

CORE STRATEGY

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RELATING TO: SECTION 3 - THE LOCATIONAL STRATEGY

QUESTION 5: To what extent would you agree with the suggested settlement hierarchy?

QUESTION 6: If you disagree, what changes would you suggest?

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN13 D Ayres	Disagree Mapping such hierarchies is acceptable, but the logic of extrapolating and locating the so-called Preferred Approach from such a map is hard to see. The proposals seem to accept unnecessarily regional and national objections to a self-contained development on such a site.	
RN14 D Liggins	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Croxton, Swithland, Newtown Linford etc are not geographically part of North Charnwood • Suggest EIA of preferred options • Need explanation why previous options disregarded 	
RN22 National Farmers Union	Neutral/Not Sure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with para 4.18 • Farmsteads that are in centre of villages should be allowed to/ encouraged to redevelop and to move out of villages. People don't want to see working farms in the middle of villages. 	
RN42 KE, DL & S Carnall	Neutral/Not Sure Need to expand facilities where development is proposed and not just expand urban areas.	
RN135 Grace Dieu and Garendon Estates Agent: Savills	Support aim of concentrating most of new development within and adjoining Loughborough. Will help strengthen the area's role as the primary sub regional centre.	
RN275 Paul Newman	Disagree Strongly Development should be scattered across the whole borough.	
RN328 K Appleby	Agree It is not clear what restrictions if any would apply to Service Centres. Concern that settlements such as Barrow, Sileby, East Goscote and Syston lack infrastructure and may have difficulty from ad hoc development.	
RN342 P Breakwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that longer-term thought, beyond the piecemeal approach is required. • Disappointed that almost half of the proposed development is on Greenfield sites. Every possible usage should be made of brown field sites. 	
RN347 M Hagger	Neutral/Not Sure Don't understand settlement hierarchy (planning jargon).	
RN438 G Wilson	Disagree Difficult to comment until it is known what the various settlement levels have planned. Any development that 'fills in the gaps' between existing settlements will destroy local separate identities.	
RN452 D Snartt (Councillor)	Concerned about Service Centres in the settlement hierarchy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development that has already taken place within these Service Centres without the infrastructure to keep pace with the 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>residential development such as highways where this also has a knock on effect on adjoining villages;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All residential schemes seem to be taken in isolation in planning terms; • Carry out a coherent assessment of individual Service Centres before any more development is directed to these centres. 	
<p>RN455 Trustees of Prestwold Estate Agent: The Peter J. Purton Consultancy</p>	<p>Trustees, who are substantial landowners (maps included with submission), major employers in and around settlements east of Loughborough and whose activities make a significant contribution to the local economy, have developed their own Core Strategy to establish priorities in respect of their responsibilities. This is founded on 4 basic principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conservation, preservation and enhancement of the principal house Prestwold Hall listed Grade 1 and its associated buildings; 2. Maintenance and improvement (currently in difficult conditions) of the quality and integrity of the Prestwold Estate's mainstream agricultural business which extends over 2500 acres; 3. Implementation, where local policies permit, of a sound policy of diversification in order to make best use of resources – particularly those no longer associated with 2.; 4. Constructive management of the derelict former wartime airfield at Wymeswold. <p>An essential element is that local policies should provide opportunities from time to time to identify and utilise assets generating 'enabling development' which can sustain that strategy. Need to recognise the potential of Cotes, Hoton, Wymeswold and Burton-on-the-Wolds for enabling development to sustain their objectives and enhancement providing an overall benefit to communities.</p> <p>Cotes is not an unsustainable settlement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential identified by indicative Masterplan (included with Submission); • Enjoys the benefit of a regular bus service on the A60 through the middle of the village • Benefits from a Public House and licensed restaurant; • Closer to Loughborough railway station than Loughborough college and linked to the station by a permanent footpath – a 5 minute walk; • All services are available but drainage system improvement would be sought as part of any infrastructure development. <p>Hoton's sustainability is not in question. An indicative Masterplan (included with Submission) shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing and potential community benefits could be provided; • The Trustees could be proactive, in terms of land within their control, provide positive relief for the village from the current unsatisfactory highway and road safety conditions. <p>Wymeswold. An indicative Masterplan (included with Submission) proposes extension to the industrial estate which will bring additional local employment opportunities and the opportunity for improvements to the local highway network.</p>	
<p>RN456 Leicestershire County Council</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the approach of dividing the Borough into North and South as this is consistent with the Structure Plan. • Support the preferred hierarchy of settlements as it is consistent with the Structure Plan. • Support the proposed service centres as these fulfil much the same role as rural centres in the Structure Plan. <p>The existing network of libraries and mobile library service within Charnwood of significance and should be taken into account particularly in relation to Draft Core Policy 1: Settlement Strategy. There are already established libraries in communities ranked at levels i) and ii) within the proposed settlement hierarchy in North and South Charnwood.</p>	
<p>RN457 N Pratt</p>	<p>Do not disagree totally but allocating all new build to present urban areas is not always as logical as it might seem. Continuous population growth inevitably leads this strategy to:</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminate the green spaces and wedges separating urban settlements Compromise the living standards of the majority. 	
RN458 FKl Plc Agent: NAI Fuller Peiser	<p>Support the Settlement Hierarchy and Draft Core Policy 1 in principle. Agree that Loughborough should be recognised as a sub regional centre in North Charnwood. Loughborough is considered to be the most sustainable location for new development as one of the main urban areas of the Borough, with good transport links.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should encourage the majority of new development in locations within or adjoining Loughborough / Shepshed, Birstall, Thurmaston and other locations adjoining the Leicester Principal Urban Area. These are considered to be the main urban areas of the Borough and thus the most sustainable location for new development, as required in national and regional planning policy.</p> <p>Support the priority given to the development of previously developed land and buildings in Draft Core Policy 1. However, it is considered that a higher more aspirational target should be set in the Policy for all additional housing to be developed on previously developed land and buildings. Although this target is set for the Borough at a regional level, it is a minimum target. The Core Strategy should actively promote as high a proportion of new housing on previously developed land and buildings as possible. This would encourage the more sustainable use of land through the beneficial and regenerative reuse and redevelopment of vacant and under utilised sites across the Borough.</p>	
RN460 Environment Agency	<p>Target of 52% of all additional housing to be developed on previously developed land should not be prescriptive so as to result in inappropriate development taking place in areas where environmental constraints would otherwise preclude development. The target should not necessarily need to be achieved on all sites.</p>	
RN465 D Baker	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overestimated amount of house building. Look at alternatives such as developing Wymeswold airfield. Council are not putting up enough Greenfield alternatives or town centre living. 	
RN467 Seagrave Parish Council	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Settlements must be sustainable. Key facilities must include a general store/post office.</p>	
RN471 R Guise	<p>Agree</p> <p>Agree with settlement hierarchy but not with the need for any new development, especially on Greenfield sites.</p>	
RN480 F Cooper	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Directing development towards larger towns, such as Loughborough, leads to the gradual inclusion of villages close to those large towns creating conurbations. The villages then lose their identity. Development should be within Loughborough.</p>	
RN516 Margaret West	<p>Large warehouses should be allocated space on industrial purpose built sites. These employ relatively few people and are a blot on rural areas. Thurmaston is an example of a village blighted by industry.</p>	
RN517 Loughborough University Agent: GVA Grimley LLP	<p>The University is pleased to see that of the growth strategies available, Policy 1 seeks to direct the majority of new development to locations within or adjoining Loughborough, Shepshed, Birstall and Thurmaston.</p>	
RN522 Holmes Antill	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wymeswold functions as a Service Centre, for Hoton, Rempstone, Wysall, Willoughby and surrounding area, and should be 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>accorded that status. It accommodates a primary school, local shops – general store and butchers – pharmacy, village hall, community sports facilities and a major employment site within walking distance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Woodhouse Eaves in the Forest area should also be a Service Centre. The current list of Service Centres is essentially self contained communities. • Smaller towns and villages must be allowed to participate in economic growth, environmental enhancement and an opportunity to provide homes and jobs in close proximity in order to bolster a sustainable lifestyle, including a reduction in the need to travel. 	
RN542 G Hobbs	<p>Neutral/ Not Sure Generally agree but consider Wymeswold as a Service Centre. Barrow and Sileby are surely insufficient to be the only Service Centres in the Wolds part of Charnwood.</p>	
RN543 S Hobbs	<p>Neutral/ Not Sure Consider Wymeswold as a Service Centre for Wolds settlements especially if redevelopment of the airfield is undertaken.</p>	
RN607 M Lear	<p>Neutral/ Not Sure Very little development beyond infilling. No development outside village limits in small villages. Protect Greenfield areas and areas of particularly attractive countryside for future generations.</p>	
RN615 R E Davies on behalf of St Michael and All Angels, Thurmaston	<p>Disagree Strongly Scope for modest development of previously developed land in Thurmaston to support services and local needs. Britannia way site looks dilapidated and could be suitable for development for housing or light industry. Nearer the village the crisp factories and warehouses are not attractive and may have surplus space suitable for other uses.</p>	
RN618 Birstall Parish Council	<p>Disagree</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birstall should not be included in the Leicester principal urban centre. Whilst geographically Birstall may fit this description physically it does not, being divided from the city. The character is almost entirely residential and the village is otherwise surrounded by countryside and rural landscape. The only village employment is in retail and education. • Dividing Charnwood into north and south areas appears unsubstantiated unless provide for in Structure Plan. One unified area seems more appropriate. • Birstall is not part of a main urban area but is a residential village. 	
RN620 Del Rosa Developments Ltd	<p>Disagree</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Small scale” development in villages has not helped meet local housing demand or provide local employment. Developments needed to maintain viable and vibrant villages. Specific references made to Mountsorrel (site adjacent Granite Way for B1 & B2 uses as Rothley Lodge does not provide for small/medium businesses) and Wymeswold. • Wymeswold should be a service centre as it has all the requirements of para 4.9 and serves other villages such as Hoton, Rempstone, Willoughby and Wysall. 	
RN659 GOEM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCP 1 South Charnwood (i) should make clear Birstall and Thurmaston are part of the Leicester PUA. • DCP1 North / South (iii) should include key facilities identified at para 4.9 as policy otherwise a case could be made for other facilities as qualifying criteria, or for rejecting proposed criteria as not significant enough to be key services. • Unclear what a “significant Class B employment site” is, why it is a measure of local employment opportunities, or in what respect 3km constitutes walking distance. • Unclear why three “key” facilities, which could be met without any education, shopping or public transport facilities, is critical threshold for further growth. This could lead to unsustainable outcomes, with development occurring at settlements which later fail to sustain the necessary service base, or being inappropriately promoted in other settlements with unsustainable service provision. Better to specify settlements qualifying under criteria (iii), and those that do not. 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be difficult to sustain at appeal applications for conversions, brownfield schemes, and possibly even for infills in settlements outside criteria (i), (ii) or (iii). Need to explain status of these settlements. • The meaning of 'small scale development' permissible at category (iii) settlements is not clear. • The policy lacks any clear targets despite reference to an indicator of the % of new development directed to category (i) and (ii) centres in the monitoring framework. 	
RN661 A C Johnson	The proportion of development on brownfield sites should be far higher than 52%. Charnwood have done very well so far in Loughborough. Keep going!	
RN713 East Midlands Regional Assembly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Core Strategy provides a clear and succinct summary of the options and makes strong reference to RSS8. The Preferred Options demonstrate a sequential approach to the allocation of land for future development with regeneration of brownfield sites seen as a particular priority. There is therefore demonstrable accord with RSS8 Policies 2 & 3. 	
RN714 Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shepshed should be a Service Centre and not part of the Loughborough Sub Regional Centre. 	
RN723 Marrons on behalf of A Keogh and Marrons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presume three settlement categories have been devised and defined using criteria at para 4.9 and list of key services and facilities • Most settlements in Charnwood are 'Other Settlements' and therefore unlikely to benefit from any new development as they are at the bottom of the sequential test. • Noted that Rural Centres would be inappropriate and unnecessary as such designations would be damaging to the 'form and character of the settlement' (para 4.18). However para 4.18 states that 'the strategy should allow for limited small scale development in keeping with the level of services and facilities and the character of these rural communities to meet local needs for affordable housing and to support rural services' • Draft CP 1 does not support this as all development is focused in Loughborough/ Shepshed, Birstall and Thurmaston or then locations adjoining Service Centres. Only small scale development ' to meet an identified local need may be accommodated within or adjoining other settlements with 3 or more key facilities/ services.' • This policy does not provide for any development in larger settlements not designated as Service Centres unless local need is identified. There is no definition of local need. • Suggest additional category of Rural Centres covering villages containing most key services and facilities: Woodhouse Eaves, Queniborough, Wymeswold, Burton on the Wolds, Newtown Linford, Rearsby, Thrussington, Barkby, Cossington, Cropston, Seagrave and Walton on the Wolds. Within these settlements there should be no constraints on development within the defined limits to development. According to 'Developing a Settlement Hierarchy for Charnwood' all have at least 5 of the types of desired services and commonly have multiple examples of some facilities. • Beneath this should be a fourth category of 'Other settlements' : Thurstaston, Swithland, South Croxton, Ratcliffe on the Wreake, Hoton, Wanlip, Cotes, Woodhouse, Barkby Thorpe, Beeby, Prestwold and Ulverscroft. Within these settlements smaller scale development should be permitted within the limits as there are opportunities for some growth. Otherwise they will decline, illogical to seek to protect community facilities if other policies undermine ability to sustain them. • Limits to development need to be clearly defined for both categories to limit any development. • The proposed hierarchy is overly simplistic and too restrictive. • Local Need. <p>Draft CP 1 indicates that small scale development may be permitted to meet an identified local need within or adjoining settlements with 3 or more key facilities/services. However there is no definition of 'local need' and it is not clear what test</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>must be passed to show a proposal meets this need, and on what basis it may (will?) be accommodated.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies between guidance. At para 4.18 that small scale development should be allowed to meet local needs for affordable housing <i>and</i> to support rural services'. Draft CP 2 and 3 set out the policy for north and south Charnwood 'to provide for limited small scale development... to meet identified local needs, particularly for affordable housing <i>or</i> to support local services and facilities.'</p> <p>Any housing in a village will bring additional support for local shops and other facilities. In essence any house meets a local need by making local facilities that bit more viable. Does this justify the policy? If not what is needed?</p> <p>Similarly transformation of a brownfield site may amount to local need.</p> <p>Is development subsidizing affordable housing acceptable?</p> <p>In the absence of clear guidance there is likely to be interpretation with subjectivity by the person reading the policy, whether a planning officer, committee member, inspector etc. The proposed approach provides insufficient guidance to applicants and no certainty to the planning process and requires clarification of what is and is not a local need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exception sites <p>At p46 para 4.77 the CS supports the release of 'exception sites' which it is hoped will meet the rural need for affordable housing. This is flawed as such sites do not come forward – none have come forward in Charnwood for many years. It is not appropriate to address rural housing needs in this way.</p> <p>CS needs to acknowledge that for any affordable housing to come forward in rural areas some degree of cross subsidy is needed for economic viability.</p>	
<p>RN726 Fisher German on behalf of Rearsby Ltd</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Overall support for the Core Strategy with majority of development focused on Loughborough and areas on edge of Leicester. However concerns about limited references to rural areas forming most of Charnwood and over detailed housing figures.</p>	
<p>RN728 R Youngs</p>	<p>Disagree strongly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed hierarchy unlikely to achieve sustainable communities. Better to develop in settlements well served by public transport including Rothley, Mountsorrel, Quorn, Syston, East Goscote and Hathern. Extension of some larger small villages would be beneficial and help reduce travel and promote sustainability: Barrow, Sileby, Quorn, Rothley, Mountsorrel, East Goscote, Syston, Anstey, Newtown Linford, Cropston, Thurgaston, Hathern and Woodhouse Eaves Hard to live in some villages if you rely on public transport. Need inter village bus routes to reach community education facilities, Soar valley centre etc. No evidence that urban concentration of development is more sustainable. New housing areas not well served by public transport. 	
<p>RN739 Bell Cornwell Partnership on behalf of Merlion Capital Corporation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for CS and in particular the proposed hierarchy at para 4.10 is supported as reflecting the distribution of settlements. However object to inconsistency between draft CP 1 identifying Services Centres, which is supported, and draft CP3 where certain Service Centres – Anstey & Syston - in south Charnwood appear to be identified as higher order District Centres. This could prejudice the reasoned consideration of locations in Service Centres not identified as District Centres at the site allocation stage. Supports approach art para 4.5 as this location is close to Leicester and is defined as a settlement well served by public transport on the A6 corridor. The separation of Rothley and Mountsorrel into south and north Charnwood does not reflect close proximity. Their combined population supports very wide range of facilities and needs adequate development to support them. 	
<p>RN741 GVA Grimley on</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No clear vision about the future of Service Centres and too many inconsistencies. Whilst the supporting text to a number of 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
behalf of Jelson Ltd	<p>policies acknowledges benefits of development at Service Centres the policies appear to severely limit prospects for development. CS needs to allow for sensitive and sustainable development and not just affordable/ local needs housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate balance between development in urban areas and Service Centres in DCP1. Policy suggests Service Centres will be preferred locations for development after preferred urban locations. Supporting text suggests only development that cannot be accommodated in main urban locations will be allowed in Service Centres. • DCP1 should simply state that the majority of new development will be directed to preferred urban locations. • Need to recognize scope for Service Centres to be extended logically and sensitively too facilitate better services or sustain existing provision. 	
RN742 Redrow Homes	<p>The Central Leicestershire policy area should provide the primary focus in the settlement hierarchy as the key location for development in the County.</p> <p>Whilst a high priority should be given to allocating suitable brownfield sites Greenfield site releases should not be withheld as they will need proper planning and brownfield sites may not in any case emerge.</p> <p>Support DCP1 but seek reference to 'locations adjoining the Leicester urban area' as the first priority locations in south Charnwood. Birstall and Thurmaston should be defined as Service Centres being separate from the City, particularly Birstall.</p>	
RN793 L McGunnigle	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>Brief is too broad and general:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No protection of villages – loss of character and identity would follow. Balance proposed between North and South Charnwood. 	
RN794 N Browne	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Shepshed should not be bracketed with Loughborough - it is a distinct community and should remain so. It should have a separated development plan. There is a feeling that Shepshed is treated as a poor relation to Loughborough and the needs of Shepshed people are not listened to.</p>	
RN796 T Stott	<p>Neutral/ not Sure</p> <p>Broadly agree with the hierarchy but have concerns over the low weighing given to windfall and small sites allowance in the calculation of housing units needed on major sites. There is an issue of hierarchy in suggesting adding to the main urban areas.</p>	
RN799 A H Olofsson	<p>Generally agree with hierarchy, but a very flexible approach has to be taken. Decisions should be made from case to case. There is a risk that Service Centre settlements could be developed out of proportion to health care and other services.</p>	
RN802 T Higgins	<p>Generally agree but have reservations concerning rural settlements. Ruling out development unless certain facilities already exist, denies the fact that villages must have some scope to grow in order to maintain viability.</p>	
RN803 Antony Aspbury Associates on behalf of G I Sanders, G L Sanders, T D Sanders & D Kettle	<p>Amend Core Policy 1 to delete paragraph 4 and include reference to the Service Centres in paragraph 3 to recognise the sustainable role Service Centres can play in providing a range of housing.</p>	
RN804 A Irving	<p>Much it makes sense, but expansion proposals and sites strike me as changes that are likely to so alter the character and appearance of our area that it will start to lose its attraction. Local people like the size and scale of the settlements and the services from the Council fit well within these. Bigger may not mean better. Big communities for 20 or so weeks and then vacant places.</p>	
RN806 A Kay	<p>Loughborough/Shepshed should not be treated as a single Sub-Regional Centre, as this creates the impression that they form a single settlement paving the way for infilling the land between them to create a conurbation. It is contrary to policies on areas of separation between settlements. Loughborough should be the Sub-Regional Centre and Shepshed a Service Centre or small Sub-Regional Centre.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN807 R Francis	Quorn should not be a service centre.	
RN812 A Millie	Coalville may be a better site for a lot of the development than Loughborough	
RN813 P Knott	Aiming for 52% rather than the already low 60% brownfield development not in environmental best interests of Charnwood. Wrong and short sighted to build on undeveloped sites to achieve sustainable communities. It will alter character of area and spoil area for future generations.	
RN814 N Booth	Soar Valley villages of Mountsorrel, Quorn, Barrow and Birstall have or will have had massive expansion already and cannot take any more development on greenfield land over and above existing commitments if their rural character is to be preserved.	
RN816 S Cuff Nanpantan Residents' Network	Shepshed is at least as important as Barrow upon Soar, Hathern, Mountsorrel, Quorn or Sileby, it should be a Service Centre in its own right. We do not trust the motives for fudging the obviously separate settlements of Loughborough and Shepshed.	
RN821 L Emmitt	In addition to the tree areas identified, West Loughborough, Birstall and North of Hamilton. I think Wymeswold and Wymeswold Airfield should be developed into a substantial Service Centre. This would reduce the pressure on Loughborough.	
RN891 A Cooper & JM Hornbuckle	Agree that residential development should be directed towards Birstall but consider that 'adjoining Birstall' includes land in the vicinity of Wanlip which is an appropriate location for development.	
RN893 FW Howgate	Protect character and boundaries of rural settlements, particularly the Wolds villages, from potential development.	
RN899 Langham Park Developments	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 as a Service Centre.	
RN903 T Davies	<p>Suggest a viable village –is one that has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A least one pub, shop, post office, doctor, church and community centre; • 600 inhabitants (30 years ago 200 may have been viable but for whatever reason -cars, supermarkets, TV, internet – more are needed); • Provides employment; • Community spirit, reducing travel and so congestion <p>Piecemeal approach - Perhaps insufficient houses have been bolted on to the smaller villages in the past.</p>	
RN906 R I Porter	<p>Given that 52% of new homes have been provided on previously developed land as opposed to national target of 60% should be looking at the number of potential brownfield sites in Charnwood.</p> <p>The Plan may not be in line with national planning policy in terms of the use of brownfield sites for student accommodation. This is a wasted opportunity to achieve housing that counts towards government objectives.</p>	
RN910 Leicestershire County Council – Property Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete references to Shepshed as a Sub-Regional Centre given that it is not identified as such by RSS8 and include Shepshed as a Service Centre. • The settlement hierarchy is unclear as to how much development should be accommodated in the Sub-Regional Centre compared to the Service Centres. To meet affordable housing needs across the Borough moderate levels of housing growth should be directed to Service Centres such as Quorn. 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN911 J Barber, Woodcock Farms Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete references to Shepshed as a Sub-Regional Centre given that it is not identified as such by RSS8 and include Shepshed as a Service Centre. • The settlement hierarchy is unclear as to how much development should be accommodated in the Sub-Regional Centre compared to the Service Centres. To meet affordable housing needs across the Borough moderate levels of housing growth should be directed to Service Centres such as Sileby and Rothley. 	
RN912 Radleigh Homes & Messers Clarke Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete references to Shepshed as a Sub-Regional Centre given that it is not identified as such by RSS8 and include Shepshed as a Service Centre. • The settlement hierarchy is unclear as to how much development should be accommodated in the Sub-Regional Centre compared to the Service Centres. To meet affordable housing needs across the Borough moderate levels of housing growth should be directed to Service Centres such as Mountsorrel. 	
RN914 Bloor Homes	<p>The settlement hierarchy for South Charnwood is unsatisfactory as it does not properly relate to the Central Leicestershire Policy Area.</p> <p>Settlements situated within the Central Leicestershire Policy Area (as designated by the Structure Plan) should be designated as a group of Service Centres and provision made for growth in this general location. No settlement in the CLPA functions individually given their proximity to one another and to the main urban area and are closely related in terms of access to services, facilities and employment.</p>	
RN916 Martin Robeson on behalf of Persimmon Homes, North Midlands	<p>Para 2.10 - Object to wording to 'Strategic Context' regarding East Midlands Plan; it should be made clear that land requirements in Core Strategy are estimates. The decreasing relevance of the Structure Plan should be made clear. Similar point is made re: para 4.31.</p> <p>Para 2.19 – Object. Make clear that a review of housing in the Regional Spatial Strategy is currently underway.</p> <p><u>Level of Growth Issues</u></p> <p>Para 3.2 (ii) - Object to growth option 1a, 1b and 1c as this would fail to ensure that Charnwood provides a range of adequate housing for its population. Similar concern are raised in relation to problems of low housing growth and current low completion rates with reference to para 4.26. In reference to para 4.27 it is recommended that growth should reflect latest Government and household projections.</p> <p>4.33. Objection to expected completions from large site permissions and remaining allocations. It is considered that a robust discount factor should be applied to expected completions, small sites and windfall allowances in order to determine a more accurate 'balance to be found'.</p> <p>Completion rate for south Charnwood is too low and assumes a trend based growth and belief that there should be greater flexibility should be built into the Council's figures.</p> <p><u>Objections to Settlement Hierarchy: Service Centre</u></p> <p>Object to the intention only for 'small scale growth' in the smaller towns and villages which could compromise the achievement of housing targets in Charnwood. The statement should refer to appropriate scale growth, and refer to the intrinsic link with public transport accessibility, access to employment opportunities, and existing services and facilities in terms of accessing sustainability.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>(Similar references are made in respect of local Service Centres and 'appropriate levels of development in paras 4.5, 4.9, 4.18, 4.21)</p> <p>Para 4.2 Object. Broad support for sequential approach to development, but would benefit from reference to sustainability criteria, as a strategy of urban concentration may not always be the most sustainable location.</p> <p>Para 4.5 There is an indication of apparent contradiction on rural centres. Referred to in 4.5, but at odds with statement in 4.7 that there are no settlements in Charnwood that function as rural centres. Suggest para 4.5 be reworded to 'service centres will be identified for appropriate scale growth to help safeguard important local services'.</p> <p>Para 4.9 Remove reference to 'those smaller rural settlements' and replace with 'those service centres'.</p> <p>Para 4.9 Objection: consider that 6th bullet point should be deleted as it is considered that regularity of bus services is more significant than walking distance.</p> <p>Para 4.11 Immediately after the statement 'around 52% of new homes will be provided on previously developed land' suggest the insertion of 'which will therefore require the identification of sustainable greenfield sites for residential development.'</p> <p>4.18 Object to this paragraph and suggest that 'The strategy should allow for appropriate scale development in keeping with the level of services and facilities'</p> <p>4.21 Object: This should refer to 'appropriate scale development' in relation to local needs.</p> <p>4.43 Support for locating majority of development in North Charnwood, but object to the overt reliance on urban extension to meet housing requirements, which does not fit easily with comments made in para 4.8 as being the most sustainable solution. Similar point is raised in relation to para 4.45 and residual amount should be diverted to Service Centres. These points are raised in relation to both north and south Charnwood.</p> <p>4.52 Make reference to a range of factors limiting growth in the northern periphery of Leicester, and not just highway capacity.</p>	
<p>RN918 Wilson Bowden and David Wilson Homes</p> <p>Agent: Pegasus Planning Group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete references to Shepshed as a Sub-Regional Centre given that it is not identified as such by RSS8 and include Shepshed as a Service Centre. • Concern is raised in relation to small-scale development to meet an identified local need. Concern that there is no definition of what small scale development would consist of. Further details are needed. • Support the view in para 4.20 that tight control over Greenfield land could mean that housing supply is constrained. 	
<p>RN1293 Loughborough Gospel Hall Trust</p> <p>Agent: J & J Design</p>	<p>In the absence of any overriding national, regional or county policy for priority locations for new development, support the 'business as usual' approach subject to comment about sustainable communities, diversity, equality and associated issues.</p> <p>Improved community provision should not be limited to opportunities from new developments. Current provision deficits need a positive policy intervention to provide guidance for community provision in the absence of any specific site allocation and to recognize that the 'business as usual approach will not meet known local needs. The Core Strategy should provide guidance in line with the 8 essential components of sustainable communities (Securing the Future. DEFRA, 2005)</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
RN15 M Birkinshaw, RN16 M Hall, RN17 E Goodyer, RN25 M P Parker, RN27 A M Clarke, RN30 C F A Sutton, RN31 G Brown, RN50 C Moon, RN52 P H Ball, RN54 P J Morrall JP, RN57 F E Norburn, RN59 K R Senior, RN147 J Heath, Thrussington Parish Council, RN179 S Bradwell, RN197 R W Hill, RN294 D Ross, RN335 P J Thrope, RN339 J Noon, CPRE Charnwood, RN345 A B Kidger, RN348 S J Tinning, RN354 C Leafe, RN356 I Harrison, Wanlip Parish Meeting, RN419 M Hall, RN462 R Frudd, Indigo Planning Ltd on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd, RN481 J Thompson, RN521 S James, Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Parkers of Leicester & A J Paker, RN546 K Davies, Fisher German on behalf of Mr Rutherford,	Agree.

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN547 Ka 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, RN605 M Flatman, RN606 G A F Locke, RN613 P Chamberlin, RN712 C Potts, Hephher Dixon Ltd on behalf of Loughborough Golf & Hotel Development, RN744 S Mitchell, RN790 P Froggatt, RN798 M Eagland, Peacock & Smith on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc, RN800 A M Ward, Mather Jamie on behalf of Hamilton Trustees, RN805 D F Bodicoat, RN810 N Morgan, RN811 C T Watson, RN892 A Cooper, M W Hornbuckle & J M Hornbuckle, RN895 J C Pearson, RN907 R Hall, Andrew Martin Associates on behalf of Persimmon plc & William Davis Ltd		
RN19 C Emmet, RN24 J L Mitchell, RN39 A Gardner, RN48 J Lambert,	Agree Strongly.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
<p>Rearsby Parish Council, RN58 S Myers, RN128 C J Keeling, RN142 E E Jones, RN143 R Wym Jones, RN293 B J Butler, RN360 C M Spencer, RN408 E A Goodson, RN461 R Hoyland, RN478 C J Blanchard, RN619 N Jones, Anstey Parish Council, RN720 J J Sutherland, RN791 R A Gough, Gough Planning Services on behalf of Revelan Group, RN817 T N Birkinshaw, RN824 A Hubbard, The National Trust, RN893 F J Howgate, RN908 M C Dimitrov, RN1295 J A Shields, RN1297 J Ridewood</p>		
<p>RN06 D B Street, RN37 N L Sharpe, RN56 A W G Ballentyne, RN171 P A Bland, RN349 A Aucott, RN355 J Booth, RN374 J Wilson, RN409 L Tillen, RN468 S N Templeman, RN545 A Wells, RN603 R C Jones, RN609 S L Batson, RN614 E Harding,</p>	<p>Disagree.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN616 H D Robinson Sharratt, RN617 C D R Sharratt, RN620 M Smallman, Del-Rosa Developments Ltd, RN661 Alan C Johnson, RN788 S Bullman, RN902 J & L Blyth, RN905 R J N Brown,		
RN18 M Bellatrix, RN23 A Rumsey, RN28 M S Smith, RN36 M C Dolby, RN41 J Sutton, RN49 Lang, RN60 G & Pa Allen, RN154 J R Cowell, RN277 P Scott, RN337 N Porter, RN353 M S J Doyle & R K Stephenson, RN469 J Green, RN477 P Moxon, RN549 P G Hipkin, RN792 Popley Family, RN815 RA Parsons, RN894 D Stott	Disagree Strongly.	
RN08 N W King, RN20 L Bates, RN26 D J Hourston, RN35 A Evans, RN45 B A Fox, RN106 C W Askham, RN129 R Bowman, RN166 F A E Reece, RN284 A C Wood, RN324 N Richards, RN338 R Singh, RN346 J R Cheshire,	Neutral/Not Sure.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
RN350 D Aucott, RN351 C Sweeney, RN361 P A Higgins, RN611 P Raja, RN621 T & C Malone, RN795 J Faulks, Normanton on Soar Parish Council, RN797 J Thompson, RN801 F F Rawson, Frank F Rawson on behalf of FFR Ultrasonics Ltd, RN808 D M Evans, RN818 A Radley, RN820 J E Mutton, Loughborough College, RN822 F Hitchinson, The Woodland Trust, RN823 D E Sykes, RN890 Cl A Clegg, RN896 D Patel, RN900 Gill, RN901 K Canner, RN1294 Rd A Dickson, Groby Parish Council, RN1296 J Folkes,	