

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

CORE STRATEGY & LOUGHBOROUGH SCIENCE PARK

SECTION 1 ~ THE VISION

There were 206 responses of which 81 made individual comments on the Vision. This includes responses from the Government Office for the East Midlands, Leicestershire County Council (Property), English Heritage, the National Farmers Union, Parish Councils for Anstey, Birstall, Groby, Normanton on Soar, Rearsby, Seagrave and Thruslington, Wanlip Parish Meeting, CPRE Charnwood, The National Forest Company, Friends of Charnwood Forest, Woodland Trust, Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group, Loughborough College, developers, landowners and local residents.

General Comments

- Vision is a fantasy, it is too vague, difficult to disagree with or includes meaningless motherhood statements.
- The timespan of the Vision should be extended.
- Concerns about central or regional government involvement in the Vision.
- The Vision is unsound, too prescriptive, unclear how it relates to the Community Strategy.
- Some concern over the style of language used in the Vision.

Settlement Hierarchy

Should be a greater role for service centres or for a more dispersed pattern of development. The role of Loughborough is questioned, with particular regard to the reference to it as a 'primary' sub-regional centre.

Community Balance Issues

Problems associated with students in Loughborough, including their concentration in one area, and pressure on housing and services. Vision has no mention of the housing needs of the elderly.

Brownfield and Greenfield Issues

Need to develop on brownfield land such as Wymeswold Airfield and carry out a survey of brownfield land. This links to wider concern over loss of Greenfield sites and lack of protection for countryside, nature or landscape. In contrast some recognised that Greenfield would be needed to meet housing needs.

Green Wedge/ Settlement Identity

Concerns about the loss of green wedges/ settlement identity were made with regard to many of the settlements affected by the directions for growth in both north and south Charnwood.

Rural Issues

Vision has limited reference to rural issues/ rural economy. It has a strong Loughborough focus and does not make it clear what it was going to be like to live in villages in 2021.

Broader Environmental Issues

- No reference to National Forest.
- Should take account of climate change.
- Garendon Park should be protected or only developed as a country park.
- Historic environment should be either protected or enhanced.
- Need of development to take account of landscape character.
- Biodiversity should be enhanced.

Transport Issues

- Concerns about rural bus services, increases in bus fares and the need to provide a transport interchange.
- Vision fails to respond to current traffic problems and will encourage car use. Current approaches to encourage bus and cycle transport do not bode well for the future.
- Make reference to Great Central Railway.

Infrastructure Issues

There is over development putting pressure on existing infrastructure and the need for new development to make provision for new infrastructure.

Housing Issues

Concerns were raised about affordable housing provision and that housing areas need the same level of cleansing as the town centre.

Employment Issues

There is not enough employment beyond factories and call centres. Question the need for a Science Park. Give greater reference to the university in terms of driving forward the local economy.

SECTION 2 ~ THE OBJECTIVES

There were 203 responses including 63 specific comments on the objectives. Respondents included EMRA, GOEM, Leicestershire County Council, the Environment Agency, Parish Councils for Groby, Normanton on Soar, Rearsby, Seagrave and Thrussington, Parish Meetings for Beeby and Wanlip, English Heritage, Friends of Charnwood Forest, the Woodland Trust, Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group, Loughborough University, Loughborough College, the National Farmers Union, a local church, residents and developer and landowner interests. EMRA find strong correlation with regional core objectives. Views on objectives are wide ranging. Some respondents feel certain objectives are over optimistic about achieving sustainable outcomes, others feel the balance is about right, and others feel some objectives would conflict with achieving sustainability. There are concerns that objectives should be Boroughwide with locations emerging as policies evolve. Some respondents envisage potential conflicts in trying to meet different objectives.

Headline comments on individual objectives are:

Charnwood's Economy – Vibrant and Diverse

SO1

- Place emphasis on small exclusive businesses not large stores.
- Town centre developments need to be compatible and integrated with surrounding communities.
- Reference to 'as well as a place to live' seems an afterthought.

SO2

- Amend to refer to need to ensure access to employment opportunities.

SO3

- Delete as no need for new housing.
- Refer to need to meet housing requirements.
- Refer to flats/ high density housing.
- Too many Greenfield areas being used for employment uses.
- Delete reference to Science Park.

SO4

- Need to ensure larger inward investment is not given too great a priority over smaller tourism /local enterprises.

SO5

- Refer to general employment needs. 'Quality' implies need for qualifications
- Will this safeguard quality of life?

SO6

- National Farmers Union particularly agree with this objective.
- Expand to allow for redevelopment of existing buildings/ previously developed land, and to meet needs of villages particularly for employment uses.

Charnwood's Communities – Strong, Healthy and Inclusive

SO7

- Expand to indicate how this will be done.
- Should apply to all deprived areas.
- May not be achievable.

SO8

- Need to provide integrated public transport ticketing.
- Need high quality bus facilities, including toilets, better services.
- Need good quality cycling facilities.
- Less car travel requires better local services and employment with a greater spread of development.
- Wm Morrison Supermarkets Ltd point out that some activities are not readily undertaken by non car modes.
- Need to ensure free flow of traffic with convenient parking.

SO9

- Amend to highlight local identity and cohesion.

SO10

- GOEM are concerned there is no evidence to identify the student issue and that the objective does not seem to address needs of the student community.
- Needs to recognize need for full range of public, private, community and voluntary services.
- May not be achievable.

SO11

- Refer to places of worship and cemeteries.

Charnwood's Natural And Built Environment – Safeguarded And Enhanced

SO13

- Beeby Parish Council, and Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group are concerned at references to specific locations.
- Locations should emerge after consideration of options.
- Threatens loss of local and regional identities.
- Should not concentrate development in main urban areas. Housing in other places, notably Service Centres, could help improve bus services, shops etc.
- Delete as no need for new housing.
- Remove reference to Shepshed.
- Seems to prejudge issues and conflicts with SO17.

SO14

- Anstey Parish Council consider this needs to provide the context for reducing traffic impacts near Leicester.

SO15

- Some villages are merging and losing identities.
- No indication of measures to safeguard identities.
- Amend to enhance and celebrate unique identities.
- English Heritage seek amendment to 'protect and enhance the historic environment' and distinctive landscapes.
- Does protection cover repair and renovation of buildings?

SO17

- Should refer to The Wolds/Soar Valley/Garendon Park.
- The National Trust seeks reference to all rural landscapes together providing local character and distinctiveness.
- Amend to protect and enhance/celebrate the historic environment and distinctive landscapes.

SO18

- The National Trust identify need for a step change in biodiversity.

Suggestions for additional objectives:

- GOEM consider local levels of crime may be an issue to address.
- Need to support responsible citizens who help achieve objectives.
- The National Trust seek strong emphasis on high quality design in new developments.
- Need to ensure infrastructure, utilities, facilities are adequate and not overstretched.
- Need to address pressing environmental pressures such as climate change and loss of agricultural land.
- Need to reduce noise and air pollution and other disturbance.

- Need for more woodlands and planting especially in the National Forest.

SECTION 3 ~ THE LOCATIONAL STRATEGY

There were 185 responses, 65 of whom gave specific comments on the Settlement Strategy. Respondents included EMRA, GOEM, Leicestershire County Council, the Environment Agency, the National Farmers Union, Parish Councils for Anstey, Birstall, Groby, Normanton on Soar, Rearsby, Seagrave and Thrussington, Wanlip Parish Meeting, the National Trust, the Woodland Trust, CPRE Charnwood, Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group, local churches, Loughborough University, Loughborough College, residents and developer and landowner interests made representations on the suggested settlement strategy.

- The County Council find the north-south split of the Borough and proposed hierarchy consistent with the Structure Plan. Service Centres are supported as fulfilling the same function as Rural Centres.
- GOEM are concerned at the lack of targets and the need to include sustainability criteria in the draft policy.

Comments on specific aspects of the draft policy are:

Leicester Principal Urban Area (PUA)

- GOEM ask that the policy makes clear that Birstall and Thurmaston are part of the PUA.
- Support from some landowner/developer interests for putting most development in locations adjoining the PUA.

Objections from local parish councils, groups and residents that:

- Green and open areas could be lost.
- Development is likely to impact adversely on existing communities.
- Birstall and Thurmaston are Service Centres rather than part of the PUA.
- 'Adjoining Birstall' should also include adjoining Wanlip.
- There is a lack of evidence that urban extensions are always sustainable.

Loughborough/ Shepshed Sub Regional Centre (SRC)

- Support for Loughborough as a SRC and the most sustainable location for development in north Charnwood.

Objections:

- Green and open areas could be lost.
- Detrimental impact of development on existing communities.
- Peripheral expansion of Loughborough threatens village identities.
- Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group, some local residents and developer interests consider Shepshed should be a Service Centre rather than part of the SRC.

Service Centres and Other Settlements

- GOEM consider sub paragraph (iii) should identify 'key facilities' or better still specify the Other Settlements with them. Clarity is sought as to what would be 'small scale'

development in these villages. The status of the smallest settlements not covered in i) to iii) is not clear and it may not be possible to resist all development in them.

- Landowner and developer interests are concerned about:
 - ~ The scale of development envisaged in Service Centres, Other Settlements and smallest villages is too low.
 - ~ Phrases such as 'local need', 'small scale' are not defined.
 - ~ The proposed categorisation of settlements is too simplistic and does not accurately reflect the distribution of settlements and how they function.
 - ~ Development in villages can help sustain and improve housing, jobs and services and reduce travel, or support important local interests.
 - ~ Some villages should be designated Rural Centres in line with the Structure Plan.
 - ~ References to 'Service Centres' and 'District (shopping) Centres' are confusing.

A number of potential locations for development are suggested at Burton on the Wolds, Cotes, Hoton, Mountsorrel, Rothley, Wymeswold

- The National Farmers Union seek allowance for relocation of farmsteads outside villages.
- Local representatives and residents are concerned at the failure to relate potential for development in settlements to capacity in infrastructure, services and facilities.

Brownfield versus Greenfield issues

- There is broad support for the high priority given to brownfield sites although some respondents are concerned this should be even higher. EMRA consider the sequential approach accords with regional planning guidance.
- The Environment Agency are concerned the emphasis on developing brownfield sites must not override constraints, notably flooding.
- Landowner and developer interests consider the phased release of Greenfield land will be required for needs to be met.

SECTION 4 ~ DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE GROWTH: NORTH CHARNWOOD – WEST OF LOUGHBOROUGH

1264 respondents made representations about the principle of the proposed 'Direction for Growth' west of Loughborough. 1112 of those who responded made further detailed comments. This included English Heritage, Leicestershire County Council, Shepshed Town Council, Hathern Parish Council, Anstey Parish Council, The National Trust, Birstall Parish Council, Wanlip Parish Meeting, Thrussington Parish Council, Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group, CPRE, local groups and residents and developer and landowner interests.

- 4 types of proforma responses were received mainly from the residents of Hathern, Shepshed and Loughborough, objecting to the direction for growth which accounted for 990 of the responses to this question.
- The County Council considers that West of Loughborough is consistent with Structure Plan policy on locations for development.
- English Heritage has significant concerns about the direct impact development west of Loughborough will have on the Garendon Historic Park and Garden, its associated designated sites and their setting.
- Hastings Community Association supports the development of employment opportunities in locations accessible to residents in East Loughborough.

- A number of developers and landowners support this direction for growth and promote specific sites. One developer disagrees with this direction for growth.

Local residents, including the 990 proforma letters, and Garendon Park Protection Group raised a number of issues relating to green wedges, countryside, settlement identity, ecological issues, transport (particularly congestion/traffic), impacts on Garendon Park, infrastructure issues and broader questions about the scale of development also were of significance.

Green Wedges/ Loss of Countryside/ Ecological Concerns

- Loss of green wedge and countryside.
- The loss of wildlife and the loss of a wildlife corridor.
- Concern over settlement identities.
- Concerns about the impact of new development on surrounding communities (fears over increase in vandalism antisocial behaviour etc).
- Loss of agricultural land.

Garendon Park

- Concerns about the loss of Garendon Park as an amenity (in terms of an open area for recreation and leisure).
- Concerns about potential damage to Garendon Park in terms of its historic buildings and landscape;
- Garendon Park should be re-designated for its ecological and recreational value.

Transport Issues

- Impact of increased traffic in terms of road congestion, pollution and noise particularly effecting Shepshed and Hathern
- Impact upon road safety.
- Concern that the proposals would encourage commuting to Derby, Nottingham and Leicester.
- There is a need for better public transport.

Scale of Development

- Doubts or questions were raised about the need for housing and/or the scale of development. Some indicating that there should be more justification given on this subject.
- Suggestions were made about how growth could be reduced or redirected.

Infrastructure

Concerns were raised about possible loss of infrastructure and the adequacy of existing community, transport and green infrastructure.

Other Issues

- Concerns over drainage and flooding.
- The development proposal does not benefit Shepshed or East of Loughborough.
- Emotional issues were not taken into account.

SECTION 4 ~ DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE GROWTH: NORTH CHARNWOOD – SOUTH OF LOUGHBOROUGH

162 respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement about the principle of the proposed 'Direction for Growth at South of Loughborough. 44 of those who responded made further detailed comments. This included English Heritage, Leicestershire County Council, Quorn Parish Council, Normanton on Soar Parish Council, Seagrave Parish Council, Anstey Parish Council, Nanpantan Residents Network, Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group, local groups and residents and developer and landowner interests. The main points are set out below.

- The County Council considers that South of Loughborough is consistent with Structure Plan policy on locations for development.
- English Heritage indicates that there are no known historic sites of national importance that would be affected by development in this location.
- Hastings Community Association and SureStart support the development of employment opportunities in locations accessible to residents in East Loughborough.
- A number of developers and landowners support this direction for growth and promote specific sites.
- Quorn Parish Council and local residents are concerned about the South of Loughborough option because development in this location would:
 - ~ Erode the Green Wedge and countryside.
 - ~ Threaten the separation between the settlements of Quorn and Loughborough. An urban sprawl will be created.
 - ~ Threaten the separate identity and character of Quorn as a village.
 - ~ Destroy the community feel of the village.
 - ~ Add extra traffic onto the roads in this area causing further congestion and pollution.
 - ~ Place a burden on local services and community facilities.
- No information is given as to the exact location of the proposed employment development or the type of employment activity that will take place at such a location.
- Not enough evidence to show that the employment land will provide jobs for local people and so reduce commuting, particularly by car.
- Uncertainties about the level of growth for housing and employment, as yet to be determined at the Regional level, mean that it is too early to identify directions of growth.
- Improvements to local roads and public transport will be needed. Consider the potential of the Great Central Railway as a commuter service.

SECTION 4 ~ DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE GROWTH: NORTH CHARNWOOD – ALTERNATIVE DIRECTIONS FOR GROWTH

106 respondents made a submission to suggest alternatives locations for 'Directions for Growth' in North Charnwood. This included Seagrave Parish Council, local residents and groups and developer and landowner interests. The County Council indicated that neither of the rejected options for the distribution of greenfield development (i.e. spreading development to Service Centres or a new settlement) were consistent with the Structure Plan. The alternatives suggested are:

- Use Brownfield, unused and derelict industrial sites. Specifically, a number of objectors to the preferred Directions for Growth' promoted a new settlement at Wymeswold Airfield and sites in Loughborough and other settlements.
- The alternative options – East, North and South Loughborough, Around Shepshed and Larger Service Centre Settlements - have all been identified as alternatives to the preferred directions for growth. South Loughborough, Around Shepshed and the Larger Service Centre Settlements have been promoted by developer or landowner interests promoting specific sites.
- Sites, built at high density, within walking distance of the Town Centres throughout the Borough.
- Purpose built student accommodation will release properties used by students to the general housing market.
- Larger settlements/Service Centres are considered to be sustainable locations – with local services and facilities and public transport - to accommodate moderate levels of development for housing and local services and facilities.
- Disperse building throughout the Borough.
- Concentrate employment land in locations such as Belton Road/Derby Road industrial estate.
- Concentrate employment development along the A6 and A46 corridors at Birstall, Rothley, Anstey and Glenfield.
- Outside Charnwood – other locations in Leicestershire or Lincolnshire.

SECTION 4 ~ DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE GROWTH: NORTH CHARNWOOD – DRAFT CORE POLICY 2

200 respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement about Policy 2. 80 of those who responded made further detailed comments. These included comments from the Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM), Environment Agency, English Heritage, Leicestershire County Council, Thrusington Parish Council, Wanlip Parish Meeting, Birstall Parish Council, Anstey Parish Council, CPRE, the Woodland Trust, National Forest Company, The Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group, local residents and groups, developer, landowner and business interests and Loughborough University.

A number of local residents re-iterated their concerns about the principle of development in the preferred directions for growth. The main areas of concern relate to the calculation of the housing and employment land requirements, transport and traffic, impact on Garendon Park and other environmental assets, sensitivity of design, provision of local services and facilities and the role of Service Centre settlements.

In terms of the Policy, the main points are:

General Points

- GOEM consider that the policy is extremely long and repeats other policies. Detailed amendments are suggested.

Sub- Paragraphs (i) to (iii)

- Developer and landowner interests argue for higher housing figures often to justify extra development outside the directions for growth but also to take account of the recently published 2003 household projections and the review of the Regional Plan. Local residents are keen to challenge for lower levels of housing growth.

- Calculations in terms of Greenfield land needs are questioned particularly in relation to windfall allowances and urban brownfield capacity.
- Raise the previously developed land target from 52% to 60% to bring the target in line with PPG3. Increase development densities to help achieve this.
- Make clear that brownfield sites that perform poorly in sustainability terms are a lower priority than better performing Greenfield sites.
- Review existing land allocations against sustainability criteria.

Sub-Paragraph (iv)

- Questions are raised about the calculation of the employment land figures by both developers and local residents.
- GOEM point out that the retention of key employment sites must be related to evidence drawn up in line with ODPM guidance on Employment Land Reviews. Define 'key employment sites'.
- The University considers that the Science Park proposal does not need to be explicitly linked to the West of Loughborough direction for growth as the Science Park can proceed independently.

Sub- Paragraph (v) to (vi)

- The University should develop at higher density on Campus rather than develop on Greenfield sites.
- Make specific reference to supporting development for recreational facilities, including hotel, outside the existing University campus to support University growth and the build up to the 2012 Olympics.

Sub-Paragraph (vii)

- English Heritage state that the housing, link road and Country Park will cause unacceptable damage that cannot be mitigated. The County Council and National Trust indicate that proper measures must be taken to identify, protect, and enhance areas, sites, buildings and settings of historic, architectural or archaeological importance for proposals affecting Garendon Park.
- State how much land the Country Park will cover, as opposed to the rest of the proposal and identify the park on the Key Diagram.
- Make efforts to protect communities and preserve identities threatened by development.

Sub-Paragraph (x)

- Make proactive, efforts rather than merely support, to provide integrated public transport systems to reduce car use. Refer to the Great Central Railway as a potential commuter service.

Sub-Paragraph (xi)

- The County Council supports the Direction for Growth but point out that development is being located in areas where there are already considerable existing transport problems. The A512/A6 link road and a south west by-pass of Loughborough is suggested but further detailed work is required to identify the scale of the impact and the necessary transport infrastructure improvements. Other respondents suggest dualling of the A512 and the need to take into account M1 widening proposals.

- Local residents ask for consideration of the significant negative impact of the link road will have on Hathern where there are already traffic problems particularly during peak hours.
- Take into account library services.
- Specifically refer to the needs of the ageing population and faith when referring to community needs.

Sub- Paragraph (xii)

- Environment Agency welcome the introduction of a strategic flood risk assessment given that the Wood Brook has significant impact on the development potential of the town centre. Other respondents agree that must give sufficient weight to flood risk and drainage issues that may pose a risk to property.

Sub-Paragraph (xiii)

- Moderate development should allowed in Service Centres for housing and employment uses to create a sustainable land use mix, choice in terms of the location of housing and to deliver affordable housing across the Borough.
- Define 'local need' in terms of the scale of development to be allowed in Service Centres and Other Settlements.

Omissions

- National Forest Company wants to include a statement to ensure that development proposals fit sensitively into this gateway into the National Forest in terms of planting and building design.
- Ensure that the development is built in a sustainable manner in terms of building materials, energy efficiency and production, green spaces, walking, cycling and integrated transport links between the town, University and Shepshed. Also consider the needs of an ageing less mobile population in terms of design.
- Include a specific requirement to provide new areas for nature conservation.

**SECTION 4 ~ DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE GROWTH:
SOUTH CHARNWOOD – EAST OF THURMASTON/NORTH OF HAMILTON**

201 respondents made representations about the principle of the proposed 'Direction for Growth' East of Thurmaston/ North of Hamilton. 35 of those who responded made further comments on this issue. This included English Heritage, Leicestershire County Council, Beeby Parish Meeting, Barkby Parish Council, Thurmaston Parish Council, Rearsby Parish Council, Thrussington Parish Council, Wanlip Parish Council, Anstey Parish Council, Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group, local groups and residents and developer and landowner interests.

- The County Council considers that East of Thurmaston/ North of Hamilton is consistent with the sequential approach in Structure Plan policy.
- English Heritage considers there would be an unacceptable impact on the setting of Hamilton deserted medieval village at the centre of an historic land unit entirely rural in character.
- Developers and landowners made representations, giving a mixture of responses.

Other concerns are from Parish Council, local groups and local residents. The main issues are summarised below:

Heritage Issues

- In addition to the comments from English Heritage, concern was raised about the impact of proposals upon the conservation areas in small villages and the impact upon Roman remains associated with Leicester.

Rural, Countryside and Landscape Issues

- The loss of settlement identities mostly related to the villages of Barkby, Barkby Thorpe, with fewer related to Thurmaston.
- Damage to green wedges, the removal of green space/countryside, loss of the rural landscape and rural identity.
- The loss of habitats/ and wildlife.
- The loss of agriculture and the loss of the agricultural identity/ way of life.
- The proposals would cause massive environmental damage.
- Loss of recreation and leisure within the countryside

Community and Infrastructure Issues

- The ability of infrastructure in the area to cope with the development. The types of infrastructure mentioned included schools, shops, utilities and roads.
- The approach to development was piecemeal
- The area has reached saturation point.
- The proposals are damaging to community spirit, and the need to maintain way of life in villages.
- Concern that Thurmaston needs more 4/5 bedroom houses to allow more families to remain in the village.
- Development in this location was more likely to serve the needs of Leicester rather than South Charnwood.

Transport Issues

- Concern about the impact of traffic upon smaller villages.
- More general concerns were raised about the impact of traffic in terms of congestion, pollution and noise.
- Concern about the poor road network and the area having poor access to major roads such as A46 and A6.
- Little confidence that proposals will reduce car use or whether this was achievable, including comments about poor bus services, and suggestion for new railway station to serve Thurmaston.
- Concerns about road safety and the problem of parked cars.
- An option proposed was to build new roads to relieve congestion in the area and the roads would act as boundaries for development.

Concerns over flooding were also raised.

SECTION 4 ~ DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE GROWTH: SOUTH CHARNWOOD – NORTH OF BIRSTALL

183 respondents made representations about the principle of the proposed 'Direction for Growth' North of Birstall. 34 of those who responded made further detailed comments. This included, Leicestershire County Council, Wanlip Parish Meeting, Birstall Parish Council, Thurmaston Parish Council, Thrussington Parish Council, Rearsby Parish Council, Anstey Parish Council, Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group, local groups and residents and developer and landowner interests.

- The County Council have strong concerns regarding the proposal to locate 20 hectares of employment land north of the A46 because it would extend the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area beyond the defensible boundary of the A46.
- Developers and landowners made representations, giving a mixture of responses.

Other concerns are summarised below, and these were mainly from Parish Councils, CPRE and local residents.

Transport and Traffic

- Impact of traffic/congestion on A46 and A6, residential roads within Birstall and smaller roads within Wanlip.
- Impact upon noise and pollution, increase in accidents and that the development will create additional road trips.

Separation/ Identity

- Loss of separation between settlements, mainly between Birstall and Rothley, Birstall Wanlip, Thurmaston, Cropston, and Cossington and concerns included the possibility of continuous urban development along the Soar Valley.
- The A46 is the natural boundary for development.
- Birstall should not be treated as a suburb.
- Nature of community has changed.

Landscape/ Countryside

- The area for growth was prominent and sensitive, buildings would be incongruous in the landscape, would have significant visual impact, and would destroy views in rural landscape.
- Development will lead to a loss of prime agricultural land, and would erode or destroy the countryside. Some raised the concern of loss of wildlife/ ecology. Comments also included the loss of countryside for leisure.

Environmental Issues

- Flooding/ drainage.
- Would increase CO2 emissions.

Employment Related Concerns

- Warehousing will not provide large numbers of jobs.
- Already industry in surrounding settlements.
- People do not want to live next to industrial estates.

- Locating employment next to housing does not necessarily mean people will choose to be employed in the area where they live.

Scale of Growth

- Birstall is over developed/Birstall has taken its fare share.
- Impact of development on infrastructure such as utilities, landfill sites, sewerage.
- Industrial land figures seem to be over stated/ unsure about the need for housing/ industry.
- Plenty of land within Leicester to use for industrial purposes/need survey.
- Is contrary to urban concentration strategy.
- Further development should be restricted to brownfield sites and there should be a study to identify these.

SECTION 4 ~ DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE GROWTH: SOUTH CHARNWOOD – ALTERNATIVE DIRECTIONS FOR GROWTH

55 respondents made a submission to suggest alternatives locations for 'Directions for Growth' in South Charnwood. This included Rothley Parish Council, Seagrave Parish Council, Birstall Parish Council, Barkby Parish Council local residents and groups and developer and landowner interests. The County Council indicated that neither of the rejected options for the distribution of greenfield development (i.e. spreading development to Service Centres or a new settlement) were consistent with the Structure Plan. The alternatives suggested are:

- Use Brownfield, unused and derelict industrial sites. Specifically, some objectors to the preferred Directions for Growth promoted a new settlement at Wymeswold Airfield. Some respondents indicated land between Rearsby and new Rearsby bypass was suitable for an extension contributing to local needs.
- The alternative options - Adjoining Glenfield, Leicester, larger settlements of Anstey, East Goscote, Rothley - have all been identified as alternatives to the preferred directions for growth, some by landowners and developers promoting individual sites.
- Larger settlements/Service Centres are considered to be sustainable locations – with local services and facilities and public transport - to accommodate moderate levels of development for housing and local services and facilities.
- Disperse building throughout the Borough, or redirect to North Charnwood.
- Development should be small scale/there should be no development.
- Renovate empty houses.
- Relocate small industrial sites to larger ones.
- Concentrate employment development along the A6, A50 and A46 corridors at Birstall, Rothley, Anstey and Glenfield.
- Outside Charnwood – other locations in Southeast.

SECTION 4 ~ DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE GROWTH: SOUTH CHARNWOOD – DRAFT CORE POLICY 3

177 respondents made comments about Policy 3. 34 of those who responded made further detailed comments. These included the Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM), Leicestershire County Council, Leicester City Council, Rearsby Parish Council, Thrussington Parish Council, Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group, local groups, residents and developer and landowner interests. The main issues are:

- GOEM are concerned the policy is very long, lacks clarity of purpose and repeats other policies. It is suggested that proposals be made a separate policy with draft policy 4 (Housing and Employment land phasing and supply). Key employment sites should not be retained unless necessary.
- Leicestershire County Council support the quantum of housing and employment land and the proportion of housing on brownfield land as consistent with the Structure Plan. There is also support for the comprehensive planning of balanced development on a phased basis. However there are concerns that extending employment land beyond the A46 north of Birstall would extend the PUA beyond a defensible boundary.
- On transport issues there are concerns substantial investment will be needed to deliver a transport solution, if one can be found, for such large scale development in an area already facing transport problems. Further detailed assessments needed.
- Leicester City Council are concerned access to an employment area east of Thurmaston could be problematic. Further work is needed to assess access options, the impact on road network and potential to link to committed east Hamilton housing. The impact on local facilities and Hamilton Centre needs investigation. The initial view is that East of Thurmaston seems most desirable if phased and properly connected to highway network, but express concern about providing a road through the green wedge.
- English Heritage are concerned that housing located east of Hamilton could have an unacceptable impact on the setting of Hamilton deserted mediaeval village.

Other comments relating to sub-paragraphs i) to xi) (incorrectly numbered xviii)) of the draft policy are:

ii)

- The phrase 'where these meet the principles of sustainable development and accord with RSS' needs to be added to reflect draft PPG3.

iii)

- Landowner and developer interests consider more housing will be needed and that the plan period should be up to 2026. Redrow Homes indicate the Hamilton/ Thurmaston locations could support more than 485 dwellings.

iv)

- Landowner and developer interests consider more employment land needed. In the case of north of Birstall the view is expressed that the quantum of land north of Birstall be kept flexible to maximize the economic potential within environmental parameters.
- Close proximity to housing at Hamilton raises amenity/ visual impact issues.

v)

- Links into existing Thurmaston areas and a new community facility are needed.
- Needs of ageing communities and provision for places of worship need to be addressed.

vi)

- Reference to District Centres seems contrary to hierarchy in Policy1.

vii)

- Separating out Anstey and Syston seems contrary to hierarchy in Policy 1.

xv)

- Requires support from City Council re transport.
- New rail station at Thurmaston could improve access to jobs and services.
- A sustainable development would not include major new roads.

xvi)

- Requires support from City Council with regard to schools.

xvii)

- The Environment Agency support a flood management strategy as proposed and in addition suggest a strategic flood risk assessment in line with draft PPS25. They are concerned development sites need to undergo a flood risk sequential test.

Representations relating to the last two paragraphs indicate the first paragraph is also applicable to draft Policy 2, and that the final paragraph should be included as text because it is not a policy statement.

SECTION 5 ~ DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT – DRAFT CORE POLICIES 4 TO 20

109 respondents made 309 submissions relating to Policies 4 to 20. These include Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM), Environment Agency, English Heritage, Leicestershire County Council, National Forest Company, Loughborough University, Network Rail, SureStart, Anstey Parish Council, Normanton-upon-Soar Parish Council, CPRE, National Farmers Union, local residents and groups and developer, landowner and business interests. The policies were generally supported but points of clarification were made by GOEM and others with an interest in specific policies. GOEM also indicated the need for policies to have targets and monitoring indicators.

Policy 4 – Housing and Employment Land Supply and Phasing

- Supported by the County Council, CPRE and William Davis Ltd.
- Developer interests argue that the development of greenfield sites should not be held back unnecessarily:
 - ~ Must be realistic in terms of urban capacity and windfalls (brownfield sites) and tied to the annual monitoring report.
 - ~ A flexible approach is needed to allow for market changes and external factors.
 - ~ No phasing of employment land release to allow a continuous and readily available supply.
 - ~ Amend the phasing periods to fit in with the adoption of the Allocations DPD in 2010, to reflect PPG3 which emphasises a continual supply of housing land and to link into employment development.
- There is an imbalance between North and South Charnwood.
- This policy is inconsistent with the Science Park DPD.

Policy 5 – Affordable Housing Provision

General support was given for this policy. Some issues of clarification raised:

- Define 'local need' and 'affordable'.
- Undertake a Housing Market Assessment to back up the need for affordable housing, the types of housing – social rented and intermediate, the location and the size site threshold.
- Include a target for the delivery of affordable housing (GOEM).
- Allow market housing in villages to secure affordable housing.

- Avoid creating ghettos by integrating affordable housing with general market housing.
- Consider the impact on viability of schemes, particularly those that do not attract grant funding and smaller schemes.
- Needs stronger language than 'seek to negotiate'.
- Amount of affordable housing could be increased by restricting student accommodation and give greater priority for affordable housing in Loughborough, reducing the amount of single occupancy homes and stopping the current stock of Council houses being eroded by sales through 'Right to Buy'.
- No reference to accommodation for the ageing population, such as bungalows.
- Ban ownership of second and third homes.

Policy 6 – Design Quality

This policy is generally supported. Some issues of clarification raised, particularly by GOEM:

- Policy covers sustainability of design and is wider than design quality.
- Wording is onerous eg. renewable energy requirements. The policy should only apply to appropriate development over a certain size.
- No reference to significant renewable energy generating proposal.
- Should not duplicate building control standards.
- Reword in line with the ODPM publication 'The Planning System and Crime Prevention' and include further crime reduction proposals.
- Density of housing should be in line with county, regional and national guidance.
- Address all forms of flood risk and bring into line with PPG25.
- Give a stronger direction in terms of Sustainable Drainage systems.
- Should retain, *manage and enhance* biodiversity interests including green corridors.
- Add reference to National Forest Planting guidelines.
- Provide positive support for a breadth of community needs including places of worship.
- Must not delegate authority to as yet unpublished supplementary planning documents.

Policy 7 – Countryside and Landscape Character

This policy is generally supported. Some issues of clarification raised, particularly GOEM who indicate that reference is made to:

- Support for energy installations, including wind turbines, in line with Regional Spatial Strategy.
- Gypsy and traveller development.
- Conversion of existing buildings to alternative uses including residential.
- Farm diversification.
- Appearance of the landscape.

And that the references to the following are deleted:

- Views are not material planning consideration.
- It is not reasonable to require all development to enhance local character.

Other respondents request reference to:

- New timber and woodland related businesses supporting the rural economy.
- The need to highlight the historic/heritage components of the landscape.
- Exclude noisy and light polluting development from the countryside.
- Meeting places for communities such as village halls.
- Recognise the importance of the Countryside for agriculture and leisure.

The policy lacks a target/monitoring indicator.

Policy 8 – The National Forest

- Confusing as to whether Policy 7, 8 and 9 apply to the National Forest. Amend Policy 8 to reflect relevant objectives and aims of the National Forest Strategy to add value to economic development.
- Give support to the National Forest Strategy and include a statement on the types of uses acceptable in the National Forest.
- Spell out why there is resistance to tourism development.
- Refer to National Forest planting guidelines.
- Highlight other appropriate green infrastructure or commuted sums.
- Policy lacks targets.

Policy 9 – The Charnwood Forest

- Tension between Policy 8 and Policy 9.
- Add reference to mitigation and compensation measures in relation to unavoidable damage to irreplaceable assets.
- Add a commitment to define the boundary of the Charnwood Forest Policy Area based on landscape character assessment guidelines.
- The Policy lacks targets.

Policy 10 – Settlement Identity

- This policy would fit better in the Development Strategy section (GOEM).
- Green Wedges and Areas of Local Separation should be retained to maintain the separate identity of settlements.
- Clear criteria are needed to review Green Wedges. New development should not necessarily act as a trigger to create a Green Wedge.
- GOEM and HBF feel Green Wedges around Loughborough are questionable as they do not extend into the town directing growth, preserve wildlife corridors or maintain separate identity and effectively act as unofficial green belt.
- GOEM considers that Areas of Local Separation should be deleted as it duplicates Green Wedge and countryside policy.
- Add reference to the protection and enhancement of natural and historic assets.
- The Policy lacks a target.

Policy 11 – Infrastructure Provision

- Development should not be expected to rectify deficiencies in existing facilities and services. This is contrary to Circular 5/2005.
- Cannot apply the requirement to all development.
- Policy should provide a level of certainty about what developers will be required to contribute to and what facilities will be provided as a result. A number of clarifications are identified.
- Reconsider wording in terms of historic sites. New facilities or amenities would not offset or mitigate the impact of development on recognised heritage sites that are irreplaceable.
- Include contributions to green infrastructure (National Forest).
- Include the provision and maintenance of drainage infrastructure (Environment Agency).
- Include upgrading of rail facilities at Loughborough station.

- The Policy lacks a target (GOEM).

Policy 12 – A Strategy for Regeneration

This policy is generally supported. The main issues raised are:

- Library services can contribute to this agenda.
- Safeguard existing employment areas.
- Take account of SureStart objectives.
- Have regard to the Community Strategy.
- Consider an Area Action Plan for Hastings ward to deliver quality of the environment, employment, parks, meeting places and community infrastructure through partnership working.
- Indicate what action will be achieved, where it will be concentrated or what effect it will have on affected communities (GOEM).
- Place greater emphasis on regenerating Shepshed.
- The Policy lacks a target (GOEM).

Policy 13 – Loughborough University

- There are concerns that the University is becoming over dominant.
- The University welcomes the support for new University facilities but has concerns about the uses specified and of particular concern is the unsound link between new floorspace and the need to provide student accommodation. Detailed issues are raised.
- GOEM consider that the policy is not based on sound evidence and would result in student accommodation on the Science Park.
- Delete reference to creating additional improved facilities and making more efficient use of land.
- Students may decide not to live in purpose built accommodation.
- Must be subject to the adoption of Green Travel Plans by the University.
- Development must use sustainable design and construction techniques.

Policy 14 – Student Housing Provision in Loughborough

- Give priority to affordable housing needs in the town centre and set clear limits on the opportunities for student accommodation in the town centre.
- Not appropriate that the University campus and Science Park are set out as the primary focus for purpose built student accommodation.
- No quantity is given for provision of purpose built student accommodation in the town centre.
- First clause would give rise to financial risks which would be unacceptable to contractors.
- Second and third clauses are likely to contradict the aims to encourage more sustainable modes of travel.
- Appears contradictory to the recently published supplementary planning document in terms of allowing student accommodation in the town centre.

Policy 15 – Leisure and Recreation

- Designate River Soar as a linear park and Garendon Park as a Country Park, expand the National Forest and link these through a series of footpaths and trails.
- Refer to the Great Central Railway.

- Reconsider the recreation site at Lane's Close, Sileby.
- Ensure non car access to key countryside and leisure locations.
- Provision of additional recreation space will mean that the University will have to provide additional student accommodation making the cost unbearable to the University.
- Monitoring the standards in the Policy will give greater certainty, a means to derive targets and assist in implementation of Policy 11 (GOEM).
- Need to determine whether a country park is the best way to secure the long term management of Garendon Park.
- Delivery of a new District Park at East of Thurmaston/North of Hamilton needs to be debated through the LDF.
- Strengthen the reference to improving leisure and recreation facilities given that there is a deficit of open and green, particularly wooded, space in the Borough.
- Moral and spiritual support is a basic human need.

Policy 16 – Managing Environmental Resources

Policy is generally supported but specific issues raised concerning:

- The policy should not be passive. Grant permission only where the policy is adhered to.
- Make the policy less restrictive.
- Not acceptable for development to minimise flooding (Environment Agency).
- Impact on water quality is better located with emissions and pollutants.
- Make reference to wood fuel initiatives.
- Too onerous to automatically require all developments to incorporate renewable energy and energy saving technology. Should not duplicate building control standards (GOEM and HBF).
- Overlaps with Policy 2, 3, and 6.
- The target to reduce CO2 emissions is potentially ambiguous and too conservative.
- Give more specific consideration to soil quality.
- The proposal for a Combined Heat and Power scheme may not be the correct solution for West of Loughborough.
- Consider the micro generation and sustainable energy bill.

Draft Policy 17 – Managing Travel Demand and Widening Transport Choice

26 respondents including key stakeholders, local groups, residents and developer and landowner interests submitted representations on this policy.

- GOEM are concerned the policy lacks any targets relating to the accessibility monitoring indicator and has no targets/ indicators to manage travel demand. They are concerned that the Inner Relief Road, A512/A6 link and more short stay parking in Loughborough town centre are not in the Local Transport Plan and could increase car dependency. Need substantial supporting evidence.
- Leicestershire County Council consider the policy consistent with the Structure Plan.
- Loughborough University consider the policy deals with travel and demand management in a measured way.
- Loughborough College are concerned that the lack of good public transport and inadequate car parks/ park and ride in Loughborough harms businesses.

Whilst there is broad support for the policy some respondents consider the policy aspirational with uncertainty as to how some elements can be implemented. There are concerns that the policy seems to plan for most people using cars in the absence of good public transport and that developments including road infrastructure could undermine sustainability.

Comments relevant to sub-paragraphs of the policy are:

i)

- Needs to be applied in Loughborough town centre and buses allowed access.
- Need greater emphasis on walking and cycling with better pedestrian routes across Loughborough and to bus stops.
- Public transport needs to improve significantly to reduce car use.
- The National Forest Company seek better sustainable travel links from urban centres to recreational sites in Charnwood Forest.
- The Great Central Railway plc expects to be part of a scheme to serve Loughborough via a park and ride site before 2021. They are trying to create a transport corridor towards Nottingham and possibly back into Leicester.

ii)

- Need more car share and car club schemes.

iii)

- English Heritage support removal of traffic from High St/ Swan St, but have reservations about the IRR as the solution to traffic problems.
- The policy does not address severe congestion on Epinal Way.

iv)

- Disabled parking provision is becoming more remote from shopping facilities, and disabled parking badges are harder to obtain.
- One car park space per new dwelling is insufficient.

vi)

- Supported but may not be achievable and seems beyond the remit of planning.
- Representations on the last two sub paragraphs covering transport issues in relation to planning applications are:
 - ~ Need to improve access to new developments by making walking and cycling easier than driving; and ensuring public transport links and local facilities are available no later than completion of a development.
 - ~ Need to build near rail or potential tram routes not near roads.
 - ~ Development in rural areas/ villages can help reduce travel to main urban centres.

Policy 18 – Town Centres

- Local Centres are not defined.
- Question whether the retail needs of the Borough are clearly understood - no locations are identified for compulsory purchase or any indication of actual need for food and non-food retail.
- Planning controls should not duplicate the role of the Licensing Act.
- Consider the potential of Loughborough for tourism, particularly, refer to Great Central Railway and National Forest.
- Loughborough needs a new bus station to allow easy interchange between services.
- Rebalance the needs of students and local residents.
- Maximise general, not student, housing to increase the sense of security at night.
- Refer to office development.
- Take account the significance of the Library service to Loughborough, District and other centres.
- Add further reference to crime reduction.

- Must welcome the car and make car parking convenient.
- Local community services should be in centres close to communities not just in town centres.
- Policy lacks targets.

Policy 19 – Built Heritage

- English Heritage suggest amendments to correct terminology and to refer to preservation.
- Note that there are only 3 entries on the National 'at risk' register as it covers only Grade I and II* structures. Suggests amendment to the monitoring indicator.
- Note that there are 4 historic parks and gardens – Bradgate Park, Garendon Park, Prestwold Hall and Whatton House.
- Refer to the settings of the designated features.
- Policy lacks targets.

Policy 20 – Biodiversity

- Give same emphasis to biodiversity as to social and economic aspects.
- Policy should be informed by specific actions and targets identified from the Biodiversity Action Plan (GOEM).

SECTION 6 ~ LOUGHBOROUGH SCIENCE PARK – WEST OF LOUGHBOROUGH SOUTH OF A512

770 respondents gave comments on the principle of the Science Park being located at a site West of Loughborough, south of the A512. 605 of these, including a proforma letter from 569 local residents, made further comments. The respondents included East Midlands Regional Assembly (EMRA), Leicestershire County Council, Rearsby Parish Council, Thrussington Parish Council, Burton on the Wolds, Cotes and Prestwold Parish Council, Wanlip Parish Meeting, Seagrave Parish Council, Birstall Parish Council, Anstey Parish Council, Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group, CPRE, Loughborough University, developer and landowner interests and local resident and groups.

The County Council indicate that the proposals are generally consistent with the requirements of the Structure Plan and are therefore supported. However, there are concerns about the traffic implications in and around Loughborough even with the construction of a northern link road connecting the A512 and A6. A link road connecting the A6 south and A512 is suggested, which would create a western bypass for Loughborough.

The preferred location – West of Loughborough south of the A512 – is supported by developer and landowner interests and others because:

- It is the most suitable, viable and available option.
- Build on current activities present at Holywell Park.
- Has to be linked to the university.
- Good accessible location.
- The landscape of the area provides a suitable location for a prestige setting.
- Best location for operational Police support.
- Wymeswold airfield is identified as an unsustainable location.

Local residents raise concerns about the evidence to prove need for a new Science Park. It is considered that:

- There was poor uptake on the first Science Park.
- University does not need a large number of incubator units.
- Start ups on a Science Park, are unlikely to have a large impact on local unemployment because will attract skilled workers from elsewhere.

The preferred location – West of Loughborough south of the A512 – is objected to by local residents and groups because the development of this site will:

- Take-up Greenfield land that is open countryside and Green Wedge.
- Development in this area will harm the acknowledged high value and sensitive landscape designated as National Forest and Charnwood Forest that is a vital part of what makes Loughborough attractive.
- Increase traffic and congestion and associated pollution in a location where this is already a problem.
- Threaten the separate identity of Nanpantan.
- Impact on Burleigh and Holywell Woods, both designated as Ancient Woodland as well as other wildlife habitats and corridors.
- Impact on historic assets.
- Be subject to unacceptable noise from the M1.
- East Midlands Regional Assembly identifies a tension between the location identified correctly using the sequential approach and objectives to ensure that there is no net loss of priority habitats and species. An ecological assessment and consultation with English Nature and local wildlife interests is needed to ensure that this objective is not compromised.
- English Heritage indicate that it will not have an unacceptable impact on any nationally designated (heritage) sites but notes there are a number of historic features to consider.

SECTION 6 ~ LOUGHBOROUGH SCIENCE PARK – ALTERNATIVE SITES

42 respondents made submissions to suggest alternative sites for the Science Park. These include local residents and groups and developers and landowner interests.

The following locations are suggested as alternatives but only the land South of Loughborough is promoted by a developer/landowner interest:

- Brownfield sites, specifically Wymeswold airfield and sites in Loughborough.
- Land South of Loughborough – less impact on the landscape, ecological interest and transport infrastructure than the preferred site.
- Land east of Rearsby Bypass – excellent access to the M1, airport and Loughborough and other local universities, protects the Charnwood Forest, there is adequate land and an existing employment area.
- Sutton Bonington – offers scope for a Greenfield development in reach of a number of universities in an area that is in need of more varied employment.
- West of Loughborough north of A512.
- Extend Dishley Grange.

SECTION 6 ~ LOUGHBOROUGH SCIENCE PARK – DRAFT POLICY 1

185 respondents made submissions about Policy 1. 55 of those who responded made further detailed comments. This includes English Heritage, English Nature, the Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM), East Midlands Regional Assembly (EMRA), Rearsby Parish Council, Thrussington Parish Council, Wanlip Parish Meeting, Birstall Parish Council, Seagrave Parish Council, Anstey Parish Council, Garendon Park Countryside Protection Group, local residents and groups, developer and landowner interests, Loughborough University and CPRE. The main issues raised are:

General Points

- Science Park is too big given the poor use of the existing science park. It should not extend beyond Snell's Nook Lane. Less land could be used by building upwards.
- Absence of a phasing policy is a concern given the slow uptake of the first Science Park. Releasing all the land at once risks allowing the land to remain unoccupied and so unnecessary damage to the landscape. Release the least sensitive parts of the site first.
- Design of the buildings should be 'eco-friendly' – energy efficient, local power generation, recycle greywater, sustainable drainage.
- Burleigh Brook and its associated floodplain run through the site. Development should not take place within the flood zone. A strategic flood risk assessment should take place to investigate on site water management and downstream flooding problems.

Sub-Paragraph (i)

- There are concerns that this is expansion land for the university presented as a Science Park whilst the University considers the definition is too narrow.
- The University asks for clarification in terms of the types of university development permitted. The policy should allow for ancillary and complementary uses such as hotel, retail health and fitness and not ruling out the possibility of outdoor sports facilities.
- Wilson Bowden consider there is a need for a wider range of general employment uses to go hand in hand with the some more specific Science Park uses.
- Restrictions on 'Science Park uses' must be controlled to ensure appropriate occupiers. Restrictions should not be relaxed to allow general employment, warehousing, housing or retail uses.

Sub-Paragraphs (ii) to (iv)

- The University questions the area and floorspace calculations in terms of the percentage of the developable area and landscaping proportion as well as exceptions to the trees aspect and defining other natural features.
- Ecological assessment is needed to ensure protection and enhancement of the areas of ecological value such as Holywell and Burleigh Wood and bats at Holywell Cottage. Specific areas are identified to be considered by the assessment.
- Landscaping must be of a sufficient scale to ensure protection and enhancement the sensitive landscape.
- GOEM indicate that low density setting conflicts with PPS1 and is inconsistent with statement to intensify development on the university campus.
- Design of the building should be sympathetic to its surroundings on the edge of the National and Charnwood Forest– landscape and residential – by restrict building heights, scale and siting, minimise light pollution, reduce visual impact upon adjoining residential properties.

Sub-Paragraph (v)

- GOEM indicate that inward investment is not justified in this location given regional and local planning policy and its environmental sensitivity.
- The University asks that the Policy is flexible to allow the University to increase its land take and not place an upper limit on University development.

Sub- Paragraph (x)

- The County Council has concerns about the transport implications. It suggests a by-pass to the west side of Loughborough but indicates that 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.
- Roads and transport need vast improvement. Transport implications in areas where there are already existing transport problems. Comment on preferred access solutions.
- Clarify that improvements will need to be made to improve public transport, walking and cycling and so reduce car dependency. Use the site as a Park and Ride at the Weekends.
- Prevent displacement car parking.
- The University wants clarification in terms of:
 - ~ The appropriateness of requiring infrastructure and service enhancements at the outset;
 - ~ Parking standards.

SECTION 7 ~ ANY OTHER COMMENTS

104 respondents made submissions about issues not covered by the previous sections. This includes local residents and groups, Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM), Great Central Railway PLC, National Offender Management Service, Anstey Parish Council, Hathern Parish Council, Seagrave Parish Council, CPRE, Loughborough University and developer and landowner interests.

A number of concerns were raised by local residents and groups about the Consultation:

- The Consultation is a paper exercise and that the decisions have already been made.
- Timescale of the Consultation period is too short given the magnitude of decisions and issues involved.
- Consultation was poorly advertised as not all households received the booklet.
- Complexity of the Response Form.
- Level of detail available and access to information.
- Documents are full of jargon and references to other strategies.

General issues were raised about:

- PPS1 indicates that there should be 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.
- The lack of linkages between the vision, objectives, development strategy and policies, monitoring framework are not clearly expressed, not locally specific and suggest a lack of evidence (GOEM).

- The Proposals Map should include policies (but not allocations), requiring spatial expression, and boundaries set by other parties such as SSSIs and areas of flood risk (GOEM).
- Lack of reference to gypsies and travellers is contrary to Circular 01/2006 (GOEM).
- Consider a criteria based policy for new prisons.
- Should include a telecommunications policy in the LDF.
- Need to make reference to the National Forest Strategy and identify the National Forest on the Key Diagram.
- Add a monitoring indicator that measures new business growth in the rural economy, particularly through rural diversification initiatives.
- Extend the Plan period to 2026 to enable a 15 year housing supply to be identified.
- Development areas must have additional health, education, community, places of worship, greenspace and leisure facilities built for the new community.
- Perception that this area of Leicestershire has taken its fair share of development and so other areas should share the burden. Should have the right to say no to more development.
- Should not develop at the expense of rural communities, many of whose residents have chosen to live in a rural area.
- No reference to the Great Central Railway.
- Do not take account of the ageing population.
- Must take account of the Community Strategy.
- Concerns about volumes of heavy traffic on the A6006 and the additional pressures that will be brought to the existing roads to and from the east due to expansion at East Midlands Airport.
- It is considered that the needs of students are put before the needs of the general population in terms of the economic well being of Loughborough town centre.
- Should not raise expectations about the impact of the 2012 Olympics given that it is not possible to be precise about the role of Loughborough and the university's facilities might play in the build up to the Olympics.
- Prepare a Loughborough Design Statement to help to set high standards for design in Loughborough.
- Need to make reference to Loughborough Market when talking about the varied shopping experience.
- Need to phrase policies negatively as 'planning permission will be granted' gives the wrong impression.
- It is not clear why only certain parts of the Local Plan have been saved.
- Need a plan to clean up the areas of town that are run down and in need of regeneration now.
- Improve Meadows wildlife area.
- Make the Soar Valley a linear Country Park.

Requests for changes to land designations and promotion of development opportunities:

- Areas of Open space of Special Character at Seagrave.
- Limits to development at Seagrave, Quorn and Newtown Linford.
- Development of hotel and leisure opportunities West of Shepshed to support the future of the University.
- Development for housing at Rothley, Sileby and Mountsorrel.

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

3 respondents made specific comments on the Sustainability Appraisals for the Core Strategy and Science Park DPDs. These include the House Builders Federation, English Heritage and Loughborough Gospel Hall Trust. The main issues raised are:

- No reference to Circular 5/2005 'Planning Obligations'.
- No reference to Diversity and Equality in Planning (ODPM) or Working Together: Co-operation between Government and Faith Communities (Home Office).
- Financial implications of affordable housing requirements are not assessed in terms of the impact on viability.
- Consider the needs of all the community including particular requirements relating to age or religion. Make appropriate changes to the sustainability appraisal framework.
- English Heritage disagree that there are no significant effects on the historic environment. There will be negative effects on Garendon Park and Hamilton medieval deserted village. Detailed comment are given for both the Core Strategy and Science Park DPDs.
- Need to re-align with PPG15.
- Add indicators on:
 - ~ Loss or damage to historic parks and gardens or their setting.
 - ~ Loss or damage to scheduled monuments or their setting.
- Table 6.1 of the Sustainability Appraisal needs a key to enable interpretation.