

CORE STRATEGY

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RELATING TO: SECTION 4 - DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE GROWTH: NORTH CHARNWOOD – DRAFT CORE POLICY 2

QUESTION 11: To what extent do you agree or disagree with Draft Core Policy 2?

QUESTION 12: If you disagree, what changes would you suggest?

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN08 N W King	Agree Unclear that the demographic need for extra housing and commercial development has been proven by Central Government	
RN13 D Ayres	Disagree The numbers of houses projected are excessive. They do not accord with the slight growth expected in Charnwood, but reflect a plan for Loughborough to become a dormitory for workers in the 3 adjacent cities. Objectives related to the University are realistic, but Loughborough University plans will also increase greatly.	
RN14 D Liggins	Disagree University should develop at high density within campus rather than build on greenfield land which should only be for uses such as sports fields, landscaped car parks etc.	
RN15 M Birkinshaw	Neutral/Not Sure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the government's imposed housing and employment targets. • Doubt that transport options are deliverable given County Council's poor record on understanding public transport and cycling needs. 	
RN18 M Bellatrix	Disagree Strongly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To make more sense, the priority you have as point (ii) should be point (i). • Point (ii), does not include damaging the habitat of wildlife and the natural environment, whereas your point i, would. 	
RN29 M Collins	Given the constraints on the villages and the Soar Valley floodplain there are not many options for growth of housing. The proposed one seems sensible but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A512 from Snells Nook Land to J23 must be dualled before housing is developed; • New loop from A512 to A6 is all very well but why does the plan not suggest a by-pass east of Loughborough from Quorn to J24 of the M1; • Where are the employment zones that go with this growth rather than create a dormitory suburb. 	
RN35 A Evans	Are all the proposed houses really needed? Council should be looking at shared ownership rather than providing for people living alone to encourage sociable living and saving green space.	
RN45 B A Fox	Agree Any link road between A512 and A6 must be dual carriageway.	
RN52 P H Ball	Agree A512 needs dualling from Epinal Way roundabout to M1. Single carriageway section near University is atrocious. What will be like with all development proposed?	
RN75 M Forrest	Content with the Charnwood 2021 plans subject to the following detailed issues: <u>Make efforts to protect communities and preserve identities.</u> Hathern is most threatened by being swallowed up by Loughborough. Shepshed is protected by the M1 and assurances over the	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>development of Garendon Park. Hathern has no natural defences. Provide a clear and separate barrier. Preserve the village from suburban drab of housing estate conformity. Preserve Hathern's character from piecemeal development and by controlling details on new and existing buildings, streets and landscape. The Conservation Area has been eroded not enhanced. Put a cordon around the present village and make positive efforts to preserve and enhance unequivocally what remains.</p> <p><u>Reduce noise and visual intrusion of the link road</u> The link road from A6 to A512 will be heavily trafficked and a dual carriageway almost inevitable and necessary. It will reduce the Green Wedge, currently a single field, between Loughborough and Hathern. A Hathern bypass is unlikely to be funded by a central authority and would only be built by a developer as a quid pro quo for very extensive development in Hathern. A link road is inevitable and desirable. However, request Hathern is given some protection from noise and intrusion through widely planted substantial trees on Hathern or both sides, linking with existing mature trees on Pear Tree Lane. Such planting should also take place at the junction of this link road with the A6. Partial or complete cutting of the road into the significant hill over which the road will pass would further reduce noise by muffling.</p> <p><u>Ensure firm and inescapable speed controls are applied on the A6 through Hathern and advanced traffic calming in put in place on Hathern streets</u> A link road will encourage local and visiting traffic shortcutting to M1 J23 and J24 which will feed extra traffic through Hathern where the A6 is already unacceptably fast and busy for a road cutting through a village. Such a scheme should be in place before the link road. These safeguards are especially necessary when the industrial development crowding in on Hathern is functioning.</p>	
RN95 Great Central Railway PLC	Add reference to the Great Central Railway.	
RN142 E E Jones	<p>Agree</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1800 homes should be maximum and not first phase • serious consideration to be given to link road between A512 and A6 • Need proactive efforts to provide integrated transport systems and not just indicate support for them 	
RN143 R W Jones	<p>Agree Strongly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More emphasis needed to actively promote an integrated transport system rather than merely support 	
RN 154 J R Cowell	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • iii) Housebuilding should be limited to areas where safe for residents and motorists re M1 and other roads • v) Limit further University expansion. Space could be used for a Science Park • vii) Rethink idea of opening up Garendon Park for public use. Needs to be a haven for wildlife. There can be no guarantee of a park being free from vandalism. • x) Transport implications between Shepshed and Loughborough unpredictable given implications of M1 widening • xi) No provision in plans for services long needed by people living in Shepshed 	
RN197 R W Hill	<p>Disagree</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • xi) Is a link road between A512 and A6 really needed? • x) Present implementation of policy is against public transport eg moving buses away from town centre and walking eg no footway on replaced Meadow Lane rail bridge. 	
RN275 P Newman	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree that Charnwood needs to build the proposed amount of land 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount of development in the area will damage Charnwood Identity. • Planning too far ahead as will not know the population in 2021. • Development should be scattered across the whole borough. • Loughborough, Shepshed, Quorn, Thurmaston, Barkby and Barkby Thorpe will lose their identities. • Suggest contact the ODPM to get a lower housing allocation for Charnwood. • Building across large areas of green belt is not sustainable. 	
RN409 L Tillen	Disagree Room for housing increase, traffic then near either north east Loughborough and/or M1 and Shepshed.	
RN421 A Dalzell	Disagree Strongly People who choose to live in urban areas expect traffic and development. People who choose to live in rural villages should be allowed to continue to do so. We do not want to join Loughborough. Building a link road from A6 Hathern would kill this village (Hathern). It is already gridlock at 8.30am and will be worse with 1800 extra houses and lorries. The link road is total destruction of our right to a life of our choosing and breaches my right to live as I choose.	
RN438 G Wilson	Neutral/Not Sure Disagree with points (i), (iii), (iv), (xi), (xiii) and plan for a new town.	
RN456 Leicestershire County Council	Detailed comments of the Director of Highways, Transportation and Waste Management are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quantity of housing proposed is generally consistent with the Structure Plan and is supported. • The proportion of new housing development on previously developed land equals the target set out in the Structure Plan, and is supported. • The annual requirement used to calculate the total amount of employment land required is based on the quantities set out in the Structure Plan. The policy is therefore supported. • The generalised directions for growth, as set out above, will allow for comprehensive planned development to take place on a phased basis to provide for the homes, jobs, transport and social and community needs of the population. This approach is consistent with the Structure Plan and is supported. • The proposed link road is supported. Detailed comments of the Director of Highways, Transportation and Waste Management are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Borough Council is following the appropriate approach to identify their preferred direction and scale of growth. However this will allocate substantial amounts of new development in areas where there are already considerable existing transport problems. The proposals will either require substantial investment in order to deliver transport solutions or compound the existing congestion. ○ At present little work has been completed to identify if there is an acceptable deliverable solution to the congestion, pollution and impact of heavy volumes of traffic that exist in and around Loughborough and in South Charnwood in settlements close to Leicester. ○ Initial traffic modelling of the proposals for the growth of Loughborough show a significant worsening of the existing congestion even with the construction of a new road link between the A512 and the A6. A road link from Epinal Way south of Loughborough to the A512 near the proposed science park should also be considered to provide a western bypass of Loughborough. This would provide an alternative route to relieve Epinal Way and other routes in the town. ○ Further detailed assessments will be required to identify the scale of the impact and the necessary transport infrastructure improvements, which can be fully funded by the development. 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>The County Council will need to be assured that polices on development and the transport system are consistent with strategic guidance when the General Development Control DPD is published for consultation.</p> <p>The principle of enhancing public access to green space within the green wedge between Loughborough and Shepshed is entirely consistent with strategic guidance contained in the Structure Plan. However, the County Council would need to be satisfied that proper measures are taken to identify, protect, preserve and enhance areas, sites, buildings and settings of historic or architectural or archaeological importance in any proposals that may affect the historic Garendon Park.</p> <p>The existing network of libraries and mobile library service within Charnwood of significance and should be taken into account particularly in Draft Core Policy 2: Development Strategy for North Charnwood Item viii. There is a major library providing a full range of services supporting learning and leisure in Loughborough.</p>	
RN457 N Pratt	South of Loughborough as far as the bypass is OK but the development should not cross south of A6 island and compromise Quorn.	
RN458 FKI Plc Agent: NAI Fuller Peiser	Support Policy 2. Support the introduction of a flood management strategy for the River Soar and its tributaries. Request that a flood management strategy is promoted in the Core Strategy. This would help to protect FKI's operations located within a floodplain albeit with a low risk of flooding, identified by the Environment Agency. FKI are keen to be informed about proposals for the introduction of a flood management strategy for the River Soar and its tributaries.	
RN460 Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome introduction of a flood management strategy for the River Soar and its tributaries. The Agency would support the Council in the preparation of Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, as advised in Draft PPS25. In particular, the Wood Brook has significant impact on the development potential of the Town Centre and other parts of Loughborough and the Borough. • In considering sites for development it must be demonstrated through a flood risk sequential test that a site is sequentially preferred, and that a site at lower flood risk is not available for development. 	
RN461 R Hoyland	<p>Agree</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve existing separation between Loughborough and Quorn; • Develop existing employment areas East of Loughborough in conjunction with flood protection measures, around Shepshed and North of Loughborough; • Concentrate additional housing requirement on brownfield sites within Loughborough supported by a new village development on Wymeswold airfield; • Boundaries of the Soar Valley villages should be retained and only infill housing on brownfield sites permitted. 	
RN462 Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd Agent: Indigo Planning Ltd	<p>Agree</p> <p>Support Policy 2, particularly point (viii), 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.</p>	
RN464 The National Forest Company	Land earmarked for new development west of Loughborough and south of the A512 falls within The National Forest. The NFC makes no comments on the broad planning merits of these proposals. However, this area forms an important gateway to the Forest and great care would be needed to ensure that development fits sensitively into its setting. The scale of proposed development would demand an overall masterplan, including substantial green infrastructure. Key principles that we would advocate in considering the proposals are set out in our letter of the 4/11/06 (summarised below) and in points made below on the Science Park Preferred Option document.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>Both sites along A512 would have a significant impact upon the setting of the Forest and around 50% of each site is within the boundary of the Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both locations are important gateway sites to the National Forest and so there would need to be substantial woodland planting and landscaping to create a green setting for each development. National Forest planting guidelines should be met for each development; • Give particular attention to roadside planting beside A512 and M1 and western edge of science park site to soften the visual impact of the Forest environment; • Roadside planting should also form a major element of creating high quality gateway to the National Forest including signage, tourist information and artworks; • Developments should have a strong Forest focus. Showcase buildings using timber in their design, incorporating woodfuel heating systems and sustainable urban drainage systems. • Potential to attract environmental industries to locate there. 	
RN465 D Baker	Disagree Strongly Do not need the amount of houses the Council or Government say. Overestimated the amount of house building.	
RN471 R Guise	Disagree Strongly The strategic requirements you propose allocating land for are based on an undemocratic, unmandated decision by the Government – ignore them.	
RN480 F Cooper	Disagree Strongly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrap the A512/A6 link road as it will generate unacceptable traffic chaos; • Scrap development north of A512 that necessitates new roads; • Improve A512 between Loughborough and J23 and upgrade A512/Epinal Way link to south of Loughborough. • Build Science Park south of the A512 • Keep existing green wedge intact and do not build housing, business or roads. 	
RN517 Loughborough University Agent: GVA Grimley LLP	<p>The University is pleased to see that Policy 2 provides for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a comprehensively planned westward expansion of Loughborough, including around 1,800 new houses; • The development of a second Science Park (although it is considered that the wording of this part of Policy 2 should be amended so as to ensure that the Science Park requirement is not linked to the general west of Loughborough growth strategy. This development can and will be bought forward independently of, say, any housing or other development contemplated to the north of Ashby Road); • the future needs of the University; • the development of additional recreational and support facilities to enable Loughborough to play a key role in the build-up the 2012 Olympic Games; and • Improvements to Loughborough town centre and transport infrastructure. <p>However, the University objects to explicit linking of Science Park proposal with the urban extension to the west of Loughborough. Whilst the University supports the west of Loughborough growth strategy, and considers that material planning benefits are likely to arise from the juxtaposition of new housing, the Science Park and the University, it is not necessary to imply, or state explicitly, that</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	the Science Park is inextricably linked to these wider proposals. The Science Park could and probably will proceed independently of the west of Loughborough expansion.	
RN520 House Builders Federation	Latest household projection figures indicate a much higher housing requirement for East Midlands than set out in the Regional Assembly's recent 'Options for Change' document. So the annual housing requirement for the district will now need to be significantly increased.	
RN521 Parkers of Leicester & AJ Parker Agent: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Object to Draft Core Policy 2 - sub criterion (iii). The housing numbers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not reflect the stated intentions of the Strategy; • Do not meet the corporate objectives of the Council; • Will not provide a basis for a comprehensively planned urban extension to the south of Loughborough, as expressed in policy and indicated on the key diagram. <p>Recent projections indicate a necessity to increase allocations substantially. Incorporate the 'above trend' housing growth in the Core Strategy to reflect the increased employment land release proposed.</p> <p>Sub criterion (vii) - agree as a minimum requirement.</p> <p>Sub criterion (xi) - agree as a requirement. This reflects the lower sustainability (and increased services investment) required to secure a western urban extension compared to that to the south of Loughborough.</p> <p>The southern urban extension:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is sustainable in transport terms without the need for substantial new infrastructure and would see further investment in existing services. • Provides for employment and housing growth; • Serves to create a more defined, useable and accessible setting to Loughborough; • Facilitates the positive management of the 'gap' between Loughborough and Quorn; • Has no overriding technical constraints which, having regard to existing transport / movement patterns, infrastructure capacity and environmental considerations would allow for a logical and sustainable extension to Loughborough. <p>The broad strategy is acknowledged, however, the objectives of securing growth will be undermined by a failure to release sufficient land to meet projected long term housing needs. ODPM projections and published economic development objectives indicate a need to accelerate, not restrain, housing growth. The 'above trend' housing projections, which reflect more specifically this objective, indicate a higher overall housing figure. This should be acknowledged by reference to potential land releases.</p> <p>Equally, the objective of securing balanced development requires the positive allocation of development within the southern urban extension area. This requires early confirmation in order to allow the form of development to be agreed, consents acquired and land sold.</p>	
RN522 Holmes Antill	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Development within Service Centres and other villages should be encouraged to provide opportunities for knowledge based employment to create the opportunity for existing (and new) residents to live and work in close proximity, so reducing the need to travel and assisting in creating a sustainable land use mix.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN532 D Pritchard	<p>Consider drainage. If building on a large area of land must consider where the rainwater will go as it can no longer drain into the ground.</p> <p>Assume it will be directed in top Black Brook and eventually into River Soar. A couple of years ago the Black Brook was not too far off overflowing which would have flooded houses in Dishley along Warwick Way.</p> <p>Given that global warming will increase the risk of flooding why are we not making provision to stop adding rainwater to already swollen rivers at times of heavy rainfall.</p> <p>Consider building a 6' by 3' high bank around Hathern limits to protect the low lying areas around Swallow Walk, Nightingale Avenue, St Peters Avenue and Pasture Lane.</p>	
RN545 A Wells	<p>Agree</p> <p>There is a difference between need and want. The number of houses needs to be challenged.</p>	
RN546 Rutherford Properties Agent: Fisher German	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Overall, the Core Strategy is supported and it is accepted that the majority of development will be focused in Loughborough and locations on the edge of Leicester. However, there is limited reference to rural areas which form the majority of Charnwood.</p> <p>Concern about reference in para 4.63(xiii) to 'identified' local need. Who/What will determine the level of growth in service centres and other settlements. Important that small scale development takes place in such areas areas to sustain existing communities.</p> <p>Delete the word 'identified'.</p>	
RN547 C Wells Agent: Fisher German	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Overall, the Core Strategy is supported and it is accepted that the majority of development will be focused in Loughborough and locations on the edge of Leicester. However, there is limited reference to rural areas which form the majority of Charnwood.</p> <p>Concern about reference in para 4.63(xiii) to 'identified' local need. Who/What will determine the level of growth in service centres and other settlements. Important that small scale development takes place in such areas areas to sustain existing communities.</p> <p>Delete the word 'identified'.</p>	
RN548 Mr Johar Agent: Fisher German	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Overall, the Core Strategy is supported and it is accepted that the majority of development will be focused in Loughborough and locations on the edge of Leicester. However, there is limited reference to rural areas which form the majority of Charnwood.</p> <p>Concern about reference in para 4.63(xiii) to 'identified' local need. Who/What will determine the level of growth in service centres and other settlements. Important that small scale development takes place in such areas areas to sustain existing communities.</p> <p>Delete the word 'identified'.</p>	
RN605 M Flatman	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>Objection because of the absence of up to date strategic planning guidance setting numerical dwelling / employment land context for period to 2021 at district level. CS para 4.6.7 acknowledges sufficient housing land supply to 2016. There is also supply of employment land. Therefore no need to introduce speculation at this early stage of LDF preparation.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN613 P Chamberlin	Disagree Any development south of Loughborough should be limited and leave a permanent green belt between the town and Quorn. There should not be development of Quorn northward in order to protect the village's separate and special character.	
RN659 GOEM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely long policy, therefore lacks clarity of purpose. The attempt to set an overarching policy context for the remaining CS policies is unnecessary resulting in excessive duplication and repetition. Key proposals for housing and employment land requirements and urban extensions would sit better alone or combined with Policy 4. A number of detailed amendments suggested. • DCP2 (iv) should not seek to retain key employment sites unless shown to be necessary in line with 2004 ODPM Guidance Note: Employment Land Reviews (also DCP12 (i)). 	
RN661 A C Johnson	Disagree Don't agree with the future vision for the Loughborough/Shepshed corridor.	
RN662 English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • iii) concern that 1,800 homes as the first phase of a comprehensively planned urban extension will have an unacceptable adverse impact on Garendon Park historic park and garden and its associated designated sites (Grade 1 and 11* listed structures, scheduled ancient monument and substantial areas of important undesignated archaeology) and their setting. Note that the 'Sustainability Appraisal' at appendix 3, p 12 indicates that development could threaten these interests. • ix) object to provision of an A512/ A6 link road as this would have a direct impact on the park by cutting through it, prejudicing its retention as a viable unit and affecting the setting of listed structures and the scheduled monument. • Reservations about proposals for Garendon Park becoming a Country Park. Do not agree with SA that development can help safeguard important historic features some of which are at risk. EH are recommending removal of Triumphal Arch from at risk register and consider repairs to the at risk Temple of Venus are achievable without developer contributions. EH would need to consider Country Park proposals as they could change its character in order to accommodate visitor facilities, car parking etc. 	
RN712 Hepher Dixon on behalf of Loughborough Golf and Hotel Development	Agree Para 4.63 Generally support spatial strategy in seeking to direct development to sustainable locations. With respect to ii) need to recognize there may be case to use Greenfield sites to help achieve sustainable patterns of development. In 9v) should also make specific reference to support development of recreational facilities outside existing campus to support University growth and support build up to 2012 Olympics. Also amend policy to reflect role and importance of hotel accommodation to support tourism developments in locations close to major sporting facilities.	
RN 717 Ms A Gimpel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make development a national showcase for sustainable development in terms of building materials, energy saving and energy producing features (triple glazed windows, solar panels etc). Examples at Sherwood Forest, Kilbride • do not stint on open spaces and provide footpaths/cycleways with seating • integrated transport links between the town, the university and Shepshed • better housing than the hotch potch at Grange Park • Mean it and then do it. 	
RN722 Anthony Aspbury Associates on behalf of W Davis Ltd	Premature to comment on quantum of development until preferred scale of growth and its distribution agreed through RSS.	
RN726 Fisher German on behalf of Rearsby Ltd	Disagree At 4.63(xiii) reference to 'identified local need' should be changed to 'local need' because small scale development is important to sustain communities. How is local need determined?	
RN728	Disagree	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
R Youngs	i) disagree ii) agree and use empty town centre buildings for housing iii) should be high density flats, terraced housing etc iv) employment land may not be needed given all empty office blocks v) should be on campus vii) disagree with development of Garendon Park viii) too vague seems to allow for everything x) Support but doubt achievable as most of proposals favour car. Need greater bus priority eg make The Rushes a bus based transport interchange.	
RN740 Signet Planning on behalf of William Davis Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantum of employment land is conservative. The methodology appears to merely extend 1996 to 2016 Structure Plan requirements to 2021. This does not acceptably balance housing and employment needs. The RSS housing rates from 2008 onwards are about 25% above Structure Plan housing requirements. Recalculation of employment land figures on this basis suggests an additional 56 ha is needed in north Charnwood in addition to the Science Park. The plan period should be extended to 2026. If figures are adjusted accordingly this suggests a need for about 100ha of general employment land. 	
RN741 GVA Grimley on behalf of Jelson Ltd	Disagree General support for DCP2 but xiii) should be deleted or reflect wording at DCP3 vi). No explanation of how windfall allowances estimated. There should be no reference to windfalls in any case as PPS3 is likely to indicate they should not be used in determining housing requirements.	
RN742 Redrow Homes	Broadly support subject to timescale of 2006 and higher build rate equivalent to RSS Option 3B. Welcome expansion of Loughborough University.	
RN744 S Mitchell	Neutral/Not Sure Concern re clause xii) that flood risk is not being given sufficient weight for example in planning decisions and preparation of town centre Masterplan.	
RN789 H Edwards British Waters	Neutral/Not Sure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the proposed priority to be given to the re-use of previously developed land. The term 'key employment sites' needs to be defined to help minimise uncertainty and provide a positive policy. 	
RN790 P Froggatt	Disagree Strongly Reduce very substantially the number of proposed new houses west of Loughborough.	
RN791 Richard Anthony Gough on behalf of Revelan Group	Object to the timescale of the Plan. Extend to 2025 and make provision for a further 1,360 dwellings. There should be a stronger policy presumption to redevelop employment land in the urban areas.	
RN792 J Drummond Popley, C Drummond Popley, R J Drummond Popley	Disagree Strongly The proposals suggested border onto what is designated as National Parkland with several listed monuments. To think that these would not be vandalised by having a housing development so close is ridiculous. Also the existing wildlife would be threatened.	
RN794 N Browne	Agree However, demonstrate that Shepshed is a respected distinct entity with its own needs and rights - do not lump it together with Loughborough. Make a specific plan for Shepshed and commit to it.	
RN802 T Higgins	Agree Generally agree but:	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The housing demand as shown on page 33 is likely to be an under-provision. Market demand is a factor which must be taken into account and there is no clear methodology showing how this has been assessed. The Small Site Allowance and Windfalls show an unacceptably high percentage of the total requirement. The University needs room for expansion for academic, residential and sporting purposes, but the Science Park does not need an allocation of 50ha, a smaller and more specific area should be allocated. 	
RN803 Antony Aspbury Associates on behalf of G I Sanders, G L Sanders, T D Sanders & D Kettle	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to specific housing number is premature in light of the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy; Reference only to "small sites" at point iii) the policy is restrictive. There is scope for the allocation of larger sites in and on the edge of the Service Centres to complement larger strategic allocations, ensure continuity of housing land supply, provide spatial choice and assist in delivery of affordable housing to all parts of the Borough. 	
RN806 A Kay	Agree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> West expansion of Loughborough does not satisfy the criteria in DCP17 of being 'located to reduce the need to travel and minimise the distances...' taking into account the distances between the town centre and Garendon Park/Science Park. In particular, these sites are as far from the railway station as Wymeswold airfield but the travel times are more to west Loughborough due to the need to travel through the town centre. Needs to be strong action to discourage car use and encourage alternatives if these developments are not to put extra pressure on the town centre. Proposed A6/A512 link will not reduce demand to travel to the town centre or through it to the rail station. 	
RN810 N Morgan	Disagree Should not create another dormitory town/village between Loughborough and the M1 but do more to regenerate Shepshed rather. Should not state that development in Shepshed is not preferred because of limited access to Loughborough's shops and local services.	
RN811 C Watson	Disagree If you are less ambitious with the development plans there will not be the need to build so many homes.	
RN812 A Millie	Disagree Strongly Disagree that Loughborough needs to grow into a 'super' sub-regional centre. Needs to be better coordination with wider east Midlands Plan.	
RN813 P Knott	Disagree Strongly Vision for Quorn appears to be of a village surrounded by warehouses and logistic centres out of character with area. Difficult to understand that there is no detail of what this employment land might be used for, its environmental impact or employment potential.	
RN815 R Parsons	Disagree There is no mention of the housing needs of the elderly. At present, a large number of elderly people are living in much larger accommodation than they need and often more than they want but the options they have are all unattractive. Small developments such as Badger Court are very	
RN816 S Cuff Nanpantan Residents' Network	Disagree Strongly Question is raised about the need for a new link road between A512 and the A6 as part of a urban extension west of Loughborough.	
RN817 T Birkinshaw	Disagree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-use of brownfield land should be main priority. The housing targets are uncertain and may be much lower than those 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
	<p>quoted. The need for employment land takes no account of employment sites that are constantly being re-used (as opposed to redeveloped) and has no commitment to getting good value of 'jobs per hectare'. South of Loughborough has only limited space for building; much less than that allocated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that proposed Science Park does not use make best use of land. Much of the current science park is taken up with car parking. • The Green Wedge South of Loughborough is poorly defined on the map; it should separate Loughborough from Woodhouse, Woodthorpe and Quorn, not protect the A6. • Question is raised about the provisional housing numbers having on the viability of plans. Not enough has been made about higher density building, return to terrace housing. Too much of this plan is beyond the Borough Council to deliver - it is in the hands of County or central government.
RN820 J E Mutton Loughborough College	Neutral/Not Sure Paragraph 5.65 conflicts with DCP13 Loughborough University. Para 5.66 is undemocratic, indicating an intention to indulge restraint of human rights.
RN823 D E Sykes	Neutral/Not Sure The inclusion of an A512 /A6 link assumes there will be an increase in traffic from proposed developments. Rejoining A6 will inevitably increase traffic through Hathern already prone to significant queues at peak hours back to Bishop Meadow roundabout. It will add to delays, increase pollution, sever the village, threaten heritage buildings, add to traffic hazards at the A6006 Hathern Turn junction. Need a bypass round Hathern with revised Hathern Turn junction, direct link to main employment areas and separate cycleway and footways,
RN824 National Trust	<p>Agree Option 1(b) of the recent RSS proposals for housing is most likely to secure an integrated approach to sustainable development in accordance with the requirements of PPS1. So the Core Strategy should be based upon the provision of 470 dwellings per annum over the plan period.</p> <p>Noted that the use of previously developed land in the District rose from 43% in the late 1990s to 75% in the early 2000s. This may reflect good practice in targeting and dealing with brownfield sites but this has been achieved partly during a period when there was less emphasis on urban concentration. Give consideration to the expectations in respect of small and windfall sites that will come forward. Suggest a target of 52% of new development being on previously developed land is unduly pessimistic. Raise to the PPG3 minimum of 60%.</p> <p>Give consideration to the densities that might be achieved on urban sites, whilst still being compatible with local character, to make additional increases in the amount of development upon previously developed land.</p> <p>Proposed Country Park based upon Garendon Park –support but considers that its development needs to fully assess its historic landscape character and its wider setting. Given the importance of this project it should feature as a specific proposal upon the Key Diagram, not just solely as one of several green wedges.</p> <p>xi) The proposal to provide a new road link appears to be at odds with the proposed new Country Park, and has particular implications for the wider setting of Garendon Park – the impact upon landscape character in particular needs careful assessment in judging whether or not a satisfactory solution can be accommodated.</p> <p>vii) Include a specific requirement to provide new areas for nature conservation (in a similar way to Core Policy 3 v).</p>

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN894 D Scott	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>Developing West of Loughborough will destroy the Green Wedge and the unique character of Garendon Park (which needs to remain as a large undeveloped area). If housing expansion is required west of Loughborough then restrict to south of A512.</p> <p>Amend the policy: Point (iii). Delete 'Around 1800 homes as the first phase of comprehensively planned urban extension west of Loughborough' and replace with 'Around 1800 homes as part of a new greenfield development based around Wymeswold airfield with appropriate new transport infrastructure.' Point (iv) Delete 'up to 50ha for a second science park as part of the proposed urban extension west of Loughborough' and replace with 'Limited additional extension of the Loughborough science park commensurate with the requirements for high technology businesses'.</p>	
RN896 D Patel	<p>Disagree</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floodplain • Only small settlements situated in all directions. 	
RN906 R I Porter	<p>Number of homes required to 2021 is highly subjective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use a two tier flexible strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Count and convert all possible brownfield; - Only use Greenfield sites designated if a shortfall occurs in brownfield sites. • Do HMOs count towards housing – if not, planning should resist more licences being given out. <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> <p>Clarify at an early strategy, the amount of land to be developed and the amount to be retained as a Country Park. Garendon is much needed as green amenity and has the potential to be better than Bradgate Park (see A Layman's Guide to Garendon Park, Marjorie Schultz).</p> <p>Garendon Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rather than Derby Road playing fields, build warehouses alongside the M1 from J23 to J23a; • Slip roads onto the industrial estate to ease lorry movements and congestion on A512, A6 and in central Loughborough; • Keep tight up to M1 to reduce encroachment into the park; • No other use could be found for land so close to the motorway; • Need to place low cost housing nearby for those working on the industrial estate so reducing car journeys to work; • Means that movement of playing fields towards Hathern does not need to happen. Place playing fields on Garendon Park to help keep more of this land green and making the fields nearer to Loughborough. 	
RN910 Leicestershire County Council – Property	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Concerns about calculations of the housing requirement for North Charnwood:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the RSS requirement (2001-2021) is 8100 dwellings, having implications for the residual requirement; • Small site and windfall allowances are over optimistic 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft PPS3 advises against the use of windfall allowances. <p>Amend Policy 2 to direct the additional requirement (1539 dwellings) to other sustainable locations such as land to the north east of Quorn.</p>	
RN911 J Barber, Woodcock Farms Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Concerns about calculations of the housing requirement for North Charnwood:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the RSS requirement (2001-2021) is 8100 dwellings, having implications for the residual requirement; Need to take into account recently published 2003-based household projections; The RSS requirement up to 2026 means that there is no longer a basis for using the Structure Plan requirement; There should be a 15 year period for new housing from the date of adoption of the Site Allocations DPD; Clarify sites 'identified for release' and give greater detail when the Submission document is published; Small site and windfall allowances are over optimistic. Draft PPS3 advises against the use of windfall allowances. <p>Amend Policy 2 to direct the additional requirement (1540 dwellings) to designated Service Centres.</p>	
RN912 Radleigh Homes & Messers Clarke Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Concerns about calculations of the housing requirement for North Charnwood:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the RSS requirement (2001-2021) is 8100 dwellings, having implications for the residual requirement; Need to take into account recently published 2003-based household projections; The RSS requirement up to 2026 means that there is no longer a basis for using the Structure Plan requirement; There should be a 15 year period for new housing from the date of adoption of the Site Allocations DPD; Clarify sites 'identified for release' and give greater detail when the Submission document is published; Small site and windfall allowances are over optimistic. Draft PPS3 advises against the use of windfall allowances. <p>Amend Policy 2 to direct the additional requirement (1540 dwellings) to designated Service Centres.</p>	
RN913 William Davis	<p>Scale of growth outlined is conservative, and should be based on latest 2003 based household projections. Allowances made for small and larger site windfall appear to be over optimistic. PPS3 states that allowance should be realistic and based on past trends.</p>	
RN914 Bloor Homes	<p>The supporting text argues for western and southern extensions but there are no details about the scale of housing and employment growth for the southern extension.</p> <p>There may be a lack of clarity in Core Policy 2 in terms of the potential of the southern extension to Loughborough. Should specifically identify the vicinity of Grange Park as an area for growth. This will avoid the constraint of National Forest and flood plain and also benefit from better relation to existing infrastructure and facilities. Access to the A6 and M1 can be improved with the possible provision of a southern link road as part of the urban extension.</p>	
RN918 Wilson Bowden and David Wilson Homes Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	<p>Agree</p> <p>Draft Core Policy 2 should be amended to say:</p> <p>'Prioritise the re-use of previously developed land and buildings where these meet the principles of sustainable development and accord with the RSS strategy'. This amendment reflects para 32 of PPG3 in that Greenfield sites should be prioritised over brownfield sites that perform poorly in sustainability terms.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to take into account recently published 2003-based household projections • The RSS requirement up to 2026 means that there is no longer a basis for using the Structure Plan requirement • There should be a 15 year period for new housing from the date of adoption of the Site Allocations DPD • Clarify sites 'identified for release' and give greater detail when the Submission document is published. • Concern about housing requirements for north Charnwood. Have included alternative calculations for housing requirements taking into account RSS end date • Concern raised about how Core Strategy has calculated the employment land requirement. Alternative calculation has been included for period 2005 to 2026 based on annualised figures. • Need to review existing allocations against sustainability criteria. 	
RN1293 Loughborough Gospel Hall Trust Agent: J & J Design	Disagree Support the broad thrust of Policy 2 but object to omission of references to meeting community needs where there are current deficits in provision, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • of an ageing community; • for the moral and spiritual needs of sustainable communities. These are required to provide a positive response to the uncertainties identified in SA Table 2.1, and faith communities are well placed to address such needs.	
RN1347 Charnwood Liberal Democrat Councillor Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support urban concentration (option B) as the best model for Charnwood but oppose strong urban concentration (option C). Support the use of 20% below trend (Option B1) and oppose the use of trend (option B2) and 20% above trend (Option B3) as figures based on historical development do not necessarily reflect future needs given that the national birth rate is falling and other factors are not projected. • Challenge the provenance of future projections produced by the region to ensure their relevance to Charnwood. • Adopt 'Lifetime Homes' standards to ensure higher standards of accessibility to recognize the potential increase in mobility problems for an ageing population. 	
RN16 MI Hall, RN19 C Emmet, RN24 J L Mitchell, RN27 A M Clarke, RN50 C Moon, RN54 P J Morrall JP, RN57 F E Norburn, RN128 C J Keeling, RN142 E E Jones, RN147 J Heath, Thrussington Parish Council, RN171 P A Bland, RN284 A C Wood, RN293 B J Butler, RN324 N Richards, RN328 K Appleby, RN338 R Singh, RN345 A B Kidger, RN346 J R	Agree.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Cheshire, RN348 S J Tinning, RN356 I Harrison, Wanlip Parish Meeting, RN408 E A Goodson, RN419 M Hall, RN543 S F Hobbs, RN604 E H Sinclair Goulden, RN606 G A F Locke, RN616 H D Robinson Sharratt, RN618 H Knight, Birstall Parish Council, RN619 N Jones, Anstey Parish Council, RN720 J J Sutherland, RN805 D F Bodicoat, RN898 D C Toone, RN900 Gill, RN901 K Canner, RN905 R J N Brown		
RN06 D B Street, RN25 M P Parker, RN28 M S Smith, RN31 G Brown, RN39 A Gardner, RN294 D Ross, RN353 S J Doyle & R K Stephenson, RN354 C Leafe, RN355 J Booth, RN360 C M Spencer, RN467 L Foster, Seagrave Parish Council, RN477 P Moxon, RN478 C J Blanchard, RN516 M West, RN542 G Hobbs, RN799 A H Olofsson, RN893 F J Howgate, RN907 R Hall, Andrew Martin Associates on behalf of Persimmon plc &	Agree Strongly.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
William Davis Ltd, RN908 M C Dimitrov, RN1295 J A Shields, RN1296 J Folkes, RN1297 J Ridewood		
RN17 E Goodyer, RN35 A Evans, RN36 M C Dolby, RN37 N L Sharpe, RN56 A W G Ballentyne, RN59 K R Senior, RN179 S Bradwell, RN335 P J Thrope, RN339 Joyce Noon, CPRE Charnwood, RN481 J Thompson, RN609 S L Batson, RN612 C Humphreys, RN620 M Smallman, Del-Rosa Developments Ltd, RN788 S Bullman, RN793 L McGunnigle, RN795 J Faulks, Normanton on Soar Parish Council, RN800 A M Ward, Mather Jamie on behalf of Hamilton Trustees, RN821 L Emmitt	Disagree.	
RN21 P&E Coughlin, RN23 A Rumsey, RN41 J Sutton, RN49 Lang, RN60 G & P Allen, RN337 N Porter, RN347 M J Hagger, RN349 A Aucott, RN374 J Wilson, RN420 A W Lacey, RN468 S N Templeman, RN469 J Green, RN549 P G Hipkin, RN608 J M	Disagree Strongly.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Neal, RN621 T & C Malone, RN714 L Needham, The Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group Committee, RN804 A Irving, RN807 R Francis, RN818 A Radley, RN902 J & L Blyth		
RN20 L Bates, RN26 D J Hourston, RN30 C F A Sutton, RN106 C W Askham, RN129 R Bowman, RN166 F A E Reece, RN277 P Scott, RN350 D Aucott, RN351 C Sweeney, RN361 P A Higgins, RN603 R C Jones, RN607 M Lear, RN611 P Raja, RN615 R E Davies, St Michael of All Angels, RN797 J Thompson, RN798 M Eagland, Peacock & Smith on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc, RN801 F F Rawson, Frank F Rawson on behalf of FFR Ultrasonics Ltd, RN808 D M Evans, RN814 N Booth, RN822 F Hitchinson, The Woodland Trust, RN890 C A Clegg, RN891 A Cooper & J M Hornbuckle, RN892 A Cooper, M W	Neutral/Not Sure.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Hornbuckle & J M Hornbuckle, RN895 John C Pearson, RN899 F Mitchell, Langham Park Developments, RN904 Alan Corner, RN1294 R A Dickson, Groby Parish Council		