

SWOT Analysis for Option 4

Description of Option

Concentrate the majority of new development into a large free-standing new settlement as a focus for the majority of new development.

Implications for Leicester and Leicestershire

- New settlement (16,000)
- Continued regeneration within PUA (10,000)
- Modest expansion of larger SRCs (Loughborough, Hinckley and Coalville) (10,000)
- Modest expansion of smaller SRCs (Market Harborough and Melton Mowbray) (4,000)

Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>HMA It could ease growth pressures at the Principal Urban Area of Leicester and within some Sub-Regional Centres but still be compatible with the ongoing regeneration activity (Ref 19) Allows high standards of sustainable development to be incorporated from the start of the development process (Ref 2) May have some merits in transportation terms (Ref 3) Would include employment and local services including health sport and recreation, avoiding pressure on existing services (Ref 2) Could be implemented by a single local authority or development corporation (Ref 7) Greatest ability to influence location and mix of all types of development (Ref 18)</p>	<p>HMA Difficult to predict effects given its unspecified location (Ref 2) Not possible to identify and test potential options in the time and resources available (Ref 7) Political challenge in identifying an acceptable location through joint HMA-wide LDF (Ref 7) It would need to be self contained and located sufficiently distant from the Principal Urban Area of Leicester to be successful (Ref 19) It would need to be developed to a sufficient scale to enable its ongoing development, and the delivery of community and employment facilities, to remain viable (Ref 19) It would require entirely new development infrastructure which would be very expensive to deliver (Ref 19) It may suffer from a lack of community and political support (Ref 19) It could take a significant period of to develop (possibly decades to plan and deliver) and this would have a negative impact on quality of life and access to services and facilities (Ref 19) Pennbury's location has not demonstrated the potential to meet the sustainability and deliverability requirements for successful development as an eco-town at this time (Ref 20) The same issues make the case for a longer term commitment to this option equally poor (Ref 20) Unlikely that this option is deliverable in the absence of deliverable proposals (no other sites or areas have been put forward to our knowledge elsewhere in the HMA for a new settlement other than Pennbury) (Ref 7) Pennbury has highlighted the difficulties of</p>

	<p>seeking to get in 'right' (e.g. match of housing and employment) (Ref 7)</p> <p>Would have to be capable of connection to the strategic transport network (Ref 3)</p> <p>Would still need to meet locally generated requirements in Leicester and SRCs, so need to determine extent of local need (Ref 7)</p> <p>May attract new residents from outside the HMA and not meet local demand (Ref 7)</p> <p>Concentration of housing (including affordable housing) supply may not fit with the need (Ref 7)</p> <p>Potentially high costs for meeting infrastructure needs (Ref 7)</p> <p>Funding of infrastructure costs through future increases in land value may not be feasible in current economic and institutional circumstances (Ref 2)</p> <p>Would need to provide economic development and service provision from an early stage to avoid creating new unsustainable travel patterns (Ref 2)</p> <p>Could potentially result in more commuting. (Ref 7)</p>
--	--

Opportunities**HMA**

It should, if deemed suitable, be located in an area to the west of Leicester to promote the greatest range of potential benefits (Ref 19)

It could be an opportunity to achieve sustainable development and growth built to very high environmental and design standards as the development would be totally new (Ref 19)

It could enable heat, power and other development infrastructure to be designed to meet renewable energy and climate change targets from outset (Ref 19)

The assessment of the Pennbury proposal can be used as a generic assessment for a new settlement elsewhere (Ref 7)

Provides for ongoing regeneration at Leicester and the local development needs of other settlements (Ref 1)

Potentially high costs for meeting infrastructure needs could be met through the actual development (Ref 7)

May help to meet longer term development needs (Ref 7)

New focus for housing and jobs to reduce in-commuting (Ref 2)

Can plan a sustainable settlement from scratch (as in eco-town) (Ref 2)

Avoids perpetuating "locked in" high energy consumption / high mobility life-styles (Ref 2)

Could enable sustainable travel patterns if located on a good rail line and designed around integrated bus, cycle and walking networks (Ref 2)

Support, including additional funding, from CLG (Ref 7)

Delivery of higher education establishments possible due to scale of development (Ref 18)

Threats**HMA**

It would result in the loss of large areas of greenfield land (Ref 19)

Potential impacts on the environment if major areas of greenfield land are to be developed (Ref 2)

The high cost of development infrastructure may divert investment away from other regeneration and development projects in the Housing Market Area (Ref 19)

It may not provide affordable homes where they are actually needed in the Housing Market Area (Ref 19)

It could generate a broad range of transport needs and create significant out-commuting patterns until local employment opportunities are developed (which could take many years) (Ref 19)

It could be difficult to deliver in a way that does not adversely impact on existing settlements (Ref 19)

Potential impacts on the regeneration of Leicester and the development of other towns and settlements through a drain of talent and diversion of investment (Ref 2)

High requirement for investment in major infrastructure in a time of very tight public expenditure (Ref 2)

Would add to road based transport if it did not develop its own character and identity with full and adequate employment and service provision from an early stage (Ref 2)

Potentially long timescales for planning and developing the settlement could mean it could not be implemented in time available (generally a maximum of 400 dwellings per year can be expected on one large site) (Ref 7)

Would require a change to the spatial strategy of the RSS (Ref 7)

Land assembly / ownership constraints could inhibit delivery (Ref 7)

Location would need to provide employment land and be able to sustain suitable

employment for the population (Ref 18)