

## SWOT Analysis for Option 3

### Description of Option

Focus development and regeneration at Leicester and major expansion at one or two of the Sub Regional Centres with complementary development at the remaining Sub Regional Centres.

### Implications for Leicester and Leicestershire

- Development would be based in places where existing or improved transport infrastructure could ensure good connections within and between settlements;
- Continued regeneration within PUA (10,000);
- Enlarge existing 2 SUEs to PUA and / or additional SUE(s) to PUA (8,000)
- Major enlargement through development and regeneration of existing SUEs and / or major additional SUEs to SRCs (one or two out of Loughborough, Hinckley and Coalville) (18,000);
- Limited new development to remaining SRCs (Market Harborough and Melton Mowbray) (4,000).

Much of the assessment of Option 1 in relation to the Sub-Regional Centres will apply to Option 3. Where this is the case, it is not repeated. This SWOT therefore lists only those factors specific to additional expansion of the Sub-Regional Centres of Loughborough, Hinckley and Coalville.

<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
<p><b>HMA</b> It allows the Principal Urban Area of Leicester to continue to grow and regenerate to meet its potential along with major expansion at other centres in the Housing Market Area (Ref 19) It would not realistically focus major expansion on the Sub-Regional Centres of Market Harborough and Melton Mowbray, but would still allow complementary development in these centres (Ref 19) It could be more effective than trying to promote a more dispersed development, regeneration and growth pattern across the Housing Market Area (Ref 19) Would reflect existing distribution of population (Ref 7) Focuses development and investment into Sub-Regional Centres with main regeneration priorities (Ref 1)</p> <p><b>Blaby</b> <b>Charnwood</b> <i>Loughborough</i> <b>Harborough</b> <i>Market Harborough</i> Reduced pressure on more sensitive settlement (Ref 2) <b>Hinckley and Bosworth</b></p>	<p><b>HMA</b> It could require substantial investment in development and transport infrastructure (Ref 19) It would require population and housing growth to be linked with economic development investment in the major expansion centres (Ref 19) It would need careful consideration of the levels and deliverability of growth if it is to gain community and political support (Ref 19) Costs of infrastructure provision and maintaining links into the future (Ref 1) New development would need to facilitate improvements to the transport infrastructure (Ref 1) Could promote more travel demand through improving accessibility between settlements (Ref 1) Unemployment in Leicester highest in the East Midlands at 6.7%, whereas unemployment in Leicestershire County is relatively low at 3.1% (Ref 10) <b>Blaby</b> <b>Charnwood</b> <i>Loughborough</i> It needs to address major development constraints such as flood risk and land</p>

<p><i>Hinckley</i>  <b>Leicester PUA</b>  <b>Melton</b>  <i>Melton Mowbray</i>  Reduced pressure on more sensitive settlement (Ref 2)  <b>North West Leics</b>  <i>Coalville</i>  <b>Oadby and Wigston</b></p>	<p>availability at Loughborough (Ref 19)  Considerable environmental constraints (Charnwood Forest / River Soar etc) (Ref 12)  <b>Harborough</b>  <i>Adjoining PUA</i>  Could result in significant extension of the PUA into sensitive rural areas (Ref 21)  <i>Market Harborough</i>  Could exacerbate affordability problems (Ref 2)  <b>Hinckley and Bosworth</b>  <i>Hinckley</i>  It needs to address major development constraints such as employment capacity at Hinckley (Ref 19)  <b>Leicester PUA</b>  <b>Melton</b>  <i>Melton Mowbray</i>  Could exacerbate affordability problems (Ref 2)  <b>North West Leics</b>  <i>Coalville</i>  It needs to address major development constraints such as regeneration and infrastructure at Coalville (Ref 19)  The housing numbers in this option would still not be sufficient to change the position regarding the reopening of the Ivanhoe Line and the need for major on-going subsidy (Ref 3)  <b>Oadby and Wigston</b></p>
--	--

**Opportunities****HMA**

It could allow for the major expansion of one or more of the Sub-Regional Centres of Coalville, Hinckley and Loughborough (Ref 19)

It should select the Sub-Regional Centres that are most appropriate for major expansion on the basis of evidence on issues such as development and infrastructure capacity, transport opportunities and improvements, economic development opportunities etc (Ref 19)

It could create the critical mass required to enable significant infrastructure investment in particular Sub-Regional Centres (Ref 19)

It could focus development and investment into the settlements with the main regeneration priorities (Ref 7)

Unemployment in Leicester highest in the East Midlands at 6.7%, whereas unemployment in Leicestershire County is relatively low at 3.1% (Ref 10)

Unusually, the workplace median earnings are lower in Leicester City than in Leicestershire. Low wages in the City are likely to be due to the relatively low number of jobs in knowledge-based sectors (Ref 10)

**Blaby****Charnwood***Loughborough*

It could allow Loughborough to meet its potential to accommodate further research and development and knowledge based industries related to the University (Ref 19)  
Considerable scope for regeneration (Ref 2)

**Harborough****Hinckley and Bosworth***Hinckley*

It could allow Hinckley to regenerate and develop to meet its potential (Ref 19)

Physical capacity exists for accommodating further growth in this area (Ref 7)

**Leicester PUA****Melton****North West Leics****Threats****HMA**

It could impact on the semi-rural and rural areas that surround the potential major expansion areas (Ref 19)

The major expansion centres could start to have competitive impacts on other small and large centres within and outside the Housing Market Areas (Ref 19)

Likely expansion of current road-based movement (Ref 2)

**Blaby****Charnwood***Loughborough*

Serious doubts whether this option could be applied in Charnwood without a very significant amount of investment in transport and social infrastructure and it is not likely that development of a scale inferred by this option could be delivered without public subsidy and environmental cost (Ref 21)

Would threaten sensitive landscapes around the Outwoods and western and southern fringe of Loughborough and is likely to involve the development of a large area of countryside in the Wolds to the east of Loughborough (Ref 21)  
Effect on nationally designated biodiversity sites between Coalville and Loughborough (Ref 2)

An eastern extension of the town would present very significant challenges in terms of infrastructure provision and achieving the integration of a large new settlement across a wide river valley in a way that complements Loughborough economically and does not compete with it (Ref 21)

Flood risk (Ref 2)

May have to include Shepshed in any major growth (Ref 3)

**Harborough****Hinckley and Bosworth****Leicester PUA****Melton****North West Leics***Coalville*

Lack of public transport infrastructure could lead to increased greenhouse gas emissions (Ref 2)

Effect on nationally designated biodiversity sites between Coalville and Loughborough including Charnwood Forest (Ref 2)

<p><i>Coalville</i> It could regenerate Coalville and provide the catalyst for attracting further investment (e.g. providing a railway link) (Ref 19) Considerable scope for regeneration (Ref 2) <b>Oadby and Wigston</b></p>	<p>If major housing growth allocated to Coalville cannot be implemented, could put pressure on Ashby, which has severe environmental constraints (effect on River Mease) (Ref 12) <b>Oadby and Wigston</b></p>
--	--