

B

**CABINET – 20 JUNE 2008****‘ECO-TOWNS’ – COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE TO PENNBURY (STOUGHTON)****REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE****PART A****Purpose of Report**

1. To seek Cabinet approval to an initial County Council response to be made to the Government in respect of their decision to include Pennbury (Stoughton) in a shortlist of proposed ‘eco-towns’.

Recommendations

2. It is recommended that the Cabinet.
 - (a) Notes the further work being undertaken to respond to the consultation on Pennbury (Stoughton) as a potential ‘eco-town’;
 - (b) Consider the comments made by the Scrutiny Commission on 18 June;
 - (c) Considers, and subject to any amendments, approves the comments set out in paragraphs 22 - 42 of this report as the initial County Council response to the Pennbury (Stoughton) proposals.

Reason for Recommendation

3. To enable the County Council to respond effectively to the proposed ‘eco-town’ at Pennbury (Stoughton).

Timetable for Decisions (including Scrutiny)

4. The Government is inviting general and initial responses to its prospectus by 30 June 2008.
5. Further discussion on the County Council’s response will have taken place at the meeting of the Scrutiny Commission on 18 June and will be reported orally at Cabinet on 20 June.

6. More detailed assessments of the 'eco-town' proposals will be published for consultation in the summer for responses by 31 October. The final shortlist will be produced in late 2008.

Policy Framework and Previous Decisions

7. The Cabinet previously considered reports on the work being undertaken to respond to the shortlisting of Pennbury at its meetings on 8 April, 6 May and 6 June 2008.
8. At its 8 April meeting the Cabinet resolved, inter alia, to authorise the Chief Executive to take all necessary measures to enable the County Council to respond effectively to the consultations and possible planning application in respect of the proposal. The report to that meeting identified the work required to allow the County Council and its partners to respond to the proposal.
9. On 6 May the Cabinet resolved:-
 - “(a) That in the interest of informed debate and meaningful consultation the Cabinet formally requests
 - the Co-operative Group to make publicly available details of its bid to the Government for an 'eco-town' at Pennbury (Stoughton);
 - the Government to make publicly available the results of its assessment of the Co-operative Group's bid, in particular the views of the Department for Transport, including the views of the Highways Agency, and the Environment Agency;
 - (b) That the work currently being undertaken to respond to the initial consultation on Pennbury (Stoughton) as a potential 'eco-town' be noted;
 - (c) That it be agreed that expenditure up to a maximum of £500,000 for that purpose be funded from the general underspend in 2007/08 or reserves;
 - (d) That the Government be requested to extend the consultation period;
 - (e) That the draft Terms of Reference for the Joint Technical Group, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be approved as the basis for joint working with other relevant parties.

- (f) That the proposal to invite the Campaign Against the Stoughton Co-op Eco Town (CASCET) to join the proposed Eco-Town Joint Technical Group be supported and that the members of that Group be requested to give this matter favourable consideration.”
10. On 6 June, Cabinet noted the further work being undertaken to prepare a response on Pennbury and agreed to seek the views of the Scrutiny Commission on 18 June.

Resource Implications

11. The draft Terms of Reference for the Eco-Town Joint Technical Group seek to ensure that most of the costs of assessing the proposal fall on either the Government or the Co-operative Group. The Cabinet has authorised spending of up to £500,000 to be met from the general underspend in 2007/08 or reserves. The Director of Corporate Resources has been consulted on the contents of this report.

Circulation under Sensitive Issues Procedure

To Members with Electoral Divisions in Oadby and Wigston and Harborough Districts, namely:-

Mr G A Boulter CC
Mr P Callis CC
Mr M H Charlesworth CC
Dr R K A Feltham CC
Mr S J Galton CC
Mr D A Gamble CC
Mr M Griffiths CC
Mr G A Hart CC
Dr S Hill CC
Mr W Liquorish JP CC
Mr A P Natzel CC
Mrs R Page CC

Officer to Contact

Andy Robinson, Assistant Chief Executive
arobinson@leics.gov.uk
Tel: 0116 3057017

PART B

The Pennbury 'Eco-town' Proposals

12. As part of their consultation exercise, the Co-op has produced a statement which outlines the proposals for Pennbury and provides the only detail which is currently available. This is reproduced as Appendix 1. In summary, the proposals are for between 12,000 and 15,000 new homes built over a 15 year period at Pennbury on 750 hectares of land (the Co-op and English Partnerships own over 1700 hectares). Between 4,000 and 5,000 of these would be affordable houses. At present, no decisions have been taken on the type and size of homes to be provided or the nature of the affordable housing. This is partly because the Co-op has said it will only decide on the details once feedback from the local authorities and the consultation exercise has been received.
13. The Co-op states that all the houses would be built to meet high environmental standards and will include a number of innovative eco measures. A range of facilities including schools, shops, health facilities, parks and leisure facilities would all be provided in the eco-town. A management body would be established for the town. The town is intended to be a sustainable stand alone community as far as possible and will provide a number of jobs for Pennbury residents.
14. The design of the town will encourage walking and cycling with good public transport both within Pennbury and to Leicester and other centres. Parking will be tightly controlled and efforts made to minimise the use of cars (for example via car sharing, quality bus schemes, reverse congestion charging, business travel plans etc). The Co-op states that it intends to minimise the impact of Pennbury on the road network but acknowledges that some improvements will be needed. There are no proposals for a new link road between the A 47 and the M1 and no proposals for a Light Rapid Transit system into Leicester city centre. The County Council's Highways and Transportation staff are currently examining the proposals in conjunction with Leicester City Council, and Harborough and Oadby and Wigston District Councils.

Consultation Exercises

15. Since Cabinet last considered this matter, a newsletter on Pennbury has been distributed by the County Council in the immediate area and two public meetings held – on 9 June at Gartree High School in Oadby and on 12 June at the Coplow Centre in Billesdon. Feedback from this consultation will be reported at Cabinet.
16. The Co-op held a public exhibition at different locations on 10, 11, 13, 14 and 16 June. This has provided an opportunity for members of the public to find out more about Pennbury, to discuss the proposals and make comments. The Co-op has offered more detailed briefings for

key individuals or organisations that could be affected by Pennbury and this offer has been extended to all County Councillors. Harborough District Council and Oadby and Wigston Borough Council have also carried out consultation exercises.

17. Cabinet on 6 May resolved to request the Minister for Housing to extend the consultation period by six months. At the time of writing this report, no reply has been received.

LGA 'Eco-towns' Network

18. The LGA has established a network of local authorities who are affected by 'eco-town' proposals. It had its first meeting on 29 May and provided an opportunity to discuss 'eco-towns' in principle, the planning process the Government intends to follow, the support that local authorities would need to respond to 'eco-town' proposals and the messages the LGA need to convey to national government in respect of this policy. As a result of the meeting, the LGA agreed to do the following:
 - (a) The Planning Advisory Service will identify and make contact with attendees needing bespoke support and facilitate information sharing and joint learning.
 - (b) The LGA will seek legal opinion on possible grounds for challenge of the Government's approach.
 - (c) The LGA will identify and circulate information on various positions on 'eco-towns' and draft a sector-wide position statement for dialogue with government; and
 - (d) The LGA will convey councils' need for more information and time to respond to Ministers and civil servants.
19. A separate meeting was held with County Councils affected by eco-town proposals within the Midlands. This recognised the strong concerns that Counties have about the potential impact that 'eco-towns' would have on their services and infrastructure while Districts have planning implications as their main concerns. It was agreed that the areas on which authorities could most benefit in sharing experience or joint working included the forthcoming Planning Policy Statement, the potential for legal challenge (building on the LGA legal opinion), lobbying on planning process, timescales etc, resources for infrastructure and Section 106 issues and the need for more information and consistent assumptions and criteria.

The Initial Response already made by the County Council

20. The County Council has already made a preliminary officer response to the Government about Pennbury. This points out that there is already

enough land allocated for residential development to meet the needs of the County and that this position was recently accepted by a Panel that examined the Regional Spatial Strategy last year. It gives the view that Pennbury is not an appropriate location for an 'eco-town', that the area lacks the necessary transport infrastructure and that Pennbury would adversely affect regeneration work currently underway in Leicester. Other more suitable sites could be found for an 'eco-town'.

21. Cabinet has also raised concerns about the lack of detail provided so far by the Co-op. Proper assessments can only be made once this is available.

Proposed Further Response to the Government

22. It is difficult to make definitive comments about Pennbury at this stage because insufficient detail is currently available about the proposed 'eco-town'. Without knowing the number, type and size of houses and the type of employment and retail development, it is impossible to assess the implications of the proposed development. Once that information is available a great deal of further work is also required to consider properly the Pennbury proposals. Only when this has been done can a conclusion be made on whether Pennbury should be supported or opposed. The Government should extend the October deadline by at least 6 months to allow the Co-op to develop its proposals further and for the County Council and other stakeholders to complete those assessments.
23. The 'eco-town' process has a complete disregard for established planning procedures. A great deal of time and effort has gone into developing and supporting the Government's "plan led" approach to planning. Through Structure Plans and Local Plans and more recently through the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)/LDF process, decisions about future development have been taken following extensive consultation and investment decisions based on the back of these deliberations. The 'eco-town' process, with its complete disregard for existing planning policies, undermines work and decisions taken in the past. It also fails to allow best location(s) for development to be selected through regional and local comparison of location and sites.
24. The Council strongly supports the principle of developing sustainable communities and ensuring that buildings are designed and constructed to meet the highest possible environmental standards. If Pennbury was to be developed, it would also strongly support the provision of affordable housing at least at the 30% level with appropriate levels of wheelchair and mobility housing.
25. The overall housing needs of the County (and indeed the City) were carefully assessed as part of the work for the RSS and the Growth Point proposals put forward for the area. This indicated a need for 94,500 new houses between 2001 and 2026. These assessments

were considered by independent consultants and then debated at the RSS Examination in Public. The Panel recommended that 96,125 houses would be needed between 2001 and 2026. The conclusion from all of this work was that there is more than enough land allocated to meet the housing needs of the City and County. Based on this, Pennbury is not needed to meet local need.

26. The work on the RSS also considered the possibility of development at Pennbury. The conclusion was that Pennbury is not an appropriate location for large scale development. The area lacks the necessary transport infrastructure and opportunities to provide it are severely constrained. The area also has major heritage and landscape constraints to development. This conclusion was supported by the EIP Panel. In addition to this, existing planning policies for the area do not support the Pennbury proposals.
27. The Government states that 'eco-towns' should meet national needs. House building rates in Leicester and Leicestershire have for many years been about 3,400 dwellings per annum. The rate to meet the draft requirement for 2006-2026 (as recommended by the Panel) is 4,000 dwellings per annum. If Pennbury is to meet a national need this build rate would need to reach 5,000 dwellings per year ie. the agreed level of development to meet local needs plus 15,000 dwellings at Pennbury (for a build period from 2011-2026).
28. This would require (in net terms) an additional 36,000 people to move into Leicester and Leicestershire than is currently expected. It seems likely that this additional inward migration will only occur if there is a substantial uplift in employment opportunities well above the employment growth that is currently expected or if people decide to live in Leicestershire but commute to work elsewhere. The Pennbury proposal needs to demonstrate that it can either bring 15,000 jobs to attract this population growth or provide the infrastructure for this number of people to commute to work outside the County. Both propositions would require excellent transport links. Employers will only be attracted if they can get their goods and services to market and bring in their raw materials and this will require good links to the national road network. The proposals for Pennbury do not currently demonstrate that the required transport infrastructure will be provided either to attract employers or support out commuting.
29. If Pennbury fails to attract additional migrants into Leicestershire:
 - (a) It could adversely affect the regeneration of Leicester. Considerable progress has been made in recent years with the regeneration of the City but much remains to be done particularly with the Waterside and New Community intervention areas. Resources for investment, be they private or public, are clearly finite and there is a real concern that the availability of land for development at Pennbury (which in the

eyes of the developer would be a much easier option) will result in investment being lost from regeneration areas.

- (b) The development of other sites already identified via the RSS process will be delayed or not developed at all if Pennbury is approved. This could include sustainable urban extensions which by their very nature offer a potentially more sustainable future than the 'eco-towns'. The high eco standards suggested for Pennbury are likely to be similarly applied to other new developments.
30. The County Council notes that the initial Government assessment of Pennbury classed it as C/D (growth possible but major issues/growth is unsustainable) but that this was subsequently revised to B/C (significant issues which can probably be addressed/growth possible but major issues). The Council is concerned that no explanation has been given for this change of category. This initial assessment did not regard Pennbury as a freestanding proposal because of the relationship to the Leicester Urban area. However, if it is to be a self contained community, Pennbury will require a full range of support and community services and facilities. An initial indication of what could be required together with likely costs has been carried out and is shown in Appendix 2. Clearly this will need to be the subject of much further work but it does give an idea of the type and scale of services and facilities which will be required. In summary, this would include:
- (a) Adult Social Care – one field work office base and one voluntary community sector resource base which together could have a capital cost of £2 million. Estimated annual revenue costs could be £5.95 million.
 - (b) Potentially 8 primary schools and 2 secondary schools with capital costs of some £94 million and very significant revenue costs. The details of the schools would, of course, depend on the actual mix of housing provided at Pennbury.
 - (c) Civic amenity waste – a requirement for a suitable plot of land for a new civic amenity site with a capital cost of £1 million and subsequent operational costs.
 - (d) A full health impact assessment of Pennbury would be needed but an initial assessment shows that the annual cost of the provision of primary health care could be £37.6 million for a population of 40,000. Up to 22 GPs could be needed with contributions requested towards the provision of primary health care facilities.
 - (e) Leicestershire Constabulary requirements are still being considered but contributions in terms of capital and revenue would be likely.

- (f) Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service requirements would include an eco fire station and fire hydrants at an estimated capital cost of £2.4 million excluding land and revenue costs.
- (g) Library Services – a new library would be needed at a capital cost of some £2 million and revenue costs of £350,000 per annum. There would also be a need for community facilities (such as community halls) and cultural facilities including possibly a museum or visitor centre. These could be combined within a single building.
- (h) Parks, green spaces, leisure facilities, sports centres etc would all be needed. The County Council would want to work closely with Harborough District Council and the local community to work out what is needed and how it could be delivered.

The expectation would be that the capital costs of these facilities would be met by the developer. Items could be identified and funded via a Section 106 agreement or a tariff approach used whereby the Co-op would contribute an agreed amount per house built. Funding to meet revenue costs would also need to be considered. The Government has commissioned consultants to carry out a financial assessment. This will need to look at all the infrastructure and facilities required, their costs and how they can be delivered. This will also test the overall viability of the Pennbury proposals.

- 31. The Leicestershire & Rutland Historic Environment Records (HER) show that Pennbury lies in an area of significant interest, both in terms of known and projected archaeological resource. Additional targeted archaeological assessments including appropriate fieldwork will be needed to enable an informed judgement to be made on the archaeological implications of the Pennbury proposals. Further details on this are given in Appendix 3.
- 32. Ecology and Environmental Management – the Pennbury area contains or is in contact with 10 parish level ecology sites and one Local Wildlife Site. As these designations can be up to 10 years old, the parish level sites will need to be reviewed and evaluated against the most recent criteria. A specific development and environmental management plan will also be needed for the area. Further details are given in Appendix 3.
- 33. In transport terms the settlement is not well related to the strategic road network, nor to the rail network and transport interchanges. It is also not well related to existing employment sites and existing facilities. The existing routes into the City (A47 and A6) and orbital routes around the City have congestion problems. There is also evidence that vehicles are using unsuitable routes to avoid the congestion.

34. There is concern that the proposal would lead to significant volumes of additional traffic (both development and construction traffic) on unsuitable routes causing congestion, accidents and problems associated with rat-running through settlements in the area. There is also concern that this would lead to a substantial increase in congestion in the south east quadrant of the principal urban area around Leicester.
35. Furthermore the specific proposals of what is included in the settlement are unclear, and therefore the resulting transport implications are presently difficult to predict.
36. The Transport Strategy supporting the proposal is designed to minimise the need to travel through design and the provision of high levels of employment within the new settlement. The Co-op intends that a significantly higher proportion of trips will be by foot, cycle and public transport, both within the settlement and to the wider area. It intends that Pennbury will be a national exemplar in reducing car use and the carbon impacts from transport and aims to exceed existing best practices and innovations both in the UK and internationally.
37. The measures the Co-op initially propose to link Pennbury to the surrounding area for Phase 1 (up to 5 000 dwellings by 2016) and Phase 2 (up to 10 000 dwellings by 2022) are summarised in the following table;

Phase 1	Phase 2
Road Infrastructure	Road Infrastructure
Capacity Enhancements on A6	Completion of EDDR (Phase 2)
Capacity Enhancements on A47	
Completion of EDDR (Phase 1)	Upgrading A563
Bus Infrastructure	Bus Infrastructure
Bus Priority Measures on A6	Upgrade A6 P&R to 1000 spaces
Bus Priority Measures on A47	Upgrade A47 P&R to 1000 spaces
Construct 500 space A6 P&R	
Construct 500 space A47 P&R	
Bus interchange improvements at Leicester rail station	
Bus Interchange improvements at Humberstone Gate	
Enhanced Bus Stops (including StarTrak/on-street ticketing)	
Rail Infrastructure	Rail Infrastructure
Increased parking capacity at Market Harborough train station	New Parkway Station at Great Glen for freight (with passenger services in Phase 3)
Other Measures	Other Measures
Car clubs	Car clubs
Pool /private cycles	Pool /private cycles

38. The measures required for Phase 3 (up to 15 000 dwellings beyond 2022) have not been identified as yet.
39. At present the Co-op has not provided a robust evidence base to show that its transport strategy can be delivered without causing substantial problems. However, a process has been agreed in collaboration with the City Council and the Co-op to identify the transport implications of the proposals using various traffic models at the disposal of the County Council. External specialist transportation consultants have also been appointed to assist in the process.
40. The first stage is to provide evidence to establish the broad scale and extent of impacts. The second stage will then provide more detailed evidence and also test the effectiveness of the Co-op's Transport Strategy, and any other mitigation measures identified through the process. The third stage will be to estimate the costs of the necessary measures and this will be included in the total costs of provision of services for Pennbury.

Further Work Required

41. A decision on Pennbury can only be taken once all the details of the proposals are fully known and once the various concerns and questions have been properly examined and answered. The fact that CLG have commissioned a sustainability appraisal and that a transport assessment is being commissioned by the developers in conjunction with the local authorities is welcomed. The further work planned on financial assessments is also welcomed noting, of course, that this can only be undertaken once the details of Pennbury and all its costs have been finally agreed and that this should also consider delivery mechanisms. However, a number of further studies are needed including:
 - (a) A review of the current planning policy framework for the area – at the national, regional, sub regional and particularly local level. Even if this is to be a decision taken to meet national needs and effectively outwith the normal planning framework, existing policies must be taken into account and must be fully documented. To what extent does Pennbury conform to existing planning policies?
 - (b) An assessment of the impact of Pennbury on the regeneration of Leicester and other towns. As investment resources are finite, would the development of Pennbury restrict regeneration activity?
 - (c) An assessment of the capacity of the housing market in Leicester and the County. Can the market cope with Pennbury and all the other developments already identified or would

Pennbury simply mean that other more difficult sites do not get developed and developers hold onto to their land? Could these issues be handled via careful phasing of development? The Council would also want to extend this to cover/ take account of other growth outside Leicester and the County including Northants, Milton Keynes, Rugby etc.

- (d) Affordable housing – how much and what type of affordable housing is needed? How much and what type could actually be delivered? How much would be available to meet local affordable housing needs and how much would be for those moving into the County?
 - (e) The capacity of the construction industry – does the industry have the capacity to deliver Pennbury at a time when Leicester is engaged in the biggest regeneration programme for years and when so many other developments across the City and County are due to come on stream? Would there be a big enough construction work force to meet demands? There is a related issue about whether the skills/ capacity/ supply chains in new eco-products (green building materials/ techniques) would be there in time to deliver eco-towns/ sustainable urban extensions etc.
 - (f) Employment land and jobs. How many jobs new to Leicestershire would be provided in Pennbury and what type would they be? What sort of industries will they be looking to attract and what would be the land and environmental consequences of this? What are the transport implications? Can these industries and jobs be delivered? Would it simply mean that jobs would be lost to other areas of Leicester and the County?
 - (g) Retailing facilities. How much retail floor space would be needed in Pennbury? What type of retailing would be provided and where? What effect would this have on existing retail facilities in the area?
 - (h) Infrastructure and support facilities – schools, community buildings, health centres, police station, green infrastructure etc. What would be needed, how much would they cost and how could they be delivered? Will funding be available to meet future revenue costs? Will the Government be contributing to these costs? What effect would Pennbury have on nearby existing facilities?
42. The County Council is currently working with Harborough District Council, Oadby and Wigston Borough Council, the City Council and the Co-op to co-ordinate the delivery of these studies. Only when this work

has been completed and the results properly considered will it be possible to come to a definitive view on Pennbury.

Equal Opportunities Implications

43. These will be assessed through the Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA).

Background Papers

Reports to the Cabinet on 8 April, 6 May and 6 June 2008 on 'Eco-Towns – Shortlisting of Pennbury (Stoughton)'.
Leader's Position Statement to the County Council – 21 May 2008.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Public Statement from the Co-operative Group on their Proposals for Pennbury

Appendix 2 – Support and Community Services and Facilities for Pennbury

Appendix 3 – Archaeology, Ecology and Environmental Management

Appendix 1 – Public Statement from the Co-operative Group on their Proposals for Pennbury

As part of their consultation exercise, the Co-op has produced a statement which outlines the proposals for Pennbury and provides the level of detail which is currently available. The Co-op state that their proposals are:

Our land

We are proposing the Eco-town for Leicestershire to be developed on land owned by The Co-operative Group and our partner, English Partnerships in southeast Leicestershire. We own over 4000 acres (1700 hectares) of land in this location but at most only 40 per cent of the land will be needed for the town itself; Of the 40 per cent used, a significant amount of land will be used for open spaces and gardens; This will leave 60 per cent of the land for countryside uses including farming and recreation. Farming and food production will be central to the future of the land: we will continue to farm the land ourselves and provide opportunities for local people to grow their own food. Working closely with local interest and environmental groups, we will enhance biodiversity on land within and around the town and expand public access to the countryside.

Homes

Our proposals involve between 12,000 and 15,000 homes of different types and tenures. 30 percent of the homes will be affordable – delivering between 4000 and 5000 affordable homes. These homes will be built over a period of at least 15 years using advanced sustainable building techniques to deliver a zero carbon community, and catering for all community needs from start up homes, to 4/5 bed family homes, to assisted living.

Community

We will build the facilities required to ensure that the eco-town has everything it needs to become a fully functioning community. These facilities will include schools, health centres, shops and community buildings. The retail centres will be vibrant and mixed, catering for a range of shopping requirements and designed to encourage new and independent businesses. We aim to create a place where residents are empowered to shape their own town supported by a management body which delivers core service functions such as the management of transport and the upkeep of public open spaces: a place where residents have a sense of belonging with opportunities for real ownership of the town's infrastructure, such as its community buildings.

Education and schools

School places will be provided in the eco-town for every child in the community and we will provide education for all ages and abilities from pre-school age to adult education. The creation of a new community provides a unique opportunity to plan a new and integrated system of education, which will be of maximum benefit to young and old alike, and we will be discussing these opportunities with local authorities. The Co-operative Group has an established track-record of developing innovative partnerships with the education sector, as an existing sponsor of an Academy, member of the UK's first co-operative trust school, sponsor of ten Specialist Co-operative Business & Enterprise Colleges and inspiration for a range of materials for use across the curriculum.

Transport and mobility

The Co-operative Group will bring major investment in transport to the south east of Leicester as part of the project and we will work with local authorities to deliver new transport innovations in the town and surrounding area with the key objectives of reducing reliance on the car. There are a number of transport solutions that can be provided including an advanced high frequency bus service, which will be closely scrutinised in order to provide the best solution not just for the community but for all those living in this part of Leicestershire. We are committed to ensuring that whatever transport solutions are proposed, they are "future proofed" to allow for additional initiatives (e.g. a tram) to be incorporated in the future.

Employment and economy

The eco-town will deliver significant employment and economic benefits not just for the immediate area, but for the wider communities. In particular, the eco-town will provide an environment in which businesses working to provide sustainable solutions in sectors such as energy, waste and construction can flourish. These will be jobs which will not only enhance the regeneration of the city itself but will bring new industries to the county which otherwise would go elsewhere. We will support local businesses and facilitate new business ventures in the town.

The environment

We will champion solutions for energy, waste and water and aim to devise environmentally sustainable technologies which can be adopted in mainstream developments elsewhere. Biodiversity will be enhanced both in and around the town through the protection and creation of habitats in which wildlife will thrive. We want to make it easy for people to live a more environmentally sustainable lifestyle.

Appendix 2 – Support and Community Services and Facilities for Pennbury

Adult Social Care(ASC) - the estimated capital and revenue costs of providing ASC in the proposed eco town would comprise a total of **£2m capital** costs to provide one field work office base (£1m) and one voluntary community sector resource base (£1m) and estimated annual **revenue costs of £5.95m** comprising Learning disabilities services £1m; Physical disability services £0.4m; Mental health services £0.15m; Older persons services £2.5m; Support for people in own homes £0.65m; Assessment & care management £0.75m; Voluntary sector services £0.1m; Support and premises costs £0.4m. The figures are based on the assumption of a population of 40,000 with a similar ASC needs profile to the existing Leicestershire population.

Children Young Peoples Service (CYPS) – the proposed eco town would require 8 primary schools and 2 secondary schools and the estimated capital cost of building the schools would be around **£94m** in total. This could vary depending on the actual housing mix of the eco town. There would also be significant revenue costs in staffing maintaining and operating the schools.

Civic Amenity Waste -The initial assessment has only considered the impact of the eco town proposal on the County Council's civic amenity sites (recycling and household waste sites). It is very likely that there will be significant implications for future waste management requirements for the County Council in its role as a Waste Disposal Authority and those district council's affected by the eco town with Waste Collection Authority responsibility. The creation of an eco town with 15,000 households would place additional demands on the nearest existing civic amenity site at Oadby. An average Leicestershire household takes 0.4 tonnes of waste to LCC civic amenity sites each year. The proposed eco town has the potential to increase waste input to a civic amenity site by 6,000 tonnes per annum.

To mitigate the pressures of the eco town would require a suitable plot of land for the development of a Civic Amenity Site within the new settlement (approximately 0.6 ha) and an additional **£1 million** capital funding for the actual development costs. There would also be significant increased revenue costs in the operation of a new site.

Leicestershire County & Rutland NHS Primary Health Care Trust

The PCT advised that the eco town proposal would have significant impacts for the health and healthcare needs of the population of the eco town and the PCT would need to undertake a full health impact assessment (HIA) of the eco town proposal co-ordinated across the health community and partners affected by the proposal.

The PCT also advises the County Council should integrate the HIA findings with the wider impact assessment. This would provide a set of evidence based recommendations about the proposed development. An initial assessment and estimate of the costs based on the information available has been provided which shows that the annual cost of the provision of primary health care (based on April 2008 figures) would be in the region of **£21.6m** for a population of 23,000 and **£37.6m** for a population of 40,000.

The proposed eco town population of between 23,00 and 40,000 based on an average of 1800 patients per GP would require the healthcare support of between 13 and 22 GPs. Consideration would need to be given to how the health needs of the eco town would be met in terms of staffing, practice size and facilities required.

In addition the PCT would seek developer contributions towards primary health care facilities relating to the proposed eco town, and the estimated infrastructure costs per healthcare

facility for a population of 23,000 with a minimum of 1500sqm would be **£2.25m** with a recurrent revenue of **£225,000** per annum and for a healthcare facility for a population of 40,000 the estimated cost of a 2,400sqm building would be **£3.6m** with a recurrent revenue of **£408,000** per annum.

Leicestershire Constabulary

It is Leicestershire Constabulary's intention to respond to the proposal by outlining the likely impact for policing infrastructure and services through such a development, and also by outlining potential means of mitigating the associated risks. Their response is likely to comprise costs in both terms of capital, and of revenue. It will also, require an input in terms of design and accessibility.

Leicestershire Fire & Rescue Service

A new development of the scale and size of the eco town should consider the securing of water to meet fire fighting needs. The fire and rescue service would seek developer contributions to secure the provision of an eco fire station and fire hydrants and possibly an alternative open water supply for example lakes, rivers, balancing ponds. LFRS would request that if there is an open water source then the developers provides an open water pumping site which provides access for a fire appliance. The LFRS has also recommended that the eco town dwellings and commercial premises be provided with approved sprinkler system/s. The capital cost of the provision of the LFRS requirements is estimated as **£2.4m** excluding land and on going annual revenue/operational costs.

Library Services

The proposed eco town would have implications for library services and for a population of between 23,000 and 40,000 a new library is likely to be required and is estimated that the capital cost of the building would be **£2m** with on going revenue costs of **£350,000 per annum** at 2008 prices. In addition there should be a percentage included for public art related to the library building.

Appendix 3 – Archaeology, Ecology and Environmental Management

Archaeological - Appraisal of the Leicestershire & Rutland Historic Environment Record (HER) indicates that Pennbury lies in an area of significant interest, both in terms of the known and projected archaeological resource.

In addition to the statutorily protected scheduled remains at Great Stretton and a number of listed buildings, the HER holds data on more than 40 non-scheduled archaeological sites within and in the immediate vicinity of Pennbury. These remains span the period between the Mesolithic (10,000-4500BC) and the recent 20th century. The HER also hold data on the historic landscape character: the Pennbury development area preserves some significant blocks of medieval ridge and furrow earthworks, notably around Great Stretton DMV. These earthwork features contribute significantly to the landscape character, otherwise typified by evidence of 16-18th century piecemeal enclosure to the north of the Gartree Road and 18-19th century planned enclosure to the south.

Additional targeted archaeological assessment, including appropriate fieldwork, will be necessary to enable an informed judgement as to the archaeological implications of the proposal. Such assessment should be used to shape the development scheme, and be undertaken to an appropriate professional standard, for example, guidance issued by the Institute of Field Archaeologists and LCC guidelines and procedures for archaeological work in Leicestershire. In line with national planning guidance (PPG15 & 16) this work should form part of the developer's pre-application considerations.

It is estimated that the completion of an initial desk at modest cost, c. £5000-8000. However the character of any further archaeological investigation cannot at this stage be assessed, but will depend upon both a clearer understanding of the development proposals and the completion of the initial desk-based assessment.

Ecology - The estimated development boundary contains or is in contact with 10 parish level ecology sites and one Local Wildlife Site. As these designations can be up to 10 years old the parish level sites need to be reviewed and evaluated against the most recent criteria.

The area within 500m of the estimated development boundary contains another 3 parish sites and 3 Local Wildlife Sites. The area within 1000m of the estimated boundary contains 7 parish sites and 4 Local Wildlife Sites. There are approximately 25 ponds within the estimated development boundary which may contain protected species. There are three main streams and their tributaries which drain the estimated development area and which provide actual or potential wildlife corridors connecting it to the wider countryside.

In order to minimize the effects of global warming and to maximize the opportunities for species to re-colonize new areas there is a need to reduce further fragmentation of the existing wider countryside, such as currently exists to the east of Leicester. This can be done by positioning new developments next to existing major urban blocks, by minimizing the area developed, by minimizing the major roads built to service them, and by maintaining existing wildlife corridors.

Environmental Management- From a strategic landscape point of view the potential issues to be faced are the implications for the land between existing settlements and the eco town. In planning terms this might be classed as some form of green separation strip or a continuation of the existing green wedge where they exist. However, its role, character and management would be very different from the existing situation and a strategic Green Infrastructure approach could be used to prepare a specific development and management plan for this area, supported by a developer contribution or financial package to help to ensure its long-term sustainability. .

This page is intentionally left blank