

Laura Bates
21 Peartree Close
Anstey
LE7 7TD
8th July 2021

Re Groby Road South and North - Anstey Davidsons Development (Planning Ref P/20/2252/2 and P/20/2251/2)

With reference to notification of Davidsons revised masterplan. I remain deeply saddened by the proposal and strongly object. My views have not changed since I originally sent my objections on 31st January this year.

My primary objections are through fear that Anstey is now already less of a village and bordering on an extension to the city. To cope with over 200 additional homes, we need to improve local amenities, traffic measures, local services and have a robust plan in place to tackle climate change and pollution.

Secondary the revised plan is of utter disrespect to the existing homes which back onto the proposed development.

Summary of objections raised previously, 31st January 2021.

- Anstey has already grown considerably over the last 10 years. Three new developments have been built in recent years on both sides of Cropston Road, Two sites along Gynsill Leicester Road with links to Anstey.
- As a resident of Anstey, I know that some of the public services are already in huge demand. The Drs surgery is difficult to gain access to unless appointments are booked well in advance and its often days before seeing anyone. [REDACTED] this is not ideal and I feel that adding residents to this extent of numbers will only cause a massive strain on vital services.
The surgery also serves residents in surrounding areas including Thurstaston to which they have plans to build a further 600 homes!
- Schools are also of a huge concern.
Knowing that there are only 2 primary schools in Anstey, 1 which has already expanded capacity by doubling year groups and the other not able to expand I only wonder where further children in the village will be able to gain access.
Again, bearing in mind the surrounding villages also use these schools.
- Flooding – please refer to the videos I submitted on Thursday 28th January. As you will see the path created as walkways around my home to the rear of Peartree close, opposite the

Davidsons St James site is completely underwater. In more recent years we have seen flooded pathways, fields and school playgrounds and fields.

There would need to be substantial measures taken to ensure the flood water does not increase with new developments on drainage land as the water hits worsened areas of Anstey around Latimer Primary School and at the brook.

- The road and levels of traffic is already chaotic. Our roads are gradually returning to pre Covid times with the nook becoming gridlocked. Once the development has been completed there will be at least 500 cars traveling to and from the development. Most residents travel though the village of Anstey using the nook daily. These roads are already overpopulated during rush hours. The new traffic light system has eased congestion slightly from Bradgate Road but has severely jammed Cropston Road. We cannot add any more cars to the existing roads during busy commutes.
Groby Road is dangerous at both ends leading to the A50 and Bradgate Road. Groby Road itself has obstacles with parked cars blocking access, making it one way only plus a poor lack of visibility often just having to risk it!
The only solution I can see is having Groby Road made into a main access road in both directions, not just the one-way slip road we have at present.

As a homeowner on Peartree Close with rear gardens backing onto the proposed development I have huge concerns.

Cunningly Davidsons submitted their last plans just hours prior to a council meeting where they had time on the agenda to present to councillors & residents. These plans added a desired green strip that Peartree residents were requesting as a duplicate of the site they built over the road (Burgin Road).

I am angered to now see they have yet again gone back on their proposal, scrapping the green strip to squeeze as many houses in as possible.

The current proposal has two-story homes across the back of our properties, many of those with garages that sit at the bottom of our gardens. These garages will have pitched roofs so this will greatly affect the light into our gardens and homes.

The only reasoning, I can see for this change is to make room for extra housing, maximum profit! The plans seem to be cramming as many houses as they can onto the strip which was before left as green space.

In all other areas on the existing development (St James) and the proposed new development on the North side, a green strip has been left between each phase.

Also, when the original North development was built a large green strip was left between the back of the houses on Burgin Road and the new development site.

Why have the same rules not been applied to the houses backing onto Peartree Close?

Davidsons say the revised proposal to fit in more homes are to protect residential amenity, secure rear boundaries and create an attractive street scene. I disagree, as a member of Neighbourhood Alert I know that crime and in particular break ins are low within my post code.

However the homes on [REDACTED] which have just had new homes built directly behind have struggled with a high volume of break ins. Over the last 2 months several homes have been burgled

at least once, many twice. Again last week a further 4 homes broken into – this completely enforces my disagreement to security, in fact confirms the opposite.

To summarise this email, I object to the proposed development given that Anstey is already bulging with new homes and residents requiring access to services, schools and using the inadequate roads. I also strongly object to the current masterplan on the grounds that the properties on Peartree Close are not given the same consideration as the existing and new houses on the Development with green space and land strips between sites.

Regards,

Laura Bates