces to benefit the entire Fosse family.
18. During the CLG site walks conducted in late summer 2022, it was highlighted that conserving key views was an important concern in relation to any potential future development.
19. The four pictured Fosse Common functions were explained in further depth, as well as the reasons behind each:

1) The Meadows –Resolving existing flooding issues is a critical challenge that the proposed new settlements will strive to address with the Fosse Common helping to collect and hold back excess rain/flood water from existing homes and settlements. The proposed position of the meadows is in the site's lowest lying land.

2) Central Park – The park is proposed as a place to meet and, more significantly, socialise for people from both the new and existing villages. The park will be sited on the highest ground possible to support views of the surrounding landscape and villages.

3) Sports Hub – The Fosse Common concept allows for the addition of significant sporting facilities, changing facilities and multiple sports pitches. The popularity of

CLG 5 Minutes

Stoney Stanton's existing recreational ground was noted and should be respected, not duplicated.

4) Secondary school –10 hectares have been estimated for the provision of a 9-form entry secondary school, of which 8 hectares will be green space. If the school is provided in this place, it would help the space to be formalised and should not be overdeveloped.

Slide 8: Fosse Central Park

20. The central park's functions were outlined: a place to meet every day, once a week, or once a month; a location to organise community events; and a place for all ages to play.

Slide 9: Fosse Sports hub

21. The sports hub will help create social cohesion, allowing existing and new residents to mingle.
22. The development of multipurpose facilities was suggested, and it was asked what the local community might benefit from, such as all-weather pitches or changing rooms.
23. The sports hub delivers a single maintained environment and the potential to share the space with the school would maximise value and ease of maintenance, avoiding the requirement for the parish or a management company to be responsible for maintenance of multiple pitches in disparate locations as has been problematic elsewhere, where the poorest plots have been designated for sports pitches based on development priorities, not placemaking.

Slide 10: Fosse Secondary School

24. Following meetings with the educational authority, a 9-Form Secondary School with 4-forms designated for existing local residents is being proposed.
25. DBW reiterated that this early planning responded directly to feedback received during previous CLG meetings regarding the secondary school, specifically concerns that a new secondary school would only serve new residents and not existing residents.
26. It was suggested that the school sports hall and pitches be made available to the public, putting the school at the heart of the community and creating synergy with the sports hub.

Slide 11: Fosse Meadows

27. DS noted the project team is aware that the 'Fosse Meadows' already exists elsewhere and that an alternative name should be identified.

CLG 5 Minutes

28. The function of the meadows was explained as providing wildlife and biodiversity gains, providing flood solutions and creating leisure opportunities, with illustrative examples displayed on the slide.

Slide 12: Joining All the Pieces Together

29. Further information was provided with regard to joining the Fosse Common to the surrounding villages and promoting active travel through the creation of 'greenways' to connect everything together.
30. It was noted that the plan outlined the existing highway network as well as possible footpaths and cycleways, and it was noted that certain Public Rights Of Way already exist.

Slide 13: Fosse Common: Extending the Concept

31. The various potential uses of green corridors were detailed, including orchards, community allotments, wildlife corridors, and a community farm.

Slide 14: Walkable Neighbourhood

32. The concept of the 20-minute neighbourhood was explained, with the goal of creating a walkable neighbourhood with vital facilities within a 20-minute walk.
33. Garden City Principles, the National Design Code, and the New Model Design Code will all be incorporated into the design brief.

Slide 15: Creating Social Cohesion

34. The illustrative walking distances between proposed new facilities were highlighted and explained in further detail, with the intention of providing all key community facilities within a 10-minute walk for new residents and 20 minutes for some existing village residents.
35. It was noted that key facilities would be delivered as early as possible in the neighbourhood centre.

Slide 16: Type of housing

36. The suggested range of densities for the new Fosse Villages was outlined.
37. It was noted that the standard housebuilder 'norm' was within the 30-45 dwellings per hectare (dph) range, which often produces a monoculture.
38. By varying the range of development between 20 dph and 60 dph with an increase in density at the neighbourhood centres, this would provide variety as opposed to one homogenous housing estate.

Slides 17 & 18 Developing the Brief...assuming that it is 4,000-5,000 homes

CLG 5 Minutes

39. DS provided an overview of the available space for the built environment as well as natural elements.
40. In terms of the built environment, it was indicated that 120 hectares of the total 290 would be dedicated to dwellings and streetscape, with around 30 hectares dedicated to private gardens.
41. The infrastructure required would cover around 45 hectares, with approximately 15 hectares dedicated to education, 15 hectares to engineering, 10 hectares dedicated to employment, such as barns or studios, and 5 hectares dedicated to the neighbourhood and local centres, such as health and retail provision.
42. In terms of natural environment features, it was noted that there is an LPA policy regarding public open space. Blaby District Council policy requires around 40 to 50 hectares of public open space, which the project team intends to provide significantly more than.

Slide 19: We have 290 hectares 'on-site'...how 'green' should/could it be?

43. The feedback from the October 2021 workshops suggested that the project team aim for the use of the Town and Country Planning Association's (TCPA) 'Garden City Principles' with TCPA requirements to achieve their 'Garden City Principles' based on a 50:50 split between the developable area (built environment) and green infrastructure.
44. Although the proposed settlement is not intended to be a garden town, the ideas can be applied to the design, with a 50:50 split between built and green space.
45. The projected built environment levels would encompass 135 hectares, with green infrastructure covering a total of 155 hectares. It was noted that while 30 hectares were projected for private gardens and amenity area, future residents could choose to pave over their gardens and therefore this must be considered in the calculations.
46. The 50:50 split is thus achievable, and 4,000-5,000 homes could be split across three new communities with significant areas of green space in and between them to respect the rural nature of the existing area and provide a desirable place to live.
47. DS emphasised that the actual housing numbers will be established by Blaby District Council's Local Plan, which is still progressing.

Questions from CLG members

48. CB questioned whether the width of the corridors was fixed or protected.
49. DS noted that they would be protected.
50. CB questioned how a private garden could be considered a publicly beneficial green area when it only benefits the individual family.

CLG 5 Minutes

51. DS answered regarding biodiversity, individual wellbeing and drainage/rainfall capture.
52. KF confirmed the existence of private versus public policy requirements.
53. It was suggested that the 30-hectare figure encompassing private gardens was inserted to shift figures in order to achieve to 50:50 split.
54. KF also stated that flood risk assessments take into account urban creep in terms of garden space.
55. EB raised the possibility of garden design variances, such as hedges and other fences.
56. DS stated that the design brief can require the inclusion of hedges for example, on selective street frontages. It was noted that future Reserved Matters applications could potentially erode quality and it is therefore critically important to set a clear design brief/code as early as possible.
57. SS asked if the site boundary had been extended.
58. DS stated that the site boundary had not been extended and the plan shown was purely conceptual to illustrate wider local benefits of the green corridors.
59. SB enquired about the proposed secondary school and the number of pupils per form.
60. KF confirmed there would be approximately 30 pupils per form.
61. KF highlighted that the project team has been in ongoing conversations with Leicestershire County Council, which has stated that a 9-form entry school would be appropriate here.
62. Discussions between the education authority and the project's appointed education consultant are also ongoing.
63. SB inquired as to how much room would be made available for primary schools.
64. DS stated that primary schools typically require 2/3 hectares of space, with the possibility of including one in each new village.
65. SB asked whether this would lead to an increase in density or whether the schools were already accounted for?
66. DS confirmed that they were considered in the 15-hectare measurement
67. BR enquired whether the proposed primary schools also took into account current inhabitants, noting that both Stoney Stanton and Sapcote primary schools were oversubscribed.

CLG 5 Minutes

68. KF acknowledged that discussions on capacity had so far focused on new residents, with the expectation of two or three-form entry primary schools. It was agreed that the project team would investigate this further with the education consultant and provide further information to CLG members once received. A response is provided below.

Following confirmation that 4FE of the 9FE being made available by the new proposed secondary school would be for existing residents, a query was raised asking whether there would be any similar provision for existing residents within the new primary school. We have checked with our education consultant and can confirm that this is not the case at primary level.

The reason for the 4FE of secondary education being allotted to existing residents of Stoney Stanton, Sapcote and surrounding villages has to do with the fact that the current secondary school provision requires pupils to travel out of the local area to attend schools much further afield. Leicestershire County feel it is a better option to incorporate new provision over and above what the proposed development site alone requires, to enable existing residents to access a school closer to them. Essentially, providing a new bigger secondary school on our site is a better option than expanding secondary schools further away, which would be the alternative option.

At primary level, the strategic development is expected to generate the need for 7 FE, which the Consortium of developers is proposing to provide through 2-3 new primary schools. All the local schools have been assessed in terms of their capacity, and whilst Manorfield is full, there are 142 spare primary school places in the wider area. This means that Leicestershire County will require us to provide sufficient primary school places generated by the proposed new development only. I appreciate you may still have concerns over the timing of the delivery of the primary school, in the context of Manorfield being at capacity.

The Consortium will work closely with LCC Education to ensure as early delivery of the first Primary School is feasible, and that there are measures put in place to be able to accommodate the first tranche of pupils that will be living on the site prior to the first school's delivery. This may include temporary accommodation on an existing school until the facility is complete and the pupils can be transferred into the new accommodation.

In terms of providing capacity for the wider area, the Consortium has an obligation to the pupils that will be living on the development site to ensure that they have Primary School infrastructure provision within walking distance. There is a balancing act to ensure that sufficient provision, and not over-provision, is provided, as the latter impacts school's ability to fund themselves in the long term and remain sustainable. The Consortium will therefore work closely with LCC to ensure that the appropriate level of provision is delivered, in the right places, and at appropriate junctures. If there is capacity at the new schools during the admissions window, this can be utilised by pupils from the wider area who apply within the appropriate timeframe.

69. BR stated that new schools within walking distance are highly desirable and advantageous, which would reduce current travel times and environmental impacts.

CLG 5 Minutes

- 70. SB questioned whether future considerations for village expansion will be considered in relation to the provision for primary schools.
- 71. DS mentioned that space would be available for future school extensions and would be subject to legal and planning restrictions.

Breakout table discussions

- 72. CLG members were divided into smaller groups, and each table was given a copy of the slide deck to annotate with key thoughts, suggestions and concerns relating to the presentation.
- 73. The following section summarises key comments and questions raised by theme for each slide.

Topic	Theme	Summary of feedback
Fosse Common Concept	Phasing	It was highlighted that phasing would be critical to the delivery of the new settlement.
Fosse Meadows	Blue infrastructure	It was suggested that the attenuation ponds become part of the landscape and not just for functional purposes. Members suggested that water features should be included as part of the meadows.
	Play spaces	It was felt that small play areas should be integrated throughout the meadows.
	Meadow area	Members suggested that the meadows area be maximised and Burbage Common be visited as an example of how this could look.
	Mental wellbeing	It was suggested the mental wellbeing of new and existing residents be considered.
Create and Protect	Energy	It was asked where energy would be provided from.
	Noise pollution	Members asked whether traffic noise from the motorway had been considered.
	Landscaping	It was suggested that landscaping should be natural rather than “developer styled”.
The Function of Fosse Common	Uses	Members suggested dedicated dog walking areas be provided to keep dogs off pitches. Potential activities, such as Park Run, were suggested.
	Public transport	The importance of good public transport provision was highlighted.
	Leisure facilities	It was highlighted that leisure facilities should be provided for all age groups
	Accessibility	Members asked how accessible green spaces would be.
Fosse Common Primary Functions	Flooding	The proposed flooding mitigation was queried
	Local benefits	It was questioned whether offsite contributions would be made to benefit existing villages e.g. Aston Flamville.

	Local context	Members asked whether the design of the new homes would be in keeping with local villages.
	Dual-use facilities	It was suggested that facilities be multipurpose and for community use.
	Parking	It was requested that on-road parking be minimised and school parking considered.
Fosse Central Park	Green space	It was questioned what quantity of the proposed green space flood plains would take up.
	Local examples	It was suggested that other local green space provision e.g., Argents Mead could not compare to the existing green fields.
Fosse Sports Hub	Pitches	It was questioned if there was a projected pitch type proposed for the sports hub.
	Sports provision	A number of different sports were suggested which could be provided in the sports hub including bowls, croquet, football, netball, rounders and hockey.
	Facilities	It was noted that different sports would have different spatial requirements for changing rooms and kit storage etc.
	Maintenance	It was highlighted that individual clubs often cannot afford to maintain changing rooms. Members asked who would manage the sports provision and whether this would fall on parishes to maintain.
	Leisure centre	The principle of providing a leisure centre on site was supported and the delivery of multi-use facilities.
Fosse Secondary School	Phasing	It was questioned whether the school would be built in phases and how big it would be.
	SEN provision	Members asked whether SEN provision had been considered.
	Sixth form	It was questioned whether the secondary school would include sixth form provision.
Fosse Villages	Phasing	It was queried how the delivery of new villages would be phased.

	Wildlife	Members asked whether existing wildlife had been considered and what would be done to protect and maximise biodiversity.
	Noise pollution	It was questioned how noise pollution would be mitigated.
	Existing villages	Members asked what benefits would be provided to existing villages.
	New villages	It was queried whether new parishes would be created and whether the new development would resemble the images displayed in the presentation. Members asked whether the villages would be self-contained.
Joining All the Pieces Together	Footpaths	Members suggested that high quality footpaths and cycleways with lighting be provided to encourage active travel, particularly to local schools, all year round. Shared pathways were suggested.
	Phasing	It was questioned how long construction would take and whether it would be phased.
	Noise pollution	Noise pollution from the M69 was highlighted and it was asked how this would be mitigated. Some members requested that noise bunds not be considered as this would deflect noise from the motorway to Elmesthorpe and surrounding villages to the west.
	Traffic	It was questioned how the surrounding road system would cope with additional cars on the surrounding road network.
	Separation	Members asked what guarantees would be made to ensure the separation between villages and protect green areas.
Fosse Common: Extending the Concept	Sports facilities	It was suggested that the local need for sports facilities should be assessed.
	Construction traffic	The proposed construction access roads were queried and whether there would be dedicated slip roads.
	HNRFI	Members stated the importance of the Fosse Common and provision of common green space, particularly if the HNRFI proceeded.
	Allotments	It was suggested that allotments would be an eyesore if visible and should be shielded behind hedges.

	Secondary school	The proposed position of the secondary school was questioned, and it was suggested that this would exacerbate flooding on the edge of Sapcote. Others suggested that the secondary school should be placed in one of the built-up areas and not the Fosse Common area.
	Traffic	It was questioned where people would work and highlighted that residents commuting to Leicester would increase traffic.
Creating Social Cohesion	Employment uses	Members questioned what types of employment would be provided on site and where employment uses would be located. It was questioned whether commitments would be made to ensure Doctors and teachers would be employed.
	Landscaping	It was suggested that landscaping including trees and hedge planting in neighbourhood centres would be desirable.
	Sports hub	Members stated that the Memorial Fields facilities should be improved through further investment and the proposed sports hub made smaller.
	Education provision	It was questioned whether early years provision would be provided. Members asked whether existing residents would be considered with regard to primary school provision, noting that Sapcote and Stoney Stanton primary schools were oversubscribed. It was suggested that the school facilities be made publicly available. One member asked for further information regarding education provision to be added to the project website
	Neighbourhood centre	Several amenities were proposed for the neighbourhood centre including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multifaith centre • Shops • Pubs • Community hall/hub • Post office

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GP surgeries • Dentist • Defibrillators in every village
Type of Housing	Affordable housing	It was queried what level of affordable housing will be provided.
	Density	Members asked whether the dwelling per hectare figure could be provided for existing villages to compare figures to the proposed development.
	Quantity	It was asked how many new homes would be provided in each village.
	Housing types	It was questioned what types of housing would be delivered and requested that new homes be built to a maximum height of three storeys. Members requested that flats not be included which would not complement the local context.
	Boundary treatment	It was requested that boundary hedges be planted between homes.
	Parking provision	The level of car parking provision was queried and it was asked whether EV charging provision would be incorporated.
Developing the Brief...assuming that it is 4,000-5,000 homes	Employment	It was queried where the new residents would work.
	Design of attenuation pond	Members suggested the design of the pond be enshrined within the design code, particularly in relation to safety.
We have 290 hectares 'on-site'...how 'green' should/could it be?	Crematorium/burial provision	It was questioned whether crematorium/natural burial gardens had been considered.
	Retirement	Members asked whether retirement/care provision would be considered and if so, where this would be located.