
From: f
Sent: 01 February 2019 14:25
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan modifications.

This Message originated outside your organization.

Page 13. I agree that Foxton allocation should be now zero. We have already a substantial allocation in our NDP.

f

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

To localplan@harborough.gov.uk

Comments ref. Lutterworth

The underpinning principle governing all deliberations concerning the expansion of Lutterworth, and indeed any settlement, should be the quality of life and well-being of its residents, both those here already and those to come.

- Lutterworth is already blighted by intolerable air and noise pollution produced by ever increasing traffic and consequent congestion. (Pol L1)
- A spine road running parallel to the M1 would increase and intensify levels of air and noise pollution within greater Lutterworth. (Pol L1)
- The local plan aims to create a fully integrated expanded Lutterworth. A spine road would create separation and division. Far better would be a relief road swinging round the eastern border of Lutterworth East, thus helping to encircle greater Lutterworth by adding to the existing perimeter roads. (Pol L1)
- Expansion of Magna Park will increase traffic. Any further construction of distribution warehouses should be kept strictly within the bounds of Magna Park. (Pol BE2)
- It is difficult to imagine any reconfiguration of the Whittle roundabout which would be capable of handling the increasing volumes of traffic in all directions. Perhaps a much more radical solution is needed. (Pol BE2)
- The aeroplane model on the Whittle roundabout has become iconic and must remain at the gateway to Lutterworth. (Pol BE2)
- No measures should be taken which would increase the risk of flooding by the River Swift in Lutterworth.

The local plan aims for “the protection of the quality and diversity of the District’s natural and historic environment”. It is to be hoped that the welfare of the human inhabitants of Lutterworth is given at least as much priority and importance as the strategic interests of commercial development and passing traffic.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2019 19:09
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

As a Lutterworth resident for over 20 years, please note that I wholly concur with the objections and points made by Lutterworth Town Council with regard to the Local Plan 2011-2031.

- We do *not* need more warehousing abutting Lutterworth town (it should be retained adjacent to the Magna Park development)
- We need more social housing
- We need infra-structure for Lutterworth East development to be in place *before* houses: roads, schools, doctor's surgery, etc.
- Spine road needs to be fully-functioning relief road – we cannot have more traffic coming down Lutterworth High Street (pollution levels are illegal already and the size and volume of commercial vehicles is, at times, terrifying)

Yours faithfully



Virus-free. www.avast.com

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 10:52
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

We need a by pass urgently to take the heavy polluting traffic away from Lutterworth town This could be achieved by creating a

Motorway junction on A4304 this will help ease the very high pollution levels The Leicester road will become gridlocked once the new housing and warehousing have become established it is very bad now

The risk injury from heavy lorises especially I the centre of town at he greyhound is extremely high Please consider the health especially the young and the elderly

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 10:56
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Local Plan

Observations :

Lutterworth. Concern exists over the seriousness over delivering a solution to a current unaddressed problem over transport within Lutterworth.

1. The small, former, market town has been all but transformed into a near grid-locked parking zone with traffic grinding its way up /down a relatively short but steep valley side to enter /exit the centre. The process has been materially exacerbated by larger vehicles simply being unable to efficiently navigate the small, steep roads with 3 sets of traffic lights within 100 meters.
2. Pollution. This is visible as well as capable of being sensed. It should be a requirement that a proper independent and thorough assessment of the CURRENT pollutants along the main north south route be conducted prior to deciding on minor adjustments elsewhere. The current Plan will exacerbate the current dysfunctional arrangements. There is arguably a case for closing the centre of Lutterworth completely to traffic as its size is simply not fit for the purpose planned. This will probably require too demanding a thought process.
3. Whatever previous planning decisions were taken in connection with Lutterworth have proven to be inadequate. It is questioned as to why confidence should be placed now in the current arrangements.
4. A significant number of housing units close to the Centre have no facilities for off road parking. This has now transformed various side roads into increasingly dangerous unofficial one-way routes and slalom courses.

Leisure

1. Concern is raised over the previous policy (current status unknown) of the Council to seek to "invest" over £20 million in a Market Harborough (MH) Leisure centre renewal arrangement whilst leaving the other only Council facility in the District -Lutterworth (L) largely unchanged. This despite the fact that :-
 - a. The former is practically inaccessible to the majority of the population.
 - b. The current site at MH is perfectly adequate for purpose and provides a superior range of facilities than that at L.
 - c. The proposed new investment would have been financed primarily by a Build Operate and Transfer mechanism which is economically inefficient and incentivises sub-optimal allocation of resources.
 - d. The process only in practice considered rewards to MH residents and "kicked the can" far down the road seeking to condemn the L Centre to a 20 year plus future of operational and financial

constraint within a contract whose sole purpose would have been to transfer operating surpluses from L to assist in the grandiose expense incurred for the MH project.

sincerely

Sent from Outlook

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 11:39
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Local Plan 2011-2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

From

I wish to associate myself enthusiastically with the suggestion that emerged from the consultation in Lutterworth, which I copy below.

In addition, I would like to draw attention to the need for a commitment on the provision of facilities for social activities and for worship.

Yours,

Quotation begins:

Lutterworth is an Air Quality Management Area, yet nothing is being done to **reduce** pollution. Indeed the plan suggests that as long as the **pollution increase** is no more than a moderate increase, this is all OK! Surely this is an ideal opportunity to improve matters, not make them worse?

At the meetings, we identified a solution.

Lutterworth needs a by-pass, but we won't be given one. So, how about this...

1) Don't build the new bridge over the motorway on the Spine Road. Instead, extend the Spine Road up to Ullesthorpe Road (the road from Gilmorton to Ullesthorpe). There is a motorway bridge already in existence that is designed for car use, and it means that any traffic going north from the new estate can do so without touching the populated part of Leicester Road.

2) Between Dunton Bassett and Countesthorpe there is a motorway bridge. Convert that, by adding slip roads, into M1 Junction 20a. All through traffic that is coming from the Leicester area to travel through Lutterworth to get to M1 Junction 20 would then be diverted on to the motorway at 20a instead.

3) Back towards Lutterworth, just after the quarry, de-classify the A426 and turn it in to the B426. At this point apply a 7.5 tonne weight limit (except for access). This will then make it illegal for HGV traffic travelling through Lutterworth to do so, but will allow such traffic if it's destination is inside Lutterworth.

4) Put a similar weight restriction on the Leicester Road at the Whittle Roundabout to protect the town from the South.

In this way

- Lutterworth is protected with a by-pass (the M1) in a way that is far cheaper and far more environmentally friendly than a new road built for the purpose.
- Traffic levels in Lutterworth reduce significantly

- An additional bridge over the M1 doesn't have to be built.
- Air Pollution levels, and noise levels, in Lutterworth (old and new) would be reduced.
- We can start to look at how we then improve the centre of Lutterworth for shoppers, visitors, and residents alike, all without the thought of 44 tonne trucks and streams of cars running through the centre just to get from one end to the other without stopping and bringing some benefit.

This won't solve all of the problems - we would still have a car parking issue. But if that was our main problem, I guess we'd be a lot happier !

As far as the industry on the new development is concerned? Well, remove the warehousing as it isn't needed and contravenes Policy BE2. Use that area to re-locate the offices and light industry - there is more than enough room. Also, if Aldi was there as well, that would remove the potential traffic issues north of the Whittle Roundabout, and could actually reduce traffic movements overall..

Quotation ends.

From:
Sent: 04 February 2019 17:06
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan Consultation

This Message originated outside your organization.

#x3fb3ce0495934a23b4c70ed7fda80d94 #x047b60e0e47b4cd5b827e768a8070080 p.MsoNoSpacing{margin:0cm 0cm 0.0001pt; font-size:11pt; font-family:Calibri,sans-serif; }
#x3fb3ce0495934a23b4c70ed7fda80d94{ font-family:'Segoe UI'; font-size:12pt;
}#x047b60e0e47b4cd5b827e768a8070080 p.MsoNoSpacing {margin: 0cm 0cm 0.0001pt; font-size: 11pt; font-family: Calibri, sans-serif;}

Dear Sirs,

I read "FINAL_Schedule_of_Proposed_Modifications_v15___AS_PUBLISHED_14.01.19.pdf" with considerable interest and would like to make these comments. Cross references are to the document, and "EE" represents "Explanation (Extract)"

- Two huge problems affect Lutterworth are coupled. They are:
 - o Traffic Congestion on the A426
 - o [EE-15.2.6] Air Quality in the AQMA.
- The remarks in the document to the effect that the spine road will take some of the traffic away from the centre of Lutterworth are welcome. However this statement needs to be reinforced to say that all through traffic will be diverted.
- [EE15.2.4] It seems that the spine road itself could divide the two parts of Lutterworth. This should be eliminated by enhancing the spine road to a bypass to the East of the new development so that it is a bypass for the whole of Lutterworth.
- [MM36-m, EE-15.2.6] The new bypass should be implemented early in the project to
 - o Ameliorate the congestion, pollution and noise as soon as possible
 - o Facilitate access to the site for construction traffic.
- [MM36-r-ii] The change to the plans for the Whittle Memorial Roundabout to enhance it to a larger roundabout is most welcome but a clause is needed to the effect that the memorial aircraft is to be retained and protected during the work.
- [MM36-v] The flood reduction works need to ensure that not only does the project not make flooding worse, but that flooding in the vicinity of the bridge on the A426 is reduced.

- [MM36-y, EE-15.2.24] **No** adverse impact on the Lutterworth AQMA would be acceptable.
This clause needs to be reworded.

Yours faithfully,

.....

—

—

—

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 13:29
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

With reference to the above , I have been a resident of Lutterworth for the past years and over recent years I have been extremely disappointed with the way our town has been swamped with new housing developments with no thought given to the impact on doctors, dentists, schools, roads, wildlife, pollution .The list is endless !!!!! I realise that even though the general consent to locals is disgust and horror at being let down, this has now happened and moving house is the only option. !!!!

I am now aware of further disappointing plans for Lutterworth East - my concerns are as follows

Impact on traffic and congestion

Impact on current residents whilst this concrete jungle is being constructed

Impact on pollution

Impact on wildlife

Impact on other local amenities that are already stretched

Impact on Lutterworth and surrounding villages being a nice place to live especially Misterton

I feel that Harborough District council want us

to pay our council tax etc but no thought is given to the quality of life given to people that live in this area .

It makes me wonder where these planners live !!! Do they live in Lutterworth ?

,
As you can see I am very very unhappy and let down by HDC and would welcome your reply .

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:23
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local plan for Lutterworth area.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to support the views and proposals put forward Lutterworth Town Council. I have always lived and worked in Lutterworth and now have a young family.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2019 21:43
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Hello all at Harborough Council

My name is [REDACTED] I'm [REDACTED] years old and I've been a resident of Lutterworth since I was born. As far as I'm concerned Lutterworth has always been and should still be a market town...unfortunately this isn't the case anymore. I've noticed over the last 5 years or so all the extra housing and developments in my town and am aware of the plans for Lutterworth East! My concerns are as follows

- Lutterworth town centre isn't big enough to cope with the current level of housing/residence in the town as it is...let alone with anymore??
- quite often now I unfortunately try to avoid the town centre because it's just too busy
- we don't have enough shops/ supermarkets/ doctors/ facilities or parking
- with the amount of people that now live here the schools are over populated as it is even without the extra 700 plus homes that have been recently built on Coventry road, Leicester road, Bill Crane Way and now unfortunately at the end of Brookfield Way
- we no longer have any police within the town and given the population we now have...this seems odd?
- a couple of years ago you could leave for work in the morning and come back in the evening and the traffic wouldn't be an issue...it definitely is now...getting in and out of Lutterworth at these times is a nightmare
- we have some good shops and facilities in the town but how are people supposed to enjoy them or come to visit the town when all they see is traffic and articulated lorries passing by????
- if and more than likely when Lutterworth East is built all of these things will become even worse and it's just sad
- why is an industrial site being planned to be constructed next to the motorway when Magna Park is big enough as it is and has already used up their quota of square meterage?
- why is it that every piece of Greenery we have in or around the town gets snapped up to be built on...even if thousands of people object?
- if Lutterworth East is built then greater access and exits must be provided by the council to ease the ever increasing congestion

- if another junction up the m1 in between lutterworth and fosse park was added (possibly somewhere in between dunton bassett and Cosby/ countesthorpe?) this would stop all the traffic that currently flows through lutterworth to the m1 from all the towns/villages south of fosse park and give them more access to the motorway and help lutterworth massively. It would also mean a greater number of lorries can avoid the town unless they actually need to be in the town
- why constuct a new Aldi next to aeroplane island by the elms when it would surely make more sense to have it in or next to the new lutterworth east development? This would also help the traffic and congestion issue in the town
- I'm aware that the council have a quota of new builds to meet from the government, although this all seems to be above and beyond what ms required, especially without helping the infrastructure of the town
- I know a lot of current residence in lutterworth feel the same way as I do and regrettably no longer want to live there...which is such as shame because the lutterworth I know and grew up in was a brilliant little town... sadly no longer!!!!!!!

If you have any issues or comments regarding any of my concerns please feel free to reply, I would welcome a response

Kind regards



Sent from my iPhone

From: -
Sent: 25 February 2019 17:50
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan - 2011-2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir/Madam

I write reference to the above local plan.

I would like to make the following pertinent points:-

1. The long mentioned north south by pass in order to avoid the Leicester Road and Town centre being completely over run by traffic. A by pass or Easter relief road should be provided instead of a spine road.
2. Pollution levels are already too high in the Town centre and would be further exacerbated by this proposal. also noise reduction and traffic reduction would also be beneficial.
3. Policy BE2 stipulates that the ONLY warehouse development that can take place is on or next to Magna Park - this proposal is against this policy. Lutterworth does not not need more warehousing; there has been an empty unit built and unoccupied for several months on the outskirts of the town, next to the M1 junction suggesting this is the case.
4. The Inspector stated that development to the North side MUST NOT stand between the existing and new Lutterworth developments - this proposal suggests it will.
5. There is no mention of Social Housing in this plan.
6. There is no mention of Secondary education facilities in this plan.
7. There is no mention on the impact on local nature reserves/population.

I would like my comments to be considered before this plan is taken further.

Many thanks

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 16:20
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough Local Plan 2011 - 2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

The plan provides for 700,000 sq mtrs of additional warehousing provision. Do we really need all this warehousing when there are empty warehouses in existence on Magna Park and immediately adjacent to J20 of the M1? Especially as there is massive development just up the road at the M69/A5 junction just before the "Hinckley Island" hotel and just down the road at DIRFT.

Additional development of the Magna Park site will generate increased road traffic - car traffic for the employees and HGV traffic servicing the warehouses. The road network can barely cope with existing Magna Park traffic let alone a "Magna Park" three times the size. At present the A5 is a useful relief road when either the M1 or the M6 is closed (road traffic accidents, police incidents etc). This may not be possible if the A5 is already congested with "Magna Park" traffic. Additionally, the A426 between Lutterworth and the M6 junction 1 at Rugby already resembles a car park during the morning and afternoon peak traffic periods.

What is the sense of developing additional road serviced warehousing at Magna Park when there is ample scope to extend rail serviced warehousing just down the road at DIRFT?

Additionally questions need to be asked regarding environmental issues, including noise, pollution, air quality, loss of amenity, loss of habitat for wild life and visual impact. An enormously enlarged Magna Park will dominate the landscape to the detriment of village life - particularly in Ullesthorpe.

Questions also need to be asked regarding employment matters. How many new jobs will be created by the Magna Park development? Are they "proper" quality jobs or low grade jobs paid at the minimum wage? Where are the employees working at the moment? Are they working and/or living in the local area or will they be commuting in to the local area from afar - and requiring good transport connections and/or reliable and affordable public transport? What impact will their commute have on traffic congestion, noise, pollution, air quality?

Turning now to the proposal for additional warehousing on land adjacent to the eastern side of J20 of the M1. I thought that policy BE2 provided for a limit of 700,000 sq mtrs of development of land adjacent to Magna Park or in its immediate vicinity. The intended development adjacent to J20 of the M1 does not satisfy this criteria. In addition, there are already sufficient available empty warehouses without building any more. The A4304 from Lutterworth to Walcote and through to Market Harborough already provides a natural southern boundary to Lutterworth and district. I fear that this planned warehousing development would breach this boundary and become a thin end of a wedge. I would propose that any building of any kind is banned south of the A4304 for the foreseeable future.

With regard to the local plan and the proposals for the new housing development at Lutterworth East, it is currently proposed that the first new primary school will be built prior to the building of the 300th new house. Depending on the mix of affordable, social and other housing, it is probable that additional primary school facilities will be required long before then. On the basis that the existing primary schools in

Lutterworth are already at capacity it seems imperative that new, additional primary school provision is made by the very latest at the time the 100th house is built.

The local plan is very vague regarding secondary education provision. My understanding is that Lutterworth High School is currently full to capacity. If 2,500 houses or so are going to be built in due course in Lutterworth East, on the basis of just one 11 to 18 year old per household, that would suggest to me that at least one new secondary school will be required (of roughly comparable size to Lutterworth College). The local plan is woefully deficient in its explanations as to how this need will be satisfied.

The local plan currently provides for a "Spine Road" through the new Lutterworth East housing development. Whilst recognising that a service road will be required (similar to Greenacres Drive in Lutterworth) the local plan is missing a fundamental and essential opportunity to provide for an "Eastern Bypass". At present, Lutterworth town centre is clogged with through traffic travelling north towards Leicester and south towards the A5, the M1 J20 and the M6 J1 and Rugby. A lot of this traffic is HGV's with the resultant noise, congestion and air pollution. Currently someone trying to park in Church Street, Lutterworth can cause traffic chaos all the way down the High Street to Stoney Hollow and beyond or up the Leicester Road almost as far as Central Avenue. A solution to this problem may well be to ban parking in Church Street but a much better, long term solution would be to remove most, if not all, through traffic out of Lutterworth along an Eastern Bypass. If, however, there is no prospect of an Eastern Bypass, then the "Spine Road" needs to be built as an "A" road capable of taking HGV traffic, with the existing A426 declassified with traffic calming, weight restrictions or width restrictions so as to ensure that through traffic uses this new "A" road and not the "old" A426.

Tel: 01454 512345

26 February 2019

Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

Dear Sirs

Representation on Main Modifications, Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031, January 2019

I write to comment on the modifications put in place subsequent to the inspector's rejection of the original submission., in particular the Modification ref MM15: "BE2: Strategic Distribution".

The main objection was that the proposal to have 700,000 sqm of warehousing at Magna Park was not based on any evidenced need and it would appear that no further evidence of need is provided, merely this amount is still based on developers' applications. As HDC has already rejected one of the applications why is the amount this proposed still included in the plan?

The only evidence available suggests that a development of this size will result in an overprovision of warehousing in this area. Indeed, there is research showing that a development of this magnitude will provide approximately four times the calculated need for additional warehouse space to 2031.

The proposed development will not be linked to any form of rail transport and the government is not in favour of this type of development, preferring developments with railheads.

The pressure on the A5 at the current level of development is clear to see and this will be exacerbated further once the developments around Hinckley are complete. For those of us living near and travelling along the A5 it is hard to imagine how this will be tenable if more development is allowed.

It seems clear that HDC has done nothing to address the Inspector's concerns regarding evidenced need and that the Local Plan should be amended to reduce the requirement for 700,000sqm to an area that can be shown to be required following detailed, independent research.

Yours truly

—

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 16:23
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] The Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031 - Policy L1

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Attn of the Government Inspector

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Schedule of Main Modifications

I have spent some time considering the modifications to the above Local Plan and submit my thoughts, questions and concerns for your consideration.

Housing

The present proposal is for 2,750 houses to be built on the new development of which only 2,160 is required to meet housing requirements by 2031.

- Why does the Plan include the extra housing?

I can appreciate the need for additional housing but Lutterworth has and is experiencing large new housing estates being built on the north and north west of Lutterworth. Housing accommodation has increased enormously around Lutterworth during the last decade and to include housing which does not appear to be required by LCC's own admission, begs the question, 'why'?

Affordable and specialist housing is referred to but not social housing, which I believe was an original requirement. In order for our residents to be able to live locally, I feel that social housing is essential.

I am concerned about plots for "self-build". I see on a regular basis, empty, overgrown or half developed "self-build" plots in Canada and they become an eyesore and space for antisocial behaviour and vermin. Who will maintain any empty plots?

Schools

The additional existing housing, together with new housing developments around Lutterworth, will put an increased demand on existing schooling in Lutterworth.

- I understand that there are plans to build two Primary Schools but that none will be built until the completion of the 300th house. If there are very few or no spare places available at present, due to the increase in built houses, how will children from these 300 properties be accommodated in the two primary schools in Lutterworth, which

also take children from surrounding villages? Will the new residents take precedence over village children? Will it lead to larger classes or accommodation in portacabins?

- There is no clear plan for Secondary education, only a statement that money would be made available, if necessary, to build another school. This does not seem to be a firm commitment and by the time the Borough decides it is 'necessary', planning permission and building will take time, leaving Secondary school age children with the possibility of larger classes and/or temporary accommodation.
- The existing pressure around schools in Lutterworth at the beginning and end of the school day, will doubtless be even worse. Buses queuing and parents parking makes passing the schools at these times slow and difficult. More parked cars and buses queuing will greatly exacerbate the problem. I anticipate that this will increase the number of buses travelling along [redacted], which is too narrow to accommodate buses easily. My house on [redacted] shakes when they pass and cracks have appeared in my property, which will no doubt worsen with more buses using this route, a route which has only been used during the last few years. As the road was not built for buses, neighbours further along the road complain that the kerbs and pavements are regularly damaged as buses have to mount the kerb to pass oncoming vehicles or parked cars. Passing the Grammar School is particularly difficult as many youngsters are able to drive themselves and park along towards the Bitteswell Road end. I avoid this area during term times.

Other facilities

With the potential increase in population of 5,000 plus residents, in addition to the increase in population due to the extensive creation of additional housing around Lutterworth, this will and is putting a strain on existing facilities. I am not sure that the Plan takes into consideration, the use by residents of local villages, of Lutterworth's facilities.

I do not see any provision for the building in east Lutterworth of additional

- Doctors' surgery
- Community hall and sports facilities
- Cafe/restaurant/public house
- Supermarket/shops
- Cemetery

There are times when it is extremely difficult to park at Morrisons, usually on a Thursday, pension and market day. Cars queue to park, sometimes onto Bitteswell Road. Parking at Morrisons and Waitrose is particularly bad in the run-up to Public Holidays such as Christmas and Easter. A supermarket and shops in the new development would help to ease this. Again, it is not just Lutterworth residents who use the shops.

Lack of another doctors' surgery will put pressure on the two existing practices, which also take non Lutterworth residents, making it more difficult to get a timely appointment.

I doubt that the church at Misterton would be capable of accommodating many new parishioners. There is very little parking and the churchyard looks fairly full already and could not take many burials.

All of the residents of the new development would be driving into Lutterworth to access shops, post office, cafes, public houses, restaurants, etc etc, creating more pollution and parking problems.

Other forms of Transport

- Will there be any provision for bus services between the two halves of Lutterworth?
- Are there provisions for public footpaths and cycleways between Lutterworth East and West?

With regard to existing public footpaths, I am concerned that changing the routes of existing footpaths are designated to become 'permissive' footpaths. This concerns me, as 'permission' to use them can more easily be removed than the century's old established footpaths. They should remain as footpaths.

Roads

I understand that the Plan does not include provision for a by-pass which has long been discussed. Why has this been removed from the Plan?

- Lutterworth town has become a rat-run for traffic coming off the M1, Magna Park by-pass and A5/M6 via the A426. Despite the by-pass to Magna Park, many lorries use the High Street to get to Leicester instead of travelling down the A5 to the M69 junction.
- The High Street is not wide enough to take lorries passing each other where it narrows just past the Greyhound. Traffic is regularly brought to a stand-still as lorries wait to pass each other. This causes back-ups which go through the traffic lights on the corner of George Street, preventing traffic on the one-way system from exiting George Street to travel right, down the High Street. Traffic also builds up from the traffic lights, blocking access to Gilmorton Road. (This happened again, today, on my way to an appointment at the doctors' surgery as 5 lorries tried to pass each other.)
- It is also nerve-wracking to walk along the pavement on either side of this narrow part of the road as the draft from lorries makes you feel as though you are being pulled into the road. It is particularly frightening when two lorries try to pass as they come so close to the narrow footpath.
- The traffic also comes to a standstill further down the High Street, past the pelican crossing, as delivery vans block the road and lorries in particular, have to wait for a gap in the traffic. When the M1 is closed, Lutterworth almost becomes grid-locked and trying to get across from Station Road into Church Street at busy times is very difficult.
- Apart from the hold-ups, the air pollution when walking along the High Street is very noticeable.

I cannot see how the "spine road" is going to help alleviate the use by HGVs and other through traffic, of the A426 High Street/Leicester Road. It would appear to only enable an alternative access to the new development for the residents, office and light industry workers.

The Plan states that ‘traffic calming measures’ will be put in once the road is built. Whilst slowing traffic down, it is well known that these add to pollution as vehicles slow down and accelerate again.

Imposing a weight limit on the A426 through Lutterworth might be a solution but as soon as the M1 northbound is closed or stationary, traffic will automatically use the route through Lutterworth. The promised by-pass would alleviate this as well as provide a faster route for this traffic.

Should Gilmorton Road be closed to all but buses, pedestrians and cyclists, this will mean that elderly/frail/ill people will not be able to access the doctors’ surgery and Cottage Hospital and residents on Gilmorton Road, Boundary Road etc will only have one way in and out via Station Road, which is regularly blocked by stationary traffic on the High Street. If the closure is just outside Lutterworth, visiting Gilmorton, Kimcote, Walton etc will entail a much longer journey, adding to pollution and fuel costs.

The Whittle Roundabout is being re-developed – to cope with the extra traffic from and to Magna Park and extra traffic through Lutterworth. It would seem that it is taken as a given that there will be extra traffic through Lutterworth – especially without the promised by-pass.

There seems to be no proposal to minimise air pollution from traffic. Lutterworth is considered one of the most polluted areas to live in and yet it appears that Harborough District Council/LCC are happy that this will be allowed/sanctioned to increase further. This is likely to increase health problems, particularly amongst the very young and the elderly, putting yet more strain on the existing medical facilities.

We were promised a by-pass and I feel that this should be reinstated as the existing problems of hold-ups and pollution will only get worse. In addition to traffic travelling through Lutterworth to access the M1 and Magna Park by-pass, there will be an increase in the traffic which wishes to access Lutterworth east.

Non-residential developments

I understand that there is to be 25 acres of office and light industry development to the north of the new development. I believe that an instruction was given that this must not be placed between existing and new Lutterworth developments. Looking at the plan, it appears that it will be. I would like the original decision to be upheld.

- Is there a recognised demand for office accommodation and light industry development?
- What will be permitted on the light industry development?
- Employees will doubtless need somewhere to buy/have lunch which would support the proposal that shops/café/public house should also be included in the plan. The alternative is for even more people travelling into Lutterworth town centre for lunch.

The plan also indicates a development of 32 acres of new warehousing on the south side of the M1 – on the right-hand side leaving Lutterworth in the direction of Market Harborough.

- This appears to be in contravention of Policy BE2 which states that the only warehouse development that can take place is on or next to Magna Park.
- LCC admit that we do not need more warehousing but that this will generate money for them – not for Lutterworth.
- There is a large new warehouse between the Whittle roundabout and the M1 roundabout which has never been occupied.
- I understand that there are at least two warehouses on Magna Park which are vacant.
- There is a large new development of warehouses about to be erected adjacent to Magna Park on the other side of Mere Lane. These will be available for occupation.
- There is vacant warehousing at DIRFT
- There is vacant warehousing on the new development near Fosse Park.
- There is probably other vacant warehousing nearby
- More warehousing on this site will increase traffic to and from the site, causing the creation of two sets of traffic lights within a very short distance of each other and just past the M1 roundabout. I can foresee traffic queuing back on to the slip way as traffic is held by the lights.

I endorse the objections to the Plan by Lutterworth Councillors. Whilst they appreciate that the town needs to develop, they live in the area and are fully aware of the wider implications and difficulties these proposals will create. I feel they have the best interests of existing and future residents at heart.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments.

Yours faithfully

.....

.....

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

.

From:
Sent: 27 February 2019 11:24
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Cc:
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: Toxic air hits UK - with 1,845 places so polluted the air can kill you

This Message originated outside your organization.

POLICY L1

For the attention of Government Inspector

Dear Sir

This was released today and seems to confirm our fears and concerns.

The M1 was closed on Monday and traffic was backed up all down the High Street and around the whittle roundabout. All roads onto the roundabout were backed up.

As there are roadworks on Brookfield Way for the new development, the traffic was backed up onto the Magna Park bypass on and around the roundabout.

The same happened yesterday as the Cathorpe junction was closed and traffic diverted to the M1 and M6.

Mere Lane is also closed. The quickest route into Lutterworth from the A5 is to travel down the A5 and travel through Ullesthorpe.

This lovely old market town is no longer a pleasant place to live as people who do not live here are forced to drive through or around the town.

I am so concerned about the level of air pollution, noise pollution and road safety through and around Lutterworth caused by the increase in HGV and general traffic.

Please help us.

Yours faithfully

Sent from my Sony Xperia™ smartphone

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Toxic air hits UK - with 1,845 places so polluted the air can kill you

Sent: 27 Feb 2019 10:17 am

From:

To:  

Cc:

I thought that you would be interested in this story I found on MSN: Toxic air hits UK - with 1,845 places so polluted the air can kill you <http://a.msn.com/01/en-gb/BBU84Uo?ocid=se>

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:47
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth East Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

IanI have looked at this plan and can see no merit in it. I cannot imagine 2500 houses but I can see at the very least 5000 people. the population of Lutterworth is approximately 11,000 people, so we are increasing by half our population.

to the east of Lutterworth is farmland and villages there is no infrastructure such as shops and places of work to support this large rise in our population. As a consequence traffic will come west causing more congestion and pollution.

If Lutterworth is to be expanded it should be on the west side of the M1 where our industry warehouses shops and schools are situated and road systems are more able to support a rise in our population.

Sent by

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 21:37
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Plans for Lutterworth East and warehousing on the Walcote Road.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

I attended a meeting at Lutterworth Town Council Office on Saturday 23rd February.

I agree with our Town Council that we don't need 2,750 new houses. 1,260 would be enough.

BEFORE building commenced we would need new schools, not after 300 houses were built. Our junior schools are full.

There would need to be Doctor led surgery. A [redacted] at the meeting pointed out that there is already a shortage of Doctors in Lutterworth, patients have been attending Doctors surgeries in Broughton Astley, but these surgeries are going to insist Lutterworth patients use Lutterworth Surgeries. A nurse led surgery will not suffice.

The suggested Spine Road would not suffice. Two [redacted] at the meeting stated that lorry drivers would not turn off the A426 to use the Spine Road through the new estate as it would take longer. It was suggested that new slip roads be built on to the M1 north of Lutterworth and call it junction 20A.

Lutterworth Town Centre has far too much through traffic, the fumes in Market Street are terrible. I cross that road regularly, and I hold a tissue over my nose and mouth as the air is horrible.

I saw plans for more warehousing off the Walcote Road. There is no need for this, as a warehouse built on the other side of the road at Misterton has never been used, plus the land is good farming land.

If Lutterworth East is built close to The Rye Hills, we would lose a peaceful area where we and our forebears have always walked over the fields to Misterton. My [redacted] take my [redacted] along by the River Swift to enjoy the countryside and see the wildlife. Having houses overlooking the footpath would ruin our walks.

We should NOT have a travellers park as part of the plan,

I have lived in Lutterworth for over [redacted] years, [redacted] of those at my present address in [redacted] junction. I have seen traffic increase hugely in those years yet our Town is shrinking, cars are just passing through.

I also agree that Magna Park is big enough. Our countryside is being eaten up with warehouses.

Please reconsider these plans. I want [redacted] to have a pleasant town and countryside to grow up in.

Yours Sincerely

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy S7 - powered by Three

From: >
Sent: 09 February 2019 19:18
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Erection of Warehousing along the A5

This Message originated outside your organization.

I am writing to you regarding the planned destruction of valuable farmland and countryside to erect yet more warehousing that Lutterworth and surrounding areas do not need or want.

I like many others use this land on a weekly basis for horse riding, walking and enjoying the wide range of wildlife that inhabits this land.

I am already horrified at the vast expanse of land that has been destroyed and will be lost forever.

The cottages have already been demolished which leads local people to think that this is already a "done deal" as Gazely will not stop until they get what they want! And when they get what they want, they will want more!

HDC need to listen to the local people with whom this expansion will have a real life impact on on a daily basis.

The roads around and through Lutterworth are already at breaking point, more warehousing equals more traffic, with workers (mostly Eastern Europeans) traveling in from Leicester, Coventry and further afield.

More traffic means more pollution which is not fair on residents and the health of their children.

HDC why would you want to do this to the people that you are supposed to represent? and let a greedy company who do not care about local people (otherwise they would accept that we don't want this)to destroy what is important to the local community.

Please do the right thing and don't sell out to a company who only has their own interests at mind.

Regards

From: ..
Sent: 22 February 2019 17:18
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Council Local Plan 2011-2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

Hi

Having seen the above for the first time today and knowing that the close off day for comments is Tuesday 26 February I would make a few observations:

- the A426 road through Lutterworth is an ever increasing problem in that it is congested with HGV traffic which is not only a problem to pedestrians but also creates considerable air pollution.
- for all traffic heading south on the A426 if there was a bridge to take traffic over the M1 motorway this would have an immediate benefit to Lutterworth and its residents. If this was carried out there would also be a greater likelihood of the Lutterworth shops becoming more viable.
- the above comments are particularly relevant in the light of the population increase that is currently taking place let alone any impact of the proposed Lutterworth East may have.
- there is considerable warehousing already in Lutterworth with more yet to be constructed. Surely it is not necessary for more to be built on land adjacent to the eastern corner of the M1 junction 20.
- if the proposed scheme is approved surely there is a need for the likes of a church for the benefit of the incoming residents.

I trust these few simple points will be given consideration.

Yours

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 February 2019 10:55
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Local Plan 2011 - 2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

I am writing to object to a number of aspects of the Harborough District Local Plan 2011 - 2031

The major problem of the plan which needs resolving is the provision of local amenities and preserving the local environment as far as is possible. Whilst the proposed development of Lutterworth East will provide additional housing which is (theoretically) required surely that area does not need even more sheds (warehousing)? There is adequate warehousing already in existence or planned for the area around Magna Park. Besides being an unsightly intrusion into open countryside and generating much additional traffic the majority of the employment opportunities are such that they require only low grade skills. What is required though, and is of prime importance, is the provision of supporting services for the area. In particular the proposed housing developments will bring many more people to the area and new schools (both primary **and SECONDARY**) and **DOCTOR'S SURGERIES**. These should be developed **BEFORE** housing development takes place so that existing facilities in Lutterworth are not swamped by new residents to the detriment of those people already living in the area. Additional employment (on a smaller scale, appropriate to the area) which requires staff of a calibre above that for warehousing should be another major consideration

Lutterworth suffers from too much through traffic with poor air quality because of this. Although Lutterworth is an Air Quality Management Area there does not appear to be any provision in the plan to reduce this. The monthly statistics for air pollution on Harborough District Council's website show that the government set objectives are regularly exceeded for Lutterworth. There needs to be some means of ensuring that heavy goods traffic is moved away completely from Lutterworth and this needs to be rather more than a spine road which purely serves and new development.

Regards

—

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 February 2019 16:30
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Cc:
Subject: [EXTERNAL] HDC Local Plan Schedule of Main Amendments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear sir madam

Ref "HDC Local Plan Schedule of Main Amendments

Please can I ask what changes to improve Lutterworth town is all the new house building and possible building is bringing to the town, because I see a number of issues that have not been addressed by you the council

Plus points

1. More council tax paid (all about the money)

Negative point

1. A lot more people for the infrastructure to cope with i.e., schools, roads, car parks, etc.
2. Shortage of the schools , the schools are already failing
3. Roads the centre is too busy already
4. Carparks there is already a shortage and only 8 disabled spaces
5. Outer roads are now so busy you can't get around the town last week took me 32 mins to get from one side to the other
6. And the disturbance caused by the building and builders, the noise near our house is very bad.

I have 4 children, whose quality of life has already been reduced due to refusal to open the car park behind the leisure centre, the council refuse to open the car park which base is near that car park. I can rarely get into any spaces in the town and so my children are being prevented from visiting the town centre

So as you have more money where is it going, there is not enough parking in the town any more (council solution charge to park) your having a joke you still need more space!!
The road system is not coping there are traffic jams every day now

For the first time in my life I am thinking of moving away from Lutterworth, once a lovely little town, now a growing town, that has lost its family , friendly outlook, to the money grabbing council and government,

Please act and sort the problems out

Ps the roads round the new build are dangerous due to builder not clearing the mud they need to be cleaned ASAP

Please do not plan any more houses

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 13:00
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] objection

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear

I am a resident of Ullesthorpe, , and believe that Policy BE2 (an additional 700,000 square metres of land being allocated to warehousing development) is not sound, so vehemently object to its inclusion in the proposed revised town plan 2011- 2031.

As 700,000 sq m corresponds with the 3 planning applications to Harborough District council for additional warehousing development, this strongly suggests that the figure is not based on need, but demand..

As 2 of the applications have been passed , then the 380,000 sq m of land they require, should be deducted from the 700,000 sq m.

As Gazeley's application (15/01531) that coincides with the remaining 320,000 sq m , was rejected by HDC in January 2018 , then it raises the question of why this vast amount of land for warehousing, is still to be included in the local plan?

In fact, allowing 700,000 sq m for more warehousing will create a huge oversupply, as research shows that this almost quadruples Leicestershire's assessed need for additional warehouse space until 2031.

Furthermore , t he A5 already struggles to manage the traffic generated by Magna Park , and as more warehouses are currently underway along its length in the locality, (such as Hinckley Park, and the huge expansion at DIRFT), that will create even more commuter traffic and HGVs, then how could it cope if Magna Park is further expanded? Also how could HDC achieve its goal of improving the very bad air quality in Lutterworth , if more traffic was generated ?

The locality is already feeling the heavy impact from the huge warehouse currently under construction in Mere Lane , so further expansion of Magna Pak would engulf Bittesby and Ullesthorpe , and completely strip their rural nature . How ironic that only a few miles away is the sign " Welcome to Leicestershire : the heart of rural England."

Consequently, I urge you to remove clause BE2 from your proposed town plan.

Yours faithfully

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 09:47
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth East

This Message originated outside your organization.

Good morning

I wish to raise my concerns regarding the following points of the Lutterworth East development
1) warehouses to the south of the development. Are these really needed with Magna Park already under expansion and applying for more expansion. We need to inspire our children with good jobs in the future; having warehouses doesn't do this!

2) Money allocated to secondary schools are the completion of the 300 house. Surely this will put extra burden those schools which are already oversubscribed and have little room/space for expansion. Money should be given to schools as soon as the first house is developed.

3) Air quality is already poor in Lutterworth and the A426 is already gridlocked in the morning and evening rush hours. An alternative is needed otherwise the town centre will simply suffer and decline. Can a relief road be put it to alleviate the town centre and improve the air quality? Can a motorway junction be inserted north of Lutterworth which the A426 meets the M1?

Kind regards

Lutterworth Resident

From:
Sent: 16 February 2019 06:59
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Infrastructure

This Message originated outside your organization.

I agree with all the comments made by Lutterworth Town Council in respect of the infrastructure be put into place prior to any building taking place.

A relief road , in my opinion, is absolutely vital. As heavy goods vehicles are getting bigger, and can only just manage to stay in their lane, it's becoming increasingly dangerous for local motorists. I also think that residents should be able to use the town centre and not have to breathe in noxious fumes while doing so.

Schooling, Doctors Surgeries should obviously be provided in tandem with house building, as the existing ones would not be able to cope with hundreds more people needing to access them.

— , Lutterworth resident.

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 07:03
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL]

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Having read the proposals for Lutterworth East and subsequent proposals for Lutterworth Town itself I protest in the strongest possible terms regarding these proposals.
If Lutterworth is to become a vibrant, attractive place to visit, and therefore bring revenue into the town, we have to address firstly the volume of through traffic, which will increase exponentially if the original plan is adhered to.
Already our air quality is comprised and this can only increase with the extra volume of traffic through the town. The road is not wide enough to take the HGVs using Lutterworth to get to Rugby, many motorists have to take evasive action whilst waiting to turn right into Church Street, and as the width of HGVs increase, which I'm sure they will, this manoeuvre becomes more dangerous.
Wouldn't it make sense to completely divert these vehicles onto a purposely built road?
Lutterworth will never be attractive again and more prosperous if it just a 'rat run ' going from A to B.
I totally support everything that _____ has proposed for Lutterworth.

Lutterworth resident.

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 15:09
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on Local Plan 2011 - 2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

We are residents of Lutterworth,
and having seen the Local Plan we would comment as follows:

We are recent arrivals in Lutterworth and one of the deciding factors in moving here, was understanding that the 'plan' was to build a by-pass to alleviate all the issues associated with such poor traffic management. Never did we dream that anyone would think the proposed plan was feasible.

We understand that the 'Spine' Road is not seen by Leics County Council as a By-Pass, (to take heavy goods traffic); but merely as a road to service Lutterworth East. This is a decision made by people who do not live here, who do not have to see a small town, with huge potential, being literally run through and killed off. Seriously, the narrow road through the town is a nightmare now. All that will happen is that people north of Lutterworth will go to Blaby, Broughton Astley etc, and those South of Lutterworth will go to Rugby/Market Harborough. One dead town will be left- still it might make a great car park. Or perhaps warehouse space!

The plan states that traffic calming measures will be put into place after the road is built. Many traffic calming measures cause additional pollution - so which ones will be put in place; what are these measures intended to achieve (apart from the obvious), and surely slowing down the traffic will only cause delays, idling traffic on the through road and will have a very negative impact on all residents and those looking to move into the town.

Surely a by-pass, by way of the 'Spine' Road would be the perfect answer for the same if not less cost (no need for traffic calming measures).

Please can someone explain the reason for Gilmorton Road being open to pedestrians and cyclists at danger of the odd bus. Although we note that there are going to be additional buses going to travel to/from East/West Lutterworth!

In addition to those with no interest in Lutterworth deciding that we should have a polluting road running through the middle of the town, they want to ensure that there is more heavy duty traffic idling down that road to further warehousing. On researching Lutterworth, we read something that stated Magna Park was the only permitted warehousing area. We have not read anything that changes that. So where and when was this permission given and did the residents of Lutterworth agree when they were consulted??

We understand that there is no provision to build a school to accommodate the children living in the 1260/2750 houses to be built, until the 300th one is completed. Well let's hope these houses are occupied by childless couples. This is just nonsensical. Unless there is a plan to vastly extend the present primary schools without disruption to the present pupils, teaching and support staff. Also - money will be made available for secondary education if necessary. What on earth do you expect to happen - the primary school children are all going to vanish into thin air? This is just ridiculous thinking.

This sits with 'cheque is in the post'. There needs to be clear, transparent plans for all education. More schools are needed to attract families to the area if nothing else.

Facilities - what facilities; "some or all - which is political speak for non. Good to see that supermarket, pubs and cafe pre cede the requirement for ONE doctor's surgery - unless that is a grammatical error. Dentist? Present dental provision, whilst excellent needs extending. There are long waiting lists. Health provision in this town is struggling now.

This 'plan' should be about reducing pollution, improving the quality of life for present residents and be a welcoming place for incoming individuals and families. Lutterworth should be a place where people can work, live and thrive as part of a community. The present plan as we see it offers nothing towards this. Frankly a plan such as is proposed will result in those with the resources to move out of Lutterworth. They will head to less polluting places with more facilities and better health and educational provision; places where there are opportunities for families to thrive and prosper. This will leave Lutterworth to become a place to drive through; a place where only the vulnerable and those without the means will have to remain in what would essentially become a very large, rundown equivalent of a motorway services.

We are not town planners, (I would question whether one has seen or had any input into the proposal!); but even we can see what a disaster this is. Please have more consultation with the residents of Lutterworth; ensure that there is full and fair representation of the tax-payers/voters of the town so they can suggest and have input into what is their hometown. More transparency, common sense and understanding of the issues. This should not be decided by a group of people who have no interest or personal connection to the town; it is all too easy to plan when you are not personally impacted by the results.

Thank you for your time - we appreciate that we have been emotional in this correspondence; but that would be our point - for a place to thrive it has to have people living in it consider the good of the community .

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 18:00
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Cc:
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan

This Message originated outside your organization.

After attending part of the hearing conducted by the planning inspector, Jonathan Bore, I wish to formally object to the proposed plan, and especially the inclusion of 700,000 m² of warehousing at Magna Park. It was the inspector's opinion that the council officials had not sufficiently provided evidence to support the size of the proposed area, and I still believe this to be the case.

As you will be aware two applications for the substantial warehousing have been agreed and one rejected by HDC. The inclusion of this amount of warehousing – so similar to the rejected application - in the local plan could suggest to some that there may be collusion between the Council and prospective developers.

This section of the proposed plan does nothing to support the central government preferred option of development on railheads, and if it comes to fruition, the development and the operation of this warehousing will greatly increase the number of HGVs on locally overcrowded roads and hence an increase in traffic accidents and air pollution.

As local unemployment is so low, this plan will not address any local employment needs. Indeed, the increase in traffic, due to any workforce needing to commute from far and wide, will exacerbate the congestion on the A5, neighbouring country lanes and local village streets, especially at times of shift change. The car share scheme which Gazeleys have tried to introduce, I understand has had very little take up and therefore is not an effective mitigation of this issue.

Taking the factors outlined above and all the other objections, the Council should listen, judge and come to the conclusion that this vast increase in warehousing area for an unproven demand, just plays into the hands of greedy developers, with no interest in the local, the regional or the national economy or the environment – and diminishes the quality of life for the residents of Harborough District Council.

From:
Sent: 22 February 2019 12:26
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] The Harborough local plan 2011 --- 2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

Good morning,
I recently viewed the proposals for the local plan for Lutterworth and feel that i should email you my thoughts on the plan.

Firstly I believe that the proposed Lutterworth East development is a good thing and would be good for Lutterworth in general. My main reason for this is to hopefully encourage new shops to the town thus reducing the need to go out of town for clothes etc.

When the first consultation was shown there was to be a relief road to help remove and divert traffic from the town centre and thus reduce pollution and therefore improve the air quality in the town. In the latest version of the map there is no mention of the relief road only to that of a spine road. This is only single carriageway and should be dual carriageway to cope with the traffic which will be routed that way. The new residents of Lutterworth east are not going to be impressed with the amount of traffic going through there new estate.

Also of concern is school provision and the lack of proposals for increased secondary school provision. Once completed the town will grow by roughly 10,000 people. That leaves approx 5000 school age kids of various ages. Where are they all going to go?

The same issue goes for Doctors and dentists where is the increased provision for them. These need to be thought about and planned for along with monies made available to implement them in a timely fashion ready before they are required and not after they are required.

I do not agree with the proposed warehouse provision where it is proposed because it should be located at an increased magna park. This is the best place to expand and increase development in the surrounding Lutterworth area.

The other important issue is we want people to shop in the town so any further supermarket development should be located the town side of the development.

regards

From:
Sent: 19 February 2019 11:00
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Local Plan 2011-2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This Message originated outside your organization.

To whom it may concern

As a resident of Lutterworth we wish to dispute to the proposal presented by HDC and agree with the amendments that LTC put forward as below.

LTC believe as follows:

- that all references to the "Spine Road" within the entire policy be replaced with the words "Eastern Relief Road".
- That the road in question is built before the commencement of the new development
- That the Eastern Relief Road is designed to have the capability of carrying HGV traffic, and that it is intended that it will be the preferred route for all HGV and car through traffic that currently uses the A426. This will have the effect of reducing traffic through Lutterworth, and will have beneficial consequences for both noise and air pollution levels.

It is of my opinion that Lutterworth is already heavily over trafficked especially through the town centre and the A426 and significant procedures should be put in place to reduce traffic throughout the town centre. Should Lutterworth East go ahead I would agree with LTC that educational/health and town centre facilities should be greatly improved and more money allocated Lutterworth rather than Harborough only!.

Regards

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 February 2019 22:59
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] HDC Local Plan 2011-2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sirs

I have today collected information regarding the above Local Plan from Lutterworth Town Council Offices and wish to confirm my objections specifically regarding the Policy L1 proposals of the Lutterworth East.

This proposal appears to be solely to allow Leicestershire County Council to make maximum profits on the land they own, without any regard for the impact on current and future residents. It does not meet the needs or demands of the local area or community.

The quoted figure of 2750 new houses is more than double the required "need" for the area. What is the reason for that?

The proposed "spine road" will have absolutely no effect in reducing traffic in an already terribly congested town. It is basically the equivalent of Brookfield Way, not a bypass. No lorries will divert through a housing estate to reach the north of the town, so traffic in the centre of town can only get worse. LCC are apparently aware it won't relieve the current issues but have failed to put forward a proposal that will. It appears they are prepared to accept that traffic in the town will get worse?

The proposed new warehouses, are by LCCs own admission NOT required and the sole purpose of building them is to make money. Surely if there is no demand for them, it's not possible they will make money? They will sit empty like the one built next to J21 over a year ago which has still not been let.

[REDACTED] Lutterworth Sherrier Primary which is almost full to capacity and [REDACTED] Lutterworth High School which is also full. Despite the proposed plans for additional primary schools, there is no mention of secondary education and there is no space to expand the current secondary schools in the town. How will this demand be met? Maybe LCC should remove plans for their Warehouses and concentrate on facilities such as schools, doctors surgeries and shops for their new town? The current facilities cannot cope now, never-mind after an additional 2750 new homes.

I urge Harborough District Council to support Lutterworth residents in objecting these plans. The area proposed is currently beautiful open countryside and cannot be regarded as an extension of Lutterworth as it has a motorway separating it from the current town. It is a completely separate town which will drain the services of the current one. The location is completely wrong and serves only as a money making exercise for LCC.

Please acknowledge receipt of this objection and keep me informed on any updates if possible please.

Yours sincerely

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 06:58
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth development consultation

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Please log this email as an objection to the proposals for the Lutterworth development and note that I fully agree with the Lutterworth Town Council alternative proposal.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 February 2019 12:27
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local plan objection

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir or Madam

I write to object to the inclusion of yet another 700,000 sq mts of warehousing at Magna Park in the Local Plan. No need has been demonstrated for this, and Magna Park is becoming a monster that is eating Lutterworth and surrounding villages.

Yours

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad

From:
Sent: 20 February 2019 14:40
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough Local Plan

This Message originated outside your organization.

Hi

I would like it to be known that I support the Local Plan and in particular the housing developments in Ullesthorpe, and my street. And in general the expansion of Magna Park.

I believe that the growth in Jobs and Housing stock are vital to Ullesthorpe, Lutterworth, and the wider community.

Thanks

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 18:40
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Strategic and Local Planning Team

I feel I must comment on the Local plan for Lutterworth as I do not believe that it supports the safe and sustainable development of the town.

Whilst the need for new housing is well known and generally accepted, I feel that the current plan for "Lutterworth East" is being used as an excuse for more warehousing that is not required and potentially violates policy BE2.

The A426 running through the town centre is an Air Quality Management Area which shows that the national air quality objectives are not likely to be achieved and the plan in its current state will only make this situation worse increasing the pollution levels in an area already identified as a problem.

The lack of proper by-pass for the town centre whilst increasing the population of the town and increasing the warehousing space is a substantial oversight especially when the M1 could effectively take up this role.

By extending the proposed Spine Road up to Ullesthorpe Road, the current motorway bridge already in existence, designed for car use could be utilised meaning that any traffic going north from the new estate can do so without touching the populated part of Leicester Road.

A new motorway junction could be made at this bridge by adding slip roads to make the M1 a Lutterworth by-pass between this junction and junction 20.

If there is insufficient distance between junction 20 and the proposed junction above, the motorway bridge on the A426 between Dunton Bassett and Countesthorpe could be converted by adding slip roads. All through traffic that is coming from the Leicester area to travel through Lutterworth to get to M1 Junction 20 would then be diverted on to the motorway at this junction instead.

Using the M1 as a by-pass for Lutterworth is far cheaper and far more environmentally friendly than a new road built for the purpose and would reduce Air Pollution levels and noise levels in the town. This would lead to an improved environment for shoppers, visitors, and residents and improved regeneration of the town centre.

Kind regards,

~
~



RECEIVED

Strategic and Local Planning Team

Harborough District Council

15 FEB 2019

CORPORATE SERVICES
Harborough District Council

The Local Plan

We the undersigned residents c are writing to object most strongly to the additional warehousing requirements at Magna Park of 700,00 square metres that is included on the new local plan.

There is no proof [which the Inspector had asked for] that the need for such development in this area is essential.

700,000 sq. metres would result in 4 times the amount research has found that is needed in the whole of Leicestershire. It is only there to accommodate the current planning applications. Why should it all be at Magna Park?

It would produce more non-rail warehousing, against the Government's specific recommendations.

It would sacrifice a unique area designated a scheduled ancient monument. [The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979] Surely preserving this is more important than speculative warehousing that has not been proven essential. This area is frequented by many people, a lovely place to walk and take the dogs. The so called "country park" offered in mitigation is laughable. Who would want to walk in the tiny area that is designated that would be surrounded by intimidating warehouses [especially if they are as large as the DHL currently being built in Mere Lane] plus the accompanying noise and pollution?

The amount of extra traffic that would be generated would overwhelm local roads. The planned A5 improvements would only affect the navigation of HGV's into and out of Magana Park, only benefitting the owners.

There is already a tremendous increase of warehousing between Lutterworth/Magna Park area and Rugby, not to mention more warehousing in the Hinkley area. The possible rail hub close to the M69 would inevitably attract more warehousing in that region, the addition of which would totally overwhelm the villages in this corner of Leicestershire.

The recently allowed DHL warehouse in Mere Lane [in the process of being built now] illustrates the impact these monstrosities have on surrounding areas. Three times more warehousing would be suffocating. The local residents deserve more consideration from their Council who, let me remind them, are elected by us!

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 20:32
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Magna Park

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

To Whom It May Concern

My family and I live in the village of Ullesthorpe. We chose this village as our home years ago because we wanted to live in a rural community.

I am writing to you today to say that I am very concerned that the extension of Magna Park be included in the local plan.

I oppose the addition of the extension of Magna Park to the local plan because of the following points;

Two applications around Lutterworth have already been agreed and this third application (15/01531) (these three applications totalled to 700,000 sq ft)was rejected by Harborough District Council, so why has it been included in the Local Plan?

Building more warehouse in this area (Magna Park) will result in an over provision of non rail warehousing in Leicestershire.

Magna Park does not have a connecting rail route which is the preferred Government option in warehouse developments.

Where is the evidence that such a huge amount of warehouses are needed in one place.

Since the three planning applications were submitted there have been many other warehouse developments, a number of them along the A5 at DIRFT and at the M69 junction.

There are massive traffic tailbacks in and around the A5 and A426 now, this is only set to get worse if the third addition of proposed warehousing is allowed.

The A5 is inadequate to take the current traffic load. Given the extent of development along the A5 between the M69 and the M1 at Jn18 the road will not cope with the additional HGV and commuter traffic.

There is research that shows that 700,000 sq mts is almost 4 times the assessed need for additional warehouse space in Leicestershire by 2031.

One of the Local Plan objectives is to reduce people travelling in for work and to bring jobs to the area. It is difficult to see how 10,000 jobs in warehousing will achieve this.

The impact of the current warehouse being built along Mere Lane is clear to anyone who travels along that Mere Lane or the A5 and the addition of the further proposed warehouses will be completely overbearing on the landscape and on the surrounding villages and Lutterworth.

I feel very passionate about this matter and wish you to take my objection to further expansion to Magna Park and the inclusion of this expansion into the local plan into consideration.

Yours faithfully

From:
Sent: 22 February 2019 14:24
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Cc:
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan Review to 2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

9. POLICY BE2 STRATEGIC DISTRIBUTION MM15

Having had regard to the Main Modification 15 proposed in the HDC Local Plan for the period to 2031 I have the following comments to make. Some of the MM are contended to be with aligned with the NPPF 2019 which has been prayed in aid to support the dramatic shift from a strategic led option to a firm allocation of land within policy BE2 Strategic Distribution in respect of the land to the north and west of Magna Park for 320,000m2 of floor space.

I find it incredible that evidence previously available in the Leicester and Leicestershire SDSS 2014 (updated 2016) that did not support a definitive allocation previously within the district and county has suddenly transmuted and now is the underpin for seismic shift in local, regional policy from having regard to the needs within HDC and adjoining authorities to embracing that of a global industry. Albeit one which has all the evidence of fairly imminent contraction.

There is no longer regard for the previous studies, cross border, inter county effects or the effects on the viability of rail led developments notwithstanding the preference for strategic rail led sites and given the specious arguments at 6.3.4 has no credible empirical impartial base for sustaining a case to exceed committed/consented sites together with an allocation which way exceeds the originally contemplated needs through to 2031.

In addition how can no account be taken of the immediate availability of land for B8 uses at the locations listed below:

- a East Midlands Distribution Centre, Castle Donnington, Leicestershire.
- b East Midlands Gateway, Lockington, Leicestershire.
- c East Midlands Intermodal Park, Etwall, Derbyshire.
- d Daventry international Rai Freight Terminal (DIRFT) Phase 3, Lilbourne, Northants
- e. South Northants, Milton Malsor, Northants.
- f. Corby Eurohub, Corby Northants.
- g. Corby International Rail Freight Terminal, Corby, Northants.

- h. Coventry Gateway and development adjoining Coventry Airport, Coventry, West Midlands.
- i. Recently consented development for DPD of 142,000 m² at Burbage House Farm adj J1 of the M69 and A5 at Hinckley, Leicestershire.
- f. A proposed development of 158 ha by DBS at Sapcote, Leicestershire adjoining J2 of the M69 with a rail hub of 15 ha.

To date I have seen no evidence to suggest the predilections for need are any different from those originally put before the council in December 2018.

Some of the narrative in these MM has a remarkable similarity in style to that of the applicants for a consent on this site.

To allocate this extent of land simply hands overriding control to the applicants/owners by reserved matters applications with departures from master planning and less of an opportunity for input by local residents to try and mitigate the impact of the critical mass of such an extensive **speculative** proposal.

The NPPF has been prayed in aid of supporting the proposed allocation but I would comment as below highlighted in red:

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT These objectives should be delivered through the preparation and implementation of plans and the application of the policies in this Framework; they are not criteria against which every decision can or should be judged. Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area. To allocate such a large additional expanse of land ignores committed and consented sites at Magna Park and the employment needs of other parts of Leicestershire. The contention of a global nature suggests that the needs of transport and distribution in Asia have an immediate and precise effect on needs and demand in HDC. This is an overarching contention which could be used to try and justify anything.

For plan-making this means that:

1. a) plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area, and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change; See supra
2. b) strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas⁵, The list above clearly demonstrates significant areas of other available sites.

i. Preparing and reviewing plans

31. The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals. I do not feel that the current market signals are necessarily conducive to an ever

expanding economy which is based on cheap money and labour. Nor will it do anything to inhibit the occurrence of in commuting.

Examining plans

35. Local plans and spatial development strategies are examined to assess whether they have been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements, and whether they are sound. Plans are 'sound' if they are:

- a) Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs¹⁹; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development; this allocation would deprive adjoining more needy areas of the opportunity to provide employment.
- b) Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;
- c) Effective – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and Given the projected need is now by far exceeded how can be deliverable within the plan period?
- d) Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework ???

80. Planning policies and decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for clusters or networks of knowledge and data-driven, creative or high technology industries; and for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations.

DOES THIS APPLY IN THE LIGHT OF PARAGRAPH 214
NPPF 2019

170. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- 1. a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan); I contend that following Cawrey v HBBC this should be properly regarded as a valued landscape.

189. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

The development currently taking place under 15/0919/Ful should adequately demonstrate the profound impact any further development will have not only on the Bittesby DMV but on the area in general.

Considering potential impacts

193. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
194. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

Substantial harm to or loss of:

195. b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional⁶³.

Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

In view of committed and consented sites I find it difficult to envisage weight of public benefit which would be secured by the proposal.

12th February 2019

Dear Sirs,

we understand that you propose in the Local Plan 2011--2031 to include provision for 700,000 sq. mts. of additional warehousing on Magna Park.

To those of us who live near to Magna Park and see and hear it on a daily basis, this is a disturbing thought. This rape of the countryside is nothing short of a scandal.

On one hand the government are encouraging the public to respect the countryside, wildlife etc., on the other councils such as yours are encouraging more pollution and congestion on the roads. At the same time, you are depriving England of valuable agricultural land. Once that land has gone, it will be forever. We are not in a position to be complacent about where our food comes from.

The size of the building that is presently being erected is outrageous and a blot on the horizon. If it were a hospital it would make far more sense and we guess more acceptable to the public.

Apart from the above considerations, the A5 is already too busy and the junctions off too dangerous. We are having more business parks built in a small area along with many more houses.

Although our village is in Warwickshire, we do suffer from Leicestershire traffic taking short cuts. We have a single track road through a farming village. We have problems now with fast, disrespectful and abusive drivers. This can only get worse.

Please see sense and call time on further expansions.

Yours faithfully,

RECEIVED

13 FEB 2019

CORPORATE SERVICES
Harborough District Council

..

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 23:19
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan-Objections

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

...

Dear Sir/Madame,

With regards to the local plan the expansion of Magna Park isn't needed for several reasons.

Where is the evidence that a huge amount of warehousing situated in one place is required. The current Magna Park still has units which haven't been let. The research shows that the proposed 700.000 square meters is almost 4 times the assessed need for additional warehousing space in Leicestershire by the year 2031.

Since the planning other warehousing sites & expansions have started. Along the A5 near the M69 (Hinckley Parkway) & DIRFT to name a couple.

The local plan proposes to bring in a wide range of jobs & to reduce commuting. Harborough district is a low unemployment area with a lot of skilled workers. A lot of warehousing will only increase commuting from outside the area as unskilled workers will have to commute to Magna Park. The A5 is already struggling with the amount of traffic & with the increased car & HGV's it will only compound the problem.

The original planning application (15/01531) was rejected by Harborough council after the other two had been passed. Why is this application being considered yet again?

Regards

~

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 15:18
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Cc:
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Council Local Plan 2011 - 2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Government Inspector,

I would like to raise my concerns regarding the proposed plans for Lutterworth.

BE2 Magna Park extension

The warehouses proposed in Lutterworth East contravene the Policy BE2, which states that additional warehouses must be on or adjacent to Magna Park. The proposed warehousing in Lutterworth East is on good agricultural land.

L1 Lutterworth East

The planning seems to be lacking in detail and therefore commitment. A Secondary School is not planned. Incomprehensive lists of what "might" happen in provisions of local amenities, Doctors, Dentist's.

Lutterworth is a small market town it does not have the infrastructure or road system to support the present current heavy traffic. This will have a negative impact on the atmosphere that this lovely small town has. I have many friends when they visit always make comments on how lovely Lutterworth is and point out to me aspects that I take for granted.

Extra vehicles will create serious problems, and very big issues regarding safety and the consequent increase in pollution. Lutterworth is an Air Quality Management Area.

The incredible number of proposed traffic lights – the distance betwixt them will create substantial traffic problems I can imagine verging on gridlock.

I fully support the solutions identified by Lutterworth Town Council. They have a more considered approach for the inhabitants of Lutterworth.

Thank you for reading my email.

I am hoping these issues will be resolved and that Lutterworth will not become a thoroughfare for heavy traffic.

Yours Sincerely






From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 21:11
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan 2011-2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

To the Strategic and Planning Team

I feel strongly that some of the proposals concerning Lutterworth East need to be reconsidered.

- * The bypass that was promised to help reduce heavy traffic through Lutterworth, is no longer happening and the proposed spine road that winds its way through the houses will not be a suitable alternative for hgv's. Therefore the plans for a bypass to run parallel to the M1 should be reinstated.
- * Due to the changes mentioned in the last point, some of the extra traffic in the area would have no real alternative but to resort to using the A426 through Lutterworth, therefore increasing noise, pollution and congestion.
- * Extra traffic and the building of Lutterworth East will cause pollution levels to rise in an area which already has very high levels of pollution. There are new houses planned which are very close to the M1 which would be particularly affected due to their proximity to the motorway and the prevailing south-westerly winds.
- * There is no need for even more warehousing to the south of the A4304, next to the junction 20 roundabout. There is already a very large area of warehousing on the opposite side of the roundabout, nearer Lutterworth, which is empty together with many other empty ones within a short distance.
- * There seem to be far more houses planned than are needed to meet housing requirements by 2031. This means that building unnecessary homes on the development would last for 12 years and that supply would be greater than demand.

I feel very strongly about these matters and hope that my opinion and that of many others who will be affected will be taken seriously.

Yours sincerely,

,

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 18:14
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan Re Lutterworth east

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sirs

The following points are essential before agreeing plans For Lutterworth East

1 The "Spine Road" must be reconfigured as an Eastern Bypass taking all heavy traffic and all through traffic out of the air polluted and constricted town centre.

2 If this is not possible the new bridge over the motorway on the spine road should have a restricted access onto the motorway taking south bound traffic onto the motorway and north bound off the motorway .This again would relieve the town centre by putting HGV restrictions on the route north and south through the centre

3 An alternative would be a similar junction on one of the current bridges already in existence north of the town

4 The Spine road should join the current motorway junction round about, with lights if required, and not be another separate junction on the Harborough Road

5 There must be provision of another Doctors surgery as the current surgeries are already over stretched

7 There must be a primary school built immediately the first houses are completed, if it were located on the western side of the development some current Lutterworth Children could fill some of the places relieving pressure on the other schools

8 There must be very substantial provision for really affordable housing

9 There is no need for further warehousing with its attendant HGV traffic either at Glebe Farm or Lutterworth East. There is empty warehousing already at Magna Park and close to the motorway and this has remained empty for many months

yours Sincerely ~

From:
Sent: 19 February 2019 20:33
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] HARBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN 2011 – 2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

We write to raise objection with the development of the new Lutterworth East development and specifically the development of the by pass, or Eastern Relief Road. As residents on the development we have concern that the new spine road will have a detrimental effect on the air quality and noise levels we will be exposed to as a result.

The current levels of noise and pollution will significantly increase if this Spine Road were to become a major Trunk Road.

We would object to this proposal to make this a major Trunk Road.

Regards

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 10:48
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Representation on Modifications to Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031, January 2019

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Representation on Modifications to Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031, January 2019

Modification “BE2: Strategic Distribution”

Magna Park is currently the largest logistics park in Europe, and planning permission has already been granted for expansion of 380,000 square metres of warehouses. To add a further 320,000 square metres of warehousing floor-space adjoining Magna Park, bringing the total expansion to 700,000 square metres, is a massive over-provision of floor-space in this one location, with no evidence to support the need for it. Furthermore the proposed location is on green-field land which should not be obliterated for this purpose.

Application 15/01531/OUT, to develop a further 320,000 square metres of floor-space, has been rejected already, so the addition of this same area should not appear in the Local Plan. The Local Plan should contain only developments that are needed by the District, and there is no evidence that a further 320,000 square metres of Strategic Distribution floor-space is needed adjoining Magna Park. Developments where planning permission has been applied for by commercial developers should not be included in the Local Plan; the Local Plan should be a vision for the future to enhance the District, not a receptacle for the benefit of commercial developers.

Magna Park does not have a rail connection for transporting freight, so it should not be expanded by yet another 320,000 square metres of Strategic Distribution floor-space in addition to the 380,000 square metres already permitted. Any further floor-space additions in the region should be at locations with a direct rail connection.

The A5 is already congested; it cannot support the increase in road-freight traffic and commuter traffic associated with further massive expansion of distribution warehousing adjoining Magna Park.

The Local Plan has the objective of reducing out-commuting, and bringing a diversity of jobs to the District; however, the proposals in the Local Plan to expand Magna Park by a further 320,000 square metres, bringing the total expansion to 700,000 square metres, will be contrary to these objectives, and should be removed from the Local Plan.

Name:
Address:
email address:

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 22:53
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Representation on Main Modifications, Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031, January 2019

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Representation on Main Modifications, Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031, January 2019

Main Modification ref MM15: “BE2: Strategic Distribution”

In the HDC Report to the Executive Meeting of 13 November 2018 (headed “Paper No. 1”), sections 4.9, 4.10, and 4.11 describe in HDC’s view the “potential consequences of not allocating land at/adjoining Magna Park for an appropriate amount of Strategic Distribution in the Local Plan”. 4.9 includes that “the District is more susceptible to speculative planning applications or the Local Plan is not found to be sound”; 4.10 includes that “the Council would not be able to adopt the Local Plan and would not have an up-to-date plan in place”; 4.11 includes that “There is a risk that the effort, time, committed resource and careful consideration of the submitted plan would be wasted with potential considerable associated repetitional damage”. None of these potential consequences justifies a decision to allocate a specific site to use in order to add 320,000 sq.m of warehousing floorspace thereby making the total in the Local Plan 700,000 sq.m. To use these potential consequences as reasons to persuade councillors at the Extraordinary Council Meeting on 18 December 2018 to vote to approve the proposal to allocate a site for a further 320,000 sq.m of floorspace is not logical and not acceptable. Properly thought-through reasons, based on independent, impartial evidence, must be used to make decisions on the need for, and the location of, Strategic Distribution sites.

Iceni Report “Policy BE2: Evaluation of Need, Demand and Impact, Final Report”, December 2018 was prepared on behalf of Harborough District Council. HDC Planning Officers clearly recommended granting planning permission for application 15/01531/OUT for a further 320,000 sq.m of warehousing floorspace adjoining Magna Park. In addition, the Iceni report quotes and uses information from a Savills report “Logistics Market report Magna Park Lutterworth”, October 2018, which itself was commissioned by Gazeley, who applied for planning permission for application 15/01531/OUT. These reports cannot therefore be viewed as independent or impartial; they were commissioned by parties who already have a vested interest in the further expansion of Magna Park. Further, these reports are very much commercially based, and do not take into account the views of, and the impact on, the community of local residents. Any decisions based on these reports are one-sided. A fully independent and impartial report should be commissioned before any decision on further Strategic Distribution expansion is made.

Local Members of Parliament have already discussed the need for a UK-wide Strategic Distribution policy where warehouse location planning is done nationally, and goes hand-in-hand with necessary essential infrastructure development; at present infrastructure development is not in place to support the proposed warehouse floorspace expansion, and until it is, the expansion should not take place.

Section 1.5 of the Iceni report states that government policy “seeks to facilitate modal shift towards sustainable modes of travel, including through growth in the movement of freight by rail and development of an expanded network of Strategic Rail Freight Interchanges (SRFI)”. The Iceni report goes on to state that it “is realistic that road-based distribution will continue to be the dominant means of freight transport for some time”. What is the rationale for this? Expansion of SRFIs is already taking place now at DIRFT and East Midlands Gateway, and further SRFIs should be planned to reduce road traffic pollution and congestion. Therefore Magna Park, which does not have a Rail Freight Interchange, and which already has planning permission for expansion of 380,000 sq.m of floorspace, should not be expanded by a further 320,000 sq.m.

Magna Park is already the largest dedicated logistics park in Europe; it is already being expanded by 380,000 sq.m; a further 320,000 sq.m expansion, bringing the total expansion to 700,000 sq.m, is grossly excessive, and highly damaging to green-field countryside. There is no evidence that such a huge increase in floorspace is needed adjoining the existing Magna Park. Planning Application 15/01531/OUT, which proposes this exact same further 320,000 sq.m of floorspace, has already been rejected, so it should not be included in the Local Plan. The Local Plan should be based on a considered need for development in the local community; it should not be based on demands and planning applications by commercial developers.

Other massive Strategic Distribution sites are already being developed along other sections of the A5. The road infrastructure cannot support the additional road freight traffic resulting from further expansion adjoining Magna Park, nor can it support the increase in consequent employee commuting road traffic. The Harborough Local Plan aims to reduce out-commuting, and bring a variety of jobs to the district; the proposals to further expand Magna Park will not help these aims.

The proposed addition of 320,000 sq.m of Strategic Distribution floorspace adjoining Magna Park, bringing the total to 700,000 sq.m, should not be included in the Local Plan. The Local Plan should be amended to state a required total floorspace of 380,000 sq.m, which is equal to the floorspace area which already has planning permission granted.

Name:

Address

email address:

7

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 23:17
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] The Harborough Local Plan 2011 - 2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Strategic and Local Planning Team

My husband and I would like to make representations to you regarding the above-mentioned Local Plan.

We moved to Lutterworth and we had a friend who lived here whom we used to visit and it was during these visits that we fell in love with Lutterworth. At the time, it reminded me of how my home town of used to be when I was growing up. We liked the friendliness of the people and the quaintness of the town centre and the good communication links which meant that if you wanted a broader choice of shops and services they were a short trip in any direction. The best of both worlds as far as we were concerned.

Then horror of horrors we find out about plans to extend Magna Park which is already a blot on the landscape. Why is it necessary to keep building more units when there are already empty ones in the area? Then, to add to our misery, we find out that there are plans to build Lutterworth East on the other side of the motorway, doubling the population of the town. This is not at all what we expected when we moved to Lutterworth. Why are more houses than needed being built?

Warehousing should be restricted to Magna Park.

On Saturday, my husband and I attended a presentation at the Lutterworth Town Council Offices and received a plan of the proposed plan for Lutterworth East. On a positive note, there do seem to be a number of green spaces. However, there are a number of negative aspects:

We would support the LTC's objection to the provision of additional warehousing on land adjacent to the eastern side of Junction 20 of the M1.

The provision of two new primary schools - the proposed schedule for building these schools would place a greater strain on the current facilities. With regard to secondary education, there seem to be vague references only to this provision.

With the increase in population, we are concerned about the strain it will put on medical provision - it is difficult enough now to get an appointment - what will it be like when the population doubles? Speaking of which, where are the prospective residents going to come from? Are there 11,000 people poised, as we speak, to move to Lutterworth? Is it anticipated that workers in the increased warehouse provision will populate Lutterworth East?

Spine Road - we would support the LTC's proposals that:

All references to the Spine Road within the entire policy be replaced with the words Eastern Relief Road;

The road in question is built before the commencement of the new development;

That the Eastern Relief Road is designed to have the capability of carrying HGV traffic and that it becomes the preferred route for all HGV and other vehicle through traffic which currently uses the A426. This will cut down on pollution and reduce through traffic.

We have concerns at the number of sets of traffic lights planned on the approach to Junction 20 from Lutterworth town centre and would ask for assurances that they will not cause a backlog of traffic which could have a huge detrimental affect on traffic congestion.

We also support the LTC's view that the spine road should not go through the new estate and that the current investigations to create a new junction to the M1 be revisited in view of the cost and possible much cheaper options as discussed at the LTC presentation.

We also support LTC in its view that if Lutterworth East is to go ahead, then there should not be additional physical barriers raised between the old and new communities - to this end, it would be better to site proposed office units on the area off the junction which has been earmarked (contrary to policy BE2) for warehousing, instead of where they are currently proposed to be.

I would hope that consideration will be given to reinstating a permanent Police presence in Lutterworth - crime is already on the increase and with the doubling of the population I would anticipate that it will only get worse.

Thank you.

-

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 10:46
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments to Planning Inspector on Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

24th February 2019

Dear Sir,

Having recently attempted to get from Ullesthorpe to the M1, I feel compelled to comment on Harborough District Council's Local Plan.

The level of traffic is already very high in and around Lutterworth and the villages. Now we are faced with months of misery due to closure of Mere Lane until summer 2019 whilst massive road works on the A5/ Mere Lane are carried out. At the same time there will be extensive road works "improving" the Airplane roundabout, again until summer 2019.

However, all the "improvements" to the Mere Lane will do little to improve the flow of traffic on the A5 as it will continue to be single Lane with dangerous bends at Wibtoft, not dual carriageway, once all the new warehousing that already has Planning permission is built the area will suffer even more misery and congestion!

Adding to road issues there are many more warehouses being built at Burbage, same road, same congested A5, same villages being used as rat runs, likewise Rugby Gateway brings the same problems in an already congested area.

All these applications will continue to be non-rail warehousing, which is not the Governments prefer option. Likewise all nearby existing and pending warehousing in close proximity to Magna Park i.e Rugby, Burbage, Northampton etc will be non-rail, we are told the Government needs to deal with air pollution , so this questions the wisdom of such extensive warehousing in a relatively small area, using already congested roads. Drift at Crick is a railhead, surely future plans in the vicinity should follow this example?

In the Local Plan it refers to allowing 700,000sq metres, presumably based on the original three applications,I question how this amount can therefore be allowed in the Local plan as two of the three applications have already been agreed, whilst the third (15/01531) was rejected, so why is it included?

I question the “need” for such large areas of warehousing, DHL do not intend to have the new warehouse under construction, already other newly built warehousing remains empty, some for three years, other older sites at Magna Park remain empty too. Surely 700,000 sq metres is well in excess of need both locally and for Leicestershire. It appears there is no overarching assessment of need for the area, local authorities can permit piecemeal developments with no real consideration for what is happening in near by areas.

It is impossible to escape the negative impact on Lutterworth, Ullesthorpe, Bitteswell, the Claybrookes and Wibtoft of the already permitted extra warehousing, another further extension would just add to the misery for both local residents and others. What about the landscape, we are told we need to wake up to the destruction of wildlife and habitats, all this warehousing will only spell further destruction.

We know unemployment is low in the area, existing warehousing relies on workers commuting large distances, the Government state a commitment to reducing this out-commuting, so this proposal is against Government guidance.

I hope that it is recognised that a further increase in more warehousing will have a huge negative impact on the area and we all ask the question is there a proven “need”?

Yours Sincerely

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 04 February 2019 19:41
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Cc:
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Changes to the Harborough District Council Local Plan 2011-2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Strategic & Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

4th February 2019

Proposed Extension of Magna Park

Dear Sirs

I wish to register my objection to the proposed further development of Magna Park. I understand that this involves the building of an additional 700,000 sq. mts of warehousing, in a location which conflicts with the Governments preferred option of rail connected warehousing. I have two main objections:

1. The impact on the road network in the vicinity including the A5 and the A426 between Lutterworth and Rugby. The traffic in this area is already extensively impacted by the Magna Park and other warehousing sites lorry traffic and at times the journey from my village, Cotesbach, to Rugby can be 4 times what it should be with lorries causing tail backs at both the A5 and M6 roundabouts. This is further compounded when there are issues on the M1. Sometimes I am unable to get out of the village onto the road and I have missed my train from Rugby due to this on a number of occasions. This proposed extension will have a significant detrimental impact to local road users like me and my family, especially in the light of other warehouse developments in the area.
2. Magna Park is already a 'blot on the landscape' as viewed from Cotesbach and at night is a contributor to light pollution (Cotesbach being in the enviable position of having no street lighting and very little light pollution at night). The proposed extension will also undoubtedly impact property values – already effected by the nearby landfill and the existing Magna Park.

We do not want this development and whilst I am not against the principles of the Internet Economy and the need for associated warehousing and logistics, Magna Park is already too big. If the additional capacity is required, which is doubtful, a suitable sight should be found **with** rail connectivity.

Yours faithfully

From: >
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:12
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Cc:
Subject: [EXTERNAL] HARBOROUGH LOCAL PLAN - LUTTERWORTH TOWN COUNCIL PRESS
RELEASE
Attachments: harborough-local-plan---lutterworth-town-council-press-release-feb-2019.pdf
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

To whom it may concern.

I agree with those comments provided by Lutterworth Town Council.

Kind Regards



Lutterworth Town Council

Coventry Road
Lutterworth
Leicestershire
LE17 4SH

Clerk to the Council
e-mail: townclerk@lutterworth.org.uk



Telephone: (01455) 550225
www.lutterworth.org.uk

HARBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN 2011 – 2031

PRESS RELEASE ON BEHALF OF LUTTERWORTH TOWN COUNCIL

Harborough District Council have published their Local Plan to run to 2031.

Lutterworth Town Council (LTC) has considered the proposals within the Local Plan document and their potential impact upon Lutterworth, and feels that it is appropriate that the views of LTC are shared with the residents of Lutterworth. For clarity, the Local Plan sets the framework and “rules” for development within the area, and any prospective planning application (large or small) **MUST** adhere to those rules. It is therefore in the interests of Lutterworth residents that the Local Plan, while allowing for development, is sympathetic to the needs of the Lutterworth Community.

Lutterworth Town Council fully understands the need for more housing, particularly affordable and social housing. However, as the proposed development will be deemed to be part of a new, expanded Lutterworth Town, it is essential that the new neighbourhood is developed in accordance with a **publicly supported** masterplan, that includes delivery and phasing arrangements. This means that extensive consultation must take place with local residents and stake holders.

Lutterworth Town Council objects to the provision of further warehousing on land adjacent to the eastern side of the M1 Junction 20. Warehousing is provided for in Policy BE2, set out in the Plan, and restricts the development to land on or immediately adjacent to Magna Park, defining a limit of an additional 700,000 square metres. This figure has already been allocated through existing planning permission and draft applications, and therefore the proposal for further warehousing must be removed.

Lutterworth Town Council is concerned about the provision of educational facilities as a result of the new development. While the proposal states that two new primary schools will be built, it requires the first of these facilities to be able to take a single form entry by the September prior to the building of the 300th new house. LTC believes that this will place too great a strain on the current facilities within Lutterworth, and that a new facility must be available in the September prior to the building of the 100th new house. Further, the proposals for secondary education are scant, stating that appropriate contributions will be made if necessary. LTC’s view is that contributions are made towards secondary education that comply with the Education Development Developer Contributions Policy. This will ensure that the requirement for financial

contributions will be established based on additional student numbers, rather than a subjective perspective of need.

Lutterworth Town Council is concerned about the provision of new neighbourhood facilities, and believes that the phasing of those new facilities must be agreed with the local community, as well as with the local planning authority. Further, that the provision of new Doctor's surgeries should be made after considering whether it would be beneficial to expand existing facilities first.

A major issue is that Lutterworth Town Council originally agreed to support the proposal of the new development on the basis that a by-pass, or Eastern Relief Road, was provided in order to reduce the level of traffic that uses Lutterworth Town Centre as a through route to Rugby, the M1 and beyond. These proposals do not provide for this, and instead refer to a "Spine Road" which would in effect merely service the new development, leaving the A426 Leicester Road as the primary trunk road through the area. LTC believe as follows:

- that all references to the "Spine Road" within the entire policy be replaced with the words "Eastern Relief Road".
- That the road in question is built before the commencement of the new development
- That the Eastern Relief Road is designed to have the capability of carrying HGV traffic, and that it is intended that it will be the preferred route for all HGV and car through traffic that currently uses the A426. This will have the effect of reducing traffic through Lutterworth, and will have beneficial consequences for both noise and air pollution levels.

Lutterworth Town Council, while in principle supporting the concept of the new development, are determined that Lutterworth as a whole will benefit from the investment, with improvements being seen in facilities, air quality, noise reduction, and traffic reduction. Further, LTC are determined that increased warehousing will not stray from the current Magna Park area, and the development of offices and light industry will not serve as a physical barrier between the old and new communities.

The above statements deal with the main points that affect Lutterworth, although they are not exhaustive. It should be remembered that everybody in Lutterworth is entitled to comment on any part of the Schedule of Main Modifications to the Local Plan proposal, and this can be done by letter or email to the following addresses.

by email to localplan@harborough.gov.uk,

or by post to Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

Comments MUST arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 26th February 2019 otherwise they will be ignored.

For further information, please contact the -----

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 09:19
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on the HDC Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir/Madam

In response to the proposed HDC local plan, and in particular the press release made by Lutterworth Town Council, I would like to lodge the following comments.

In general, I personally support all the points made in the press release, however I would like to draw attention to the following.

Warehousing (in line with LTC's objections).

The ever expanding Magna Park development is in fear of eroding the natural barrier that currently exists between Lutterworth and the warehouse park. To increase development on the eastern side of the town would mean that Lutterworth will eventually be enveloped in what could be construed as a collection of warehouse buildings larger in overall mass than the original town footprint they accompany. To have a series of commercial developments that dwarf the adjacent town seems to me to be extremely poor master planning and urban design.

Whilst it could be acknowledged that the current Brexit situation is having an impact on the confidence of companies to expand and relocate. It is clear that for some time a number of units across the whole commercial footprint of Magna park etc have been empty and underutilised. Indeed, the "white elephant" that is the distribution building adjacent the M1 has been what appears to be a massive disappointment, both in terms of financial and environmental loss. How long has this building now been vacant? Along with those on Magna park and alongside the link road from the town to the A5.

Health and social provision in Lutterworth

Again, I would concur with Lutterworth Town Council's concerns of future provisions of schooling and health provision in the area.

It is clear that an ever expanding population will need improved schools, healthcare, policing, fire and ambulance facilities etc.

The mere provision of section 106 agreements with potential contractors is not sufficient to ensure these increased demands are met.

If the Lutterworth East development is to proceed, we need a clear commitment from the council to provide upgraded/new facilities across the board for the increased population.

I would go so far as to say that, regardless of the proposed Lutterworth East development, the current social situation, with all the recent housing developments in Lutterworth, is not sustainable. We are seeing an increased crime rate, as a result of having no police station, the health centre is over subscribed and I'm sure the fire and ambulance services would argue they are pushed to the limit.

Eastern Relief Road

I would strongly agree with the council's comments regarding the need to create a "true" Eastern Relief road, Lutterworth desperately needs to reduce the amount of traffic passing through the centre, this

includes both cars and especially HGV's. There is currently a real issue with congestion, air pollution and potential for serious road traffic accidents. It could be argued that is an issue that has been going on for a good number of years, and by virtue of further developments the problem has become exasperated! Without a dedicated relief road, the traffic issue will only increase!

I trust the above comments will read and understood by the relevant bodies/persons.

Kind Regards

_____, (Lutterworth Resident)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2019 19:56
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on Lutterworth Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Good Evening, thanks for the opportunity to comment on this local plan which fortunately Lutterworth Town Council have publicised, I feel it is a real shame that my District and County Council have not not done similar work - despite sending publicity about "What the County Council" are doing for me!

I have studied the plans for Lutterworth East and it raises a few questions and concerns for me. Firstly the residents of Lutterworth already deal with a large amount of Warehouse and Distribution activity as we have the 'pleasure' of living in the "Golden Triangle of Logistics, Magna park is the designated area for warehousing near Lutterworth and spreading to the area south of the Mkt Harborough Rd is just opening up that whole area for future development and is fundamentally wrong and against the previously promised development criteria given to Magna Park. We currently have empty "sheds" both at Magna park at the side of Junction 20 and again at Junction 21, whilst not future proof - warehousing is subject to regular refurbishment/demolition and rebuilding to a double deck format of the current facilities would provide the additional capacity- it happens within the M25 and would work here! As a Member of the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport and a member of the European Logistics Association, I have over 35 years experience in Logistic matters.

The bridge connecting the new development to the Lutterworth/Leicester road is quoted as costing £10m, this figure is somewhat unbelievable as the recent Lubbethorpe crossing of the M1, 9 miles further up the M1 just after junction 21, cost over £15m <https://www.leicestermercury.co.uk/news/local-news/new-15-million-bridge-over-197581> (July 2017). Why not run a road along the M1 and use the current Gilmorton - Leicester Road bridge which comes out less than half a mile from the current edge of Lutterworth.

Another concern is that Air pollution within Lutterworth seems to have become a forgotten subject but has regularly been recorded as one of the worst in Leicestershire, I don't see these plans addressing this issue! An additional issue is noise- Lutterworth currently suffers from a marked increase in M1 road noise when the wind is from an Easterly/South Easterly direction, if it rains it increase again by a marked degree. If these houses are to be built on the East of the M1 they will suffer road noise for the majority of the time and again the noise levels will increase when it rains- no mention of mitigation/earth barriers is made- having lived in The Netherlands concrete curved acoustic barriers are mandated where homes are built close to motorways to address the noise issues.

Education provision is also a concern as I am advised that no secondary school provision is included- Lutterworth currently has 2 Secondary schools but capacity and options to extend are extremely limited (despite the Whitley Academy closing) with existing housing developments already approved and the other options being in Countesthorpe, it would imply that pollution and congestion in Lutterworth (especially at school times) will only get worse either with buses taking children to Countesthorpe or busing them in to the crowded streets around the two current secondary schools.

[REDACTED] and saw the issues the busing of pupils around the area caused- chaos!)

Looking at the plan it appears the planners are looking to use Misterton Way as a through route, this road is extremely narrow and the junction on to Leicester Road is extremely difficult to negotiate as single lane road with narrow pavements on both sides as it meets Leicester road, is this proposed as "school walking route" or cycle route - it will be extremely dangerous and will require careful management!



The other route would appear to connect with Station Road again how do the planners propose to manage this transport/pedestrian traffic?

Whilst nobody denies the need for additional housing if it is to support the workers of Magna Park it needs to be low priced starter homes (currently lacking in Lutterworth) both terraced and flats and not large houses. The area will also require additional infrastructure such as Police, Fire, Ambulance and Dental & doctors facilities although current surgeries are struggling to recruit!

A final area of concern for me is water drainage and sewage, warehouses put a large amount of run off water on to the ground very quickly and this could soon overflow the River Swift and local waterways which necessitates many developers building water "buffers" to be able to manage the flow of water into local waterways these are a constant hazard for children. What provision is being put in to support the additional sewage waste being generated from this development? Lutterworth has seen significant growth in its population over the last 20 years but no significant increase in the sewage facilities, this offers serious risk of flooding and pollution to the surrounding areas given the global warming alerts to flash flooding!

Your consideration of these points is greatly appreciated.

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 10:36
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Modifications to the Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir

I write to register my objection to the modifications made to the Local Plan in respect of the 700,000 sqm of additional warehousing at Magna Park.

I believe this figure equates to three different planning applications. As two of these have been approved and the third rejected, why has this been included in the Local Plan?

This acreage of warehousing far outstrips the assessed need for warehousing for the whole of Leicestershire by 2031, but these sheds are popping up all over the County and along its boundaries.

Does anyone at HDC actually look at our neighbouring District Councils and take the impact of their developments into consideration?

Does anyone at Leicestershire County Council take any interest in the hugely detrimental impact these hideous developments have on the residents of the neighbouring towns and villages?

The A5 is already stretched to breaking point and takes the brunt of any problems on the M6, so drivers use country lanes to avoid hold-ups. Were the planners at Highways England thinking straight when they stopped northbound traffic from the M6 joining the M1 at junction 19? That traffic now leaves the M6 at j.1 and travels up the A426 to Lutterworth, thus creating intolerable traffic jams when it meets the HGV traffic on the A5 travelling between DIRFT and Magna Park and beyond.

The Government has expressed a preference for developments at railheads which is more than adequately met by the growing capacity at DIRFT. The A5 cannot cope with the huge increases in HGV and commuter traffic that is bound to happen if Magna Park is allowed to expand even further.

Has a need been demonstrated? The Gazeley development in Mere Lane was trumpeted as being built for DHL, in spite of the fact that nothing had been signed and DHL are now nowhere to be seen.

Has any consideration been given to the detrimental environmental impact that these developments have? Air, light, noise and litter pollution will be uncontrollable.

Please do not blight our surroundings any further.

Yours faithfully

From:
Sent: 21 February 2019 15:48
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Cc:
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Policy L1 Lutterworth East

This Message originated outside your organization.

Having viewed the proposed plan I have a couple of observations.

1. It is essential that the "Spine Road" is replaced by a proper by-pass road. At this stage of the planning it could be brought over the M1 as currently indicated for for the Spine road but upgraded to sweep across as the preferred through route making the old A426 into Lutterworth a secondary choice. On reaching the east side of the M1 it could be made to go south immediately adjacent to the motorway and all new development kept to the east of that. This would be considerably less expensive than swinging a by-pass round the whole development at a later date.
2. People living on the new development should be encouraged to walk or cycle into town whenever possible by using the existing farm crossing over the M1 and upgrading it to make it a scenic and attractive option.

Regards,

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 11:26
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth local plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Having had more of the proposals explained to me, I feel even more worried about the impact of the plans on Lutterworth and the surrounding area. If the warehousing allocation has already been reached with the extensions to Magna Park, why are extra warehouses needed on a site on the south side of the A4304? There traffic situation is already at breaking point, even before the Magna Park extension, so by adding even more traffic heading to the two roundabouts at the south of Lutterworth seems like madness.

Unemployment in the local population is as low as it possibly could be, this is backed up by the fact that employees for the existing warehouses are brought in from as far away as Birmingham, Coventry, Rugby, Hinckley, Market Harborough, Leicester and surrounding areas. All these people have accommodation in their present locales, so any argument about houses being needed to accommodate them cannot hold water, as these people have been coming to work in the area for years and have never seen a need to move to Lutterworth.

Bearing in mind then that there are a great many cars coming into the area already, by creating by warehouse space you naturally increase that traffic, along with all the delivery vehicles servicing the new warehouses. All that traffic is concentrated at the south end of town which already has problems with volume. The present road system is at maximum pressure now and with no serious effort being taken to upgrade the roads, it can only get worse.

The question that concerns me most is that there are warehouse developments all over the Midlands with no regulation on what is being built and where. So who knows what, or where , new warehousing is needed most? Or is it just left to district councils to decide where it is less inconvenient to their principle town, in our case, Market Harborough?

Sent from my iPad

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 January 2019 19:43
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Development.

This Message originated outside your organization.

I am a Lutterworth resident, I know what I will say will make no difference because this has secretly been approved, between Government and Developers.

There is absolutely no need for the development, what we need is social housing, at what percentage will the social housing be?

With regard to employment there is a Magna Park plus various small businesses, with regard to Magna it is predominantly warehouse staff needed who get £9.00 per hour how on earth will people afford the mortgages on the new properties.

The infrastructure, who will recruit the Doctors, Nurses and Teachers which will surely be needed, can the local roads truly cope with the extra traffic? I very much doubt it.

I am not a Nimby, but this development is not necessary, ok build homes, but not not on that scale and not at the expense of open countryside.

It will be a disaster and will alter Lutterworth forever.

Don't pass the plan.

From: ..
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:48
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

25.02.19
Harborough District Council

Dear Harborough Council

I wish to comment on the Harborough Local Plan, in particular policy BE2, Magna Park, for the following reasons:-

The planning inspector asked for more evidence of **need** for this level of warehouse expansion. The only evidence offered comes from a survey commissioned by Gazeley, whose lack of impartiality is obvious, and which in any case fails to establish need.

Since the original bid was made, more large scale warehouse development has taken place eg at DIRFT, and near the M69/A5 junction, which alter the frame of reference. Huge warehouses at Magna Park have been unoccupied since they were built several years ago, as has the development beside the M1 at J20.

Why does the Lutterworth East plan include yet more warehousing in addition to Magna Park?

Assumptions of ever increasing demand take no account of the emerging reaction against excessive consumerism and for increased environmental concern, as exemplified by the growing distain for disposable fashion, and the notion we have arrived at "peak stuff". The escalation of this kind of development cannot continue unchecked, in our finite green & pleasant land.

The plan acknowledges the poor **location** in terms of accessibility, lack of public transport and lack of a workforce nearby.

The road system is inadequate for further development at this location. It already operates at capacity, compounded by its proximity to the motorway network. Any problem on the M1 or M6 leads to gridlock on the A5. This can happen several times a week. I have driven north from DIRFT to Lutterworth in a nose-to-tail jam of lorries all the way, at midnight. The prospect of warehouses stretching for almost all of this distance and on to Hinckley is a nightmare scenario.

Harm caused to local people by this development includes obvious increased pollution, increased travel times, severe environmental detriment, and a sense of being overwhelmed & intimidated by the dominance of massive sheds and HGVs, in a rural location.

Why threaten No Plan?

At the Harborough council meeting on 18.12.18, when the proposed amendment to reduce the level of expansion was rejected, those speaking for the plan said while they did not like it, not to have a plan would mean unrestrained development would take place. Why is No Plan the only alternative? Why cannot the plan go ahead without the extra 300,000 square metre development? Why should sticking to their original rejection of this in January 2018 result in no plan?

I urge the adoption of a more proportionate, more environmentally sustainable plan for us, our children and the generations that follow, by removing policy BE2.

Yours faithfully

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 09:25
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to the additional 700,000 sqm meters of warehousing

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Hi,

To Whom it may concern I would like to raise an objection to the plan for an additional 700,000 sqm of warehousing with the magna park area.

My my points of objection are as follows

- Magna Park is non rail warehousing while the Government has stated a preferred option on developments with a rail connection.
- The A5 often struggles with the current traffic volume. The size of the development along with only exasperate the volume of traffic on the A5 between the M69 and M1 at J 18. The local road network will be beyond capacity with the additional HGV and employee traffic.
- The effect of the "DHL" development being built along Mere lane is easy to see to when travelling along the A5. Increasing the amount of warehousing 3 fold will be hugely impactful on the landscape and on the local villages of Willey, Bittesby and Ullesthorpe.
- There is evidence that building additional warehouses at Magna Park will provide an over requirement of warehousing without a rail link, within the Leicester shire and local area.
- What market intelligence is there that a concentration of warehousing such as this is what is required within the logistics sector?
- In the time since the original planning applications were submitted a number of other logistics developments have had approval or completed in the local area, such a DIFT extensions, M6 Junction 1, along the A5 & M69.
- Within the 'Local Plan' two of the objectives are to reduce commuting and to widen the range of jobs in the area, with such a low unemployment rate in the local area and a large percentage of the working population employed in the logistics sector it is hard to understand how having an additional circa 10,000 jobs in a concentrated area will meet this objective. In particular to recruit for these new positions employees are likely to have to travel from further afield, Leicester, Coventry or even further.
- There is already an issue in local villages of HGV and Magna park employee traffic using small roads within villages to gain access to the Magna park site, this has not been resolved over the previous decades by Magna park management, this will only cause this matter to become a greater issue. Additional on numerous occasions HGV traffic use local villages as overnight lorry park due to the limited space provided by the current Magna park, The site had a requirement for a lorry park included in it proposal, this has never been provided, and the current owners have not been held accountable to this.
- From what I have seen in the plans there is no provision for maintaining or improving air quality in the local area. With the substantial increase in heavily polluting HGV traffic and thousands off additional employee traffic local air pollution will degrade within a robust solution in place to manage this.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 February 2019 10:46
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Application 15/01531

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

For the attention of the Planning Inspector,

I write to you to ask you to **NOT** approve this planning application for more warehousing which is not required at MagnaPark.

Lutterworth will soon be surrounded by warehouses which will in turn will cause more pollution due to the increase in traffic i.e. haulage lorries & cars going to and from.

There are already warehouse developments going north up the A5 by the M69 junction.

There are more going south down the A5 at DIRFT.

There is a warehouse just outside the Lutterworth town by the M1 roundabout which has not been occupied since being built.

There are units still unoccupied and there is one that has remained unoccupied since it was rebuilt at least 2 years ago.

There is no evidence to say that all this warehousing is required in such a concentrated area.

As companies merge they will be reducing the warehousing required, i.e. Sainsbury & Argos.

I noticed Gazeley's have built more warehousing by the side of the M1 heading north towards Lutterworth.

WHY do they need more warehousing when they can't fill what they have and are building.

The government are trying to reduce road haulage and use rail haulage instead and MagnaPark is no where near railheads. Whereas DIRFT is right by a rail link and no where near a residential area. This is more strategically placed for expansion and companies to move to. With **NO IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AREAS**.

How can creating approximately 10,000 jobs reduce out-commuting when Lutterworth has very low unemployment. So therefore, people **WILL** be commuting to MagnaPark if they want to work in that environment given that there will be so many warehouses already built and will they all be occupied. More pollution and traffic chaos to an already congested area & town.

The A5 is already in adequate for the traffic that uses it now and certain stretches are very dangerous.

We hope someone somewhere will listen to the residents of Lutterworth and the surrounding villages and dismiss this application once and for all.

There has been no regard to the wildlife etc its all about how much money.

The people who make these decisions do not live here and have to put up with what we will and are putting up with.

If I could afford to move I would as I don't like what is happening to this once small market town which is gradually losing its character, which is one of the reasons I moved here.

I urge you not approve this application.

Yours sincerely

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 21 February 2019 08:18
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan 2011-2031 modifications

This Message originated outside your organization.

When the first draft of the Local Plan 2011-2031 was consulted on I wrote expressing the view that there was no demonstrated need for up to 700,000 sq mts additional warehouse space at Magna Park.

It would appear that the Inspector agreed as he said that Policy BE2 made the plan unsound.

The modifications once again include 700,000 sq mts of warehouse expansion at Magna Park, nearly 400,000 sq mts of which already has planning approval. The narrative to the modifications provides no additional independent evidence of need for such a large concentration of warehousing in one place.

I would therefore ask that policy BE2 be amended to include 400,000 sq mts not 700,000 sq mts.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPad

From: |
Sent: 21 February 2019 09:24
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan modifications

This Message originated outside your organization.

Local Plan 2011-2031 Modifications consultation

In the first version of the Local Plan 2011-2031 Policy BE2 Strategic Distribution allowed further development at Magna Park up to 700,000 sq mts. This policy was based on three planning applications from two developers.

Two of the three planning applications have now been granted and cannot be over turned. However the third planning application, 15/01531/OUT, was rejected by the full Council of HDC and yet is, once again, included in the revised Local Plan. The inclusion of this level of warehouse space is still based on the planning application, the information provided by the developer and a report supported by the developer. There is no further evidence of the need for additional warehouse space at this location.

The inclusion of 700,000 sq mts of warehouse space in BE2 will result in an over provision of non-rail warehousing in Leicestershire and a huge concentration in one place rather than providing a range of geographical locations.

The concentration of warehousing at Magna Park will bring little or no benefit to the local area. It will not bring the desired reduction in out commuting, rather it will ensure the opposite as the current employers at Magna Park have to draw extensively on regional and international labour to fill jobs at the site. The competition for labour will be intensified as the large number of new warehouse sites within a few miles of Magna Park come on stream.

The A5 between the M69 and the M1 is becoming a continuous corridor of warehousing with no corresponding improvement in the A5. The increased commuter and HGV traffic on the inadequate A5 will result in greater congestion, poorer air quality and more accidents.

At the same time the area is being changed from a rural to an industrial area. This does not fit with the aspirations of HDC in relation to the countryside and small scale development in rural areas.

I ask that Policy BE2. Strategic Distribution be amended by reducing the 700,000 sq mts to 380,000 sq mts (the area already approved by HDC).

Thank you

.....
.....

.....
.....

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 23:37
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sirs

As a local resident at [REDACTED], I am emailing to express my objection to the plans for construction of 700,000 square meters of warehousing space at magna park.

I understand that the 700,000 square meters is a total of three separate planning applications. Although the number of applications indicates there is a clear demand for warehousing, it does not suggest there is a need for this development in order to maintain the local economy. I also understand that one of the applications (15/01531) was rejected previously by HDC, I therefore cannot understand why this is still being included in the plans.

My understanding is that the warehousing built will be non-rail warehousing. This is against the current governments preference to railhead developments and I am therefore concerned this may disadvantage the area if there is little government support. Furthermore I worry that this may result in an excess of non-rail warehousing which would put significant pressure on the existing infrastructure in the Leicestershire and surrounding area.

For example, I use the A5 daily and believe that this is struggling to accommodate the existing traffic load and would not be capable of handling the additional load which would arise following the development. There is already a large amount of warehousing in the area, along the A5 and between the M69 and M1 at J18 and the impact on the local infrastructure of this is noticeable. I do not feel the current road network will be able to cope with the additional Heavy Good Vehicles and commuter traffic.

I have also noticed a clear increase in traffic and congestion caused by the development of warehouses along Mere lane. Therefore I cannot see how the development of 700,000 square meters of warehousing will do anything other than overwhelm the local landscape, road network and villages such as Bittesby, Ullesthorpe and Willey.

Since the original applications were submitted, additional warehouse construction projects have been undertaken in the local area such as at DIRFT and at the M69. I believe these developments means the original planning applications are no longer relevant and should be reviewed again in light of this, as I believe the additional developments reduce the need for any further warehousing in the area. I have also not seen any evidence that the huge increase in warehousing capacity is necessary, required or will be beneficial for the local area.

One of the stated objectives in the Local Plan objectives is to reduce the number of individual commuting out of the area by providing a wide range of jobs to the area. However this will result in the creation of 10,000 jobs in warehousing, therefore this will not be of any real benefit for the majority of local residents who have existing skills, professions or vocations which will not be relevant to the new development.

Therefore the only impact will likely be to increase the number of commuters into the area, placing further pressure on the road network.

Kind regards

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 08:52
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031 Modifications Consultation-Objection

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to complain about the inclusion of "*Additional development of up to 700,000 sq.m. for non rail-served strategic storage and distribution (Class B8) use will be provided in the District.*"(MM15) in the Harborough Local Plan.

This includes another 320,000 sq.m of additional warehousing which is clearly not needed, when there is already a large number of other warehouses in the area, such as DIRFT, the one under construction near the M69, and in Rugby (as well as many others). Indeed it appears the anticipated demand is based on only looking at the capacity in the Harborough district area and not all of those in the wider area (and by wider I mean within say 7 miles of Magna Park, hence including DIRFT, M69 and Rugby) of which all 3 sites are outside the remit of Harborough District council but are contending for the same workers, road infrastructure and demand. Indeed these other sites are closer to Lutterworth than Harborough itself, and hence closer than the majority of inhabitants of the Harborough District Council area.

This means there will be insufficient local workers in the Lutterworth area, meaning an increase of commuting into the area for low skilled workers and placing yet more demand on the local road infrastructure, particularly the A5 which is inadequate for this additional demand. On the basis that the proposed warehouses are right on the edge of the Harboough area, most of the workers will be travelling in from Rugby, Coventry etc and this is creating work for very few Harborough council folk.

Furthermore, the warehouses at DIRFT are based around a rail head which is much more environmentally friendly and sustainable – and I understand this to be government policy. The warehousing outlined for Magna Park is not built on an environmentally friendly policy, and is only mitigated by phrases such as

"impacts on Lutterworth Air Quality Monitoring Area are minimised and an HGV routing agreement (to include a monitoring and enforcement scheme) is to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority;

impacts of construction on air quality through dust and other emissions are mitigated and a dust management plan is to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority;

h. impacts on nature conservation are mitigated and a Biodiversity Management Plan (specifying the mitigation requirements) is to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority;"

Clearly it would be far more effective and environmentally appropriate to design in the most-environmentally friendly approach from the start, rather than making mitigations to try and address it, (unless you can clearly articulate why a non-railhead solution is more environmentally friendly than a railhead solution). Therefore, there is the real risk of over supply and under-utilisation of non-railhead warehousing.

The recent World Climate Change summit in Poland (Dec 2018) heard evidence from the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that there is only 12 years to limit global

warming to avoid catastrophe for hundreds of millions of people – this solution does nothing to address that and by using non railhead transport increases the potential impact on Global warming and Climate Change.

Based on this, I fail to see the need for the additional warehousing and call for this additional 700,000 sq m to be removed from the local plan

Yours

From: .
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:42
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Magna Park expansion

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Hello

I am writing to you regarding the planned 7000m expansion of magna park. As a local resident I believe that the expansion would be bad for our road network. The a5 already faces a myriad of queues and many of the roundabout are simply not equipped for the current traffic, never mind increasing the number of HGVs on the road.

Rather I believe that if more warehouses are needed the government's advice to build them on train networks should be followed, this would relive the roads significantly. DIRFT is therefore perfect to build these new warehouses.

I do not think magna park should be expanded, it is not beneficial.

Regards

From:
Sent: 21 February 2019 14:23
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth plans

This Message originated outside your organization.

As a resident of Lutterworth I am objecting to some of the proposed future plans for my town

Main road through town (Leicester road) should not carry through traffic, too much fumes and noise pollution. Also safety aspect of crossing this busy road, especially as secondary schools are on opposite side to new development. We need to be able to have a relief road, either by the proposed 'spine road' - which just pushes problem into new development, OR make a new M1 junction ie at Dunton Bassett. Then have deterrents to through traffic. Relief road needs to be completed before new development starts.

Proposed new warehousing eastern side of M1 junction 20- this is not adjacent to Magna Park. There are already empty warehouses at Magna Park and that by junction 20. Therefore I am against this.

Education provision- the first new primary school should be ready before 100th new house is ready for occupation, otherwise existing schools will be unable to cope.

Secondary education funding- wording seems very vague, need to ensure that funding complies with education developer contributions policy.

Lutterworth east housing- there should be plans for some social housing

Definitely need more GPs in town. Either by expanding existing health centre or providing another one in Lut east. Sports centre - I heard that this was a proposal to build a new one in new development to replace existing facility. Our current sports centre is a central hub of our town and should not be replaced. It does need upgrading so money should be allocated for this.

concerned citizen.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10



Virus-free. www.avast.com

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 00:20
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth Local Plan & Lutterworth East

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sirs.

I regret I have some serious misgivings about the Local Plan for Lutterworth and the proposed East of Lutterworth plan. As delineated below.

- The local plan does not give us the promised relief road. Currently the traffic is stationary along the A426, literally from the end on the nation speed limit to the restart.
- The spine road, East of Lutterworth we were told would take traffic off the A426, through the town. It might if it were a dual carriage way with roundabouts at each junction.
- Now LCC tells us it's not going to relieve the town. Lutterworth east is going to be built on the most suitable land for the relief road. And there is no provision for the extra traffic that is being generated by the housing presently being built, Lutterworth East, the new warehouse being built North of Magna Park, the M1 Access warehouse, the empty warehouses in Magna Park or anything else.
- If it is not agreed that Lutterworth needs a bypass now there will be no sensible route after Lutterworth East is built, unless it is planned for now.
- The possible restrictions of traffic on the Gilmorton Road will lead to a substantial extra distance for any alternative, therefore greater use of fuels and greater pollution.
- The proposed extra junctions roundabouts and traffic lights, so far on 50 years apart leave much to be desired. One wonders who thought them up. Remembering the extra fuel consumption option, hence pollution when stopping and starting vehicles and the waste of fuel in regaining momentum, especially with the HGVs.
- The extra warehousing to the South East of the Junction 20 roundabout. With the proliferation of the new and empty warehouses, one really wonders how many more will actually be used. Also it is interesting to note that Policy BE2, of the local plan states that the only warehouse development can take place at or adjacent to Magna Park.
- LCC admit that we do not need any more warehouses, yet they are the developers of this site!
- The Inspector has already stated that the proposed office and light industrial area, proposed for the North Western tip on Lutterworth East, MUST NOT stand between the existing and new Lutterworth developments.
- Housing. I believe that before more green fields are tarmacked over, we should use up the empty housing. And the empty hotels which seemingly every city has near its centre. My last figures suggested that there were 600,000 empty homes in England, yet we create over acres of land every year regardless
- Lutterworth East plans 2750 houses, yet an estimated 1260 will be needed by 2031. This suggests bad planning.
- There seems to be a lack of provision for basic infrastructure, until it's too late. Our schools, doctors, dentists, roads are already at capacity. And yet, there is no provision for anything to be done about some of that, and no immediate provision at all for the rest.
- Yet again, there is no mention of the pollution within Lutterworth. Indeed the continual expansion of it and Magna Park will only exasperate the situation.

In conclusion, considering the contradictions, I feel that even a GCSE student would have been marked down on some of the suggestions, let alone professional, trained and paid for planners.

All the best

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 16:00
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objections to revised local plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Sir

I refer to the Harborough Local Plan 2011-2013 Schedule of Main Modifications published on 14th Jan 2019 as published on your website.

I specifically refer to Modification reference MM15 referring to policy BE2 Strategic Distribution. In my opinion the modifications to the plan do not address the issues raised by the Local Plan Inspector and thus this part of the local plan remains unsound. The reasons for my opinion are:

- The inspector considered that the figure of 700000m2 of extra warehouse space at Magna Park was based on opportunity not demand. Nowhere in the modifications is the demand demonstrated.
- It is claimed that impacts on the highway are mitigated by 3 modifications to the A5, 2 junction improvement and an extension of the dual carriageway. This is insufficient mitigation unless the dual carriageway is extended completely from the current section near Willey right through to Gibbet Hill. Any gap between these points will become a bottleneck and create tailbacks onto any dualcarriageway.
- Experience shows that provision of a Travel Plan has negligible effect on commuting behaviour so this measure is irrelevant.

Your sincerely

Harborough District Council
The Symington Building
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
Leics. LE16 7AG

Attn: Strategic and Local Plan Service Manager email: Tel:

9yj February 2019

Dear

**Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031
Modifications Consultation
Magna Park Expansion**

In reply to your letter dated 14th January 2019 I see **NO NEED** for additional space required for development at Magna Park.

To my knowledge two planning applications have already been accepted by the Harborough District Council.

As this is the case why are these **not** included in the local plan?

My research shows that the 700,000 square metres quoted for additional warehousing at Magna Park is almost four times that needed in the whole of Leicestershire by 2031.

Employment in the area is at the moment good which would mean that future staff employed at Magna Park would need to motor in from outside the Lutterworth area. As there is no train service and a very limited bus service available this would add to further road congestion on local roads not counting lorry traffic generated from the site itself.

If the Planning Committee can convince me of a **need** for further development on the current site (**which has no Rail connection**), I would reluctantly consider your proposal providing you can provide evidence.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Your Sincerely,

RECEIVED

13 FEB 2019

CORPORATE SERVICES
Harborough District Council

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 16:41
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Sir
I wish to register my objections to the modified local plan as published on your website. The modified plan does not address my objections to the original plan in respect to the planned expansion of Magna Park. The planned expansion is excessive and not supported by a demonstrated need. There are also insufficient mitigations to prevent any expansion affecting the quality of my life as a nearby resident. In particular extra measures are required in respect to air quality (I am an asthma sufferer), traffic congestion and light pollution.

Yours sincerely

...

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 23 February 2019 12:39
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Hello,

My name is _____ in the District at :

My comments on the draft local plan are as follows:

1. There is a massive amount of warehousing, developed or being developed, within the area with Magna Park , Symmetry Park and the new development on the A5 between the Burbage turn off and the M69 roundabout being just some of them. I do not see the that all this is anywhere near necessary.
2. All this development will be a huge blight on the rural landscape with the consequent impact on all local villages such as ours. This is not NIMBYism as we already accepted, however reluctantly, Magna Park and Symmetry Park. Why the concentration on the A5 corridor? The impact on traffic will be immense, it is already horrendous at the beginning and end of working days.
3. I believe that this will bring in some 10,000 warehousing jobs. All of one type and will not help with the Local Plan aim of bringing in a wide range of job types so that it can meet the employment needs of the diverse range of people who live in the surrounding area. Surely all this will achieve is a greater degree of commuting in from a much wider area with a consequent further increase in traffic congestion.
4. The Local Plan includes 700,000 square metres of development which provides for three applications. As two of the applications have already been approved and the third has been rejected by HDC: why include this amount of development at all? I believe that research as to the need for warehousing shows that this represents around four times that which is necessary.
5. I read the Government preference is for distribution warehousing to be concentrated around railway access such as DIRFT, Magna Park does not classify as such a development as is shown by the stated need for a shuttle of lorries delivering containers to and from DIRFT. Clearly the plan does not meet this Government preference. It only further worsens the already appalling traffic conditions.
6. I have mentioned above three ways (points 2,3 &5) in which the intentions behind this plan will have a seriously damaging impact on the roads in and around the A5 between the M1 and M69. This road cannot cope now, with the increase ion HGV traffic the road will become far worse and have the probability of continuous and expensive road repairs.
7. Whenever there is a problem on the A5 traffic is forced onto minor roads such as the High Cross to Lutterworth road which goes through the middle of the Claybrooks, Ullesthorpe, Bitteswell and Lutterworth. These villages have narrow roads that cannot take large amounts of HGV traffic and the proximity of schools and bus stops makes it dangerous to children and less mobile or aware residents.
8. Finally , I try to keep abreast of local news, including political and economic topics. I have not seen any outcry for such warehousing needs, except that is, from local politicians who want to generate business rate income. I am more likely to hear of warehousing sitting empty for months or even years on end. Where is the evidence upon which this plan bases its need for such developments in one place ?

From:
Sent: 19 February 2019 16:02
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Changes to the local Plan 2011-2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

FAO the Planning Officer

I am strongly opposed to any changes being made to the above plan.

My reasons are as follows:

The area is being ruined by constant building of huge warehousing sites.

There is no requirement for more of the same there will be huge empty warehouses causing a further blot on the landscape.

The council have already agreed to 2 of the plans we do not need a third development here! Who is going to want to live in this area if it is full of warehouses?

I am considering moving out of the area as I am so fed up of all the congestion and pollution being caused by all the lorries going up and down the A5.

There is no evidence of a need for further warehouses, evidence has shown there is 4 times as much warehousing being planned than is actually required in Leicestershire.

Please do not implement the changes and further ruin what was once a nice countryside to live in.

From:
Sent: 19 February 2019 15:53
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Changes to the Local Plan 2011-2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to **object to the above changes** to this planning consideration. As a resident of Claybrooke Magna I am **strongly opposed** to any further developments being carried out in my area of Lutterworth/Claybrooke.

The main concerns I have are as follows:

- The traffic on the A5 is already at high capacity causing high levels of pollution and congestion which will only add to more traffic having to divert through the villages of Ullesthorpe and the Claybrookes.
- We already have two huge developments on our door step and the third one was turned down by Harborough District Council so why has it been included again in this plan?
- There are already two huge warehousing developments along the A5 at the M69 junction and Dirft near Catthorpe, there is no evidence we need more availability near Lutterworth.
- The impact on the landscape and wildlife of the local area will be massive and continue to run what was once a very peaceful and tranquil place to live.

Yours unhappily

From:
Sent: 20 February 2019 16:19
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Modifications to the Local Plan 2011-2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to oppose the proposed changes to the above plan.

For the following reasons:

Harborough District Council rejected the third application (15/01531) so why has it now been included in the Local Plan?

The government preferred option is for developments on rail heads whereas Magna Park provides non-rail head warehousing. There will be an massive over supply of non rail head warehousing if this goes ahead.

There is no evidence that such a large amount of further warehousing is required. 700,000 SQM of warehousing in Leicestershire is 4 times what is required in Leicestershire by 2031.

There are now 2 other massive developments along the A5 at Dirft and the M69 junction adding to an already congested route, further developments will only compound the heavy traffic with more huge lorries and commuter traffic.

I await your comments with interest.

From:
Sent: 20 February 2019 12:35
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to the Changes to the Local Plan 2011-2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to voice my **STRONG OPPOSITION** to the changes to the above Local Plan.

My family has lived in Claybrooke and I have enjoyed a peaceful and tranquil environment to live in. This will no longer be the case when more developments continue to go up in this once country area.

There is no evidence for more warehousing in this area - we have Magna Park which is huge and the new development on Mere lane near Ullesthorpe is going to cause congestion and pollution in this area and on the A5. We also have the developments further down the A5 at the M69 island and at Dirft near Clifton upon Dunsmore.

The local schools are already well over subscribed and the traffic associated with it at drop off times is, to put it bluntly dangerous, adding more traffic along these country roads will inevitably lead to more incidents and possibly accidents.

The original plan allowed for 2 huge developments in this area so why has this 3rd one been included again when there is **NO** evidence of a need for more warehousing?

I therefore am strongly opposed to this plan being amended. **Enough is enough!** Tell the developers their massive and ugly warehouses are not welcome here! Build them elsewhere!

Yours sincerely,

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 21:23
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031 Modifications January 2019

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

With regard to the Lutterworth SDA, east of the M1, I acknowledge that the drafted modifications strengthen the Plan in respect of many highly desirable aspects of development of the SDA, but I submit that further modifications are essential to positively ensure that the 'Spine Road' does, by its very design, alleviate the heavy traffic passing through Lutterworth town centre and also incorporates adequate means of its safe crossing by the cyclists and pedestrians foreseen in the Plan

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 22:49
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment on the modifications to the Local Plan

Importance: High

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear HDC.

As a local resident of Ullesthorpe, I have studied the revised local plan and would like to make the following comments.

- Magna Park provides non-rail warehousing whereas the Governments preferred option is developments on railheads. So why does HDC want to extend Magna Park further?
- There is clear evidence that building more warehousing at Magna Park will result in an over provision of non-rail warehousing in Leicestershire and the surrounding area.
- Where is the evidence that such a huge concentration of warehousing in one place is what is required?
- Since the three planning applications were submitted there have been many other warehouse developments, a number of them along the A5 at DIRFT and at the M69 junction.
- The A5 is inadequate to take the current traffic load. Given the extent of development along the A5 between the M69 and the M1 at Jn18 the road will not cope with the additional HGV and commuter traffic.
- The research shows that 700,000 sqmts is almost 4 times the assessed need for additional warehouse space in Leicestershire by 2031.
- One of the Local Plan objectives is to reduce out-commuting and to bring a wide range of jobs to the area. 10,000 jobs in warehousing will do the opposite.
- There are already huge staff vacancies at Magna Park, which cannot be filled so further expansion will just create more unfilled vacancies.
- The impact of the current warehouse being built along Mere Lane is clear to anyone who travels along that road. The additional of 3 times more warehousing will be completely overbearing on the landscape and on the villages of Bittesby and Ullesthorpe

I cannot understand why the further expansion of Magna Park was included in the Local Plan? Two of the planning applications have already been agreed but the third application (15/01531) was rejected by HDC.

There is no need for further development at Magna Park so the local plan needs to be amended again to reflect this.

Kind regards

From:
Sent: 22 January 2019 15:44
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: FW: Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031: Modifications Consultation
Attachments: MM Consultation Statement of Reps 09 01 19 V1.pdf

From: |
Sent: 22 January 2019 15:29
To: |
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: FW: Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031: Modifications Consultation

This Message originated outside your organization.

Hi

Thanks for the invite to make representation about the Modifications but as I spent a great deal of time making representations to the original plan - all of which were totally ignored - I can see no reason to spend the time on the Modifications, as they will no doubt receive the same degree of interest.

Regards

From: /
Sent: 23 February 2019 19:18
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth proposed plans.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

To whom it may concern,

Regarding the proposed plans for Lutterworth development, I'd like to raise my concerns:
The negative affect on the environment; increased pollution on an area where there is already an increasing rate of child asthma-the largest in the UK. So where would the extra health facilities come for these children? We need another dental practice as Leicestershire has the largest amount of tooth decay in Britain.
Traffic is a known issue in Lutterworth and if the extra junction on the motorway was built that would only increase the sheer volume of traffic, which would cause total gridlock.
Please think about the daily lives of the Lutterworth people. The High Street has many listed buildings, and the HGVs that pass through already shake the foundations.
Increase in HGVs would only increase the damage to buildings, our local heritage, our health and ruin our community market town feel.

Thank you for taking the time to read through my concerns. I hope you can understand my upset and seriously reconsider your plans for Lutterworth's future generations.

Kind regards,

From:
Sent: 18 February 2019 15:27
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Cc:
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Consultation Response on Local Plan

This Message originated outside your organization.

Thankyou for circulating your revised draft Plan for runner comment. My specific interest lies in Section 2.2.6 in relation to climate change issues.

However I suggest that

- i) On page 137 you should make more explicit reference to the "DEFRA Statement on Environmental Principles" which is currently tabled as part of the National agenda.(released Autumn 2018) and the "DEFRA NET GAIN" consultation (January 2019). The latter addresses issues around wildlife and biodiversity offsets from developers as a means to possible future funding routes for Local Government .It also refers to future intentions to reward developers or penalise them in relation to the extent of low carbon technologies incorporated in the design.
- ii) The revised version is somewhat narrow in referencing wind and solar PV in Policy CC2 – instead it should include broader terms such as "low carbon technologies" to embrace emergent applications such as heat pumps, ground source heat, battery storage and electric car domestic charge points. This would apply to commercial and domestic applications.
- iii) CC2 could be more broadly worded to "Attach importance to those technologies which offer reduction and substitution of fossil fuel consumption in the District in support of national policies aimed at mitigating the impact of climate change locally".

In the past of shared energy systems being ridiculed on developments of 8 or more houses or ,more recently, fossil LPG systems being considered instead of deep bore heat pumps (which obviate any long term fuel supply logistics impacts). In the case of single dwelling applications or multiple commercial sites the case for conditions on low carbon technologies or applications of SUDS systems have been seemingly ignored as carrying no weight .

Best wishes in your endeavours.
Kind regards

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 09:35
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Council 2011-2031 Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Strategic and Local Planning Team,

I am a resident of Lutterworth and have reviewed the most recent proposals for the Local Plan and would like to comment as follows:

- I am concerned that the community of Lutterworth will become fragmented into an East community which lacks integration with the established existing Lutterworth. Of course the M1 corridor is problematic, but the Plan exacerbates this by encouraging a greater traffic density along the current A426 within the market town, partly as the proposed access to new residential areas is considerably constrained by traffic lights and massive warehouse capacity with presumably consequential movements of HGVs.
- The projected demand for housing up to 2031 would appear to be met by half of what is proposed in the Plan. This will lead to a very drawn out development phase and indicates some poor prioritisation if housing capacity outperforms demand.
- The proposed plan gives no commitment for essential public services, such as doctors, dentists, and secondary schooling. Much of these public facilities are indicated as only being 'possible' and any trigger points for even primary schooling could well be many years away, meaning that the existing essential public services will be overstretched for years, and only available via car journeys due to the disparate community being built to the east, exacerbating traffic density along the A426. It seems to be anomalous that no provision appears to be proposed for secondary education as a result of the development.
- The proposed 13 hectares of new warehousing capacity seems to be at odds with/contravenes LCC Policy B12 limiting additional warehousing in the area to on or adjacent Magna Park. As the current warehousing built capacity is underutilised, and more planning is being currently considered for Magna Park, it really seems that LCC have potentially conflicts of interest as both landowner and local authority.
- What expert, impartial, evidence has been considered in respect of the totality of warehouse capacity proposed in the Plan? Expert assessment by an independent highly regarded professional is surely needed and their report made available for all aspects of proposed new warehousing in Lutterworth East, Magna Park, and Glebe Farm etc before land is committed to this, rather than other uses which might promote higher-value/greater diversity of inward investment to the area.
- Lutterworth has long been hoping to gain a relief road to improve the air quality along the A426 and to reduce congestion in the market town. This proposed local plan appears to exacerbate rather than address the existing problems. With a significantly increased population and warehousing space the proposed spine or service road will encourage greater traffic flows along the A426, and much of it

potentially HGV traffic. Surely the opportunity should be taken to provide an eastern relief road instead of just a spine road? This could be built to encourage through traffic to avoid the town centre by rerouting traffic from M1 junction 20 / Whittle roundabouts in the south, taking to the east of the development and by rejoining the A426 or the M1 at a point north of the town. Thus the new development east of Lutterworth can be made to feel a more contiguous community with the traditional centre. Access for through-traffic via the town centre could be discouraged by de-trunking the A426 which would restrict HGV for local deliveries etc.

- There appears to be little provision in the plan for truly sustainable travel. Practically, cycling is discouraged if bikes are placed in contention with cars/lorries or pedestrians or where segregated provision is made adjacent to high-speed unbuffered traffic flows. Once into the town centre, unless de-trunked as suggested above, the A426 will present a 'no-go' artery for cycling - both for travelling along it and for crossing it - which would add to the feeling of two communities rather than one.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: .
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:14
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Harborough District Council Town Plan 2011-2031

I wish to confirm that I support all the views and comments of Lutterworth Town Council as mentioned in their recent press release in their entirety regarding the above mentioned Town Plan.

Regards,

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 16:49
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth East

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

I am writing with comments on the proposed development Lutterworth East.

1. There is no provision to alleviate the extra traffic generated. The North-South road through Lutterworth suffers major congestion to the detriment and wellbeing of shoppers and public. Lutterworth east would make it worse. An eastern by-pass is needed or a motorway junction north of Lutterworth.
2. Extra warehousing is not needed as there are many existing ones that are not being used.
3. Half of the extra housing is not needed to meet housing requirements by 2031.
4. There is no provision for secondary education.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From:
Sent: 23 February 2019 14:35
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local plan 2011 - 2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir/Madam

I would like to express my concerns about the local plan as distributed early 2019.

The main problem, which already makes it difficult to live in Lutterworth, is the horrible amount of traffic coming through the town centre on the A426. This road has long been identified as having poor air quality from the traffic, with nothing ever done to ameliorate the situation. Additional developments in the draft plan allow for no relief road, so we can only expect the A426 to be worse in the amount of traffic and subsequent pollution. I believe that a proper solution to a relief road for Lutterworth must be a priority for any plan and that this is long overdue.

The proposal for more warehousing to the south-east corner of J20 of the M1 is astounding. I strongly object to this happening whilst we have Magna Park already blighting our environment. It is a bad idea to spread warehousing that far, especially after some warehousing was allowed to be built at the southern end of Lutterworth on the way to the M1 roundabout which has never been occupied. The many, many lorries on our local roads should be kept to the one side.

The development of an eastern district to Lutterworth must be done with proper facilities for the people living there. The estates that have been added to Lutterworth in recent times have had no local amenities added. The people living at far-flung areas cannot easily walk to pick up items they need, so are forever driving in, causing more pollution and more difficulties parking in town. Lutterworth East would be adding to these problems without shops, doctors, schools being provided.

I feel that the local plan as of early 2019 shows no regard for the quality of life of the people of Lutterworth. A solution to the traffic going through our town centre must be part of the council's thinking before proceeding with additional housing and keeping warehousing on the west side is a must.

Your faithfully

RECEIVED

Strategic and Local Planning Team

Harborough District Council

15 FEB 2019

The Local Plan

CORPORATE SERVICES
Harborough District Council

We are writing to object most strongly to the additional warehousing requirements at Magna Park of 700,00 square metres that is included on the new local plan. We consider it to be unsound!

The Inspector had asked the HDC to provide evidence that there was a need for such development in this area. It has failed to do this., so not positively prepared.

Page 238 of the Local plan states "compared with the National Average the District has higher levels of employment" "in transport and storage"

Page 244 Employment objectives. States "to create jobs that meet local employment needs. To contribute to reduce the need for out-commuting"

Additional job creations would have to be sourced from a much wider area, resulting in more traffic and more chaos and delays. And more traffic would not help the already high air pollution.

Page 82. 6.34 That Magna Park is a "focus of strategic distribution" in a "logistically favourable location" in the "Golden Triangle which is bounded by M1, M6 and M69" This is not true! The triangle does in fact extend to the M42, Junction 23A on the M1 and Junction 4 on the M6, encompassing a much larger area! This is not justified.

700,000 sq. metres would result in 4 times the amount research has found that is needed in the whole of Leicestershire. It is only there to accommodate current planning applications.

It would produce more non-rail warehousing, against the Government's specific recommendations. And would sacrifice a unique area designated a scheduled ancient monument. [The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979] Surely more important than obviously speculative warehousing! This area is frequented by many people, a lovely place to walk and take the dogs. The so called "country park" offered in mitigation is laughable. Who would want to walk in a tiny area surrounded by intimidating warehouses [especially if they are as large as the DHL currently being built in Mere Lane] with the accompanying noise and pollution? Especially when there's no proof that they're needed.

The amount of extra traffic would overwhelm the local roads. The planned A5 improvements would only affect the navigation of HGV's into and out of Magana Park.

There is already a tremendous increase of warehousing between Magna Park area and Rugby, not to mention more warehousing in the Hinkley area. The possible rail hub at Junction 2 M69 would inevitably attract more warehousing in that region which would totally overwhelm the villages in this corner of Leicestershire.

The recently allowed DHL warehouse in Mere Lane [in the process of being built now] illustrates the impact these monstrosities have on surrounding areas. Three times more warehousing would be suffocating!

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 22:41
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan modifications consultation

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This Message originated outside your organization.

Regarding the modifications to the Local Plan consultation.

To Whom it May Concern,

The Inspector has requested modifications to the draft Local Plan to demonstrate the specific allocation of 700,000sq.m B8 strategic distribution is required in the proposed area. None of the evidence documents demonstrate that specific area is required for that volume of B8 distribution, indeed some of the documents have been produced by property developer and marketing agents themselves that work for Gazeley, or indeed the documents have been produced by Gazeley themselves.

The evidence documents fail to highlight significant pipeline developments, and the only reason why the allocation has been set for these sites is due to a 7+ year old call for sites that clearly demonstrates how out-of date the proposals are. In other words, the market has moved on over that time and many other sites have been developed or are in development far more quickly, already saturating the area with B8 distribution.

Key potential benefits to the allocation have been diluted in the modifications, for example there was previously an emphasis on reducing out-commuting from the district, and this has now been removed and it shouldn't have been.

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 16:07
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local plan Lutterworth

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir,
With regard to the development of Lutterworth, we wish to make the following points:-)
We feel that a by pass is needed in order to prevent the town centre being completely over run with traffic,
We also feel that we don't need any more warehousing in Lutterworth and that any built should be restricted to the Magna Park area.
Yours faithfully,

Sent from my ASUS

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 19:15
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear sir/madam

I would like to forward my concerns over the future plans for Lutterworth I strongly believe that we have adequate warehousing within the Magna Park plan and therefore do not consider it necessary to include more in the Lutterworth East development. Warehousing newly constructed near to the M1 is still unoccupied so demand cannot be high.

The idea of creating primary school without secondary school placements is unrealistic. The quality of education is paramount and to expect existing schools to absorb the additional pupils will result in large class sizes, this is a huge negative.

Likewise the residents of the new housing will require doctors and dentists and these must be provided for as an addition to existing facilities. Road networks have to be a priority and cannot be built after the development has begun. Traffic has to flow without congestion so a bypass is essential.

To attract potential property buyers to the new Lutterworth East we will expect the above concerns to be addressed or we may find people may not want to relocate here and we have an embarrassing amount of empty properties!

Regards

From:
Sent: 23 February 2019 18:20
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth Local Plan 2011-2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Subject: Lutterworth Local Plan 2011-2031

Dear Sir/Madam

As residents of Lutterworth and after seeing the Lutterworth Local Plan 2011-2031, we would like you to consider the following points which are of major concern to many of us-

- Leicester Road 'by-pass'. The proposed 'spine road ' will not give the town centre the currently much needed relief of heavy traffic congestion, pedestrian hazard and pollution which will undoubtedly increase in the future. It's proposed location will only cause problems for the Lutterworth East Housing development. Surely another route can be found which links the Leicester Road to the M1/A4304.
- Lutterworth East Housing Development should be thought out with careful consideration regarding primary installation of facilities such as schools and health centres well before the timing of house completions to avoid extra pressure on Lutterworth Town's existing and already strained facilities due to recent increase in new housing . Bus services, cycleways and walkways linking Lutterworth East to Lutterworth Town should also be considered.
- The proposed 32 acres of new warehouses on the south side of the M1 is definitely not needed, there are already empty warehouses on the north side, there doesn't seem to be any need for more, and plans are already going ahead for warehousing development at Magna Park, which is the most sensible location for any further warehousing. We hope you will carefully consider the concerns of residents before any of the proposed plans are passed. Yours Sincerely

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 11:13
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough Local Plan Objection

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir

I would wish to object to the Harborough Local Plan for the following reasons.

I accept the present (and past government's wishes for more housing, particularly affordable and social housing, but I would also expect that any expansion of Lutterworth would be developed with the local populace publicly supported masterplan. In my opinion, this short period of consultation does not meet that requirement.

- Given the likely expansion of Magna Park I can see no reason for the provision of further warehousing on land adjacent to the eastern side of the M1 Junction 20.
- The proposal states that two new primary schools will be built, it requires the first of these facilities to be able to take a single form entry by the September prior to the building of the 300th new house. But what happens before that? Both existing primary school are already at breaking point.
- My major concern however is the 'spine road'. Having seen the original proposals and attended the public session at the Wycliffe Room in Lutterworth, the proposal was for an Eastern Relief Road with the express purpose of reducing the amount of traffic that uses Lutterworth Town Centre as a through route to Rugby, the M1 and beyond. These proposals do not provide for this, and instead refer to a "Spine Road" which would in effect merely service the new development, leaving the A426 Leicester Road as the primary trunk road through the area. Lutterworth already suffers high levels of air pollution, due to levels of traffic and it is imperative that the Local Plan reflects the need for Leicestershire County Council to adhere to their initial proposals and provide a relief road for the inhabitants of Lutterworth

From: .
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:59
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] LOCAL PLAN

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Whilst I accept that the local plan for Lutterworth East looks good and seems to offer nice green spaces and housing which I am not against. I do have some concerns which I feel have been missed and are detrimental to the existing Lutterworth Town where I have lived for the last years.

My concerns:

1. Whilst the local plan makes reference to the new development being protected from pollution and includes certain measures nothing in the plan serves to reduce the current levels of pollution / NOX in Lutterworth. In fact the additional congestion / development traffic will only increase pollution. My children who walk to school already comment about the smell and taste of the air. You must not ignore this!
2. Congestion. By not providing a bypass you are forcing even more traffic through the Town centre. This cannot be acceptable and will only add to point 1 above.
3. Primary Schools in the area are already at maximum levels and the development only adds to the issue. The lack of infrastructure investment in Old Lutterworth and the delay in providing new primary schools based on completed housing will greatly cause issue and may cause schools to yet again increase class sizes. Again as part of point 2. Children will have to be driven to school and so will create more pollution. There are significant shortages already around the existing schools and this cause potential dangers to children crossing roads in the local area on the school walk.
4. Parking shortages already exist and the additional demand on landlocked business will cause issue for shoppers / visitors to the Town.
5. Do we need more warehousing. I believe the additional warehousing is in excess of limited restrictions already set with the Magna Park expansion.
6. There is relatively no unemployment in Lutterworth. Additional warehousing will create more congestion/pollution and given that typically is 'lower' paid will not help these people purchase housing in the area. As a result these persons will not add any value to the local economy.
7. Build new offices that pay greater salaries and add to the area.
8. Health services are already limited. You cannot guarantee that new surgeries will be built and this will cause severe issues with appointments. Dental surgeries etc are already on big waiting lists.
9. Where the proposed warehousing is to be put would be greater used for retail as this would help reduce traffic from new to old Lutterworth.
10. The connection between New and Old Lutterworth will make it difficult for the two to unite as one. Greater work on the 'links' are required.

Please do not ignore pollution. Please refer to HDC's own reports on NOX levels..... save our children from all the effects of this. Please be aware that smart motorways are scheduled for the M1 and this will increase levels. We need more trees and less traffic.

Regards

From:
Sent: 22 February 2019 13:45
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth Local Plan

This Message originated outside your organization.

I would like to make some comments on the Local Plan 2011-2031.

I object to the provision of a 'Spine Road' rather than a Lutterworth bypass, as was in the former plan. It just moves heavy goods traffic from one road (A426) to another (the spine road). A bypass would mean traffic would avoid both aforementioned roads.

I object to the proposed warehouses on the south side of the M1. There is already one just outside Lutterworth which is empty. Any warehouse development should be in the Magna Park area. I object to the 25 acres of office and light industry in Lutterworth East between the two developments.

I object to there being no mention of social housing in the list of housing types proposed.

I object to the plan on pollution grounds and believe it will make pollution levels both sides of the motorway worse rather than better.

I object to the building of a new bridge over the motorway as there are several bridges already in the locality which could be utilised to link a Lutterworth bypass to the M1.

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 20:04
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Local Plan - Objection to Policy L1 (Lutterworth East)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

As residents of Lutterworth we wish to register our deep concern that the plans for the proposed Lutterworth East development have first and foremost not taken the resulting impact on traffic through the old town into consideration.

When Lutterworth East was first envisaged we remember this being put forward in conjunction with a proposed bypass to divert traffic away from the A426 through Lutterworth. The A426 is already very busy, particularly during peak periods, and many heavy lorries use this route through the town from South Leicester down to the M1. Congestion is added to by delivery vans and lorries parking on the hill down through the town, particularly on the southbound side of the road. We find it hard to believe that any of the counsellors responsible for promoting the East Lutterworth development without a bypass actually live in this area - the current proposals for further warehousing and employment areas can only bring more heavy traffic through the town, and it is completely unacceptable to think the provision of a 'spine road' will in any way compensate for this and for the amount of traffic generated by the new housing. We know new houses are needed, but the infrastructure for transport needs to be adapted to support these developments and there is scant evidence of this in the proposed Plan. Modification of the Whittle roundabout, new traffic lights and / or roundabouts in the area will go nowhere near alleviating the increase in traffic, and consequently, pollution.

You will be aware that the massive warehouse built near junction 20 on the old Lutterworth side has been standing empty since construction - we would dispute the need for more warehousing in Lutterworth being so near to Magna Park and the Rugby developments in any case. Lutterworth seems to be turning into a semi-industrialised urban sprawl according to your plans. Building warehousing outside Magna Park contravenes your existing policy BE2 which you are undoubtedly aware of and no doubt prepared to override if these plans are passed.

Please rethink your policies and develop a plan that is sympathetic to the people who live - and will come to live - in the area, with adequate infrastructure provision. Your existing proposals are disappointingly ill thought out and inadequate for the long term future of our area.

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 22:16
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL]

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

As a resident of Lutterworth I would like to make the following comments on the local plan:

- The local plan does not provide a long needed by pass and traffic is bound to increase along the already very busy, pollution filled Leicester Road. This needs to be looked at again and solutions found. Lutterworth needs a bypass not more traffic and HGV traffic.
- Lutterworth does not need more warehouses, there are already relatively new ones next to the M1 which have never been used. The warehouse development planned is contrary to Policy BE2 as any further warehouse development is only permitted in or next to Magna Park which this site clearly isn't.
- The proposed housing development (Lutterworth East) seems to lack the necessary facilities, schools etc. The Lutterworth primary schools are almost at capacity now. I would like to see the plan require a primary school way before the completion of the 300 th house (which seems far too late). I think there should also be provision for a secondary school as currently Lutterworth College has some spare capacity but houses are still being built in Lutterworth at present which could reduce that. A doctors surgery and dentist would also need to be provided as the current provision would not be able to cope with the proposed population increase.
- If this housing development and the current town of Lutterworth are to become one 'extended Lutterworth' how is this to be done with a major motorway running through the middle, although there are some greenways and walkways proposed between the two, I'm not sure there are enough and the distances seem quite far so further traffic and pollution are likely to be created - just what Lutterworth does not need. Again traffic / road planning management needs to be investigated carefully in order to find a creative and effective solution.
- Safety, the Gloster Road housing estate just off the Leicester Road has already suffered a terrible fatality due in part to the ease of which the motorway can be accessed by a pedestrian. Adequate fencing / barriers need to put in place as soon as development starts.

Thank you

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 22:56
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan modifications consultation

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

I am writing in relation to the consultation on the modifications to the Local Plan. I have 3 main areas of feedback:

1) The lack of substantive evidence for the 700,000sq.m to be allocated at Magna Park and adjoining areas specifically.

This was the requirement that the Inspector set of HDC, and sufficient answers have still not been provided. Market forces and market demands are highly unknown in the logistics sector - after all, the business model of the developers for the 700,000sq.m (gazeley and dbsymmetry) are “speculative” developers, and they themselves do not know whether their investments will be returned. The plain matter of fact is that these sites were chosen because the developers were more advanced in these regions, and now it’s too late to turn around. A call for sites more than 5 years ago has resulted in this outcome. The true evidence would be to re-launch a call for sites to see which developers did express interest - if any, given the significantly high volumes (indeed surplus according to HEDNA report) of forecast B8 distribution space in the region.

2) The modification in L1 for Lutterworth East to also have the potential for B8 >9,000sq.m floorspace is totally unreasonable and needs to be removed.

The suggested policy itself even admits that further B8 allocation in the area would far exceed any projected demand. Why has it been altered from non-strategic? B8 warehousing at J20 has remained empty of over 1 year now, how can further B8 allocation be required? It is understandable that commercial property is needed to enable infrastructure improvements, but not at >9,000sq.m B8 scale.

3) The lack of emphasis on the Lutterworth East “through” road relieving traffic through Lutterworth / reducing air pollution.

There is no benefit of Lutterworth East to Lutterworth as it stands. A “mirrored” town (as the policy itself now says) with its own facilities, with the expectation that people will walk into Lutterworth over the M1. The modifications have reduced the emphasis on the road through Lutterworth East being able to help reduce traffic through Lutterworth along the A426. This has to be addressed and greater commitments made in the policy now.

Regards,

From:
Sent: 17 February 2019 07:27
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Plans for Lutterworth

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir

Having read the recommended plans for Lutterworth I am very concerned that no provision has been made for an expansion of the Feilding Palmer Hospital.

This will be of utmost importance to the Town and will need many more beds in order to cope with a much larger population.

Yours faithfully

Sent from my iPhone

From: '
Sent: 24 February 2019 16:18
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] comment on local plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Strategic and Local Planning Team

Re Lutterworth development

Having viewed the plans at the town council yesterday, I am writing with my concerns and objections.

1) I understand that there is a demand for housing, but the number proposed (2750) is much greater than the number needed to meet the requirements (1260) .

2) The only schools proposed are 2 primary schools. In fact, although the Lutterworth primary schools are full, there are many surrounding village schools with capacity. What we really lack is secondary schools, with both the college and the high school being at capacity already (and facing greater pressure when the existing building near the high school is complete). Providing additional funding to the existing secondary schools is not sufficient. A whole new school would be needed.

3) We need a guarantee of a doctors surgery, sports facilities, and good public transport in the new development.

4) There appears to be no logical thought when it comes to roads, with lorries heading to Magna Park still expected to go through either "old" or "new" Lutterworth. The pollution levels are already significant, and this will make them considerably worse. The so called "spine road" will take lorries through new residential areas.

5) Warehouses - this is my main concern. There is known to be no need for more warehouses. Magna Park already has several empty warehouses, and it is already being expanded, which will give rise to even more empty warehouses. We also have a warehouse near the motorway roundabout, built 18 months ago and still unused. It is my understanding that LCC are simply selling their land to companies building warehouses just to get money, regardless of whether or not there is a need for this facility. This fact has been admitted by LCC. Also, policy BE2 states that the only warehouse development that can take place is on or next to Magna Park. However, according to the plan, a huge warehouse development is proposed adjacent to the motorway roundabout, literally miles away from Magna Park. This is surely contrary to the policy requirements.

6) The vast scale of this proposed building, much of which is unnecessary and will remain unoccupied, is clearly being seen as a money-maker for LCC. Whilst I understand that county councils have had their funding slashed, and are keen to generate money wherever they can, I feel this is a terrible mistake. Carving up huge swathes of land will destroy wildlife, create pollution, reduce green spaces, and turn what is supposed to be a "market town" into a ghetto of unused warehouses. There are already empty warehouses a little further up the M1 near Fosse Park, and there is a huge development of warehouses being built on the A5 near Hinckley. Just how many empty warehouses do we actually need on our countryside?

Please consider this issues when making planning decisions.

yours sincerely

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 09:57
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Council Local Plan 2011-2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir/Madam ,

I have read the Local Plan for Harborough District for Lutterworth and have the following concerns:

1.The Plan shows that there is no relief road for Lutterworth when one is clearly needed, to alleviate traffic congestion and pollution of our already congested town.

This could easily be achieved by creating a new junction at one of the bridges between Lutterworth and Dunton Bassett. This would serve a double purpose, as it would mean heavy traffic going to Luttwerworth East would by pass the town, as well as meaning that residents who live on the north side of the town, would be able to access the motorway going north, saving them the hassle of going south through the town, in order to travel north on the motorway.

2.The Plan shows there is to be 25 acres of office and light industry by the side of the motorway - WHY?, this could be achieved by simply moving the proposed development to the southside of the roundabout, where the proposed 32 acres of new warehousing is to be built, as I am sure we do not need more warehousing in Lutterworth when we already have large new warehouses standing empty, both in Lutterworth and also a few miles away in Rugby by the M6.

3. Where in the Plan is the provision for new secondary schooling, to ease the burden on our already busy 2 secondary schools.

Sent from Windows Mail

From:
Sent: 19 February 2019 19:59
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] HDC Local Plan 2011-2031 modifications

This Message originated outside your organization.

HDC Local Plan 2011-2031 modifications

In October 2018 the inspector of the HDC Local Plan 2011-2031 stated that the plan was not sound due to Policy B2 Strategic Distribution which would allow further expansion at Magna Park. The Inspector required HDC to review the policy and provide evidence of the need for further development at Magna Park, rather than the demand demonstrated by basing Policy B2 on three planning applications from two developers.

I do not believe that the modified version of Policy B2 provides any additional independent evidence of the need for further development at Magna Park. In fact the opposite is the case as the evidence shows that providing more non-rail based distribution land will result in an over supply in Leicestershire.

The concentration of warehousing at Magna Park and other sites along the A5 is having a devastating effect on the local area with little or no benefits for that area. It is significant that the full Council of HDC rejected the third planning application ([15/01531/OUT](#)), which matches the area of land under discussion, stating: “the landscape impact is severe and outweighs the economic benefits”.

I would ask that Policy B2 proposing additional land be allocated to warehousing at Magna Park be deleted from the Local Plan.

Thank you

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 13 February 2019 13:52
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] LOCAL PLAN 2011 TO 2031 OBJECTION

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir/Madam

I object to the following on the grounds of:

1. The 700,000 sqmts is based on three planning applications, which demonstrates demand not need.
2. Why include it in the Local Plan when 2 of the planning applications have already been agreed. I understand that the 3rd application (15/01531) was rejected by HDC.
3. Surely we should be looking at non-rail warehousing in Leicestershire, Crick in particular, to save traffic, pollution, environment. More warehousing at Magna Park will result in an over provision.
4. Magna Park provides non-rail warehousing whereas the Government's preferred option is developments on railheads.
5. Do we require a huge concentration of warehousing in one place?
6. In this area there are extension warehouses being built in Warwickshire down A5 DIRFT etc why are we not looking at the whole area not just county councils, look at the map in this area there are far too many the roads cannot cope with traffic as it is? The A5 is inadequate to take the current traffic load. Given the extent of development along the A5 between the M69 and the M1 at Jn18 the road will not cope with the additional HGV and commuter traffic.
8. The research shows that 700,000 sqmts is almost 4 times the assessed need for additional warehouse space in Leicestershire by 2031.
9. the increase in warehousing will create more road traffic and pollution for commuting!
10. We are losing our heritage and landscape in and around the villages and towns of Lutterworth, it is looking monstrous and unattractive.
11. What happened to the Government's aim to cut pollution and the risk to health with fumes from traffic etc. Lutterworth is renowned for bad pollution as it is>

Yours faithfully

From:
Sent: 07 February 2019 15:02
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to amendments made to the Local Plan 2011-2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sirs

As a resident of Ullesthorpe, I wish to further object to the changes made to the Local Plan 2011-2031 in respect of additional development at Magna Park in Lutterworth.

You have continued to pursue additional development of warehousing space in Lutterworth without regard for the current oversupply of distribution centres locally, or the fact that there is already significant development being undertaken at Rugby, DIRFT and Hinckley/M69 (all less than 8 miles from Magna Park).

Furthermore you have already passed a not insignificant expansion of Magna Park South together with the massive DHL development along Mere Lane, none of which were approved when the plan was originally drawn up.

The A5 is already a significantly busy road (which I cross twice daily to get to work) and at peak times there are queues at all junctions without the significant further increases in traffic that this development will cause. To all intents our village will be cut-off from the West should this together with the other developments already started continue to go ahead.

I also have severe doubts that the existing developments are sustainable as there are already vacant units on Magna Park, so when you add in DIRFT and the M69 it is likely that we will have a series of white-elephant units covering what is otherwise fertile farmland and with the consequential losses of habitat and draining implications that go with developments of this nature. I would ask you therefore where is the evidence that there is either the need for this warehousing, and that such a concentration in a small geographic area is desirable?

Finally I know that many of the existing Magna Park businesses struggle to find employees, with busloads being shipped in from Birmingham and beyond on a daily basis. Once again there is no evidence that these types of jobs are required in our district, or that there are workers available to fill them. Once more the continued development would only further exacerbate congestion along the A5 corridor with commuter vehicles added to the increase in commercial traffic. As you will be aware the A5 is already overburdened and any problems on the M6, M1 or M69 already bring the area to near grid-lock, is it really sensible to add further traffic to an already overstretched route? Surely it would be desirable to have links with alternate rail/air transport rather than simply adding more trucks?

Yours sincerely

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 17:48
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth east

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir,

I accept the need for more houses in Lutterworth. The town, however, has major problems with traffic congestion and pollution. The plan put forward for Lutterworth east seems only to increase these problems. Originally there were proposals for a ring road but that seems to have disappeared. The now proposed spine road is simply not good enough. There have been ideas put forward by Lutterworth town council which seem to solve many of the problems i.e. The construction of junction 20a on the M1. I support their plan and urge you to give it your full consideration.

I would also question the need for more warehousing in Lutterworth east considering the plan for expansion of Magna Park.

Yours faithfully

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 08 February 2019 12:00
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Consultation objection

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir,

I would respectfully ask that the following points were taken into consideration before any decision is taken re. the expansion of Magna Park.

- The Government's preference is for transport to be via 'Rail-heads' (eg. DIRFT) to remove HGV's off the major routes not in massive sites such as Magna Park.
- The A5 is overwhelmed by traffic! Recent M1 closures due to accidents have re-routed via M69 and A5 and have clearly shown this .
- A wide range of jobs in the area. Warehousing does not provide this (they are mostly picking). More important the vast majority of workers commute from Leicester, Coventry and further afield NOT from Lutterworth. This only adds to the traffic problem!
- Lutterworth is already encircled by the road system- the M1, A5, and Lutterworth by-pass. A huge increase in HGV traffic due to this development can only increase the already dangerous levels of fumes and toxins in this area. Our HEALTH is important!!
- If this expansion is so necessary why are there numerous unoccupied units on Magna Park? There are more to come- Symmetry Park and along the A5 and next to the M69. In addition why have the purpose built units at Junction 20 not been occupied? If there was need they would have been used instead of being empty for almost a year!!

Yours sincerely,

Resident of Lutterworth.

From: ..
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:11
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Council Local Plan2011-2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

I wish to add my support to the concerns expressed in the recent Lutterworth town council press release. Particularly relating to :- 1. Although it seems originally a bye pass was proposed it appears to have been forgotten.

Absence of a bye pass would be detrimental. At this time the town centre has the taste, sound, smell and pollution of a large traffic junction.

With sympathetic consideration this could be improved to restore a much more pleasant environment.

2. warehouses in Lutterworth East contravene policy BE2.

3. Timely provision of primary school access and realistic assessment of secondary school requirements, relating to the Lutterworth East development.

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 08:56
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan 2011 - 2013; Lutterworth

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

26 Feb 2019

Re Local Plan 2011 – 2031. Lutterworth

To Whom it may concern,

I was pleased to be able to view the Local Plan 2011 – 2013 recently exhibited at Lutterworth Town Council offices, and also to see the Harborough plans for the development of the Lutterworth Town Centre last week at Waitrose store.

Finally I am pleased there is now a plan for the area to stop much of what I believe to be piecemeal development which has been uncoordinated and a blight on the area. Hopefully with the plan there will now be some coordination to development. I understand that development in the area is inevitable, particularly for housing. But control and strategic planning have thus far been absent it appears.

Below are some points/observations I would like to make.

- The plan for housing in Lutterworth East , even though I would rather retain the prime agricultural land, gives a unique opportunity to co-ordinate development in the area and even solve some of our long standing issues. (Traffic congestion, noise and pollution in the Town Centre in particular.)
- If this development was accompanied by a north south by pass, and/or an extra motorway junction north of Dunton Bassett, much of the town centre congestion would be alleviated. And as Lutterworth Town Council point out, need not add significantly to the overall cost.
- This could then allow for traffic calming and reduction measures to be introduced in the centre, to enhance the attractiveness, a pedestrian area along Church street would further aid this as would seating areas, social areas.
- This would make the Town more attractive to the growing population for shopping, leisure and businesses. It could even resurrect the struggling Thursday Market.
- Extra, cheaper car parking in the centre would also encourage this.
- The above seems such an obvious and I believe relatively simple solution to the issues we face in Lutterworth, I find it hard to believe that planners currently only have outline for a spine road through Lutterworth East. This will be totally inadequate. And when I spoke to the developers at last year's presentation on Lutterworth East it was evident they were not familiar with the local problems and issues. It seemed they were merely performing an exercise on a map! And their thoughts re encouraging residents in the area to use cycle ways and pedestrian routes totally unrealistic.

- Plans for schooling is totally inadequate. *
the problems of overcrowding some schools currently have. Primary schools need to be built sooner than allowed for, and provision must be made for secondary education; school leaving ages have been raised!
- Plans for health care provision falls short of what will be needed. GP surgeries are already very full.
- Finally, Plans allow for more warehousing development to take place in Lutterworth East. Magna Park is already growing, too large in my opinion, to the west of the town. It seems totally impractical and aesthetically undesirable to squeeze Lutterworth between two areas of warehousing. Further, Policy BE2 says that warehousing must be on or next to Magna Park. Please ensure this is followed.
- I would like to congratulate the Inspector for his thoroughness so far in looking at proposals. It appears he has grasped the need to maintain the community of Lutterworth. i.e. his comments concerning the site of the existing Leisure Centre.

Please take this opportunity, whilst developing Lutterworth, to keep its essential character and community and even enhance it, despite having to lose so much of our agricultural space.

Yours sincerely

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:57
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re Local Plan 2011 - 2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sirs,

I write with deep concerns over various issues in the Local Plan for this area.

Firstly, whilst the proposed new development, Lutterworth East, will in all likelihood go ahead, I would like to raise the following points, in hope that the Inspector may take them into consideration :

2750 new homes are proposed. However to satisfy the projected demand by 2031, only 1260 homes will be needed. So this is possibly going to be a 25 year project. Whilst this will bring more people into the area, I feel that Lutterworth East should be seen as part of Lutterworth and must not be seen as another town. This in itself would open more doors for further developments!

The plan for an increase in educational facilities with Lutterworth East suggests that there will be 2 new Primary Schools allowed for, but no Secondary School. The plan states that the first Primary School will be available before the 300th house is built.....this is far too late and it will be needed before or when the first 100 houses are built. Secondary facilities ARE NEEDED and yet we are told money will be available if so, but there is NO firm plan. This in itself is very short sighted as schools in this area have already got way over average class sizes.

There is also a 'Community Hub' area on the plan. When discussing this with Marrons, back last year, they were not sure what this space would be used for. In fact they didn't seem to have any idea really and were suggesting various options, which seemed to be shot from the hip and were very vague, in general, to say the least.

Health facilities, including dentistry are stretched to bursting point already. not cope with more than another 2,000 new patients on their books between them. (This was before the new housing estate off Brookfield way was even started, which in itself is going to provide another 250 homes at 2.3 national average, per household = 575 new patients before Lutterworth East even starts) There is also a study/engagement currently taking place by the local Clinical Commissioning Group into the improvement of Community Services in the area, but again funding and staffing issues are significant. (this being the national picture also.) unlikely that another Health Centre would be built in Lutterworth East, as again there is a national shortage of GP's to fill any vacancies! So this is a very serious issue and needs to be addressed as well as the education position.

Also, I note that there is an allocation for more warehouses in Lutterworth East Plan. What is the proven need for this? We have Magna Park to the West, which in itself is being extended , doubling its size. Surely, there is no reason whatsoever for more warehouses at Lutterworth East other than Leicestershire County

Council wanting the money. The land that will be used is top class agricultural land and the warehouses in Lutterworth East contravene Policy BE2 (Magna Park)

Traffic and pollution: Our town currently has one of the highest readings for pollution in the country. We have enormous traffic issues through the town. We were told (Lutt East) we would get a by pass. We were told the developers were interested in the future of Lutterworth. The current proposals do not help. Instead of a new bridge across the motorway to accommodate Lutterworth East and Spine road, surely it would make much more sense to add a new junction 20a where the A426 and M1 meet . This would be a key element of a new route to the south and east of Leicester as part of the A46 Expressway proposals and falls within the A46 Priority Growth Corridor, identified in the Leics and Leicester Strategic Growth Plan and Midlands Connects Transport Strategy. This option could maximise the ease of traffic through Lutterworth town enormously.

I hope that my points will be considered and taken into account.

Yours faithfully,

From:
Sent: 19 February 2019 20:04
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan 2011-2031 modifications

This Message originated outside your organization.

I would like you to reconsider the proposal to allow further expansion at Magna Park as per the modified Policy BE2. The Inspector requested that the council review the original Policy BE2 because it made the draft plan unsound as it was based on three planning applications, demonstrating demand rather than need.

No additional independent evidence of demand has been produced. HDC state in their evidence that "authorities should ensure that there are multiple strategic sites with vacant development plots available at different geographical locations at all times". However the only site in the draft local Plan is Magna Park where there will be a massive concentration of warehousing in one location. There is already availability at this location. Why build more here?

Policy BE2 feels as if it designed to meet the needs/demands of one developer rather than the needs of the wider industry and the local communities.

Please remove the proposed further expansion of Magna Park from the Local Plan.

From:
Sent: 04 February 2019 14:34
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local plan to extend Magna Park

This Message originated outside your organization.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

I strongly object to further development at Magna Park site. There are already many industrial units empty There is enough development in the area with the Dirft , A69/A5 building and all that is being built at Stoney Stanton/ Donnington Area Do we need all this warehousing ?? The A5 is always too busy without further lorries using it. Also in the future we will need all the good agricultural land we have to be able to feed our growing nation.

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 20:17
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth Local Planning Objections

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir,

I am writing to share a few concerns with 'The Local Plan 2011-2031' for Lutterworth.

Firstly, I can see there is a need for further 'affordable' housing in the Lutterworth but am not sure that there is a need to DOUBLE the size of the town. 1260 is what is needed to meet housing requirements by 2031 and this should be the only amount built. Especially as there is the new town of Houlton currently under construction just down the A5 (south) which will bring circa 6000 houses. This is approximately 3-4 miles away.

The local plan mentions that there MAY be provision of two primary schools but no mention of a secondary school. All of the surrounding villages have primary schools, it is secondary schools which the area needs more of, where do all the children go once they have been through primary school? How are they supposed to get to school from the new housing development as both of the current secondary schools are across the M1 ?

Are there any plans for more doctors/dentists etc? With the size of Lutterworth almost doubling in terms of residents, will there be provision for a police station?, we currently have no immediate police presence and crime is rising steadily in the area, It just so happens that we have some of the best exit routes as we are central for various motorway networks, making Lutterworth an easy target for crime.

The local plan seems to think that we need more warehousing !!! I have lived in Lutterworth for years now, and there are at least four large warehousing units which have stood completely empty for a number of years (two of them from before we moved in). There is a huge warehouse construction underway at Magna Park and I think that these will also stand empty once it is completed. I don't believe that Lutterworth East should have any warehousing provision. What we have stands empty.

There is talk that Aldi might put in planning permission to be sited opposite 'The Elms'. This will just bring more traffic through Lutterworth and cause problems with exiting the shop, all traffic will have to turn left in order to be safe, thus putting more traffic and pollution through an already congested road. A retail unit might be much better placed just past the M1 motorway bridge (heading out towards Market Harborough on the right). This would also be more convenient for the proposed housing which is that side of the M1.

The local plan shows a spine road on the A426 north of Lutterworth. I have heard that a new bridge is to be built for this spine road at enormous cost. The addition of this road will not relieve any traffic through the centre of Lutterworth as this is the only route from people in south Leicestershire travelling south to head towards junction 20 to gain access onto the M1 or A5. It has been suggested that there is a bridge which is already in use near Dunton Bassett (north of Lutterworth) which could be utilized by the addition of new slip roads, therefore creating a new junction (20A) of the M1 which would allow traffic to join the M1 earlier and completely bypass Lutterworth town, therefore lower traffic and lower pollution. This could be taken one step further, by adding weight restrictions to the A426 and making it B426 (again lowering traffic and pollution further).

Whilst we all realize that nothing can ever stay the same, small measures can be taken to reduce the impact of those things that we know will change. I hope that you read this email and realize that the points above are all valid and some of them are even cost reducing points (spine road solution for example).

I would be very interested in hearing your comments, if you would like to ring me to discuss the matter further, please feel free, my number is

Kind regards

Sent using my iPhone!

Best Regards

From:
Sent: 13 February 2019 14:46
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Magna Park

This Message originated outside your organization.

Once again, I am writing to urge the planning authorities to refuse to allow further development at Magna Park. Considering the number of warehouses under construction, and already existing, in the local area, it is not credible that yet more are necessary.

The ever increasing volume of heavy traffic is causing air pollution, detrimental to the health of residents. At the same time, green fields are disappearing at an alarming rate, further jeopardising the well being of those living nearby.

While there is still time, please respect the wishes of local people, and call a halt to proposed expansion at the already over-bearing eyesore at Magna Park.

Yours faithfully,

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 20:00
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth Local Planning Objections

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir,

I am writing to share a few concerns with 'The Local Plan 2011-2031' for Lutterworth.

Firstly, I can see there is a need for further 'affordable' housing in the Lutterworth but am not sure that there is a need to DOUBLE the size of the town. 1260 is what is needed to meet housing requirements by 2031 and this should be the only amount built. Especially as there is the new town of Houlton currently under construction just down the A5 (south) which will bring circa 6000 houses. This is approximately 3-4 miles away.

The local plan mentions that there MAY be provision of two primary schools but no mention of a secondary school. All of the surrounding villages have primary schools, it is secondary schools which the area needs more of, where do all the children go once they have been through primary school? How are they supposed to get to school from the new housing development as both of the current secondary schools are across the M1 ?

Are there any plans for more doctors/dentists etc? With the size of Lutterworth almost doubling in terms of residents, will there be provision for a police station?, we currently have no immediate police presence and crime is rising steadily in the area, It just so happens that we have some of the best exit routes as we are central for various motorway networks, making Lutterworth an easy target for crime.

The local plan seems to think that we need more warehousing !!! I have lived in Lutterworth for years now, and there are at least four large warehousing units which have stood completely empty for a number of years (two of them from before we moved in). There is a huge warehouse construction underway at Magna Park and I think that these will also stand empty once it is completed. I don't believe that Lutterworth East should have any warehousing provision. What we have stands empty.

There is talk that Aldi might put in planning permission to be sited opposite 'The Elms'. This will just bring more traffic through Lutterworth and cause problems with exiting the shop, all traffic will have to turn left in order to be safe, thus putting more traffic and pollution through an already congested road. A retail unit might be much better placed just past the M1 motorway bridge (heading out towards Market Harborough on the right). This would also be more convenient for the proposed housing which is that side of the M1.

The local plan shows a spine road on the A426 north of Lutterworth. I have heard that a new bridge is to be built for this spine road at enormous cost. The addition of this road will not relieve any traffic through the centre of Lutterworth as this is the only route from people in south Leicestershire travelling south to head towards junction 20 to gain access onto the M1 or A5. It has been suggested that there is a bridge which is already in use near Dunton Bassett (north of Lutterworth) which could be utilized by the addition of new slip roads, therefore creating a new junction (20A) of the M1 which would allow traffic to join the M1 earlier and completely bypass Lutterworth town, therefore lower traffic and lower pollution. This could be taken one step further, by adding weight restrictions to the A426 and making it B426 (again lowering traffic and pollution further).

Whilst we all realize that nothing can ever stay the same, small measures can be taken to reduce the impact of those things that we know will change. I hope that you read this email and realize that the points above are all valid and some of them are even cost reducing points (spine road solution for example).

I would be very interested in hearing your comments, if you would like to ring me to discuss the matter further, please feel free, my number is

Kind regards

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 10:10
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection 15/01531

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

To Whom It May Concern

I have lived in Willey and I strongly oppose the proposed further development of Magna Park.

When the third application 15/01531 has already been rejected I fail to understand why it has been included in the plan?

The A5 is congested with the current traffic load. Given the extent of the development along the A5 between the M69 and M1 at J 18 the road will not cope with the additional traffic. In addition it will increase noise and pollution for those living within close proximity.

The impact of the current warehouse being built along Mere lane is evident to all. I cannot imagine how overbearing 3 times the amount of warehousing will be on the landscape and how it will affect the surrounding villages our quality of life, the countryside, the environment and our wildlife!!!!

Yours sincerely

Sent from my iPhone

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:24
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan Comments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

To whom it may concern,

Please find my comments regarding the Local Plan.

Magna Park Expansion:

1. I see no evidence of any actual planning from the Planning department. Planning involves analysing NEED against SUPPLY. In my view there is no NEED for additional warehouse space at Magna Park given the abundant SUPPLY of empty warehouse space in the following locations. I see no analysis of the utilisation of these sites as part of the analysis
 - i. Magna Park itself
 - ii. M1 @ Lutterworth
 - iii. Rugby Gateway
 - iv. Burbage (served by rail)
 - v. DIRFT (served by rail)
 - vi. East Midlands Gateway (served by rail & air)
2. The creation of jobs should be to increase the wealth of a community, and the role created should be diverse. Warehousing, Distribution & Logistics are very much at risk from automation yet HDC continues to destroy countryside to build these monstrous warehouses without considering future employment (and therefore future economic success). Some studies have found that up to 80% of these roles are now at risk. Please find some interesting articles below:
 - i. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/apr/30/reality-automation-terrifying>
 - ii. <https://www.peoplevox.com/blogs/warehouse-automation-job-loss>
 - iii. <https://www.technologyreview.com/the-download/609672/amazons-investment-in-robots-is-eliminating-human-jobs/>
3. Even if the articles above end up to be wrong, Warehousing, Distribution & Logistic roles traditionally are lower paid. They are not wealth creating, and would result in a community too reliant on one industry and unable to afford to invest and grow within itself.
4. The plan appears to include a third Magna Park planning application that was rejected by HDC. Why is this included?
5. The Inspector who analysed HDC's plan did not believe there was sufficient evidence provided by HDC. I cannot see any further analysis of this evidence becoming available.
6. Magna Park is not served by rail and the Government says distribution sites should be. It is therefore at odds with Governmental policy.
7. Any right minded individual would agree that the current warehouse being built for DHL (who if the grapevine is to be believed are now not to take residence) is a disaster for the local countryside. It is simply enormous, and no amount of painted stripes will lessen it's impact. If it is to be used it is still hideous. If it is to be a Blue Stripty Empty White Elephant then it's a scandal and HDC Planners

should be ashamed. And if that is the case then what is to stop future developments also being left as empty blights due to terrible planning.

8. Road distribution creates a tremendous impact on the local environment and community. Air, noise & light pollution are already too high. The Government has a strategy to bring this down, with scientists the world over almost unanimously agreed that we must do everything we can to temper global warming and reduce emissions. Individuals are told to walk more, drive more efficient cars, recycle more, stop single use plastics, reduce utility use. Yet HDC wishes to inflict yet more hideous pollution onto it's residents and communities. Once again I ask myself WHERE IS THE PLANNING?

It appears to me that HDC does very little planning, and is engaged in a greedy race for business rates from developers who have zero regard for the communities they affect. They don't live here - so why should they care? It's for exactly that reason planning committees exist - to help protect communities and balance development so it benefits communities. HDC is just simply not doing that and so is failing - the Local Plan is clear evidence of this in my view.

I also must complain at the way that both Lutterworth East & Magna Park are used as justifications for each other. There is already very low unemployment within Harborough. There are also many housing developments which have units unsold (and more already approved). Building for the sake of building isn't planning. HDC must properly analyse need, and not simply speculatively build in the hope of generating more income.

In summary:

1. HDC is not planning anything - merely scrambling to generate income from speculative builds
2. HDC has not properly demonstrated NEED for Magna Park expansion through detailed analysis
3. HDC has not considered the Government policy of rail served distribution which exists elsewhere locally
4. HDC has not considered the abundant supply of warehousing, distribution and logistic facilities already in existence or currently being built
5. HDC has not considered the environmental impact of vast increases in road traffic
6. HDC has not planned the long term future of jobs within the community, including analysis of existing and future technologies
7. HDC has not planned a diverse and wide range of roles, and appears to be putting all it's eggs in one (decreasing) basket
8. HDC has not properly addressed the issues raised by the Inspector
9. HDC continues to help perpetuate the "done deal" viewpoint by including REJECTED applications in it's own Local Plan and passing them off as "need".
10. HDC continues to ignore the views of it's hard-working, tax paying residents and it seems is prepared to risk ruin to their countryside, economy, livelihoods and health through ill thought-out and poorly researched policies.

PLEASE START LISTENING TO RESIDENTS. LUTTERWORTH IS NOT SOME DUMPING GROUND YET IT APPEARS WE ARE TREATED THAT WAY BY HDC. WE CARE ABOUT OUR COMMUNITY AND OUR VIEWS SHOULD BE HEARD, RESPECTED AND ACTED UPON.

Thank you for taking the time to read this

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 19:22
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

, Claybrooke Magna,

Dear Sirs

I wish to object to the proposed further development of Magna Park contained in the Local Plan.

The addition of all this further development along Mere Lane is already having a huge impact on Ullesthorpe and Claybrooke and this proposed huge addition will be unbearable. What price our living environment around here - do you even care as most of you councillors live miles away.

We are being bombarded by huge warehouse developments at the M69 and all the way down to Dirft, plus a proposed railfreight terminal with warehousing near Hinckley. How can you justify increasing the size of Magna Park when there is going to be an over provision of warehousing in Leicestershire very soon?

What about the Government's preferral for warehousing at railheads?

What is the evidence that a warehouse development such as Magna Park is better than smaller ones - the increase in traffic on the A5 will be horrendous.

Why did you reject the third application of 15/01531 and then include it in the Local Plan?

Residents of Lutterworth and the surrounding villages have had enough.

Yours faithfully

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 21:20
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Policy L1 - east of Lutterworth strategic development

This Message originated outside your organization.

We attended the local town council offices last Wednesday night to view the plan and comment as follows:

The spine road, that is to link to Bill Crane Way, we are unhappy and object that this is being proposed as a measure to take traffic from the town as Bill Crane Way is already a busy road, with family housing estates both sides, a 40 mile per hour speed limit and many families walk children to schools in Bitteswell and Sherrier.

The massive increase of general traffic and HGV's will rumble at speed (40) plus past my home which sides onto Bill Crane Way making it very noisy and some vehicles already cause vibration being felt indoors, I can say this categorically because at present there are diversions and traffic lights all over Lutterworth and with new homes and warehousing being built the high volume of HGV traffic in Bill Crane Way is significant.

Surely a more appropriate way would be to create the spine to link down Hall lane, and other roads to join to Mere lane taking all the hgv traffic destined for magna park that way and the A5. That route does not pose a risk to any children, no noise pollution for the traffic and fumes from vehicles and goes straight to the area the distribution warehouses are being created for.

We don't object to any new opportunities for Lutterworth East in terms of housing but we strongly object to Bill Crane Way being used as a road to divert significant traffic and HGV's from the town and the routing of additional traffic usage created from Lutterworth east housing This is not an appropriate route to consider. There will be an increase in noise, traffic fumes pollution, speeding traffic and will hugely impact on our wellbeing and comfort in our home.

We are happy to discuss our views further if required and we would like our objection to be considered as per policy L1 - East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area.

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 17:39
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir or Madam,

Having looked at the Harborough Local Plan 2011 , -2031, I am concerned that there is no provision for a North South by pass of Lutterworth town . The service road through Lutterworth East development is only an estate road. I suggest that a link on to the motorway north of Dunton Bassett on the A426 where it crosses the motorway would keep the heavy traffic out of Lutterworth, by making the A426 a B road . There would be no need to make the bridge bigger at Cotes de Val.

Yours Faithfully

Sent from my iPad

Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough, LE16 7AG
f.a.o. Mr R Thornhill

19 February 2019

Dear Mr Thornhill

MAIN MODIFICATIONS TO THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN 2011 - 2031

This letter expresses our personal concerns as residents in relation to policy BE2 on non-rail-served storage and distribution sites, particularly the main modification ref.MM15 proposed in response to the National Inspector's examination.

- The total 700,000 sq m of space allocated in this small area exceeds the need identified for such additional space for the whole of Leicester & Leicestershire, and will overwhelm Lutterworth and nearby villages.
- It does not take into account several of the many other developments already committed or planned close to the A5 and the M1 locally, for example the existing Rugby Gateway development and potential developments near the M69-A5 junction at Hinckley and Burbage, all within 5-6 miles of Magna Park at Lutterworth.
- The total space allocation proposed will introduce substantial additional traffic, both commercial transport and commuting workforce vehicles, to an extent that will severely damage the local environment adversely for residents who will be impeded in pursuing their own lives and work.
- The total allocation of 700,000 sq m includes 380,000sq m already committed by approved planning applications for two adjacent sites. The balance of 320,000 sq m exactly matches the remainder of the site defined by planning application 15/01531. It is clear, therefore, that Harborough Council's motivation is primarily to satisfy the commercial aspirations of Gazeley as developer, demonstrating their demand rather than any assessed need.
- The inclusion of this precise figure in the Local Plan as an allocation expanding Magna Park seeks to overturn the earlier refusal of planning permission by a full Council meeting in January 2018 and pre-determines

the outcomes of Gazeley's appeal yet to be heard at the end of March 2019.

- The proposed expansion of Magna Park offers the wrong jobs in the wrong place. It will not meet the objective of increasing the proportion of local employees by decreasing the outflow of skilled residents, most of whom are unlikely to want to work in a vast warehousing environment. The substantial increase in relatively low-skilled jobs will simply increase the volume of commuting workers from other distant areas.

We object strongly, therefore, to the draft Local Plan modifications set out by MM15.

Yours sincerely,

From:
Sent: 23 February 2019 13:55
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth local plan

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear sirs

Having looked at the revised proposals for Lutterworth East, I have a number of comments to make.

Roads

Sadly we are not going to get the Eastern Bypass but the spine road can be upgraded by providing parallel service roads off the spine to the house frontages. This would keep cars and HGVs away from the houses making a safer environment and reducing the number of road junctions needed along the spine road.

Detailed traffic calming measures are required in the plan for the A426 so that the perception of the spine road is that it is a faster way to get to the other end of Lutterworth can be demonstrated.

Junctions

The junction by Bill Crane Way should be designed to encourage traffic to take the spine option rather than staying on the A426

Industry

There is no need for more warehouse space as many of the recent builds in Lutterworth and Magna Park remain unoccupied and there is competition from new developments alongside the M1 both to the north and south of Lutterworth.

If this site is to be developed then it would be better to provide more office and small light industrial units

Regards

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 24 February 2019 16:39
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth East Development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

To whom it may concern,

We would like our views known regarding the proposals for Lutterworth East as long standing residents of the town .

Our main concern is traffic congestion and pollution which will plainly increase unless a proper eastern relief road is built. The traffic situation in Lutterworth is already unbearable and emits a high amount of pollution which is already unacceptable, to add to this is lunacy. The proposed spine road is woefully inadequate.

To add to all that, people will be using their cars more to access green space for walking and leisure with their families and dogs as these are sadly disappearing at an alarming rate in the Lutterworth area.

The proposals for the extension to Magna Park are not needed given that it is already the largest distribution park in Europe which already puts our inadequate road system under huge pressure. As far as we can see in the plan there are no new roads to be built just widening of existing ones, this is unacceptable given the pressure put upon the roads at peak times.

Furthermore the additional 2750 homes that are proposed as Lutterworth East surely facilitates the building of bigger and better health care services ie doctors surgeries, dentists and chemist facilities which is in contrast to the fact that our cottage hospital is under constant threat of closure and it's a valuable asset to the community and should be expanded.

Consideration should also be made regarding the integration of Lutterworth East as far we can see this will be a new town development and not an integrated plan.

We really hope our considerations are taken seriously because it affects everyone in Lutterworth
Regards

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 10:05
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Local plan and Magna Park

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: ~
Date: 26 February 2019 at 09:49:15 GMT
To: localplan@harborough.gov.co.uk
Subject: Local plan and Magna Park

I wish to object strongly to the inclusion of an extra 700,000 square metres of warehousing at Magna Park going in the Local Plan.

I don't think there is a need for this huge development locally, since there are already large similar projects near the M69 and at DIRFT, which also has a rail freight link which Magna Park does not.

Any extra warehousing would have a huge impact on the A5 which cannot cope already, at rush hour near Magna Park there are long queues of traffic which impacts on local villages.

Yours sincerely,

Willey resident

Sent from my iPhone

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:28
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan - Expansion of Magna Park Lutterworth

Importance: High

This Message originated outside your organization.

I wish to object to any further expansion of Magna Park for the following reasons;

- Warehousing on A5 granted by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council is currently under construction only a short distance from Magna Park. Given the amount of traffic on the A5 to and from Magna Park, I am concerned about this and any further development in terms of the extra traffic created and the pollution from this extra traffic. The A5 is not fit for purpose.
- I question the need for any further warehousing given all the extra warehousing being currently built – DIRFT is huge, Magna Park and Burbage (Hinckley M9) – Please provide evidence of this need.
- Loss of beautiful countryside.
- HGV vehicles cutting through once quiet village communities, this will only get worse if more warehousing is granted. The infrastructure is not adequate. How will HDC stop HGV's cutting through small villages?
- Why are applications which have been rejected included in this plan – again not listening to the views local people – the same as the traveller sites – no need and previous rejected applications included in the local plan.
- Over 700,000 sq. m. is 4 times the assessed need in Leicestershire by 2031 – why so much?
- Who is going to work in these ware houses – local people? No, people who travel to the area therefore creating more traffic and more pollution.
- A5 is not adequate to take the current volume of HGV's let alone anymore!

HDC do not consider the views and concerns of people who live in Lutterworth and surrounding villages. HDC have stripped us of our beautiful countryside and wish to take more from us. They have no consideration for the effects of our health caused by the increased pollution. The people of Lutterworth feel that this area is just a dumping ground for HDC to locate warehousing and traveller sites with no consideration given to our strong and valid views. HDC do not support or care for the needs of the local community.

HDC PLEASE START CONSIDERING THE NEEDS AND VIEWS OF PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN LUTTERWORTH AND SURROUNDING VILLAGES – THEY HAVE TO LIVE WITH YOUR DIABOLICAL DECISIONS!!! MAYBE A CASE OF BIG BUSINESS AND MONEY BEFORE PEOPLE AND THEIR HEALTH.

From:

From:
Sent: 18 February 2019 16:26
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Magna Park Proposed Development

This Message originated outside your organization.

I wish to register my opposition to the proposed development at Magna Park. There is no evidence of the need for any more warehouses in this area. In fact there appears to be an over supply. To build more would not only be a commercial mistake it would be destructive of the rural environment and increase congestion on the local roads which are already overloaded.

Yours faithfully

From:
Sent: 15 January 2019 22:57
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Signalling for junction 20 m1

This Message originated outside your organization.

Having read the local plan , I am very concerned that traffic light controls will result in queues on the M1 as traffic tries to leave for Magna park and Lutterworth resulting in many fatalities as seen previously at the A14 junction :-As traffic will be queuing around the island above the motorway, due to new lights at the Whittle Roundabout

Regards

Sent from my iPhone

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 17:55
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] harborough local plan 2011-2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

I wish to make the following comments with regard to Policy L1 - East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area

- 1) To put a settlement of 5000 people alongside a known health hazard (i.e. the M1) is beyond thoughtless. The draft plan states that action will be taken to limit noise and air pollution, but no action will completely prevent residents from suffering from the adverse effects of particulates and nitrogen dioxide, resulting in unnecessary premature deaths.
- 2) The idea of developing the town of Lutterworth on the far side of a motorway is absurd. Setting aside the noise and air pollution issue, the motorway will serve as a physical barrier between the two halves of the town. L1 para 3 states that the new settlement will be "largely self-sufficient", yet it will be reliant on facilities in the existing town, and will ultimately take facilities (e.g. the leisure centre) away from the existing town. By all means develop to the west of the town; developing to the east is nonsense.
- 3) It is recognised by all local authorities that Lutterworth currently suffers from unacceptable levels of air pollution, yet this new development will increase those levels. Para 15.2.4 states that the new 'spine road' "is predicted to remove some of the through traffic currently travelling through the centre of Lutterworth" but gives no indication of what that traffic might be. The spine road is not a relief road and will not take any of the HGV traffic from the A426. What lighter or local traffic is expected to take a detour along the spine road other than traffic which has the new development as its destination? This is not removing through traffic at all.
- 4) According to the plan, the 'spine road' will not be completed until 2029 in any case, and so for a period of up to 10 years (nearly the whole of the remaining period of this Plan) the already polluted centre of Lutterworth will experience an increase of traffic (and therefore pollution) of 10-17% during peak times (para 15.2.19). This is unacceptable.
- 5) L1 para 3 y states that there will be "no moderate or worse adverse impact upon air quality within the Lutterworth Air Quality Management Area". These are weasel words: what they surely mean is that there will be an adverse impact on air quality but it will not be sufficiently high to be described as "moderate". Put another way, the council is proposing to make air pollution worse in an area where the level of pollution is already unacceptable.
- 6) Leicestershire County Council has already determined that a Western Relief Road, a Western Bypass and an Eastern Relief Road are not feasible. The problem of air pollution in Lutterworth is thereby kicked into the long grass with, perhaps, the hope that at some time in the distant future technology will solve the problem through the introduction of electric vehicles and the demise of the internal combustion engine. This is an abdication of its duty of care on the part of the County Council (and Harborough District Council). Instead we are presented with a proposal to make the situation worse. I would have thought that some creative thinking could be put into this; for example, consideration might be given to a limited-access junction on the M1 at the point where the A426 crosses it at Whetstone Magna, taking northbound traffic from the M1 onto the A426, and southbound traffic from the A426 onto the M1, thereby using the M1 as a bypass for Lutterworth.

I have no objection to Lutterworth being developed to the north and to the west, but developing it to the east has no merit whatsoever.

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:30
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments - local plan for East Lutterworth

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Planning Team,

I would like to register my objections to this plan.

First: while I have no objection to the current building work going on in Lutterworth, I have a number of objections to the proposal for East Lutterworth:

-there would be constant air pollution from diesel and nitrous dioxide. This is a big issue these days and Lutterworth's air quality is often poor, but on the east side of the motorway the prevailing winds would blow these gases and particulates into the development. Electrification of all vehicles is still a long way off. Noise pollution would also be a problem.

- I doubt there would be much sense of community between west and east Lutterworth, as the M1 will always remain a huge barrier. In the real world mothers with pushchairs, the elderly and disabled would not cross over the motorway on foot or bicycle to access the shops and other facilities, they'd get in their cars, as would people returning from work, or anyone in bad weather, the dark etc. All this does is increase the traffic and thereby the pollution.

-there would be no reason for Lutterworth folk to go over to East Lutterworth, so the proposal to move the leisure centre over to that side is an artificial attempt to bring the two communities together but all it will do is deprive the much larger existing community of an important facility.

- the proposals include putting traffic lights on all the junctions and roundabouts between east and west. At present the traffic does not justify this. Roundabouts without lights are far more efficient in keeping traffic moving. Put lights there and three-quarters of the traffic is being held up unnecessarily 24/7, again leading to increased noise and pollution. Vehicles use much less fuel if they keep going rather than have to keep stopping. Having several sets of lights within a short space would be guaranteed to lead to more build-up of traffic, and accompanying noise and fumes. The only place where the traffic really builds up is at the Whittle roundabout where it is traffic moving through the town centre that is the problem, and that won't be solved by putting traffic lights on the roundabout.

Magna Park: I understand the doubling of this area is still not finally approved. Not increasing this but putting more housing on that side of Lutterworth makes far more sense. Without a proven need for this storage the loss of green space is unjustifiable. If it went ahead and all the warehouses were filled the traffic would be dreadful; if it didn't, it would be a colossal waste of money and loss of green belt land.

There is a warehouse built a year ago that lies empty just along from the Whittle roundabout. The proposal to build a cluster of warehouses on the other side makes no sense either, and I thoroughly object to the unnecessary loss of any green space because of the impact on wildlife. Even small pockets of scrub land support species of birds and insects and we lose these at our peril. Climate change is a huge issue that threatens us all and plans must always aim to minimise the impact here, and this plan to build these

unwanted warehouses is a cynical move if the aim is to make money. We must protect what we can of our green land.

Lutterworth needs a relief road to take through traffic off the High Street. There is a suggestion supported by some on our Town Council that a (perhaps limited access) junction with the M1 could be created where the M1 crosses the A426 north of Dunton Bassett. This would enable traffic from the south and south east of Leicester to access the M1 without coming further south through our town, and I would support this.

The work that will be needed to bring this plan into being will be very expensive, with a bridge across the M1 to take the proposed spine road and the other walkways/cycleways across the motorway. For the number of houses being built it seems out of proportion, unless the plan is in future times to hugely increase the size of east Lutterworth - but without attending to the road problems this will just create a nightmare for the centre of Lutterworth.

With regards,

From:
Sent: 18 February 2019 12:23
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Development - Lutterworth East etc

This Message originated outside your organization.

I am writing to object to this proposed development under the local plan.

The planned road, referred to as a spine road, should be the much needed and long-promised by-pass for Lutterworth to remove lorry traffic and reduce air pollution from the existing town.

The warehousing suggested close to Junction 20 of the M1 is superfluous to requirements which are already met by existing permissions at Magna Park, and as evidenced by the warehousing constructed on the Lutterworth side of the M1 which remains empty after 12 months.

Housing need can be met by sensitive development to enhance the town of Lutterworth and its facilities. It is already being expanded with no added amenities.

The planning inspector's modifications to the plan must be respected, as must the views of residents of Lutterworth and the surrounding villages.

Yours sincerely

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 08:16
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on local plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear whom it may concern,

I am writing to share my thoughts on the Harborough local plan 2011 to 2031 particularly in regards to the extension of Lutterworth (Lutterworth East) and proposed extension to magna Park.

Lutterworth East

I have no objection to a new community or village a similar size to Lutterworth being built between Lutterworth and Misterton but that community needs to be self reliant with its own infrastructure to serve the needs of the people living there. I believe the new wording of the local plan has changed from a self sustaining development to an extension of Lutterworth. There should be more new developments that create new communities with amenities to serve residents in those communities not just try and tag onto existing overstretched town infrastructure even though this may be the most cost effective option. The former housing minister Dominic Raab has informed me personally that there is a government infrastructure fund of 2.7b for new housing development to provide councils with the funds to build new self sustaining communities with new infrastructure and amenities. The government has put this in place so that developments are built as communities where people can access amenities such as schooling and healthcare and enjoy hobbies, interests and leisure activities where they live.

Currently the plan is to provide as many links into Lutterworth as possible from this new development so that only a small community hub with small shops, possibly a community hall, some park areas and two primary schools are required to serve the residents of this very dense development. When you look at the size of Lutterworth's town centre and compare that to the size of the overall town and small villages around, it is clear that the proposed community hub in the new development is far too small. This new development should be a separate community to Lutterworth with a different name with its own secondary school, supermarkets, local shops, doctors surgery, dental surgery, sports centre, town park and play area, recreation grounds for sports, country park for walking, town hall with space available for churches, classes, toddler groups and other community groups to meet.

Lutterworth town is there to serve Lutterworth and surrounding small villages and is certainly not suitable to serve a dense housing development the same size of Lutterworth to be tagged on next to it. Traffic in Lutterworth is already very heavy and schooling and healthcare facilities are overstretched without the building of new housing development that is already going on in Lutterworth. The local plan states that 'However, its residents will need to access facilities within the existing part of Lutterworth for secondary schools, leisure and health facilities as well as for wider employment opportunities'. I don't see how air quality will not be compromised in Lutterworth town centre with this in mind. The town is running out of land to make more facilities and amenities and huge amounts of money will have to be spent in future years to allow the town to function if planning is not thought about at this stage. The town simply cannot cope with another town the same size of it using its amenities. The town currently has very little in the way of a park, playground, pond or country park, supermarkets are incredibly busy, schools and healthcare services are overstretched, and the sports centre is at capacity. I attach some pictures I have recently taken of the car park at Lutterworth sports centre with absolutely every parking space taken. The swimming pool is struggling to fit everything into its schedule which means adult leisure swimming times are few, there are only a couple of rooms for the large number of classes that happen and the gym area is small for the number of people that use it. The sports centre in Lutterworth is absolutely at capacity and cannot take anymore people using it, nor does it have the land to expand, which means a large housing development needs its own sports centre. It is worth noting that many people in Lutterworth are able to walk to town or local amenities and there is still a lot of traffic in Lutterworth. Planning for the town centre and other facilities to be used by non residents who don't live in the town will severely add to the level of traffic as they will have to drive to all facilities in Lutterworth. The thinking that they will walk or take a bus from the other side of the M1 is very misguided and the effects will have a negative impact on air quality in Lutterworth.

There is a lot that a family does throughout the week, parents commute to work, do the weekly grocery shop, top up groceries in the corner shop, children go to school or college, younger kids go to toddler groups, playgrounds and swimming classes, older kids play football, rugby, cricket, learn dancing, gymnastics, play instruments and perform in local theatres or assembly rooms, parents do evening classes at the local college, join hobby groups that meet in the community or town hall, go to the gym or the swimming pool, do exercise classes, the family have a pub lunch and a country walk on a Saturday and go to church on a Sunday. All of this should be able to happen near where they live and planning should take this into account when building new communities as well as considering the absolute necessities of schools and healthcare. Communities need adequate schooling, healthcare services, road links, leisure facilities, community halls to undertake hobbies and classes, churches, retail services to include supermarkets, diy stores, and convenience stores, places for people to go walking in the fresh air such as ponds and country parks, public houses, play and recreation grounds, and the place should have space and land available in the middle of the community to grow additional facilities and supermarkets as the population increases.

Lutterworth cannot cope with such a large housing development that will ruin the town. Lutterworth East if considered should be built as a self reliant community with everything needed to build and grow a community. For the houses themselves, lack of density should be considered, the layout should be fairly linear, adequate parking for each house (at least two accessible parking spaces per home) should be built and plenty of green areas and permeable land should be planned within the residential areas. Roads and play areas should be council managed and not managed by expensive management companies residents who already pay council tax have to pay for. We are currently looking for a new home and will not even consider Lutterworth east if it will be a dense housing development with houses on top of each other at odd angles, lack of parking and management fees.

If the development is not spacious with plenty of green space, parking, a leisure centre, and a community centre with comprehensive facilities the place will turn into a ghetto like environment with cars everywhere and no sense of community. The once pleasant town adjacent to it will be swarmed with traffic and people who don't even live in the town trying to use the few amenities available.

Lutterworth east should be built separate to Lutterworth without the connections to Lutterworth, be given a different name and have its own community facilities to be a village in its own right. The planned housing itself should also be considered with green space and parking in mind.

Magna Park

The local plan includes an extension to magna Park. This will not only be overbearing to the landscape but is not needed from an employment point of view. From a logistics point of view, whilst the centre of gravity for much outbound distribution has been moving south in recent years, magna Park is still a very attractive (and therefore expensive) position for national distribution hubs for many businesses. However with the lack of rail link for inbound European freight and saturated warehouse operative and driver employment in the area means it is becoming less attractive for logistics companies. The average age for a driver is now 52, they are incredibly hard to recruit particularly in saturated employment areas and new housing in an area will not attract them because it is easy enough for a driver to get employment where they currently live. With warehouse operatives there is so much employment in the nearby areas of Rugby, Coventry, Leicester that they find employment where they live and don't move for it. Magna Park will create relatively low skilled warehouse roles as well as driving roles which are very specialist with not many trained in it. One of the Local Plan objectives is to reduce out-commuting and to bring a wide range of jobs to the area, but magna Park being all warehousing and distribution will not achieve this. It is difficult for me to see where 10,000 warehouse operatives and drivers will possibly come from to fulfil these roles.

Thank you

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 13:25
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] East Lutterworth strategic Development Area

This Message originated outside your organization.

Having viewed the proposals for the new development, I have one or two concerns about the plan.

1. The proposal for a spine road and extra traffic lights is not going to improve traffic congestion in the town and traffic wating at lights will increase pollution at a time when central government is trying to control pollution in towns to improve the health of the local population, especially children.
 2. We really do not need more warehouses and empty buildings simply attract vandalism. There must be other ways to generate money. Could we not have a waste disposal plant that could generate enegy for instance? and if we must have more warehousing than at least keep it to the Magna Park site.
 3. The proposed inferstructure for all these new houses does not seem adequate. We need provision for secondary school education. It makes no sense to increase class sizes or to go down the road of enlaging existing secondary school or providing mobile classrooms as an interim measure. Providing transport to schools outside the area only increases congestion on the roads and comes at extra cost.
 4. I has to wait six months before being able to access the services of a local NHS dentist and It wouod appear local GP's surgeries are already under pressure. Any new development should include proper health provision on the proposed site.
 5. A new cemetry should be considered and as local people appear to wait up to three weeks for cremation of loved ones this might indicate that a town the size of the new Lutterworth needs its own crematorium.
- I trust that you will consider the views of local residents who although broadly supporting the plan are determined that life in the town should suffer as a consequence of the new development.

Yours sincerely

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 08:17
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] local plan coments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Comments on proposed local plan

1 No bypass around Lutterworth and East Lutterworth result pollution and traffic danger

2 Use of traffic hindrance by Traffic lights result extra pollution through stop start action - not reduced by the introduction of electric vehicles - coal and nuclear stations to be shut down with no replacements, then the extra requirement for 6 more power stations just to charge electric cars. The supply of lithium for these car batteries is only 10 years at existing use rate, no reserves available for the planned increase in battery requirements.

3 No public transport in or out of Lutterworth in the evenings result car must be used to travel out of Lutterworth in the evenings

4 Warehouses to be built in East Lutterworth should be kept in one large group - Magna Park - and a rail link used to remove HGVs from the roads. This rail link should have a parkway station to connect the area to Leicester and Rugby (see 3 above) - there is no other way Lutterworth area will ever get a railway station.

5 There is no provision for dentist, crematorium, or secondary education. The proposed warehouse area should be used for industrial and retail buildings.

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:48
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

I am writing as a resident to express my concerns about the proposed expansion of Magna Park. Having, along with hundreds of locals, submitted well researched objections at every stage I cannot understand why we continue to be ignored. What is the point in carrying out expensive lengthy consultation exercises if there is no intention of listening to the results? Inauthentic consultation is wasteful and worse than no consultation at all; the public are not stupid and are able to recognise box ticking exercises.

Many people have been ground down and are no longer prepared to engage. However in the hope that this really is a genuine consultation here are my key points:

- There is no evidence of need and such a massive expansion which will irrevocably harm the landscape cannot be undertaken without clear and irrefutable evidence
- The expansion will be overbearing and harmful to the rural nature and landscape of the area
- We do not have the necessary infrastructure
- Jobs are not needed and would be better created where they are required
- We are worried about the cumulative impacts of this development along with other new and growing logistics parks in the area
- There is no railhead and therefore this goes against the Clean Growth Strategy.

I do hope the voice of the local community is finally heard.

Regards

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Strategic & Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam & Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

7 February 2019

Dear Sir / Madam,

Local Plan 2011–2031 - Modifications Concerning Magna Park Expansion

I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the inclusion of an additional 700,000 m² of warehousing outside the bounds of the original Magna Park airfield site. How can this be termed a "Local" plan when so many local people and businesses have objected to further expansion and a planning application by Gazeley (15/01531 on Mere Lane / A5) has, for very good reasons, already been resolutely REFUSED by an assembly of the whole council?

Further salient points of objection are provided as follows:

- Local plans should predominantly reflect local needs, and the voices of local residents and businesses must be respected. We already have more than our fair share of this sort of destructive development.
- The modified plan will result in gross over-provision of non-rail warehousing (there is no rail-head at Magna Park).
- The government's preferred option is for warehousing developments to be situated at rail-heads (i.e. not Magna Park).
- The Midlands is being swamped by similar developments and there is no longer a need for further expansion at Magna Park – note expansion at DIRFT and the new A5/M69 development near-by.
- Because developers apply for permission does not mean that there is real need in this location. Where is the evidence of need from an independent and impartial source?
- The A5 is inadequate to take the additional HGV traffic without causing unacceptable congestion. Local traffic struggles to cross the A5 safely. Road accidents are frequent.
- 700,000m² of warehousing is almost 4 times that needed in Leicestershire by 2031.
- Why cannot offices or a science park be built (on a smaller scale) to provide the sort of jobs suited to the skills of the local workforce? More and more out-commuting will be required (to avoid a career of low-grade, low-pay work) as the local population grows.
- The imposition of these gargantuan warehouses completely dwarfs the landscape and the growth in HGV and commuter traffic is destroying what tranquillity there once was.
- The environment and wildlife habitat is being devastated. Pollution is increasing and is at unacceptable levels (e.g. Lutterworth AQMA which is impacted by back-up of traffic caused by Magna Park HGVs using the Whittle roundabout).

Yours faithfully,

RECEIVED

11 FEB 2019

CORPORATE SERVICES
Harborough District Council

|

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 17:49
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] LOCAL PLAN 2011-2031, POLICY L1 EAST OF LUTTERWORTH STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT AREA (LUTTERWORTH EAST)

This Message originated outside your organization.

The LCC local plan to build a roundabout just 50 yards north of Bill Crane Way (Leicester Road), to provide a 'Spine Road' to serve Lutterworth East, is **NOT** what Lutterworth Town requires. It would be completely inadequate for present, and more importantly, future transport needs.

What the town desperately needs right now is a **North/South By Pass** a road to take HGV's through to the M1 island, Junction 20. This is a first class opportunity to provide access to the new Lutterworth East Development and also keep HGV's out of the town centre. A 'Spine Road' similar to Brookfield Way, Lutterworth will **NOT** achieve this. It would be a grave mistake to build a 'Spine Road' just to service houses and not to consider the wider issues affecting our little market town. So please, please listen to the voice of Lutterworth residents, we cannot all be wrong!!!! Don't miss this golden opportunity to achieve the sensible solution for the future.

The building of this new road should be financed by the developers, built in stages, and incorporating new schools after the first 100th house is built. Followed in short order by a new Health Centre, as both are on overload in Lutterworth Town at the moment.

We have also heard mention of a plan to build foot bridges across the M1 to connect Lutterworth East to the town to share our amenities. This is outrageous and totally unacceptable and would be vehemently opposed by the majority of Lutterworth residents.

Regards

From:
Sent: 16 January 2019 18:08
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burnmill Farm construction

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear HDC

I am extremely disappointed to see that the numerous concerns expressed by local residents do not seem to have been taken into consideration.

The issues remain:

Worry about flooding into surrounding gardens and into Kingston Way.
An enormous increase in traffic in a road which already struggles in bad weather.
Loss of wildlife.
Encroachment of privacy on existing houses due to the elevated nature of the site.

I note the amended plan says:

" a financial contribution fairly and reasonably related to the development to mitigate the impact of the scheme, where the impacts of the development taken cumulatively with other schemes would have a significantly adverse effect on the transport network"

This does not take into account the effect on all the current residents living in the access road who will now see a dangerous and enormous increase in traffic. People who live in side cul-de-sacs just below the new entrance will need to exercise extreme caution when leaving their homes due to poor visibility and at busy times may find it difficult to pull into Kingston Way. The road simply wasn't built for such a large amount of traffic.

The plan also says:

"a construction traffic management plan, including the proposed routing of different sizes of construction vehicles which seeks to maximise use of the existing farm track for construction traffic, to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning "

While it will obviously take some of the danger from Kingston Way, I already know how precarious it seems when farm vehicles use the farm track. It is frightening to imagine construction traffic going past all time.

It is really disappointing that the council has so little regard for current residents and has completely disregarded their comments so they can add yet more houses to the outskirts of the town.

Yours sincerely

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 17:45
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments

This Message originated outside your organization.

Hi

These are my comments on the local plan.

1. Lutterworth needs a by pass and has for a long time. This plan does not seem to be giving us this. There is a spine road but this, apparently, will not be taking any of the HGV's off the 426, instead it will be classed as a service road for the housing estate. Lutterworth needs a proper by pass.

The 426 is the main route between Leicester and Rugby and traffic is already bad at peak times. With all the plans in place for the Whittle roundabout and now Mere Lane being closed it is becoming increasingly difficult to get through Lutterworth to Rugby at all, particularly from the villages on the East side. This will only get worse.

2. Why would Gilmorton Road be closed to all but bus routes, cyclists and pedestrians? This is a needed route and if the idea that Lutterworth is to remain as one town with the new housing, this seems to cause segregation straight away.

3. I am concerned that there are more warehouses planned for the other side of the M1 (south) when we already have an empty warehouse on this side. If we need more warehousing (according to LCC we don't) then surely it should go to Magna Park. Particularly as I have found out that policy BE2 states that warehouse development should only happen on or next to Magna Park.

4. 2750 houses are to be built but according to housing requirements only 1260 are needed by 2031. This ultimately means more houses than necessary or a very long project.

5. My biggest concern is secondary school education. I know this school is already at capacity and struggling for space. The High School is also at capacity. How can the plan be 'no provision for secondary education other than money being made available if necessary! This is incredibly woolly and very worrying. There should be a proper plan in place for secondary education.

Kind regards

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 09:10
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Additional warehouse provision Magna Park.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Sent from myMail for iOS

----- Forwarded message -----

From:
To: localplan
Date: Tuesday, 26 February 2019, 08:55 +0000
Subject: Additional warehouse provision Magna Park.

Dear planner,

I am writing to strongly object to the provision in the new HDC plan for extra warehouse provision for Magna Park.

Where is the evidence for this requirement? It would seem to be based on demand by powerful companies and politicians rather than by the actual need for it in our local communities. The A5 will simply not be able to cope with the increased amount of lorry and commuter traffic. We face the certainty of increased congestion, pollution, traffic accidents and the use of local villages as rat runs should this politically motivated plan go ahead.

Why has the defeated planning application 15/0531 been included in this plan as well as the two planning applications that have been passed? This is a failure of democracy and you should be ashamed of it.

This type of extra development also runs counter to the government's preferred location for warehousing to be situated near rail heads.

There are already many warehouse developments of this type and I would ask you to look at whether they are all being utilised to their capacity.

The impact on the local environment will be nothing less than catastrophic for wildlife and for the overwhelming effect of the development on the nearby villages, particularly my own village of Willey and on Ullesthorpe and Bitteswell.

Finally, there is no justification for this provision on the grounds of jobs. The jobs provided will be commuter jobs and totally inappropriate for this rural area.

Sent from myMail for iOS

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 10:18
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Magna Park "North" (15/01531/OUT) - Objection

This Message originated outside your organization.

Afternoon

I would like to express my objections for the purposed Magna Park - North planning application.

I live in Claybrooke Parva which is a tiny hamlet, it is also a conservation area and I want it to remain so, it is the reason I moved here in the first place. I wanted an opportunity to take walks into the countryside from my front door as well as enjoying peace and quiet from my garden.

We are currently living on the diversion route to support the closure of Mere lane to allow the modifications to be completed to that road and also the A5. The increase of traffic is really noticable and already impacting day to day life.

The original Magna Park site still has units available for let. There was a unit built in Lutterworth before the M1 bridge which has laid empty since its construction. If there is such a need to extend Magna Park for demand why so these units remain empty?

In addition there is a 33 acre construction already underway at Hinckley Island, this is 5 miles away, whilst I accept this is next to the M69 and a hotel complex it is a large area of countryside which will be lost.

http://www.winvic.co.uk/our_projects/geoposthub-4-hinckley/
This will damage the local wildlife and also air pollution.

So the proposal to increase Magna Park feels like we are being attached from both sides.

Hope you appreciate the concerns raised here.

If you need anything else from me, please get in touch.

Best regards

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 22:00
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Council Local Plan 2011-2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Hello

We recently attended a talk given by Lutterworth town councillors where the above proposal was outlined, with particular reference to the development of the area to the east of Lutterworth.

Our objections, which are in agreement with those of the Lutterworth councillors, are as follows:

Although the council intends to build a substantial number of houses to the east of Lutterworth, which will see an attendant increase in traffic, the proposed Lutterworth relief road has disappeared from the local plan. Instead, there will only be a spine road taking traffic across the motorway to the new development. Pollution is already high with the amount of traffic going through the town, and the traffic will only increase with this development. The plan should be looking to decrease the amount of pollution in the High Street, not merely for it to get "no worse".

Two new primary schools are proposed, but these may not be built soon enough to prevent too much strain being put on existing provision. Also, why is there no specific plan to also expand the secondary provision?

There is also a proposal to build more warehousing in the field just past the motorway roundabout on the A303 to Market Harborough. A new warehouse facility has recently been completed on the same road just before the motorway roundabout. To all appearances this appears completely unoccupied. There are still 2 recently completed warehouses at Magna Park which have not been let, plus Magna Park itself is being extended just off the A5. Therefore, this new proposal seems completely unnecessary

Regards

Sent from my iPad

From:
Sent: 13 February 2019 17:23
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local Plan 2011-2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

Strategic & Local Planning Team
Harborough and District Council
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

I strongly object to the changes to the Local Plan 2011- 2031 to include 700,00sq metre additional warehousing at Magna Park.

I live in . within 50 metres of the A5 & we seem to already be surrounded with warehouse developments - to the south down to DIRFT & the north near the M69 roundabout. There is no evidence that this development being needed in the local area and the scale of the development proposed is not justified in terms of land and employment requirements for the Local area. This site is not adjacent to a rail network and is already scheduled for significant warehouse expansion. We are being swamped!

The A5 is already being stretched to capacity and more warehousing could only increase the traffic. It is already dangerous and difficult accessing the A5 at our village junction which has a history of fatal accidents. There is no requirement for jobs in the area so why do HDC want to provide employment for commuters from outlying areas?

The current and planned development of the Magna Park site can only lead to an in the levels of noise and air pollution in the area. This currently seems to just being ignored.

The destruction of the countryside coupled with noise & light pollution will effectively reduce any biodiversity from the development area & wildlife will flee adjoining land further desecrating this rural area.

Please, please do not allow this to go forward in the Local Plan.

From:
Sent: 19 February 2019 11:48
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Modifications to Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

I would like to object to any further expansion of Magana Park :

All anyone from this area talks about is traffic, traffic , traffic.....

#At rush hour , it is already very time consuming to get onto the Leicester Road into Lutterworth , and to get onto the Gibbet roundabout .

#Our road system cannot cope at this point in time , and there is much house-building going on , bringing even more cars onto our roads .

#There is no proven need for more industrial units ; if you bother to survey the locality , there are un let buildings galore , including the very obvious one between the airplane roundabout and the motorway .

#If you travel north , up the A5 , there is extremely substantial expansion along Mere Lane (have you been along Mere Lane ? They are humungous !!!) Have you worked out how many more lorries and cars this will bring onto to our OVERLOADED local system ?

Then , going further north , there are going to be industrial units ALL the way from the Burbage turn , right up to the M69 !!!

Gazeley also have huge ones empty beside the M1 , going south .

Why on earth is there a NEED for more ?

Yours ,

From:
Sent: 19 February 2019 13:30
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Magna Park local plan

This Message originated outside your organization.

I wish to object to any further expansion of warehousing at Magna Park on the following grounds:

1. Traffic:

Local roads cannot cope with the traffic due to the existing warehousing at Magna Park.

On a daily basis the A426 from the M6, the A426 roundabout at Shawell and the junction with the Lutterworth roundabout have traffic queues .

To increase the traffic volume at Magna Park with the existing roads is sheer stupidity and is a failure of the councils awareness of the situation.

2. Expansion of warehousing in the area:

Rugby council have recently created further warehousing at the junction of the M6 and the A426, and the A5 with a railway junction which will increase further traffic for the goods to be distributed on the local roads.

3.Labour requirement:

In order to service the proposed warehouses at Magna Park there will be a requirement of an extra 10,000 jobs to be filled for people who will have to travel daily and therefore increasing local traffic chaos.

MAGNA PARK IS BIG ENOUGH

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 10:47
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on the Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to express my objections to the proposals to the current plans.

I have concerns about the impact of HGV traffic particularly causing congestion and additional pollution on the A426 Leicester Road. It would be more beneficial to create a by-pass in order to avoid Leicester road and the town centre being completely over run by traffic. The increase in traffic will have a detrimental effect on our air quality. What plan is in place to combat this?

I am concerned that there will be 32 acres of new warehouses, we already have a large warehouse at the side of the M1 that has not been occupied as of yet. What need is there for more warehousing? Any warehousing should be limited to the Magna Park area.

Schooling is a concern. The Primary schools currently have no spare places available. Yet the plan for the 1st primary school to be built is by the time the 300 house is completed. How will the 2 current primary schools be able to fulfil the places needed for the additional families that move in before then?

There is no plan to build an additional secondary school yet at least 1 of the current secondary schools is at capacity now with no immediate plans for expansion.

In recent times the crime rate has dramatically increased. Certainly the closure of the Police station in Lutterworth has had an impact. Lutterworth is currently campaigning to improve its existing police provision, yet there is no plan to include an increase in police presence or a police station in the Local Plan.

Yours sincerely,

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From:
Sent: 23 February 2019 17:33
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth East Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear sir/ madam

I am writing regarding the current Lutterworth East proposal following a consultation at the Lutterworth Town Council offices this morning.

I strongly object to the current proposal for the following reasons which I will bullet point below:

- The current proposal will create further congestion, pollution and traffic without a bypass around the town. I note that a 'spine road' has been included however, this will not help the long term congestion levels at all. I am also told that traffic signs will be erected to 'encourage' traffic to use this road rather than the A426. This makes no sense to me as surely a HGV or lorry driver will take the most direct route rather than detour through a housing estate. In addition, I can't imagine any future residents will want a property whereby HGVs and lorries pass by 24/7.
- Lutterworth is one of the country's most polluted towns already due to Magna Park and associated traffic, further warehousing, houses, residents etc will add to this already dangerously high level of pollution. There are no measures to mitigate this further but only add to it.
- The inclusion of additional warehousing seems ludicrous given that this was suggested as potential employment for future residents; I don't know of any if many warehouse or factory workers on zero hours contracts who could afford homes of around 200k upwards (Lutterworth is the second most expensive area for housing in the Harborough district). In addition, Magna Park has a percentage of warehouses vacant so where is the demand coming from?
- The inclusion of traffic lights at entrance and exit points will cause traffic from the town/ Magna Park and other areas to build up as evidenced when new traffic lights were switched on outside a newly erected and as yet occupied warehouse along this road. The fact this warehouse remains unoccupied since construction hardly suggests a strong need for further warehousing along this route.
- There seems to be a lack of green spaces on the proposal, given the pollution levels surely concreting over swathes of country side is short sighted? In addition to this point, there will be thousands of extra residents and no green spaces for leisure activities such as walking the dog or for children to play outside- a major factor in mental well-being for adults and children.

... we do not have capacity for further pupils, even now we are over subscribed, we also do not have capacity to extend as this would mean the school would not have any playing fields. Where are the additional children to be educated?

- Overall, I do not understand the need for this development at all as I was informed that Harborough district council has met its housing target based on the government's revised figures. Where does the arbitrary figure for 2,750 new houses come from? What is this based on? Social housing/ affordable housing is a small percentage therefore this does not resolve that need.

In conclusion, this proposal seems ill thought out and will worsen pollution, result in over crowding and create traffic chaos and give no benefit to the residents of Lutterworth. The over riding factor, as usual seems to be driven by money. Leicestershire county council from what I understand have a deficit and wish to sell land for their benefit. This will not benefit Lutterworth at all. There must be more suitable brown field sites that would be more suitable across the county.

Yours faithfully

-

Sent from my iPhone

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 19:19
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough Local Plan - BE2

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sirs

I write in response to the Harborough Local Plan 2011-2013 Modifications Consultation - in particular the BE2 Strategic Distribution and the expansion to Magna Park.

We live in Willey - directly opposite the land proposed for the proposed IDI Gazelely application 15/01531/OUT. This seems to be included in the plan although the application was rejected and they are appealing. It seems you are assuming this will be granted or some sort of expansion will occur on this land? I just cannot understand why any further expansion is needed. There are plenty of empty units currently on Magna Park and the new HUGE unit that is currently being built also currently has no prospective tenant. It dwarfs the landscape and the disruption to the local area during its development is already being felt with noise, lights 24 hrs and road closures in place.

Should the expansion to Magna Park be approved extending the A5 dual carriage way section will not help the congestion as inevitably there will be more traffic for it to deal with. We already have lorries cutting through the village trying to get to Magna Park (although it obviously states the road is unsuitable for HGVs) and apparently Highways will not close the right hand turn from the A5 through the village to assist with the rat running that takes place when the A5 is experiencing delays.

Your plan says that it will generate employment options - as far as I know there is not unemployment in Lutterworth and there are already colleges for education and engineering.

There are more warehouses being built further up the A5 near the M69 - DIRFT further south on the A5 - new empty warehouses close to the M1.

There cannot be a need for any further warehousing and research shows that 700,000 sqmts is almost 4 times the assessed need for additional warehouse space in Leicestershire by 2031.

We have not been engaged in anyway as to the local impact this application is likely to have and we live closest to it.

The current farmland cannot be replaced with a country park and expect it to look anything like it does now. How the light pollution and air pollution will not be negatively affected I cannot imagine.

I strongly object to this part of your plan.

Yours faithfully

Strategy and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market bHarborough
LE16 7AG

8th February 2019

Subject: Local Plan 2011-2031 Objections

Dear Harborough District Council,

I wish to object to the modified Local Plan 2011-2031 which still identifies that 700,000 sqm of warehousing can be built at the Magna Park site even though two planning applications have already been agreed

Any further increase in the warehousing at Magna Park will be detrimental to and overbearing on the local landscape and the adjacent villages of Bittesby and Ullesthorpe. I would wish HDC would consider the wellbeing of the local community and not just accepting endless demands from large international corporations with only global interest, which is at the expense of small communities

There is no evidence that continually increasing the warehousing at Magna Park is either needed or required in one huge concentration. Government papers identify preferred option for warehousing development at rail heads such as that at DIRFT not, adjacent to small villages (as Magna Park is) with inadequate road infrastructure and no rail link

The roads around Magna Park are already congested with the current heavy vehicles too and from Magna Park which is compounded by the increase in commuter traffic from the many housing developments in the Lutterworth area. This was pointed out to HDC before the last two planning application for additional warehousing were accepted. The A5 between M69 and the M1 at Junction 18 is already seriously congested, any further movement of heavy vehicles would be unsustainable

Yours sincerely,

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 09:30
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] HARBOROUGH LOCAL PLAN 2011 -2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

I would like to put my concerns about certain sections of the proposed plan for Lutterworth

The extra houses will put an extreme pressure on social facilities such as doctors, schools etc before completion of the first group of houses.

Extra pollution as with the small roads planned there will be more traffic coming through Lutterworth.

It is all about money and not concerns about the area and environment

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 10:18
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: Expansion of Magna Park

This Message originated outside your organization.

Sent from Outlook

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 10:12
To: localplan@harborough.gov.co.uk
Subject: Expansion of Magna Park

I am a resident of the village of Willey and I feel compelled to contact you to voice my objections to the totally dis-proportionate amount of building that is taking place at Magna Park and along the A5. The first warehouse along Mere Lane is close to completion and is SO huge that it can be seen for miles in each direction. This is just the first of many of the same type that are being built for which planning has already been granted or in the process of being considered.

What madness is this, to consider that buildings of this type are in any way an asset to the area? Not only will our landscape be scarred and ruined FOREVER, and anyone who lives locally or travels regularly along the A5 cannot fail to have noticed the impact such a development will have on the local countryside, but I simply cannot accept that there is such a need for this type of development, on this scale. Are there companies lining up to use the warehouse units since there are other large developments along the A5 in at least two other locations?

As I understand it, the known preferred option is for an increase in rail-freight warehousing such as DIRFT. What evidence is there that more non-rail warehousing is what is required in this area?

The traffic along the A5 is a very big problem at the present time, the road is simply not adequate for the amount of traffic that is using it now on a daily basis, let alone an increase that is inevitable with such developments.

Our village and others have become 'Rat Runs' for cars and particularly HGVs (who use a standard Sat Nav rather than the appropriate type for HGV vehicles) who are trying to avoid traffic hold ups or to find a quicker routes to avoid problems or road works on the A5.

The traffic will of course increase beyond all imagination with the completion of this development. The road infrastructure simply cannot cope with the amount of HGV traffic this will create and I wonder just how much consideration has been given to this when discussing and granting planning permission for such a development?

I know that the current Local Plan outlines 700,000 square metres of additional warehouse building which have not been approved yet. This implies it is a foregone conclusion and I think this to be a crass presumption and shows a total lack of regard for the local area and it's residents.

Please think again!

In all conscience, think about what you are inflicting on the local area and the residents you are supposed to represent.

Think about the damage to the area, to what will be lost that can NEVER be recovered.

Please think about the proportions of such a development and whether this is REALLY required.

Please, please do the right thing and reject the third Planning Application and therefore avoid inflicting 700,000 square metres of warehousing that this area simply DOES NOT NEED!

Regards

Sent from Outlook

25th February 2019

Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Local Plan

I am writing to express my grave concerns regarding the recent amendments to the Local Plan.

I believe the decision to include 700,000 sqmts of warehouse space has not been properly justified or examined. I do not believe the council has provided sufficient evidence that there is a need for this enormous development at Magna Park but that evidence has shown that building more warehouses will result in an over provision of non-rail warehousing in Leicestershire.

Research into the need for warehousing in Leicestershire by 2031 has determined that 700,00 sqmts is almost **4 times more than what will be needed**. Why build something that clearly research has shown that it is **not required?**

Since the three planning applications were submitted, there has been significantly large warehouse distribution sites developed down the A5 corridor from the M69 junction at Hinckley, to the A5 DIRFT site at Crick – again, the research is showing that Leicestershire will be overdeveloped with warehousing which will not be needed in the future.

The council must see that to even consider including the 700,000 sqmts in the Local Plan is not justified and that further development of Magna Park is not required as there is not evidence of need, in fact, it is the oppositeno need!

Yours faithfully

From: --
Sent: 22 February 2019 15:12
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] policyL1 lutterworth strategic plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear sir, I would like to protest to the plans that you have for lutterworth`s future especially regarding the fact you have not made any proposals regarding the amount of traffic that comes through lutterworth on a daily basis. If you spent a day counting all the lorries and cars coming through and all the pollution they cause you might understand why we need "EASTERN RELIEF ROAD."

Strategy and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

7th February 2019

Subject: Objection the Changes to the Local Plan 2011-2031

Dear HDC,

I would like to make known my objections to the latest changes to the Local Plan 2011-2031 where the Plan still states that up to 700,000 sqm of additional warehousing can be built at Magna Park with no additional evidence of the need provided

It would seem that the 700,000 sqm is now out of date since it was based on the previous three planning application which were themselves based on demand not a need. Especially when two of the planning applications have already been agreed and the third (15/01531) was rejected

Recent research shows that 700,000 sqm would be 4 times the assessed need for additional warehousing space in the whole of Leicestershire by 2031

Things have moved on with regard to warehousing, there have been many other warehouse developments in the area, a number of them along the A5 at DIRFT and at the M69 junction

Furthermore the impact of more warehousing at Magna Park fore no need would have a completely overbearing effect on the landscape and the villages of Bittesby and Ullesthorpe.

Such increase in warehousing would impact on the congestion along the A5 between M69 and the M1 at junction 18. There is already increasing congestion along this route from additional commuter traffic caused by the substantial increase in housing in the Lutterworth and Rugby area

I would request that the Local Plan 2011-2031 be modified and the statement that "...up to 700,000 sqm of additional warehousing can be built at Magna Park..." be removed from the Plan

Best Regards,

25th February 2019

Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Local Plan

I am writing to express my grave concerns regarding the recent amendments to the Local Plan.

I believe the decision to include 700,000 sqmts of warehouse space has not been properly justified or examined. I do not believe the council has provided sufficient evidence that there is a need for this enormous development at Magna Park but that evidence has shown that building more warehouses will result in an over provision of non-rail warehousing in Leicestershire.

Research into the need for warehousing in Leicestershire by 2031 has determined that 700,00 sqmts is almost **4 times more than what will be needed**. Why build something that clearly research has shown that it is not required?

Since the three planning applications were submitted, there has been significantly large warehouse distribution sites developed down the A5 corridor from the M69 junction at Hinckley, to the A5 DIRFT site at Crick – again, the research is showing that Leicestershire will be overdeveloped with warehousing which will not be needed in the future.

The council must see that to even consider including the 700,000 sqmts in the Local Plan is not justified and that further development of Magna Park is not required as there is not evidence of need, in fact, it is the oppositeno need!

Yours faithfully

Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

25th Feb 2019

Dear Sirs.

Further Expansion of Magna Park

There is no proven evidence based need for additional warehousing at this location. Their last new build warehouse has been empty for the 3 years since building. Do you need any more proof.

The planning Ombudsman came to this conclusion after an enquiry.

The A5 and arterial roads are not fit for purpose now and will be solidly Wharehoused from Crick to Hinckley soon.

Only Crick and the new M69 Jcn 2 meet the Govmt preference for warehousing.

We may live in the Golden Triangle but only if you are a Logistics Park operator or an HGV operator. For the residence of Lutterworth and surrounding villages its already overcrowded polluted nightmare and you want to inflict even more on your rate payers.

Give is a break, no more Wharehouse development.

L

18 February 2019

Dear Sir

I am objecting to the proposed change to the Local Plan to allow for even more warehousing at Magna Park.

My main concern is that these units will be built but will remain empty as there is no proven need for additional warehousing in the area especially as it is so far from any railway. There are many other new warehouse developments in the county – a few miles up the A5 towards Hinckley, around the Rugby area and down the A5 at DIRFT. It would seem they would all be competing for the same business. An additional 700,000 square metres is four times the total assessed need for warehousing in Leicestershire by 2031. Why waste space of unwanted units which would not add anything to the local economy.

Secondly, the additional traffic on the A5 and surrounding roads from existing and planned warehousing will inevitably cause safety problems. Accidents at High Cross and Wibtoft are relatively frequent and sometimes fatal. The accompanying air, noise and light pollution will also be detrimental to our quality of life.

Furthermore, other environmental issues cannot be ignored as acres and acres of green fields will be covered in concrete.

Finally, this third development has already been rejected by HDC.

Please don't ignore these very real and valid concerns. This third

Yours faithfully,

7/2/19

Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

Ref Local Plan 2011-2031. Policy BE2: Strategic Distribution

Dear Sir or Madam

I wish to STRONGLY OBJECT to the Local Plan update allowing an additional 700,000m² of warehousing to be built at Magna Park because I believe, no additional evidence of the need has been provided.

Further:

- It is on greenfield land, used by the local community (including myself) for recreational walks
- There is more than ample space at DIRFT (Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal), less than 9 miles away, which has the advantage of a rail head and this is brownfield land
- A railhead, such as the one at DIRFT, reduces road transport and is thus more environmentally friendly
- Planning application 15/01531 was rejected by HDC. Why therefore include it in the Local Plan?
- There is currently unfilled warehousing space at Magna Park and on the A4303 immediately adjacent to the M1 near Lutterworth, so how can there be a need for additional space?
- Additional warehouse space is also currently being constructed at the A5/M69 junction and at DIRFT
- Research shows that 700,000 m² is almost 4 times the assessed need for additional warehouse space in Leicestershire by 2031.
- The single-lane A5 through Wibtoft is adequate to take the current traffic load, let alone any increase wishing to get to the M69.
- One of the Local Plan objectives is to reduce out-commuting and to bring a wide range of jobs to the area. It is difficult to see how 10,000 jobs in warehousing will achieve this objective.
- The impact of the current warehouse being built along Mere Lane is clear to anyone who travels along that road. The additional of 3 times more warehousing will be completely overbearing on the landscape and on the villages of Bittesby and Ullesthorpe, even after any attempts to landscape it.

Please ensure that this additional 700,000m² of warehousing at Magna Park is NOT included in the Local Plan.

Yours faithfully

1

19th Feb 2019.

Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

Dear Sirs,

I wish to register my objections to the changes you have made to the local plan 2011-2031.

In this plan you have not demonstrated the need for the additional warehousing at Magna Park especially as there are already warehousing developments on the A5, either side of Magna Park, at Dirft & the M69 Junction. People reading this plan will see straight away that your inclusion of 700,000 square meters of warehousing are based directly as a result of the planning applications made by Gazley & nothing else. One of these applications was rejected by Harborough District Council, so why persist in including the remaining application (15/01531) in the plan, especially as it is not required?

You have also failed to consider the impact of traffic congestion along the A5 from all the developments, not just Magna Park. Where in the local plan does it cater for highway infrastructure planning to counter such an increase in traffic movement along the A5?

I hope you take onboard my comments & review the plan again.

Yours Faithfully,

My concern on the development of Lutterworth East:

There is no proper plan for secondary school provision. Being a student at Lutterworth college I know that the school is at maximum capacity. We can't possibly take any more students in as there is already no room for seating in hallways and in classrooms at lunch and break times. A majority of us end up sitting outside during winter for the last two/three years. In addition to this, classrooms are full there are simply not enough tables and chairs for students to sit at and there are also not enough teachers to teach multiple classes of forty.

2,750 new houses cannot be built without a plan for secondary school education. Giving the school more money will not increase the amount of space for students and for teacher in hallways and classrooms as we are already going to suffer the loss of the Frank Whittle Studios which will increase the number of students by at least 100 this will already have a huge impact.

So, in Lutterworth we either need a brand-new secondary school or enough money to build up Lutterworth College even more.

24th February 2019

COMMENT ON LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS

I wish to raise my concern at the inclusion of planning application 15/01531 in the modifications to the local plan.

This application has been previously refused, and I believe rightly so. There is no evidence of need, the projections of need to 2031 are already met by existing and permitted development.

Pollution is already excessive, we need to protect our environment. Expansion on this scale is neither needed or bringing any improvement to the area.

Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

Dear Sir/Madam

Re. Objection to the Harborough Local Plan

Please reconsider your local plan; put a stop to the huge destruction you are planning to our countryside. Such destruction can never be reversed.

Your plans for the expansion of Magna Park make no sense when so many of the warehouses in this region are standing empty. There is obviously no need for new warehouses as there are already many 'To Let' signs on the existing ones. There is also new warehousing at Junction 20 M1 and Junction 1 M69, so 700,000m² is now hugely exceeding (by 4 times) the Leicestershire 2031 plan.

My understanding is that the planning application 15/01531 has already been rejected by HDC so I do not understand how it can still be in the plan. It makes no sense (and it is not fair) to allow Gazeley to continue to appeal time after time if HDC has already rejected it.

The health implications for people in this area do not seem to have been considered either – asthma rates are already above the national average due to us being within the M69/M6/M1 triangle and bringing more traffic fumes in will only exacerbate this issue. (Orchard Medical Practice asthma rate = 6.2%, National average = 5.9%)

The road infrastructure is already at full capacity which you will know if you've ever tried to drive from the M6 to the A5 Gibbets Roundabout. With more traffic heading to the area, I foresee this causing complete gridlock to the area. The A5 at High Cross is also hideous with several fatalities in the last couple of years with people desperately struggling to turn right out of the junction onto the A5. More traffic on the road will make this manoeuvre virtually impossible and puts the village commuters lives at risk every day. There are no railways serving this area either so this development will go against what the government priorities are.

asked me to include this proverb in my letter:

"When the last tree has been cut down, the last fish caught, the last river poisoned, only then will we realise that we cannot eat money."

She seems to understand that continuing to build for money is not a sensible thing to do for their future – why can't you??

Please do the right thing – Don't destroy Harborough District (I couldn't see any other county in the UK ever agreeing to such an outrageous future plan)

Yours faithfully

Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031: Modifications Consultation

Comments on the Main Modifications Consultation Statement by

24/1/19

Modification reference - MM16

Policy reference and name - BE4 Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground

Local plan page - 88 to 90

Point 1.f

f. traffic to be generated by the development ~~is within the capacity of the highway network~~ **would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network and would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of local resident;** and

Comments - the original wording "is within the capacity of the highway network and would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of local resident" should be reinstated. This would restrict development at BPG to that which is in proportion to and can be supported by the existing highway network. It would recognise that BPG is located in a rural area, unsuitable for additional development and that future development would have an impact on the roads in the surrounding area and the residents that live there. Some of the proposed wording could be retained but the words "unacceptable, severe" and "significant" should be deleted. The policy should be restricting future development that has **any** impact on road safety, the road network or the amenity of local residents.

I would suggest the following wording;

traffic to be generated by the development is within the capacity of the highway network, would not result in an impact on highway safety or residual cumulative impacts on the road network and would not have an impact on the amenity of local residents;

Point 1.g

g. highway ~~mitigation improvements are~~ **is provided where necessary in accordance with the requirements of the highway authority** taking into account total traffic to be generated by existing and proposed development within the Proving Ground and the Industrial Estate, **with all access taken via the main gate to Bath Lane.; and**

Comments - highway mitigation should be in accordance with the requirements of the Highway Authority and not just where necessary. It should also be subject to a Travel Plan as per the proposed wording for the Bruntingthorpe Industrial Estate policy. The point regarding access via the main gate to Bath Lane should be amended to ensure that all access **and egress** (ie. in and out) should be via the main gate on Bath Lane. The rear gate to the site on to Mere Lane should be physically blocked off and closed. Otherwise what is to stop the continued use of that entrance/exit after the development is completed.

I would suggest the following wording;

it is subject to the approval and implementation of a Travel Plan seeking to reduce reliance on access by private car and highway mitigation is provided in accordance with the requirements of the highway authority taking into account total traffic to be generated by existing and proposed development within the Proving Ground and the Industrial Estate, with all access/egress taken via the main gate to Bath Lane and the entrance to Mere Road permanently blocked and closed; and

2.b. traffic generated by the development ~~is within the capacity of the highway network~~ would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network and would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of local residents;

Comments - the original wording "is within the capacity of the highway network and would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of local resident" should be reinstated. This would restrict development at BIE to that which is in proportion to and can be supported by the existing highway network. It would recognise that BIE is located in a rural area, unsuitable for additional development and that future development would have an impact on the roads in the surrounding area and the residents that live there. Some of the proposed wording could be retained but the words "unacceptable, severe" and "significant" should be deleted. The policy should be restricting future development that has **any** impact on road safety, the road network or the amenity of local residents.

I would suggest the following wording;

traffic to be generated by the development is within the capacity of the highway network, would not result in an impact on highway safety or residual cumulative impacts on the road network and would not have an impact on the amenity of local residents;

2.c it is subject to the approval and implementation of a Travel Plan seeking to reduce reliance on access by private car and highway mitigation improvements are is provided where necessary, in accordance with the requirements of the highway authority taking into account total traffic to be generated by existing and proposed development in the Industrial Estate and the Proving Ground and with all access taken via the main gate to Bath Lane; and

Comments - highway mitigation should be in accordance with the requirements of the Highway Authority and not just where necessary. The point regarding access via the main gate to Bath Lane should be amended to ensure that all access and egress (ie. in and out) should be via the main gate on Bath Lane. The rear gate to the site on to Mere Lane should be physically blocked off and closed. Otherwise what is to stop the continued use of that entrance/exit after the development is completed.

I would suggest the following wording;

it is subject to the approval and implementation of a Travel Plan seeking to reduce reliance on access by private car and highway mitigation is provided in accordance with the requirements of the highway authority taking into account total traffic to be generated by existing and proposed development within the Proving Ground and the Industrial Estate, with all access/egress taken via the main gate to Bath Lane and the entrance to Mere Road permanently blocked and closed; and

Date: 18th Feb 2019

Dear Sir,

Ref: Magna Park ref **15/01531**

I understand there is a planning application in which aims to expand Magna Park to perhaps twice its current size. In my view this will have a hideous effect on Mere Lane and the countryside around Ullesthorpe, where I live. Ullesthorpe has recently become inundated with domestic dwellings which are not selling (please go and visit the golf course development, which now has two streets of empty houses.). I fear that this rush for development will consume countryside for warehousing which is not required, and I point you at the warehousing development on the A5 near Hinckley, and ask, how has the volume requirement for warehousing been justified when neighbouring boroughs are also building warehousing? I suspect this speculative building will become a bubble and the warehouses will not be fully utilized, just like the housing developments are in Ullesthorpe.

I ask that you reject the application to make Magna Park even bigger.

Sincerely,

The proposed modifications to Policy BE2 in the Local Plan 2011-2031 do not address the Local Plan inspector's concern that the Council has not provided satisfactory evidence of the need for a further 700,000 square metres of warehousing/logistics space. The Council appears unable to distinguish between demand and need. The demands of two applicants, Gazeley and dbSymmetry, to develop land adjoining the existing Magna Park are based on the availability of land to the south (dbSymmetry) and on long-standing options on land to the north (Gazeley). They are opportunistic rather than based on provable need. Policy BE2 is clearly designed to suit the applications rather than the applications being designed to fit the policy.

Justification for Policy BE2 is based on the 2014 LLEP Strategic Distribution Sector Study which estimated that the additional growth (i.e non-replacement) requirement for large (9000 + sq.m.) warehousing/distribution facilities in Leicester and Leicestershire up to 2031 was a minimum of 185,000 sq.m. This figure was confirmed in 2016 but has already been exceeded many times over. In the Lutterworth area alone, Harborough District Council has approved, in outline or in full since that date, 391,500 sq.m. of large logistics facilities, which is more than double the projected growth figure for the whole of Leicester and Leicestershire for the entire local plan period. While in planning meetings officers have often stressed that the LLEP figure is a minimum, the opposite of minimum cannot be 'unlimited', or else the business of forecasting is quite pointless.

The excess of approvals over forecast need is shown even more starkly when figures for the whole LLEP area are considered. A minimum of 853,430 sq.m of non-rail-linked large units have been built or approved across the area since 2014. A further minimum of 666,835 sq.m. (including Gazeley's Magna Park application 15/01531/OUT currently subject to appeal) is awaiting a decision.

Magna Park lies on the very western edge of Harborough District. Notwithstanding forecasts which are restricted to Leicestershire and Leicester, the modified Plan still takes a silo mentality by considering growth in isolation from nearby developments across the district and county borders. Five miles from Magna Park, Rugby Borough Council has since 2014 approved 127,936 sq.m. of large units adjacent to junction 1 of the M6, some of which remains vacant, and within 12 miles it has approved in outline a further 186,500 sq.m. All this growth provides competition for any additional development adjoining Magna Park.

On top of the above growth, several rail-linked developments have recently been approved and already exist or are under construction. Principally these are the East Midlands Gateway NSRFI, consent for which granted by Secretary of State in January 2016 (547,414 sq.m.) and the East Midlands Distribution Centre (230,000 sq.m. of which 50,911 is still available). Additionally a <79,000 sq.m. rail-linked site at Ashby de la Zouch was approved in 2012 with a forecast of 1,000 new jobs. This has been advertised ever since but remains vacant, undermining the case for further approvals. An application for an NSRFI of up to 850,000 sq.m. of rail-linked space at Burbage/Stoney Stanton is pending. Less than 10 miles from Magna Park the Daventry International Rail-Freight Terminal continues to grow and advertise vacant space.

With all the growth approved in the LLEP area since 2014, or with approval pending, and with large scale development close by across the county boundary, the Local Plan, even with its modifications, fails utterly to justify any expansion of Magna Park.

25th February 2019

Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

Dear Sir/Madam,

Local Plan 2011-2031 Modifications

I am writing to object to the modifications to the Local Plan, concerning the expansion of Magna Park. Review of the original plan raised the concern about the demonstrable need for additional warehousing in the Magna Park area. The revised plan now states the need for 700,000 sq mts of additional warehousing and yet the only evidence provided is the three planning applications related to the site, which add up to 700,000 sq mts. This is not a demonstration of need, this is simply following the developers requests. We cannot be driven by what developers want, but by independent validated research in to the needs. Research shows that 700,000 sq mts is almost 4 times the assessed need for additional warehouse space in Leicestershire by 2031.

Of the three planning applications mentioned above, one has already been rejected and therefore why has it been included in this revised plan?

No account has been taken of the other local expansion in warehousing including at DIRFT , Rugby and currently under construction just two miles down the A5 towards Hinckley Island. No evidence currently exists to support such excessive expansion. All of this will put further pressure on the existing infrastructure with much of the A5 single carriage way and creating significant pinch points and congestion.

Magna Park does not have a direct rail head and expansion goes against national policy. Although a shuttle service is put forward in some of the planning applications to run loads between Magna Park and DIRFT this is not a sustainable or environmentally friendly method leading to more road trips, increased congestion resulting in further lowering the already poor air quality in the area.

With regards to employment one of the Local Plan objectives is to reduce out-commuting and to bring a wide range of jobs to the area. Although 10,000 jobs are predicted less are low skilled jobs and will not be filled from within the local community that has extremely low unemployment. Workers will be drawn in from outside the area and go against the local plan objective. The commute of these

workers will again put further strain on the infrastructure, with significant environmental impact, particularly on air quality.

I don't not believe that any attempt has been made to justify the expansion of Magna Park in the plan. The local council have simply used the current planning applications to try to justify the need, rather than undertake a proper analysis of the need as they should have done. This is totally unacceptable and the modified plan should be rejected.

Yours faithfully

15 February 2019

TO:

Strategic and Local Planning Team

Harborough District Council

LE16 7AG

Dear Sirs/Madams

I have written many times about the Council's decision to proceed with the approval of planning applications on the Magna Park site. My main concerns are around the unproven need for expansion and the effect on road infrastructure that will result with the increase in heavy goods vehicles, an inevitable outcome of site expansion.

Once again I set out the arguments against the approval of amendments to the Local Plan 2011 to 2031.

*The application suits the needs of the District Council but does not respond to the needs or wishes of the Council constituents as it will over-provide warehouse accommodation in the area (see below).

* The location of this provision – some distance from a railhead – does not comply with Government's preferred option for developments of this nature.

* This application needs to be placed in the context of other applications of a similar nature running alongside the A5 between the M6/M69 junction and the M1 junction with the A5.

* Most importantly, the current roads are inadequate for the current traffic flow and will require continued maintenance at public expense when that flow increases. Tinkering with what is there already is not good enough.

* the application does not fit with the Strategic Plan or comply with Government preferred options. i.e. 700,000 square meters of additional warehouse space is four times the assessed need for additional space in Leicestershire by 2030; and, given that the Local Strategic Plan has

an objective to increase out-commuting it is difficult to see how this application fits that target.

* Finally, as a local resident in a small and charming Leicestershire village it is clear that the increased warehousing will dominate and over-power the landscape and crush many of the nearby villages decreasing the quality of life of their residents.

Sincerely,

15.02.2019

12th Feb 2019

Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

We wish to object to the inclusion of the 700,000 sq mts additional warehousing at Magna Park in the modified Local Plan 2011-2031. Yet again, there is no evidence provided of the need for further warehouses. Furthermore, why has this been included in the Local Plan when application 15/01531 was turned down over a year ago?

Since that time, there have been many other warehouse developments all along the A5 from DiRFT to the Hinckley Island Hotel and at nearby Rugby Gateway. The Government prefers this kind of development at railhead sites to avoid the pollution and road congestion from HGVs shuttling goods, so why the planned concentration of so many warehouses in one non-rail location on the already overcrowded A5 at Magna Park?

As a local resident, traffic problems are already causing concern at shift change times at Magna Park with tail backs at existing traffic islands before further islands are constructed. Meer Lane is now, of course, congested with the current construction work taking place leading to bus route delays, large plant having difficulty negotiating a country road and there has already been one lorry fire leading to the closure of Meer Lane. All this is happening even before this biggest warehouse in Europe is in operation.

According to research, the 700,000 sq mts is far in excess of the additional warehouse space needed for the whole of Leicestershire by 2031. What is the evidence for the need in this one location?

10th February 2019

Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

Ref Local Plan 2011-2031. Policy BE2: Strategic Distribution

Dear Sir or Madam

I STRONGLY OBJECT to the Local Plan update allowing a further 700,000m² of warehousing to be built at Magna Park because I believe no additional evidence of the need has been provided.

Further:

- It is on greenfield land, used by the local community to enjoy walks in the natural countryside
- There is a large area available for warehouse expansion at Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal, less than 9 miles away, which has the advantage of a rail head and this is brownfield land
- A railhead, such as the one at DIRFT, reduces road transport and is thus more environmentally friendly
- The single-lane A5 through Wibtoft, which has a significant bend, is dangerous for the current traffic load, let alone any increase wishing to get to the M69.
- Planning application 15/01531 was rejected by HDC. Why therefore include it in the Local Plan?
- There is currently unfilled warehousing space at Magna Park itself as well as on the A4303 immediately adjacent to the M1 at the SE of Lutterworth, so how can there be a need for additional space?
- Additional warehouse space is also currently being constructed at the A5/M69 junction and at DIRFT
- One of the Local Plan objectives is to bring a wide range of jobs to the area. How will this be achieved with even more warehousing jobs? We need a greater variety of jobs and higher skill ones.
- The large DHL warehouse being built along Mere Lane is creating a significant impact on the surrounding area. The addition of 3 times more warehousing will be completely overbearing on the landscape and have a detrimental effect on the villages of Bittesby and Ullesthorpe, even after any attempts to landscape it.

Please ensure that this additional 700,000m² of warehousing at Magna Park is NOT included in the Local Plan.

Yours faithfully

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 20:39
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Cc:
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth Local Plan 2011-2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

From

To

Strategic and Local Planning Team

Harborough District Council

Adam and Eve Street

Market Harborough

LE16 7AG

Comments on Lutterworth Local Plan 2011-2031

The increase in housing to the east of Lutterworth will substantially increase the volume of traffic through the town which is currently already very bad. There seems to be no attempt other than traffic lights to manage the traffic increase, and this will lead to traffic chaos. What is really needed is a north to south by-pass. As a suggestion why not use the M1 motorway for this purpose by creating a new motorway junction where the A426 crosses the M1 to the north of Dunton Bassett. Failing this we need a proper north south by-pass around the town.

The plan shows additional warehousing on land adjacent to the eastern side of the M1 Junction 20. I see no need whatsoever for this additional warehousing as the town plan already greatly increases warehousing at

Magna Park. There is a large new warehouse to the west of Junction 10 that has remained empty for the last 18 months. Instead of warehousing I suggest that this land is used for the light industry sites shown scattered amongst the new housing development.

~ ~ ~

From: 1>
Sent: 25 February 2019 10:15
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Development of Magna Park.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

----- Original message -----

From: '
Date: 25/02/2019 10:10 (GMT+00:00)
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: Development of Magna Park.

Dear sirs,

I am writing to object to the unproven need for more warehousing along the A5 in the Harborough District and the changes to the local plan 2011-2031.

This would be detrimental to the countryside and environment, also as would the necessary infrastructure of road upgrades along the A5 and A426 link to the M6.

There is already massive development of warehousing and distribution in the local area at M69/A5 and at Rugby gateway both within a short distance. DIRFT also. How can more be justified?

We can live without it, but we can't live with it.

Thank you for reading,

***Note A426 not 465 sorry!**

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

From:
Sent: 18 February 2019 20:56
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Local plan modification

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Sent from my hudl.

My comments on planning application .

I would like someone to explain why you think it is necessary for all this warehousing in an area which is flooded with it (A5 at Drift M69) we all know why ,greed. There are empty unit's at the moment and now we find that DHL no longer want this massive new Warehousing on the mere ,will that be standing empty too.

The distruction to beautiful countryside and wildlife is heartbreaking , devastating the lake ,the swans which I have watched bring there young up over many years gone. I remember when magna park was first built we were to have a country park as a sweetener then ,we are still waiting .We are once again being offered a country park but I am not holding my breath.

The government prefures development on railheads ,so would we, how will the A5 cope it doesn't now.

|

From:
Sent: 26 February 2019 20:47
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Good evening,

Whilst I appreciate the need for housing, I wish to register some concerns about the Lutterworth local plan.

1. We need a proper bypass so that through traffic doesn't go via the town centre. This will help to reduce the level of pollution. The M1 with a junction north of Lutterworth would provide the ideal solution.
2. Magna Park is being extended so there is no need for warehouses to be built near the M1.
3. Adequate education and medical provision needs to be in place before current services are overwhelmed.
4. I'm concerned that Brookfield Way will become busier and would recommend that traffic calming measures are put in place.

I hope these concerns are taken into account when decisions are finally made.

Kind regards,

From: J. [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2019 18:18
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objections to Policy L1 harborough district council local plan 2011 - 2031

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sirs

Whilst in principle I accept that expansion of Lutterworth is inevitable, I am concerned regarding the above on three major points :-

1. That there is not a viable option within the proposals to take traffic (including HGVs) out of Lutterworth town centre on the A426, which, following the proposed new housing and associated services, will become more seriously overloaded. The plan merely proposes a 'spine' road which is effectively just a route to and through the new housing development. I feel that the only way to achieve this reduction in traffic is by introducing a weight restriction on the A426 either side of Lutterworth and a) provide a bypass around the town, or b) utilise the proposed new M1 junction 20A, therefore making the M1 effectively act as the bypass and remove traffic that way.
2. I don't feel that there is any need, given the huge increase proposed at Magna Park, for any further warehousing at Lutterworth East. Indeed, I understood that policy BE2 restricts warehouse development to be either on, or adjacent to Magna Park, which this clearly is not. In addition, there are, including at Magna Park, a number of empty warehouses so the 'need' for more is questionable.
3. Whilst it does not affect me personally, I feel that the need for more primary school provision must come much sooner than is proposed in the plan. The primary schools in Lutterworth are already full so additional places for incoming families not being made available until completion of the 300th house is quite ridiculous and provision needs to be made much earlier than proposed.

Until these points are addressed adequately I cannot support the masterplan in its current form and look forward to seeing modifications put in place which improve the proposal.

Yours faithfully

From: |
Sent: 25 February 2019 09:39
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Policy L1 East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area, Lutterworth Easte

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir,

I saw the plan for Lutterworth East for the first time on Saturday 23/2/19. I am very disappointed with this plan and object strongly to it for the following reasons :-

1 Lutterworthg By-Pass.

All along there were proposals for a by-pass to relieve the air quality and reduce the HGV traffic in the middle of Lutterworth. This is now deleted and the LCC has stated that the spine road is NOT intended to relieve the traffic through Lutterworth on the A426. This means that there will be worse air polution and incresed HGV traffic through Lutterworth, probably resulting in even more trafic jams that will reflect back to the Whittle roundabout and counter the current plan to ease congestion at that roundabout because of the expected increase due to the enlarged Magna Park.

2. Additinal Warehousing.

Magna Park is being about doubled is size and therefore there is no need for further warehousing around the Whittle roundabout especialy as this seems to demolish existing housing.

3. Benefits to Lutterworth

There seems to be no benefit to Lutterworth in this scheme only disadvantages.

Finally I would ask that you reply to me with your comments on my objections

Yours sincerely

New Outlook Express and Windows Live Mail replacement - get it here:

<https://www.oeclassic.com/>

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 February 2019 22:21
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth Local plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the Local Plan proposals.

My objections are;

Lutterworth is an Air Quality Management Area, yet nothing is being done to **reduce** pollution.

If you look at the published monthly statistics for air pollution on Harborough District Council's website you can see that every month the government set objectives are exceeded for Lutterworth and that there is nothing in place to deal with this, it is just accepted despite the understanding that these pollutants are dangerous and harmful.

Whilst I don't agree with the proposal to build Lutterworth East, if it is to go ahead then surely it provides an ideal opportunity to improve air pollution matters by making it a condition to the developer to provide a road, a bypass not just a spine road but a road that could take HGV traffic and take it out of the town centre and reduce the pollution.

Leicestershire County Council's LTP3 2011-2026 (paragraph 3.48) talks about LTP2 Air Quality Strategy showing that Lutterworth has not met the Governments Air Quality objectives repeatedly due to road traffic. It goes on to say the only resolution for Lutterworth is to create a bypass but 'There is no prospect of a Lutterworth bypass being deliverable in the foreseeable future'

Surely this proposal is the ideal opportunity to make the developers provide this to the people of Lutterworth to actually improve their town in return for development and providing at least double the amount of houses that are actually necessary (2750 houses proposed when only 1260 are needed to satisfy the projected demand up to 2031)

The provision of a bypass would be simple in that a new bridge should not be built over the motorway on the Spine Road. Instead, extend the Spine Road up to Ullesthorpe Road (the road from Gilmorton to Ullesthorpe). There is a motorway bridge already in existence that is designed for car use, and it means that any traffic going north from the new estate can do so without touching the populated part of Leicester Road.

Between Dunton Bassett and Countesthorpe there is a motorway bridge. Convert that, by adding slip roads, into M1 Junction 20a. All through traffic that is coming from the Leicester area to travel through Lutterworth to get to M1 Junction 20 would then be diverted on to the motorway at 20a instead. After the quarry, de-classify the A426 and turn it in to the B426. At this point apply a 7.5 tonne weight limit (except for access). This will then make it illegal for HGV traffic travelling through Lutterworth to do so, but will allow such traffic if it's destination is inside Lutterworth.

Put a similar weight restriction on the Leicester Road at the Whittle Roundabout to protect the town from the South.

There is infrastructure in place that could be utilised and upgraded to provide an economical way of providing a bypass and solving the air pollution problem in Lutterworth that is acknowledged but ignored.

I also wish to object to the proposal for Lutterworth East to provide more warehouses, this it isn't needed and contravenes Policy BE2.

If Lutterworth East is to be agreed then confirmation and commitment is needed (that can be held to account) as to the nature of amenities to be provided by the developer in Lutterworth East i.e an agreed commitment for another secondary school, doctors surgery and actual amenities such as shops/restaurants as the town will be split away from Lutterworth - the M1 will be between the 2 settlements and there is no getting away from this fact.

Yours faithfully,

Sent from my iPhone

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 22:52
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lutterworth Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the Local Plan proposals.

My objections are;

Lutterworth is an Air Quality Management Area, yet nothing is being done to **reduce** pollution.

If you look at the published monthly statistics for air pollution on Harborough District Council's website you can see that every month the government set objectives are exceeded for Lutterworth and that there is nothing in place to deal with this, it is just accepted despite the understanding that these pollutants are dangerous and harmful.

The proposal to build Lutterworth East surely provides an ideal opportunity to improve matters by making it a condition to the developer to provide a road, a bypass not just a spine road but a road that could take HGV traffic and take it out of the town centre and reduce the pollution.

Leicestershire County Council's LTP3 2011-2026 (paragraph 3.48) talks about LTP2 Air Quality Strategy showing that Lutterworth has not met the Governments Air Quality objectives repeatedly due to road traffic. It goes on to say the only resolution for Lutterworth is to create a bypass but 'There is no prospect of a Lutterworth bypass being deliverable in the foreseeable future' Surely this proposal is the ideal opportunity to make the developers provide this to the people of Lutterworth to actually improve their town in return for development and providing at least double the amount of houses that are actually necessary (2750 houses proposed when only 1260 are needed to satisfy the projected demand up to 2031)

The provision of a bypass would be simple in that a new bridge should not be built over the motorway on the Spine Road. Instead, extend the Spine Road up to Ullesthorpe Road (the road from Gilmorton to Ullesthorpe). There is a motorway bridge already in existence that is designed for car use, and it means that any traffic going north from the new estate can do so without touching the populated part of Leicester Road.

Between Dunton Bassett and Countesthorpe there is a motorway bridge. Convert that, by adding slip roads, into M1 Junction 20a. All through traffic that is coming from the Leicester area to travel through Lutterworth to get to M1 Junction 20 would then be diverted on to the motorway at 20a instead. After the quarry, de-classify the A426 and turn it in to the B426. At this point apply a 7.5 tonne weight limit (except for access). This will then make it illegal for HGV traffic travelling through Lutterworth to do so, but will allow such traffic if it's destination is inside Lutterworth.

Put a similar weight restriction on the Leicester Road at the Whittle Roundabout to protect the town from the South.

There is infrastructure in place that could be utilised and upgraded to provide an economical way of providing a bypass and solving the air pollution problem in Lutterworth that is acknowledged but ignored.

I also wish to object to the proposal for Lutterworth East to provide more distribution warehouses, this it isn't needed and contravenes Policy BE2.

If Lutterworth East is to be agreed then confirmation and commitment is needed (that can be held to account) as to the nature of amenities to be provided by the developer in Lutterworth East i.e an agreed commitment for another secondary school, doctors surgery, dentists and actual amenities such as shops/restaurants as the town will be split away from Lutterworth - the M1 will be between the 2 settlements and there is no getting away from this fact. Additionally, the sports centre should remain at the centre of the existing town and not relocated to Lutterworth East.

Yours faithfully,

From: ^
Sent: 24 February 2019 09:13
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] The Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031 in connection to Lutterworth possible development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Sirs'

Like our Town Council I have many concerns about your possible inability to care seriously about the local environment & air quality in particular.

It is already a fact that we in this town have almost the worst air quality in the area & you are totally failing to address this by not relieving the growing affects of this. In my opinion you should not only be promising but committing to build a by-pass as part of the development of "East Lutterworth." And this should be part of phase I of any such development. If not, I an explanation would be helpful please.

An earlier commitment to build new schools to service East Lutterworth & therefore at least relief traffic twice daily & the consequent even greater air pollution, must also be part of the very first stage of any development.

I therefore endorse & share Lutterworth Town Councils concerns & views in totality as already conveyed to you.

A suggestion to enable you to generate more revenue – there has been mention of a possible Sports Centre in East Lutterworth. Why don't you support our current facility by investing further but at the same time open up the opportunity for say, a Bannatynes or David Lloyd Leisure or ANO Club in East Lutterworth, thus giving us the "best of both worlds."

Yours,

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 February 2019 11:49
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on plans for L1 East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area (SDA)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031
Schedule of Main Modifications (SMM) : MM36
L1 East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area (SDA)
Ref: Illustrated Master Plan 8379-L-05 18 January 2018(?)

My main concerns continue to be the proposed plans to overcome the issue of 'community severance' across the M1 to Lutterworth.

1. It is becoming obvious that a by-pass or 'Eastern Relief Road' (the 'Spine Road') has always been key requirement of the new development, designed to take HGV traffic from the centre of Lutterworth. On this, and earlier plans, the road creates a further division of the new 'neighbourhood'. It will now cut through the middle of one of the proposed new 'villages' (Wycliffe Fields), bringing noise and pollution to a high density populated area, with homes, schools, shops and community centres, and with an uphill approach from the south. This is exactly the same situation we have in Lutterworth Town now!
2. The creation of three 'villages' (presumably separated because of the overhead high voltage cables dissecting the development) with what appears to be only single roads connecting each other, will surely create traffic congestion and confusion within the overall development, particularly during rush hours and weekends. Also this does not seem to meet the requirements for an integrated community?
3. Is it not wishful thinking that the bridges, footpaths and tunnel for pedestrian and cyclists to cross the M1 will significantly lessen the traffic going into Lutterworth? It seems highly likely that people will still need, or want to take their cars into Lutterworth, creating further congestion and which will exacerbate an already serious parking problem in the town. A solution to this might be to provide a free car park in the new development, close to the footbridge and tunnel (designated on the plan as Sports Pitches). Another factor, which has not seem to have been mentioned or considered anywhere, is that near the footbridge and tunnel, the terrain on both sides of the M1 slopes down considerably towards the River Swift, which also may deter walking or cycling safely into town.
4. The Swift Valley is designated a High Risk Flood Area, which has flooded more frequently in recent years, and which would seriously affect the southern (A4304) access to the development? What provisions are being considered (if any) to minimise flooding in the Swift Valley area without affecting the wetlands environment, specifically Misterton Marshes SSSI?

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2019 21:21
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re Lutterworth east and development of magna Park

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear sir/ madam

Having recently been to a meeting and being more informed of development plans ahead I feel it necessary to write my concerns.

In general I appreciate the need for development but am firstly concerned about the increase in traffic and pollution. Lutterworth is an extremely busy town for traffic already and we are like a through route for companies. With all the planned development this undoubtedly will only worsen and is this acceptable for such a small town to have such an increase in traffic and pollution. We are a prime location for the M1, A5, M6 but I think it's necessary to consider developing a bypass. Not only will this help traffic congestion but also businesses within Lutterworth. If people visit the town we want it to be for the right reasons not as a cut through. An increase in traffic I'm sure eventually will increase council tax contributions as the upkeep of the roads will be in greater need due to usage and should residents foot the bill for businesses.

I think road decisions should be discussed at length with our local councillors as they have Lutterworth's best interest at heart.

Secondly my concern is education. I think there should be a firm plan in place for when the primary school is built and secondary schools need financial support to expand and develop. Are there plans for nursery provisions, will these be attached to the primary schools? You can't keep building houses without adequate provisions. Lutterworth has always had a good reputation for schooling and we should enhance that not make the situation worse. Both schools could be extended and as a town facilities wise we should be putting much more money into making our town a sought after location for amenities/ facilities and not just location. I would like to see more money put into developing schools and sporting facilities for our futures generations. I have a [REDACTED] and if secondary schools aren't developed now, by the time [REDACTED] is due to go to secondary school I'm almost certain [REDACTED] won't get a place locally.

Thirdly I must discuss Gp practice development. I welcome development of a new health Centre, however this seems very uncertain. Including the plans for Lutterworth East and the current houses being developed in Lutterworth, have the health services of the town been looked at in any detail or is it easy to write we may do this, that and the other with very little thought and appropriate planning. Currently I live in Lutterworth but my doctors is [REDACTED]; I'm sure many people still have doctors elsewhere. My surgery is struggling under the pressures of new houses in their location and are looking at asking Lutterworth patients to leave. I know this first hand so has this been considered that if I leave [REDACTED] and have to register with Lutterworth and others do, with the new development how do you plan to support health care locally and ensure every individual in Lutterworth or surrounding villages have access to local GP. Also as a [REDACTED] am aware of Gps shortages and this issue will worsen so despite a new health Centre being built, can this be safely staffed. It's ok throwing money at development but that money has to allow changes to benefit the community not destroy it. There is no mention of any other health care provisions such as dental practices.

I realise this is an add on point but as a resident in Lutterworth for many years I have slowly seen crime rates increase and with no police station now and nearest one half hour away with an increase in traffic using us as a

through route crime will be even more difficult to manage. With more development should more money be spent on security within the community ?

I'm not opposed to development or change, I just things need more thought behind them to get it right straight away so we avoid unnecessary issues later on down the line. Let's put Lutterworth on the map for positive reasons, not negative.

Thank you for taking the time to read my email.

Kindest Regards

From: >
Sent: 07 February 2019 10:16
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OBJECTION TO THE EXPANSION OF MAGNA PARK IN THE LOCAL PLAN

This Message originated outside your organization.

I object on the following grounds

1. in the time passed since the three planning applications have been submitted we have seen new and additional provisions along the A5 both at DIRFT and a massive site at the M69 junction with the A5
- 2 - The A5 now currently struggles with the traffic load. As many vital junction points- A5 M6 M1 and M69 are in very close vicinity , one incident on any of the motorways means very long queues on the A5. The roundabout junction at the M89 development is already not fit for purpose with long queues from exiting the M69 and lengthy queuing times down the A5 both south and North. With the stresses of a massive development already underway at this Juntion the A5 is overwhelmingly inadequate to cope with the traffic yet alone from such a massive proposal not far at Magna Park
- 3 - One of the Local plan objectives is to reduce commuting and bring wide and varied job types/roles to the area. 10,000 jobs in warehousing will not achieve this objective.
- 4 -The 700,000 m² is based on three planning applications which demonstrate only demand and are not reflecting actual need.
- 5- Two of the applications out of the three have already been agreed **with the third (15/01531) being rejected by HDC. It is puzzling as to why this therefore appears in the local Plan?**
- 6- The Government have stated preferred development options on railheads going forwards. Magna Park clearly does not align with this objective being non-railhead warehousing, this will result in a clear over provision of non-rail warehousing in Leicestershire and the surrounding area.
- 7- Research has also shown that 700,000 m² of warehousing is nearly 4 times the assessed need for additional warehouse space in Leicestershire right up to the date of 2031

I object on the grounds of the lack of evidence or supporting data that such a huge concentration of warehousing in one place is what is actually required. Refer to points 1, 4 8 and 7 above

My final comment is that this has far reaching concerns and implications to the local communities who often forgotten and overlooked The impact of the current enormous building going up rapidly along Mere lane cannot be missed or ignored nor indeed be unseen by the residents.

The additional 3 times more warehousing will dwarf overbear and detract completely on both the landscape the green belt the housing and the resident's lives. The residents of particularly Bittesby and Ullesthorpe have surely borne enough.

Local Land owner in

Ex resident of Lutterworth now residing in '

is a company registered in England and Wales. Company Number .
CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE / DISCLAIMER: The information contained in this message or any of its attachments may be confidential and is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s). If you've received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete the material from any computer. Any disclosure, reproduction, distribution or other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited without the express permission of the sender. The contents are subject to copyright regulations. The views expressed in this email or its attachment(s) are those of the individual and not necessarily those of the company. Please note that this email and any attachments have not been encrypted and may therefore be liable to be compromised. The content of this email is not legally binding unless confirmed by us in a signed letter. This email and any response(s) may be monitored by the company.

From:
Sent: 23 February 2019 16:11
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on Lutterworth East proposals - L1 East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area (SDA)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message originated outside your organization.

I have the following objections to the modified plan:

1. The 13 hectares of storage and distribution (B8) is inappropriate and unnecessary. There are already unused warehouses in Magna Park and the warehousing immediately before the motorway junction has remained unused since it was built there over a year ago.
2. The provision of schools only after 300 houses have been completed puts far too much pressure on existing facilities. This provision should be there by the completion of 100 houses at most.
3. The provision of a regular and frequent bus service to all parts of the SDA sounds like wishful thinking in view of the cut backs in bus services in the county.
4. However many cycle and pedestrian paths are put in, realistically, the majority of people will still use their cars to come into Lutterworth, which does not have the parking capacity to cope with this influx and will add to the pollution and congestion from heavy traffic coming through Lutterworth on the A426. Bypassing Lutterworth by changing the spine road through the new development into a relief road having the capability of carrying HGV traffic and diverting the A426 traffic onto this road as Lutterworth Town Council press release suggested would merely transfer heavy traffic and pollution right through the heart of the new development. A more sensible suggestion would be to create a new access to the M1 further north, where the A426 already crosses the M1. This would divert the heavy traffic currently going through Lutterworth to get to the motorway, on to the M1 further up thus bypassing Lutterworth by already being on the motorway.
5. The proposal states "Higher densities will be expected to the west of the site, maximising opportunities for connectivity with Lutterworth and reducing reliance on the private car" However, looking on the draft site map, it appears that the bulk of the housing development butts on to the green fields on the north and east.
6. Extensive building on quite boggy ground near to the River Swift increases the risk of flooding both in the new development and further back up the brook to Walcote.

RECEIVED

22 FEB 2019

CORPORATE SERVICES
Harborough District Council

Lutterworth

19th February 2019

Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my concern with regard to the modifications to the Local Plan 2011-2031.

I obviously commute the A5 in the immediate area of Magna Park and am concerned with the current volume of traffic travelling into the local area. I was under the impression that one of the objectives of the local plan was to reduce out of commuting along with offering a wider range of job opportunities into the area. I don't see that the inclusion of 700,000 sqmts of further warehousing development can possibly offer this? The A5 is currently inadequate to take the extra volume of traffic this would bring.

I don't feel there has been any evidence that we need this kind of by volume of BE2 development all in the one area and feel that that the council should reconsider the 700,000 sqmt area which has been included. This appears to have been based solely on the 3 applications submitted and not on any evidence of requirement. Currently there is unoccupied warehouse space in and around our area why do we need more?

I object to this plan modification and would strongly recommend that the volume of allocated BE2 warehouse space be reduced.

Kind Regards

RECEIVED

22 FEB 2019

CORPORATE SERVICES
Harborough District Council

Lutterworth

20th February 2019

Strategic and Local Planning Team
Harborough District Council
Adam and Eve Street
Market Harborough
LE16 7AG

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my disappointment with regard to the new local plan. I don't feel that the council have listened to its residents who live in the immediate area. The plan appears to have been amended to include all three planning applications which were submitted to expand Magna Park including (15/01531) which was rejected by HDC. The plan appears to have been amended solely on the basis that these three applications have been submitted and not on evidence of need. The evidence in fact suggests that building more warehousing at Magna Park will over provide on non-rail based warehousing in our surrounding area when the government is stating rail lead as the preferred option.

I travel on the A5 and currently feel this road to be totally unsuitable for further development, already there are frequent hold ups at peak periods and even now there is further development going on with a warehouse near Hinckley. Research shows that 700,000 sqmts is nearly four times the need for additional warehouse space in Leicestershire that's required by 2031 and if further development were to be allowed it would seriously put pressure on our local villages. Why do we need to concentrate it all in one place? I don't feel that any evidence has been offered to support this size of development in our area and it would be far to overbearing completely ruining the countryside and air quality for us local residents.

Please note I strongly object the inclusion of 700,000 sqmts of additional warehousing at Magna Park into the local plan and hope that you will reconsider and reduce this to only include the two planning applications which have already been accepted.

Kind Regards

21/2/19

Concerning Lutterworth East Proposals

The scale of the proposed development of "Lutterworth East" is enormous, Lutterworth will nearly double in size, the town currently retains an effective and attractive market town ambience. The size of this proposal will have a huge impact on local residents, and the surrounding village during years of construction.

The countryside east of Lutterworth is good productive farming land for three farms, which should not be swallowed up by a huge 'out of scale' development. This land provides a scenic area of environmental interest, with many mature trees along field edges and also along the Gilmorton Road.

Although a new link road is proposed, this would not create less traffic as 2,750 new houses, mostly housing car owners, will actually negate any of the new road benefits, traffic will be more congested. The eastern relief road will be extremely expensive to construct, as will a bridge over the M1 at the northern end of the proposed development.

The current Doctor's surgery is already over stretched due to recent house building development in the Lutterworth area.

To summarise:

1. Scale of Lutterworth East is far too large and will damage the historic town of Lutterworth.
2. This area already has too many industrial warehouses.
3. The proposal would actually create more traffic problems.
4. The Eastern road and M1 bridge will be expensive to construct.
5. Construction will cause chaos for many years.
6. Good farming land will be destroyed for ever.
7. Substantial extra support for health services would need to be included if this development goes ahead.

Notes supplied by

RECEIVED

25 FEB 2019

CORPORATE SERVICES
Harborough District Council

From: >
Sent: 07 February 2019 18:16
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Schedule of Main Modifications - January 2019 - Consultation Response

This Message originated outside your organization.

With regard to the public consultation on the above document, please find attached my comments.

MM36 - Policy L1

1. Point 2 - Page 57. The point refers to Community Consultation, and is supported by 15.2.2 in the Explanations (Extract), in that the development "...should be in accordance with a masterplan that is produced with the **full engagement of the existing community of Lutterworth and which has the support of the population through a consultation process...**" I have highlighted the key words simply because, for the residents of Lutterworth, this is an absolute requirement. We already know, from discussions with [redacted] of Leicestershire County Council, that the promoter has little interest in consulting with the community, indeed at a push he offered to put up some "sight boards" so that the residents could see what the final masterplan would look like. He did not want to provide staff to attend the event, and he certainly didn't want any further questions. His view was that we will get what we are given. He did offer to attend a meeting with Lutterworth Town Council, however when it was arranged he was not one of the people who represented LCC. It is essential that the full consultation process is not only used, but is seen to be used, and at the end of the process the residents of Lutterworth are happy that their views were listened to.

So, in summary, the policy needs to clearly and strongly state the need for full consultation, and that without the agreement and support of the population of Lutterworth a masterplan cannot be adopted.

2. Point 3 - Page 57. At the Inspector's Hearing on October 10th 2018, he made very strong points regarding the need for the "old" and "new" Lutterworth both to be seen as one and work as one. He recognised the issue of the M1 motorway as causing community severance, and said that although the M1 could not be moved, the new development **MUST NOT** create any further cause of severance. This is essential to the creation of a single settlement, and **MUST** be recognised throughout the Policy L1, and further **MUST** be rigidly enforced when the masterplan is being debated. Areas where this will potentially be ignored include the 10 hectares of B1 and B2 business use - the Inspector stated that they **MUST NOT** sit alongside the M1, yet in the latest draft masterplan from LCC (dated 18th January 2019, and presented to Lutterworth Town Council a few days later, this is exactly where the 10 hectares are located. Further, the "Spine Road" (which will be dealt with at length later) acts to form another line of severance in the draft masterplan between the two developments. While this is only a draft, it is essential that Policy L1, and subsequently HDC in enforcing the policy, does not allow the clear directions of the Inspector to be diluted.

So, in summary, the policy needs to clearly state that nothing can sit between the old and new developments that may cause community severance, including but not limited to B1 and B2 business use development and any arterial road

3. Point e) - Page 58. This is possibly the most objectionable part of the policy. We recently had policy BE2 voted through by HDC which allowed for a further 700,000 sq m of warehousing on land at or immediately adjacent to Magna Park. There was strong opposition, but it was overruled. Policy BE2 states that this figure is the limit of additional warehousing in the district, and it is already allocated to specific sites. Therefore, to allow for a further 13 hectares of B8 warehousing within policy L1 is in direct contravention of the provisions within policy BE2. The Inspector has already said that the warehousing cannot be justified, and the very fact that in the Explanations (Extract) point 15.2.13 HDC state that HEDNA 2017 does not identify a need for this quantity of B8 use, and that this part of the development is in fact a cash cow to fund the motorway junction development is disgusting. Not only is there not a need, there is no market - on the opposite side of the junction at "M1 Access" there is a 129,000 sq ft warehouse that is brand new and cannot find an occupier. Creation of more of the same will not generate funds, it will merely cost money and provide a white elephant. If funds are needed, then offer the site to Aldi as a replacement for their preferred lot next to the Whittle Roundabout. It will be better located for the new housing development, still convenient for Lutterworth, and will generate less traffic impact.

So, in summary, the provision for any form of warehousing as part of policy L1 needs to be removed

4. Point g - Page 58. Concern exists over the late provision of Primary schooling. The simple fact is that neither of the two existing Lutterworth primary schools have room to expand further, yet the Policy allows for nearly 300 dwellings to be built before the provision of further Primary places. Based on the Education Developer Contributions ratios, this would mean that 72 primary age children would be in the area, without primary schooling, before any places were provided. This is clearly unacceptable. If the promoter is serious about providing a sustainable development then the timescale for the provision of this schooling MUST be brought forward - the suggestion would be the September prior to the completion of the 100th house.

So, in summary, the provision of primary education needs to be brought forward in the development time frame

5. Point h - Page 59. There is extreme concern within the locality with the lack of clarity regarding further provision of secondary education facilities. The nearest High School to the new development, Lutterworth High, is already full and can take no further intake without significant redevelopment. While there is some space at Lutterworth College, we have recently had the news that the Frank Whittle Studio school is closing, so clearly demand that this currently absorbs will have to be taken by the college. Clarity is needed in terms of where and how the additional places would be provided, and the relevant schools informed.

So, in summary, plans for increased secondary education provision need to be clearer and more specific. Within both of these points, we would expect that the full financial assistance from the Education Developer Contributions is made available to the area

6. Point i - Page 59 The Lutterworth Community have been working on the basis that a large number of facilities will be provided within the new development. However, we now see that there is an option for "some" rather than "all" of these facilities to be created. Which facilities are possibly not going to appear - this needs to be made clear.

So, in summary, we need clear direction regarding the facilities that will be provided, and these need to be required by the policy

7. Highways and Transportation - Page 60 We now start to address the main area of concern within Policy L1, and that concerns Highways. Firstly, it is disappointing that even at this late stage the language used is inconsistent, and this leads us to believe that in developing the Policy HDC are leaning towards the desires of LCC and their draft masterplan, rather than providing a policy that delivers the best result for Lutterworth. This is unacceptable. When the idea of Lutterworth East was first discussed, it was with the intention that a by-pass would be provided with the result that through traffic would diminish, noise pollution would abate, and air pollution within the Lutterworth Air Quality Management Area would reduce. Over the years the concept of the "Eastern Relief Road" has diluted to something that is effectively now a service road for the new community, and is now known as a "Spine Road". The Inspector directed that HDC must demonstrate in its policy how it would reduce or remove the flow of HGVs through Lutterworth - nothing within the main part of the policy does this, as all traffic management measures are retrospective to the creation of the road network, and there is nothing within the policy that determines the size or quality of the roads that are to be built. However, there is one glint of light - in the Explanation (Extract) 15.2.24, the policy states that "...development of the site provides the potential to deliver an eastern relief road for the town which can deliver significant environmental benefits to the town centre, as well as improving the health and well being of residents." I would ask that HDC rephrase all areas of the policy that relate to highways, and replace the words "Spine Road" with the words "Eastern Relief Road", and stress the need to reduce noise and air pollution within Lutterworth. As part of this, we need the policy to state the requirements of the Eastern Relief Road, in that (as the Inspector required) the road is capable of reducing or removing all through traffic from Lutterworth Town Centre, both HGV and car. This is the only way that the policy will provide the improvements in noise pollution and air quality, and it will also allow Lutterworth to be re-vitalised as a market town. The Eastern Relief Road is very easily routed around the new development, meaning that both old and new residents do not have to suffer the increasing through traffic and its detrimental effects on the town.

So, in summary, the concept of the Spine Road needs to be removed, and replaced with an Eastern Relief Road to go around the new development rather than through it, creating a true Lutterworth by-pass

8. Point 6 - Page 62 Following on from point 6 (above), traffic management plans that are retrospective to the design, planning and construction of the road network will inevitably be inhibited by the nature of the road that was actually built. Therefore, all traffic management plans MUST be created before the road is designed, in order to ensure that the road concerned is capable of carrying the required traffic.

So, in summary, the policy must clearly state traffic management requirements, and the removal of through traffic from Lutterworth Town Centre

9. 15.2.24 - Page 66. I am very concerned that the narrative relating to Air Quality Management allows for "...no moderate or worse adverse impact upon air quality within the Lutterworth Air Quality Management Area". There is a fantastic opportunity here for HDC to **reduce** air pollution as a result of this Policy, and this can be effected by the creation of the Eastern Relief Road which is routed around the new development. Be bold, take a risk, and if necessary upset the promoter. Take the through traffic out of Lutterworth, publicise what you are doing, be seen as a forward thinking District Council that improves things, not just prevents them from getting much worse.

So, in summary, require that noise and air pollution reduces, demonstrate that you are the right group to lead the district and that a Unitary approach would therefore be a negative step. HELP LUTTERWORTH.

10. Policing. Lutterworth is currently suffering from increased crime, and the fact that it will double in size as a result of this development will mean that it becomes a crime hot spot, with perhaps the best escape route possible available in the form of the M1 motorway. While it is not on the face of it a planning issue, there should be a requirement for the provision of additional policing in the immediate area, to be funded from the revenues that the new development will generate.

So, in summary, along with the new development there is a requirement for a permanent police presence in order for the plans to be acceptable.

Thank you,

Regards,

From:
Sent: 22 February 2019 17:13
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Schedule of Main Modifications - FAO [redacted], Planning Insector

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear [redacted]

Further to my response to the Schedule of Main Modifications (attached).

Over the last week, there have been a number of community consultation meetings between Lutterworth Town Council and the residents of the town, for the sole purpose of ensuring that residents are aware of the proposals within Policies L1 and BE2, and have an informed opportunity to assess the situation and determine their views.

Many of the thoughts expressed in my original response were repeated by residents, and there is widespread concern for the future of Lutterworth if these points are allowed to go forward uncorrected.

However, the Lutterworth community do not take the view that it is acceptable for development to take place as long as it is elsewhere - we all recognise the need for housing and in that respect support the proposals and to a reasonable extent the draft masterplan that Leicestershire County Council have developed. The problem lies in the consequences of that masterplan relating to traffic volumes, routing, congestion and the associated pollution levels. Lutterworth is already an Air Quality Management Area, although little is being done to manage the air quality, and all future actions point to it getting considerably worse.

The people of Lutterworth, through Lutterworth Town Council, believe that we have a solution to these issues that will deliver the core aims of Policy L1, will deliver most of the requirements of the masterplan as currently presented, but will also deliver significant benefits to Lutterworth Town in terms of traffic reduction, pollution reduction, and improvement of the existing and future living environment.

We understand that the next stage of the process is for you to receive comment on the Schedule of Main Modifications, after which you will determine whether or not the Local Plan is sound, and that this process does not allow for further public enquiry. However, we would be very grateful if Lutterworth Town Council were allowed to present the revised proposals to you, as we believe that acceptance of these proposals would remove the vast majority of opposition to the Local Plan in the Lutterworth area. Lutterworth Town Council will be asking the promoter to consider the revised proposals over the next week, however based on the nature of response received in the past we do not expect the promoter to deviate from their current course.

We would be very grateful if you would grant us this request - this is a genuine attempt to move the process forward with a solution that delivers for all parties.

Thank you.

Regards,

From:
Sent: 25 February 2019 10:23
To: localplan@harborough.gov.uk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Harborough District Council Local Plan 2011 - 2031

This Message originated outside your organization.

Dear Sirs, Please see my comments below on the above plan.

I am a resident of Lutterworth and, whilst I accept the need for additional housing of all sorts over the next 10 years or so, I think that the plan does not take sufficient account of the following.

1. Local schools

There is no plan to build a primary school until after the first 300 houses are built and no plans at all for secondary education. With all the additional housing there will be children in need of school provision. All current schools in Lutterworth, at all levels, are now full so how will their immediate needs be accommodated?

2. Roads

There is a high level of pollution and radon in the Lutterworth area which will be increased with additional traffic. This could be resolved by putting a by pass around Lutterworth from Magna Park to the motorway thus preventing the need for a number of cars and lorries to come through Lutterworth. If Lutterworth Town is having more residents surely it would be better to reduce traffic and develop the Town centre to accommodate. There would be savings as an additional motorway bridge need not be built but other existing ones utilised.

3. Warehousing

The current local plan allows for a 50% growth of Magna Park and there are additional warehousing being built along the A5 between Lutterworth and Hinckley. Current warehousing is not being taken up so why is their extra provision in this plan?. It is not needed, as the quota in the current local plan shows. This is just a way of generating more finance.

I would be grateful if these comments could be passed to the Inspector.

many thanks