

CORE STRATEGY

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RELATING TO: SECTION 2 - THE OBJECTIVES

QUESTION 3: To what extent would you agree or disagree with the objectives of the Charnwood 2021 Core Strategy?

QUESTION 4: If you disagree, what changes would you suggest?

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN13 D Ayres	Disagree Strongly SO1-SO6 the objectives are commendable, but the Core proposals cannot do much to advance them nor do they justify the need for a further Science Park with so much space in 2 existing science/technology sites and the former British Gas research centre being unoccupied for so many years	
RN14 D Liggins	Disagree SO1 – Need SPD to ensure empty shops taken by retail uses not bars, and new shops have more human scale than, for example The Rushes.	
RN15 M Birkinshaw	Neutral/Not Sure Lip service is paid to sustainability in a plan for counter-sustainable, massive growth.	
RN22 National Farmers Union	Agree Particularly agree with SO6 on rural enterprise and farming.	
RN31 G Brown	Agree Strongly SO5- What is a “quality job”? seems to be an unhelpful distinction. Need to promote employment not just for those with higher qualifications.	
RN36 M C Dolby	Disagree Concern that villages are losing their identities and merging together	
RN41 J Sutton	Disagree Strongly Rethink the whole plan.	
RN45 B A Fox	Neutral/Not Sure Enable bus users to buy only one ticket from source to destination regardless of number of services involved	
RN49 Mrs Lang	Neutral/Not Sure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on large stores in Loughborough means poor stores for consumers. Need small unusual businesses • Do not destroy green belts for housing that limits walks and accessibility. Better to have footpaths and open fields than contrived parkland. 	
RN56 A W G Ballentyne	Disagree The objectives seem externally imposed.	
RN94 L A Briers	Disagree Strongly More details needed.	
RN129 Prof R Bowman	Neutral/Not Sure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development in town centre and surrounding neighbourhoods needs to be mixed and integrated with community rather than led by developers/ student accommodation. 	
RN154 J R Cowell	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO4-need to finely balance needs of inward business investment and promotion of tourism. Too much concentration on the business/ Science Park side may overlook the other – farming, tourism, crafts etc 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need more support for responsible citizens otherwise those less responsible may spoil community and environmental aims. 	
RN171 Beeby Parish Meeting	Disagree Broadly agree other than 3.7 SO13 reference to development east of Thurmaston and north of Hamilton	
RN197 R W Hill	Agree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Council really follow SO8? Fancy bus shelters are no alternative to facilities such as toilets open when buses run, or services that go where people need them – for example the town centre. Cycle facilities are too often poorly designed, poorly built and more dangerous than using the road or inconvenient and conflict with pedestrians. Need to be brave and provide good facilities that do not just get cyclists off the road. 	
RN409 L Tillen	Disagree Not certain there is a need to keep developing. We are losing local and regional identities. Not against change but not for changes sake.	
RN438 G Wilson	Neutral/Not Sure SO13 – Disagree with concentrating most new development in existing urban areas. SO15 – No indication is given of the safeguards to protect the separate identity of the local towns and villages.	
RN452 D Snartt (Councillor)	Endorse the main objectives of the Core Strategy.	
RN453 S Rasiaah	Minor changes suggested to spatial objectives, aimed at celebrating the differences and similarities of communities and places in order to contribute to the development of community cohesion through spatial planning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> S09 – ‘to create safe, healthy, accessible, <i>cohesive</i> and distinct places for people by encouraging the quality, <i>local identity through community involvement</i>, and sustainable design and construction.’ (this could be delivered through the % for art policy on major developments, where local culture, and identity and built heritage is celebrated to provide a sense of place and belonging). S015 – ‘to protect, <i>enhance and celebrate</i> the built heritage and <i>unique</i> separate identities of the Borough’s locally distinctive towns and villages.’ S017 – ‘to protect, <i>enhance and celebrate</i> the distinctive landscapes, in particular the Charnwood Forest and <i>development</i> of the National forest. For the objective on Social inclusion it would be helpful to consider how this will be done? e.g. S07 – ‘To address social exclusion and reduce deprivation in those parts of the Borough identified as areas of relatively higher need including Loughborough, Shepshed, the Soar Valley villages and South Charnwood <i>by developing integrated spatial responses to the needs of these areas that include aspects of leaning, employment, health, crime reduction, livable spaces and positive activities and spaces to engage the communities.</i>’ (this would link well with the new community strategy too). 	
RN456 Leicestershire County Council	Leicestershire Library Service provides focal venues for local communities. The Service’s priorities include: supporting and promoting learning, literacy and reading for pleasure; providing access to information and on-line services; providing an inclusive service that reflects and helps to build cohesive communities; and providing library premises that meet the needs of 21 st century communities. As such Library Service objectives correspond to the following well being aims contained within Charnwood Borough Council’s Community Strategy 2003: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve learning, skills and employability To promote social inclusion To develop leisure and culture opportunities and are also relevant to the following Core Strategy objectives:	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO1 to sustain and enhance Loughborough town centre as a successful, attractive and vibrant destination for shopping, entertainment and leisure as well as a place to live • SO2 to ensure that there is a network of vibrant district centres so residents have access to a range of shops, services and facilities • SO7 to address social exclusion and reduce deprivation in those parts of the Borough identified as areas of relatively higher need including Loughborough, Shepshed, the Soar Valley villages and South Charnwood. 	
RN458 FKI Plc Agent: NAI Fuller Peiser	<p>Support SO5. The Core Strategy should provide access to quality jobs and improved standards of life by safeguarding key sites and creating opportunities for new high quality employment. Request that LDF policies safeguard the FKI site from new development that may have a detrimental impact on its operations, in recognition of its role as an important employment site in the Borough.</p> <p>Support SO13. Agreed that the Core Strategy should seek to concentrate most new development in the main urban area of Loughborough and give priority to previously developed land. This is in-line with national and regional planning policy, ensuring the most sustainable use of land.</p>	
RN460 Environment Agency	Support the natural and built environmental objectives SO12, SO13, SO16 and SO18.	
RN462 Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd Agent: Indigo Planning Ltd	Agree Support SO1 subject to clarification that the Sainsbury's store will continue to be formally recognised as an integral element of the defined Loughborough Town Centre. This reflects the positive contribution that the store makes to the vitality and viability of the centre.	
RN467 Seagrave Parish Council	Disagree SO17 – Include the Wolds.	
RN471 R Guise	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with SO3 and SO13 as there is no need for new housing; • Agree with SO8 and SO17 although this should only apply to all rural landscapes. 	
RN504 A R Thistleton	<p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <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; • 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. 	
RN517 Loughborough University	<p>The University are keen to support the following Spatial Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO1 – Loughborough town centre; • SO3 – development needs; 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Agent: GVA Grimley LLP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO4 – raising the Borough profile; • SO5 – creating employment opportunities; • SO8 – sustainable transport; • SO12 – prudent use of natural resources; and • SO13 – development strategy. 	
RN518 W English	The core strategy and objectives were generally fine sentiments, with which one would not argue but add reference to protection of the landscape of the Soar Valley flood plain as well as Charnwood Forest and the National Forest.	
RN522 Holmes Antill	Disagree Amend SO6 to: To support and positively encourage a thriving and diverse, sustainable rural economy through initiatives involving the redevelopment and replacement of existing buildings, and the introduction of new buildings on previously developed land.	
RN616 H D R Sharratt	Agree Consider noise and nuisance affecting houses near employment land and along roads to town centre.	
RN617 C D R Sharratt	Neutral/Not Sure Most objectives appear sound but achieving some notably S08, SO15, S016 will be difficult.	
RN619 Anstey Parish Council	Agree Strongly SO14 needs to provide the basis for reducing the impact of traffic in settlements close to Leicester.	
RN620 Del Rosa Developments Ltd	Disagree Strongly SO6 needs to be expanded to ensure rural businesses are provided to meet needs of villages for jobs in light industry and office parks and help reduce car use.	
RN621 Mr & Mrs T Malone	Agree Objectives SO13 and SO15 are not met if development takes place in vicinity of Nanpantan.	
RN659 GOEM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information from local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership may identify levels of crime as an issue needing to be addressed • No supporting evidence to identify the student issue and how this might influence content of SO10 and DCPs 13 & 14. Needs of the student community do not appear to have influenced the policy approach. 	
RN661 A C Johnson	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO2 If this means villages, just what part does CBC play at all in this? If it means more shopping malls.....no thanks! • SO6 Support agricultural diversity how? (Fine words) • SO7 What "social exclusion & deprivation" exists in the Soar Valley villages and what would CBC do to alleviate it. • SO17 Protect distinctive landscapes – agreed, but you omitted Garendon Park <u>in its present form</u>. 	
RN662 English Heritage	SO15 & 17 should seek to "protect <i>and enhance</i> " the built heritage and distinctive landscapes. "Built heritage" should be replaced by "historic environment" to reflect the varied nature of resources.	
RN713 East Midlands Regional Assembly	There is strong concurrence between regional core objectives as set out in Policy 1 of RSS8 and the Core Strategy.	
RN714 Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group	Agree Apart from SO13 for which alternatives need to be sought.	
RN728	Not sure.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
R Youngs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO1 'as well as a place to live' seems an afterthought. Better quality of life is one key principles • SO2 add 'and so that decrease need to travel in that there are employment opportunities in different sectors of employment in the larger villages' • SO3 must include flats of all types so there is higher density housing • SO5 does 'improved standards of life' safeguard quality of life? • SO7 Does increased development in these areas address social exclusion and less deprivation? • SO8 reductions in distances traveled by car needs better local services and employment. If all in Loughborough cannot make people use bus and often may require travel on two routes. • SO9 should cover the Wharf development • SO10 mixed balanced communities is good in principle but landlords cant be forced not to rent to students • SO11 use legal agreements to secure public transport access • SO13 More housing in Loughborough could make social exclusion and deprivation worse. Better to increase housing in other places to help improve bus services, shops etc • SO14 Integrated schemes require direct access, eg through a town centre rather than longer routes around. • SO15 could this mean repairing listed buildings and renovating disused factories 	
RN744 S Mitchell	<p>Neutral/Not Sure</p> <p>Concerned about the extent to which SO7, SO8 and SO10 are achievable.</p>	
RN792 J Drummond Popley, C Drummond Popley, R J Drummond Popley	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>Businesses are closing down and there is not enough work in Charnwood already. Resources are already stretched eg traffic systems, water supplies and reclamation of all types ie sewerage and refuse both industrial and domestic.</p>	
RN793 L McGunnigle	<p>Disagree</p> <p>More detail and emphasis is needed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charnwood's natural and built environment" • protecting separate identities in distinctive villages; • protecting distinctive landscapes. <p>Large-scale projects such as this have the strength and power.</p>	
RN796 T Stott	<p>Neutral/Not Sure</p> <p>We have concerns over a number of these as stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO1 - 'as well as place to live' sounds like an after thought - better quality of life should be central to the strategy. • SO2 - add 'and in larger settlements to employment opportunities' - We should be more determined to protect these. 	
RN798 Peacock & Smith on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets Ltd	<p>Agree</p> <p>Broadly, but in implementing the objective of reducing travel by car the Council should take into account the practical difficulties of carrying out certain activities by public transport, walking and cycling. For example, use of the car for the bulky food shopping trip has become the norm.</p>	
RN802 T Higgins	<p>Agree</p> <p>Generally, but certain of the spatial objectives need amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO8 - The sentiments here expressed can only meet with partial success, and the needs of the community would be better served by ensuring free flow of traffic (thus reducing pollution) with convenient parking. 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN803 Antony Aspbury Associates on behalf of G I Sanders, G L Sanders, T D Sanders & D Kettle	Disagree Amend SO13 to recognise the role Service Centres can play in providing a range of housing.	
RN808 D Evans	Disagree The Strategy should set overall objectives for the Borough which can then be later translated into locational choices. To do this now undermines the opportunities for input into the options.	
RN811 C Watson	Disagree Most of the objectives are reasonable, but question the expansion of business	
RN812 A Millie	Disagree Strongly Agree with many points but some appear incompatible. SO13 states priority for development will be to use previously developed land. However, the planned Science Park (SO3) is on greenfield land. This is incompatible with SO17.	
RN814 N Booth	Neutral/Not Sure Support the objective to restrict piecemeal housing development in existing villages but plan for 2 more strategic sites but this is spoilt by overdevelopment of greenfield sites for industrial use.	
RN816 S Cuff Nanpantan Residents' Network	Disagree Strongly SO3 has very little to do with the real needs of local people, the university and businesses, it is simply a sop to John Prescott's misguided 'predict and provide' policy.	
RN824 National Trust	Agree Support the Objectives, but suggest the following improvements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO17 – All landscapes potentially add to local character and distinctiveness, not just those of specially recognised, wider, value. It is important that all development is located and designed in a way that respects landscape character in accordance with assessment work as referred to in PPS7 and the relevant detailed guidance provided by the Countryside Agency/Scottish Natural Heritage. <i>A wording such as 'To protect the special and distinctive qualities of all landscapes, and to pay special attention to impacts upon the more widely recognised and important landscapes associated with Charnwood Forest, and to support the National Forest Strategy.'</i> is recommended. • SO18 – Give a stronger commitment to securing a 'step change' in the levels of bio-diversity. • Add an additional Objective seeking quality in design in new development in accordance with RSS Policy 4. 	
RN894 D Scott	Disagree Strongly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO3 – Delete 'including a new science park at Loughborough'. • SO8, SO9, SO11 – Strongly support. • SO17 – Include Garendon Park as a protected area. 	
RN899 Langham Park Developments	Disagree SO13 - Remove reference to Shepshed as being part of the Sub-Regional Centre as RSS8 does not refer to Shepshed as a defined Sub Regional Centre. Add reference to the role of Service Centres, including Rothley in meeting the Borough's development needs.	
RN905 R Brown	Disagree Good statement but marred by SO13 that prejudices the issue and contradicts SO15.	
RN906	Neutral/Not Sure	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
R I Porter	Can state objectives but not achieve them. Implore that affordability of housing, the need to balance out communities, cutting down car travel, sustainable development and communities is kept in mind. This has not happened in central Loughborough where families have been forced out and Roseberry School closed.	
RN907 William Davis Ltd & Persimmon PLC Agent: Andrew Martin Associates	Agree Support Objectives.	
RN911 J Barber, Woodcock Farms Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO3 should refer to the need to meet the housing requirement for Charnwood as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. • SO13 refers to Shepshed as a Sub-Regional Centre. Given that it is not identified as such by RSS8 this reference should be deleted. SO13 does not refer to the role of Service Centres in meeting the Borough's development needs. Add reference to the Service Centres, including the role of Sibley and Rothley as locations to accommodate new housing development. 	
RN912 Radleigh Homes & Messers Clarke Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO3 should refer to the need to meet the housing requirement for Charnwood as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. • SO13 refers to Shepshed as a Sub-Regional Centre. Given that it is not identified as such by RSS8 this reference should be deleted. SO13 does not refer to the role of Service Centres in meeting the Borough's development needs. Add reference to the Service Centres, including the role of Mountsorrel as locations to accommodate new housing development. 	
RN918 Wilson Bowden and David Wilson Homes Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	Disagree SO3 should refer to the need to meet the housing requirement for Charnwood as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO13 refers to Shepshed as a Sub-Regional Centre. Given that it is not identified as such by RSS8 this reference should be deleted. • SO13 should refer to growth on the edge of Loughborough rather than being in the main urban centre. 	
RN1293 Loughborough Gospel Hall Trust Agent: J & J Design	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO7 – acknowledge the need to address social exclusion and deprivation throughout the Borough, not limit to specific deprived areas. • SO10 - place greater emphasis on access to a full range of public, private, community and voluntary services. This issue extends beyond the extent and distribution of student accommodation; • SO11 – include places of worship and cemeteries as key community facilities. <p>Council should have regard to in terms of community facilities such as places of worship and cemeteries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPS1 paragraphs 16 and 42 (ODPM, 2005) • 'Working Together: Co-operation between Government and Faith Communities (Home Office, 2004); • Diversity and Equality in Planning (ODPM, 2005) 	
RN1347 Charnwood Liberal Democrat Councillor Group	Support the intention to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reserve the Soar and Wreake valleys for conservation and public enjoyment; • Prepare the Borough to benefit from the 2012 Olympics with more public open space and sports facilities • Build better designed houses with a requirement for at least 10% of their energy generated from renewable resources; 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more woodlands and tree planting especially in the Forest area; • Preserve villages and focus development in urban areas and brownfield sites; • Designate Garendon deer Park into an official Country Park managed for wildlife and the public. 	
<p>RN06 D B Street, RN16 M Hall, RN17 E Goodyer, RN26 D J Hourston, RN27 A M Clarke, RN48 J Lambert, Rearsby Parish Council, RN50 C Moon, RN52 P H Ball, RN57 F E Norburn, RN97 A Davis, RN147 J Heath, Thrussington Parish Council, RN179 S Bradwell, RN284 A C Wood, RN324 N Richards, RN328 K Appleby, RN335 P J Thrope, RN339 J Noon, CPRE Charnwood, RN346 J R Cheshire, RN348 S J Tinning, RN354 C Leafe, RN355 J Booth, RN356 I Harrison, Wanlip Parish Meeting, RN419 M Hall, RN461 R Hoyland, RN477 P Moxon, RN516 M West, RN521 S James, Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Parkers of Leicester & A J Paker, RN542 G Hobbs,</p>	<p>Agree.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
<p> RN543 S F Hobbs, RN546 K Davies, Fisher German on behalf of Mr Rutherford, RN547 K Davies, Fisher German on behalf of Mr C J Wells, RN548 K Davies, Fisher German on behalf of Mr D Johar, RN604 E H Sinclair Goulden, RN606 G A F Locke, RN607 M Lear, RN612 C Humphreys, RN613 P Chamberlin, RN726 W Young, Fisher German on behalf of Rearsby Ltd, RN788 S Bullman, RN790 P Froggatt, RN791 R A Gough, Gough Planning Services on behalf of Revelan Group, RN794 N Browne, RN797 J Thompson, RN799 A H Olofsson, RN800 A M Ward, Mather Jamie on behalf of Hamilton Trustees, RN804 A Irving, RN806 A Kay, RN807 R Francis, RN810 N Morgan, RN815 R A Parsons, RN817 T N Birkinshaw, RN891 A Cooper & J M Hornbuckle, RN892 A Cooper, M </p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
W Hornbuckle & J M Hornbuckle, RN895 J C Pearson, RN896 D Patel, RN904 A Corner, RN1294 R A Dickson, Groby Parish Council, RN1295 J A Shields, RN1296 Joan Folkes		
RN19 C Emmet, RN24 J L Mitchell, RN25 M P Parker, RN39 A Gardner, RN54 P J Morrall JP, RN58 S Myers, RN59 K R Senior, RN128 C J Keeling, RN142 E E Jones, RN143 R Wym Jones, RN146 Y W Hannell, RN293 B J Butler, RN294 D Ross, RN345 A B Kidger, RN360 C M Spencer, RN408 E A Goodson, RN478 C J Blanchard, RN481 J Thompson, RN720 J J Sutherland, RN893 F J Howgate, RN908 M C Dimitrov, RN1297 J Ridewood	Agree Strongly.	
RN18 M Bellatrix, RN37 N L Sharpe, RN42 Carnall Family, RN166 F A E Reece, RN275 P S Newman, RN353 S J Doyle & R K Stephenson, RN361 P A Higgins, RN374 J Wilson, RN465 D Baker,	Disagree.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN468 S N Templeman, RN480 F L Cooper, RN609 S L Batson, RN614 E Harding, RN795 J Faulks, Normanton on Soar Parish Council, RN813 P Knott, RN821 L Emmitt, RN900 Gill, RN902 J & L Blyth		
RN21 P&E Coughlin, RN23 A Rumsey, RN28 M S Smith, RN35 A Evans, RN60 G & P Allen, RN337 N Porter, RN347 M J Hagger, RN420 A W Lacey, RN421 A Dalzell, RN469 J Green, RN549 P G Hipkin, RN605 M Flatman, RN608 J M Neal, RN610 A Norman, RN615 R E Davies, St Michael of All Angels	Disagree Strongly.	
RN08 N W King, RN20 L Bates, RN30 C F A Sutton, RN106 C W Askham, RN221 D Howard, Friends of Charnwood Forest, RN277 P Scott, RN338 R Singh, RN349 A Aucott, RN350 D Aucott, RN351 C Sweeney, RN545 A Wells, RN603 R C Jones,	Neutral/Not Sure.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
<p> RN611 P Raja, RN618 H Knight, Birstall Parish Council, RN712 C Potts, Hepher Dixon Ltd on behalf of Loughborough Golf & Hotel Development, RN801 F F Rawson, Frank F Rawson on behalf of FFR Ultrasonics Ltd, RN805 D F Bodicoat, RN818 A Radley, RN820 J E Mutton, Loughborough College, RN822 F Hitchinson, The Woodland Trust, RN823 D E Sykes, RN890 C A Clegg, RN897 D Mear, RN898 D C Toone, RN901 K Canner, RN910 G Lees, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Leicestershire County Council </p>	