

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RELATING TO: SECTION 7 - ANY OTHER COMMENTS**

QUESTION 25: If you have any other comments on the Charnwood 2021 Core Strategy and/or Loughborough Science Park Development Plan Documents ...

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN06 D Street	Improve Meadows wildlife area.	
RN07 E Goodyer	Enhance employment opportunities developing smaller starter units as SMEs contribute well over 50% of GDP.	
RN18 M Bellatrix	The forms are too complex and could be written and portrayed to the general public in a more accessible way. In contrast, the small booklet about the 'preferred option' was far too simplistic and lacked the details that would have answered my questions.	
RN20 L Bates	The process of informing the public has been made very complicated and not very reader friendly.	
RN21 P & C Coughlin	Dislodge all members of the council from their seats at the earliest opportunity.	
RN23 A Rumsey	Replace the government with some one who can say no to all the do gooders and political correct and stop immigration send those that don't belong here home and then free up the houses for the people of this country keep Britain green and pleasant for our children	
RN28 M S Smith	Concern plan is already decided and that there is no real choice and people will not be listened to.	
RN33 Disability Rights Commission	The consultation documents do not concern matters which are directly related to the work of the DRC.	
RN35 A Evans	Understand issues facing the Council and applaud frank nature of proposals and apparent openness to suggestions.	
RN37 N L Sharpe (and on behalf of R Truslove, Ms A Sharp)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All necessary information including summary of key points of documents should be included with form to ensure proper consultation; or would this mean we could no longer hide our intentions by being so succinct?</li> <li>• All parish councils should have a copy of relevant documents</li> <li>• Should have been a consultation roadshow in Hathern</li> <li>• More time needed to respond in detail required.</li> </ul>	
RN39 A Gardner	Make the Soar Valley a linear country park for pedestrians and cyclists, possibly achieve by improving towpath throughout.	
RN48 J Lambert	Good ideas.	
RN50 C Moon	There has to be progress. Seems much thought has been given and to me it is positive. Local people tend to moan about everything.	
RN58 Mrs S Myers	Great idea and what the area needs for the future generations. It is the only way to move forward.	
RN65 L Dickens	Public consultation has been poorly advertised. Not all households have received the booklet. Delivery inside a free newspaper means that some will not look at it.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN67 E Bell	Angry that the plan was given the go ahead without any consultation or consideration for the strong feeling regarding this plan. I feel the Council will disregard the level of feeling for profit.	
RN95 Great Central Railway PLC	<p>Horrified that Great Central Railway does not figure in the plan, on the map or in the text. It is an asset:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of leading tourist attractions in Charnwood;</li> <li>• A local employer and bring trade to the local economy;</li> <li>• The Council is a major shareholder and owners of the trackbed.</li> <li>• Great resistance to proposals to build flats and houses close to the Great Central Station</li> <li>• GCR plans to move their locomotive department to the tip site to ensure the Council complies with European air quality directives;</li> <li>• GCR and Great Central Railway (N) are attempting to bridge the gap to create a transport corridor to link villages towards Nottingham. There is also a notion to extend back to Leicester.</li> <li>• GCR expect to be part of a scheme to move school children or shoppers, via a park and ride, into Loughborough before 2021</li> <li>• GCR plans to develop attractions along the line including an education facility probably at Quorn.</li> <li>• GCR have put to the Council its views on establishing a heritage quarter around Loughborough Central station to enhance this are and bring more visitors into the town using the railway as a focus.</li> <li>• Social inclusion can be achieved in the context of what the GCR can offer the Borough.</li> </ul>	
RN99 National Offender Management Service (incorporating HM Prison Service)  Agent: Lambert Smith Hampton	<p>While there are no specific proposal for new prison development in your district at present., consider including a criteria based policy to deal with a firm prison proposal should it arise during the Plan period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PPS12 paragraph B3 requires local planning authorities to develop a strategic approach to infrastructure provision (including community facilities) when preparing LDFs;</li> <li>• Circular 3/98 'Planning for Future Prison Development' sets a specific need to identify more sites for new prisons. Local Planning Authorities should work together with the Prison Service to identify new land for prisons through the development plan process. The Prisons Service will consult with authorities about likely areas of future need.</li> <li>• In recent years there has been a significant increase in the prison population and the prison estate is experiencing serious overcrowding.</li> </ul>	
RN100 R M Matts	Disgruntled that I have not been sent a copy of this document as a matter of courtesy.	
RN101 Vodafone	Mono Consultants act on behalf of all the Telecommunications operators in terms of LDF policies.	
RN103 A Smith (Parish Councillor)	Difficult to fill in the form without access to the information in the full document which would cost me £21.77 or I could view.	
RN106 C W Askham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wish to hear what others think via workshops etc</li> <li>• Traffic pressures in Loughborough are worrying for locals.</li> </ul>	
RN117 Mr & Mrs Walker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that leaflet not received until after exhibitions and some neighbours still awaiting copies.</li> </ul>	
RN128 C J Keeling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growing concern for volume of heavy traffic on A6006 increased by 14-16% (depending on direction and time) over two year period</li> <li>• Expansion at NEMA and 200 ha site at M1 J24 for a sub regional intermodal terminal will add to pressures on existing roads to and from the east without improvements other than on A453.</li> </ul>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
RN142 E E Jones	Hope for further opportunities to comment when details are considered, in particular in areas west of Loughborough/ Garendon park area.	
RN143 R W Jones	Very important that well publicized consultation takes place in future to consider particular elements of plan, for example Garendon Park, A512-A6 link road etc	
RN146 Y W Hannell	Core Strategy: Roads/ transport need vast improvement. Shepshed needs vast improvement.	
RN166 F A K Reece	The open space policy placed on garden land overlooking open fields at 53 Rectory Road, Wanlip should be removed. No other property in Wanlip treated in this manner	
RN170 Mrs B Gowlett	Leaflet delivered with little time to respond.	
RN197 R W Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leaflet nearly lost in all "binsort" in free newspaper</li> <li>• Delivery of free newspapers is sporadic. How many people received and found the leaflet?</li> </ul>	
RN275 P Newman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a perceived lack of publicity about the Loughborough Science Park.</li> <li>• Concern that local democracy doesn't exist in planning and that development will go ahead whatever.</li> </ul>	
RN294 D Ross	Agree/strongly agree with the core polices. But it is essential to maintain and improve the balance or quality of services and amenities in line with the number of houses.	
RN308 Hathern Parish Council	The six week consultation period has been compromised as residents of Hathern did not receive their summary documents until March 8 <sup>th</sup> .	
RN318 G B Stephenson	Did not receive correspondence concerning the Core Strategy until 25th March 2006. Has not received supporting documents referred to in the Council's correspondence.	
RN324 N Richards	Each developed area must have additional leisure/doctors/dentist/ school facilities built into this plan.	
RN333 J R Healey	A lot of people are being given the opportunity to object too late.	
RN337 N Porter	Questions raised about accountability of local government, the role of central government and the Council not defending local interests.	
RN339 CPRE (Charnwood)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaire is flawed as it does not allow agreement with the strategy to be registered, if there is disagreement over parts.</li> <li>• Object to the figures given for small site allowances and for windfall sites.</li> <li>• Agree with most of development strategy, however carbon footprint of development needs to be kept to absolute minimum.</li> <li>• With regard to locational strategy, there is a need for defensive boundaries.</li> </ul>	
RN340 A Clift	Within section 2.26 on the Community Strategy be more specific about the social and environmental well being of the Borough and Loughborough town centre in particular and the economic well being of Loughborough town centre. Planning decisions give less weight to the need for a safe, diverse, sustainable and socially exclusive town centre than the issues of economic viability. Development is driven by the lure of the student purse in prioritising exclusive student accommodation and food and entertainment venues without sufficient emphasis of the social and environmental well being of all citizens. Whilst recognising the importance of economic, social and environmental aspects this imbalance should be robustly addressed.	
RN348 S Tinning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create cycle tracks which are separated from footpaths for safety reasons</li> <li>• Educate/ involve/ inform farm workers about hedge cutting</li> <li>• Provide information boards in woodland.</li> <li>• Walk in clinics, crèche and nursery facilities are great idea for workers</li> </ul>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High quality food outlets (Question whether it is possible to limit fast food outlets (smell, litter and health issues)</li> <li>• Access to health/ sports/ fitness facilities</li> <li>• Question whether student numbers are going to increase into the future (especially with growing financial problems)</li> <li>• Carrying luggage to bus stop or railway is problem for certain sections of society</li> <li>• Possibly allow for a fresh fish unit</li> </ul>	
RN349 A Aucott	Concern was that it was difficult to obtain information, and question whether this was intentionally to get less replies.	
RN350 D Aucott	All documents required to fill in this form should be delivered to each home to give everyone a chance to have their say.	
RN351 C Sweeney	Core planning and science documents with the 2021 in order for everyone to have a chance to comment.	
RN352 C Sweeney	Core planning and science documents with the 2021 in order for everyone to have a chance to comment.	
RN377 P Green	Perception that this area of Leicestershire has taken its fair share of development. Other areas should share the burden.	
RN421 A Dalzell	<p>Plan appears fundamentally flawed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth is good but not at the expense of rural communities that have existed for hundreds of years;</li> <li>• Should not go against people's right to choose to live in a village.</li> </ul>	
RN457 N Pratt	Strategy is well thought through and Charnwood are to be complimented on its production and consultation process. Greatest worry is that future development is dictated by the Government through Regional bodies and decision making has been taken away from those who have the knowledge of local needs and trends.	
RN458 FKI Plc  Agent: NAI Fuller Peiser	FKI is located on an established site where approx 1000 local people are employed. Company are keen to continue its engineering operations from the site for the foreseeable future. Request policies of LDF support and protect the existing industrial use of the site from new development which may have a detrimental effect on the engineering operations particularly where this may result in restriction on these operations.	
RN464 The National Forest Company	<p>Welcome recognition that the Core Strategy will need to take account of the National Forest Strategy but feel National Forest is underplayed and should feature more prominently in the final LDF. Comments elsewhere indicate the ways the Forest's contribution should be strengthened.</p> <p>Chapter 6: Monitoring and Implementation The indicator of securing new planting with developments in The National Forest is supported. There should also be an indicator that measures new business growth in the rural economy, particularly through rural diversification initiatives of the type promoted in Draft Core Policy 7.</p> <p>Key Diagram This should include the boundary of The National Forest and be cross-referenced to Draft Core Policy 8.</p>	
RN465 D Baker	<p>Not looked at the bigger picture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better infrastructure – schools, hospitals – is needed to be put in place;</li> <li>• Loughborough town centre is a laughing stock;</li> </ul>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local transport services are poor;</li> <li>Rural communities are ignored.</li> </ul>	
RN467 Seagrave Parish Council	Concerned about lack of reference to extra school places, surgeries and amenities.	
RN470 I White	<p>Within section 2.26 on the Community Strategy be more specific about the social and environmental well being of the Borough and Loughborough town centre in particular and the economic well being of Loughborough town centre. Planning decisions give less weight to the need for a safe, diverse, sustainable and socially exclusive town centre than the issues of economic viability. Development is driven by the lure of the student purse in prioritising exclusive student accommodation and food and entertainment venues without sufficient emphasis of the social and environmental well being of all citizens. Whilst recognising the importance of economic, social and environmental aspects this imbalance should be robustly addressed.</p>	
RN471 R Guise	Resist development requirements set by Government. Tell them that their assumptions are wrong.	
RN477 P Moxon	<p>Concerns expressed about the Council's performance on these issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic flow in Loughborough;</li> <li>Management of University expansion;</li> <li>Provision to move older people out of large houses into smaller houses/flats.</li> </ul>	
RN497 Thurmaston Action Group	<p>Thurmaston Action Group was formed as a result of the Rural Community Council undertaking a 'Healthcheck' that has since been recognised by Charnwood Borough Council. The Healthcheck was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to identify the economic, environmental and social strengths and weaknesses of the village;</li> <li>to identify the impact of changing local circumstances;</li> <li>to provide a sound basis for creating an Action Plan for the future of the community.</li> </ul> <p>In terms of consultation, the project has been poorly communicated to the wider community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Booklet is at best confusing and at worse misleading. It is ambiguous and full of contradictions;</li> <li>Lack of clear criteria in the document makes it hard to object to the plan and left with the feeling Charnwood wants no opposition to their vision;</li> <li>Questionnaire made available at the public consultation evening strengthens feelings that Charnwood are going out of their way to make sure the plan is not met with too much hostility;</li> <li>Access to the full core strategy is needed to answer the questionnaire – document is not readily available unless the individual has a computer or capacity to go to County Hall or Southfields at Loughborough to view a copy. Thurmaston library is closed for refurbishment and residents are asked to pay £21.77 for a copy</li> </ul>	
RN501 A J Burgess	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should have the right to say that certain types of development are unacceptable;</li> <li>Should not believe Government figures;</li> <li>Should fight for the right to preserve our heritage;</li> <li>Should fight for the right to say no more development;</li> <li>Making the best of a bad situation should not be an option;</li> <li>No more erosion of Greenfield sites</li> </ul>	
RN517	Challenge	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
<p>Loughborough University</p> <p>Agent: GVA Grimley LLP</p>	<p>To avoid challenge later, the Council must be able to demonstrate that several key procedural criteria have been satisfied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the Preferred Option document is presented in sufficient detail to enable community involvement and sustainability appraisal;</li> <li>• that the document is presented clearly;</li> <li>• that the document explains with sufficient clarity the reasons why, in each instance, the Preferred Option has been selected; and</li> <li>• that the document describes all of the alternative approaches available and contains a précis of these.</li> </ul> <p>Also should have in mind the soundness tests detailed in PPS 12, to ensure that when the DPD is progressed to the Submission stage, the appropriate evidence base is in place.</p> <p>As the Science Park DPD is concerned with a site allocation, the Council must demonstrate that the Preferred Option is suitable, available and accessible. Moreover, where specific delivery issues arise, such as access, accessibility and design, these should be considered in the DPD also.</p> <p>2012 Olympic Games</p> <p>The Preferred Option refers, in several places, to the need to capture benefits that could accrue to the Borough in the build-up to the 2012 Games. The University welcomes the support offered by the Preferred Option and the way in which the Local Authority is seeking to maximise the benefits deriving from the Games. However, and notwithstanding the fact that the University will also be striving to attract Games-related activity and investment, we would advise against raising expectations to too high a level.</p> <p>At this stage, it is impossible to be precise about the role Loughborough, and in particular the University's facilities, might play in the build up to the Games. It is highly likely that there will be increased activity on-campus, particularly in respect of athletics, swimming, triathlon and hockey and it is likely, also, that the University will be used as a preparation camp by foreign teams in the four years preceding the Games. However, it is unlikely that the University will be able to host a major foreign team immediately prior to the Games as priority will be given to Team GB. If this is the case, it may be that only modest additional development would be needed in the lead-up to the competition (both in the year of the event and, perhaps also, summers in advance). However, obvious improvements that would benefit the town and its Olympic prospects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improvements to the University running track to provide eight lanes and competition standard floodlighting;</li> <li>• the construction of an athlete recovery area (hydrotherapy pool); and</li> <li>• the provision of additional hotel accommodation close to the University Campus.</li> </ul> <p>Insofar as hotel development is concerned, the Borough Council will note that the University has suggested, in its response to the Science Park DPD, that additional hotel accommodation ought to be constructed in connection with that development. If the Science Park DPD does, ultimately, make provision for this form of development also, this could go some way to satisfying demand arising on the back of Olympic Games related activities. In the University's opinion, specific provision should be made for this form of development in the Core Strategy as well as the Science Park DPD.</p> <p>The University continues to explore opportunities likely to be presented by the Games and when further information becomes available it will share this with the Borough Council.</p>	
RN518	Attempted to use the online response form, but it hung up part way through.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Wendy English		
RN520 House Builders Federation	<p>Undertake a Housing Market Assessment to corroborate the assertion in para 2.7 that there is an unmet need for flatted accommodation and to quantify the level of any such demand (a Housing Needs Survey cannot do this properly).</p> <p>Extend the Plan period to 2026 in line with the new draft RSS.</p>	
RN523 SureStart Loughborough East	<p>Congratulate the Council in producing a document that is very well presented and easy to follow. There are a large number of very complex issues that have been succinctly brought together in this document, with the obvious focus on the future development strategy and directions for growth.</p>	
RN546 Rutherford Properties  Agent: Fisher German	<p>Amend limits to development and delete Open Space of Special Character designation in Seagrave (map attached):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essential to identify some small scale development in and around rural villages to maintain their viability as existing settlements;</li> <li>• Village school and transport provision in Seagrave are important local services that would be supported by small scale development;</li> <li>• Seagrave has the required 3 or more key services set out in the Core Strategy in para 4.9;</li> <li>• Previous Local Plan Inspector gave a direct indication to amend the limits in line with the Conservation Area boundary which were not taken on board by the Council;</li> <li>• Development since the last Plan review has consolidated Green Lane with the other parts of the village so it would be logical to review the limits to development;</li> <li>• Land east of Green Lane adjacent to No 49 is not public open space and nor does include any features of special character and so should be deleted as an 'Open Space of Special Character'.</li> </ul>	
RN547 C Wells  Agent: Fisher German	<p>Amend limits to development and delete Open Space of Special Character designation in Seagrave (map attached):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essential to identify some small scale development in and around rural villages to maintain their viability as existing settlements;</li> <li>• Village school and transport provision in Seagrave are important local services that would be supported by small scale development;</li> <li>• Seagrave has the required 3 or more key services set out in the Core Strategy in para 4.9;</li> <li>• Previous Local Plan Inspector gave a direct indication to amend the limits in line with the Conservation Area boundary which were not taken on board by the Council;</li> <li>• Development since the last Plan review has consolidated Green Lane with the other parts of the village so it would be logical to review the limits to development;</li> <li>• Hawley Fields Farm, within the proposed new limits to development, is suitable to meet local housing needs and to sustain the rural community. Redevelopment of the site would give potential to improve this area of the village due to current odours and farm traffic nuisance. It would also enhance the Conservation Area, visual appearance and residential amenity.</li> </ul>	
RN548 Mr Johar  Agent: Fisher German	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quorn is identified as a Service Centre in the Core Strategy so small scale development is acceptable relative to the services available in that settlement;</li> <li>• Land at Armston Road could help to meet some of this small scale development through residential development;</li> <li>• Previous Local Plan Inspectors and a Section 78 appeal have recommended this land's inclusion within the limits to development but the Council, due to political pressures, did not do so;</li> <li>• Since the adoption of the Local Plan the strong physical boundary to the site, which forms a logical definition to the limits to development, has matured and now further underlines the suitability of the proposal;</li> <li>• Site is surrounded by residential development on three sides and would provide a logical rounding off to the village with a clear</li> </ul>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	defensible boundary.	
RN604 E H S Goulden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with most things in plan but believe that once approved things will be changed and once again the green spaces and parks, shops etc promised will be forgotten but extra homes will be built as usual.</li> </ul>	
RN607 M Lear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industrial building in small villages is not needed and usually does not serve local labour needs eg Leicester Paper at Rothley</li> <li>Quorn and Mountsoresel experience daily problems from daily blastings at hardrock quarry with 20 years of supply remaining.</li> </ul>	
RN619 Anstey Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall Anstey PC welcomes the proposals.</li> <li>The current Charnwood Community Strategy is an important document that needs to be taken into account in Charnwood 2021.</li> </ul>	
RN658 M Randle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Received no leaflet, nor did anyone else living in my street. Time for consultation is too short.</li> </ul>	
RN659 GOEM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commend production of CS in accordance with LDS.</li> </ul> <p>Document Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkages between the Vision, objectives, development strategy, policies and monitoring framework are not clearly expressed. Many policies lack clear direction. Indicators at the end of the cascade process do not match issues at the start.</li> <li>Issues largely repeat the spatial portrait (itself a useful starting point) but lack topic or geographical detail. Many issues as framed seem to be not fully evidenced or understood and there is a lack of local distinctiveness and local relevance.</li> <li>The lack of focused issues leads to a less clear vision. Need to focus more on the needs of the whole community and on the effects of projects rather than the projects themselves. The latter gives flexibility if projects do not happen.</li> <li>Some issues are not, or are only partly, addressed by spatial objectives. Some spatial objectives are not linked to identified issues. Together these suggest there could be a lack of evidence. A few objectives do not link well to targets or policies.</li> <li>In the Monitoring and Implementation Framework the lack of clear targets for many policies relating to local issues suggests a lack of evidence. Need to ensure each issue is evidenced by monitoring data with a clear context for vision, objectives and nature of policies</li> <li>The submission Proposals Map should include policies (but not allocations) requiring expression, boundaries set by other powers and third parties (SSSIs, flood risk etc). The resultant framework of agreed constraints gives a basis for the Allocations DPD.</li> <li>The lack of any reference to gypsies and travellers is contrary to Circular 01/2006. The CS needs to set the context for the allocations DPD where the needs of these groups will need to be addressed.</li> </ul>	
RN660 Mono Consultants on behalf of the Mobile Operators Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A clear and flexible telecommunications policy and supporting text should be introduced in one of the main LDDs. Suggested text included in submission. Any background information should be contained in a separate LDD like an SPG outside the main consultation process.</li> </ul>	
RN661 A & E Johnson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current <b>consultation process</b> appears to be no more than a sop to local community involvement because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-brochure not received by us or most people we have spoken to. Those responsible for delivery have failed and severely impaired legitimacy of the process</li> <li>-as is usual with Charnwood public meetings not adequate. The Quorn meeting was instigated by local request at short notice. Holding a meeting 4 days before the deadline does not show good faith.</li> <li>-questionnaire made difficult to complete and the brochure does not give information to answer all questions</li> <li>-website has more than enough pdf info but this is difficult to access without broadband</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p data-bbox="465 132 1187 159">-difficult to obtain copy of documents for inspection at Southfields</p> <p data-bbox="465 193 1193 220">Efforts on community involvement have been nominal and derisory</p>	
<p data-bbox="185 228 405 408">RN712 Hepher Dixon on behalf of Loughborough Golf and Hotel Development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="465 228 1899 443">• Paras 2.1 to 2.9 Agree presence of the University is significant to the economic and social well being of the Borough. Need to ensure facilities available to match University's reputation, draw benefit from the 2012 Olympics and be available to wider audience. The University recognize there is a lack of hotel accommodation to attract sports nations to be based in Loughborough/ for training teams. The Council needs to encourage development of hotel accommodation and explore opportunities to combine with leisure in suitable locations, for example at Shepshed. This will boost employment and strengthen the local economy. The Borough with easy access to the M1, regular inter city train connections, close to NEMA and well connected to towns by bus and train is a sustainable location for development.</li> <li data-bbox="465 448 1899 663">• Para 3.2xii) Need to support future development of the University especially its long term requirement to maintain its world leading role in sports education. Support could involve releasing land in appropriate locations to meet long term needs. An appended letter from the University outlines aspirations to set up the first Academy of Golf in Britain with constraints preventing this on campus. The Council should support development of a golf course with associated hotel/leisure uses close to the University at Shepshed; and acknowledge need for enabling development (housing, retail etc) to generate funding for the proposed facilities. Important to develop tourist accommodation to ensure Loughborough's continued success as a prime destination for sports training.</li> <li data-bbox="465 668 1899 724">• Para 4.1 On occasion may be need to provide development contrary to the settlement hierarchy to bring social, economic or environmental benefits.</li> </ul>	
<p data-bbox="185 735 387 850">RN714 Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="465 735 1899 1441">• Lack of fair, adequate and proper consultation. The six week period was too short given the magnitude of decisions and issues involved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="517 826 1899 882">- Estimate at least 25% of households did not receive a publicity leaflet and many still have not. Lack of leaflets in Hathern identified by Parish Council addressed at least two and half weeks into consultation period.</li> <li data-bbox="517 887 1899 1007">- The concept of a Garendon Country Deer Park had been regularly promoted in the press prior to the consultation without mention of related housing development. It is unknown how much of the Park would be given for public use, if any. Prior publicity misinformed people and the consultation was designed to sell something apparently already decided so objections reduced.</li> <li data-bbox="517 1011 1899 1099">- Shepshed Town Council and Hathern Parish Council did not know anything about the Plan until approached by GPCPG. The Borough Council attended a Shepshed Town Council meeting and held meetings and roadshows in some areas but not in Hathern until the Parish Council complained.</li> <li data-bbox="517 1104 1899 1192">- Response forms not included in publicity booklets. People had to go to libraries or Southfields. Forms were not available on first day of consultations at the local library. At Southfields the receptionist seemed unaware and could only find one form.</li> <li data-bbox="517 1197 1899 1284">- The publicity booklet unhelpful in completing the form. The full document was required and these were in very short supply, difficult to find and even if available at libraries would not be time to read during opening hours. Residents did not have proper information needed to respond.</li> <li data-bbox="517 1289 1899 1377">- Not made clear that a letter could be submitted to express views. The form did not enable comment on implications of supporting the strategy, namely that if residents of Shepshed, Hathern and Loughborough supported the strategy there would be complete urbanization of the area between those settlements</li> <li data-bbox="517 1382 1899 1437">- the options for consultation were narrowed down to four, all Greenfield sites. Little information given on the other three and none on other possible options. Information was not balanced nor objective. This could persuade other areas of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
	<p>Charnwood to favour the Garendon option as they did not want development in their area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consultation period should be extended so residents can be fully appraised of implications of the strategy in order to submit thoughtful and studied responses.</li> </ul>	
RN716 Mr & Mrs B Needham	Concerns about consultations notably not all households receiving booklets, response form incompatible with booklet, difficulty of obtaining and completing a response form.	
RN727 Hastings Community Association	Welcome the opportunity for early comment. There is good articulation of different elements, coherence and practicability.	
RN728 R Youngs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P15(v) refers to traffic problems in Loughborough and close to Leicester. Perversely these are preferred growth locations. This appears contrary to quality of life issues</li> <li>5.3 quality in new development Concern that Wharf development does not set high standards, and this continues standard of schemes being built in Loughborough. Suggest a Loughborough Design Statement (as Village Design Statements) to set local styles and materials prepared by local residents and local groups.</li> <li>5.9 require not encourage very good BREAM standards. These standards should be used for every building, as should renewable energy provision. All developments should have design and BREAM statements</li> <li>p16 (xi) could safeguard and improve local shops by dispersal of development</li> <li>too much emphasis on road schemes and lack of proposals to improve public transport, eg no mention of Ivanhoe rail services. Need stronger measures to deter car use, eg parking meters, workplace charging, congestion charging etc. Road schemes should be matter of last resort.</li> <li>5.14 need provision to encourage rail based freight movement, eg as part of Eastern Gateway project</li> <li>5.111 may not be one dedicated walking route in whole of Loughborough</li> <li>Draft Policy 7(e) is too open ended and could allow a Portland Downs type scheme</li> <li>5.77 what are spin off benefits of Olympics and Garendon Park?</li> <li>Draft CP v) should be a requirement for granting planning permission.</li> </ul>	
RN735 R P & A E Tweddle	Displeasure at not receiving a leaflet and having to collect one from Asda roadshow.	
RN737 G Templeman	Otherwise generally approve contents of document.	
RN741 GVA Grimley on behalf of Jelson Ltd	<p>In terms of procedural issues concerned there may not yet be an adequate evidence base:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of clarity as to why preferred option was chosen.</li> <li>Not clear that sufficient attention given to analysis and discounting of alternative strategies and policies.</li> <li>The CS should cover the period to 2026 to accord with revised RSS and PPS3 expected to require identification of land supply for 15 year period.</li> </ul> <p>Would welcome any further information in advance of the Submission stage.</p>	
RN788 S Bullman	Please note this is an ABC response, but has not been fully discussed within ABC for logistical reasons.	
RN791 Richard Anthony	Object to the timescale of the Plan. Draft PPS3 requires that a fifteen year supply of housing land be identified. This should be post expected adoption date of the Site Allocations DPD. Request that the Plan period be extended to 2025.	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Gough on behalf of Revelan Group		
RN796 T Stott	<p>Comments about the consultation process and this form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The form is not used friendly;</li> <li>• There are no boxes for comments where you agree.</li> <li>• Filling in the form and copying what you have submitted is a nightmare.</li> <li>• It is an appallingly designed form and on line system. It does not fulfill the objectives of the Statement of Community Involvement about encouraging participation.</li> <li>• You cannot print all your comments as part of the form: you have to copy them into a separate file if they exceed the limit.</li> </ul>	
RN806 A Kay	<p>The Core Strategy is constrained by the Leicestershire Structure Plan which determines how much development is required. The Charnwood LDF simply decides where the best location for the development is and how it will be implemented. Whereas public consultation on the LDF has been exemplary so far, there was far less scope for public input to the Structure Plan where the really important decisions are being made. This is a serious democratic deficit that the Council should protest to the ODPM about.</p>	
RN808 D Evans	<p>The strategy is far too prescriptive overall and should concentrate on major aims without yet determining specific locational outputs. By doing so it invites a 'fait accompli' interpretation and generates inevitable opposition instead of engaging in meaningful consultation.</p>	
RN810 N Morgan	<p>Make reference in paragraph 2.6 of the Core Strategy to the vibrant Loughborough market when describing the "varied shopping experience".</p>	
RN812 A Millie	<p>The argument that Loughborough has to plan for expansion is flawed. If development was viewed regionally, then other potential growth areas can be identified</p>	
RN813 P Knott	<p>The sustainable communities programme and ODPM aspirations fill me with deep foreboding. Little of rural Charnwood left by 2021 and the results will give planners and politicians same reputation as tower blocks and destruction of heritage in the 60s and 70s.</p>	
RN817 T Birkinshaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Find room for a new Senior School (14+) for south and east Loughborough to take pressure of Rawlins (and Burleigh) and allow standards to be increased.</li> <li>• Concerns about wording of policies 'planning permission will be granted' gives wrong impression – rephrase negatively.</li> </ul>	
RN819 R Iley	<p>Want to complain about the lack of information concerning 2021. Only found out about it through Parish Council meeting. Overwhelmed by the amount of information needed to take in to fill in response form</p>	
RN821 L Emmitt	<p>The major residential developments should include a links site for Shops, Schools, Community Centres and Places of Worship. The faith communities should be encouraged to partner at an early stage.</p>	
RN824 National Trust	<p>Para 2.18 – the assessment of PPS1 should note the key commitment to seeking an integrated approach to sustainable development whereby economic, social and environmental benefits are achieved together over time rather than being traded off against each other (PPS1 paras 4 and 13(i)).</p>	
RN890 C Clegg	<p>Unhappy with the consultation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not receive documents and our village meeting was held on 27<sup>th</sup> March giving limited time to respond.</li> <li>• Given the impression that you are paying lip service to the whole consultation process and that decisions have already been taken;</li> <li>• Documents are full of jargon and references to strategies.</li> </ul>	
RN896	<p>Investment from the Council needs a return from settlements. We are stronger together as a whole. We do not need influence</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
D Patel	<p>from Leicester City Council.</p> <p>How the public be able to use facilities for Loughborough. Maybe the car park can be used as a park and ride point to bring people and investment into Loughborough.</p>	
RN902 J & L Blyth RN903 T Davies	<p>The booklet 'Charnwood 2021' does not relate to the questionnaire.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "In May 2004 we published an Issues Paper and asked local community groups, businesses and other bodies what they thought ..." Why were a sample of Council tax payers not asked for their views?</li> <li>• The Council should not proceed with planning and expenditure until after the County Council has given approval.</li> <li>• A Plan should be permanent and amendments made to it regularly and incrementally rather than a major undertaking at infrequent intervals.</li> <li>• There are too many documents.</li> <li>• Not aware that the Borough is obligated to create more housing together with infrastructure. Likely that through rising sea levels due to climate change will increase pressure for new development in areas such as the East Midlands not at risk.</li> </ul>	
RN906 R I Porter	<p>Tick box questions do not enable people to get across their views. This is not a market survey exercise but about planning for people's future. A written form of response shows a stronger conviction.</p> <p>Question whether nothing has been decided when giving preferred options hints that it is cut and dried. Need to learn from criticisms of past consultations.</p> <p>Why have only parts of the Local been 'saved':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What if some gets in the Plan way of planning to 2021;</li> <li>• Green bits have not been saved. Where does this leave green spaces?</li> </ul> <p>Why are the sites at Derby Road for warehouse development and Pear Tree Lane for housing allowed to continue when the options North and East of Loughborough causes so many problems?</p> <p>Developing the site at Derby Road for warehousing will prevent AstraZeneca from expanding or a similar large scale research and development company from moving to Loughborough. There are unlikely to be any other locations in Loughborough for such development if the infrastructure is similar to AstraZeneca.</p>	
RN909 Webb	<p>Comments of the process of drawing up and consultation on the Framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation of cut and dried options to the general public at this stage is an oppressive and technocratic measure;</li> <li>• Structure of the response form invites respondents to accept the technical analysis without question;</li> <li>• Identification of the options has been carried out without input from the public – public debate and controversy at the start would help to make clear what is and is not possible and empower the Council to come up with genuinely creative alternatives despite the constraints of Government policy and the evidence base.</li> </ul>	
RN911 J Barber, Woodcock Farms  Agent: Pegasus	<p>Consider land south of Rothley and land adjoining Sibleby (plans included) for allocation as housing land.</p>	

Respondents	Summary of Comments	
Planning Group RN912 Radleigh Homes & Messers Clarke  Agent: Pegasus Planning Group	Consider land at Mountsorrel (plans included) for allocation as housing land.	
RN915 Peatfield Associates	Sets out 8 detailed points for review the boundary of Countryside Designation and Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside in relation to 434 Bradgate Road, Newtown Linford.*  *Detailed points that would be considered by an allocation Development Plan Document.	
RN917 Mr & Mrs Westwood	Inaccessibility of Borough Council Offices to south of the Borough should be tackled by having a mobile office for Charnwood Borough Council.	
RN1180 Richard Murray	Charnwood 2021 is strategically short sighted.	
RN1293 Loughborough Gospel Hall Trust  Agent: J & J Design	Table 6.1 This matrix requires a clear key to the symbols used.	
RN1328 J Telfer-Smith	Majority of the community are not concerned about 2021 but what you can do for the community now. Generate a more efficient and reasonable plan to clean up the areas of town that are run down and in need of regeneration.	
RN1329 C Grimes	Concerned about the creation and role of the East Midlands Regional Assembly and its impact upon the quality of the environment.	
RN1330 E Taylor	Not all people living in Charnwood in 2021 will be under 40 years. Need to consider the needs of the retired population in terms of providing reasonably sized bungalows and other retirement accommodation in Loughborough.	
RN1350 J Key	It is difficult to use the Response Form as it mixes excellent ideology with details that are not always in alignment.	