

CORE STRATEGY

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RELATING TO: SECTION 1 - THE VISION

QUESTION 1: To what extent would you agree or disagree with our overall vision for Charnwood by 2021?

QUESTION 2: If you disagree, what changes would you suggest?

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN07 R J Mellar	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Too many vague aspirations to do good rather than tangible objectives. No mention of what success looks like or how it is to be measured.</p> <p>There should be objectives to tackle crucial issues such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reducing the pressure on housing, land and services by reducing population growth (especially immigrants & students); • Join the real world and learn to deliver better services, quicker and at lower cost. Unless progress is made on these matters before 2021 the Vision will remain what it is - a fairy tale. CBC has its fingers in too many pies and so spreads its resources too thinly with the consequence that some basic services are poorly delivered (filthy streets being an example). It should concentrate on core services / competencies and abandon the peripheral stuff. 	
RN08 N W King	<p>Neutral/Not sure</p> <p>Extra building at edge of Leicester needs new roads and local facilities.</p>	
RN13 D Ayres	<p>Disagree</p> <p>The description of the existing Charnwood situation has limited justification, but the future plans are not the appropriate response ie. West of Loughborough.</p>	
RN14 D Liggins	<p>Disagree strongly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing areas need same level of cleansing as Town centre. • Lack of quality bus services linking housing areas (Thorpe Acre) to employment areas (Bishop Meadow Road). • Good mix of house types available but not affordable. • Full use of brownfield sites will need survey to identify. • Disagree a suitable mix of residents and students is achieved in Loughborough. • Disagree that a new science park is required. Many businesses face take-overs and closure or relocation. • Document is fantasy based on unrealistic ideals. Leisure and other needs of homeless, poor, socially isolated, disabled, non car users are not being addressed. 	
RN15 M Birkinshaw	<p>Agree</p> <p>Could be a more sustainable view.</p>	
RN31 G Brown	<p>Agree Strongly</p> <p>The phrase "effect of designing out crime principles..." seems technical and meaningless to me.</p>	
RN36 M C Dolby	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far too much building taking place destroying greenfield land • Efforts to try and reduce traffic on roads will only add to problems 	
RN42 KE, DL & S Carnall	<p>Neutral/Not Sure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision sounds good but concern local services such as healthcare will expand with additional housing especially as in Syston area they cannot cope with present expansion. 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Garendon Park is good. 	
RN45 B A Fox	Disagree The vision is pie in the sky: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No guarantee any of the forecasts will happen The rail station should incorporate the bus station Congestion on Epinal Way already bad will only get worse Who will be able to afford leisure and healthcare in 2021? Housing must be affordable to all Emphasis on larger developments areas compels people to travel increasing car use 	
RN49 Mrs Lang	Disagree Strongly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased bus fares over past year make it cheaper to drive into Leicester than pay for two on bus Recycling scheme is too selective in terms of what can be included Not enough employment other than factories. No real trade in Leicester beyond call centres Leisure facilities already overcrowded. More homes will mean more crowds. 	
RN56 A W G Ballentyne	Disagree Minimise spoiling of Greenfield sites by redeveloping unused land in the town for new homes in small parcels. Needs thought and imagination but would preserve at least some of the areas proposed for development.	
RN94 L A Briers	Disagree Strongly Too vague.	
RN95 Great Central Railway PLC	Add reference to the Great Central Railway.	
RN142 E E Jones	Agree Use of present tense for aspects not yet achieved creates uncertainty if any of it is currently true	
RN143 R W Jones	Agree Not able to make sense of para 3.6. in terms of separating out description of past and present from the future.	
RN154 J R Cowell	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para 8- small scale approach could be applied to bigger towns to give residents and wildlife time to adjust Para 9- need to acknowledge problems of an unlimited student population – bars, housing, and retail outlets Para 11- expansion of Loughborough could easily be seen as encroachment on Shepshed, Garendon and Charnwood Forest. 	
RN166 F A K Reece	Disagree Most aspects of Charnwood 2021 fine other than location of lorry and industrial park.	
RN197 R W Hill	Agree Some current approaches such as reducing bus access and restricting cycle access to the town centre do not bode well for trying to reduce car use.	
RN294 D Ross	Agree Grand visions are in danger of remaining visions when current needs are not being met and obvious decline is being ignored.	
RN337 N Porter	Disagree Strongly Point made vision is not a vision for Charnwood, but government imposed. (Catering for development which is not needed within the borough).	
RN372	No point in disagreeing with as planners will comply with Deputy Prime Ministers sweeping powers.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Anon		
RN374 J Wilson	Agree Concentrate on existing problems i.e. run-down areas, empty shops and businesses and major traffic problems.	
RN419 M Hall	Neutral/Not Sure Bus service not brilliant especially to villages and affordable housing needs a lot to be desired.	
RN420 A Lacey	Disagree Strongly Regenerate brownfield sites such as Wymeswold airfield.	
RN421 A Dalzell	Disagree Strongly Plan fails to identify the problems it will cause to the current road/traffic situation in and around Loughborough. Loughborough is a market town with defined rural villages. People choose to live in either Loughborough or a village. Don't mix this as this is a choice.	
RN438 G Wilson	Disagree Strongly Urban development to south and west of Loughborough is a short term view. A long term view, past 2021, is needed. This means a community with its own housing and employment, not expansion of existing towns and villages.	
RN464 The National Forest Company	Continued creation of the National Forest should feature as a key issue, particularly given its national and local significance. Not enough to state the Borough "includes the eastern edge of the National Forest". The vision does not mention The National Forest and is weak in relation to the rural environment and economy. The vision should describe how The National Forest's creation is making a major, positive contribution to the Borough and how the rural economy and environment will be improved through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New woodland and other habitat creation and management – contributing to a more rich, biodiverse environment. • New public access and recreation opportunities, for local residents and visitors – contributing to more healthy lifestyles. • Rural diversification through recreation, tourism, agri-environment schemes, new timber-related businesses and woodfuel initiatives – all contributing to a vibrant rural economy. • An expanded visitor economy, building on the advantages of more people visiting The National Forest in general. 	
RN471 R Guise	Disagree Strongly Sustainable development, as defined in the Core Strategy, is impossible to achieve. Reject the Regional Plan's requirement for more housing and industry as it is ill conceived and without democratic mandate.	
RN473 D Carter	Disagree Safeguard and maintain the existing green wedge areas of open land between Shepshed, Quorn and Hathern relative to Loughborough. Shepshed has M1 as a natural barrier to being swallowed up by Loughborough.	
RN474 J Carter	Disagree Strongly Safeguard and maintain the existing green wedge to protect the separate identity of Shepshed, Quorn and Hathern relative to Loughborough.	
RN504 A R Thistleton	The decisions about to be made need an entirely different approach which reflect environmental pressures that are building way ahead of public perceptions and for this reason remarkable vision and leadership will be required. Council does not want to acknowledge that conditions in the future will be different – endlessly repeating old recipes must stop. I would like to see plans that reflect the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Greenland ice is melting; • Devastating East Coast floods are only a matter of time; • Farm land in this area is far too precious to cover with concrete and tarmac; 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More roads are not required. The answer is fewer cars achieved by using buses to take people to/from school and work; • New houses and estates that architects would not dream of living in are effectively slums which waste the land they are built on thereby feeding the demand for new land. 	
RN522 Holmes Antill	Disagree Strongly Give further consideration to Loughborough related growth and east-west traffic problems.	
RN546 Rutherford Properties Agent: Fisher German	Agree Overall, the Core Strategy is supported and it is accepted that the majority of development will be focused in Loughborough and locations on the edge of Leicester. However, there is limited reference to rural areas which form the majority of Charnwood.	
RN547 C Wells Agent: Fisher German	Agree Overall, the Core Strategy is supported and it is accepted that the majority of development will be focused in Loughborough and locations on the edge of Leicester. However, there is limited reference to rural areas which form the majority of Charnwood.	
RN548 Mr Johar Agent: Fisher German	Agree Overall, the Core Strategy is supported and it is accepted that the majority of development will be focused in Loughborough and locations on the edge of Leicester. However, there is limited reference to rural areas which form the majority of Charnwood.	
RN615 R E Davies on behalf of St Michael and All Angels, Thurmaston	Disagree Strongly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst Charnwood is an excellent place to live and work access to Loughborough the prime centre for shopping, leisure and entertainment is not possible by bus and rail from Thurmaston. Whilst people use recent shopping developments they would like to be able to get to Loughborough • Thurmaston is losing its rural identity due to industrial sprawl on northern and southern approaches. At northern end 30 –40 year old factories disfigure what was once a good canal and riverside walk. Such areas could be redeveloped as employment land with riverside areas given over to housing. Need to preserve identity by not building up to boundaries and infilling golf driving range and adjacent land. 	
RN616 H D R Sharratt	Neutral/Not Sure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constraints/ actions needed to address traffic congestion in Loughborough. Otherwise all options will add to problems at peak times • Need to provide traffic calming, healthcare, emergency services, education, utilities transport, waste management for any increase in housing. 	
RN617 C D R Sharratt	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All sounds great but substance lacking • traffic congestion issues somewhat glossed over as it is bound to increase • question positive impact of student population, as problems seem more and intrusive year on year • Impossible to gauge how much of the available brownfield land will be utilized. 52% figure for reuse seems pessimistic. 	
RN619 Anstey Parish Council	Agree Strongly Strong agreement with the Vision especially the development proposals for south Charnwood.	
RN659 GOEM	Indications that Loughborough's is a 'primary' sub regional centre and that its role is to provide 'clear alternatives' for business investment to the three cities appear contrary to RSS8 Policies 5 &15 and should be removed (see also DCP2(i) & (viii)).	
RN661 A C Johnson	Disagree Question why Loughborough needs to be a "primary sub-regional centre"....what's wrong with good transport links to Leicester??	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN662 English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that para 3.4, relating to the aims of the Community Strategy only refers to protection of “the best” of Charnwood’s heritage. Need to make clear how the historic environment is to be protected and managed. EH promotes a wide definition of the historic environment including features with statutory protection and others locally valued and important, including historic landscapes. The County Council is undertaking an Historic Landscape Characterisation to provide greater understanding and help inform planning decisions. 	
RN712 Hepher Dixon on behalf of Loughborough Golf and Hotel Development	<p>Neutral/Not Sure</p> <p>Para 3.6: Need greater reference to University’s role in driving forward the local economy and to support its long term development.</p>	
RN722 Anthony Aspbury Associates on behalf of W Davis Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend para 3.6 (6) to read: <i>‘The population is decently housed and a good variety of housing types and tenures is available to fully meet Charnwoods housing requirement as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy and making living in the Borough more achievable for all ages and incomes. In meeting the Borough’s housing and employment needs development has been directed in accordance with the defined settlement hierarchy :firstly, to the main urban centres of Loughborough and Shepshed and locations adjoining Leicester including Birstall and Thurmaston; secondly to the Service Centres; and, thirdly, to the other settlements. Provision for appropriate levels of development have been made at all levels of the hierarchy.’</i> Amend para 7 by adding additional penultimate sentence: <i>‘...Strategic provision to meet development needs in the later phases of period to 2026, to increase choice and to maintain balance and continuity of housing supply, has also been made west of Loughborough, with smaller scale growth in smaller towns and villages...’</i> There is a need to provide a range of housing of an appropriate scale in all parts of Borough. The emerging RSS review prepared in the light of ODPM housing projections is likely to make the draft CS figures look conservative. Both market and affordable housing need to be distributed by market areas and their sub areas and in response to local needs. As the main provider of affordable housing will be market housing schemes there must be sufficient market housing to deliver the requisite number of affordable houses. Housing must be delivered throughout the LDF period which should be extended to 2026 in line with RSS and in light of emerging PPG3 guidance to plan housing over full 15 years. The Vision needs flexibility to reflect RSS and local settlement hierarchy. 	
RN726 Fisher German on behalf of Rearsby Ltd	<p>Agree</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need some small scale development in and around rural villages to maintain viability. At Rearsby the bypass has improved communications and allows scope for further development. Client’s land indicated abutting the village at Gaddesby Lane and also New Lane (Avenue? No plan included) within heart of village. 	
RN728 R Youngs	<p>Disagree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable communities and rural regeneration needs dispersal of housing and employment to towns and villages and not urban concentration in areas already congested and polluted 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loughborough is a market town and attractive because of size and compactness. Should not be competing with Three Cities Wymeswold airfield could be made more sustainable with shops, facilities bus services etc Difficult to imagine increased use of quality public transport being achieved due to lack of a bus station/ interchange, no public toilets open after 6pm, proposals to only allow a pilot scheme of buses one way through Market Place Garendon park should only be developed as a Country Park and retain rural setting allowing people to cycle between Loughborough and Shepshed. Building anew link road would only increase reliance on the car. 	
RN741 GVA Grimley on behalf of Jelson Ltd	Disagree: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core Strategy should cover the period to 2026 to accord with revised RSS and PPS3 expected to require identification of land supply for 15 year period. Need to recognize scope for Service Centres to be extended logically and sensitively too facilitate better services or sustain existing provision. 	
RN742 Redrow Homes	Support vision subject to para 3.4, 4 th heading clarifying sufficient new homes will be provided to meet Borough needs.	
RN744 S Mitchell	Disagree Section 2.26 needs to be specific about the balance between the social and environmental well being of the Borough, in particular Loughborough town centre, and the economic well being of the town centre. Need to create sustainable and balanced communities and ensure the town centre is not dominated, for example, by excessive numbers of students etc. at expense of the needs of all citizens. Provision for such transient residents should be restricted. Maximise general housing provision in the town centre to improve security and safety at night for all and give best access to public transport and employment.	
RN788 S Bullman	Disagree I have significant comments on some aspects of the vision which I feel should be taken into account.	
RN790 P Froggatt	Disagree Strongly Future development should avoid use of invaluable greenbelt areas and utilise existing brown field sites within the town or such as Wymeswold Airfield.	
RN793 L McGunnigle	Disagree Vision is narrow and does not reflect the broader needs and desires of residents who do not wish to become part of one large settlement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not give any focus on village life or identity. Does not protect the countryside, nature or landscape. Statements that leads towards villages like Quorn being swallowed up into the larger areas such as Loughborough. 	
RN794 N Browne	Agree Shepshed is distinct and has its own needs. It is only mentioned as separate when mention is made of Garendon Park.	
RN796 T Stott	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To agree with this overall vision is to agree all the details. This is an inappropriate mixture of visions and detailed locational options to achieve them. These ought to be in separate statements. It is an attempt to gain simplistic endorsement of the whole package. Strong Loughborough focus. As it attempts to set out how living in the borough might feel in 2021 it ought also to have a clearer vision of what it might look like from a village or small town perspective. Recast structure of this vision. Specifically, to give greater emphasis on the achievement of a low carbon economy and in particular direct reference needs to be made to use of embedded power sources in housing and industrial development. 	
RN801	Neutral/Not Sure	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
F F Rawson on behalf of FFR Ultrasonics Ltd	The car will remain the preferred transport of choice. Bikes do not work well in UK weather. Adequate road and parking provision must be made. Many families have one person working in another city.	
RN803 Antony Aspbury Associates on behalf of G I Sanders, G L Sanders, T D Sanders & D Kettle	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recently published housing projections and emerging Regional Spatial Strategy indicate a significant increase in housing provision over the plan period and explicit reference should be made to the Borough's strategic obligations in the Vision to provide flexibility; Paragraphs 6 and 7 fail to make adequate allowance for the potential growth of the District's Service Centres and their important role within the settlement hierarchy. There is a need to provide a range of housing throughout the Borough and the large Service Centres can play a more important role in meeting these requirements in a sustainable fashion. 	
RN804 A Irving	Disagree It would be a pity to turn Charnwood into a large community more like a city than a market town. The latter description has always been one of its great strengths, and why people like moving to live here. All kinds of social and economic problems go with city life. Constraining the size and make a case against the proposed metamorphosis to the regional GOEM.	
RN808 D Evans	Disagree The vision is too prescriptive in allocating preferred options for development. It should offer a range of options with balance sheets for each and allow consultation to judge these.	
RN810 N Morgan	Agree How could anyone disagree with it?	
RN811 C Watson	Disagree Strongly Over many years of living in Shepshed I have seen the green land between Shepshed and Loughborough slowly eroded. It is time to call a halt. There should be no more building of any kind on this land.	
RN813 P Knott	Disagree Strongly Restrict development to existing brownfield land. The legacy of your proposals will be terrible for Charnwood. Stop building on green fields.	
RN815 R Parsons	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree that it is important to maintain the local character and distinctiveness of the villages. No mention of the housing needs of the elderly. At present, a large number of elderly people are living in much larger accommodation than they need and often more than they want the alternative options they have are all unattractive. 	
RN816 S Cuff Nanpantan Residents' Network	Disagree Strongly The Western side of Loughborough is a unique approach aspect to the town. It must be protected from the unsubstantiated, so-called demand for commercial and residential development. The 'demand' is almost entirely due to the avarice and influence of local and national building and property development companies.	
RN817 T Birkinshaw	Agree Would like something about Charnwood being a low energy or low carbon Borough.	
RN824 National Trust	Agree Agree with the Vision but it would be improved by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring that the location of new development takes account of landscape character; and an aspiration that all new development respects landscape character (including its historic dimension) and local distinctiveness. A commitment not merely to seek the preservation of built heritage but additionally to pursue its enhancement. A commitment to secure a 'step change' in the level of biodiversity within the Borough in line with RSS. The new Country Park sought as part of the western extension of Loughborough should have due regard for the historic 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	significance of Garendon Park and its wider setting in accordance with RSS Policies 27 and 31.	
RN890 C Clegg	Disagree Take into account the needs of local villages and communities. Place more emphasis on support services – health, education etc. Local infrastructure will be affected.	
RN891 A Cooper & JM Hornbuckle	Agree Not all the housing provision will be able to be provided on brownfield sites and a number of green field sites will need to be identified.	
RN892 A Cooper, MW Hornbuckle, LM Cooper (dec'd) & JM Hornbuckle	Agree Not all the housing provision will be able to be provided on brownfield sites and a number of green field sites will need to be identified.	
RN894 D Scott	Agree but pretty meaningless motherhood statements.	
RN898 D Toone	Neutral/Not Sure Generally OK.	
RN899 Langham Park Developments	Disagree Add to vision reference to Service Centres as being appropriate locations to accommodate levels of housing and employment development.	
RN902 J & L Blyth	Disagree Over the last few years Planners have: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spoil the town with the eyesore called the Rushes and all the apartment blocks going up; • Catering for student lets with no thought for first time buyers. 	
RN905 R Brown	Disagree Really good vision for next 15 years of development in Charnwood but then you have lost your nerve and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reverted to status quo – piecemeal development; • Contradicted yourselves (eg Compare preferred options to paras 3.2, (xviii) and (xix). 	
RN906 R I Porter	Neutral/Not Sure As nothing is decided I cannot comment.	
RN907 William Davis Ltd & Persimmon PLC Agent: Andrew Martin Associates	Agree Support Vision.	
RN910 Leicestershire County Council – Property Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	Disagree Amend the Vision to acknowledge the contribution that Service Centres can make in terms of being appropriate locations to accommodate levels of housing and employment development.	
RN912	Disagree	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Radleigh Homes & Messers Clarke Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	Add to the Vision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reference to providing sufficient housing to meet the housing requirement for Charnwood as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy and taking account of the 15 year housing requirement set out in draft PPS3; • to acknowledge the contribution that Service Centres can make in terms of being appropriate locations to accommodate levels of housing and employment development. 	
RN913 William Davis	Vision should be extended to 2026.	
RN918 Wilson Bowden and David Wilson Homes Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	Disagree Vision should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make reference to providing sufficient housing as set out in RSS (15 year housing requirement) • Refer to east of Thurmaston rather than the north of Hamilton/ Thurmaston to be in line with the rest of the Core Strategy. • Make specific reference to employment development being directed to Thurmaston on the edge of Leicester as part of comprehensive proposal because it is specifically referred to in Draft core Policy 3. 	
RN1293 Loughborough Gospel Hall Trust Agent: J & J Design	Disagree The Vision is unsound because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains laudable aims and objectives but is lacking in clarity and over detailed; • Unclear how the overall Vision relates to the Community Strategy Vision. 	
RN1347 Charnwood Liberal Democrat Councillor Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise the need to create a strategic plan for Charnwood which balances the need for homes, facilities and work for us and our children, with the need to protect the environment. • Oppose providing for people moving into Charnwood with no connection to the services provided for the local people and the economic well being of the electorate. • Reject future additional housing allocations that are not based within its limits. 	
RN06 D B Street, RN16 M Hall, RN17 E Goodyer, RN22 P Tame, National Farmers' Union, RN25 M P Parker, RN27 A M Clarke, RN30 C F A Sutton, RN48 J Lambert, Rearsby Parish Council, RN50 C Moon, RN52 P H Ball, RN57 F E Norburn, RN97 A Davis, RN146 Y W Hannell, RN147 J Heath, Thrussington Parish	Agree.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
<p> Council, RN179 S Bradwell, RN221 D Howard, Friends of Charnwood Forest, RN284 A C Wood, RN293 B J Butler, RN324 N Richards, RN328 K Appleby, RN335 P J Thrope, RN346 J R Cheshire, RN348 S J Tinning, RN354 C Leafe, RN355 J Booth, RN356 I Harrison, Wanlip Parish Meeting, RN408 E A Goodson, RN409 L Tillen, RN461 R Hoyland, RN477 P Moxon, RN521 S James, Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Parkers of Leicester & A J Paker, RN542 G Hobbs, RN543 S F Hobbs, RN607 M Lear, RN611 P Raja, RN612 C Humphreys, RN613 P Chamberlin, RN618 H Knight, Birstall Parish Council, RN797 J Thompson, RN798 M Eagland, Peacock & Smith on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc, RN799 A H Olofsson, RN802 T Higgins, </p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN805 D F Bodicoat, RN806 A Kay, RN807 R Francis, RN820 J E Mutton, Loughborough College, RN821 L Emmitt, RN895 J C Pearson, RN896 D Patel, RN908 M C Dimitrov, RN1294 R A Dickson, Groby Parish Council, RN1295 J A Shields		
RN19 C Emmet, RN24 J L Mitchell, RN39 A Gardner, RN54 P J Morrall JP, RN58 S Myers, RN128 C J Keeling, RN345 A B Kidger, RN360 C M Spencer, RN467 L Foster, Seagrave Parish Council, RN478 C J Blanchard, RN516 M West, RN720 JJ Sutherlandington, RN791 R A Gough, Gough Planning Services on behalf of Revelan Group, RN893 F J Howgate , RN1297 J Ridewood, RN31 G Brown,	Agree Strongly.	
RN18 M Bellatrix, RN37 N L Sharpe, RN59 K R Senior, RN129 R Bowman, RN171 P A Bland, RN339 J Noon, CPRE Charnwood,	Disagree.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
RN361 P A Higgins, RN480 F L Cooper, RN481 J Thompson, RN603 R C Jones, RN609 S L Batson, RN621 T & C Malone, RN795 J Faulks, Normanton on Soar Parish Council, RN800 A M Ward, Mather Jamie on behalf of Hamilton Trustees, RN812 A Millie, RN900 Gill, RN901 K Canner, RN911 N Harris, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Mr J Barber,	
RN21 P&E Coughlin, RN23 A Rumsey, RN28 M S Smith, RN35 A Evans, RN41 J Sutton, RN60 G & P Allen, RN275 P S Newman, RN277 P Scott, RN347 M J Hagger, RN465 D Baker, RN469 J Green, RN474 J A Carter, RN522 J Holmes, Holmes Antill, RN549 P G Hipkin, RN605 M Flatman, RN606 G A F Locke, RN608 J M Neal, RN610 A Norman, RN614 E Harding, RN620 M Smallman, Del-Rosa Developments Ltd,	Disagree Strongly.

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN714 L Needham, The Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group Committee, RN792 Popley Family, RN814 N Booth		
RN20 L Bates, RN26 D J Hourston, RN106 C W Askham, RN338 R Singh, RN349 A Aucott, RN350 D Aucott, RN351 C Sweeney, RN353 S J Doyle & R K Stephenson, RN545 A Wells, RN604 E H Sinclair Goulden, RN818 A Radley, RN822 F Hitchinson, The Woodland Trust, RN823 D E Sykes, RN897 David Mear, RN903 T H Davies, RN904 A Corner, RN1296 J Folkes	Neutral/Not Sure.	