

LOUGHBOROUGH SCIENCE PARK

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RELATING TO: SECTION 6 - LOUGHBOROUGH SCIENCE PARK - WEST OF LOUGHBOROUGH SOUTH OF A512

QUESTION 20: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our preferred location - West of Loughborough South of A512 – for the Loughborough Science Park?

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN03 J Agar	Science park plan is a Greenfield site and would impact on the local area in terms of increased traffic and pollution.	
RN13 D Ayres	Neutral/Not Sure South of A512, west of Loughborough is unsuitable being a greenfield/wedge site with harm to National Forest and picturesque landscape on approach to Loughborough with increased traffic flow and associated pollution. Long term need for second Science park not justified given poor uptake of first site.	
RN35 A Evans	Disagree Strongly The proposed Science park location: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the National Forest, a green wedge and Charnwood Forest all acknowledged to be of high value and should be protected from all further intrusion. • The whole area around Snells Nook Lane is beautiful, a piece of undulating countryside guiding the eye up to the higher ground to the south. It is a part of the very fabric of Charnwood Forest, and a vital part of what makes Loughborough attractive. Snells Nook Lane likely to need widening. This would spoil lovely approach route to the Forest. • Development will add to traffic congestion in the Forest. • Presence of urban influences in this area is no justification for more development. Using past mistakes to validate future ones is wrong. • No more monstrosities like the British Gas building. Architecture needs to show high sensitivity to the environment. • The proposals encroach too close to and threaten Nanpantan's separate identity. The rural access via Snells Nook lane is vital to the character of the village and the whole aspect of west Loughborough and should be retained. • The current proposals are too big. Development should be alongside the A512 and not extend up Snells Nook Lane. • Burleigh and Holywell Woods must be safeguarded with several fields width of open space all round to safeguard wildlife corridors for flora and fauna in woods and fields (thrushes, meadow pipits, yellowhammers, rabbits, fieldmice and badgers). Other existing tree copses should be left as they are. • Having said all this would rather see some proposed development south of the A512 for a genuinely landscaped ecologically good practice Science Park now rather than see area left untouched and threatened by heinous housing development 15 years hence. There must be no housing in the area proposed for the Science park south of the A512. 	
RN41 J Sutton	Disagree Strongly Not used sufficiently already. Large enough area not to impact on the environment.	
RN46 Leicestershire Constabulary – Architectural Liaison Officer	Agree as this is the best location for operational Police support.	
RN70	Object to development of Science Park 2:	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
B Blood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of a Greenfield site. Lost enough countryside already; • Destroy valuable wildlife habitats, the flora and fauna; • Impact on roads will be horrendous. There are queues every day into Loughborough and this would exacerbate the problem; • It will not be the case that people will walk or use public transport; • Pollution would increase from the obvious traffic jams and M1 widening the 4 lanes; • Carry out in depth surveys into brownfield sites and empty housing. 	
RN86 J Tassell	Object to development of Science Park 2 on the south side of A512 at Snells Nook. There is no credence for the argument to build a science park between British Gas building and Snells Nook Lane. It does not need to be near the University. Oxford and Cambridge science parks are no where near the universities but they still work.	
RN87 C W Tassell	Object to development of Science Park 2 on the south side of A512 at Snells Nook. There would be little opposition to a science park if it was kept within the present brownfield site rather than expanding into the historic area up to Snells Nook Lane	
RN88 J Crowther	<p>Object to development of the Science Park 2 on a Greenfield site at A512/Snells Nook. These proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow Green Wedge/Greenfield sites to become a planning tool to create urban sprawl • Displace wildlife, by destroying natural habitats of animals and birds; • Cull through a historic landscape; • Loughborough already experiences heavy traffic problems on the A512 with its connection to M1. Development and the new link road to this already busy road will exacerbate the problem; • Carry out a survey on brownfield sites, empty homes and evaluate future traffic implications. 	
RN94 L A Briers	Disagree Strongly The only place is next to the University.	
RN104 J C Langham	<p>Oppose Science park 2 at Snells Nook/A512:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Another Greenfield site; • Impact on National Forest and surrounding landscape • Increase traffic and pollution; • Better located on a brownfield site. 	
RN135 Grace Dieu and Garendon Estates Agent: Savills	<p>Site west of existing Science Park to south of A512 around Snells Nook Lane is the best option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build on activities at the present Holywell Park • Take advantage of the high quality accessibility of this location; • Landscape is suitable to provide a setting for a prestige development; • Most suitable, viable and available option. 	
RN154 J R Cowell	Disagree Strongly More evidence required of need for Science park.	
RN179 S Bradwell	Agree Has to be linked to University but restricted to land east of Snells Nook Lane. Otherwise unrelated development might happen to utilize locational advantages.	
RN242 P Lovett	Object to Science Park 2 as no belief that it is needed. Should be making use of brown field sites.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN335 P J Thorpe	Neutral/Not Sure Demand for Science park is questioned.	
RN342 P Breakwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong questions raised about developing science park on land which is within the National Forest, forms part of the green wedge, contains two significant areas of woodland and which has a number of sites of ecological interest. • The whole area around Snells Nook Lane is part of the fabric of Charnwood Forest and vital part of what makes Loughborough attractive. • Would prefer to see some of the area south of A512 used for genuinely landscaped science park. • Science park area is too big • Science park encroaches too closely on Nanpantan • Burleigh and Holywell woods should in now way be interfered with and open fields provide wildlife corridors • Design of buildings must show a high degree of sensitivity. • Need confirmation whether there is any intention to build houses south of A512 	
RN355 J Booth	Agree Strongly Support for Loughborough Science Park as Shepshed is already a dormitory town.	
RN374 J Wilson	Disagree Loughborough Science Park will add to congestion problem, where roads are already at saturation level.	
RN539 E Pentecost	Object to Science Park 2 proposal on a Greenfield site next to A512 and Snells Nook.	
RN608 J M Neal	Agree Seems logical to develop Science park in location proposed because facilities already developed encouraging closer relationships with new development sharing common aims.	
RN621 Mr & Mrs T Malone	Disagree Strongly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No houses and Science Park should be built in vicinity of Nanpantan and Snells Nook Lane. Science Park should only be built near Advantica site. Burleigh Wood should be extended up to properties in Nanpantan and Snells Nook Lane. Development would add unacceptably to noise (from M1) in a beautiful area • If development takes place west of Loughborough all existing properties should be protected by rows of trees. 	
RN713 East Midlands Regional Assembly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Assembly is broadly supportive of the concept of this Science Park especially given need for such developments identified in RSS8 para 4.2.11 • RSS8 regional core objectives need to be applied in balance, notably 1.6 and 1.7 to achieve effective protection of the environment and increase the level of the region's biodiversity (that there should no net loss of priority habitats and species) • RSS8 Policy15 places emphasis on regeneration of deprived city centres and sub regional centres. The development proposed is essentially a Greenfield site but the sequential approach is led by reuse of land. Policy 22 sets out regional priorities for employment land and recognises the need to bring forward good quality sites to meet specific requirements of potential investors. • RSS8 Policy 27 recognises sustainable development should ensure protection, appropriate management and enhancement of the region's natural and cultural assets and their settings. Policy 28 sets priorities to enhance biodiversity. CS Para 3.8 refers to ' a number ' of areas of ecological interest but does not identify locations, indicate the interest or give any indication of interdependency between habitats on the site and the adjoining area. <p>EMRA's considers an ecological assessment is needed to record habitat types and species and address the following:</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - if particular species assemblages are sensitive to development, and if so, to what degree - if ecology/biodiversity studies/ surveys of the whole site and adjoining areas have been carried out (there may be interdependency with the golf course) - species interdependency between woodland and other parts of the site eg some fauna may roost in woodland but feed off grassland. Woodland edge habitat is likely to be very sensitive. - the long term robustness of site ecology with /without the proposed development and the ability of development to secure this robustness by eg facilitating long term management - landscaping to maintain and enhance the site's biodiversity even if this is different from traditional practices. <p>EMRA would look to guidance from English Nature and also Leics & Rutland Wildlife Trust and Biodiversity Partnership. Studies/ evidence are needed to demonstrate diversity can be increased if development takes place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RSS8 Policy 29 seeks to increase the Region's woodland cover; and the National Forest is a priority area to create and maintain woodland. It is presumed ancient and other existing woodland will be safeguarded as the baseline from which to increase woodland cover. • RSS8 Policy 30 sets priorities for management and enhancement of the region's landscape. Charnwood Forest, with only two other areas, is highlighted as an area for initiatives to protect and enhance natural and heritage landscape assets. • EMRA identifies clear tensions between the desire for development, the sequential approach and objectives to maintain and enhance the region's biodiversity. These issues need to be resolved on the basis of best information. Detailed ecological assessments of the site plus appropriate consultations are pre-requisites to a firm opinion on conformity. 	
RN716 Mr & Mrs B Needham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Science Park not fully utilised • Preferred option of 50ha of prime agricultural land encroaching on National Forest and destroying wildlife habitats • The car will always be the first choice of transport – there are no bus stops on the M1 	
RN728 R Youngs	Not sure.	
RN729 Protection of Wildlife in Charnwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong objection to development encroaching into the green wedge between Loughborough, Shepshed and Hathern and to the Science Park on a greenfield site. • Both proposals would greatly increase traffic on M1, A512, A6 & J23 and related pollution • Both proposals would displace wildlife, destroy habitats and landscape steeped in history. 	
RN809 R Seager	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>I have several fundamental objections to the scheme as proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge based start-ups do not generally have a large impact on unemployment locally. They bring skilled workers in, with further unskilled workers attached. • This will be over costly. RELPS finds that Science Parks tend to deter private sector involvement in development. I do not see the benefits as being worth paying for out of our local taxes. • From my information, the University is not desperate for a large number of "incubator units". 	
RN811 C Watson	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>Unconvinced that Loughborough needs a science park of this size.</p>	
RN812 A Millie	<p>Disagree Strongly</p> <p>Loughborough University already has ample room for growth within the university's existing 'footprint' with the acquisition of the gas research site already developing as a Science Park.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	A huge Science Park in the Snells Nook Lane area is out of keeping with the Charnwood/ National Forest designation. The existing road is already congested. Alleviating this by widening or blocking off will have a negative impact on the area. The Snells Nook area could be designated green wedge and used for amenity linking to wider Forest.	
RN824 National Trust	Agree DCP20 – strongly supported.	
RN893 F W Howgate	Agree Strongly Endorse locating the Science Park next to the University so it can prosper. Wymeswold airfield option is clearly unsustainable from many aspects. Traffic problems in the Wolds villages. Continuing need to address the issue from an overall east/west traffic flow perspective.	
RN902 J & L Blyth	Agree If there is a need for a science park, it would be best situated by the motorway to keep the town clear of extra traffic.	
RN913 William Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the Science Park forming part of the proposed western expansion of Loughborough. • Support the location south of the A512 • Support for the physical extent of the Science Park • Reservations about efficient use of land in its prescription for not more than 20% built coverage, and its target for 50% landscape and ecology, which will impact on the schemes viability. • The inefficient use of land in Science Park would be contrary to Draft Core Policy 6 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options 	
RN917 Mr & Mrs Westwood	Support the idea of a Science Park near to the university.	
RN1297 Juliette Ridewood	A Science Park should be based near Loughborough University.	
RN1347 Charnwood Liberal Democrat Councillor Group	Support the development of a new Science Park to attract new high tech industries that have a firm future and good working conditions for local people. Support the preferred location but wish to ensure that the development is as environmentally friendly as possible.	
RN1350 J Key	<p>Agree that using the land highlighted in Green on page 8 of the pamphlet is the best of the alternatives for a Science Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being close to the M1 requires little new road infrastructure to the new coach and car parking and therefore have little impact on the existing road systems from North / South and West. Those travelling from further East of the country would, I assume, be directed onto the M1 North or South of Loughborough. • Originally British Gas purchased the whole farm but only built on about a third of the land. Transferral of ownership to the University will make the land acquisition negotiations easier. • The wood and an area of farmland should be kept for scientific knowledge. Maintenance of this whole area could then continue from the existing farm. • Take the small square area West, up to the motorway adjoining the road. This area could be used for parking and would leave more space for future science park expansion in due course. 	
RN01 M Wortley, RN04 D Dennis, RN05 G Lee, RN62 Mrs Marion I Hull,	<p>Object to development on Green Wedge between Shepshed, Hathern and Loughborough and to the Science Park 2 on a Greenfield site at A512/Snells Nook. These proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has little regard for the environment 	

Respondents	Summary of Comments
RN73 J Crofts, RN77 F G Ing, RN78 J S Ing, RN80 M A Jordan, RN82 E A Wingfield, RN83 J M Spencer, RN84 A Spencer, RN85 J B Collier, RN90 M Bacon, RN92 D Jones, RN93 J Morrow, RN102 T Hudson, RN130 B Burton, RN131 R Johnson, RN132 J M Cottam, RN133 M J Cottam, RN134 T Oakes, RN176 M Barnwell, RN177 G M Barnwell, RN188 V & K Mason, RN192 H R Porter, RN193 M F Porter, RN194 G Porter, RN195 A Porter, RN196 M N Porter, RN204 S Lovett, RN205 S Neilson-Fletcher, RN235 E Neale, RN236 G Neale, RN287 N E Freestone, RN288 R N E Freestone, RN291 B Cookson, RN292 H Orton, RN295 P Cartledge, RN364 Mr & Mrs Berridge, RN365 I Measures, RN371 D Pearson, RN383 D B Buckley, RN498 B Wall, RN499 V Wall, RN500 H Wall, RN657 J Kershaw, RN658 M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add pollutants from M1, A512 and A6 • Allow Green Wedge/Greenfield sites to become a planning tool to create urban sprawl • Increase traffic on M1 J23, A512 and A6 which are already the focus of heavy traffic • Displace wildlife, destroy habitats • Rip through a historic landscape <p>Carry out a survey on brownfield sites, empty homes and evaluate future traffic implications.</p>

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Randle, RN663 M Seims, RN664 S Philpott, RN665 S Flood, RN666 L Bailey, RN667 L Hrynkow, RN668 J Chalmers, RN669 D Wortley, RN670 S Soor, RN671 A J Breacker, RN672 P Roberts, RN673 J Walker, RN674 S Holt, RN675 G R Sutton, RN676 J Lakhani, RN677 N Paul, RN678 B Smits, RN679 A Harriman, RN680 C Goode, RN681 S Harriman, RN682 K Harriman, RN683 C Harriman, RN684 J Harriman, RN685 J Goode, RN686 M Goode, RN687 S Lovett, RN688 S Lovett, RN689 L Lovett, RN690 A Lovett, RN691 A Healey, RN692 G Fitchett, RN693 A C Lodey, RN694 K Fitchett, RN695 D J Edwards, RN696 T Preston, RN697 E R Preston, RN698 M A Hunt, RN699 C P Edwards, RN700 J Savage, RN701 G Rowbotham, RN702 B Macpherson, RN703 R Shaw, RN704 M Shaw, RN705 M Shaw,		

Respondents	Summary of Comments
RN706 J Freeman, RN707 M Kirk, RN708 T B Willson, RN709 D Gray, RN710 A Dexter, RN711 T Bennison, RN718 R Kershaw, RN745 S Bryant, RN746 J Thorpe, RN747 S Thorpe, RN748 R C Pinchbeck, RN749 D A Kendall, RN750 P Shaw, RN751 J Shaw, RN752 C Scott, RN753 P Harberd, RN754 H Newton, RN755 K Coulson, RN756 J Whitaker, RN757 D Miller, RN758 P J Miller, RN759 S Heyhoe, RN760 J Bruce, RN761 M P Pervin, RN762 A D Pervin, RN763 J K Marriott, RN764 V Jobling, RN765 S J Spiby, RN766 J Couser, RN767 N Clarke, RN768 M Ford, RN769 A Hubbard, RN770 E Tzouliou, RN771 S A Baxter, RN772 W Flowers, RN773 C Davie, RN774 D Freeman, RN775 R Campsall, RN776 K Palmer, RN777 R E Woolley, RN778 J Grimley, RN779 M Conway, RN780 C Astrom,	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN781 P & D Kendall, RN782 D Campsall, RN783 P Hammond, RN784 J A Anscombe, RN785 C Woolley, RN786 L Kendall, RN787 V Peaty, RN826 A Lakin, RN827 J Blake, RN828 J R Gower, RN829 M Green, RN830 H Nassall, RN831 I Forbes, RN832 L Kyle, RN833 D E Andrews, RN834 B Wortley, RN835 J Godson, RN836 B Gilliver, RN837 S C Goult, RN838 A H Kerry, RN839 P Clark, RN840 S Pams, RN841 R Mccluskey, RN842 M Dawson, RN843 Y H Alanezi, RN844 D Poyser, RN845 C A Poyser, RN846 J Monk, RN847 S Cooke, RN848 Mr & Mrs Teague, RN849 Adams, RN850 B Day, RN851 S Abell, RN852 R Davie, RN853 J Williamson, RN854 C E Tivey, RN855 S L Pearson, RN856 J Lennie, RN857 C Beale, RN858 D Bates, RN859 P Mould, RN860 M Hillier, RN861 J Morley,		

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN862 R Wright, RN863 T Long & E Long, RN864 J Parry, RN865 G Spencer, RN866 C Wortley, RN867 D Chesterton, RN868 F Draper, RN869 R Pearson, RN870 L Oliff, RN871 C Magee, RN872 D Lowles, RN873 D M Lowles, RN874 A Grimley, RN875 J Oxbrough, RN876 J Oxbrough, RN877 S Pears, RN878 Mrs Ruddle, RN879 W Stafford, RN880 G E Harding, RN881 M L Savage, RN882 C Perkins, RN883 J M Pears, RN884 L Pears, RN885 E Jex, RN886 R A O'Brien, RN887 G Leslie, RN888 C Ford, RN889 C Ruddle, RN919 M Froggatt, RN935, RN936 J Stevens, RN937 P R H Mauger, RN938 E J Y Mauger, RN939 M J West, RN940 D P L Mauger, RN941 K J Mauger, RN942 A Fox, RN943 P Henshaw, RN944 S Barnby, RN945 J A Green, RN946 J Whitaker, RN947 S Dunsmore, RN948 G Crook, RN949 C Dunsmore, RN950 A		

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
<p> Moon, RN951 D Lovley, RN952 S Hickinbottom, RN953 M J Chaplin, RN954 M J Chamberlain, RN955 S Elliott, RN956 D Barber, RN957 S Hughes, RN958 B Kelham, RN959 M Coe, RN960 A Coley, RN961 S Stark, RN962 D Farmer, RN963 D Nassau, RN964 E Thomson, RN965 P A Noon, RN966 A Eames, RN967 T Needham, RN968 D Hollingsworth, RN969 M Hollingsworth, RN970 E Barsby, RN971 J Barsby, RN972 N Watson, RN973 J Cooke, RN974 R Biddles, RN975 G Biddles, RN976 O M Snelson, RN977 H Townsend, RN978 L Monk, RN979 V Wilson, RN980 J Neill, RN981 V Swithenbank, RN982 J Swithenbank, RN983 J Watret, RN984 N Watret, RN985 M Witherbed, RN986 M Ward, RN987 W Oakes, RN988 D Oakes, RN989 N S Kirk, RN990 R Owen, RN991 S Hunter, </p>		

Respondents	Summary of Comments
RN992 C Guess, RN993 C Tyler, RN994 C J Goodall, RN995 A Foster, RN996 A Bennison, RN998 J Pitchers, RN999 W D Lord, RN1000 J Lord, RN1001 S Bettoney, RN1002 I Payne, RN1003 H Furnival, RN1004 J M Lamb, RN1005 J Fines, RN1006 S Martin, RN1007 H Wood, RN1008 J Phillips, RN1009 A Hammond, RN1010 D I Evans, RN1011 N Roberts, RN1012 H D Craige, RN1013 O Morris, RN1014 R Hoisley, RN1015 M J Briggs, RN1016 R A Ward, RN1017 K Tillier, RN1018 A Hamilton, RN1019 B Smith, RN1020 E M Milodowski, RN1021 M Kelham, RN1022 W McDonogh, RN1023 I Gutteridge, RN1024 T C Willson, RN1025 A Purdom, RN1026 J Graham, RN1027 S Gray, RN1028 Harry Dalzell, RN1029 J M Baxter, RN1030 D Baxter, RN1031 G R Bonam, RN1032 P Bonam, RN1033 J Watret, RN1034 J	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Stock, RN1035 M Wortley, RN1036 J M Wale, RN1037 R Wortley, RN1038 A Hyatt, RN1039 L Williams, RN1040 L Giorgio, RN1041 M Lelapi, RN1042 J Neal, RN1043 P Soar, RN1044 J Persse, RN1045 A Carnell, RN1046 M Herbert, RN1047 B Jones, RN1048 T Hickling, RN1049 S J Barnett, RN1050 G Peberdy, RN1051 J Peberdy, RN1052 J Bowley, RN1053 R Bowley, RN1054 T N Waldron, RN1055 S Waldron, RN1056 I King, RN1057 K A Miller, RN1058 J M Miller, RN1059 C Brown, RN1060 T S Maxwell, RN1061 Mr Willmore, RN1062 L Hughes, RN1063 T Sharpe, RN1064 S Walker, RN1065 D Eagle, RN1066 D Kingsmill-Stocker, RN1067 P B Ennis, RN1068 M A Woolley, RN1069 R Jones, RN1070 J Walker, RN1071 A Kirkby, RN1072 Mrs Willmore, RN1073 J H Brown, RN1074 K Brown, RN1075 H		

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Johnson, RN1076 N I J McHugh, RN1077 R Hodges, RN1078 A Blake-Hardy, RN1079 R C Peaty, RN1080 S Wood, RN1081 L Watret, RN1082 P M Botham, RN1083 T Wilford, RN1084 P King, RN1085 A Davies, RN1086 R Rudin, RN1087 J Price, RN1088 P A Davies, RN1089 C Simms, RN1090 I Gillard, RN1091 W J C Worth, RN1092 S Fewkes, RN1093 M Carrington, RN1094 P A Austin, RN1095 P Stock, RN1096 C Gamble, RN1097 P Gamble, RN1098 D Harris, RN1099 J L Harris, RN1100 S A Bowley, RN1101 J Bowley, RN1102 L Savage, RN1103 J Savage, RN1104 W D Mott, RN1105 K Fox, RN1106 G Fox, RN1107 M Revill, RN1108 T Revill, RN1109 A Brown, RN1110 Jo-Ann Brown, RN1111 S L Pell, RN1112 M B Pell, RN1113 J M Williams, RN1114 S Selby, RN1115 S M Gibson, RN1116 D Wood, RN1117 P Wood,		

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN1118 P M Simons, RN1119 J M Farmer, RN1120 N Bramley, RN1121 A Bowley, RN1122 A Bowley, RN1123 M Rennocks, RN1124 T Dakin, RN1125 E Grimley, RN1126 J Peck, RN1127 R B Steeples, RN1128 A Sharpe, RN1129 G Stock, RN1130 M P Stock, RN1131 K J Liggins, RN1132 L Kyle, RN1133 J Griffin, RN1134 M Smith, RN1135 M Fantam, RN1136 B Melbourne, RN1137 P Bennett, RN1138 A M Bakewell, RN1139 A E Bakewell, RN1140 R Line, RN1141 E M Sutherland, RN1142 J M Burton, RN1143 V Capell, RN1144 P Gayson, RN1145 L Grimley, RN1146 A Bennett, RN1147 K M Percy, RN1148 M Rush, RN1149 P Rush, RN1150 A Grimley, RN1151 R Woolley, RN1152 J L Rennocks, RN1153 R M Lester, RN1154 P A Lester, RN1155 J A Lester, RN1156 T Gartshore, RN1157 M Gartshore, RN1158 C W Hall, RN1159 G Hall,		

Respondents	Summary of Comments
RN1160 P J Lester, RN1161 J C Heal, RN1162 A M Heal, RN1163 K Needham, RN1164 R Roberts, RN1165 B Dakin, RN1166 A Stock, RN1167 A Hill, RN1168 C M Bradley- Stevenson, RN1169 C Erasmus, RN1170 D De Ville, RN1171 W Saley, RN1172 J Wortley, RN1173 S J R Eaton, RN1174 J Wallam, RN1175 G Hannigan, RN1176 P Hannigan, RN1177 M J Schulz, RN1178 R Schulz, RN1179 R Law, RN1180 R Murray, RN1181 B Kavanagh, RN1182 G D Woolley, RN1183 R & W Fox, RN1184 C Bonam, RN1185 W A Parsons, RN1186 J Ochalek, RN1187 F A Gray, RN1188 R Gorey, RN1189 J Elliott, RN1190 A M Adams, RN1191 G Elliott, RN1192 R Whitmore, RN1193 P W Whitmore, RN1194 D M Loole, RN1195 M Morley, RN1196 B Fox, RN1197 M Fox, RN1198 J Corbett, RN1199 D Wright, RN1200 P C Betts,	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN1201 J Bennett, RN1202 B Thompson, RN1203 M Partridge, RN1204 K Partridge, RN1205 A G Todhunter, RN1206 K Matthews, RN1207 A Coupe, RN1208 M Fox, RN1209 C A Fox, RN1210 S Bowler, RN1211 R Manning, RN1212 M White, RN1213 L Allard, RN1214 R Allard, RN1215 C Ducker, RN1216 I Ducker, RN1217 T Taylor, RN1218 A Stock, RN1219 T Stock, RN1220 M Stock, RN1221 H Merchant, RN1222 E P Ward, RN1223 N Ducker, RN1224 P M Danvers, RN1225 P A Danvers, RN1226 S Danvers, RN1227 A Danvers, RN1228 I Davie, RN1229 E Davie, RN1230 J Guest, RN1231 C Heffer, RN1232 D Heffer, RN1233 D Boddy, RN1234 D Stock, RN1235 K Stock, RN1236 D Peat, RN1237 S Clarke, RN1238 D J Clarke, RN1239 A Danvers, RN1240 M M Maxwell, RN1241 R Watret, RN1242 J Hamill,		

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN1243 J A Moore, RN1244 G Hewitt, RN1245 J Hewitt, RN1246 K Hollingsworth, RN1247 L Danvers, RN1248 G Danvers, RN1249 R Hewitt, RN1250 J Cave, RN1251 D Cave, RN1252 C J Pilkington, RN1253 G Roberts, RN1254 J Rose, RN1255 R Lee, RN1256 T Ansingh, RN1257 E Burton, RN1258 H C Rossell, RN1259 B Stormont, RN1260 W Wortley, RN1261 D Wortley, RN1262 N Moore, RN1263 G Murphy, RN1264 S Murphy, RN1265 R Burne, RN1266 V Allard, RN1267 L Sands, RN1268 E Hannigan, RN1269 D Fallon, RN1270 E Evans, RN1271 D J Cowley, RN1272 S Glover, RN1273 N Fortnam, RN1274 M B Wright, RN1275 S Tolley, RN1276 M M Harrington, RN1277 W Ochalek, RN1278 R Jolly, RN1279 J Ready, RN1280 T Jarran, RN1281 Y M Dawson, RN1282 S Holt, RN1283 J Blood,		

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN1284 T Austin, RN1285 A Mumford, RN1286 A Despard, RN1287 Mr & Mrs T Rose, RN1288 L Padgett, RN1289 A Beasley, RN1290 D Edgington, RN1291 R Greenwood, RN1292 B Foukes, RN1298 L Saunders, RN1299 H Wright, RN1300 A H Butler, RN1303 T Hazeldine, RN1341 R V Higham, RN1342 C Higham, RN1343 M Higham		
RN16 M Hall, RN30 C F A Sutton, RN45 B A Fox, RN48 J Lambert, Rearsby Parish Council, RN50 C Moon, RN52 P H Ball, RN57 F E Norburn, RN97 A Davis, RN106 C W Askham, RN129 R Bowman, RN147 J Heath, Thrussington Parish Council, RN171 P A Bland, RN197 R W Hill, RN284 A C Wood, RN293 B J Butler, RN324 N Richards, RN338 R Singh, RN339 J Noon, CPRE Charnwood, RN345 A B Kidger, RN346 J R Cheshire, RN349 A Aucott, RN350 D Aucott, RN351 C Sweeney, RN352 K W Davies,	Agree.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
<p>Burton on the Wolds, Cotes & Preswold Parish Council, RN353 S J Doyle & R K Stephenson, RN360 C M Spencer, RN409 L Tillen, RN438 G H Wilson, RN461 R Hoyland, RN465 D Baker, RN604 E H Sinclair Goulden, RN605 M Flatman, RN609 S L Batson, RN611 P Raja, RN612 C Humphreys, RN616 H D Robinson Sharratt, RN620 M Smallman, Del-Rosa Developments Ltd, RN744 S Mitchell, RN791 R A Gough, Gough Planning Services on behalf of Revelan Group, RN793 L McGunnigle, RN795 J Faulks, Normanton on Soar Parish Council, RN796 T Stott, RN805 D F Bodicoat, RN806 A Kay, RN808 D M Evans, RN810 N Morgan, RN817 T N Birkinshaw, RN818 A Radley, RN820 J E Mutton, Loughborough College RN890 C A Clegg, RN898 D C Toone, RN900 Gill, RN901 K Canner, RN904 A Corner, RN910 G</p>		

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
<p>Lees, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Leicestershire County Council, RN911 N</p> <p>Harris, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Mr J Barber, RN912 A Kitchen, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Radleigh Homes & Messrs Clarke, RN1296 J Folkes</p>		
<p>RN06 D B Street, RN17 E Goodyer, RN19 C Emmet, RN24 J L Mitchell, RN25 M P Parker, RN26 D J Hourston, RN27 A M Clarke, RN31 G Brown, RN39 A Gardner, RN54 P J Morrall JP, RN58 S Myers, RN59 K R Senior, RN128 C J Keeling, RN142 E E Jones, RN143 R Wym Jones, RN146 Y W Hannell, RN294 D Ross, RN328 K Appleby, RN348 S J Tinning, RN354 C Leafe, RN356 I Harrison, Wanlip Parish Meeting, RN408 E A Goodson, RN419 M Hall, RN421 A Dalzell, RN467 L Foster, Seagrave Parish Council, RN474 J A Carter, RN477 P Moxon, RN478 C J</p>	<p>Agree Strongly.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
<p>Blanchard, RN480 F L Cooper, RN481 J Thompson, RN516 Mt West, RN542 G Hobbs, RN543 S F Hobbs, RN545 A Wells, RN607 M Lear, RN618 H Knight, Birstall Parish Council, RN720 J J Sutherland, RN799 A H Olofsson, RN800 A M Ward, Mather Jamie on behalf of Hamilton Trustees, RN801 F F Rawson, Frank F Rawson on behalf of FFR Ultrasonics Ltd, RN802 T Higgins, RN815 R A Parsons, RN823 D E Sykes, RN896 D Patel, RN897 D Mear, RN905 R J N Brown, RN908 M C Dimitrov, RN918 T Bateman, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Wilson Bowden & David Wilson Homes, RN1295 J A Shields, RN1297 J Ridewood</p>		
<p>RN08 N W King, RN56 A W G Ballentyne, RN521 S James, Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Parkers of Leicester & A J Paker, RN603 R C Jones,</p>	<p>Disagree.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN617 C D R Sharratt, RN661 A C Johnson, RN788 S Bullman, RN792 Popley Family, RN794 N Browne, RN821 L Emmitt, RN895 J C Pearson, RN903 T H Davies		
RN14 D Liggins, RN23 A Rumsey, RN60 G & P Allen, RN221 D Howard, Friends of Charnwood Forest, RN337 N Porter, RN347 M J Hagger, RN420 A W Lacey, RN469 J Green, RN471 R G Guise, RN549 P G Hipkin, RN804 A Irving, RN813 P Knott, RN816 S Cuff, Nanpantan Residents' Network, RN894 D Stott, RN906 R I Porter	Disagree Strongly.	
RN15 M Birkinshaw, RN20 L Bates, RN28 M S Smith, RN36 M C Dolby, RN37 N L Sharpe, RN49 Lang, RN166 F A E Reece, RN275 P S Newman, RN277 P Scott, 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	Neutral/Not Sure.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
<p>Wells, RN548 K Davies, Fisher German on behalf of Mr D Johar, RN614 E Harding, RN615 R E Davies, St Michael of All Angels, RN619 N Jones, Anstey Parish Council, RN712 C Potts, Hephher 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, RN797 J Thompson, 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, RN814 N Booth, RN822 F Hitchinson, The Woodland Trust, RN891 A Cooper & J M Hornbuckle, RN892 A Cooper, M W Hornbuckle & J M Hornbuckle, RN899 F Mitchell, Langham Park</p>		

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Developments, 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		