

Q29. Is there a need for new passenger railway stations in the District & if so, where ?

No.	Respondent	Response
1.	Kirby Muxloe Parish Council	Re-opening of Desford and Kirby Muxloe stations would provide convenient access to the city and elsewhere – would reduce car use!
2.	Natural Life Leicestershire County Council	No answer
3.	National Playing Fields Association,	No answer
4.	The Gypsy Council	No answer
5.	LE9 2LT	Nice thought but I cannot see where they would be viable
6.	Health & Safety Executive	No answer
7.	Grove Park Commercial Centre Ltd	Kirby Muxloe
8.	Alliance & Leicester Plc	Potentially yes – see answer to Q25. Not sure where – research needed
9.	LE3 2JP	Yes Fosse Park
10.	LE9 2DF	Yes – Kirby Muxloe
11.	LE19 3ET	No
12.	Transport 2000 (Leicestershire)	Yes – Elmeathorpe and Croft on the Birmingham-Leicester line and Kirby Muxloe on a new “National Forest” Leicester-Burton on Trent line
13.	LE3 8AE	Definitely – Ivanhoe line
14.	Architectural Liaison Officer. Leicestershire Constabulary	No answer
15.	Jelson Limited	No answer
16.	LE18 3TH	Don't know
17.	A J Granger	Yes – anywhere where strategic rail permit
18.	Cllr E A Webster-Williams	Yes, Blaby
19.	LE9 3GB	Yes – Croft (this would be useful for Croft, Huncote, Stoney Stanton, Sapcote)
20.	LE3 2XH	No answer
21.	LE19 3LY	Yes – Croft and possibly Blaby with car park

22.	LE3 3AB (Anon)	This seems ok
23.	LE2 9JQ	Yes definitely! At the point where the railway crosses over Leicester Road. This could integrate at a later date with a tramway if one is ever built alongside Great Central Way
24.	LE8 4DN	Train into Leicester
25.	LE3 8PU	Probably not
26.	LE8 5RH	As far as possible any town/village near a rail track
27.	Leicester Forest East Parish Council	No answer
28.	Anon LE3 3LY	The Ivanhoe line should be re-opened to provide local communities with a service
29.	LE9 Anon	No answer
30.	LE8 6LT	No
31.	LE8 5RD	What's the point if we have no railway
32.	LE19 3ET	Again, too late – lines have been dismantled, some built on. Need to know how well existing stations are used.
33.	LE9 1SX	They seem adequate
34.	Cllr Dilks	Possibly not with the way railways operate today. Although this should not be abandoned as a possibility for the future. Consideration should therefore be given to how Narborough Station could be better utilised.
35.	LE9 3GG	What about the Ivanhoe line?
36.	LE9 3BA	Larger parking space at Narborough Station would ease traffic into Leicester?
37.	A T	No answer.
38.	LE8 5YJ	No.
39.	Anon	Meynells Gorse/Kirby Muxloe (Ivanhoe line).
40.	Stoney Stanton WI	Yes – where possible on the previous sites.
41.	Stepping Stones Countryside Management Project	No answer.
42.	LE3 8EH	Is there any hope of the Ivanhoe line being progressed?

43.	Cllr Alan Tanner	Yes – Blaby.
44.	Ford & Slater Limited	No answer.
45.	BT Group Plc	No answer.
46.	Persimmon Homes (North Midlands) Ltd	Perhaps Blaby but the rail transport in this country is under resourced and overpriced so perhaps wouldn't be used.
47.	Leicestershire County Council (Structure Plans)	No comment.
48.	Department of Highways, Transportation and Waste Management Leicestershire County Council	(New passenger railway stations) – There is still an aspiration to have a new passenger rail station in Blaby (parish), possibly linked to a park and ride site if practicalities were to allow it. I would wish to work with you to clarify the best location.
49.	Cllr John Kenney	On the existing rail system. Blaby and Croft with a new spur to Fosse Park, Meridian and a new transport hub at J21.
50.	Blaby Parish Council	Yes. Blaby village. Reinstate the old station near Leicester Road.
51.	Strategic Planning - SRA	<p><u>Proposed New Stations</u></p> <p>The text of the LDF would benefit from reference to any new station proposals being worked up in detail in consultation with the SRA. In particular, the SRA published new policy and guidance in September 2004 concerning new stations which is available on our web site. This offers guidance on technical, commercial/economic and operational feasibility for new stations and provides a process that promoters should follow when seeking the industry's agreement to a new station. It is requested that reference to this SRA new stations policy and guidance is included in LDF, together with an indication in the explanatory text of the need for any new rail stations to meet the railway industry's requirements for technical, commercial and operational feasibility.</p>
52.	Local Strategic Partnership	The LSP believes that there will be a continued increase in pressure from the public for access to the public transport including the rail network. The LSP would welcome the impact a new passenger railway station would have in terms of sustainability and improvement in the quality of life of residents and users.

53.	Woodland Trust	No comment.
54.	Glenfield Parish Council	Yes, Kirby Muxloe.
55.	Sapcote Parish Council	No comment.
56.	LE3 8SD	Not known.
57.	Aston Flamville Parish Meeting	No.
58.	Leicester & Rutland Society of Architects	Ivanhoe line to Burton should be developed with stations as appropriate.
59.	Cattrell Associates	No comment.
60.	LE19 4WE	No
61.	The National Trust	No comments.
62.	Billington Road West Elmesthorpe	Consideration should be given to providing the short amount of extra track from the existing Hinckley-Leicester line to create a station at Fosse Park, also to opening a "bus stop" style facility at Elmesthorpe.
63.	LE2 9HJ	I think Blaby village/Glen Parva would be a good place for a new passenger railway station, perhaps in conjunction with a park and ride scheme.
64.	LE8 4GD	Blaby – also a railway station with car parking to be used as park and ride projects.
65.	Rutland Country Homes	No answer.
66.	LE9 9FW	Yes, Desford or Kirby Muxloe.
67.	LE2 9JA	Where the old one was.
68.	Braunstone Town Council	No answer.
69.	Leicestershire County Council	No answer.

	(Chief Executive's Department)	
70.	Network Rail	<p>Any new railway stations or lines should be fully explored with both Network Rail and the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) (question 29). A useful starting point for any new station proposal is the SRA's recently published document "New Stations: A Guide for Promoters". Any new proposed rail schemes may also require funding for relevant rail/timetable studies and section 106 developer contributions for expansion in terms of train services/facilities.</p> <p>We would welcome support in the plan for rail infrastructure proposals and movement of freight by rail in general terms. Finally, we would be interested to learn of the Council's stance on the re-opening of the rail line to Burton on Trent for passengers.</p>
71.	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	No answer.
72.	LE19 2JJ (1)	Yes, Enderby Road, Whetstone (opposite the incinerator).
73.	Thurlaston Parish Council	Not known.
74.	Countesthorpe WI	Blaby, Croft.
75.	LE19 2JJ (2)	Croft, maybe!
76.	Leicester City Council (Regeneration and Culture)	No answer.
77.	Leicester City Council Investment and Development	No answer.
78.	Next plc (CgMs)	No answer.
79.	LE19 2JJ (3)	Maybe. Try at Blaby, Croft, and other stations on the Hinckley Line not forgetting Kirby Muxloe. But you do need to consider parking facilities.
80.	House Builders Federation	No answer.
81.	LE9 9SU	Yes – Desford or Kirby Muxloe.

82.	Highways Agency	Highways Agency would support any new passenger railway stations in line with encouraging sustainable modes of transport.
83.	LE9 3HD	Yes at Croft.
84.	English Nature Eastern area Team	No answer.
85.	LE3 8AT	No answer.
86.	LE8 4AQ	Yes Blaby to enable commuting into the city. Combined with park and ride, train.
87.	Anon	Not answered
88.	LE19 2 JH	No ideas on this one either.
89.	LE2 3TJ	No answer.
90.	LE9 3EJ	Yes. One around Croft maybe on Marions Way (road to quarry) with increase of population in the South of the district and Broughton Astley. A joint partnership with Harborough (to cut cost) to enable access to the rail network without overloading Narborough. It could be a perfect park and ride site linked with all public transport to surrounding towns and villages.
91.	LE19 5HG	Yes Enderby Road, Whetstone.
92.	Housing Corporation	No answer.
93.	Development Plans Group Leicester City Council	The City Council supports the implementation of a rail service between Leicester and Burton on Trent with appropriate passenger stations along the route. Land should be safeguarded for this purpose.
94.	Nottingham East Midlands Airport	No answer.
95.	Powers Estate	No answer.
96.	Thorpe Astley community Association	No answer.
97.	Blaby W.I	Yes Blaby
98.	Leicester and Leicestershire Motorcycle forum Transport Strategy Team Leicester City Council	No answer

99.	Pegasus Planning Group	No answer
100.	LE9 3BA	Next or within reach of the park and ride centres which should be increased in the district. Less cars on the road and more rail and coach travel.
101.	British Waterways	No answer
102.	The Square, Littlethorpe, Leicester	Yes. Blaby
103.	Leics & Rutland Federation of Women's Institutes	No answer
104.	LE9 7SE	Yes – as many as possible.
105.	LE2 4QX	No, but enlarge safe parking facilities at Stations.
106.	Glen Parva Environment Group	Your advice in 1993, which my group used to oppose the Glen Parva By-pass, was that there was an intention to open stations at Croft, Elmesthorpe and Blaby.
107.	J S Bloor (Services) Ltd	No answer
108.	English Heritage	No answer
109.	Croft Parish Plan Group	No answer
110.	Wheatcroft & Son	No answer
111.	Taylor Woodrow Strategic Developments.	No answer
112.	Campaign for Dark Skies	No answer
113.	Gordon Smith Associates.	No answer.
114.	Revelan Group (Gough Planning Services).	No answer.

Summary

The potential for new stations received general support from those responding. Stations were suggested at Blaby, Croft, Elmesthorpe and Whetstone on the Leicester to Birmingham line and at Kirby Muxloe, on the Ivanhoe (National Forest line). A new spur to the junction 21 area was also suggested. There was however recognition that these suggestions may not be achievable and reference was made to previously proposed schemes on the Ivanhoe (National Forest) line that have not come to fruition. A few respondents suggested that better use be made of the existing facility at Narborough Station.

Q30. Do you think that the amount of car parking spaces in new developments should be limited, or would this result in greater levels of on-street parking ?

No.	Respondent	Response
1.	Kirby Muxloe Parish Council	No shouldn't be limited – could consider width of roads in new developments which can cause parking difficulties for visitors/deliveries
2.	Natural Life Leicestershire County Council	No answer
3.	National Playing Fields Association,	No answer
4.	The Gypsy Council	No answer
5.	LE9 2LT	No – we have to be realistic
6.	Health & Safety Executive	No answer
7.	Grove Park Commercial Centre Ltd	No and yes
8.	Alliance & Leicester Plc	Should not be limited but alternative public transport can help to reduce demand
9.	LE3 2JP	Yes it could result in on street parking
10.	LE9 2DF	Not limited
11.	LE19 3ET	Yes but parking should be underground or multi-storey <u>not</u> like A & L at Carlton Park who have acres of parking at ground level which is misuse of green space/environment
12.	Transport 2000 (Leicestershire)	Yes – it should be limited in accordance with PPG notes
13.	LE3 8AE	On street parking must be deterred
14.	Architectural Liaison Officer. Leicestershire Constabulary	<p>Any desire to reduce the dominance of the car within new development should not be such as to increase the likelihood of crime occurring or such as to lead to an increase in the fear of crime.</p> <p>This is particularly relevant to the parking of motor vehicles.</p> <p>All current design guidance advocates that parking provision should be under surveillance from buildings.</p> <p>Solutions that remove the visual impact of the car on the street scene for example the use of communal parking or garage courts enclosed by rear gardens within residential development should be strongly resisted.</p>

		<p>Unless parking spaces are well related to dwellings with the necessary guardianship built into the design, cars might well end up being parked within carriageways where they can be seen from living spaces. This may result in traffic management problems including possible obstructions to emergency vehicles or inconvenience to pedestrians.</p> <p>Planning policy should legislate against poorly related parking provision.</p>
15.	Jelson Limited	Jelson is mindful of the need to encourage a reduction in reliance on the use of the private car. However, it is mindful also that significant problems can be caused within residential developments when inadequate provision is made for off-street parking. DPD policy should not set onerous parking standards unless it is clear that reliable, adequate and quality alternatives to the private car are available to occupiers.
16.	LE18 3TH	New developments should include off road parking
17.	A J Granger	No they should not – on street parking is dangerous
18.	Cllr E A Webster-Williams	Limited
19.	LE9 3GB	Limited and restrict on-street parking
20.	LE3 2XH	All properties need parking space and it should be used!!
21.	LE19 3LY	Car parking spaces are essential for the flow of traffic
22.	LE3 3AB (Anon)	It should be planned in according to ratios of employees, bedrooms, etc
23.	LE2 9JQ	It would result in more on-street parking. See also Q25
24.	LE8 4DN	No answer
25.	LE3 8PU	You have to be realistic
26.	LE8 5RH	To put down on car parks can only create even more chaos
27.	Leicester Forest East Parish Council	No answer
28.	Anon LE3 3LY	Consideration should be given when new developments are proposed for adequate car parking
29.	LE9 Anon	No. Again life today demands a car. All new

		developments should incorporate sufficient off-street parking for the houses/flats that are being built.
30.	LE8 6LT	No
31.	LE8 5RD	What's the point, people park on the road anyway
32.	LE19 3ET	What a question! Often there are three cars to a family – much overflow into streets. Perhaps extra Council Tax to these families could be a start.
33.	LE9 1SX	I think all new houses should have off street parking for 2 vehicles
34.	Cllr Dilks	No. Existing provision of car parking spaces on new developments is already resulting in greater levels of on-street parking, evenings and weekends and Christmas. I feel Blaby District Council should be encouraging developers to increase provision of <u>underground parking</u> .
35.	LE9 3GG	New developments should provide sufficient parking.
36.	LE9 3BA	Every house should have parking facilities.
37.	A T	No answer.
38.	LE8 5YJ	No – but make car ownership unnecessary with better bus/tram links etc.
39.	Anon	<u>Not</u> limited – of course it would cause more on street parking.
40.	Stoney Stanton WI	No and yes it would.
41.	Stepping Stones Countryside Management Project	No answer.
42.	LE3 8EH	Realistically at least one car space should be provided for all new developments (including for the elderly). County standards can be excessive in some cases though.
43.	Cllr Alan Tanner	It would result in more on-street parking, the car needs accommodation.
44.	Ford & Slater Limited	No answer.
45.	BT Group Plc	This should be assessed on the type of development being provided.
46.	Persimmon Homes (North	This would result in more on street parking.

	Midlands) Ltd	
47.	Leicestershire County Council (Structure Plans)	Yes, the number of car parking spaces in new developments above the maximum standards will only be permitted where a higher level of need can be demonstrated by a Transport Assessment, in accordance with Accessibility and Transport Policy 7 of the Structure Plan.
48.	Department of Highways, Transportation and Waste Management Leicestershire County Council	<p>(Car parking provision in new developments) – The reliance of the public on using some highways for on street car parking is already a concern. This leads to public demands for traffic regulation orders (there are currently 15 on the outstanding list in Blaby District) and once in place there is a burden of enforcement.</p> <p>On street car parking can lead to problems for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport, emergency services and people with disabilities. It detracts seriously from the environmental character of some streets and is a significant factor in some road accidents.</p> <p>Thus developers should be required to provide adequate off street car parking and servicing.</p>
49.	Cllr John Kenney	Car ownership is likely to grow but with the right public transport policy car use should decrease for short local journeys. Perhaps secure underground parking lots for residents who only use their cars at weekends!
50.	Blaby Parish Council	i) No. ii) Yes.
51.	Strategic Planning - SRA	No answer.
52.	Local Strategic Partnership	This is more an issue of air quality and sustainability. The LSP believes that there should also be more of a emphasis upon accessible public transport.
53.	Woodland Trust	No answer.
54.	Glenfield Parish Council	No, it would lead to more on street parking.
55.	Sapcote Parish	General Planning Considerations in Respect of

	Council	Transport - Overall planning policy in respect of new residential development should ensure, and indeed encourage, cars to park off road and accordingly a basis standard requirement of two parking spaces per property should be applied to all new residential properties. This principal should be extended to commercial and industrial development with an appropriate number of spaces being a requirement.
56.	LE3 8SD	Should be adequate for purpose.
57.	Aston Flamville Parish Meeting	i) No. ii) Yes.
58.	Leicester & Rutland Society of Architects	Should be adequate for the use.
59.	Cattrell Associates	No answer.
60.	LE19 4WE	No – it would definitely increase on street parking.
61.	The National Trust	Potentially yes, but would need to be part of a wider transportation strategy that also ensures appropriate public transport provision.
62.	Billington Road West Elmesthorpe	No answer.
63.	LE2 9HJ	I think new developments should take account of car use and the need for car parking spaces. Limiting spaces too much would only lead to greater levels of on-street parking which causes annoyance and in some instances can be very dangerous.
64.	LE8 4GD	On street parking can be a way of slowing traffic. There is a need to balance off street parking to the developments – put the developments in the right place, i.e. on public transport routes.
65.	Rutland Country Homes	No.
66.	LE9 9FW	No.
67.	LE2 9JA	No – yes.
68.	Braunstone Town Council	No answer.

69.	Leicestershire County Council (Chief Executive's Department)	No answer.
70.	Network Rail	Any new railway stations or lines should be fully explored with both Network Rail and the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA). A useful starting point for any new station proposal is the SRA's recently published document ' <i>New Stations: A Guide for Promoters</i> '. Any new proposed rail schemes may also require funding for relevant rail/timetable studies and section 106 developer contributions for expansion in terms of train service/facilities.
71.	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	No answer.
72.	LE19 2JJ (1)	No – see answer to no. 25.
73.	Thurlaston Parish Council	High density building requirements only cause parking problems as off road parking not provided at owners premises.
74.	Countesthorpe WI	Cars should be parked in garages or drives.
75.	LE19 2JJ (2)	All new developments should have adequate designs for off road parking for 2no. cars.
76.	Leicester City Council (Regeneration and Culture)	No answer.
77.	Leicester City Council Investment and Development	No answer.
78.	Next plc (CgMs)	No answer.
79.	LE19 2JJ (3)	No answer.
80.	House Builders Federation	No answer.
81.	LE9 9SU	No
82.	Highways Agency	Any new developments car parking must be in line with the maximum car parking standards prescribed in PPG13 and the Local Plan's maximum car parking standards for new

		developments. The Highways Agency would wish to ensure appropriate parking was provided in locations which may create a safety impact on the trunk road network.
83.	LE9 3HD	New developments should provide or be provided with car parking areas off streets.
84.	English Nature Eastern area Team	No answer.
85.	LE3 8AT	New housing should have a space for at least one car per unit/family.
86.	LE8 4AQ	There should always be sufficient parking planned for the usage anticipated of any new development.
87.	Anon	No
88.	LE19 2 JH	New developments should have realistic levels of parking. Horseshoe Close, Cosby is a classic example of where inadequate parking spaces cause problems. A very badly planned development which ought not to have been approved.
89.	LE2 3TJ	A balance is needed here.
90.	LE9 3EJ	There should be no limit, but this depends on size area. Therefore a new station around Croft would have the ability to grow with any increase in demand. Very difficult in proposed Blaby site and Narborough station.
91.	LE19 5HG	No, space should be allocated for a reasonable lifestyle.
92.	Housing Corporation	No answer.
93.	Development Plans Group Leicester City Council	No answer.
94.	Nottingham East Midlands Airport	No answer.
95.	Powers Estate	No answer.
96.	Thorpe Astley community Association	You have only to drive around our development in the evening to discover that even the current levels of car parking provisions are inadequate. That is unless you count what were intended to be footpaths as car parking for this is what was the majority of residents do. One practical suggestion would be to discount garages from the calculation of parking spaces per property as very few are actually used for this purpose.

97.	Blaby W.I	It would result in more on-street parking
98.	Leicester and Leicestershire Motorcycle forum Transport Strategy Team Leicester City Council	Parking levels at individual properties should be limited, but alternatives should also be considered: this could include a number of solutions including promoting communal visitors parking in housing developments (this could include PTW parking bays), promoting shared car schemes, promoting travel plans at businesses but most importantly either ensuring facilities are located in “ accessible” locations in the first place, or using planning gain to ensure any access gaps could be filled. It is vital that the council should ask for financial contributions to improve existing transport infrastructure (including public transport) where new development places additional pressures on existing infrastructure. Especially when the infrastructure work could benefit PTW users.
99.	Pegasus Planning Group	No answer.
100.	LE9 3BA	No answer.
101.	British Waterways	No answer.
102.	The Square, Littlethorpe, Leicester	A balance is required
103.	Leics & Rutland Federation of Women’s Institutes	No answer.
104.	LE9 7SE	Do not limit car spaces – this will result in streets being clogged with cars.
105.	LE2 4QX	All development used for housing should be given adequate parking. Most areas in Spain MUST provide parking for every flat/house.
106.	Glen Parva Environment Group	Provide car parking spaces to keep streets clear.
107.	J S Bloor (Services) Ltd	No answer.
108.	English Heritage	No answer.
109.	Croft Parish Plan Group	No answer.
110.	Wheatcroft & Son	No answer.
111.	Taylor Woodrow Strategic Developments.	No answer.
112.	Campaign for Dark Skies	No answer.
113.	Gordon Smith	A balance is needed here.

	Associates.	
114.	Revelan Group (Gough Planning Services).	No answer.

Summary

Opinion regarding the need to minimise parking in new developments was split. Whilst some respondents reflected Central Government Guidance in wishing to minimise the amount of parking spaces in new developments a considerably greater number of respondents felt that on-street parking was one of the problems that would be exacerbated by minimal parking provision. Suggestions included encouragement to underground car parking.