

CORE STRATEGY

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RELATING TO: SECTION 4 - DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE GROWTH: SOUTH CHARNWOOD – EAST OF THURMASTON/NORTH OF HAMILTON

QUESTION 13: To what extent would you agree with our preferred directions for growth in South Charnwood - East of Thurmaston/North of Hamilton

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN08 N W King	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development at Thurmaston/ Hamilton will lead to loss of separate identities of Barkby and Barkby Thorpe • Building more roads will push excessive traffic through these villages as well as Queniborough, Beeby , Syston. 	
RN11 Thurmaston Parish Council	<p>Strong objection to development at East of Thurmaston/North of Hamilton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure of facilities and services required to sustain increased housing development and support a larger community is not sufficient – local schools, medical practices and leisure facilities are already fully committed; • Vitally important to maintain Thurmaston's identity and protect this area of Green Wedge, prevent further urban intrusion of the rural landscape <p>East of Thurmaston/North of Hamilton should not be identified for future employment growth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thurmaston has a saturation of employment land to serve the residential area. • Unsuitable for industrial development due to lack of road links to A46 or A6; • Road infrastructure surrounding new shopping centre, A607/Barkby Thorpe Lane and new housing at Sandiacre Drive is inadequate and further employment development would exasperate the situation. <p>Request data showing the ratio of employment land in Birstall and Thurmaston.</p>	
RN40 G & G Braybrook	<p>Object to development at East of Thurmaston:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detrimental to future generations; • Efforts by local groups to regenerate a community spirit in Thurmaston will be wasted by sticking a huge housing and industrial estate on one side of our village; • Remove substantial area of Green Wedge between Thurmaston, Barkby Thorpe, Barkby and Hamilton. The ideal of green wedges to create a rural and open appearance between local settlements will be lost. • Effect habitat of local wild birds and animals • Affect local farmers who are growing crops <p>Disagree that present system of adding a few new houses to existing towns and villages puts pressure on infrastructure like roads, GP surgeries, schools and leisure facilities. In our area over the last few years more surgeries, school classrooms and new leisure facilities have been built to keep up with gentle growth.</p> <p>In terms of roads there has been some improvement but the roads are only just coping with the existing traffic and require some more improvement. Further development of houses and a 42 hectare industrial site will introduce a lot more cars and heavy transport. This will make the road system impossible.</p> <p>Idea of housing people close to their place of work to reduce car journeys is a pipe dream. Some people may walk, cycle or use</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>public transport but you cannot guarantee reduced use of cars. No scheme, except London's congestion charge, has done so. Supermarkets and large retail parks are designed for people with cars. Sticking a large housing and industrial estate will create more car journeys in one area not less.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our lives are designed around the car and this is likely to continue especially with the use of cleaner fuels. The problem will not go away. Using the anti-car tool to decide the housing strategy is not a good idea. • Retain England as a green and pleasant land not create larger and larger urban sprawl. Do not remove Green Wedges and let so maintain our village communities in the future. • Traditional products are now being manufactured abroad so what industry is to be encouraged into these factories and offices. 	
<p>RN43 D Shuttlewood</p>	<p>In relation to East of Thurmaston I do not know exactly where the site is but:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access via Colby Drive is a rat run due to the ASDA and Thurmaston shopping centre as this area is unable to cope with traffic. Churchill Road bridge is dangerous, there are queues to get through and regular floods. Difficult to get onto Humberstone Lane at peak times and there is constant gridlock at the Roundway. • Access via Barkby Thorpe Road, allowing traffic through Barkby Thorpe and Barkby will create more gridlock than currently exists – 6500 cars per day. Plans are in place for traffic calming in Barkby to discourage traffic so more development would be ludicrous. Hamilton has thrown A47 to A46 traffic through Thurmaston and Barkby, both villages built for rural traffic. • The message is not to use cars. Buses cover one third of Colby Drive, buses cannot get under the bridge and there is no access to Midland Mainline. Nearest health centres are 1.5 to 2 miles away. • Before planners put ideas onto mountains of paper they should walk the area and speak to people who have to live with traffic problems every day. • Land is precious and necessary to our farming communities 	
<p>RN47 D Moore</p>	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thurmaston overfull already and infrastructure inadequate. Too much traffic via Barkby already. The Asda area is already busy. What will happen when adjoining new shopping centre opens? Concern about surface water and flooding impacts. • Development east of Thurmaston will ruin area. Just look at impact of Hamilton • Thurmaston will lose identity and become part of Leicester • Green wedge should be defined from Colby Drive? June Avenue across to Barkby Thorpe Lane • Hamilton should be expanded as 500 houses will make no difference given harmful impact of the existing development. 	
<p>RN49 Mrs Lang</p>	<p>Disagree Strongly. Development around Leicester will spoil a pretty place removing green areas few of which are let that are accessible to children.</p>	
<p>RN51 J A Skippen</p>	<p>Opposed to more building on Green Wedge Land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would spoil our village; • Thurmaston voted to remain a village when there was a chance to become a town; • When choosing a new location to live people look at schools and the type of community they want to live in eg. Towns with shops, villages etc • Already been vast building within the village that has spoilt the village • Keep green land for our children and wildlife • There are not enough resources – currently there are water shortages, problems with gas and other energy • Need to cope with existing problems and not create more. 	
<p>RN96</p>	<p>To integrate this package of expansion, East of Thurmaston and North of Hamilton, a response of great sensitivity is needed:</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
K Randon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently many houses are being built at Hamilton and Syston where strong local objections were overruled. The area needs time to digest what is currently being done before more is received; • Barkby is surrounded by working farms • Wildlife is in great abundance especially birds during harvest time • Richly endowed with footpaths giving recreation to people from miles around. This would be of increasing benefit of those who wish to escape the bricks which surround them and walk amongst greenery; • Barkby, Barkby Thorpe and Hamilton DMV are an accidental survival which is likely to be unique so close to an English city. Active decisions by the landowners means that farms have not been merged making an enduring landscape and a truly rural community. This adds to the feeling of being deep in the countryside; • Cricketer's Hill is a beautiful setting for cricket and the pavilion is smart and unvandalised. Despite being very close to the City, criminality is very uncommon in this area; • Developing the immediate area around this geographical group leaving a narrow moat of grassland and arable would not give enough distance to allow continuation of what has survived here – fetes and festival s are enjoyed and well attended by people from miles around; • This area contains the history of the immediate environs of a Roman City • The expansions of Thurmaston and Hamilton must not approach too closely.
RN103 A Smith (Parish Councillor)	<p>Concerned about development at Thurmaston:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thurmaston has enough industry and there is no easy access to motorways. Heavy traffic would have to come through the residential areas causing more noise and pollution; • Birstall has more going for it than Thurmaston in terms of industry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ The new housing development is now in progress and would lend itself to industry as there is none at the moment; ~ Access to the major road network for heavy goods vehicles would cause less impact on the village. • In terms of housing there is mostly affordable housing being built in Thurmaston. Need a better class of housing so people can move in Thurmaston, rather than leave, when family finances increase. • No mention made of housing for older population – a complex of bungalows with shops, café, leisure facilities and parkland; • Leisure facilities in this part of Charnwood are non-existent. Building cinemas, swimming pools and other sporting facilities would create the jobs needed for this area and beyond.
RN108 S Tebbatt	<p>In terms of the development for future housing at Thurmaston:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main concerns are traffic related. The by-pass divided the village, problems around ASDA and huge increase in traffic along Colby Drive due to new cul-de-sacs and more new development to rear of properties on Colby Drive; • Safety of people using Church Hill Road under the railway bridge is important as no previous measure has been successful; • What happened to railway station at this site to link with Loughborough. Links are not good using buses via Syston. • Concerned that the new development will be planned along the lines of the Jelson estate at Blount Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Car parking areas are not used and in a terrible state; ~ Play area to rear of Offranville flats is not safe for children to play on as it is hidden from view; • Relocate new community centre to play area site and play area to community centre site; • Obvious that the proposed area for block housing is what is proposed in the original Hamilton Plan; • Let us hope that when development goes ahead the people of Thurmaston get some gains.

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN117 Mr & Mrs Walker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate identities of Barkby and Barkby Thorpe in jeopardy. Reducing separation between villages would lead to a loss of character. Surrounding countryside needs to be safeguarded as important to them as historic separate settlements • Resulting traffic would add to congestion on major roads increasing likelihood of unsuitable minor roads through Barkby and Barkby Thorpe being used. • The Borough Council may not be able to service the new development • Fears re healthcare and education already stretched to breaking point • Parking is already a local hazard. How much greater would it get in future? 	
RN139 O Bentley	<p>Object to east of Thurmaston/ north of Hamilton as preferred option because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to preserve nature and character of existing towns and villages. Barkby and Barkby Thorpe were historically agricultural villages and this adds to character. Any lessening of land between them and Leicester would threaten their nature and character, their "local distinctiveness" and "separate identities". • This is a greener cleaner safer living environment as referred to in Plan. • Land between Barkby Thorpe and Hamilton is Grade A agricultural land • Intolerable burden of traffic on roads through Barkby and Barkby Thorpe. Existing traffic has led to traffic calming measures for implementation after Hobby Horse junction improvements are complete. • Existing homes to be built in Syston and near Barkby will impact on these villages. This small area has already had more than its share. 	
RN140 J Bentley	<p>Object to east of Thurmaston/ north of Hamilton as preferred option because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to preserve nature and character of existing towns and villages. Barkby and Barkby Thorpe were historically agricultural villages and this adds to character. Any lessening of land between them and Leicester would threaten their nature and character, their "local distinctiveness" and "separate identities". • This is a greener cleaner safer living environment as referred to in Plan. • Land between Barkby Thorpe and Hamilton is Grade A agricultural land • Intolerable burden of traffic on roads through Barkby and Barkby Thorpe. Existing traffic has led to traffic calming measures for implementation after Hobby Horse junction improvements are complete. • Existing homes to be built in Syston and near Barkby will impact on these villages. This small area has already had more than its share. 	
RN171 Beeby Parish Meeting	<p>Disagree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much development already east of Thurmaston and at Hamilton. Road system will not be able to cope. • Need to maintain identity of villages. Proposed development east of Thurmaston and north of Hamilton in addition to housing being built east of Syston will enclose Barkby. 	
RN240 P A Summers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that roads cannot cope with development • Current services (local medical services, schools, community centres) are overstretched • Barkby has the right for a separate identity • This area of Leicestershire is subject to extensive development and cannot absorb anymore. 	
RN277 P Scott	<p>Neutral/Not Sure. Strongly oppose to further extension of Hamilton site.</p>	
RN351 C Sweeney	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area has already undergone extensive development without added services. • Roads around Barkby and Barkby Thorpe are overwhelmed with traffic. • We have right to keep separate identity and to keep green wedge 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN352 C Sweeney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals involve massive environmental damage. • This area has already undergone extensive development without added services. • Roads around Barkby and Barkby Thorpe are overwhelmed with traffic. • We have right to keep separate identity and to keep green wedge • Proposals involve massive environmental damage. 	
RN377 P Green	<p>Object to proposal to develop East of Thurmaston and Hamilton for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area is already over-developed • Existing facilities in terms of doctors, schools, police cannot cope with influx of people • Barkby and Barkby Thorpe Conservation Areas are under threat by encroaching development. Their character should be maintained • Adequate farming land should be kept to maintain way of life/culture • Traffic situation in villages of 'rat running' will be made worse. 	
RN454 A Barnett	<p>Object strongly to development East of Loughborough/North of Hamilton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further building will damage the character and identity of the conservation villages of Barkby and Barkby Thorpe; • Damage employment opportunities in these farming villages; • Worsen the huge traffic problem in the villages. • Narrow streets and right angle bends of Barkby and Barkby Thorpe are entirely unsuitable for heavy goods traffic that would be generated by industrial building. 	
RN456 Leicestershire County Council	<p>Support the preferred options for the development strategy. These are consistent with the sequential approach in the Structure Plan.</p> <p>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.</p>	
RN497 Thurmaston Action Group	<p>(East of Thurmaston) proposal raises issues that are detrimental to our village, in relation to:</p> <p>Community Cohesion - Divides Thurmaston into three distinct communities – east, central and west and this is detrimental to our village identity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an issue that the Council through the Healthcheck has been recognised. Positive action is needed to ensure the flow of people and traffic from west to east. On foot old and new Thurmaston is connected by three foot bridges and a subway across the dividing A607 bypass. Assume the new proposal will build on Greenfield sites which would be separated from the existing community by Midland Mainline railway. Only access road is via a single traffic lane under a railway bridge (Church Hill Road). <p>Employment Land - Within Thurmaston and on its borders there is already a high concentration of manufacturing. More manufacturing would be detrimental.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a VAT registered business for every 11 homes, a strong local economy with low numbers of residents on income support and low unemployment in Thurmaston. • Thurmaston contains numerous industrial estates interspersed between residential areas. The village appears uncared and unkempt due to the owners/managers of the industrial units and many workers living outside the village and having no commitment to caring for the village. 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More factory units would provide more jobs from people outside Thurmaston and add to congestion and pollution without any economic benefits to the community. • New retail park at Barkby Thorpe Lane boasting high street stores is essentially a district wide shopping centre that adds nothing to the regeneration of Thurmaston as a community. • If we are to have more employment land then Thurmaston requires a greater variety than factory units and shops such as a multiplex leisure complex to diversify employment opportunities. <p>Housing – understand that housing has to keep up with demand and no objection to some housing but it should offer a mix of dwellings to cater for the whole community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thurmaston has a high percentage of unskilled and semi-skilled workers (27% compared to 20% national average); • Needs an increase of 4/5 bed high quality houses to allow families that have grown up in Thurmaston to remain; • Facilitate the elderly with bungalows or a ‘retirement village’; • Starter homes to enable the young to stay in the area. <p>Sensitively handled housing development could revitalize the village whereas more industrial areas would further divide the community. Careful consideration must be given to infrastructure, amenities, joining of new development to Thurmaston by cycle paths, minor roads and public transport.</p> <p>Leisure – a broad term that has changed with time. Land planned for business could cater for facilities that the younger generation look for. Combine employment and leisure to offer a multi entertainment complex including cinema, gym, swimming pool and more. This would offer more diverse employment opportunities.</p> <p>Infrastructure – proposed area is unsuitable for industrial development due to lack of road links to the A46 or A6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road system for transport to get to A47/M1/M69 would put intolerable strain on these already overused and congested roads; • Heavy duty haulage would increase pollution and noise so not addressing your clean, safe and healthy environment point; • Thurmaston residents cannot enjoy the facilities supplied by Charnwood unless they have a car. To redress this unreasonable situation consider opening a railway station in Thurmaston; • Need to look at amenities to cater for additional households such as schools, local grocery shops, dentists, doctors and so on. <p>Green Wedge – Hinterland has been lost to north and south of Thurmaston. A green wedge would be essential if Thurmaston is not to be engulfed by surrounding settlements.</p>	
RN503 L & S Healey	<p>Object to development East of Thurmaston:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of green belt, protected land; • Spoil our view, our way of living and be noisy, detrimental to and devalue our property; • Overpopulate an area where schools, doctors and dentists are at bursting point; • Area is used by walkers, bird/wildlife enthusiasts and horse riders and there is an ancient bridleway next to our property; • Fields provide crops and protect our wildlife and environment; • Takes the remaining little green area of Thurmaston; • Loss of the land will affect Thurmaston's identity and will join up with Hamilton, Leicester, Barkby Thorpe, Barkby and Syston. 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN544 C M Osborn	Concerns about the Thurmaston/ Hamilton location are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development likely to engulf Barkby & Barkby Thorpe, or at least reduce separation to a token gesture with the villages losing their identities as historic conservation villages • Traffic problems on roads through villages especially at peak times would be made worse by further development with congestion on narrow, unsuitable roads. 	
RN610 A Norman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic through Barkby is a nightmare. Development east of Thurmaston/ north of Hamilton would add to problems. Roads and facilities cannot take any more. Need to maintain village identity. Urban development would lead to loss of character. Development should take place elsewhere. 	
RN618 Birstall Parish Council	Agree. Thurmaston should be the preferred location because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geography – land north of Birstall , north of the A6 is sensitive, being more elevated and prominent to views in the wider landscape (CSPO para 4.56). The A46 is a clear boundary. Breaching this would create a threat to the separation of Birstall and Rothley. Development would be a substantial intrusion in open rural landscape visible in approaches from the north, (CSPO para 4.62). Birstall is separated from the Leicester urban area by a river valley, its elevation and a railway corridor. The area north of Birstall has elevated landscape and is a critical green wedge, reasons for not choosing the Glenfield area. • By contrast the Thurmaston – Barkby Road – Hamilton area is already part of urban sprawl and liberally industrialized. • Traffic- CSPO para 2.9 accepts air quality and congestion problems exist along the A6/A46. The Hallam Fields development will create thousands of additional car trips. Birstall has inadequate facilities to cope with this let alone more development. Birstall has a main road running through it difficult to cross already and traffic from new development would impact on village and attract car trips from a wide area. The Highways Agency have already indicated the extent of problems on the A6 and A46. • Planning policies- National policy guidance seeks best use of previously developed land and a reverse of the decline in rural areas. In Charnwood when business sites close sites are used for housing necessitating use of Greenfield sites for employment. • The Birstall allocation is contrary to the reduced emphasis on urban concentration in south Charnwood in the approved Structure Plan. • Development will totally change the character of the area. • Birstall is a residential village with low unemployment of 1.1 to 1.6% in different wards. People living there tend to have stable employment already. Its residential character is a major part of its appeal in contrast to other parts of south Charnwood. • Birstall is already committed to more than its fair share of development for many years to come. <p>Birstall PC fully endorse the submission made by Wanlip Parish Meeting on this issue.</p>	
RN728 R Youngs	Strongly disagree.	
RN735 R P & A E Tweddle	Concerned at impact on Barky and Barkby Thorpe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Anstey / Glenfield location appears to be more acceptable as Glenfield is already attached to Leicester and area has excellent roads and access to A46 and M1. • Disappointed that CS indicates need to safeguard this area of green wedge and settlement identities before others. • Lack of road planning has allowed villages to be cut through for unacceptable levels of traffic. More housing will mean more motorists try to avoid congested main roads and travel through villages • Inadequate car parking at Thurmaston shopping centre is causing chaos especially at weekends. Further development will make matters worse. • Village identities must be safeguarded. Any reduction in separation between villages and encroachment of development will lead 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>to loss of identity and character</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to safeguard historic settlements and agricultural countryside. Need to maintain productive farmland to reduce imports. • Meeting development needs should not mean destruction of countryside or loss of rural communities 	
<p>RN738 Barkby Parish Council</p>	<p>Concerns about proposals at Thurmaston/ Hamilton are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barkby/Barkby Thorpe is a historic distinctive settlement first mentioned in Domesday Book. Surrounding agricultural land contributes to its special character and identity • Encroachment into the green wedge/ area of separation would reduce settlement identity and structurally important separation from main urban area. • Local countryside around village is important local characteristic. • Development would generate further traffic adding to rat running traffic on unsuitable minor roads through the villages. • If development were to proceed in this location there is a need for improved infrastructure in form of a bypass from Melton Rd, Syston to the Hamilton roundabout in the City. This road could contain building land within the boundaries of Syston and Thurmaston. 	
<p>RN741 GVA Grimley on behalf of Jelson Ltd</p>	<p>Neutral/ not sure.</p>	
<p>RN742 Redrow Homes</p>	<p>North of Leicester direction of growth should focus on Hamilton (eastern arrow on key diagram). Hamilton is a natural and seamless extension at the edge of Leicester with infrastructure and facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development in the Thurmaston location would threaten the separate identities of Barkby and Barkby Thorpe. • The location meets a number of broad principles for sustainable development in CS and national guidance (eg positive sustainable framework for economic growth, promoting urban and rural regeneration, promoting inclusive, healthy, crime free communities, providing land to meet identified needs taking account accessibility and transport infrastructure needs, ready access to jobs, health, education, shops etc by non car modes, reducing need to travel, enhancing natural / key cultural assets); • Meets all Sustainability Appraisal criteria; • Performs well against other locations in south Charnwood. It satisfies the broad sequential approach and offers the most sustainable solution to development of the Borough and Central Leicestershire policy area. • Accept need for careful treatment of Hamilton medieval village and setting. 	
<p>RN806 A Kay</p>	<p>Disagree. If development East of Thurmaston goes ahead, a new railway station must be provided at Thurmaston, paid for by developers. The railway line is conveniently located east of Thurmaston.</p>	
<p>RN817 T Birkinshaw</p>	<p>Neutral/Not Sure. Disagree with extension north of Hamilton. There needs to be a green wedge between Leicester's Hamilton and any development on the Charnwood site, otherwise Charnwood will just be an extension of Leicester. Barkby and Beeby must be kept well separated from urban sprawl. The housing targets are uncertain and may be much lower than those quoted.</p>	
<p>RN825 G P Francis</p>	<p>Object to urban expansion East of Thurmaston/North of Hamilton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would not cause the least environmental harm as you suggest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traditional farming countryside and an historic agricultural resource; - Wildlife haven; - Balance to the urban areas 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key part of our environment and heritage we should not lose; • Spoil the genuine rural character, feel and separate identity of Barkby, a small traditional farming village; • Leave the pleasant parts alone for future generations to enjoy; • Local facilities – medical centres, schools, pubs and shops – cannot cope with additional development. New facilities will destroy further the historic farming countryside; • Roads through Barkby are not suitable for additional traffic; • This side of Barkby is a fluvial floodplain. Development would alter existing drainage characteristics and increase the likelihood of flooding to buildings. 	
RN904 A Corner	Agree. Potential land around Thurmaston that is already subject to significant development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could meet all future employment needs for South Charnwood. • Improved road structure supports this. • Area North of Birstall is on higher land and would be visible from large parts of the County. <p>There is a clear need to identify a sustainable way forward but this should always be carried out with minimum impact to the environment/greenfields. Locating centres of employment around existing large developments and other industry seems most appropriate. An opportunity is being missed if we do not develop areas around Thurmaston and preserve other areas.</p>	
RN1346 A Johnston	Expansion east of Thurmaston, north of Hamilton should not be at a scale which results in coalescence with other settlements such as Syston.	
RN14 DLiggins, RN16 M Hall, RN19 C Emmet, RN21 P&E Coughlin, RN23 A Rumsey, RN24 J L Mitchell, RN25 M P Parker, RN30 C F A Sutton, RN37 Nicola L Sharpe, RN48 J Lambert, Rearsby Parish Council, RN50 C Moon, RN54 P J Morrall JP, RN57 F E Norburn, RN59 K R Senior, RN129 R Bowman, RN142 E E Jones, RN143 R Wym Jones, RN146 Y W Hannell, RN147 J Heath, Thrussington Parish Council, RN179 S Bradwell, RN197 R W Hill, RN324 N	Agree.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
<p>Richards, RN345 A B Kidger, RN346 J R Cheshire, RN348 S J Tinning, RN353 S J Doyle & R K Stephenson, RN354 C Leafe, RN356 I Harrison, Wanlip Parish Meeting, RN360 C M Spencer, RN419 M Hall, RN420 A W Lacey, RN461 R Hoyland, RN481 J Thompson, RN603 R C Jones, RN604 E H Sinclair Goulden, RN607 M Lear, RN609 S L Batson, RN613 P Chamberlin, RN616 H D Robinson Sharratt, RN621 T & C Malone, RN788 S Bullman, RN795 J Faulks, Normanton on Soar Parish Council, RN796 TStott, RN801 F F Rawson, Frank F Rawson on behalf of FFR Ultrasonics Ltd, RN811 C T Watson, RN814 N Booth, RN818 A Radley, RN821 L Emmitt, RN890 C A Clegg, RN893 F J Howgate, RN895 J C Pearson, RN897 D Mear, RN898 D C Toone, RN900 Gill, RN901 K Canner, RN908 M C Dimitrov, RN1293 JR Shephard, J & J Design</p>		

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
on behalf of Loughborough Gospel Hall Trust		
RN06 D B Street, RN26 D J Hourston, RN27 A M Clarke, RN39 A Gardner, RN97 A Davis, RN128 C J Keeling, RN318 G B Stephenson, RN421 A Dalzell, RN542 G Hobbs, RN611 P Raja, RN619 N Jones, Anstey Parish Council, RN720 J J Sutherland, RN790 P Froggatt, RN793 L McGunnigle, RN800 A M Ward, Mather Jamie on behalf of Hamilton Trustees, RN824 A Hubbard, The National Trust, RN902 J & L Blyth, RN905 R J N Brown, RN918 T Bateman, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Wilson Bowden & David Wilson Homes	Agree Strongly.	
RN56 A W G Ballentyne, RN171 P A Bland, RN338 R Singh, RN408 E A Goodson, RN516 M West, RN726 W Young, Fisher German on behalf of Rearsby Ltd, RN802 T Higgins, RN806 A Kay, RN899 F Mitchell, Langham	Disagree.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Park Developments, RN911 N Harris, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Mr J Barber, RN1295 J A Shields		
RN28 M S Smith, RN41 J Sutton, RN42 Carnall Family , RN60 G & P Allen, RN275 P S Newman, RN337 N Porter, RN349 A Aucott, RN350 D Aucott, RN409 L Tillen, RN467 LFoster, Seagrave Parish Council, RN477 P Moxon, RN545 A Wells, RN615 R E Davies, St Michael of All Angels, RN792 Popley Family, RN813 P Knott, RN891 A Cooper & J M Hornbuckle, RN892 A Cooper, M W Hornbuckle & J M Hornbuckle, RN896 D Patel	Disagree Strongly.	
RN13 D Ayres, RN15 M Birkinshaw, RN17 E Goodyer, RN18 M Bellatrix, RN20 L Bates, RN31 G Brown, RN36 M C Dolby, RN45 B A Fox, RN52 P H Ball, RN106 C W Askham, RN166 F A E Reece, RN284 A C Wood, RN293 B J Butler, RN294 D Ross, RN328 K Appleby,	Neutral/Not Sure.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
<p> RN335 P J Thrope, RN339 J Noon, CPRE Charnwood, RN347 M J Hagger, RN355 J Booth, RN361 P A Higgins, RN374 J Wilson, RN438 G H Wilson, RN465 D Baker, RN469 J Green, RN478 C J Blanchard, RN521 S James, Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Parkers of Leicester & A J Paker, RN543 SF Hobbs, RN546 K Davies, Fisher German on behalf of Mr Rutherford, RN547 K Davies, Fisher German on behalf of Mr C J Wells, RN548 K Davies, Fisher German on behalf of Mr D Johar, RN551 W Antill, Holmes-Antill on behalf of Palmer- Tomkinson Trust, RN605 M Flatman, RN608 J M Neal, RN612 C Humphreys, RN614 E Harding, RN617 C D R Sharratt, RN620 M Smallman, Del-Rosa Developments Ltd, RN661 A C Johnson, RN712 C Potts, Hepher Dixon Ltd on behalf of Loughborough Golf & </p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
<p>Hotel Development, RN714 LNeedham, The Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group Committee, RN744 S Mitchell, RN791 R A Gough, Gough Planning Services on behalf of Revelan Group, RN794 N Browne, RN797 J Thompson, RN798 M Eagland, Peacock & Smith on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc, RN799 A H Olofsson, RN803 J Wadcock, Antony Aspbury Associates Ltd on behalf of GB Sanders, GL Sanders, TD Sanders & D Kettle, RN804 A Irving, RN807 R Francis, RN808 D M Evans, RN812 A Millie, RN815 R A Parsons, RN816 S Cuff, Nanpantan Residents' Network, RN820 J E Mutton, Loughborough College, RN822 F Hitchinson, The Woodland Trust, RN823 D E Sykes, RN894 D Stott, RN907 R Hall, Andrew Martin</p>		

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Associates on behalf of Persimmon plc & William Davis Ltd, RN910 G Lees, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Leicestershire County Council, RN912 A Kitchen, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Radleigh Homes & Messrs Clarke, RN1294 R A Dickson, Groby Parish Council, RN1296 J Folkes		