

ISSUES PAPER RESPONSES: A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

Question 2: How can the LDF help to promote sustainable development and build more sustainable communities?

Contributor	Summary of Comments
RN02/1 Association of Charnwood Tenants	Stop closure of village post offices or use a local property as a 'one stop shop' for rent collection, council tax, post office, social services and crime reporting.
RN03/2 Andrew Granger & Co	By linking transport to new development and by protecting land for commercial development.
RN11/2 Anstey Parish Plan Group	Employment land should be retained unless impractical. Development for housing changes village character and increases car use- a commuter village is not sustainable.
RN14/1 M & G Evans	Student ghettos in Ashby/Storer Road area of Loughborough are not sustainable communities. Local communities are threatened by student let properties. Request Haydon Road is declared an 'area of student housing restraint' and that an urgent investigation is undertaken to ensure a more balanced community. Encourage the university to build student accommodation on campus.
RN16/1 AT Greatorrex	Develop brownfield sites within walking distance of shops, schools etc.
RN17/1 S Mitchell	Students in Storer and Southfields wards of Loughborough form an unsustainable and transitory 'vocational' community with few points of common interest with the existing local and geographical community. Take account of local views expressed in the press and the consequences of the 'buy to let' uncontrolled epidemic locally.
RN12/4 English Nature	Welcome sequential approach, particularly in safeguarding protected sites.
RN19/2 Mr Porter	Council should build, own and run houses to rent.
RN24/2 Thorpe Acre 2000	Follow national guidelines and consult bodies with a strong interest in sustainability.
RN34/2 T Birkinshaw	Sustainability is in conflict with economic growth. Sustainability is something that can be carried out indefinitely which cannot be true of economic growth, land use and fossil fuel use. Compact communities.
RN34/18 T Birkinshaw	Future housing developments should incorporate homes using solar heating, 'eco' housing and combined heat and power/district heating using sustainable fuels should be encouraged.
RN45/3 CPRE - Charnwood	All new development – urban and rural, business and housing should use sustainable building practices eg. conservation of land, the use of sustainable materials and incorporation of energy efficiency and renewable energy (see Oadby & Wigston BC's guidance). The LDF should also consider Village Design Statements to incorporate good design.
RN44/1 Mr Seager	Animals, birds and green fields should be protected as wildlife depend on them for survival.
RN56/1 GVA Grimley (University)	Loughborough is the principal settlement of the Borough, and evolved into a centre for high-tech business and general commercial activity. LDF should focus majority of new high-tech development within and on the edge of Loughborough, and where necessary urban extensions to relieve the congested centre. LDF will need to provide for infrastructure improvements to ensure residents and businesses can take advantage of efficient services (drainage, gas, electric, water and telecomms), less congested roads, improved public transport links, integrated footpaths and cycleways which are safe and easy to use. LDF will need to provide for town centre enhancement, area based regeneration where necessary, and insist upon quality

ISSUES PAPER RESPONSES: A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

Contributor	Summary of Comments
	new development. High quality environment will encourage prosperity and civic pride.
RN53/7 Smith Stuart Reynolds (George Wimpey East Midlands Ltd)	Build in most sustainable locations. In South Charnwood (the CLPA) these include land adjacent to the 'Leicester and Adjoining Settlements area' at Anstey and the principal villages providing a choice of travel modes and easy access to jobs, services and facilities, such as East Goscote.
RN50/1 Highway Agency	<p>Development on west side of Loughborough would be a favourable strategic location in relation to trunk road network, as access would be via M1 junction 23 rather than along the congested A6. Link capacity on the M1 is a consideration likely to be critical over next few years until full 4-lane widening is completed.</p> <p>Additional development on south side of Loughborough would benefit from the A6004 Epinal Way extension, which has provided some relief to the A6 and will reduce the likelihood of new development-related trips routing via A6 through Loughborough town centre.</p> <p>Development along the A6 corridor between Loughborough and Leicester would be better located to the north of this route, to encourage a greater focus on Loughborough and minimise impact on A6/A46 junction. Employment development in this location would benefit from proximity to residential development on the south side of Loughborough.</p> <p>The A6 is to be de-trunked and responsibility will be passed to the County Council, hopefully in autumn.</p>
RN51/3 British Waterways	Policies to encourage sustainable drainage systems can promote sustainable development. PPG25 and RPG8 supports such systems. The regional guidance requires such systems in all new developments where practicable.
RN58/1 Thurmaston Action Group	<p>The Group undertook a Market Towns Healthcheck in 2002 and is now managing an Action Plan (underpinned by local consultation) to revitalise the village centre by improving gateways to Watermead Park from the village; promote diversification of businesses; establish a local partnership to involve local businesses and Councils with residents to co-ordinate the Action Plan.</p> <p>(Action Plan and consultation results included)</p>
RN64/2 Ms Humphreys	LDF should have clear guidelines on energy saving/energy efficient buildings. Many communities unsustainable due to lack of balanced population, for example parts of Loughborough due to short term lets with absentee landlords. LDF should include policies to halt this trend, e.g. prevent over extension of small terraced houses, introduce areas of housing restraint (as in Headingly, Leeds). LDF should contain definition of percentage of short term lets in given area which is considered acceptable, which is used to guide change of use and extension applications.
RN63/6 Action for a Better Charnwood	Achieving a sustainable society depends on the way public transport, energy efficient development are implemented. The Local Development Framework and supporting Supplementary Guidance needs new and imaginative approaches.
RN63/7 Action for a Better Charnwood	Good design standards must be addressed in the Local Development Framework and require developers to use good environmental practices – location and layout of development, conserve finite resources (land, energy, water and building materials), use of natural energy sources, energy efficiency (use of solar energy, orientation of buildings to prevent heat loss, use of sustainable materials). Business developments, including the Science park, should generate a proportion of their power on site. Council should lead by example (see Oadby & Wigston BC's guidance).
RN65/7 M Johnstone	Do more to reduce the need to recycle so much packaging and use of plastic bags. Compare how other European countries do this.

ISSUES PAPER RESPONSES: A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

Contributor	Summary of Comments
RN65/8 M Johnstone	Think 'small' – communities fall apart when they become too large and remote. Encourage small cells of community life by involving local schools and encouraging small businesses such as corner shops, chemists, hairdressers etc. Don't destroy existing communities eg. loss of 2 small community businesses at Valley Road/Woodbrook Road which is being developed for high density housing.
RN76/2 Redrow Homes (Midlands) Ltd	<p>Support Council's objective to satisfy sustainable development and main findings/aims of Community Strategy. National, regional and county planning policy provide clear direction for Charnwood's future settlement strategy.</p> <p>Achievement of national sustainable development objectives will include seeking to achieve broad balance between homes and jobs, harnessing new development to secure a range of services and facilities and achieving high standards of design quality and energy efficiency.</p> <p>Does not mean pursuing a one dimensional approach of restricting release of greenfield land at all costs. National, regional and county policy gives first priority to previously developed urban sites and second priority to greenfield land on the periphery of towns and cities. Once brownfield land is exhausted the next step is to identify 'major urban extensions' that support a full range of infrastructure and facilities that are more self sustaining and create balanced and mixed communities (including affordable housing) with access to a range of jobs.</p> <p>Leicester is the main sub-regional centre and Central Leicestershire Policy Area represents the preferred location for new development in the County. Rework interpretation of 'sequential approach' on page 10 to 'considering the scope for extensions to Leicester and the other main settlements'. Provides the opportunity for an urban extension of at least 250 dwellings on the edge of Leicester in line with the Structure Plan.</p> <p>Birstall and Thurmaston are not the only locations on the edge of Leicester having a broad range of jobs and services making them suitable for future growth – areas adjacent to Hamilton and Scraftoft have similar advantages.</p>
RN17/5 S Mitchell	Need an effective policy on sustainability and energy conservation to be a material consideration on every planning application.
RN82/1 Pegasus Planning Group (David Wilson Estates/ Wilson Bowden Devts)	<p>Best way of accommodating the District's needs without harming the environment is to adopt the sequential approach taking account of Regional Planning Guidance and Strategic planning policy which also requires weight to be given to the Central Leicestershire Policy Area.</p> <p>Given existing commitments at Birstall, the primary edge of Leicester location for future development is Thurmaston which has a large service base with significant employment provision. Government guidance makes it clear there are benefits in locating homes and jobs close together – increase the opportunity for walking and cycling between the two. Important that development is, or has the potential to be, served by public transport.</p>
RN83/2 S Bradwell	Must encourage sustainable development but maximising the use of urban areas should not include development which is out of scale with prevailing buildings or at the cost of important open/green spaces.

ISSUES PAPER RESPONSES: A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

Contributor	Summary of Comments
	<p>Important to limit spread of Loughborough to prevent blurring of breaks between the town and its adjacent, separate settlements.</p> <p>Prepare Development Briefs to ensure the good design of key sites – The Rushes is a poor example of modern architecture and does not make a positive contribution to the built environment.</p>
RN85/2 Leicestershire County Council	Strategy Policy 2A and 2B of Structure Plan set out the sequential approach and criteria for suitability of land for development. Other policies – eg. Strategy Policy 9 ‘Mixed Use Development’, Strategy Policy 10 ‘Good Design’ and Resource Management Policy 2 ‘Energy Efficiency’ - also give strategic advice on promoting sustainable development.
RN89/4 P Hubbard	Insist on design quality – stop giving green light to abysmal design and build schemes. Use planning agreements for community parks, not just lame landscaping.
RN94/4 Countryside Agency	<p>Welcome commitment to sustainable development. Framework needs to contain a strong and robust policy framework to ensure social, economic and environmental objectives are met together and conflicts are identified and reconciled through the planning process.</p> <p>Countryside Agency wants to see an overall net gain resulting from development – see research note on ‘Policy Integration’.</p> <p>Incorporate a vision for the district and suggest 2 further objectives for the Framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing community involvement in the local planning system to better inform it; • Seek to achieve high quality standards of design and construction in all development incorporating the wider objectives of sustainable development. <p>Countryside Agency promotes use of Parish Plans and Village Design Statements to help engage local communities in the planning process and ask that the Quality of Life Assessment approach is used as a mechanism to engage local community groups.</p>
RN98/4 Charnwood & North West Leicestershire Primary Care Trust	In terms of sustainable development, it is important to ensure that the needs for health and education are considered. Difficult to identify health needs over next 10 years- needs to be flexibility in options considered.
RN98/6 Charnwood & North West Leicestershire Primary Care Trust	The focus of development in urban areas and brownfield sites assumed this would help access to local services. May be helpful to map capacity in education and healthcare service provision in the various parts of the Borough and relate this to the capacity for expansion – may identify areas where it would be relatively easier to expand provision of education and health services to meet increasing demand (which is not necessarily in urban areas).
RN101/1 Mr Harvey	LDF should designate student housing restraint on Ashby Road between University and town centre. It would reduce artificially inflated house prices in area, enabling first time buyers and families to return creating a balanced community. Positive encouragement and penalties should be introduced to ensure properties are maintained.
RN45/2 CPRE - Charnwood	Welcome key aim but questions how and through what policies the aim will be achieved, how is ‘ensuring a better quality of life’ defined, how economic growth and environmental protection can both take place and what are the priorities for the

ISSUES PAPER RESPONSES: A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

Contributor	Summary of Comments
	national sustainable development objectives.
RN63/5 Action for a Better Charnwood	Welcome fact that 'sustainable environment' is first aim but concerned this is a surface approach and the sustainable approach needs to up front in all sections. 'Ensuring a better quality of life' needs defining and criteria to explicitly link to achieving a sustainable environment. Sustainability is underplayed on page 5 and the aims could be taken forward in ways that are hostile to enhancing the environment and pursuit of sustainability eg. employment and housing sections emphasises 'development' rather than 'sustainable'. No indication of balance or priorities of the 4 national sustainable development objectives. Development aims are prioritised above sustainability ones.
RN92/2 Mr Pickford	Wolds villages have become satellites of Loughborough, rather than thriving self sufficient village communities. Between them Wolds villages have one garage with a few small shops, and no full time health care. The future development of the airfield could become a major benefit rather than an eyesore to villages.
RN105/1 Ms Kerslake	No definition of 'sustainable development'. It underpins LDF, yet used in several ways.
RN107/2 Mr Keeling	Wymeswold is an attractive village and worthy of protection, but this militates against affordable housing. Its charm is due to the gradual development, allowing sympathetic integration of properties and incomers, to create a community feel.
RN108/9 Cllr Edwards	Wanlip is producing a Parish Plan and village design statement that I will be supporting for adoption as SPG.
RN102/4 A Newtown Linford Parish Councillor (anonymous)	By tailoring development to the requirements of the locality, taking note of village appraisals and VDS.
RN110/1 Hoton Parish Council	Applaud use of brownfield sites, and support its continuation. Need to protect greenfield sites, use only as last resort. Any new houses in villages should be infill and include low cost housing.
RN112/1 Wymeswold Parish Council	Pleased to note that Parish Plans will be taken account of. Currently undertaking one. Concerned about regional governance, particularly on how local community will be consulted.

Question 3: Which settlements are the most capable of accommodating new development in a sustainable way? Why?

Contributor	Summary of Comments
RN03/3 Andrew Granger & Co	Those with rail access as well as road and bus.
RN11/3 Anstey Parish Plan Group	Comments relate only to Anstey. Where spaces become derelict in housing and employment they should be cleared and encouragement given to small units. Development of sporting facilities, sustained by strong voluntary sector within village.
RN19/3 Mr Porter	Stop dumping development in Loughborough. Rothley and Woodhouse always seem to escape development
RN24/3 Thorpe Acre 2000	Areas near existing communications.
RN34/3 T Birkinshaw	Infill and re-use is OK in all settlements. Otherwise the larger places – Loughborough, Shepshed, Birstall and possibly Syston must carry the burden.
RN37/3 Woodhouse Parish	Old Woodhouse or Woodhouse Eaves are not appropriate to accommodate new development. Main traffic routes through the Parish are over used, the school has poor access and cannot possibly accommodate any more children.

ISSUES PAPER RESPONSES: A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

Contributor	Summary of Comments
Council	
RN53/2 Smith Stuart Reynolds (George Wimpey East Midlands Ltd)	<p>Consider Anstey and East Goscote are sustainable settlements in south Charnwood. Leicestershire and Leicester Urban Area is not restricted to Birstall and Thurmaston but also includes Glenfield and hence the land south of Anstey; Other urban areas are also sustainable locations for new housing;</p> <p>Numerous employment opportunities in north west part of Leicester's urban area – Gorse Hill industrial estate, Gorse Hill hospital, County Hall – which have access for pedestrians and cyclists. Need to revisit the boundaries in respect of Countryside, Green Wedge and Areas of Local Separation to determine the future location of development in the most suitable and sustainable locations.</p> <p>Identification of Anstey as a 'vibrant local centre' is welcomed but consider that East Goscote is one of the more sustainable locations - provides a choice of travel modes and easy access to jobs, services and facilities - and its role as a local centre providing vital services and facilities should be recognised.</p>
RN54/1 A Kay	<p>Settlements with a decline in traditional industries, eg. Sileby, Loughborough East of the A6 need new development to regenerate them. Have brownfield land to accommodate the development and the best transport links, both well situated for the railway.</p>
RN71/1 William Davis	<p>Most development should be located towards Loughborough and Shepshed - 'Main Town' designations in the Structure Plan. RPG recognises Loughborough as a centre for sustainable growth.</p> <p>There are other settlements that function as small towns, notably Birstall, Syston and Thurmaston. Birstall and Syston have already been acknowledged to represent sustainable locations for strategic development in the existing local plan, but should be recognised in the LDF. Birstall is acknowledged in the strategic policies of the Structure Plan, although Syston to date has not (perhaps in error?).</p> <p>Below these settlements a lower tier of settlements function as 'urban' centres, namely Quorn, Mountsorrel, Rothley, Barrow, Sileby and Anstey. Recognised in existing Structure Plan as located on good transport corridors, and having a good range of facilities and services. These attributes still exist even though policies of replacement Structure Plan do not acknowledge this status in the same way. The LDF needs to address a strategic definition of these intermediate settlements, which acknowledges their capacity for additional sustainable growth.</p> <p>Existing allocations will presumably be carried forward. Still a requirement for additional housing and employment in CLPA, consider Rothley well placed to meet residual requirement, rather than directing growth to Birstall, Syston and Anstey.</p>
RN82/2 Pegasus Planning Group (David Wilson Estates/ Wilson Bowden Devts)	<p>Optimum location in Central Leicestershire for new housing and employment is Thurmaston and elsewhere Snells Nook Lane to west of Loughborough. Anstey and Barrow are also well located to accommodate development in a sustainable way.</p>
RN85/3 Leicestershire County	<p>Sequential approach set out in Strategy Policy 2A favours Loughborough and Shepshed and locations adjoining the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area – Birstall and Thurmaston.</p>

ISSUES PAPER RESPONSES: A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

Contributor	Summary of Comments
Council	
RN94/5 Countryside Agency	Support directing majority of new development towards the main urban area of Loughborough and outside those areas towards local service centres but concerned if Framework did not allow any future development outside of these areas. Such an approach would be extremely restrictive in terms of sustaining vitality and viability of rural communities and meeting local needs for affordable housing and opportunities to diversify the rural economy.
RN90/1 HBF	It is stated that LDF can set standards for well designed, energy efficient housing development (p.9). The promotion of energy efficiency is a Building Regulations matter, not a planning one. PPG12 advises that planning should not seek to duplicate matters controlled by other legislative regimes.
RN69/16 Ms Youngs	Have Loughborough as main urban centre, but still need facilities in villages and outer areas. This is needed in all villages for locals so the need to travel is minimised. A range of sites for new development is needed across the Borough.
RN102/5 A Newtown Linford Parish Councillor (anonymous)	Affordable housing for young and elderly designed to fit in style of conservation villages.

Question 4: Which settlements in Charnwood could act as Rural Centres providing local services for a wider rural hinterland?

Contributor	Summary of Comments
RN03/4 Andrew Granger & Co	Sileby, Barrow-upon-Soar, Anstey, Rothley, Mountsorrel, Syston and East Goscote.
RN19/4 Mr Porter	Garendon- Council should buy it.
RN37/4 Woodhouse Parish Council	Further definition is required for rural centres. Pleased Woodhouse and Woodhouse Eaves are not identified as rural centres. In practice, Woodhouse and Woodhouse Eaves is a rural centre for tourism – this does not fit with definitions but should be considered in the LDF and subsequent plans.
RN53/6 Smith Stuart Reynolds (George Wimpey East Midlands Ltd)	Unclear whether villages that ‘enjoy good bus services and most have access to local rail services’ will be treated as ‘first division’ villages, with smaller villages identified as Rural Centres. If so, the status of these ‘first division’ villages needs to be made clear in the LDF so there is no confusion in terms of the sequential approach. Otherwise should identify ‘first division’ villages as Rural Centres so that they can secure development necessary for them to remain vibrant centres.
RN53/12 Smith Stuart Reynolds (George Wimpey East Midlands Ltd)	East Goscote as it contains all or most of the function required for Rural Centres set out on Strategy Policy 2C of the emerging Structure Plan.
RN71/1 William Davis	Explanatory Memorandum to Structure Plan drew attention to Wymeswold as only Rural Centre in Charnwood. If it’s agreed that Rothley, Mountsorrel, Quorn, etc. merit a different ‘urban’ status, then only additional settlement that should be a Rural Centre is Hathern.
RN82/3 Pegasus Planning Group	Number of larger settlements have potential for additional development but important to ensure any development proposed is properly related to meeting sustainable development objectives and that the level of growth in these

ISSUES PAPER RESPONSES: A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

(David Wilson Estates/ Wilson Bowden Devts)	settlements does not undermine the sequential approach and the viability of the largest settlements. Settlements which could act as Rural Centres: Barrow – good quality transport links Anstey – close proximity to Leicester urban area and very good quality public transport links.
RN85/4 Leicestershire County Council	Strategy Policy 2C sets out the criteria for designating Rural Centres.
RN96/3 Transport 2000	Settlements which could act as Rural Centres include Shepshed, Barrow, Sileby, Syston, Birstall and Anstey
RN97/1 Mr Hill	New business centres near rural settlements to provide local employment does not guarantee local people will work there or that businesses will employ local people. In all probability create more car journeys, degrade rural settlements and set a precedent for further development in countryside.
RN94/6 Countryside Agency	Support concept of smaller rural service centres/clusters of villages outside Market Towns to provide a range of services but must recognise rural service centres can function in different ways according to local circumstances. Vital to understand the functions before identifying settlements as a focus for future development to prevent unsustainable patterns of development. A sound evidence base, including Parish Plans information, is required to justify the selection of local service centres. See also ' The role of Rural Settlements as Service Centres ' which researches the functioning of small rural settlements.
RN107/4 Mr Keeling	Concerned that Wymeswold may be earmarked as a Rural Centre. Need a clear definition of a Rural Centre. The concern is that Wymeswold could be earmarked for development without necessarily having the infrastructure to handle it. Concerned that as a Rural Centre may have an urban extension of at least 250 dwellings.
RN112/2 Wymeswold Parish Council	Understand that Wymeswold may be designated as a Rural Centre, want to know more about the implications. The village is remote from the rest of the Borough. Happy to look to sustaining rural community, particularly because loss of visiting doctor surgeries, and no public transport to other surgeries. But, concerned that infrastructure could not sustain a large increase in population.

Question 5: Which settlements do you think should remain as they are – because they already have enough homes/ jobs or because more development would be harmful? Why?

Contributor	Summary of Comments
RN03/5 Andrew Granger & Co	Majority of settlements in Charnwood Forest area apart from Anstey.
RN15/1 N Simpson	Queniborough – close to and will possibly be affected by the new A607 Rearsby by-pass and is beset by traffic through the village. Space for new housing could only take place on greenfield sites along South Croxton Road which would completely destroy the rural nature of the village.
RN11/5 Anstey Parish Plan Group	Do not wish Anstey to remain as it is, want better services/facilities, particularly for the young. However, congestion in the Nook is a problem exacerbated by several brownfield developments and Bradgate Road development. Support retention of green wedges and employment land.
RN19/5 Mr Porter	Loughborough is a small town with natured boundaries. It is already overdeveloped.

ISSUES PAPER RESPONSES: A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

Contributor	Summary of Comments
RN24/4 Thorpe Acre 2000	Nowhere is capable of remaining as it is. The present policy of not building in the open countryside is sound and supported.
RN33/1 Mrs Gerrard	Syston should stay as it is, infrastructure cannot take any more houses.
RN36/1 Dr and Mrs Brown	Seagrave- a small village in a conservation area. Its charm and character should be preserved according to strict guidelines in place, Open spaces add charm to a village and greenfield land should only be used as a last resort. Small communities sustain themselves. Should not allow village to become a non-descript part of a larger urban sprawl.
RN38/3 Syston Town Council	Syston has taken a substantial and unprecedented amount of residential development over the last 30 years or so and is still taking place now. This growth has not been matched with growth in social infrastructure so that the town is stretched to the limit in terms of medical facilities, roads, parking provision, recreation and playing facilities. No further greenfield development should take place until the social infrastructure has caught up.
RN54/2 A Kay	Substantial development in rural settlements to east of Borough, ie. east of the Soar valley, and in Charnwood Forest villages should be resisted. Such development would detract from the rural character of the Wolds villages; and these villages have poor transport links, so major developments would lead to increases in motor traffic on unsuitable rural roads. However, small-scale enterprises (typically, but not exclusively, linked to agriculture) retaining employment for local people in these areas without having a major impact on the landscape should be encouraged.
RN50/5 Highway Agency	Development in the vicinity of A46 Western Bypass is least favoured location in terms of trunk road impact and sustainability, as it will likely encourage long-distance travel via A46 and radial routes into Leicester. As indicated in the RDS this route is likely to be subject to continued capacity pressures with or without development in the area. Current constraints and recommendations in relation to development pressures on the A46 are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A46/A5630 Anstey- currently operates within capacity, subject to the resolution of exit blocking from adjacent junction to the south, it would be a favourable location for new development. • A46/A6 Birstall- scope for further mitigation should be considered. • A46/A607 Hobby Horse Roundabout, Syston- Development impacting on this junction within LDF timescale should be considered in relation to available capacity following initial improvements. Earliest anticipated start of construction to enlarge and signalise the roundabout is May 2005. Long term plans are to grade and separate the junction, but not likely to happen before 2015.
RN65/9 M Johnstone	Loughborough is an optimum size and should not extend beyond its present boundaries. Accommodate population growth on brownfield sites in attractively designed flats/town houses with underground car parking. Revitalise areas such as Shelthorpe replacing older housing with well designed blocks incorporating shopping, health and leisure amenities. Loughborough is an attractive place to live due to its size, compactness and semi-rural nature. This should be preserved along with the character of the villages in Charnwood.
RN67/1 Birstall Parish Council	Birstall has accepted the development of 900 houses at 'Hallam Fields' and is adamant that this figure is not exceeded. Brownfield sites have also come forward for development. With such a large village community Birstall is anxious to retain its community character. Any further development, within or adjacent to its boundaries, will have an adverse effect and spoil the environment and adjacent areas of greenfield or recreational value that it needs.

ISSUES PAPER RESPONSES: A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

Contributor	Summary of Comments
RN85/5 Leicestershire County Council	Settlements not designated as Rural Centres are last in the sequential approach (Strategy Policy 2A), and would therefore be expected to take minor development in the form of limited infill or affordable housing.
RN97/2 Mr Hill	Charnwood's great diversity needs to be recognised and protected, the river valleys and floodplains, undulating wolds, unique beauty of Charnwood Forest, tiny hamlets and villages. Need to preserve diversity of region by protecting smaller villages from growing enormously.
RN94/7 Countryside Agency	<p>Include strong policy that is flexible to accommodate sustainable development in rural areas to meet the social and economic needs of communities without sacrificing environmental quality.</p> <p>Opposed to blanket restrictions on development in villages and the wider countryside. Have strong concerns about drawing hard lines on maps tightly around villages that seek to define village envelopes – need flexibility to allow development to take place in rural areas to respond to economic and social needs. Restricting development where there are no existing services – eg pub or shop – is unnecessarily negative and damaging to longer term sustainability of rural communities. Include a permissive policy basis for new service, affordable housing or housing development which carefully reflects the local needs of the settlement.</p> <p>Encourage sustainability appraisal of villages using Quality of Life Assessment to ensure new development serves to enhance the balance of services and social cohesion in rural areas rather than diminish their special character and exacerbate economic difficulties.</p>
RN33/7 Mrs Gerrard	Syston- air quality is well above safe levels. Medical centre cannot take any more patients. Schools are bursting. Have only one post office. No room for any more traffic jams or more parking. No cemetery land allocated in the plan for Syston. No more development on greenfield sites.
RN97/10 Mr Hill	<p>Must protect what we hold dear because no-one else will. Seagrave is a small conservation village now under threat from development.</p> <p>Future generations inherit the sum total of all mistakes that we allow to happen. e.g. inappropriate floodlighting allowed on the driving range at Park Hill Golf Club.</p>
RN108/1 Cllr Edwards	Birstall received the largest allocation in the last local plan. The Hallam Fields development includes more than enough housing and employment for this and neighbouring settlements.
RN102/6 A Newtown Linford Parish Councillor (anonymous)	Newtown Linford.
RN110/2 Hoton Parish Council	Feel that Barrow has grown as much as it can to keep village atmosphere.

Question 6: Which aspects of Charnwood's environment should the LDF seek to protect?

Contributor	Summary of Comments
-------------	---------------------

ISSUES PAPER RESPONSES: A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

Contributor	Summary of Comments
RN02/2 Association of Charnwood Tenants	Protect all existing green areas and allow for open spaces when planning any residential building.
RN03/6 Andrew Granger & Co	Charnwood Forest.
RN11/6 Anstey Parish Plan Group	The current mix of housing, employment and commerce should be protected for sustainability reasons. Retain green wedges. Reduction in noise from A46 by 'whisper' road surface when next resurfaced.
RN19/6 Mr Porter	Its townspeople- from being forced out by the University.
RN24/5 Thorpe Acre 2000	All elements.
RN31/1 M Charlesworth	The fields and woods off Snell's Nook Lane are the last Green Wedge that side of town – it must be protected.
RN34/4 T Birkinshaw	All woodland, green wedges and farmland and floodplains.
RN33/2 Mrs Gerrard	Greenfield sites
RN36/2 Dr and Mrs Brown	See response to question 5, relates to Seagrave.
RN37/5 Woodhouse Parish Coucil	The priorities will come through village design statements and parish plans.
RN45/4 CPRE - Charnwood	Impact of harmful development on quiet lanes.
RN52/2 Loughborough Archaeological and Historical Society	<p>Many examples of architectural heritage in Loughborough – streets of Victorian and Edwardian housing and 20th Century art deco buildings in the town centre – as well as architecturally interesting buildings and road arrangements in the surrounding villages that should be preserved.</p> <p>Where there is redevelopment, we urge policy provision to allow adequate opportunity of recording of archaeological and architectural features before development takes place.</p>
RN54/3 A Kay	Protect unique character of Charnwood Forest (preferably by policies agreed with NW Leics DC), the character of all landscapes, water quality in rivers and streams, and air quality especially in towns and larger villages. Noise and light pollution are also threats to the environment.
RN40/1 National Forest Company	Charnwood includes a significant part of The National Forest. Key issues that need to be addressed are, continued support and endorsement for The National Forest Strategy and practical help towards its implementation. LDF should continue to include specific policies related to the National Forest. Should be continued and application of The National Forest development planting guidelines, which have been recently revised. Farm/ rural diversification: there should be continued support for forest related activities, including new woodlands, tourism, recreation, farm diversification, and environmental conservation and enhancement. Training and skills development related to the economic opportunities that the Forests' creation presents. Sustainable transport to and within the Forest, for leisure and recreation in particular, which should

ISSUES PAPER RESPONSES: A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

Contributor	Summary of Comments
	include promotion of public transport, cycling and walking.
RN51/4 British Waterways	River Soar and Grand Union Canal are valuable resources. LDF policies should recognise the importance of waterways in relation to regeneration, sport, recreation, tourism, heritage, culture, natural environment, and transport (including cycling, walking and public access). Waterways address many aims of the community strategy.
RN64/3 Ms Humphreys	Prohibit further building on Cumberland Road recreation ground.
RN71/8 William Davis	Current and emerging government policy advises local designations for landscape protection, such as Charnwood Forest APAC, should not be promoted at local level. The Charnwood Forest Policy Area has strategic policy status in the replacement Structure Plan, it should not be assumed the boundaries will be the same as the APAC. They could not be the same if Loughborough and Shepshed are to accommodate sustainable development as in the regional and strategic policies, requirements for a 50ha science park is just one example.
RN76/5 Redrow Homes (Midlands) Ltd	Carefully protect and where possible enhance the lost mediaeval village of Hamilton to preserve its physical structure and setting. An urban expansion to Hamilton/Scraptoft will help to secure and protect the old village of Hamilton, as well as making it more accessible to visitors and school children.
RN83/3 S Bradwell	Protect historic landscapes including the Charnwood Forest but also others such as Garendon Park as well as the built heritage and villages.
RN85/6 Leicestershire County Council	Make wider reference to the whole of Charnwood's accessible countryside as well as featured bits. Important for the Framework to help promote recreational rights of way. Structure Plan includes a number of policies intended to protect the environment eg. Strategy Policy 14 'Charnwood Forest.
RN94/8 Countryside Agency	<p>Enhance manage and conserve, Charnwood's natural and cultural assets – biodiversity and landscape- as fundamental to sustainable development and enriching the quality of life. Protect environmentally sensitive areas and open space for biodiversity interest, amenity of local residents and protection of local character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>Adopt a robust landscape character based approach to underpin planning policy, in line with existing and emerging Regional Planning Guidance</p> <p>Local landscape designations imply some landscapes are more important than others but all landscapes are valued locally – should recognise that all countryside is of at least local importance. Character approach allows for positive and strong conservation in more sensitive areas and does not represent a weakening of landscape protection.</p> <p>Development proposals in the countryside should always be carefully designed and sited to satisfy the objectives of a countryside character policy and Countryside Design Summaries and Village Design Statements.</p>
RN94/10 Countryside Agency	Include specific policy recognising the need for an integrated approach to managing the important social, economic and environmental value of the Borough's river corridors in line with emerging Regional Planning Guidance (model policy included).
RN12/1 English Nature	Community Strategy should look to provide a policy framework for enhancing Charnwood's environment. Recognise benefits of utilising agreed design standards for major development or SPG on how development can contribute to environmental improvements. Policies should include the protection of regulation 37 habitats (linear habitats, e.g. hedges,

ISSUES PAPER RESPONSES: A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

Contributor	Summary of Comments
	ditches, ponds), which allow movement and exchange between species and habitats. Protect Strategic River Corridors through specific policy (suggestion of a worded policy on form). Fully integrate the Charnwood Biodiversity Action Plan into the Community Strategy to identify how planning can contribute positively. Include policies for wildlife sites, SINCs and Local Nature Reserves.
RN57/2 Environment Agency	Wish to see policies in LDF requiring areas of ecological value to be preserved and enhanced. E.g. policies that require buffer strips to be left next to watercourses, which would benefit wildlife and landowners, the latter would not be burdened with maintenance or a sterile environment in which to live. Information is attached in respect of flood risk assessment, culverting of watercourses, and surface water disposal in the form of sustainable drainage.
RN83/1 S Bradwell	Framework should give greater emphasis to the importance of Charnwood's historical legacy of buildings (including archaeology), areas and landscapes.
RN69/1 Ms Youngs	Safeguarding unique assets should include Grade II Listed Buildings, e.g. houses in Fennel Street in Loughborough. Energy efficiency in new buildings. Underground parking beneficial and save space thus more money for development, and more pleasing to the eye than mass car parking. Ensure improved access for all to local services and that all developments, existing and new, have a range of local services.
RN104/6 WESSRA	Charnwood Forest should have a stronger focus on recreation.
RN102/7 A Newtown Linford Parish Councillor (anonymous)	Additional areas of open countryside which are of particular beauty around villages and retain existing protection in structure and local plans.
RN110/3 Hoton Parish Council	Encourage planting of hedges and spinneys in farming areas to encourage wildlife and help it prosper.
RN112/9 Wymeswold Parish Council	Need firm policies to conserve and protect attractive villages from over development. Development should be driven by the desire of the village not developers' wishes. Any large development on greenfield should not be an extension of a village, but of a large urban settlement. If Wymeswold is not considered rural, then would not want to suffer from the possibility of an urban extension of 250 dwellings or more on greenfield.