## Contents

1. Introduction .......................................................... 3
2. The Proposed Development ......................................... 8
3. Alternative Options .................................................. 7
4. Environmental Impact Assessment ............................... 14
5. Socio-Economics ..................................................... 19
6. Traffic and Transport ................................................ 22
7. Ecology and Nature Conservation ................................. 24
8. Landscape and Visual Impact ....................................... 27
9. Archaeology and Built Heritage ................................... 29
10. Noise and Vibration .................................................. 30
11. Air Quality ........................................................... 33
12. Flood Risk and Water Environment .............................. 34
13. Arboriculture ........................................................ 36
14. Type 1 Cumulative Effects ......................................... 38
15. Availability of Environmental Statement ....................... 44
Important notice: This Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary has been prepared by Deloitte Real Estate, with technical input from Environmental Dimension Partnership (EDP), KSS Group, Curtins, SLR Consulting (SLR), and TRP Consulting (TRP) (together “the Consultants”). Table 1, Chapter 4 of this Non-Technical Summary sets out the parties responsible for the technical content within Sections 5-13 of this Non-Technical Summary.

Although we have read the Consultants' reports for consistency and provide our observations based on our knowledge and experience, we accept no liability or responsibility for the Consultants' Reports and technical content within Sections 6-13 of this Non-Technical Summary. We will also not be responsible for the technical content of the associated Environmental Statement Chapters 7-14, Volume 1, nor the associated content in Volume 2.
1 Introduction

What is this document?

1.1 This is a ‘non-technical summary’ of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) undertaken as part of the proposed demolition and redevelopment of the Park Hill Golf Club and Fishing Centre, Park Hill Lane, Seagrave, Loughborough, LE12 7NG (‘the Site’).

1.2 The EIA has been carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (‘the EIA Regulations’) and best practice guidance.

1.3 The non-technical summary (NTS) is a standalone document, and is required under the EIA Regulations.

1.4 The NTS is designed to be read on its own. It explains the environmental implications of a proposed development to the public, informing them, and allowing them to decide whether they would like more detail on the proposals.

1.5 More information and greater technical detail is available in the Environmental Statement (ES). The ES is a separate document which has been submitted as part of the planning application. Please see Section 15 of this report for details on how and where to view the ES.

What is being proposed?

1.6 Leicester City Football Club (the ‘Applicant’) is applying for planning permission for the redevelopment of the Site to provide a mixed-use development.

1.7 All existing on-site structures at the Site would be demolished.

1.8 The full description of development is:

"Application for full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings on-site; earthworks; erection of a new football training facility (Sui Generis) comprising grass and artificial turf football pitches, multi-use training and ancillary uses building including 30no. bedrooms for players and dining facilities, indoor training pitch with associated facilities, show pitch with 499 seat spectator stand, multi-sports hall building, parents’ pavilion, grounds maintenance buildings; sports turf academy building, security lodge building; 9-hole golf course; site plant and energy centre, including combined heat and power plant; landscaping, including shrubs, hedging, trees, ponds, area of hardstanding, lighting and access routes; floodlighting; secure boundary treatments including fencing, lighting and CCTV; and associated access, car parking and other works.”
1.9 A planning application has been submitted to Charnwood Borough Council (CBC) seeking approval for the proposed development.

**Where is this happening?**

1.10 The Application Site comprises the former Park Hill Golf Course and Fishing Centre on Park Hill Lane near Seagrave, and is bound by Park Hill Lane to the north, the A46 dual carriageway to the east, agricultural farmland to the south, and Sileby Brook to the west.

1.11 The Site is approximately 75 hectares.

1.12 Figure 1 shows the Site context, whilst Figure 2 overleaf shows the Site boundary.

*Figure 1 – Site Context*  
(Source: Design and Access Statement prepared by KSS)
What is located on the Site at the moment?

1.13 The Site is a former 18-hole golf course with associated facilities, which closed in January 2018. The facilities are no longer open to the public.

1.14 The Site is undulating in nature and comprises predominantly open grass terrain, associated with its former use, with a number of ponds, sand bunkers, and trees dispersed throughout.

1.15 The Site is currently accessed via Park Hill Lane. Areas of hard standing provide dedicated car parking for circa 120 cars and access routes across the Site.

1.16 The eastern part of the Site is dissected roughly from north to south by a Public Bridleway, which connects Park Hill Lane to Ratcliffe Road via Ratcliffe College.

1.17 A residential property is located near to the Site entrance. This is owned by LCFC and forms part of the Site and the redevelopment proposals.

1.18 Figure 3 shows the existing site features, with existing buildings towards the north of the Site labelled and the red line showing the site boundary.
What is located around the Site?

1.19 The surrounding area is characterised predominantly by agricultural land and associated farm buildings at Park Farm, Ratcliffe Farm, Sunrise Farm and Highgate Farm.

1.20 A residential dwelling boarders the Site to the north, set back approximately 135 metres from the Site by a private paddock and outbuildings. An additional private stable yard and associated paddocks occupy land to the north east of the Site.

1.21 There are two education facilities located in close proximity to the Site; Park Hill Training Centre to the north of Park Hill Lane, which offers courses for a range of agricultural based qualifications; and Ratcliffe College, an independent day and boarding school located 1km to the south of the Site.

1.22 Sileby, Seagrave and Thrussington are the nearest settlements to the Site. These areas are predominately residential in nature, with supporting commercial, educational, sports and retail uses. Sileby is identified as a 'service centre’ in the adopted Charnwood Core Strategy (2015).

What is the history of the Site and why is this development being brought forward?

1.23 The existing golf course was closed by its previous owners in January 2018. Following this, LCFC has acquired the Site and intends to redevelopment.
1.24 Prior to the use of the Site as a golf course it was agricultural land.

1.25 The proposals are being brought forward as LCFC has identified the need for a new football training facility. Their needs cannot be accommodated at the existing Belvoir Drive training ground site in Leicester, and so following an extensive site selection process they have identified the Site as that which can accommodate their needs.

**Who has been consulted?**

1.26 The proposals have been formulated following extensive consultation with, amongst others, the local public, Charnwood Borough Council, Leicestershire County Council, Local Parish Councillors, Highways England, Severn Trent Water, and the Opun Design Review Panel.

1.27 The evolution of the scheme has been influenced by the findings of public consultations. Public consultations on the proposals were held in Sileby, Seagrave and at the King Power Stadium in March, April and June 2018. Comments received during the consultation process have been considered by the project team throughout the design process.
2 The Proposed Development

What will the redevelopment process involve?

2.1 The proposals involve redevelopment of the Site to provide a football training centre, indoor pitch, sports hall, sports turf academy with full-size and part-size outdoor football pitches and associated facilities.

2.2 The proposed site layout provides a consolidated campus for the LCFC First Team and Academy.

2.3 The proposals will involve the comprehensive redevelopment of the Site to provide a mixed-use development, comprising:

- 12no. full size football pitches, including 10 grass pitches, 1 external artificial pitch and 1 indoor artificial pitch;
- 6no. part sized grass pitches;
- 2no. artificial caged pitches;
- 2no. goal keeper areas;
- 1no. attacking area;
- 5no. warm-up and technical training areas;
- Associated external goal storage areas and players benches;
- Sports Hall;
- Indoor Pitch building including Media/Parents facilities;
- First Team / Academy Training Centre Building with changing and training facilities, hydrotherapy, medical and rehabilitation, dining facilities, education facilities, offices, 30no. bedrooms for players and management, offices, plant and back of house facilities and other associated accommodation;
- Ancillary buildings, including security and maintenance facilities, parents pavilion and incoming services enclosures;
- Ground maintenance machinery store and Energy Centre, including Combined Heat and Power Plant and external open storage bays;
- 9 hole golf course;
- 421 no. parking spaces, including 8 coach parking spaces;
- Sports Turf Academy / ground maintenance building and show pitch changing facilities; and
- Covered show pitch stand with 499 seats, spectators’ toilets, elevated camera platform and player benches.

2.4 Additional features of and activities related to the proposals include:

- Significant land re-grading to create development platforms for buildings and pitches.
- Removal of c. 4,000 existing trees, and replanting of 38,000 of new trees.
- Introduction of drainage infrastructure and sustainable urban drainage system (SUDS) features.
- Floodlighting of external pitches, subject to appropriate lighting design and controls.
- Introduction of a secure boundary fence, with associated lighting, CCTV, and landscaped screening.
2.5 Broadly, construction of the proposals will involve:

- Site clearance;
- Earthworks, levelling and ground compaction;
- Laying foundations;
- Building of the new structures;
- External works and hard and soft landscaping; and
- Internal fit out of the main structures.

2.6 Machinery used during redevelopment will consist of standard construction plant, including plant items such as: excavators, piling rigs, mobile cranes, compacting and vibrating mechanical plant, wheel washing and road sweeping equipment.

2.7 The Site will be secured and appropriately hoarded to ensure public safety and mitigate adverse environmental effects during construction.

How long will it take?

2.8 The demolition and construction programme is anticipated to span an approximate two year period. Works are expected to commence in late 2018 following the issue of planning consent, with the proposals becoming operational in autumn 2020.

2.9 The exact timing and sequence of development will be determined at a later date and will be subject to agreement with contractors at the time of their appointment. A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be prepared for the demolition and construction phases of development, and will contain a range of measures to ensure environmental effects are fully managed. This would be agreed with CBC for approval prior to works commencing.

What ecological enhancements will the site feature?

2.10 The Proposed Development incorporates the following key ecological features:

- Creation of 12 new wildlife ponds with a total area of 4,300 sq. m. in a network around the Site;
- Creation of an additional 5 attenuation basins within a total area of 5,100 sq. m. which will provide additional resources for local wildlife;
- Creation of 4.41 hectares of broadleaved plantation and 1.03ha of ecotone shrub planting to enhance and connect the existing woodland stock;
- Retention and enhancement of 11.23 ha of existing woodland stock;
- Enhancement of retained Local Wildlife Site habitats (retention of 76% of Local Wildlife Sites);
- Enhancement of amenity grassland habitats resulting in the creation of 14.59 hectares of wildflower grassland; and
• Relocation of c.1,000 trees from within the development footprint; and
• Planting of approximately 38,000 new trees.

When will the development activity take place?

2.11 Working hours during demolition and construction will be agreed with the Council, however they would are expected to be:

• Monday to Friday, 7.30am to 6pm;
• Saturday, 8am to 1pm; and
• Sunday, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays, no working or noisy activities on Site.

2.12 All work outside these hours will be subject to prior agreement of, and/or reasonable notice to the Council.

2.13 Night-time working will be restricted to exceptional circumstances, and internal works within buildings. By arrangement, there may be some out-of-hours construction deliveries made to the Site.

What will it look like afterwards?

2.14 The proposals will create a modern training centre for use by the first team and all age-groups within the Club’s academy on a single site.

2.15 Key principles of the masterplan design are:

• To replace the Club’s existing training centre which, through availability of facilities, potentially limits or adversely impacts on player performance and in particular fitness and rehabilitation.

• To create the best training centre in Europe, providing state-of-the-art facilities that will attract the best talent and encourage the complete development players, both as individuals and footballers.

• To develop facilities which meet Category 1 of the Premier League Elite Player Performance Plan (EPPP).

2.16 The layout of the proposals is illustrated in Figure 4, with the labelled facilities defined below it (and 9 hole golf course shown around the Site’s perimeter).
2.17 Figure 5 shows an indicative computer generated image (CGI) of the proposals looking north.

Figure 5: The Proposals – indicative CGI
(Source: Design and Access Statement prepared by KSS)

2.18 The proposed indoor pitch is located in the middle of the Site to act as a primary focal point for the proposals. The training centre is
located adjacent to the indoor pitch as a singular, linear building separating the academy and development phase pitches.

2.19 Figure 6 below shows the indoor pitch on the right, and the training centre on the left.

*Figure 6: The Proposals – indicative CGI
(Source: Design and Access Statement prepared by KSS)*

2.20 The entrance to the Site is broadly aligned to the existing vehicular access point. The single entrance to the Site will be used by all players, staff, visitors and deliveries to the Site.

2.21 Coach parking is provided in the academy and show pitch car parks. Cycle racks are provided in each car park to encourage sustainable methods of travel.

2.22 Vehicular access into the Site will be provided in one location, from Park Hill Lane to the north-east. In total, 421 car parking spaces will be provided, including 176 spaces for the training centre, 59 spaces for the Sports Turf Academy and 186 spaces for the show pitch.

2.23 The show pitch facilities and sports turf academy are located just past the site entrance with a separate car park. A small pavilion with facilities for parents of academy players is located in the centre of the academy pitches.

2.24 12 full-size pitches and a mix of smaller pitches and training areas are proposed, with the academy pitches located closest to the entrance in the most public part of the Site.

2.25 The proposals consist of a series of buildings of varying heights, which respond to the surrounding context. The indoor pitch is the largest and tallest (113m AOD) element of the proposal and is situated in the centre of the Site.
2.26 The materials used for the training centre have been influenced by the rural character of the Site. As a result, a simple palette of natural materials is proposed that will complement the surrounding setting of the Site.

2.27 Figures 7 and 8 show indicative computer generated images (CGI) of the proposed indoor pitch and the proposed training centre.
Figure 7: Proposed Indoor Pitch (illustrative CGI) 
(Source: Design and Access Statement prepared by KSS)

Figure 8: The Proposed Training Centre (illustrative CGI) 
(Source: Design and Access Statement prepared by KSS)
2.28 The landscape strategy for the proposals has been developed with three core aims:

- To integrate the new training complex sensitively into the landscape, ensuring the proposals are a good fit for the local area and fits with the local landscape character as far as possible.

- To provide an exceptional quality of landscape treatment in and around the complex that reflects the ethos associated with Leicester City Football Club.

- To positively promote biodiversity on the Site through the creation of new habitats and the retention of existing valuable habitats.

2.29 Figure 9 shows the proposed landscape masterplan for the Site.

*Figure 9: Landscape Masterplan
(Source: Landscape Design and Access Statement prepared by EDP)*

2.30 The Site is fairly well contained visually and the built development is located in the centre with a broad landscape buffer to the wider countryside. Much of the existing tree planting around the edges will be retained along with the enhancements to the boundary hedgerows.

2.31 The Public Bridleway will be diverted around the Site and a perimeter fence runs around the site boundary. The Public Bridleway's width and surface will be upgraded to meet the modern specifications required for a designated bridleway.

2.32 Part of the golf course will also be retained and used/managed as a nine-hole course.
2.33 The landscape strategy seeks to enhance existing retained areas of woodland, grassland, ponds and hedgerows within the Site as well as creating additional habitat in areas where golf holes have been removed.

What will it be used for afterwards?

2.34 The venue will operate throughout the year with most activity taking place during the football season. The venue will be a private site for LCFC, although it will be accessible to families of academy players and visiting academy teams and their support, together with the standard deliveries, maintenance and visitor access expected of this type of development.

2.35 No public access or viewing of training will be permitted. In addition to the training centre, the sports turf academy will be accessed and managed by students training with the Club.

2.36 Weekday usage will be primarily the first team and development phase squads who will spend most of the day at the training centre with the foundation phases arriving for training in the afternoon and early evening. At the weekends, most activity will be academy home matches.
3 Alternative Options

3.1 The EIA Regulations require the ES to identify the main alternatives that were considered during the design process.

3.2 The following key consultations have been undertaken through the pre-application process and have informed the design evolution of the proposals:

- Regular engagement via meetings, email and calls has taken place with planning, highways, heritage & design, ecology and landscape officers at CBC and Leicestershire County Council throughout the design development process.

- Adjacent landowners and local residents were invited to two public exhibitions to view and provide feedback on early concept plans of the proposals. The events were held in Seagrave and Sileby respectively and sought feedback on the principles of development and understanding of local issues and priorities.

- Meetings were held with Charnwood Borough Council and Leicestershire Council Executive teams; and with local Ward and Parish Councillors to discuss key project objectives, local authority and community priorities, and feedback from the community engagements.

- Representatives of local walking and equestrian groups attended the community events and provided written feedback via email.

- Engagement with local community and sports groups.

- Engagement via calls, emails and a meeting with Highways England and their advisors, AECOM.

- Engagement with sports bodies including Sport England and England Golf.

- Independent Design Review by Opun, attended by Local Authority Officers.

3.3 The wider project team (see Table 1) has also played an important part in influencing the design of the proposed development to ensure that potentially significant environmental effects are avoided or mitigated.

3.4 This process has aided discussion and refinement of the design and various options for redevelopment of the Site.

3.5 The design has been based on a number of key principles, which underpin the scheme. These are outlined below.
Key Principles

Conservation and Heritage

3.6 The presence of heritage assets, including Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings, in the area around the Site was considered. Impacts upon the setting of Seagrave Conservation Area and the open aspects from there eastward across the Site were of primary consideration.

3.7 The north-west part of the Site was excluded from development so as to provide an appropriate buffer from the Conservation Area boundary. Much of the existing tree planting around the edges of the Site will also be retained along with enhancements to the boundary hedgerows.

3.8 The landscape design will ensure there are minimal views of the proposed development from these sensitive areas, including the Seagrave Conservation Area.

Public Bridleway

3.9 A Public Bridleway intersects the Site roughly from north to south. The Public Bridleway was required to be diverted to accommodate the proposal.

3.10 The Public Bridleway currently does not meet the required specification to be classed as a bridleway. Therefore as part of the proposal the Public Bridleway will be realigned, and the surface upgraded to make the bridleway more useable and therefore attractive to a wider class of users.

3.11 The proposed route of the Public Bridleway will be redirected through the eastern woodland area, which will be enhanced through further tree planting.

Highways

3.12 It was identified that the proposed development could have had potential impacts on the A46/Park Lane junction, the access arrangements to the Site and impacts on the local network within the adjacent settlements.

3.13 Significant consultation has taken place between the Design Team, CBC highways officers and Highways England on aspects associated with the junction between the A46 and Park Hill Lane. Detail of these consultations and proposed minor alterations to the junction to improve safety are set out within the submitted Transport Assessment and in Chapter 7 of the ES.
Arboriculture

3.14 The proposal includes the significant loss of trees within the Site. It is therefore proposed that there would be significant replanting to mitigate the loss.

3.15 Introduced and enhanced tree planting areas will ensure continuous tree lines around the proposed development, minimising views from beyond the Site’s boundaries.

Ecology

3.16 The location of football pitches was considered to ensure they were located away from ecological areas, ponds and woodlands.

3.17 The landscape strategy seeks to enhance existing retained areas of woodland, grassland, ponds and hedgerows within the Site as well as creating additional habitat in areas where golf holes have been removed.

3.18 The landscape design seeks to protect and enhance the habitats of existing species recorded on-site including, bats, badgers and otters. This includes retaining mature hedgerow trees, considering the revised route of the Public Bridleway and ensuring ecological mitigation is implemented to provide enhancements to habitat.

Layout

3.19 The location of proposed buildings was assessed to take a number of attributes into consideration. The main buildings were located in the flattest area of the Site to reduce levelling works. This lead to a number of further key benefits including ease of access for medical staff, maximising training time rather than transition time and limiting distances travelled by academy players and parents.

3.20 Incorporation of the existing ponds has been considered and, where possible, adopted either as part of the ecological plan or water attenuation strategy.

3.21 The decision was also taken to retain 9-holes of the golf course for use by the players and staff.

3.22 The proposals subsequently evolved through consultation with LCFC’s in-house design team which has a direct influence on both the internal layouts and the look of the Training Centre and other buildings.

Consultation

3.23 The evolution of the scheme has been influenced by the findings during stakeholder and public consultation, summarised at paragraph 3.2.
3.24 Comments received during these consultations have influenced the design process and the Proposed Development.

3.25 Public consultations on the proposal were held in Sileby, Seagrave and at the King Power Stadium in March, April and June 2018. These pre-application consultation exercises were conducted to gain feedback from the public on proposals and to provide an update on design development.

3.26 The feedback from the sessions yielded a range of views which have been fully considered and, where appropriate and feasible, incorporated into the proposal.

Alternatives Considered

3.27 The EIA Regulations require the ES to identify the alternatives that were considered during the design process.

3.28 To summarise the key alternative options which could be considered, the section below sets out the consideration given to the use of alternative sites, alternative uses for the Site, and alternative configurations for the Site.

Alternative Sites

3.29 The Applicant has been actively searching for a new suitable training ground over a three year period in consultation with Leicester City Council, Leicestershire County Council and other local authorities within the County.

3.30 The site search has been constrained by the very specific requirements of the elite-level training facility proposed, including:

- Sufficient size to accommodate the facilities proposed, including c.12 full size training pitches;
- Accessibility to the highway network and excellent linkages to the King Power Stadium in Leicester;
- Appropriate topography to reduce the necessity for cut & fill to create level playing pitches;
- Natural screening to provide security and privacy to protect the 1st team and academy media intrusion.

3.31 The Site has been identified as the only suitable and available option that meets these operational requirements.

Alternative Uses

3.32 LCFC requires a suitable site on which to build a football training facility which meets their requirements. The Site has been selected on the basis that it can accommodate these requirements. Further information on LCFCC’s specific requirements is set out in the DAS and planning statement which accompany the planning application.
3.33 As the Site has been specifically selected in order that it can accommodate the proposals for a football training facility and associated uses, the consideration of alternative uses for the Site is not appropriate in this instance.

3.34 The proposed development does incorporate a range of ecological mitigation and enhancement measures which will ensure that the ecological impact of the scheme is demonstrably beneficial in biodiversity terms, and will result in a significant net addition to trees on the Site.

**Alternative Configurations**

3.35 As set out above in the ‘Key Principles’ section, the existing features of the Site and its surroundings have been carefully considered throughout the design process to ensure that the final layout proposals suitably respond to the surrounding environment.

3.36 At the very early design stages, a decision was made to locate the main buildings in the flattest area of the Site thereby reducing the magnitude of earth levelling works required, which has both a commercial and environmental benefit.

3.37 Following this, a key decision was made to include a route from first team facilities located deeper in the Site to academy pitches, press facilities and the sports turf academy located closer to the Site entrance. These factors highly influenced the shape and layout of the proposal and restricted the consideration of alternative configurations for the Site. As such, the consideration of alternative configurations was limited due to the various constraints of the Site and the establishment of early-stage design principles.

3.38 The configuration of built development has been considered in a range of formats, albeit centred around the middle of the Site for landscape and visual purposes as well as reducing earthworks requirements. Figure 9 shows a range of previous configurations which were considered during the design process. In initial designs, built development centred around the indoor pitch, however for practical reasons this was not progressed. A range of configurations were considered, with the key drivers being how the buildings sit within the landscape to minimize visual impacts, and how much earthworks were required which have both cost and environmental implications. The decision was made to site the main training centre building as an ‘s’ shape within the centre of the Site, and a key benefit of this decision was that the building addresses a difference in levels and thus reduces the amount of earthworks required, thereby reducing construction traffic and emissions impacts.
3.39 The indoor pitch design has been heavily influenced by the need for the development to relate sensitively to the surrounding landscape. The building features a curved roof shape, along with a transparent roof, which serve to both create architectural interest and minimize visual impacts in the context of the surrounding landscape. The building also features a part green roof at the edges, which again serves to visually blend in with the wider landscape.

3.40 More detail on design alterations is outlined in the DAS which accompanies the planning application.

Summary

3.41 The proposed development has been influenced by a variety of stakeholders, including planning officers at CBC, the ODRP, statutory consultees and the public, as part of an iterative design process which has led to the final design.

3.42 The key alternatives which were considered during the design process have been described within this chapter, along with the main reasons for selecting the chosen option. The primary environmental drivers for design choices have been a combination of ensuring project feasibility, minimising landscape and visual impacts, and seeking to
reduce the levels of earthworks required in order to minimize the associated traffic and emissions impacts.

3.43 The wider project team have also played an important part in influencing the design of the proposed development to ensure that likely significant environmental effects are avoided or mitigated. The resulting scheme, the proposed development, is described in further detail in Chapter 3 of this ES.
4 Environmental Impact Assessment

What is an EIA?

4.1 The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process is the mechanism by which development proposals are appraised in terms of environmental criteria, in addition to socio-economic, engineering and technical considerations.

4.2 The purpose of the EIA is to establish the nature of development proposals, and the environment in which they are likely to take place, in order to identify likely significant effects on the environment that may arise.

4.3 Both the short-term and long-term effects of development, including temporary and permanent impacts, are considered. This is done by comparing the existing situation at the start of the work (baseline) with the projected situation during and after the proposed development.

4.4 The EIA has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the EIA Regulations, and in line with best practice guidance.

4.5 This non-technical summary forms an important part of the EIA process. Please refer to Section 1 ‘Introduction’ for more detail on the non-technical summary.

What environmental effects does the EIA consider?

4.6 An EIA should consider all likely significant environmental effects resulting from the proposed development. These are identified through ‘scoping’ of the effects, the purpose of which is to narrow the focus of the EIA to what is considered to be significant.

4.7 An EIA scoping exercise was undertaken by the project team to identify the likely significant effects on the environment, and therefore the scope of the assessment. As a result of this, a formal Scoping Opinion was issued by CBC on 10th April 2018 which outlined their opinion on, and broad approval of, the proposed scope of the EIA.

4.8 In addition to the formal Scoping Opinion, the project team has undertaken subsequent discussions with CBC and other relevant parties. Items identified through the scoping process have been considered and responded to in the ES.
4.9 The scope of the EIA has therefore been developed through formal and informal consultation with statutory and non-statutory consultees. Chapter 2 of the ES and the individual technical chapters (6-14) discuss the scoping exercise in more detail.

4.10 The following topics were identified as being likely to experience potentially significant effects and so were assessed within the EIA:

- Socio-Economics
- Traffic and Transportation
- Ecology and Nature Conservation
- Arboriculture
- Landscape and Visual Impact
- Archaeology and Built Heritage
- Air Quality
- Noise and Vibration
- Flood Risk / Water Environment

4.11 The following topics were agreed to not be included in the assessment, as they were identified as not likely to have significant environmental effects and have therefore been 'scoped out' of the EIA:

- Wind Microclimate
- Electronic Interference
- Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing, Light Pollution and Solar Glare
- Agricultural Circumstances and Soil
- Human Health
- Climate Change

4.12 In addition to the effects resulting from the proposed development, other developments within the wider area have also been considered in order to account for any cumulation of effects between the proposed development and surrounding developments. The nearby schemes for the cumulative assessment were agreed with CBC via the scoping process. The following schemes (or ‘committed developments’) have been considered:

1. Land off Seagrave Road, Sileby ref. P/11/0860/2
2. Land at 195 Seagrave Road, Sileby ref. P/17/2391/2
3. Land to the east of Seagrave Road, Sileby ref. P/15/0047/2
4. Land off Seagrave Road, Sileby ref. P/14/1395/2
5. Peashill Farm Ratcliffe Road Sileby ref. P/17/1578/2

4.13 Further detail on these committed developments is available within Chapter 2 of the ES.

How will environmental effects be managed?

4.14 Environmental controls (or mitigation measures) will be introduced to eliminate, reduce or offset likely significant adverse environmental effects resulting from the proposed development. Mitigation measures are described in greater detail in the individual technical ES chapters (6-14), and summarised in Chapter 15 of the ES.
4.15 The environmental controls proposed include:

- Preparation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which clearly sets out the methods of managing environmental issues for all involved with the proposed development, including supply chain management.

- Requirement to comply with the CEMP included as part of the contract conditions for each element of the work. All contractors tendering for work will be required to demonstrate that their proposals can comply with the content of the CEMP and any conditions or obligations secured through the planning permission;

- Establishing a dedicated point of contact and assigning responsibility to deal with demolition and construction related issues if they arise. This would be a named representative from the construction team; and

- Regular dialogue and engagement with the Council and the local community to reduce construction impacts.

4.16 It is anticipated that these controls would be agreed with CBC prior to works commencing and, if required, could be secured by appropriate planning conditions or obligations.

Who has been involved in the EIA process?

4.17 The EIA process has involved communication and collaboration between LCFC, CBC, the project team (see Table 1), statutory consultees and the public.

4.18 Table 1 shows the project team and their roles.

**Table 1 - Project Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCFC</td>
<td>The Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadis</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSS</td>
<td>Architecture and Masterplanning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Dimension Partnership</td>
<td>Landscape Design and Public Realm, Ecology, Arboriculture, Archaeology and Built Heritage, Landscape and Visual Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtins</td>
<td>Traffic and Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLR Consulting</td>
<td>Air Quality, Noise and Vibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP Consulting</td>
<td>Water Environment, including Drainage and Flood Risk; Ground Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte Real Estate</td>
<td>Town Planning, Consultation, EIA Coordination, Socio-economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What were the results of the EIA?

4.19 The following sections summarise the methodology used in determining the likely significant effects of the proposed development and summarise the outcomes of the EIA.

4.20 The following sections are organised into technical subjects which were assessed (see para. 4.10). Greater detail can be found in the relevant chapters of the Environmental Statement (6-14) and within the relevant technical appendices and volumes.

4.21 The technical topics are those elements of the environment considered likely to experience significant effects and therefore assessed in the EIA.

4.22 With regard to the assessment for each topic, the subsequent sections broadly discuss:

- Methodology and scope;
- Baseline conditions;
- Likely significant effects of the proposed development;
- Mitigation;
- Cumulative effects with other developments;
- Likely ‘residual’ effects following mitigation.

4.23 A summary of likely effects prior to mitigation, proposed mitigation measures, and the likely ‘residual’ effect following mitigation is also included in Chapter 16 of the ES.

Significance of Effects

4.24 The likely effects of the proposed development have been classified according to their significance.

4.25 Significance is determined as a function of both the scale (magnitude) of change from the existing (baseline) environment and the sensitivity of environmental receptors, such as population, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, including the architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the inter-relationship between these factors. Chapter 2 of the ES describes this process in greater detail.

4.26 Where discipline-specific methodology has been applied that differs from the generic criteria below, this has been clearly explained within the relevant ES chapters (6-14).

4.27 Each technical assessment considers both construction phase and operational phase effects, where relevant.

4.28 Table 2 illustrates how most significance ratings were determined.
### Table 2 - Significance of Effect Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major Adverse / Beneficial</td>
<td>Major - Moderate Adverse / Beneficial</td>
<td>Moderate - Minor Adverse / Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Major - Moderate Adverse / Beneficial</td>
<td>Moderate - Minor Adverse / Beneficial</td>
<td>Minor Adverse / Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Moderate - Minor Adverse / Beneficial</td>
<td>Minor Adverse / Beneficial</td>
<td>Minor - Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.29 In general, negligible or minor effects are not considered to be significant, whilst moderate or major effects are.
5 Socio-Economics

5.1 This assessment considers the likely significant effects of the proposals with respect to socio-economic indicators.

5.2 The assessment has been conducted to identify the likely significant effects of the proposed development with respect to the following factors:

- Population: impact of development on local population;
- Local Expenditure and Economic Impact: changes in local retail and leisure spending and economic impacts of development;
- Employment and Training: changes in infrastructure to support education and training opportunities;
- Leisure, recreation, amenity and sport: changes in the provision of infrastructure for leisure, recreation, amenity and sport; and
- Access, rights of way, and Common Land: impact of development on access routes, public rights of way (‘PRoW’), and changes in the provision of Common Land.

5.3 The assessment considered the impacts of the proposed development during the demolition and construction and the operational phases to ascertain any requirement or opportunities for incorporating mitigation measures.

5.4 A construction phase assessment for population and leisure, recreation, amenity and sport was scoped out as workers are not likely to be housed either on-site or nearby during this stage of the proposed development, and therefore are not likely to result in impacts on these topics.

5.5 Published statistics and information in the public domain have been collected to establish the baseline conditions. The assessment has been carried out using a combination of quantitative methods, published formulae and qualitative approaches based on industry best practice, guidance, professional judgement and experience of other major mixed use development projects.

5.6 Where appropriate, the assessments have considered the ‘worst case scenario’ to ensure a robust assessment of the proposed development.

5.7 During the construction phase, approximately 495 full time equivalent (FTE) jobs would be created on site, resulting in a temporary, major
beneficial effect on the local employment market. Total job creation would amount to more than this figure, when taking indirect job creation into account from increased demand within the supply chain.

5.8 Local expenditure would also increase during the construction phase, due to the presence of construction workers making use of local facilities during, for example, lunchbreaks. This would result in temporary, moderate beneficial effects on the economy in the local area.

5.9 Construction workers may make use of nearby open spaces during lunch breaks, particularly in the summer months. It is anticipated that there would be sufficient space to accommodate construction workers' amenity requirements within the local area and it is therefore considered that effects on open space during the construction phase are of negligible significance.

5.10 Non-significant minor adverse effects on access and rights of way and are anticipated during the construction phase as the proposals will involve the temporary closure of the right of way in order to facilitate the works. The effect on common land during construction will be negligible as construction vehicles will utilize the existing site access.

5.11 On completion of the proposed development, there would be a permanent minor beneficial impact on the local population. The proposals will rejuvenate a brownfield Site which is currently vacant and are expected to increase expenditure in the local area.

5.12 Local expenditure is anticipated to increase due to spending by future employees of the proposed development and through supply chain effects associated with the facilities. Effects on local expenditure are considered to be of moderate beneficial significance to the local economy and permanent in nature.

5.13 The proposals will result in job creation as a direct result of the proposed development. It is anticipated that the operational proposed development would generate approximately 185 jobs at the Site, and will provide a range of training and opportunities for both staff and junior players. In the short-term, it is expected that the majority of staff would be relocated from the existing LCFC training facility at Belvoir Drive. Over the longer-term, it is expected that as staff naturally move on over time an increasing amount of staff would be drawn from the local area and the proposed development would become a significant local employer. This is considered to result in a permanent, moderate beneficial effect on the local economy.

5.14 The proposals involve the rerouting and upgrading of the bridleway through the Site, which will be widened and resurfaced to accommodate equestrian users and will meet modern specifications for bridleways. The impact on leisure, recreation, amenity and sport
are considered to be minor adverse, primarily as a result of the change of use of the Site, whilst the effects on access, rights of way and common land is considered minor beneficial.
6.1 This assessment considers the likely significant effects of the proposals with respect to traffic and transport.

6.2 The content of the assessment has been prepared following two meetings with Highways Officers at Leicestershire County Council (LCC) and one meeting, plus additional correspondence with Highways England (HE) and/or their advisors AECOM.

6.3 The assessment also utilises the guidance document entitled “Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic” to inform the methodology of assessment. This guidance states that the following rules should be used as a screening process to delimit the scale and extent of the assessment:

“Include highway links where traffic flows will increase by more than 30% (or the number of heavy goods vehicles will increase by more than 30%); and

Include any other specifically sensitive areas where traffic flows have increased by 10%, or more.”

6.4 Analysis indicates that the only link that experiences an increase in excess of the above thresholds is Park Hill Lane between the Site access and the A46. On this basis, further assessment of driver delay, severance, pedestrian amenity and delay, highway safety, and accessibility has been undertaken for this link.

6.5 The assessment indicates that the impacts for each of the above are either negligible or minor adverse, with the exception of severance which is major adverse.

6.6 The major adverse impact is largely a result of low existing (background) traffic flows which give the impression of a more significant issue. The actual traffic flows on Park Hill Lane will be very low even with development and there will be ample opportunity for pedestrians to cross the road.

6.7 This section of Park Hill Lane is also largely bordered by open fields and agricultural land. There are no existing footways and no obvious pedestrian routes for pedestrians between key amenities (desire lines). This means that existing pedestrian flows are limited and there is little requirement for pedestrians to be crossing the road.

6.8 Mitigation is proposed in the form of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Whilst neither Highways England nor the Highways Authority sought formal mitigation measures at the
junction between the A46 and Park Hill Lane, the Applicant has proposed to deliver improvements to this junction as part of the Proposed Development to address perceptions of safety reported during public consultations.

6.9 The residual impacts following the mitigation are all negligible, minor adverse or minor beneficial, with the exception of severance which remains major adverse as a result of the way the calculation is determined. Based on professional judgement, the overall impacts of the development are considered to be acceptable and not significant.

6.10 In summary, it is the conclusion of this chapter of the ES that the proposed development can be accommodated without any unacceptable detriment to the environmental effects of traffic. Furthermore, it is noted that the inclusion of mitigation measures at both construction and operational phases would reduce the effects and impacts of the development further, providing confidence in the conclusion of this assessment.
7.1 This assessment considers the likely significant effects of the proposals with respect to ecology and nature conservation.

7.2 It assesses the impacts and consequential ecological effects that may occur to Important Ecological Features from the proposed development. Important Ecological Features includes designations, habitats, protected and Priority Species of plants and animals (terrestrial and aquatic).

7.3 The ecology chapter of the Environmental Statement assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development with respect to Ecology. This includes the impacts and consequential ecological effects that may occur to Important Ecological Features from the Proposed Development.

7.4 The Site predominantly comprises of well-maintained amenity grassland and plantation woodland of relatively low ecological value that has traditionally been subject to high levels of disturbance associated with the golf course. Habitats of greater ecological value include:

- Semi-improved neutral grassland along the sites northern boundary associated with Park Hill Verges and Field South West of Park Hill Lane Local Wildlife Site’s (LWSs);
- Network of ponds around the golf course;
- Hedgerows and associated mature trees which are present on the majority of external boundaries as well as forming internal dividers between fairways in a small number of locations;
- A small seasonally wet stream flows north-east to south-west towards the eastern extent of the Site;
- A block of continuous unmanaged plantation woodland within the north-east corner of the site.

7.5 These habitats were considered to have potential to support a number of species and a suite of field surveys have therefore been completed. The detailed surveys have recorded:

- Relatively high abundance of bird species along hedgerows and woodland edges. The majority of the species recorded were
generalists, although a small number of woodland and wetland species were recorded;

- Confirmed common pipistrelle and brown long-eared bat roosts within the Club House, a common pipistrelle bat roost within Parkleigh Cottage which is a suspected maternity roost and trees with bat roosting potential;

- Low levels of foraging and commuting bats across the Site with a limited number of common species present. The foraging activity was mostly centred around the hedgerows and ponds on-site;

- Evidence of otter on-site. It is considered likely, since the golf course and fishing lake were shut to the public, an individual infrequently visits from the adjacent Sileby Brook to hunt within the ponds on-site; and

- A medium population of great crested newts with a maximum of 90 individuals recorded on any one survey. 10 of the 22 ponds on-site support this population of great crested newts with absence of the species being confirmed at the remaining 12 ponds through environmental DNA testing.

7.6 The assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development has been undertaken in accordance with best practice guidance and considers both on-site impacts and those that may occur to adjacent and more distant ecological features. Impacts are considered at both the construction stage and operation stage and significant negative or beneficial effects on wildlife identified.

7.7 The development will predominantly result in the loss of amenity grassland and plantation woodland habitat of low ecological value and with limited protected species interests. However, a small area of semi-improved neutral grassland, which forms part of Field South West of Park Hill Lane LWS, will be lost, in addition to a small number of ponds that would have a significant negative effect on the breeding population of great crested newts. There is also potential for wetland habitats to be adversely affected by changes in surface water run-off and pollution incidents. The loss of plantation woodland/trees and use of lighting is also likely to adversely effect commuting and foraging bats, while bat roosts within the club house will also be lost.

7.8 To mitigate for the potential adverse ecological effects identified, the network of retained habitats across the wider site will be consolidated and enhanced through new habitat creation and management to strengthen connectivity to surrounding habitats and enhance these habitats for protected species. This would include the creation of substantial areas of new woodland, wetland and meadowflower grassland, to maximize opportunities for wildlife and deliver a significant gain in these habitat types. Bird, bat, great crested newt and other species interests would be further protected through sensitive working methodologies and opportunities for these species enhanced through measures such as the erection of bird and bat...
boxes and creation of log piles. These measures will be delivered via the Ecological Construction Method Statement (ECMS) and Ecological Management Plan (EMP) submitted with the proposals.

7.9 In summary, with appropriate avoidance/mitigation measures successfully implemented, no significant adverse effects are predicted to the ecology interests identified. Indeed, it is considered that the habitat creation and enhancement measures proposed, combined with the species enhancement measures, could potential deliver significant beneficial effects over the long-term, particularly with respect to woodland habitats, birds and great crested newts.

7.10 All planning applications in the local area which have been approved, validated or have a current appeal lodged have been considered and it can be demonstrated that there are no significant cumulative construction or operational effects to Important Ecological Features.

7.11 In summary, the development will predominantly result in the loss of plantation woodland and amenity grassland golf course habitat of low ecological value and with limited protected species potential. The loss of higher quality habitats (e.g. ponds, semi-improved grassland, hedgerows) has been minimised through the design process and will be mitigated and compensated for through significant areas of new grassland, wetland and woodland habitat creation across the wider site and enhancement of retained habitats through appropriate long-term management. Protected species interests will be safeguarded during construction and new opportunities for these species delivered over the long-term.

7.12 In light of the ecological assessment, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposed development, with the use of the appropriate safeguards, mitigation and enhancements proposed, would lead to significant adverse effects on any of the ecological features of value. Indeed, the development could potentially create and enhance opportunities for wildlife, and contribute to a net gain in biodiversity in accordance with planning policy.
8.1 This assessment considers the likely significant effects of the proposals with respect to landscape and visual impact.

8.2 The proposed development would have direct effects on existing landscape resources. Given the change in land use from an intensively managed golf course to a state of the art football training facility, the proposed development would inevitably result in effects on the landscape character of the Site. Critically, however, and in part due to the high quality of the design of the proposed development, it would not significantly alter the character of the wider surrounding landscape due to the discrete geographical area over which effects would be experienced.

8.3 Based on the assessed viewpoints, the overall visibility of the proposed development is relatively well-contained due to the predominantly well vegetated nature of the Site and its boundaries, localised topographical variation, in addition to the contribution that hedgerows and trees within the landscape make to limit general intervisibility within the study area.

8.4 The visual effects predicted to arise as a result of the introduction of the proposed development follow a similar pattern to effects upon landscape character, in that significant effects are likely to occur only within, or in very close proximity to the proposed development; the magnitude of change to views decreases rapidly with distance from the Site, partly due to screening, and partly due to the masterplan layout, which is designed to respect close range and more distant views. Therefore, receptors most likely to experience a significant effect at Year 15 following completion would be users of the PRoW and road network in close proximity (within 500m) and running through the Site.

8.5 As the proposed development would be within the confines of an existing Golf Club with much of the existing vegetation retained or transplanted elsewhere on site, it would be integrated visually with the existing landscape fabric. The proposed development would be partially visible from the edges of Seagrave to the north-west but more noticeably from properties in close proximity to the Site entrance and close to the southern area of the Site. Very few properties would actually have clear views. There is likely to be limited, or no, visibility from within the wider villages of Sileby and
Thrußington or from other nearby settlements and isolated residences within the detailed study area. Furthermore, the masterplan, sections and elevations indicate that building heights have been designed to be sensitive to the most proximate, and sensitive, visual receptors.

8.6 The assessment concludes that, from a landscape and visual perspective, the development site is suitable for the proposed development. The landscape character areas can accept development, owing to its current usage as a golf course, and relatively low landscape sensitivity. Containment by local topography, site vegetation and successive field boundary vegetation ensures that the visual effects of the proposed development are also limited. The proposed development with embedded mitigation measures would have a limited effect on views from the surrounding areas, as it would be well-integrated, through a combination of considerable tree planting, high quality design in buildings and control of building heights.

8.7 The assessment identifies that, during construction, a range of landscape and visual effects of between no effect and major adverse would be experienced temporarily during the construction period; the specific effect would depend upon the receptor and where it is viewed from. During operation, again a range of effects are expected between no effect and major adverse and the specific effect would depend upon the receptor and the context. A range of mitigation is embedded into the design of the scheme which is intended to ensure that, over the longer term, effects would be addressed as vegetation around the Site matures. Over the longer term, it is considered that the proposals will represent a well-designed and sensitive addition along Park Hill Lane.
9.1 This assessment considers the likely significant effects of the proposals with respect to archaeology and built heritage.

9.2 It has been produced with reference to information contained within a baseline assessment, which itself draws on data held by the Leicestershire HER, the Leicestershire Records Office, the Historic England Archives and the National Heritage List for England. To augment this baseline, a geophysical survey was completed across the Site and an eight-trial trench evaluation has been carried out.

9.3 With regard to designated heritage assets, further information was obtained from the accompanying heritage setting assessment, which identifies those heritage assets which will be affected by the proposed development and the manner in which they will be affected.

9.4 Two designated heritage assets within the Site’s wider zone of influence were considered to have the potential to be affected by the proposed development. These comprise Seagrave Conservation Area and the Grade II* Listed Church of All Saints, Seagrave. A heritage setting assessment has been undertaken to determine the potential effects arising from the proposed development.

9.5 It was determined that the land within the Site does not contribute to the significance of either of the designated heritage assets, as it does not enhance their appreciation or understanding. As such, the proposed development will not affect the importance or heritage value of these designated heritage assets.

9.6 For all designated heritage assets assessed, it is considered that there will be no change to their significance brought about by the proposed development, therefore a neutral effect will be generated.

9.7 Those archaeological remains that do survive within the Site (which are assessed as being of no more than medium sensitivity), would likely be entirely removed during the construction process. It has been determined, through consultation with the local planning authority (LPA) archaeological advisor, that any impacts will be mitigated through a phased programme of archaeological works, to investigate and record them prior to their removal. All impacts following mitigation will be neutral and non-significant.
10 Noise and Vibration

10.1 This assessment considers the likely significant effects of the proposals with respect to noise and vibration.

10.2 The assessment has considered the potential for the proposed development to impact upon the noise environment near the application Site. The scope has been described along with the relevant legislation, assessment methodology and the baseline conditions existing at the Site and its surroundings. It has considered any potential significant environmental effects the proposed development would have on this baseline environment.

10.3 The noise assessment was based on a baseline sound survey undertaken over midweek and weekend periods at locations considered representative of the nearest noise-sensitive receptors to the Site.

10.4 The assessment has considered the potential noise and vibration impacts from the construction of the proposals. The predicted construction noise levels for the closest receptors were assessed against an external daytime noise limit. The predicted noise from the assumed construction plant and phases of works will not exceed noise thresholds as defined in relevant British Standards at any of the identified noise sensitive receptors. Therefore, significant construction noise effects are unlikely to occur during the construction phase of the project and no mitigation would be required.

10.5 The assessment also considered the potential vibration impacts from the construction of the proposed development. It was highlighted that the main source of vibration from these construction activities would be from any piling required for building foundation works. Although the extent and types of piling which may be required are not known at the time of writing a couple of examples have been provided to give some guidance on the likely impacts from the piling operations. The predicted vibration levels for the nearest residential receptor were assessed against the guidance on effects of vibration levels taken from the relevant British Standard. For the assumed piling examples the maximum predicted vibration rate falls below the vibration level where it might be just perceptible in residential environments. Vibration would be perceptible to occupants of the building during some of the piling, particularly the tubular steel or concrete piling, but the effect would be temporary and of limited duration, and would not be expected to interfere with working activities. Therefore, based upon the assumptions made, a significant
vibration effect is unlikely to occur during the construction phase of the project and no mitigation would be required.

10.6 The specific sound levels generated by construction traffic movements travelling to and from the Site have been predicted at the properties. Construction traffic noise was quantified using methods set out in British Standards. Using the distances from residential properties to the centre of the relevant carriageway where site traffic will be, the maximum sound pressure level due to traffic flows during the most intensive period of activity was below the significance threshold.

10.7 All construction phase impacts are assessed as having no effect on local receptors.

10.8 An assessment also considered the predicted noise levels from the combined effect of increased traffic flows and activities associated with peak construction of the proposed development works are below the thresholds set out in British Standards at the nearest noise sensitive receptor.

10.9 An assessment was completed for the operational noise associated with the on-site traffic movements of the proposed development. For the daytime assessment the rating level at the residential properties, due to the proposed development, is predicted to be below the measured daytime background sound level by relatively large margin. An assessment of the noise impact in relation to the activities associated with the artificial grass pitches (AGP) at the proposed development has been undertaken with reference to the Sport England guidance whereby the predicted levels associated with the AGP activities are assessed against the criteria outlined World Health Organisation (WHO) ‘Guidelines for Community Noise’. BS8233:2014 which adopts external noise levels as recommended by the WHO for external amenity areas, the daytime operation of the AGPS at the proposed development would have a low impact at all of the residential properties assessed.

10.10 Therefore, with reference to British Standards, the daytime operation of the pitches at the proposed development would have a low, minor adverse and non-significant impact at all of the residential properties assessed. No observed effect on health or quality of life would therefore be expected as a result. All other impacts, bar those relating to the pitches, are assessed as negligible or having no effect.

10.11 An assessment of the noise impact from the fixed plant on-site was not able to be completed, as at the time of preparing the assessment the exact details of the fixed operational plant associated with the proposed development were not available. Noise limits have therefore been set at the nearest noise-sensitive receptors based on the measured baseline noise levels. It has been assumed that a
specific sound level equal to the background sound level would be acceptable for the proposed noise limits, in line with standard practice. These limits are expected to be secured as a condition of planning permission to ensure they are delivered.

10.12 An assessment of the noise impact on the nearest residential receptors on the access route to the proposed development for off-site operational traffic has been considered in accordance to the established guidelines. The results of the short-term impact assessment show that the magnitude will be either no change or negligible for the operational traffic on each of the assessed link roads.

10.13 An assessment of the noise impact in relation to any occasional helicopter movements at the proposed development was undertaken with reference to the Department for Transport published document; Consultation Response on UK Airspace Policy. The assessment which was based upon many assumptions due to the unplanned nature of the helicopter trips, predicted the noise levels associated with the helicopter trip at all of the nearest receptors were below the relevant thresholds for daytime noise limit as specified by the DfT publication on the Consultation Response on UK Airspace Policy.

10.14 It is therefore considered that the noise and vibration from any construction activities, operational activities and any associated traffic movements would have a low impact during all time periods in conjunction with the relevant guidance.
11 Air Quality

10.1 This assessment considers the likely significant effects of the proposals with respect to air quality.

10.2 A qualitative assessment of the potential dust impacts during the construction of the proposed development has been undertaken. Through good practice, and the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, it is expected that the release of dust would be effectively controlled and mitigated, with resulting impacts considered to be 'not significant'. All dust impacts are considered to be temporary and short term in nature.

10.3 Due to the low additional number of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) trips anticipated during the construction phase of the development, there is predicted to be a neutral / insignificant effect on air quality from road vehicle emissions. Furthermore, emissions from plant / construction vehicles on site is predicted to result in a 'not significant' impact on air quality.

10.4 Additional development trips arising from the operational phase of the proposed development are predicted to result in a negligible impact on annual mean NO2 and PM10 concentrations at all human receptor locations. There is no new predicted risk of exceedance of the 1-hour mean NO2 or 24-hour mean PM10 air quality objectives (AQO) as a result of the development proposals. As such, the overall effect is considered to be 'not significant'.

10.5 It is therefore considered that air quality does not represents a material constraint to the proposed development, which conform to the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and Charnwood Borough Council’s Core Strategy.
12 Flood Risk and Water Environment

12.1 This assessment considers the likely significant effects of the proposals with respect to flood risk and water environment.

12.2 The assessment considers the likely significant effects of the proposed development on flood risk, surface water drainage and water quality. Key receptors affected by flooding have been identified as Sileby Brook, which runs parallel to the westernmost section of the western site boundary, and an unnamed watercourse which crosses the Site entering from the north and then following part of the eastern Site boundary. There are also a number of other ponds, ditches, drains and a borehole on the Site. Increased surface water run off or contaminated run off could contribute to flooding of these features and impact on sites and residents downstream of the Site. The assessment covers both the construction and operational phases of the proposed development.

12.3 The majority of the Site is located within Environment Agency Flood Zone 1, at the lowest risk of flooding. The land associated with both watercourses is shown on Environment Agency flood mapping to be located in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and therefore is at higher risk of flooding.

12.4 Sileby Brook, the onsite watercourse, ponds, ditches, groundwater and the underlying aquifer are the key receptors to flooding or contamination.

12.5 The Site is largely open grassland with land drainage directed to the watercourses crossing the Site. To minimise the impact on the local watercourses, post development flows and volumes will be matched to the greenfield run off rates.

12.6 Attenuated flows will be stored in a series of SUDs features including detention basins, ponds and swales.

12.7 Potential water contamination during the construction phases will be controlled by construction best practice and management processes set out in the CEMP.

12.8 Following the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures the risk to the receptors would be assessed as negligible. Residual risks will remain from:
Surface water run-off caused by extreme storm events with annual probabilities of less than 0.1% (1 in 1000 year)

Fluvial flooding associated with extreme weather events.

Blockages within watercourses.

Blockages in Site drainage systems, sewers or culverts.

Contamination reaching Controlled Waters during extreme weather events via surface water runoff.

12.9 The alteration of the surface water runoff regime and consequential effects of this on flood risk and surface water quality could result in an impact that could be escalated by the cumulative impacts of other developments or extreme weather conditions within the locality.

12.10 However, given the overall size of the local river catchments that may be affected, and the proposed scale of development works, the cumulative effects from other developments are considered to be insignificant if properly managed and thus have not been assessed in detail in this chapter.

12.11 The proposed development and associated mitigation will have a negligible impact on the water environment and flood risk.

12.12 During construction, key works will be the attenuation of surface water flows and the control of silt run off. This will be controlled by a CEMP and construction best practice.

12.13 On completion of construction, flows will be limited to greenfield run off rates with attenuated flows retained in SUDs features. This will protect the proposed development and downstream receptors from the risk of flooding.

12.14 Following the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures the residual risk from flooding and contamination would be negligible.
13 Arboriculture

13.1 This assessment considers the likely significant effects of the proposals with respect to arboriculture.

13.2 The assessment evaluates the likely impact of the proposals on trees and hedgerows based on their arboricultural resource. The chapter also describes the methods used to assess:

- The baseline conditions currently existing at the Site;
- The nature and extent of any effects;
- The mitigation measures proposed to prevent, reduce or offset any significant negative effects; and
- The likely residual effects after these measures have been adopted.

13.3 The assessment has been informed by a baseline assessment (desk studies and detailed arboricultural survey) based on the assessment methodology set out within BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction.

13.4 In summary, with appropriate mitigation incorporated into the construction environmental management plan no significant, adverse construction nor operation effects are predicted to the retained arboricultural resource. Furthermore, with the planting of approximately 38,000 new trees, the proposals can potentially deliver a long-term significant beneficial effect at a Local level with respect to new woodland creation and specimen tree planting.

13.5 A summary of the assessment results is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Significant Effect</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree Loss</td>
<td>Proposed planting of approx. 38,000 new woodland and specimen trees with management in the long term</td>
<td>Moderate Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation Pruning</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to retained trees and hedgerows</td>
<td>Arboricultural method Statement, ACW, Tree Protection Measures &amp; technical solutions, incorporated into the</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Summary of Arboricultural Assessment Results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Significant Effect</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Environmental Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to rooting environment of retained trees</td>
<td>Arboricultural method Statement, ACW, Tree Protection Measures &amp; technical solutions, incorporated into the Construction Environmental Management Plan</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root damage/ severance.</td>
<td>Arboricultural method Statement, ACW, Tree Protection Measures &amp; technical solutions, incorporated into the Construction Environmental Management Plan</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No significant effects have been identified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 Type 1 Cumulative Effects

14.1 Type 1 cumulative effects are also known as ‘inter-project’ effects, and are the combined effects arising from the development upon a set of defined sensitive receptors (e.g. a noise impact might combine with a traffic impact at certain receptors, leading to a combined impact arising).

14.2 Type 2 cumulative effects relate to the proposed development’s effects combining with other development, and these are considered within the technical assessment chapters (6 to 14) of the ES, and sections 5 – 13 of the ES Addendum.

14.3 A standalone assessment of these effects was undertaken in order to identify whether any significant Type 1 cumulative effects were considered likely to arise.

14.4 The assessment was based upon relevant guidance and professional judgement, drawing upon the identified residual effects of the proposed development which were identified through the technical assessments within the Environmental Statement. It is noted that the assessment process is subjective, however an approach was developed based on the relevant guidance in order to understand where significant effects might be likely and to ensure Type 1 cumulative effects were given proper consideration.

14.5 The assessment focuses on receptors, particularly those which are considered more sensitive, and identifies where significant cumulative effects are likely. The results of the assessment process are presented below.

Construction Phase

14.6 Based on the methodology detailed above, Table 3 presents the results of the review of the potential for interactions of individual effects during the construction phase of development. The potential effect interactions are then discussed further.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitive Receptor Group</th>
<th>Construction Phase Residual Effects</th>
<th>Likely Significant Cumulative Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Neighbouring residential properties, local business, and education/community facilities | Moderate beneficial effects on local expenditure and economic impact  
Major beneficial effects on employment and training  
Between minor adverse and major adverse landscape/visual effects on residential receptors | No likely significant Type 1 cumulative effects |
| Construction site workers | No likely significant Type 1 cumulative effects |
| Local highway, public transport, pedestrian and cycle network users | Minor adverse effects on local highway network from construction traffic  
Minor adverse effects on access, Rights of Way and Common Land  
Between no effect and moderate adverse landscape/visual effects on public highways  
Between no effect and major adverse landscape/visual effects on public rights of way and open access land | Temporary in-combination effects of minor transport impacts, combined with a range of landscape/visual impacts on road users.  
**Minor adverse, temporary**  
Temporary in-combination effects of major impact on limited right of way users, combined with a moderate landscape/visual impacts on pedestrians using the right of way.  
**Moderate adverse, temporary** |
<p>| Ecological receptors at and surrounding the Site | Between not significant and beneficial, significant impact on | No likely significant Type 1 cumulative effects |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitive Receptor Group</th>
<th>Construction Phase Residual Effects</th>
<th>Likely Significant Cumulative Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>local ecological receptors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.7 Table 3 shows that there is the potential for in-combination construction phase Type 1 cumulative effects to arise in relation to local highway, public transport, pedestrian and cycle network users.

14.8 Individual residual effects with the potential to give rise to a significant Type 1 cumulative effect are predominantly expected to relate to the interaction between temporary adverse construction (nuisance) impacts.

14.9 The combined construction phase effects are considered to be significant, although are temporary and so would only be experienced during the demolition and construction works. As the demolition/construction works and phasing progress then the location and severity of the cumulative effect is expected to be varied in magnitude and duration.

14.10 Although the potential for a Type 1 cumulative effect arising from construction impacts has been identified, this will be temporary and limited to certain elements of the demolition/construction phase.

14.11 The identified effect is typical of such a construction project, and the Environmental Statement has identified a number of key mitigation measures to be employed during the construction phase to mitigate and minimise construction impacts. These mitigation measures are expected to be secured by a CEMP which is standard construction best practice, to be either agreed between LCFC and LBL prior to determination of the application, or secured as a planning condition.

**Operational Phase**

14.12 Based on the methodology detailed above, Table 4 presents the results of the review of the potential for interactions of individual effects during the operational phase of development. The potential effect interactions are then discussed further.
### Table 5 - Type 1 Cumulative Effects – Operational Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitive Receptor Group</th>
<th>Operational Phase Residual Effects</th>
<th>Likely Significant Cumulative Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring residential properties, local business, and education/community facilities</td>
<td><strong>Minor beneficial</strong> effects of flood risk (increased surface water run-off) on the proposed development and surrounding residential properties</td>
<td>In-combination effects of beneficial flood risk, socio-economic, and adverse landscape, and noise impacts. <strong>Minor adverse to major beneficial, permanent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors and workers at the Site</td>
<td><strong>Between no effect and major adverse</strong> landscape/visual effects on residential receptors</td>
<td>In-combination effects of socio-economic impacts. <strong>Moderate beneficial, permanent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minor adverse</strong> noise effect from artificial grass pitch activities on residential properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minor beneficial</strong> effects on population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderate beneficial</strong> effects on local expenditure and economic impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderate beneficial</strong> effects on employment and training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minor adverse</strong> effects on leisure, recreation, amenity and sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local highway, public transport, pedestrian and cycle network users</td>
<td><strong>Minor beneficial</strong> socio-economic effects on access, Rights of Way, Common Land</td>
<td>In-combination effects of beneficial impact on users of improved right of way, and adverse transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitive Receptor Group</th>
<th>Operational Phase Residual Effects</th>
<th>Likely Significant Cumulative Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor adverse</td>
<td>effects on pedestrian delay and amenity</td>
<td>landscape/visual impacts. Between minor beneficial to moderate adverse, permanent (adverse effects primarily as a result of severance and landscape impacts in limited locations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor adverse</td>
<td>effects on pedestrian delay and amenity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor beneficial</td>
<td>effects on highways safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major adverse</td>
<td>effects on severance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between no effect and major adverse</td>
<td>landscape/visual effects on public highways, rights of way and open access land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological receptors at and surrounding the Site</td>
<td>Between not significant and beneficial, significant impact on local ecological receptors</td>
<td>No likely significant Type 1 cumulative effects, though a moderate to major beneficial impact on ecology overall is anticipated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.13 Table 4 shows that there is the potential for in-combination operational phase Type 1 cumulative effects to arise in relation to the following receptor groups:

- Neighbouring residential properties, local business, and education/community facilities;
- Visitors and workers at the Site; and
- Local highway, public transport, pedestrian and cycle network users.

14.14 The interaction between residual socio-economic, flood risk, landscape/visual and noise effects of the proposed development on local residents and other occupiers is expected to give rise to some
cumulative effects, albeit in limited circumstances. The interaction between the various elements is likely to be complex and varied, depending upon a range of factors such as the specific location of the residents and how they interact with the Site and the wider socio-economic environment. As such, it is not likely that one typical effect can be concluded, and a range of cumulative effects might be expected as shown in Table 4. Although at times adverse effects may be experienced, it is not considered that these are significant and such effects will be appropriately controlled through the design and planning processes, and specific measures subject to planning conditions as appropriate.

14.15 The cumulative effect on neighbouring commercial properties is considered to be beneficial and long-term, with the addition of new economic activity to the area which in turn will bring socio-economic benefits to the wider area.

14.16 The impact on local highway, public transport, pedestrian and cycle network users is again likely to be complex and varied, depending upon a range of factors such as the specific location of the transport groups and how they interact with the Site and the wider transport network. As such, it is not likely that one typical effect can be concluded, although the cumulative effect of the impacts identified is expected to be adverse and potentially significant for certain receptors. Although at times adverse effects may be experienced, primarily as a result of severance and landscape impacts in limited locations, such effects have been considered through the design process with the intention to minimise impacts on local receptors.

14.17 The interaction between residual effects on a range of local receptors is considered to be both adverse and beneficial, as discussed above. The interaction between these effects on local receptors might be expected to vary according to a range of factors. The receptors would include those in the local area, and also in the wider sub-regional area. The extent and magnitude of these cumulative effects would again be expected to vary as shown in Table 4.

14.18 Where relevant, the individual residual effects which contribute to the potential cumulation have been considered within the ES and mitigated where necessary and feasible.

14.19 No mitigation is proposed for the identified Type 1 cumulative effects, although appropriate consideration has been given to potential effects throughout the technical chapters of the ES (6-14) and have proposed appropriate mitigation. All mitigation measures are summarised in Chapter 16 of the ES.
15 Availability of Environmental Statement

15.1 The ES is available for public viewing online via LBL’s Planning Register\(^1\), and a hard copy can be viewed during normal office hours at the following address:

Council Offices
Southfield Road
Loughborough
LE11 2TX

15.2 The ES may be purchased in volumes, the costs for which are set out below:

- Non-Technical Summary (NTS) - £15
- Volume 1: ES Main Text & Figures - £150
- Volume 2: ES Appendices - £150
- Full copy (Volumes 1 and 2 with NTS) of the ES on CD - £15

15.3 For copies of any of the above documents please contact Oliver Jago (ojago@deloitte.co.uk / 020 7303 6925) at Deloitte Real Estate:

Deloitte Real Estate
Planning and Environment
Athene Place
66 Shoe Lane
London
EC4A 3BQ

\(^1\) https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/planning_applications
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