

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RELATING TO: SECTION 6 - LOUGHBOROUGH SCIENCE PARK - DRAFT POLICY 1

QUESTION 23: To what extent would you agree or disagree with the proposed policy to guide the development of the Loughborough Science Park?

QUESTION 24: If you disagree, what changes would you suggest.

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN14 D Liggins	Disagree. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University needs to review assets to ensure more within existing campus whilst safeguarding the big houses on Ashby Road. • Landscaping and parkland setting sound in principle but at such large scale will take long time to develop and may prove difficult to maintain. • Should not extend beyond Snells Nook Lane into National Forest. • Science Park will not be sustainable: close to motorway, high car use, few jobs for local people. 	
RN15 M Birkinshaw	Agree. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services should be specified as frequent (ie at least 1/2hourly) • Limits should be set on areas covered by car parks - the current site is largely parking and roads. • Building size (height) should be limited. The Advantica building dominates the area. • Large landscaping areas needed for ecological value. Need links to countryside corridors in the town. 	
RN19 C Emmett	Neutral/Not Sure. Include some family housing for the people who will be working at the science park.	
RN41 Jacqueline Sutton	Disagree Strongly. Fill the units that are empty in the Borough to make the towns and villages more attractive.	
RN46 Leicestershire Constabulary – Architectural Liaison Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give thought to potential uses within a Science Park that may require above average levels of security. Particularly where teaching or student accommodation is incorporated into the development or where rights of way cross the site. • Planning development principles should allow development to achieve appropriate levels of defensible space and access control associated with the individual buildings. 	
RN49 Mrs Lang	Disagree Strongly. Not sure a Science Park is really needed.	
RN61 M Hamilton	Make an ecofriendly development such as those existing in North Notts. Science park could: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine living/workspace units • Generate power locally • Recycle waste materials eg. greywater recycling and ponds doubling up as a reed bed compost recycling human manure. 	
RN100 R M Matts	Asks what are the plans for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed mitigation/abatement methods to reduce dust and noise emissions during construction phase of development when working in close proximity to my rear garden on Snells Nook Lane; • Long and short term measures to reduce noise and air emissions post construction phase when development is fully commissioned and operational; 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of obtrusive lighting and light pollution resulting from lighting schemes and surveillance equipment from encroaching upon my house and garden; • Screening/planting to reduce visual impact of the finished development to the rear of my gardens; • Removing any flora and trees as part of clearance work in anticipation of the project to the rear of my garden; • Adopting mitigation and methods to protect established wildlife corridors and habitats. 	
RN129 Prof R Bowman	Agree. Case for a science park needs more detail before including in Plan.	
RN146 Y W Hannell	Agree Strongly. Roads/ transport need vast improvement. This is a good chance to vastly improve the area. Needs bold, imaginative building that makes a statement	
RN154 J R Cowell	Disagree Strongly. ix) a, b, c Benefits of cycle and pedestrian links and bus stop improvements could be made regardless of the Science park. Concern about implications of M1 widening.	
RN221 Friends of Charnwood Forest	Agree. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26ha is too large. • Loughborough university has no track record in attracting inward investment • Area could become another retail warehouse outlet. 	
RN293 B Butler	Disagree. Do not develop the science park beyond Snells Nook Lane towards the M1.	
RN339 CPRE (Charnwood)	Agree. Appreciate the need for the amount of land take and hope areas will be subject of more detailed consultation with relevant interest groups.	
RN345 A Kidger	Agree. Site for Loughborough Science park could be used for Park and Ride service at the weekend.	
RN419 M Hall	Agree Strongly. Include an exhibition centre, for visual arts, public café, theatre for performing arts, open spaces with sitting gardens and sculptures, within the science park development.	
RN421 Alan Dalzell	Agree Strongly. Agree with science park proposal but must be without the link road to A6 near Hathern.	
RN453 S Rasaiah	Welcome the opportunity to have a proper Science park, designed to a very high standard, adjacent to the university that is only for science based employment use and not for general business/workspace development on this very environmentally attractive location.	
RN456 Leicestershire County Council	<p>The proposals are generally consistent with the requirements of the Structure Plan and are therefore supported. There is concern, however, regarding the transport implications:</p> <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. 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
RN460 Environment Agency	<p>Paragraph 3.32 proposes that the site would be developed at low density within a parkland setting. Burleigh Brook runs through the site with its associated flood plain. No development should take place with Flood Zone 3 and a flood risk assessment should investigate whether on-site water management could address downstream flooding problems, removing an environmental constraint to regeneration.</p> <p>In addition, an increase in surface water run-off generated by development of the greenfield site would need to be managed using sustainable drainage techniques so as not increase flows in Burleigh Brook which could contribute to flooding downstream.</p>	
RN464 The National Forest Company	<p>The land proposed for the science parks development falls partly within and partly outside of The National Forest. The area west of Snells Nook Lane falls within the Forest and proposed development of 27 ha in this area would have a significant landscape impact upon The National Forest setting. A full environmental impact assessment of the proposals is, therefore, needed. It is acknowledged that the intention is the “protect and retain existing ecological interests, allow for additional compensatory provision of ecological sites and create a strong wooded and parkland setting for the development”. Reference is also made (para. 3.36) to “approximately 50% of the net site allocation being retained as part of the landscape and ecological setting for the site”. The NFC would like to know the area (in hectares) that this would cover within The National Forest, compared with the proposed development footprint.</p> <p>The NFC would also have an interest in the potential scale and siting of buildings within The National Forest. It is noted that the average height of buildings would be “one and a half storeys”. It would be important that the height and mass of proposed commercial units did not impact strongly on The National Forest and Charnwood edge settings, particularly in views from the M1, A512, Snells Nook Lane and local Rights of Way. Buildings should be set back from these routes and contained within substantial woodland planting and parkland landscaping.</p> <p>As a further point of interest, and without prejudice to the planning process for the Science Park proposals, the NFC has discussed separately with the University the potential of wood fuel for heating their buildings. There may be value in discussing this further with you and the University in the future.</p>	
RN469 J Green	<p>Disagree Strongly. Object to Science Park 2 proposal on a Greenfield site A512/Snell Nook. It is an area of significant ecological importance including Holywell cottage – the home of the biggest colony of brown long eared bats in the East Midlands. These bats and the local habitat are protected. English Nature will need to undertake an assessment to include a bat survey in line with PPG9.</p>	
RN471 R Guise	<p>Disagree Strongly. No development.</p>	
RN481 J Thompson	<p>Agree Strongly. Build the science park in an attractive way with landscaping. Blend in to but be screened from the surrounding countryside.</p>	
RN517 Loughborough University	<p>The University supports the Preferred Option and will assist the Council by providing information to ensure that robust evidence can be presented to the Examination in Public. Particularly pleased to see that the DPD makes provision for University uses and that the Council has not sought to differentiate, on the allocation plan, between areas for University and Science Park development.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
<p>Agent: GVA Grimley LLP</p>	<p>As the University has asserted previously, to attempt to draw such boundaries would be inappropriate and unhelpful.</p> <p>The University is a little concerned by the continued use of the title 'Science Park'. This may conjure an image of research and development activities that could be too narrow and may not actually be aligned with the University or other research companies in the town (although this is obviously not the Council's intention). However, to use an alternative title at this stage would almost certainly over-complicate matters. So, and as long as the UKSPA definition is retained in the DPD, and Policy 1 does not use the term 'science' to define appropriate uses, the University has no objection to the ongoing use of the term Science Park.</p> <p>The DPD is presented in sufficient detail to enable community involvement and sustainability appraisal, it contains a description and precis of alternative allocations considered and describes, with sufficient clarity, why the Preferred Option has been selected. Notwithstanding this, elements of the DPD are not as clear and precise as they shall need to be at the Submission stage. In particular, the University has difficulty understanding the Borough Council's area and floorspace calculations, and its plans for the development of the land left over after allowances have been made for Science Park and University uses (about 23 ha(gross)).</p> <p>The salient points (in the University's opinion) to be made in the Key Planning Principles section of the DPD are set out below. Unfortunately, several of the points are not made clearly. The existing text could be more succinct and must explain more precisely the area calculations used to arrive at the net developable land and floorspace figures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the majority of the land between the existing University campus and Snells Nook Lane (including the former GRTC), is controlled by Loughborough University; • the land to the west of Snells Nook Lane is in one ownership and is controlled by a single developer; • the Core Strategy acknowledges the importance of the University to the local and regional economy and the need to provide for its development as necessary. After making efficient use of the existing campus, expansion onto the open land to the west represents the most sustainable and functionally appropriate strategy; • in addition to University uses, the DPD must provide for a substantial Science Park in accordance with strategic planning policy; • the Science Park proposals and University development are stand-alone requirements and can proceed independently of the west of Loughborough expansion promoted in the Core Strategy [although it must be acknowledged there will be a degree of synergy between these various land uses, as well as common infrastructure requirements that might benefit from co-ordinated solutions]; • the land allocated for development in the DPD extends to 127 ha. Of this, about 32ha is already developed or shall be protected from development (Holywell Wood, Burleigh Wood and the woodland belt). This leaves about 95 ha (gross) for Science Park and University facilities; • of the 95ha, at least 50ha (gross) will be made available for Science Park development and at least 22 ha (gross) will be made available for University development; • not more than 20% of the 95 ha shall be covered by buildings and at least 50% shall be landscaped to form a parkland setting; • this scale of allocation will provide for at least 150,000 sq m of Science Park development and at least 66,000 sq m of University development [see assessment of floorspace figures in Section 3 below]; • some of the University development which takes place within the allocated site will have Science Park characteristics and close physical and function relationships with Science Park occupiers. On this basis, and also because the Borough Council cannot be precise at this point in time about the scale and location of University development, it would be inappropriate for the DPD to specify which parts of the allocated site should be safeguarded for Science Park uses and which parts should be developed for University uses: so far as the University is concerned, any specific decisions should await the outcome on the University's

Respondents	Summary of Comments
	<p>masterplanning exercise for Holywell Park;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is important that the development of the Science Park is suitably controlled to ensure that the occupiers have appropriate links with the University, each other, or other 'high added value', high technology, or R&D-based companies in the town. However, it is important to strike an appropriate balance so as to ensure that planning policy does not deter, restrict or prohibit the possibility of a wide range of appropriate high-value development within the Science Park; • there shall need to be provision made, within the Science Park, for a range of units (incubator through to large facilities for inward investors) and it is appropriate that planning policy ensures that land is reserved for these various buildings; • for the purposes of determining the scale of allocation required, assumptions have been made about development density (plot ratio 0.2) but applicants for planning permission will not be compelled to adhere to this density so long as, overall, not more than 20% of the site is covered by buildings and at least 50% is landscaped; • the release of land for development shall not be phased; • because of its location, the allocated site offers the opportunity to provide for a high quality development that conserves and enhances the landscape, uses and builds on high frequency bus services, takes advantage of proximity to Loughborough town centre and the railway station, benefits from proximity to the M1 and, perhaps most importantly, benefits from proximity to Loughborough University. <p>Suitability To confirm that the Preferred Option is suitable, an assessment must be made of: its locational characteristics; its scale and the wording of Policy 1.</p> <p>Location - The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) states that, within the Three Cities Sub-Area, there is a particular shortage of sites suitable for science and technology users. It also refers to the Regional Employment Strategy and the Quality of Employment Land Supply and Regional Employment Land Priorities study, both prepared by the East Midlands Development Agency (EMDA). However, the RSS does not highlight the findings that are relevant to the Borough Council's proposals and nor does it state categorically that there is a need for an additional Science Park in the Three Cities Sub-Area. With this in mind, the University is pleased to note that the DPD does make reference to the content of these other strategic documents. Together with the Structure Plan, they make it clear that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is a need to develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation within the Region by encouraging new business starts, developing new technologies and stepping up the commercialisation of research undertaken by Higher Education Institutions; • because of the shortage of sites for science and technology users, there is a compelling need for additional Science Park development (and the need for EMDA to assist with Science Park delivery); and • a suitable location for additional Science Park development would be the land adjacent to the GRTC at Loughborough. <p>In the University's opinion, it is right that the Borough Council highlights this strategic context and the development requirement set by the Structure Plan.</p> <p>In so far as locational characteristics are concerned, no other site in the Borough can offer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • juxtaposition with Loughborough University and the research, development and technology activities already in existence within and adjacent to the campus; and • University control over the majority of the land needed for the development and University commitment to the Science Park

Respondents	Summary of Comments
	<p>concept; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University commitment to expansion, within the allocated site, of its Business Innovation and Knowledge Transfer facilities (core Science Park uses); • proximity to Loughborough College; and • access to direct, high frequency bus links to Loughborough town centre (including railway station and bus interchange); and • access to direct, high frequency bus links to Shepshed (meaning that the Borough's two largest settlements can easily be reached by non-car modes); • fast and easy access to the M1 Motorway and Nottingham East Midlands Airport; and • an urban edge setting capable of being moulded and enhanced to create a high quality, naturally landscaped environment; and • proximity to the Borough Council's preferred area for future housing growth; and • sufficient developable area to provide for the necessary critical mass of Science Park development whilst providing for University uses also. <p>The University notes that part of the Preferred Option site extends into an area currently designated as Green Wedge. Whilst the University has no particular view on the merits of the planning strategy in terms of Green Wedges, it is important to note that the Preferred Option would not result in the total erosion of the Green Wedge and a strategic gap between Loughborough and Shepshed would be maintained.</p> <p>Insofar as the National Forest and Charnwood Forest designations are concerned, the University considers that the Council is right to conclude that, with appropriate master planning and design, the Preferred Option site offers the potential to secure landscape and bio-diversity enhancements. In other words, whilst the site is clearly greenfield and is considered by the Council to be particularly attractive, landscape character would be improved rather than harmed if the development were to proceed.</p> <p>Scale - As described within Section 2, it is understood that of the 95ha of developable land to be allocated in the DPD, the Council will allow only 19 ha (20%) to be occupied by buildings. Assuming, as the Council does, that the average building within the site will extend over 1.5 floors, this gives a notional capacity of 285,000 sq m of development. Of this, at least 150,000 sq m should be Science Park and, if the same plot ratio is applied to University development, at least 66,000 sq m should be University floorspace. Clearly, if taller buildings were constructed (and policy should not prevent the construction of taller buildings), then the site could accommodate a greater quantity of floorspace.</p> <p>Overall, the University considers the scale of the proposed allocation to be appropriate. In the University's opinion, it is necessary for the Borough Council to plan for at least the scale of Science Park development contemplated in the Preferred Option and, clearly, it is necessary also to provide for an appropriate quantity of University development.</p> <p>The quantity of development the allocation provides for is clearly significant but it is certainly not unachievable. Indeed, the University considers that the Borough Council should not limit the developable area to 20% of the allocation. This should be increased and the percentage of the site given over to landscaping should be decreased. A percentage (for landscaping) of 40% would be closer to the norm and would, in the west of Loughborough context, provide ample space for the creation of a woodland setting and the protection and enhancement of land of ecological value. Insofar as the scale and density of development is concerned, it is relevant to note that Cambridge Science Park (which does not accommodate University facilities) covers 61.5 ha and contains 145,540 sq m of development (plot ratio 0.24). There is an additional 75,000 sq m of development at the Granta Science Park, also in Cambridge, giving a total Science Park floorspace for that area in excess of 215,000 sq m.</p>

Respondents	Summary of Comments
	<p>Insofar as the University requirement, it may be necessary to develop out more than the 22ha referred to in the Preferred Option. This quantity of land would satisfy the University's Business Innovation and Knowledge Transfer space needs in the period to 2020 but if, in accordance with Policy 1, the University needs to develop additional academic floorspace, recreational or sports facilities and / or residential accommodation, this would almost certainly mean that it would be creating more than 66,000 sq m of development. However, the Preferred Option appears to have the physical capacity to accommodate more than 22 ha of University and, so long as the DPD does not place an upper limit on University development (and so long as this is made clear in the Document), there should be no need to make adjustments to the wording of the Policy.</p> <p>The University cannot be certain about the rate at which the Science Park will grow or, indeed, how quickly it will need to build new University facilities within the Preferred Option site. However, the University will be looking into this further in the coming months.</p> <p>Draft Policy 1 Much of Draft Policy 1 is appropriate and necessary but several amendments should be made to ensure that: sufficient clarity is provided; an appropriate degree of flexibility is allowed; and that the Policy provides the right framework for the development of a vital and vibrant Science Park community and sustainable University growth. The matters requiring attention are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the types of University development to be permitted must include: teaching; research and development; sport and recreation (indoor and outdoor); ancillary staff and student facilities; and student residences; • to complement the Class B uses permitted by Policy 1, appropriate allowances should be made for ancillary and complementary development including: an hotel; day nursery; retail; food and drink uses; and health and fitness facilities; • it should be permissible to cover 20% of the site with buildings. In other words, it should not be necessary for developers to accommodate courtyards and service areas (and car parking facilities or highways) within this 19 ha; • Policy 1 should not rule out the possibility of outdoor sports facilities being provided within the parkland areas (ie the landscaped 50% of the site) or the remaining 30% of the site; • it should not be necessary within paragraph (vi) to specify extensive landscaping given that, on the back of this development, 47.5ha of landscaping will be provided; • paragraph (viii) should make exceptions in the respect of dead, dying or dangerous trees and hedgerows and should define 'other natural features'; • whilst it will be necessary to ensure that occupiers of, and visitors to, the development have the ability to use (and are encouraged to use) non-car modes of transport, it would be inappropriate to require the infrastructure and service enhancements specified within paragraph (iv) at the outset. A graduated approach to demand management and infrastructure improvements will be required if development is not to be stifled; and • it appears to the University that the parking standards contained within the Regional Plan will not be applicable to the development contemplated by the DPD (because of floorspace thresholds.) As a consequence, parking provision will be a matter for the Borough Council. <p>Availability All of the 95 ha referred to in the Preferred Option as "developable" is available for development. This land is owned by a small number of parties and those parts of it which are not controlled by the University are controlled by developers that are keen to facilitate the Science Park proposals. Together with these developers, the University has prepared separate Representations to the</p>

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>Borough Council, confirming joint commitment to development delivery and responding in a positive fashion to the general objectives of the DPD.</p> <p>Accessibility The Preferred Option site benefits from being adjacent to the A512 providing direct connectivity with the M1 and access to high frequency bus services linking Loughborough with Shepshed. The motorway provides a high speed route to Nottingham East Midlands Airport, Derby and Nottingham and the bus service connects the site with nearby housing and employment areas, and other public transport facilities converging on the town centre, including national rail services. The DPD should highlight these benefits and, as necessary, comment on preferred access solutions.</p> <p>In terms of site specifics, the preferred option could be accessed directly from the A512 and also from Snells Nook Lane and Holywell Way. The University is discussing highway capacity with Leicestershire County Council and the Highways Agency and has commissioned trip generation and distribution analysis. The conclusions made of this work will be shared with the Borough Council in due course.</p>	
RN549 P Hipkin	<p>Disagree Strongly. The case for a science park has not been explained. Who is going to use it and for what?. What will be done there that cannot be done in existing educational and research centres, commercial or otherwise.</p>	
RN612 C Humphreys	<p>Agree. 3.40 ix) current Holywell park development has led to significant problems of displacement parking. No development should be allowed until these are addressed.</p>	
RN616 H D R Sharratt	<p>Disagree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve Burleigh Wood as place of peace and tranquility by minimizing noise. • Improve bus services from Nottingham, Loughborough and Leicester to serve this area. • Address parking to protect residents and provide for workers and visitors. 	
RN617 C D R Sharratt	<p>Disagree. Some criteria to control the development seem somewhat impractical, and woolly at best. Industrial areas always grow and develop.</p>	
RN620 Del Rosa Developments Ltd	<p>Disagree. Development of knowledge based industries should not be to detriment of similar developments in rural areas.</p>	
RN659 GOEM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Happy with principle of a new science park west of Holywell Park but concerned development at low density within a large parkland setting would conflict with PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'. The argument for low density is undermined by the stated intention to intensify development on the University campus. • Reserving 26ha of land west of Snells Nook Lane for inward investment does not appear justified by regional or local planning policy, and this is an environmentally sensitive location. 	
RN661 A C Johnson	<p>Disagree. Disagree with the premise of creating a high quality theme park setting contained in its own dedicated environmental bubble. This is elitist, outdated thinking and will be Non Value Added to the local economy.</p>	
RN662 English Heritage	<p>The preferred option would not have an unacceptable impact on any nationally designated sites. However features of historic interest eg Holywell Farmhouse, former Charnwood canal and an area of ridge and furrow are not identified in para 3.6. Advise us to contact County Archaeologist to discuss how they could be integrated into scheme. In order to take account of historic interest suggest amend DPD Policy 1 iv):</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN721 Network Rail	<p>“..Horseshoe Woodland Belt and other biodiversity <i>and historic</i> features are retained and, <i>where appropriate</i>, enhanced.....”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft DPD Policy 1 does not mention rail services. This development has potential to increase passenger numbers generally across the immediate area as employees bring families to the area and services based on future development of the university and SP also grow. • In order to reduce car dependency in line with PPG13 Transport the policy needs to make clear that enhancements will be made through contributions to public transport facilities of all types to remedy deficiencies associated with low density office park developments. 	
RN728 R Youngs	<p>Neutral. Sustain natural heritage/ biodiversity without fragmenting corridors. Secure good walking/ cycling links.</p>	
RN743 English Nature	<p>Objects to selection of this option and policy guidance.</p> <p>Proposed site includes Burleigh and Holywell Woods two areas of ancient woodland designated as local wildlife sites. The proposed policy is vague, gives no indication of the level of biodiversity resource and does not appear to protect and enhance these resources contrary to RSS8 policies 28 and 29.</p> <p>Policy needs too include details covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological assessment prior to grant of any planning permission to influence design and layout in terms of impacts on habitats and species • Impacts both during and after development to ensure pollutants do not contaminate woodlands and other habitats. SUDS should be secured. • Management plans to ensure effective long term management of resources and buffer zones • 50m buffer zones around woodlands and other significant habitats • links between habitats and countryside and other habitats to allow movement by species • inclusion of green corridor to enable public access from urban areas to identified greenspace areas. 	
RN788 S Bullman	<p>Disagree. Do not disagree with the Science Park, but Policy 14 makes a mockery of the term "Science Park". If it is to be a student village, then it should be termed so rather than deceive by using the term science park. The public perception of the Borough benefit of a "Student village", which indicates a primary benefit to the University will be very different to a 'science park' which implies a wider Borough benefit with jobs for a differently skilled workforce.</p> <p>Why exactly that parcel of land. This appears to be "pre-fixed" without any justification. Such lack of transparency leads to a suspicion that there is a hidden agenda.</p>	
RN796 T Stott	<p>Neutral/Not Sure. Agree that the preferred option is the best location but have concerns about the way in which it may be developed. This is a sensitive site. We are concerned about the nature of developments that would be placed across Snell's Nook Lane and about the possible linkage of a</p>	
RN799 A H Olofsson	<p>Agree. I don't know enough about this to have an opinion, but I strongly agree with the ideas of the development of the Science Park. In addition to that I think that the development should be challenged to build in accordance with the latest technology with regards to energy saving and environmentally friendly design.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN802 T Higgins	<p>Disagree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bearing in mind the slow take-up of land for science parks, an allocation of 50ha is not necessary. A smaller and more specific area should be allocated and Snells Nook Lane should form the Western boundary. The land west of Snells Nook Land and the motorway forms a barrier between the motorway and the science park site that will enhance the approach to Loughborough if left undisturbed. • The use classes need to be restricted to those detailed in para. 3.40 (1)a and (1)b and not extended to para.(1)c. 	
RN804 A Irving	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection to some expansion but not across Snell's Nook Lane. It could go upwards rather than across. Please no thin end of a wedge on this one as it really is unnecessary. • The Gas site is adequate if they build up a layer or two. I think this is preferable to spreading across the top of the Forest. 	
RN806 A Kay	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly disagree with the absence of any phasing in the policy. The existing Science Park has had an extremely slow uptake of space since it was started in 1995 and so the demand for a major expansion of Science Park facilities is not proven. Releasing all the land at once risks allowing the land to remain unoccupied resulting in unnecessary damage to the landscape. Phase development so that the least sensitive parts of the site are developed first ie land closest to A512. • Landscape protection and other sustainability considerations in paras 3.31 to 3.37 are very important; • Given the distance from the railway station the provision of excellent bus services and cycle facilities together with demand management measures, eg site travel co-ordinator, is vital; • Energy efficient design is essential • Restrictions on land use must be adhered to at all times even if the uptake is slow. 	
RN809 R Seager	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p> <p>There are bound to be "pressing" reasons to reduce these percentages. This site is too grandiose and should be scrapped.</p>	
RN810 N Morgan	<p>Neutral/Not Sure.</p> <p>Clarify whether student accommodation to be permitted on the Science Park site.</p>	
RN816 S Cuff Nanpantan Residents' Network	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p> <p>The needs of the University do not equal the science park. It is deceitful to pass-off these as one and the same!</p>	
RN817 T Birkinshaw	<p>Agree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am unhappy with this imposed target(from Whitehall via Region & County) • Why does a 50ha Science Park cover 100ha. Surely the landscaping should be integral to the scheme (part of the land allocation). • The development should not stretch across Snell's Nook Lane. The 2 ancient Woodlands should be protected and enhanced (with public access). Landscaping areas need to be of sufficient size to be viable; ie no fragmentation • The university science park site is in danger of being a big dividing wedge through west Loughborough. • There needs to be provision for walking cycling (and possibly bus) access across the site, linking NW and SW areas (and giving access to the jobs from SW Loughborough). 	
RN818 A Radley	<p>Disagree Strongly.</p> <p>Consider splitting proposals for the Science Park from those for new housing, provision for which could be sought elsewhere in the Borough. This change to the Plan would retain the proposed Science Park with its positive aspects regarding the university and future employment.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN823 D E Sykes	<p>Agree Strongly. Overall agreement with Science Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From personal experience as company director there is a real need for high quality space for high tech SMEs in the Loughborough area from a minimum size of 300m2. • There must be freehold and leasehold accommodation. • Concerned there need to be rigorous constraints to limit occupancy. At existing Science park constraints relaxed and my neighbours are travel agents. If there is low take up of such a large area there could be pressures to allow general industrial uses on behalf of Persimmon Homes, North Midlands. 	
RN894 D Scott	<p>Disagree Strongly. Object to the Science Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of the Science park is too large and is not required as the current science park is barely used; • The expansion will end up being used for distribution warehousing due to the proximity of the M1; • Preserve the Green Wedge between Loughborough and Shepshed; • Land west of Loughborough (south of A512) could be used for mixed housing and technology industrial development. So fulfilling Spatial Objective 8. <p>Safeguards should be built in to prevent its use for warehousing and distribution centres.</p>	
RN903 T Davies	<p>Wherever located, make the science park self contained with housing mix, shops etc to avoid car travel.</p>	
RN913 William Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If future housing requirements prove to be higher than currently anticipated in the Core Strategy, then it is considered that part of the Science Park is allocated for housing development. • Para 3.16 of the Science Park DPD is inaccurate as the university does not own all of the land (Representation includes plan showing site to the east of Snells Nook Lane). 	
RN918 Wilson Bowden and David Wilson Homes Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	<p>Agree Strongly. Support the proposal for Science Park (supported by a lot of evidence), but consider that this should be broadened out to include a wider range of employment uses. Support the findings of SA appraisal that land to the north would have adverse impact upon Garendon Historic Park and Garden More general employment would be 20 ha and could be located west of the education/research based site Disagree with the 20% developable area and 50% landscape area Pegasus have developed a landscape strategy which shows that more than 20% can be developed Concern about the wording of policy: rather than stating 'at least' the policy should say 'aim towards' The policy at present lack flexibility and therefore will restrict the ability of investors to provide facilities. Structure Plan definition of high technology firms is too restrictive, and concern that policy should not be a bar to inward investment to the Borough Also concern that very rigid proposals for the size of areas for different types/sizes of businesses Concern that development being within 400m of bus service may not be the most appropriate solution. A number of detailed points are made about design and landscape issues of the Science Park and adjoining areas.</p>	
RN1295 J Shields	<p>Agree. Science Park should contain eating and shopping facilities which could be available to other users out of office hours.</p>	
RN1331 D Neville	<p>Holywell Cottage, situated in the middle of the proposed science park development, is home to one of the largest colonies of long eared bats in the Midlands. What are the plans for maintaining this building, the colony and the surrounding habitat on which the</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN1347 Charnwood Liberal Democrat Councillor Group	bats depend? The Science Park development should be as environmentally friendly as possible: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the destruction of wildlife habitats and the loss of woodland; • Maximise the potential for maintaining and stimulating biodiversity and apply for relevant funding support for creating woodland habitats; • Development should be low density and designed to enable wildlife corridors and natural habitats to be extended and maintained. • Support opening up of Garendon Park for more accessible public use that would be enabled by this development; • Adopt the Countryside Agency's 'By all reasonable means' access standards to comply with disability rights legislation. 	
RN13 D Ayres, RN16 M Hall, RN26 D J Hourston, RN30 C F A Sutton, RN45 B A Fox, RN48 J Lambert, Rearsby Parish Council, RN50 C Moon, RN52 PI H Ball, RN57 F E Norburn, RN59 K R Senior, RN97 A Davis, RN106 C W Askham, RN143 R Wym Jones, RN147 J Heath, Thrussington Parish Council, RN171 P A Bland, RN197 R W Hill, RN284 A C Wood, RN294 D Ross, RN324 N Richards, RN338 R Singh, RN346 J R Cheshire, RN348 S J Tinning, RN353 S J Doyle & R K Stephenson, RN354 C Leafe, RN355 J Booth, RN356 I Harrison, Wanlip Parish Meeting, RN360 C M Spencer, RN408 E A Goodson, RN438 G H Wilson, RN461 R Hoyland,	Agree.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN465 D Baker, RN474 J A Carter, RN480 F L Cooper, RN516 M West, RN542 G Hobbs, RN545 A Wells, RN604 E H Sinclair Goulden, RN608 J M Neal, RN618 H Knight, Birstall Parish Council, RN720 J J Sutherland, RN794 N Browne, RN795 J Faulks, Normanton on Soar Parish Council, RN805 D F Bodicoat, RN814 N Booth, RN820 J E Mutton, Loughborough College, RN895 J C Pearson, RN897 D Mear, RN898 D C Toone, RN900 Gill, RN901 K Canner, RN904 A Corner, RN905 R J N Brown, 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		
RN06 D B Street, RN17 E Goodyer, RN24 J L Mitchell,	Agree Strongly.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN25 M P Parker, RN27 A M Clarke, RN31 G Brown, RN39 A Gardner, RN54 P J Morrall JP, RN58 S Myers, RN128 C J Keeling, RN328 K Appleby, RN419 M Hall, RN467 L Foster, Seagrave Parish Council, RN473 D F J Carter, RN477 P Moxon, RN478 C J Blanchard, RN543 S F Hobbs, RN607 M Lear, RN800 A M Ward, Mather Jamie on behalf of Hamilton Trustees, RN801 F F Rawson, Frank F Rawson on behalf of FFR Ultrasonics Ltd, RN893 F J Howgate, RN896 D Patel, RN906 R I Porter, RN908 M C Dimitrov, RN1297 J Ridewood		
RN35 A Evans, RN37 N L Sharpe, RN56 A W G Ballentyne, RN335 P J Thrope, RN374 J Wilson	Disagree.	
RN23 A Rumsey, RN337 N Porter, RN420 A W Lacey, RN792 Popley Family	Disagree Strongly.	
RN08 N W King, RN20 L Bates, RN36 M C Dolby, RN166 F A E Reece, RN275 P S Newman, RN277 P Scott, RN347 M J	Neutral/Not Sure.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
<p>Hagger, RN349 A Aucott, RN350 D Aucott, RN351 C Sweeney, RN361 P A Higgins, 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, RN603 R C Jones, RN605 M Flatman, RN609 S L Batson, RN611 P Raja, RN614 E Harding, RN615 R E Davies, St Michael of All Angels, RN619 N Jones, Anstey Parish Council, RN712 C Potts, Hepher Dixon Ltd on behalf of Loughborough Golf & Hotel Development, RN714 L Needham, The Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group Committee, RN726 W Young, Fisher German on behalf of Rearsby Ltd, RN790 P Froggatt, RN793 L McGunnigle, RN798 M Eagland, Peacock & Smith on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc, RN803 J Wadcock,</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
<p>Antony Aspbury Associates Ltd on behalf of GB Sanders, GL Sanders, TD Sanders & D Kettle, RN808 D M Evans, RN813 P Knott, RN822 F Hitchinson, The Woodland Trust, RN824 A Hubbard, The National Trust, RN890 C A Clegg, RN891 A Cooper & J M Hornbuckle, RN892 A Cooper, M W Hornbuckle & J M Hornbuckle, RN899 F Mitchell, Langham Park Developments, RN902 J & L Blyth, RN907 R Hall, Andrew Martin Associates on behalf of Persimmon plc & William Davis Ltd, RN1293 J R Shephard, J & J Design on behalf of Loughborough Gospel Hall Trust, RN1294 R A Dickson, Groby Parish Council, RN1296 J Folkes</p>	