

From: Roger West
Sent: 10 July 2021 13:43
To: development.control@charnwood.gov.uk
Cc: Cllr. Paul Baines; Mrs. D. Taylor
Subject: Application numbers P/20/2251/2 and P/20/2252/2

To whom it may concern,

I originally sent an email to you with the attached comments on for both of the above planning applications. I understand the plans have been revised but I would still like the attached to be considered on both of the revised plans.

Additionally I would point out that my wife and I have recently received a household survey form (to which we have replied) jointly issued by Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Council. The end objective is to decrease private vehicle use in the Anstey, Glenfield and Westcotes areas of the city and county. This has been reported on in the Leicester Mercury. I fail to see how the County Council with any sort of intelligent thinking can enter in to such a survey knowing of the house building applications on Groby Road Anstey as well as a new school and the Thurstaston proposed development on City land. This is obviously not joined up thinking! I repeat my strenuous objections to the two Groby Road proposed development applications.

Regards,
Roger West,
64, Groby Road,
Anstey,
LE7 7FL

Planning applications P/20/2251/2 and P/20/2252/2
Land North and South of Groby Road, Anstey

Proposal for 220 houses to be built on this land, 100 in North and 120 South.

I would like the following points and objections to be taken into account when deciding upon both the outline planning applications listed above.

1. I think that the 2 applications should be considered in conjunction with each other as the impact on the village and surrounding area is doubled. They are on opposite sides of the same country road. In isolation their impact is less.
2. Traffic increase. I estimate an increase of at least 440 additional cars plus associated increase in deliveries and other general traffic including visitors etc using Groby Road. This increase in traffic through and within the village would result in pressures on the already busy road systems. In real terms the traffic planning measures being considered will have very little effect. Cycle ways are not being introduced within the village and roads are too narrow and busy to be safely used. If a bus route is reinstated very few people from the estate will use the bus (the previous bus route 54A was withdrawn being insufficiently used).
3. The junction of Groby Road and Bradgate Road. Due to parking on one side of Groby Road opposite the mouth of Ashfield Drive, Groby Road is reduced to a single lane approaching the Bradgate Road junction. This is a bottleneck. Difficulties arise at this point because views are obstructed by buildings as well as parked cars and large vans. Larger vehicles have particular difficulty negotiating the Bradgate Road junction in both directions. Increase in traffic will exacerbate this problem.
4. Junction with Groby Road and A50. Feeding from Anstey Lane, Groby into 4 lanes of speeding traffic is hazardous. Increase in traffic will make this junction more hazardous both to people exiting and cars already on the A50. Although the A50 speed limit is 40mph at this point traffic takes little notice of this as it exits the 70mph section.
5. Increase in population in Anstey will put more pressures on local services and amenities where there are already problems i.e. Doctors, schools, car parks etc.
6. Increase in pollution: Building of estates leads to increased traffic, noise, dust and light pollution.
7. Our house vibrates when vehicles don't slow down sufficiently when they negotiate speed bumps on Groby Road. Increase in traffic will make this worse.
8. Increase in people using local footpaths into surrounding countryside and using local countryside amenities. Increase use of places such as Castle Hill Park, Bradgate Park, Swithland Woods, Beacon Hill, Outwoods There has

been a massive increase in people using footpaths and these amenities in recent years. Footpaths are deteriorating and becoming wider. More people in locality will add to this problem.

9. Flooding: Increase in built up area will result in more water run-off and increased flooding risks in the locality. At present the Co-op car park regularly floods, as does the land all along Rothley Brook. The proposed southern building land is currently saturated but it does hold floodwater to a certain extent. If built upon excess water from the area of the south proposed estate will be directed into the Rothley Brook. The land should be planted with trees and not used for building.
10. What is meant by New Country Park on land beyond the south proposed estate? This land regularly floods and would need to be managed - presumably at the expense of local council.
11. Potential new sports pitches - The plan says that there is land for "potential new sports pitches" by the Rothley Brook. Obviously potential for no new sports pitches as well! How would this land be used, it regularly floods. Potential does not mean that it would ever be used as an amenity for the village. If such a sports field was ever created, who pays for its creation, drainage and maintenance?
12. Problems with existing footways built by Davidsons: St Jame's Gate footways both in the estate and in the park at the top of Burgin Road have disintegrated where water has washed them away causing trip hazards, difficulties for young children accessing the parks on bikes etc. The material used is loose and not substantial enough for the use they get. The footways have not been maintained. I am concerned that the public areas in the new estates promises a great deal but in real terms Davidsons pay lip service to building and maintaining these amenities.
13. The park at the top of Burgin Road and the allotment space has not yet been passed over to the council despite St. James's Gate having been completed several years ago. The park has been poorly maintained. The grassy areas are not mown regularly and are not suitable for children to play games on. Further evidence of poor management.
14. The footpath linking the new estate built by Davidsons on Gynsill Lane to the village has been a magnet for dog walkers; there has been no provision for dog waste. The paths are smelly in hot weather and hazardous. Dog waste in the park at the top of Burgin Road is irregularly collected and the areas next to the overflowing bins are a hazard – again evidence of poor management.
15. Building of one or both of these estates will have a negative effect on both the physical and mental well-being of people living in the area for the reasons given above.
16. Over the past decade or so, the village of Anstey has "hosted" seven new housing estates with the built up area edging ever closer to neighbouring

parishes. I feel that any more expansion means that Anstey is in danger of losing its identity as well as much of its farmland and becoming just another suburb of Leicester. The Borough of Charnwood is in danger of losing much open space and countryside as a result of proposed building on land at Shepshed/Loughborough, Thurgarton and elsewhere. With the recent acknowledgement by most authorities that open spaces are vital to health and wellbeing I can only consider further building on open land in Anstey as detrimental.

Roger West
64 Groby Road,
Anstey,
Leicestershire
LE7 7FL