

CORE STRATEGY

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RELATING TO: SECTION 4 - DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE GROWTH: NORTH CHARNWOOD - ALTERNATIVE DIRECTIONS FOR GROWTH

QUESTION 9: If you disagree with the preferred directions, please identify which alternative you would prefer.

QUESTION 10: Please explain your reasons for choosing one of the alternatives.

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN06 D Street	Emphasis on brownfield sites. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further development of east and south east Loughborough (Nottingham Rd-Empress Rd-A6) • Incentives for sustainable businesses on business parks (hi-tech and R&D on environmental issues) 	
RN07 E Goodyer	Reduce pressure of Greenfield sites by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain a landbank of brownfield sites in Council and private ownership, made available to developers. The Borough Council developing sites in partnership with the developers, rather than reacting to planning applications. • Identify in-fill opportunities, including moderate in-fill to enable controlled expansion of low priced/low rent properties • Build at high density. High density areas should have a mix of tenures and ownership. Target all industrial sites along Canal and River Soar and plan for their removal with housing.	
RN13 D Ayres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build on brownfield sites. Development of a site such as Wymeswold Airfield, reduces the levels of motorway noise on residents, air pollution, increased car traffic and irreparable damage to the ecology and ancient park. • Build appropriate new accommodation within walking distance of town centres throughout the Borough 	
RN14 D Liggins	East of Loughborough could be developed with adequate flood alleviation measures. Development here could enhance views of town by rail and road Greenfield locations at Barrow, Hathern and Sileby would not involve areas of green wedge. South of Nanpantan Road in APAC could be justified on same basis as Science Park south of A512.	
RN15 M Birkinshaw	Make better use of land within Loughborough, especially brownfield	
RN18 M Bellatrix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Find more of the required new housing, in existing brownfield sites within Loughborough and existing settlements • Create/reclaim run-down areas and brownfield sites. These would be more suitable for the sort of housing that seems to be required - cheap, low maintenance housing for working people • Bear in mind that the university is increasing its Halls of residences and aiming to take 1000-1500 students out of rented accommodation. 	
RN21 P & C Coughlin	East of Loughborough and then Larger settlements. These areas could be extended without causing major increased urbanisation of Loughborough and Shepshed causing them to gradually becoming a single settlement - not withstanding the imminent inclusion of Hathern within Loughborough.	
RN23 A Rumsey	Build on brown sites only.	
RN28 M S Smith	Put development north of Loughborough.	
RN35 A Evans	Every possible use must be made of brownfield land to reduce pressure on beautiful, inspirational, wildlife rich green fields.	
RN36	East of Loughborough and then North of Loughborough (as well as other listed options):	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
M C Dolby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer locations away from major road routes • Concern about ability to meet extra demands for water, utilities, healthcare, roads, schools and police • Huge increases in pollution from HGVs and traffic from developments. 	
RN37 N L Sharpe (and on behalf of R Truslove, Ms A Sharp)	Develop eastern parts of East Midlands and other areas of Leicestershire.	
RN38 M Sadler	If the size of development is a new community, consider creating a new community in the north east of the county where the main A46 runs. A new village could have its own shops, school, doctors etc and the A46 would provide good access to Leicester, Nottingham and Lincoln for employment and other facilities.	
RN41 J Sutton	There are sufficient empty warehouses on established industrial estates and empty houses in the centre of Loughborough and surrounding areas.	
RN42 KE, DL & S Carnall	Locate development in Charnwood Forest and at Wymeswold Airfield and not just at Loughborough, Shepshed, Birstall, Thurmaston.	
RN 49 Mrs Lang	<p>North of Loughborough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better links to airport • Better links to M1 with less cars travelling south to Leicester so reducing congestion • Roads in south of Borough unable to cope with existing traffic • Use already developed sites and develop the City fully first 	
RN54 P J Morrall JP	Larger settlements tend to be overlooked or not made a possible priority.	
RN56 A W G Ballentyne	<p>Other locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimise spoiling of Greenfield sites by redeveloping unused land in the town for new homes in small parcels • Road infrastructure in Loughborough is scarcely able to handle existing traffic seems unwise to expand town. 	
RN59 K R Senior	<p>Around Shepshed, then East of Loughborough (and other options):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of open land between Shepshed and M1 would provide more people to use Shepshed town centre which is underused at present • All Greenfield land in Garendon Farm estate between Loughborough and Shepshed should remain as it is in agricultural use or revert to scrub • Stapleford Park is adequate for residents of west Loughborough • Development west of Loughborough should be restricted to Science Park restricted to area between A512 and green wedge next to Charnwood Forest. <p>Brownfield sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of inner Loughborough is presently derelict and should be redeveloped for housing. • No development to expand in direction of Hathern until all brownfield sites in Loughborough used, notably land at Clarence St and former railway sidings. 	
RN94 L A Briers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put the environment first • Question who wants all these dwellings. Have all brownfield sites and empty homes been used? 	
RN105 H Hall	Land east of Loughborough behind Brush Engineering works on disused land would be preferred.	
RN 128	Around Shepshed and then North of Loughborough:	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
C J Keeling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the most part infrastructure already exists. East of Cotes is virgin territory. 	
RN129 Prof R Bowman	<p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> South of Loughborough between A6 and Grange park development. 	
RN135 Grace Dieu and Garendon Estates Agent: Savills	<p>In terms of West of Shepshed you should note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the edge of a major settlement that already contains a wide range of local services; High standard of accessibility Well located relative to existing and proposed employment areas; Extra population growth could support regeneration Generally consistent with regional and structure plan strategy. 	
RN154 J R Cowell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need more detail on alternatives to be able to comment on them. If there is genuine need for more housing and services in north Charnwood an area south / east of Loughborough towards Quorn or on the Quorn to Hathern north to south approaches in a better position between Leicester, Derby and Nottingham. However admit to a lack of knowledge and strength of feeling in relation to any areas. Other areas ruled out may benefit from further research. Reconsider a new settlement at Wymeswold airfield. 	
RN179 S Bradwell	<p>Around Shepshed, then Larger settlements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too much development being directed towards Loughborough Other settlements offer opportunities for sustainable development Greater proportion of housing and employment should be directed to Soar valley settlements to support existing services and facilities. Might also help reduce congestion in Loughborough. 	
RN197 R W Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Villages need facilities (leisure, youth, education, health, public transport) to cope with thousands of houses already built. 	
RN314 Mr & Mrs Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing housing stock in the centre of town will be freed up as more students accommodated on university campus. Develop Brownfield sites in town. 	
RN321 Mr & Mrs M D Radford	<p>Reduce the number of student houses in town. Increase the number of apartment blocks that are within easy walking distance of employment and facilities. Make more use of derelict industrial sites.</p>	
RN333 J R Healey	<p>Allow villages to grow. To allow children to live close to their parents, and to allow elderly to move to more appropriate housing near to people they know.</p>	
RN355 J Booth	<p>Around Shepshed and then North of Loughborough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shepshed has good road structure, but needs money spent on the town centre If sufficiently large employment and housing were built this may improve Shepshed town centre. Shepshed is already a town and would not affect village balance. Shepshed a dormitory town and would help development in that area. 	
RN361 P A Higgins	<p>Wymeswold airfield is a more sustainable longer term development. There are a lot of vacant industrial buildings around Loughborough. Do we really need more?</p>	
RN369 A Maddocks	<p>Propose to have smaller development spread across the Borough.</p>	
RN374 J Wilson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Putting the proposed housing development in Wymeswold is a better option as first choice in addition to development at 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>Cotes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These two locations have a good road infrastructure. 	
<p>RN409 L Tillen</p>	<p>Around Shepshed or East of Loughborough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of roads • Science and business park • Loss of local identity <p>Commercial development south of Loughborough will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduce/eliminate the green wedge protecting Quorn; • clog the local and trunk roads. <p>Should be sites near to M1 for better control.</p>	
<p>RN419 M Hall</p>	<p>Cotes would be an extension of Loughborough as it has easy access to the station – need for more roads of course.</p>	
<p>RN420 A Lacey</p>	<p>Wymeswold airfield is a brownfield site.</p>	
<p>RN421 A Dalzell</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land East of Loughborough and South of Loughborough is underdeveloped. • Wymeswold airfield is a brownfield site. 	
<p>RN438 G Wilson</p>	<p>Should plan for a new settlement for 10,000 homes and a new community over 30 years rather than in fill and concentration.</p>	
<p>RN449 M Trickett</p>	<p>Disperse building throughout the Borough rather than concentrate huge numbers in one spot.</p>	
<p>RN456 Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>Neither of the rejected options for the distribution of new greenfield development is consistent with the Structure Plan.</p>	
<p>RN465 D Baker</p>	<p>Site at Wymeswold airfield is ideal. Look at bypass around Hathern. Road traffic is poor in that area. How many deaths will it take?. The current planned junction onto Pear Tree Lane is woeful. Look at alternatives such as developing Wymeswold airfield. Council are not putting up enough Greenfield alternatives or town centre living</p>	
<p>RN467 Seagrave Parish Council</p>	<p>Eastern Gateway provides the opportunity to develop an area. It is next to the railway and already earmarked for development.</p>	
<p>RN469 J Green</p>	<p>Shepshed residents would welcome more businesses including a science park. This would help to improve the local economy and reduce the need for people to travel to Loughborough for work and shopping.</p>	
<p>RN471 R Guise</p>	<p>No development. No directions. However, if development north of Quorn, your development and green wedge are back to front. Development is best alongside road, leaving fields free.</p>	
<p>RN472 D Mizen</p>	<p>Consider combining the expansion of adjoining Boroughs to create a new town either to the west in old mining areas or at Wymeswold airfield.</p>	
<p>RN473 D Carter</p>	<p>Develop brownfield site at Wymeswold airfield for 20 hectares of employment land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve green wedge between Loughborough and Quorn; 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage developer to contribute to cost of new improved road link to A46; • Encourage bus companies to provide services to new site; • Local villages have access to employment areas without having to work in Loughborough. 	
RN474 J Carter	<p>Develop brownfield site at Wymeswold airfield: Existing roads could be upgraded by developers if necessary to offer varying routes for raw materials and finished goods from employment land via A46/A6006 using J24 and J21 of M1; Provide accessible job opportunities for local villages; Help to maintain Green Wedges.</p>	
RN477 P Moxon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrate the employment land together in one area as has been argued for the housing development. Extend Belton Road/Derby Road industrial estate. This would give more critical mass to maximise economies of scale, infrastructure etc. • Larger settlements – building up to the M1 would not materially affect the area as much as joining another village to Loughborough. • East of Loughborough - more room towards Cotes so more development could be accommodated and could be joined to Belton Road. 	
RN480 F Cooper	Expansion outside of Loughborough is not necessary. Accommodate the required homes by redevelopment of brownfield and infill sites. Brownfield sites within Loughborough can accommodate the extra housing without impacting on the surrounding areas.	
RN481 J Thompson	<p>Around Shepshed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closer to road links and M1; • Closer to science park and university; • Shepshed needs enhancing. 	
RN482 D Walker	<p>Alternative: Develop flatted accommodation within walking distance of the town centre such as five storey flats at Empress Road and Station sidings area.</p>	
RN502 P J Kinch	Use Wymeswold airfield or locations where development is already taking place, such as Rothley Lodge, for employment land.	
RN516 M West	<p>Around Shepshed and then North of Loughborough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit from future growth as it is a run down area with little facilities; • Would easily blend in with Loughborough to its advantage. 	
RN521 Parkers of Leicester & AJ Parker Agent: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd	Agree in principle with Strategy, but give greater emphasis to land south of Loughborough as a means of providing balanced, sustainable growth.	
RN526 C & M Adkin	Land off Shepshed Road has been land banked should be considered for building. The housing would dovetail into the village unobtrusively and not create a total blot on the landscape twice the size of Hathern at the moment. Must also be land suitable in other villages which could be considered for development.	
RN603 Mr & Mrs R Jones	Look to land East of Loughborough for homes and work. Cotes/ Wymeswold has a large airfield which could be developed to benefit the community rather than building on greenfields forming gap between Loughborough and Quorn.	
RN606	Around Shepshed and then North of Loughborough:	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
G A F Locke	Shepshed has first class access to M1 and will be close to development west of Loughborough.	
RN607 M Lear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land adjacent to Mountsorrel quarry road opposite Budgens and up to quarry entrance • Completely retain the nine sixteenths of a mile gap between Loughborough and Quorn. • Additional employment areas not needed as surrounded by heavy industry – quarry, British Gypsum, Rothley Lodge etc • As unemployment below national average Greenfield sites should not be needed. 	
RN608 J M Neal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop round Wymeswold airfield and improve access to the east helping remove disruption at times Soar floods making access difficult into Loughborough; encourage better medical cover serving east of county without need to travel to Loughborough and Leicester; provide better shops for Wolds villages • Towns need green wedges to enable access to countryside without need to travel to Bradgate Park, Beacon Hill, Outwoods adding to pollution. 	
RN609 S L Batson	<p>Prefer North of Loughborough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location north of Loughborough would mean people travelling to Leicester, Nottingham and Derby could use M1 and not congested A roads. • Use derelict land in Loughborough for industry instead of greenfields. 	
RN611 P Raja	<p>Around Shepshed and then North of Loughborough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shepshed has a lot of amenity close by to help it be expanded. 	
RN612 C Humphreys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mention made of current Loughborough town centre sites (Hospital, Wharf) which should be used first for affordable housing and not student accommodation. Sensible use of these sites would reduce the need for Greenfield sites. • Concern about large scale Greenfield developments is lack of infrastructure. Large scale development between Loughborough and Shepshed would lead to significant increases in congestion on the A512 already a traffic blackspot. Housing would be more than 2km from the town centre so most people would use cars for trips to shops etc. 	
RN614 Mr & Mrs E Harding	Use Wymeswold airfield.	
RN616 H D R Sharratt	Cotes option could include reuse of old buildings in east of town avoiding use of Greenfield sites and with access via rail and bus.	
RN617 C D R Sharratt	<p>East of Loughborough and then North of Loughborough:</p> <p>Main reason for disregarding a new settlement option is cost. Cheap options will be preferred if it suits.</p>	
RN620 Del Rosa Developments Ltd	Cotes new village should be considered	
RN661 A C Johnson	<p>Other – Wymeswold airfield and then East of Loughborough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the BPB site, one of the largest generators of road & rail freight in the region, using low frequency routes out towards the A46, and causing little cost and few problems to other communities. With modest infrastructure investment this can be applied to the East of Loughborough and around Wymeswold and Prestwold. • There is an argument for establishing community based on Wymeswold Airfield. Turn a problem child into a solution! And attempt to qualify for ODPM points by taking this kind of path. 	
RN716 Mr & Mrs B Needham	New settlement could be found within Wymeswold.	
RN728 R Youngs	In the larger settlements - already have local facilities accessible by walking and cycling. In some cases bus travel is an option.	
RN740	About 12 ha Land north of Ashby Rd, east of Shepshed is considered to be suitable for employment related uses. The northern part	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Signet Planning on behalf of William Davis Ltd	of the overall 20ha site would be retained as open land given topography and landscape quality. This location is well related to the Loughborough/ Shepshed sub regional centre and adjacent to established housing suggesting a sustainable solution more likely to reduce car based travel. Being close to an urban area and having good transport links would provide for locational demands of businesses. The east of Shepshed option should be added to CS Policy 2.	
RN741 GVA Grimley on behalf of Jelson Ltd	Larger settlements - the Preferred option may not be most sustainable as claimed in Sustainability Appraisal. Outlying areas of large development areas may be no better served by public transport and no closer to facilities and main centres than sites within and adjacent to Service Centres. Need to explain in detail why 1800 houses are proposed west of Loughborough.	
RN788 S Bullman	Other locations and then larger settlements are preferred. The flood plain should NOT be used for development. Comments on priority of Green wedge development is given in Section 7.	
RN790 P Froggatt	East of Loughborough and then Larger Settlements: • There are existing brown field sites in this area and would have lesser impact on the environment than a westward expansion.	
RN792 J Drummond Popley, C Drummond Popley, R J Drummond Popley	• Other – Brownfield Sites: ○ Building only on brownfield sites with more flats built rather than houses as the government states first time buyers like flats. These would take up less room than houses and would still satisfy most of the requirements. ○ There are many houses vacant within Charnwood that are not selling already. Any old council properties should be upgraded and any long term vacant industrial properties should be looked at as potential dwellings. • Relocate rest somewhere such as Lincolnshire where there is a need for housing, jobs and improvements to the infrastructure.	
RN793 L McGunnigle	North of Loughborough and then Around Shepshed: Greater effort should be placed on using existing land to be regenerated rather than ruining more countryside. Once land is built on it is lost forever. The infrastructures of Loughborough and Shepshed are better suited to sustain further development.	
RN796 T Stott	Wherever it goes it would have to be sustainable.	
RN801 FF Rawson on behalf of FFR Ultrasonics Ltd	Use Wymeswold airport area for industrial and a new settlement: • Gives a sustainable area in the future; • Does not destroy the separate identities of the villages in the Soar valley. More development will erode their physical separation. • Is sustainable for the requirements after 2021. • Other location s all the villages are very near to physically joining the next one.	
RN803 Antony Aspbury Associates on behalf of G I Sanders, G L Sanders, T D Sanders & D Kettle	Land to the north of Barrow-upon-Soar (at Cotes Road) is considered suitable for residential development. Details of have been provided previously.	
RN805 D F Bodicoat	Around Shepshed and then East of Loughborough: - Shepshed is already a large centre of population and the M1 forms a barrier between integrating it with Loughborough. In any case, the local landowner has been offering Garendon Park for development for many years and it is inevitable that this will happen.	
RN807 R Francis	Around Shepshed and then East of Loughborough: Quorn is a village. Developing between Loughborough and Quorn will mean that Quorn disappears - this will have a disastrous effect on house price and put unbearable pressure on the excellent village facilities	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	noticeably St Barts school.	
RN811 C Watson	It is unfair to play one area against another.	
RN812 A Millie	Other and then Around Shepshed: Other towns notably Coalville would be both possible and desirable as a growth area. Loughborough may be able to cope with 'limited' growth. Otherwise risk ruining character as a small market town in a location attractive to investors.	
RN813 P Knott	Other and then North of Loughborough: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop in Loughborough on brownfield sites and create a sustainable urban area. • Growing outwards in a pincer movement from Loughborough and Leicester will destroy the area putting pressure on Rothley, Quorn and Mountsorrel. • The proposition is based on a false premise. • Need to make clear the links between employment and housing, the relationship between the needs of people and types of employment. Need to take a wide view on quality of life to embrace art and culture, the environment and genuine sustainability. Providing a park by an environmentally damaging massive building programme is a joke. 	
RN814 N Booth	Around Shepshed and then East of Loughborough: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent the Soar Valley becoming just urban sprawl. • Apart from the proposed science park disagree with the need for new industrial development on greenfield land. 	
RN815 R Parsons	Around Shepshed and then Other: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider employment locations close to the motorway as they have excellent transport links and use land that is unattractive for housing. • Larger settlements such as Sileby which has lost local employment could benefit from new businesses. 	
RN816 S Cuff Nanpantan Residents' Network	Larger Settlements and then Other: Significant brownfield, low grade agricultural and poorly-used industrial land is available in these areas. Dispersed development will take the pressure off Loughborough, whilst at the same time giving these settlements the critical mass to attract much better-quality shops and services than is now the case.	
RN817 T Birkinshaw	Other and then Around Shepshed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better use of brownfield and greenfield land within Loughborough • South of Loughborough has taken a lot of building in recent years, there is not much land left • Roads are busy and public transport and cycling is poor, except on Leicester Road. 	
RN818 A Radley	Larger Settlements - This would distribute development so that these places could develop self-sustaining amenities, removing the pressure on Loughborough town and environs.	
RN821 L Emmitt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West of Shepshed rather next to the M1. • Suggest the wedge of land between Burleigh Wood and Nanpantan Road, should not form part of the science park, but be given to residential development. • It is not desirable that a major residential development should be very close to a motorway. There is potential for significant development between Shepshed and Belton without impacting the beauty of Charnwood Forest. 	
RN825 G P Francis	Expand Loughborough in directions that would not encroach on surrounding villages	
RN890 C Clegg	Take into account the needs of local villages and communities. Creating large areas of employment/industry etc will have an adverse effect on current facilities	
RN894	Wymeswold airfield:	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
D Scott	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flat land easy to develop; Will require similar additional roads but could be easily linked to A6. <p>Part of the Land being allocated to an extended science park (south of A512).</p>	
RN895 J Pearson	<p>Other and then Around Shepshed: Intensify appropriate land use within the areas already partly consumed including brownfield sites.</p>	
RN897 D Mear	<p>Other and then North of Loughborough: Develop near new rail station (Parkway) on the mainline by the power station and airport. Could provide links between the airport and railway.</p>	
RN902 J & L Blyth	<p>Wymeswold Airfield is the best place for new development. No mention of Woodhouse.</p>	
RN903 T Davies	<p>Use smaller settlements and make them viable by bringing them to the size of larger settlements.</p>	
RN904 A Corner	<p>North of Loughborough and Around Shepshed: Despite potential flooding issues, there is significant land North of Loughborough that could be developed without losing the identity of Hathern.</p>	
RN905 R Brown	<p>Develop at Wymeswold airfield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be planned with housing type, industry and infrastructure being chosen; A by-pass for Wymeswold can be planned to fit development; Resolve the use of this potentially difficult Brownfield site. <p>Fine but conventional view. Break out of the cul-de-sac heading for North Charnwood. Jump the River Soar wetlands and plan a staged development East of Loughborough centred on the Brownfield site of Wymeswold airfield.</p>	
RN906 R I Porter	<p>Check all brownfield sites in Charnwood. New settlement at Wymeswold – where A6006 and A46 cross:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High tech jobs at the science park would mean no large transport vehicles; Wymeswold bypass would be achievable; Place housing between Wymeswold and Seagrave. 	
RN908 M Dimitrov	<p>In the Larger villages – to provide larger settlements with more job opportunities and cheaper housing to keep young people in their home villages.</p>	
RN910 Leicestershire County Council – Property Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	<p>Not all the housing needs for North Charnwood should be met at west of Loughborough. To meet affordable housing needs across the Borough moderate levels of housing growth should be directed to Service Centres such as Quorn.</p> <p>Land north east of Quorn (plan included) is suggested as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land south of Loughborough between Loughborough and Quorn is designated as Green Wedge Can accommodate both housing and employment development needs in a sustainable, less sensitive and low environmental impact location. 	
RN911 J Barber, Woodcock Farms Agent: Pegasus	<p>Not all the housing needs for North Charnwood should be met at west of Loughborough. To meet affordable housing needs across the Borough moderate levels of housing growth should be directed to Service Centres such as Sileby.</p> <p>Moderate amounts of new housing development within Service Centres such as Sileby as the land south of Loughborough between Loughborough and Quorn is designated as Green Wedge, to avoid coalescence.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Planning Group RN912 Radleigh Homes & Messers Clarke Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	<p>Not all the housing needs for North Charnwood should be met at west of Loughborough. To meet affordable housing needs across North Charnwood moderate levels of housing growth should be directed to Service Centres such as Mountsorrel.</p> <p>Moderate amounts of new housing development within Service Centres such as Sileby as the land south of Loughborough between Loughborough and Quorn is designated as Green Wedge, to avoid coalescence.</p>	
RN913 William Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad support for the western expansion of Loughborough. But to meet increased housing provision (above that stated in preferred options) the western expansion of Shepshed is also necessary. Development of Shepshed is wrongly dismissed on grounds of its impact upon the Charnwood Forest landscape. Land to the west of Shepshed could be characterized in the same manner as land to the west of Loughborough (in terms of landscape). Suggest provision should be made for around 500 homes as part of a planned western urban extension to Shepshed. • There would be adequate separation between Loughborough and Quorn if Bull in the Hollow site is developed. Bull in the Hollow Farm would accord with strategy for employment south of Loughborough. • A higher proportion of new housing should be directed to North Charnwood, to Loughborough and Shepshed, to avoid the potential for major expansion schemes on the edge of the city of Leicester having an adverse effect upon the City's regeneration objectives and traffic conditions at the urban fringe. 	
RN917 Mr & Mrs Westwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with the locational strategy particularly with regard to employment land. Concern that employment in same areas as residential areas. • Employment should be located on A6 corridor Birstall, Rothley Anstey/Glenfield, A46 Western Distributor Road M1 link road. • Housing should also be placed on main roads. • Road network needs to be improved before development commences. 	
RN1295 J Shields	<p>Around Shepshed – Shepshed needs further development to encourage more sustainable services such as improved shopping facilities.</p>	