

CORE STRATEGY

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

QUESTION 8: To what extent would you agree with our preferred directions for growth in North Charnwood - South of Loughborough towards Quorn

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN12 J Davies	Strongly object to development South of Loughborough towards Quorn or any interference with losing the identity of Quorn.	
RN26 D J Hourston	Disagree Southward growth of Loughborough: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threatens Quorn as an independent village; • Villages should be clearly demarcated with some service improvements; • Do not see need for housing and employment in same area in such a small town as Loughborough. 	
RN29 M Collins	Agree with the direction for growth South of Loughborough towards Quorn	
RN293 B J Butler	Disagree We need to keep a green belt between Loughborough and Quorn. Large developments should be enough.	
RN347 M Hagger	Disagree Strongly Quorn should remain a separate settlement from Loughborough: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would turn Quorn into an industrial suburb. • Quorn has unique character that attracts many people to enjoy evenings out and to walk around, which will be lost if Quorn is enveloped into greater Loughborough. • Not just ugliness of modern developments, but noise and pollution 24 hours a day. 	
RN355 J Booth	Disagree Concern is raised about the merging of Quorn and Loughborough.	
RN 419 M Hall	Neutral/Not Sure Not in favour of South of Loughborough to Quorn: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be solid houses from Loughborough to Quorn; • Put extra traffic on existing bypasses. 	
RN438 G Wilson	Disagree Strongly Comments are asked for without any detailed information. South of Loughborough has been identified for employment but there is no exact location or whether it will start north or south. There is no assurance that the 20 hectares proposed will not grow.	
RN456 Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the preferred options for the development strategy. These are consistent with the sequential approach in the Structure Plan. • The County Council will need to be assured that the suitability of specific allocations, including those carried forward from the saved local plan are consistent with strategic guidance when the Allocations DPD is published for consultation. 	
RN459 I Bexon (Parish Councillor)	Acknowledge that there are regional demographic forecasts and constraints the Council is obliged to work within. Some elements of the Preferred Option in response to these are rational and logically argued but other elements are less obvious. It is difficult to respond when there are discrepancies between the published information and what is stated at public meetings.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>It is unclear whether the South of Loughborough option relates to a site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjoining south Loughborough – this would be consistent with statements about concentrating future development in the major urban centres, or. • Adjoining north of Quorn – this is at odds with statements about spreading development to the larger villages being unreflective of the regional strategy and preserving the nature of our existing villages <p>Development north of Quorn would be more firmly resisted by local people than development at southern end of Loughborough. Both would involve loss of Green Wedge between settlements.</p>	
<p>RN461 R Hoyland</p>	<p>Disagree Strongly</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. <p>Object to erosion of green space between the Soar Valley villages and in particular between Loughborough and Quorn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very real danger of creating a linear city between Loughborough and Leicester when there are other employment opportunity sites north and east of Loughborough (subject to flood protection measures); • Opportunity for a sustainable housing development on the Wymeswold airfield site of sufficient size to justify supporting infrastructure <p>In terms of the proposal for employment land South of Loughborough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no indications of the type of employment activity; • Likelihood of a substantial increase in HGV traffic clogging inadequate routes to M1 junctions; • Unacceptable doubt as to whether this development will be approved South of Loughborough towards Quorn or North of Quorn towards Loughborough. <p>Employment land should be confined to traditional employment areas north and east of Loughborough plus the proposed science park.</p>	
<p>RN468 S Templeman</p>	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>Not appropriate to develop south of Loughborough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threatens separate identity of Quorn; • Add 20 hectares of employment land for south of Quorn should be added to the West of Loughborough option towards Shepshed. <p>If it does go south of Loughborough, then should be added to Loughborough not north Quorn.</p>	
<p>RN469 J Green</p>	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>Core Strategy and Loughborough Science Park DPDs go against the objectives set out in the Community Strategy regarding 'sustaining the local environment' by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting the environment; 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarding Charnwood's cultural heritage and natural resources and to actively encourage the use of brownfield sites. <p>Building more homes and businesses in Loughborough is not sustainable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most people travel by car and not public transport causing traffic congestion and pollution; • Disappearance of countryside will affect people's well being and so increase spending on healthcare <p>Evaluate traffic and environmental considerations of these developments.</p>	
RN472 D Mizen	<p>Opposed to expansion south of Loughborough towards Quorn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No definition of the nature of the proposals • No agreement of environmental compatibility with new and present housing areas • Must be unbreakable guarantees for the future • No reference to protection of Green Wedge north of Quorn. 	
RN473 D Carter	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Find alternatives to placing 20 hectares of employment land south of Loughborough towards Quorn: Safeguard and maintain the existing green wedge areas of open land between Shepshed, Quorn and Hathern relative to Loughborough; • Protect village identity of Quorn. 	
RN481 J Thompson	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>Development of urban expansion should not encroach south towards Quorn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain Green Wedge and Quorn's separate identity; • Too much pressure on roads in this area already. 	
RN502 P J Kinch	<p>Object to development on land south of Loughborough or north of Quorn for employment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep Green Wedge between Loughborough and Quorn as large as possible; • If building should take place it should be for housing only; • Putting employment land and housing development next to each other is unlikely to get people out of their cars. 	
RN519 Quorn Parish Council	<p>Concerned about southern expansion of employment land from Loughborough towards Quorn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erode Green Wedge • Threatens separation between Loughborough and Quorn • Threatens separate and very special identity of Quorn; • Destroy character of Quorn; • Damage community feel of the village • Advantages of placing employment land south of Loughborough do not outweigh the environmental and community disadvantages. <p>It was not clear from the document that the employment land could either be attached to Loughborough or north of Quorn. If south of Loughborough is chosen then the employment land must be attached to Loughborough not north of Quorn village. This would be contrary to stated policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrating future development in the major urban centres; • Spreading development to the larger villages would not reflect regional strategy of steering development to the larger urban areas; • Preserving the nature of our existing villages. 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>Place employment land proposed for south of Loughborough with other development proposed to west of Loughborough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic links are far better. Proximity to M1, M42 and Airport will result in vehicles covering less miles on more minor roads in the Borough; • Epinal Way link from south is frequently close to gridlock; • By keeping the employment land together it will be close to more housing, ie the larger conurbation of Shepshed and new housing development land where as the document states there would be “schools, health facilities, local shops and new transport facilities including footpaths and cycleways and a possible new link road between the A512 and A6”. 	
RN523 SureStart Loughborough East	<p>Supports the employment proposals to the south of Loughborough as this would be the most accessible area for SureStart residents.</p>	
RN549 P Hipkin	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>Oppose further destruction of Green Belt between Loughborough, Hathern, Shepshed, Quorn and Woodhouse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contrary to the Structure Plan (1996) and contravenes the Biodiversity Plan (1998) which is supported by the Government and the Rio accord. • This area of the North Midlands is already overdeveloped. Constantly told that there is a shortage of labour not jobs. Areas in the north and east of the country and north east Derbyshire that would benefit more. • Not possible to build new self contained villages in green belt areas already hemmed in by housing estates. Will produce an endless conurbation producing pollution and social problems. • All the undeveloped land between Shepshed and Loughborough is essential to the ecology of the area. Wildlife cannot exist in isolated pockets. The Biodiversity Plan calls for corridors to allow movement of species. Further loss will affect the immediate vicinity and the Soar Valley and Charnwood Forest. The remnant it is proposed to leave is no use to Shepshed as it will be cut off by the new link road and housing. • Wildlife of the woods and streams in the area – hares, buzzards, kingfishers, crayfish, brown trout and stone loach and golden plover and fieldfare – depend on this location. • Value of agricultural land to west of Loughborough is ignored; • Loss of all the existing parks and bridleways across the farmland. • Adversely affects flood plains of River Soar • Scope for development next to the Midland Railways. Plenty of underdeveloped agricultural land to north east of the district – Wymeswold and Six Hills – which could be the focus for a new village. • No better use for the farmed Garendon Estates land (other than agriculture) than planting a community woodland to provide a healthy environment to benefit many generations to come. • Every available piece of land in our towns and villages is being packed with high density housing from which people will need somewhere to escape. • The shortage of affordable housing in Loughborough has been created by use of terraced housing in Ashby Road/Derby Road for student accommodation, converting what was a pleasant conservation area, modernised as housing by public money, into a crowded slum, while the Council looked on. 	
RN605 M Flatman	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>Strongly disagree with concept of expanding Loughborough towards Quorn.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the absence of a preferred Regional Spatial Strategy it is arguably premature to progress the LDF in any way that conflicts with the provisions of the adopted Structure Plan. Structure Plan Strategy Policy 5 seeks to safeguard green wedges as structurally important areas of open space, preserve the identity of settlements etc given the strategic context development 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>locations around Loughborough should avoid incursion into green wedges. Alternative directions for growth should be fully utilized prior to the erosion of green wedges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Structure Plan Key Diagram shows an area south /south west of Loughborough designated as open countryside unaffected by National Forest or green wedge policies. This area should be developed prior to green wedge land. It would benefit from close proximity to most recent residential development of the town. • The adopted Local Plan designation of this area as part of an Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside is a local designation not directly supported by the Structure Plan, nor superseded PPS7 or PPS7. The last mentioned at paras 24 and 27 advises criteria based policies be used instead of blanket designations • Given uncertainty about quantum of employment and housing land required in the absence of the new RSS it is premature to determine directions for growth. In addition there is already an immediate short term supply of housing and employment sites • The new RSS may result in a different policy emphasis in terms of the distribution of development. 	
RN606 G A F Locke	<p>Disagree Strongly No advantages in extending south of Loughborough. The Soar valley is already congested making further large scale development unthinkable.</p>	
RN609 S L Batson	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location north of Loughborough would mean people traveling to Leicester, Nottingham and Derby could use M1 and not congested A roads. • Given all development already taking place around Loughborough and Quorn concerned that targets must already be exceeded • Road network south of Loughborough already congested at peak times and in school terms cannot take any more traffic • Building on narrow area between Loughborough and Quorn would join settlements and Quorn would lose its identity. 	
RN614 Mr & Mrs E Harding	<p>Disagree Strongly There should be no further development between Quorn and Loughborough.</p>	
RN616 H D R Sharratt	<p>Disagree Developing south of Loughborough means Quorn will eventually lose identity and merge with town. Villages must stay unique entities and merging must be prevented. Preserve green wedges between settlements.</p>	
RN662 English Heritage	<p>No historic sites of national importance are known that would be affected by development in this area.</p>	
RN715 J B Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development in Quorn over number of decades whilst resident of village has secured excellent balance of housing, amenities, roads and travel. Village has achieved a number of 'Best Kept Village Awards' • Additional development envisaged in CS would be anathema, harming the balance by bringing more population impinging on arable land, roads, amenities, education and local way of life. 	
RN727 Hastings Community Association	<p>Welcome development of employment land and dwellings south of Loughborough to improve job opportunities accessible to east Loughborough.</p>	
RN728 R Youngs	<p>Neutral/ not sure.</p>	
RN737 G Templeman	<p>West of Loughborough is not constrained for space, does not threaten identity of Shepshed and is accessible via M1 and A512.</p> <p>Serious reservations about impact of development south of Loughborough on villages south of the town:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10-40 ha of industrial land is out of proportion to the distance between Quorn and the town and amount of available land. It would take school playing fields and change character of the village from a rural community to a small industrial town. Great 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>emphasis is placed on safeguarding character of other villages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic is already at a standstill in morning and evening peaks extending from Quorn to the University campus. More traffic from development will make site unworkable • Green wedge should be inviolable • No evidence that the employment created would provide jobs for local people and reduce commuting • Suggestion that there is a hidden agenda to create an urban township from Quorn through Mountsorrel and Rothley. This would only attract more commuters from Leicester. 	
RN740 Signet Planning on behalf of William Davis Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support south of Loughborough direction for growth • Land at Woodthorpe adjacent to the outer edge of Loughborough should be allocated at the next LDF stage either in isolation or as part of a wider scheme. This small area could be developed without harming separation between Loughborough and Quorn in a green wedge redefined to accommodate needs. It may be a suitable location for a hotel (A4) / public house complementary use to 'pump prime' any employment development. 	
RN741 GVA Grimley on behalf of Jelson Ltd	Neutral/Not sure.	
RN793 L McGunnigle	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distance between Quorn and Loughborough is very little, to develop between the two places will lead to the areas becoming one. • Quorn people have the stress of living with a loud, noisy and dirty quarry that shows little respect for the area it is in. Dust, dirty road, pollution and at least 1 horrendous blast a day. The quarry is an example of industry overpowering village life. • Greater emphasis on protecting greenfields, areas of beauty, views and landscapes, areas of wildlife and countryside is needed; • Allow the villages to remain villages, not become industrial destinations. 	
RN797 J Thompson	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>Concerned about the plans for expansion "incorporating employment uses" towards Quorn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quorn is an asset to the area; • No reference to any safeguards to maintain it's integrity vs Loughborough as have been mentioned for Shepshed and Hathern; • do not see a need to "rebalance" housing and employment in this location. 	
RN799 A H Olofsson	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Strongly disagree with a development attached to Quorn. Enlarging Quorn will ruin the village atmosphere. If there has to be any development between Loughborough and Quorn, it has to be joined to Loughborough, where the new road makes a more distinct border.</p>	
RN815 R Parsons	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>Expansion of employment to the south of Loughborough towards Quorn, in addition to the housing already planned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will destroy the green wedge and we will become another London or Birmingham, one large urban sprawl • Is important to maintain the local character and distinctiveness of the villages including Quorn. <p>New employers would be better off near to the new science park, alongside the motorway where no-one wants to live.</p>	
RN890 C Clegg	<p>Disagree</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question whether the proposals for industry are necessary; • Development will have a negative impact on the area and on community infrastructure; • Give more attention to access facilities – roads, public transport etc – which are already inadequate. 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve current Green Wedges. 	
RN897 D Mear	Disagree Do not object in principle to development south of Loughborough but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need better idea of what type of employment opportunities will be allowed; • Need Improvements to Epinal Way including bus lanes for better access to hospital, college and university; • Do not spoil the Great Central Railway – there is potential to create a commuter railway. 	
RN902 J & L Blyth	Disagree Strongly No more housing or employment land needed in Quorn: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are not enough facilities – school and medical centre cannot cope; • Volume of traffic would increase; • Quorn wants to be kept a separate identity from Loughborough. • There is plenty of new housing being built at the moment in Loughborough – in the town centre and towards Hathern at Maxwell Drive. 	
RN905 R Brown	Disagree Strongly Developing southwards from Loughborough is contrary to statements about green wedges and separate identities.	
RN908 M Dimitrov	Disagree Strongly Disagree with southward extension towards Quorn as there is a danger that Quorn will no longer be a distinct and separate village.	
RN918 Wilson Bowden and David Wilson Homes Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	Neutral/Not Sure Support the view that Westward expansion of Loughborough should come forward before southern expansion of Loughborough.	
RN1332 G H Colley	Object to scheme to fill the immediate locality with overwhelming quantities of housing and industrial buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current road system has almost reached capacity – additional traffic will cause sever problems throughout the Borough; • Extra residential areas to provide a workforce for the planned industrial estates will place a heavy burden on already overstretched facilities – shops, schools and medical services. • Even a more modest scheme should be considered very carefully and cautiously. 	
RN1333 D Colley	Object to scheme to fill the immediate locality with overwhelming quantities of housing and industrial buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current road system has almost reached capacity – additional traffic will cause sever problems throughout the Borough; • Extra residential areas to provide a workforce for the planned industrial estates will place a heavy burden on already overstretched facilities – shops, schools and medical services. • Even a more modest scheme should be considered very carefully and cautiously. 	
RN1350 J Key	Disagree with the development South of Loughborough: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quorn does not want to be a suburb of Loughborough or have industry brought into the village; • People purchased housing in Quorn because it was a village and do not want this altered. • It is essential to keep Quorn a village community. • In terms of the Key Diagram: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The green wedge drawn along the A6 is not an area of any interest to most people who live in the area – the whole area is a flood plain set of fields. - There is a green wedge between Leicester and Anstey, so why was one not put between Loughborough & Quorn? 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The growth arrow between Loughborough and Quorn has been put along the easy, cheap to develop area of growth on some of the best rural land. The A6 bypass was successfully built in the centre of the floodplain. So consider using the edge of floodplain to the East of the A6 coming out of Loughborough where no crops are grown. - Appear to have picked easy to draw on options in this area of development with little thought as to what will happen when work starts. 	
<p>RN08 N W King, RN16 M Hall, RN19 C Emmet, RN24 J L Mitchell, RN31 G Brown, RN45 B A Fox, RN50 C Moon, RN52 P H Ball, RN57 F E Norburn, RN59 K R Senior, RN97 A Davis, RN128 C J Keeling, RN129 R Bowman, RN171 P A Bland, RN179 S Bradwell, RN197 R W Hill, RN221 DHoward, Friends of Charnwood Forest, RN324 N Richards, RN345 A B Kidger, RN346 J R Cheshire, RN348 S J Tinning, RN356 I Harrison, Wanlip Parish Meeting, RN360 C M Spencer, RN374 J Wilson, RN478 C J Blanchard, RN543 S F Hobbs, RN618 H Knight, Birstall Parish Council, RN621 T & C Malone, RN794 N Browne, RN795 J Faulks, Normanton on Soar Parish Council, RN806 A Kay, RN821 L Emmitt, RN824 A Hubbard, The National Trust, RN898</p>	<p>Agree.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
D C Toone, RN900 Gill, RN1293 J R Shephard, J & J Design on behalf of Loughborough Gospel Hall Trust		
RN06 D B Street, RN27 A M Clarke, RN39 A Gardner, RN54 P J Morrall JP, RN142 E E Jones, RN143 R Wym Jones, RN354 CLeafe, RN421 A Dalzell, RN521 S James, Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Parkers of Leicester & A J Paker, RN542 G Hobbs, RN611 P Raja, RN790 P Froggatt, RN802 T Higgins, RN893 F J Howgate, RN896 D Patel, RN901 K Canner	Agree Strongly.	
RN15 M Birkinshaw, RN18 M Bellatrix, RN49 Lang, RN56 A W G Ballentyne, RN275 P S Newman, RN335 P J Thrope, RN339 J Noon, CPRE Charnwood, RN351 C Sweeney, RN408 E A Goodson, RN465 D Baker, RN467 L Foster, Seagrave Parish Council, RN480 F L Cooper, RN516 M West, RN612 C Humphreys, RN617 C	Disagree.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
<p>D R Sharratt, RN661 A C Johnson, RN788 S Bullman, RN791 R A Gough, Gough Planning Services on behalf of Revelan Group, RN792 Popley Family, RN800 A M Ward, Mather Jamie on behalf of Hamilton Trustees, RN805 D F Bodicoat, RN810 N Morgan, RN812 A Millie, RN814 N Booth, RN817 T N Birkinshaw, RN895 J C Pearson, RN904 A Corner, RN1295 J A Shields</p>		
<p>RN13 D Ayres, RN21 P&E Coughlin, RN41 J Sutton, RN60 G & P Allen, RN337 N Porter, RN349 A Aucott, RN350 D Aucott, RN361 P A Higgins, RN409 L Tillen, RN420 A W Lacey, RN471 R G Guise, RN474 J A Carter, RN477 P Moxon, RN522 J Holmes, Holmes Antill, RN545 A Wells, RN603 R C Jones, RN607 M Lear, RN608 J M Neal, RN801 F F Rawson, Frank F Rawson on behalf of FFR Ultrasonics Ltd,</p>	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN804 A Irving, RN807 R Francis, RN811 C T Watson, RN813 P Knott, RN816 S Cuff, Nanpantan Residents' Network, RN906 R I Porter		
RN14 D Liggins, RN17 E Goodyer, RN20 L Bates, RN23 A Rumsey, RN25 M P Parker, RN30 C F A Sutton, RN35 A Evans, RN36 M C Dolby, RN37 N L Sharpe, RN106 C W Askham, RN146 YW Hannell, RN147 J Heath, Thrussington Parish Council, RN154 J R Cowell, RN166 F A E Reece, RN277 P Scott, RN284 A C Wood, RN294 D Ross, RN328 K Appleby, RN338 R Singh, RN353 S J Doyle & R K Stephenson, RN546 K Davies, Fisher German on behalf of Mr Rutherford, RN547 K Davies, Fisher German on behalf of Mr C J Wells, RN548 K Davies, Fisher German on behalf of Mr D Johar, RN604 E H Sinclair Goulden, RN613 P Chamberlin, RN615 R E Davies, St Michael of All Angels,	Neutral/Not Sure.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
<p> RN619 N Jones, Anstey Parish Council, RN620 M Smallman, Del-Rosa Developments Ltd, RN712 C Potts, Hepher Dixon Ltd on behalf of Loughborough Golf & Hotel Development, RN714 L Needham, The Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group Committee, RN720 J J Sutherland, RN726 W Young, Fisher German on behalf of Rearsby Ltd, RN744 S Mitchell, RN798 M Eagland, Peacock & Smith on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc, RN803 J Wadcock, Antony Aspbury Associates Ltd on behalf of GB Sanders, GL Sanders, TD Sanders & D Kettle, RN808 D M Evans, RN818 A Radley, RN820 J E Mutton, Loughborough College, RN822 F Hitchinson, The Woodland Trust, RN823 D E Sykes, RN891 A Cooper & J M Hornbuckle, RN892 A Cooper, M W Hornbuckle & J M </p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
<p>Hornbuckle, RN894 D Stott, RN899 F Mitchell, Langham Park Developments, RN907 R Hall, Andrew Martin Associates on behalf of Persimmon plc & William Davis Ltd, RN910 G Lees, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Leicestershire County Council, RN911 N Harris, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Mr J Barber, RN912 A Kitchen, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Radleigh Homes & Messrs Clarke, RN1294 R A Dickson, Groby Parish Council, RN1296 Joan Folkes,</p>		