



## **Charnwood 2021 Preferred Options Consultation: Summary of Workshop Sessions**

## **SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP EVENTS HELD AS PART OF THE PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION ON CHARNWOOD 2021 CORE STRATEGY AND SCIENCE PARK DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS**

As part of the consultation on the Charnwood 2021 Preferred Options, two workshop events were held to enable a discussion of the preferred options and alternatives. The events were run by officers from the Planning Policy Section with the support of Shilpa Rasaiah, Regen Solutions.

The first workshop event was with members of the Charnwood Together Forum and was held on the 14<sup>th</sup> March. The half day session consisted of brief presentations and workshop exercises looking at the principles of sustainability and discussing broad alternative approaches to the distribution of development.

The Citizen Panel event was a half day session held on the 25<sup>th</sup> March. Some 24 Panel members attended from across the Borough. Following brief presentations groups discussed the various alternative directions for growth outlined in the Preferred Options paper, looking at the pros and cons and what they considered was necessary to deliver sustainable solutions.

At each session attendees had the opportunity to “vote” for their preferred option.

The appendices summarise the events and the various comments made.

## Consultation Summary - The Charnwood 2021 Preferred Options Core Strategy.

### What Makes a Sustainable Community – Exercise 1

Citizens Panel Responses – 25 <sup>th</sup> March 2006	Charnwood Together LSP Forum Responses 14 <sup>th</sup> March 2006
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development without prejudicing natural resources</li> <li>▪ Environmental consideration development to meet the needs of all groups within the Borough consistent with transport housing and environmental pressures</li> <li>▪ Each community is part of a collective whole</li> <li>▪ All facilities within walking/wheeling distance</li> <li>▪ Not necessary to have a car</li> <li>▪ Good bus service to town/big shops</li> <li>▪ Compact community design – not ‘ribbon development’</li> <li>▪ Local green areas/parks, nature reserves</li> <li>▪ Complete</li> <li>▪ Self-sufficient</li> <li>▪ Capable of including in line with population</li> <li>▪ Meets needs of all age groups</li> <li>▪ Provision of services</li> <li>▪ Environmental impact</li> <li>▪ Employment Quality of life</li> <li>▪ Standard of living</li> <li>▪ Development to maintain key elements of Governments Quality of Life Index</li> <li>▪ A community that can pride support for its residents</li> <li>▪ Community groups for all ages</li> <li>▪ Facilities – library, doctors, dentist, post office, shops, schools,</li> <li>▪ For all age groups need for jobs, shops, doctors and schools close to homes so people do not have to travel far, also minimise impact on environment – social and leisure eg. Larger villages, Quorn, Rothley, Mountsorrel, Anstey</li> <li>▪ Regeneration Impact on environment – schools, leisure facilities, access</li> <li>▪ Employment, housing, shops, leisure, schools, doctors,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community providing – housing, education, retail (local shopping), transport, employment;</li> <li>• Balanced growth;</li> <li>• Cater for today’s needs, but retain options and resources for tomorrows needs;</li> <li>• Minimise environmental pressures;</li> <li>• Create a walking town;</li> <li>• Minimise car commuting;</li> <li>• Energy efficient buildings;</li> <li>• Growth within town apartments</li> <li>• A walking town – minimise car;</li> <li>• Energy efficient buildings;</li> <li>• Minimise environmental pressures;</li> <li>• Future flexibility;</li> <li>• Effective use of resources</li> <li>• Does overuse available resources;</li> <li>• Limited supply of brownfield cannot just use it needs management;</li> <li>• Accessibility to facilities and services;</li> <li>• Viable communities;</li> <li>• Cost effective;</li> <li>• Well placed fro transport;</li> <li>• Reasonable access to disabled friendly leisure</li> <li>• Link Leisure Park area;</li> <li>• Safe dog walking area;</li> <li>• Developments that edge or part of an existing community (not remote);</li> <li>• Use of cars;</li> <li>• Need transport system;</li> <li>• Local facilities – shops, doctors, surgeries;</li> <li>• Local Employment;</li> </ul>

<p>access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some employment in local area to help reduce pollution and traffic problems</li> <li>▪ Does SC mean permanence?</li> <li>▪ Does SC mean stand alone?</li> <li>▪ Does SC mean use resources wisely?</li> <li>▪ Integrated</li> <li>▪ Complete within itself</li> <li>▪ Everything you need is within the community – schools, shops, leisure, doctors, chemist, church, community centres</li> <li>▪ Everything you need eg jobs, housing, resources, shops, transport, roads, hospital</li> <li>▪ Work opportunities, housing, services (banks, doctors etc), education, accessibility, recreation facilities</li> <li>▪ Established community going through constant change, self-supporting its residence, contributing</li> <li>▪ Basic amenities and resources available locally for everyday living, self-sufficient, employment in local area</li> <li>▪ Balanced development of housing, employment, facilities and services which are flexible enough to support future needs, as yet unknown</li> <li>▪ Development that doesn't just mean more houses but includes the facilities to sustain growth</li> <li>▪ A well rounded integrated community that reduces travel to other areas</li> <li>▪ Sustainable structure – post office, doctors, health centre, dental, shops, parks, recreation, need leisure centres, not necessary jobs, Syston has just got rid of 3 factory and replaced with housing</li> <li>▪ Goods eg locally – Gorse Covert, Shelthorpe, Shepshed</li> <li>▪ Development – affordable housing in the village, eg. Woodhouse Eaves</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Businesses that support the local area;</li> <li>• An area that can support the area, within good public transport;</li> <li>• Good public transport links;</li> <li>• Transport links (including park and ride);</li> <li>• Reduce traffic movements;</li> <li>• Facilities for all ages – PO, schools, village communities;</li> <li>• Care for vulnerable individuals and groups</li> </ul> <p><b>What are the consequences of not having sustainable development?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for new infrastructure therefore creating a new town;</li> <li>• Long journeys b single occupancy cars;</li> <li>• Disadvantaged vulnerable groups;</li> <li>• Global air pollution and climate change;</li> <li>• Degraded biodiversity;</li> <li>• The community dies and become derelict;</li> <li>• Crime increases;</li> <li>• Urban sprawl;</li> <li>• Green networks.</li> <li>• Sustainable communities without dis-functionality;</li> <li>• Traffic chaos;</li> <li>• Air pollution from car traffic;</li> <li>• Urban sprawl – loss of community identity;</li> <li>• Long commuting.</li> </ul>
---	--

**Charnwood Together Forum Workshop on the Preferred Options of the LDF  
Held on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2006, at the Victoria Room, Town Hall, Loughborough**

**Pros and Cons of the Different Development Models**

<b>DISPERSAL</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make it work?</b>
<p><b>Social</b> Variety of house design/types/locations (VDSs support); <u>Might</u> be able to add evening bus services; Good for community development; Easier to integrate (new) people into a “smaller” existing community; Housing can support local shops and businesses; <i>Housing can help meet <u>affordable</u> housing needs – for local needs, elderly;</i> <i>Support for schools;</i> <i>Scope for new facilities e.g. recreation</i></p>	<p><b>Social</b> <i>Increases pressure</i> on (sometimes inadequate) services and facilities – no scope to address local issues; Communities can become imbalanced if more housing without jobs, services; More isolation for people without access to a car; Lack of social infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Social</b> <i>Smaller amount of development allocation;</i> <i>Shorter timescale for plan;</i> High density housing developments supported by public intervention</p>
<p><b>Economic</b> New employment can help improve balance of home/work and reduce need to travel; Can support development with internet shopping, homeworking; Local job opportunities suited to skills of local people e.g. Sileby.</p>	<p><b>Economic</b> <i>“Fragmentation – harder to plan investment in infrastructure and make real difference;</i> <i>Less scope to secure contributions from development.</i></p>	<p><b>Economic</b> Joint approach to infrastructure – e.g. district wide planning gain supplements.</p>
<p><b>Environment</b> Greater flexibility to balance on environmental constraints’ Avoid most sensitive locations; Creation of habitat corridors possible.</p>	<p><b>Environment</b> Exacerbate existing problems (with little prospect of resolving them); Cotes Road, Barrow (e.g. traffic); More car based travel – emissions higher; Loss of tranquil areas, woodland, open spaces, recreation areas; Public transport not good enough now and harder to improve public transport;</p>	

	Description of footpaths; Hard to get strategic landscape solutions for development areas. Negative effect on settlement identity; Lack of suitable sites to develop.	
<b>NEW SETTLEMENTS</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make option work?</b>
<b>Social</b> Large enough to be cohesive settlements;	<b>Social</b> Lack of focus on existing areas; Regeneration issues for Loughborough; Investment vast? Impact on existing villages; No benefit for deprived wards.	<b>Social</b> East Goscote as good example? Perhaps not!
<b>Economic</b> Potential for shorter journey times? Jobs for rural areas? <i>New hub as longer term solution?</i>	<b>Economic</b> Danger of being satellite; Infrastructure issues; No need for scale of development (population projections?); Impact on existing centres – Loughborough Town Centre viability.	<b>Economic</b> Needs to be remote; Needs to be big enough; Need to encourage new industry; Incubator units (applicable to other options).
<b>Environment</b> <i>Impact less if large enough;</i> Efficient – environmental friendly infrastructure Reduce risk of coalescence; Re-use of brownfield in remote areas.	<b>Environment</b> Impact on rural landscape; Impact on drainage – flooding; Loss of tranquil areas; Could add to travel movements;	<b>Environment</b> Need very careful site selection; Need proper infrastructure; <i>Needs to be looked at for sub-region;</i> <i>Work with other Districts – joint decision.</i>
<b>URBAN CONCENTRATION</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make it work?</b>
<b>Environment</b> More encouragement for brownfield development Delivery of Country Park at Garendon (also a social issue) Greater potential to use public transport Less harmful in terms of climate change Protects large/significant areas of	<b>Environment</b> Loss of wider landscape setting e.g. Charnwood Forest, Science Park along A512 Puts pressure on existing transport infrastructure in main towns Swallows up nearby settlements e.g. Quorn, Hathern	<b>Environment</b> Design new development to ‘fit in’ sensitively with landscape/context Make it more difficult to use private cars – charging, less car parking, green travel plans How can ‘fear’ of settlement coalescence be reduced – build sense of community

<p>countryside ‘Cheaper’ to collect waste from urban areas and pipe sewerage</p>	<p>By narrowing the options to the growth of Loughborough/Leicester means it is more difficult to avoid environmental assets Loss of some of green wedge (West of Loughborough) which separates Shepshed and Loughborough Can’t force people to use public transport.</p>	<p>within.</p>
<p><b>Economic</b> Easier access Reduce carbon footprint More choice of employment Encourage more people to live and work in Loughborough Infrastructure already exists Greater pool of people and skills in an urban area Enables competitiveness in a global economy Added value to community of Science Park</p>	<p><b>Economic</b> Undermine less urban settlements and infrastructure that is associated with it Loss of village employment Easy access to M1 (west of Loughborough) cause more commuting to Leicester, Nottingham and Derby Neglecting the Rural Economy Internet and mail order rely on different centres than traditional shopping/employment centres Loss of compactness of Loughborough if continue expansion</p>	<p><b>Economic</b> Transport choice – buses that are frequent and cheap Effective integrated transport Skills pool to match requirements Consider small scale employment areas in villages</p>
<p><b>Social</b> Travel distance/times less – less carbon emissions Increasing range of jobs – Loughborough has highest concentration of deprivation Better facilities as greater concentration of people e.g. Loughborough Hospital does not provide a great enough variety of services</p>	<p><b>Social</b> New communities are not fitting in with existing Previous large scale developments have not included ‘social’ facilities and services Social facilities may be neglected in the non urban areas Is the existing ‘social infrastructure’ adequate to take new development e.g. Hamilton does not have the facilities to make it a district centre Makes leisure facilities non viable in small communities</p>	<p><b>Social</b> How to sustain the smaller communities outside Loughborough/edge of Leicester Cross routes for public transport e.g. Soar Valley Leisure Centre Checklist of social facilities needed Better integration with service provides e.g. health in terms of new development</p>

**Citizen’s Panel Consultation Workshop on the Charnwood 2021: Core Strategy Preferred Options  
Pros and Cons of the Different Development Models**

<b>DISPERSAL</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make it work?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ability to re-visit suitability of each settlement</li> <li>▪ Less Destruction of infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Fairer for all villages to take share</li> <li>▪ Mix of housing</li> <li>▪ Re-use of brownfield sites</li> <li>▪ Encourage younger people to stay in area</li> <li>▪ Might get better bus services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Housing built without facilities</li> <li>▪ Industry not suited to residential villages</li> <li>▪ Less able to get benefits of gain</li> <li>▪ Villages starting to merge together</li> <li>▪ Could end up with more car users</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Build facilities before development</li> <li>▪ Suitable industry to be found</li> <li>▪ Twist developers arm</li> </ul>
<b>NEW SETTLEMENTS</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make option work?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Flexibility of development</li> <li>▪ Less impact on existing villages and towns</li> <li>▪ Creating a proper “community”</li> <li>▪ A more holistic approach</li> <li>▪ Possible economic benefits</li> <li>▪ Encourages a more environmentally friendly lifestyle</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Take trade away from town centre</li> <li>▪ Takes focus away from regeneration</li> <li>▪ Impact on Local Authority resources</li> <li>▪ Division of open areas</li> <li>▪ Brownfield site wouldn’t be large enough</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site</li> <li>▪ Money</li> <li>▪ Size</li> <li>▪ Community provision</li> </ul>
<b>URBAN CONCENTRATION</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make it work?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cost effective</li> <li>▪ Improving/enhancing services</li> <li>▪ Preserves green wedges</li> <li>▪ Employment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in traffic</li> <li>▪ Potential new roads</li> <li>▪ Pollution levels</li> <li>▪ Environment/impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Integrated transport</li> <li>▪ New/local services</li> </ul>

Citizens Panel Consultation Workshop on the Charnwood Preferred Options Core Strategy - 25<sup>th</sup> March 2006

Pros and cons of the various directions for growth options in Charnwood

<b>NORTH CHARNWOOD – EAST LOUGHBOROUGH</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make it work?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Plenty of space for development</li> <li>▪ Help to provide local employment</li> <li>▪ Could enhance quality of life for villages already out there – better services and facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvements to road will affect sites of SSI and environment in general</li> <li>▪ Flood plain a potential problem</li> <li>▪ Impact on character of villages and local residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sensitive development</li> <li>▪ Development of services and facilities.</li> <li>▪ Road development</li> </ul>
<b>NORTH CHARNWOOD – NORTH LOUGHBOROUGH</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make option work?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Main road out to M1</li> <li>▪ Easier access for employment outside Hathern and airport</li> <li>▪ Potential to create waterside facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Potential for flooding</li> <li>▪ Joins Loughborough and Hathern</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expand facilities</li> </ul>
<b>NORTH CHARNWOOD – SHEPSHED</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make it work?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Employment and housing together</li> <li>▪ Good transport facilities (airport and motorway)</li> <li>▪ Good bus services – Shepshed to Loughborough</li> <li>▪ Good access to space centre and Leicester</li> <li>▪ Might bring retail to Shepshed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Merge Loughborough and Shepshed</li> <li>▪ Loss of identity and some Forest</li> <li>▪ No good shops in shepshed town centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regeneration of town centre</li> <li>▪ Road improvement and parking</li> <li>▪ Need to develop community as whole</li> <li>▪ Purpose built student accommodation</li> </ul>
<b>NORTH CHARNWOOD – SOUTH LOUGHBOROUGH</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make it work?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Convenient work for people in Quorn</li> <li>▪</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pressure on Quorn’s facilities</li> <li>▪ No green wedge</li> <li>▪ Roads</li> <li>▪ Long way from university</li> <li>▪ Possible loss of leisure facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ More roads</li> <li>▪ Facilities</li> <li>▪ Employment</li> <li>▪ Public transport</li> </ul>

<b>NORTH CHARNWOOD – WEST LOUGHBOROUGH</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make it work?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Garendon Park gets improved public access</li> <li>▪ Purpose built student accommodation can be built</li> <li>▪ Will release low cost accommodation for home-ownership</li> <li>▪ Next to motorway for Science Park and airport</li> <li>▪ Attract international concerns</li> <li>▪ Close to university</li> <li>▪ Road network</li> <li>▪ Retain Garendon Park as the green wedge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ May change local road access</li> <li>▪ Students may not integrate into community</li> <li>▪ Increase in local traffic</li> <li>▪ Lessen Shepshed’s identity</li> <li>▪ If accommodation is student lets adversely affects the “community” (schools etc)</li> <li>▪ Removing green wedge</li> <li>▪ Pressure on Loughborough</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Student nos. to stay up</li> <li>▪ Ensure good publicity for Science Park</li> <li>▪ Create good Links to airport and railway.</li> <li>▪ Review of green wedge provision</li> <li>▪ Create sustainable community.</li> <li>▪ Provide more facilities</li> <li>▪ Upgrade Shepshed</li> </ul>
<b>SOUTH CHARNWOOD – ADJOINING GLENFIELD/LEICESTER</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make it work?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Good road network and access</li> <li>▪ Lot of infrastructure already there</li> <li>▪ Economics</li> <li>▪ Close to open space (Bradgate)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Floodplain</li> <li>▪ Fragmented area</li> <li>▪ Detrimental to Anstey’s community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development of existing infrastructure or building of new facilities</li> </ul>
<b>SOUTH CHARNWOOD – EAST OF THURMASTON/NORTH OF HAMILTON</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make it work?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existing housing and infrastructure so easy to add additional development</li> <li>▪ Affordable house</li> <li>▪ Industrial land cheaper</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concentration of housing development with no central point and lack of facilities</li> <li>▪ Traffic already congested but new development would add further pressure</li> <li>▪ Long way from motorway</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supporting services</li> </ul>
<b>SOUTH CHARNWOOD – NORTH OF BIRSTALL</b>		
<b>GOOD</b>	<b>BAD</b>	<b>What is needed to make it work?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some employment available – extra would help adjoining communities</li> <li>▪ Main transport good</li> <li>▪ Good bus services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Merging of villages, Thurcaston and Cropston, Wanlip</li> <li>▪ Local road structure poor for residents and labour force.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Extra employment</li> <li>▪ Better local roads</li> <li>▪ More consultation with City Council</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Almost merging with Leicester City development</li> <li>▪ Poor shopping facilities</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

## Comments

The members of the Citizens Panel had a good understanding of the concept of what makes sustainable development and were able to apply this thinking in their reflections over the preferred options for growth in Charnwood. Thus for some options, the issues relating to impact on the environment and transport come out strongly, whereas for other options the issues relating to access to services, employment and safeguarding community identity come out strongly.

The column on ‘what is needed to make it work?’ should be taken account of when preparing the detailed development plan allocations document. Recurring issues relate to access to employment, transportation and community facilities.

## Response to the Science Park Core Strategy

There was some discussion about the Science Park Core Strategy at the end of both the consultation workshops. The issue of location was not in doubt – favouring the location adjacent to the university, west of Loughborough, however, the quality of the built development, access to the wider Charnwood public to this site and sensitive development to respect the setting of the Charnwood Forest came out as recurring themes. There was a strong feeling amongst all the respondents that the Science Park should make a very bold architectural statement on the gateway into Loughborough and should not be like the ‘Ford’ building. The site should also be safeguarded for a specialist science park and not permit ‘ordinary’ employment development on this sensitive site.

There was a very strong view that the science park should be ‘opened up’ in terms of:

1. Access for the benefit of the wider community (particularly in the evenings. Possibly linked to entertainment and lectures/education/sports tourism that invites the wider Charnwood community to participate).
2. Also in terms of layout and design – it should open up onto the main approach rather than be hidden and inward looking.

## Park and Ride Schemes on Employment sites

When planning for major new developments – consider the scope of multi-use car parking facilities as part of the planning requirement to create shared use at times when one user would not be using the site. For example on employment sites – look to develop Park and Ride Schemes at the outset for weekend and evening use.

**VOTING BY THE CITIZENS PANEL AND LSP FORUM ON DIRECTIONS FOR GROWTH OPTIONS**

**SOUTH CHARNWOOD**

---

**URBAN CONCENTRATION**

	Citizens panel	LSP Forum
East of Thurmaston/North of Hamilton (Council's preferred option)	14	17
North of Birstall (Council's preferred option)	5	15
Adjoining Glenfield/Leicester towards Anstey	9	1

**DISPERSAL**

	Citizens panel	LSP Forum
Service Centres of Anstey, East Goscote, Rothley, Syston	5	5

**NEW SETTLEMENT**

	Citizens panel	LSP Forum
Rearsby?	11	0
Other?	0	2

**NORTH CHARNWOOD**

---

**URBAN CONCENTRATION**

	Citizens panel	LSP Forum
West of Loughborough towards Shepshed (Council's preferred option)	27	22
South of Loughborough towards Quorn (Council's preferred option)	4	8
North of Loughborough towards Hathern	0	0
East of Loughborough	5	1
Around Shepshed	1	0

## **DISPERSAL**

	<b>Citizens panel</b>	<b>LSP Forum</b>
Service Centres of Barrow Upon Soar, Hathern, Mountsorrel, Quorn, Sileby	4	1

## **NEW SETTLEMENT**

	<b>Citizens panel</b>	<b>LSP Forum</b>
Wymeswold Airfield?	5	11
Other?	0	0

CHARNWOOD CITIZEN'S PANEL  
Charnwood 2021 Core Strategy and Science Park Preferred Options  
Saturday 25th March 2006

ATTENDANCE LIST

Name	AREA
Mrs J A Shields	Burton on the Wolds
Yvonne Hannell	Loughborough
Jennifer Thompson	Quorn
Charlotte Spencer	Shepshed
Mrs Myra Hall	Woodhouse Eaves
Mr Duncan Ross	Loughborough
Mr David Goodman	Loughborough
Ken Appleby	Loughborough
Mr K Higgs	Loughborough
Anne Goodson	Anstey
Miss Amanda Jacobs	Anstey
Mrs S J Tinning	Queniborough
Judith Booth	Rothley
Mrs M West	Syston
Mr Jon Hodgson	Birstall
Allan Wood	Rothley
Mrs A Gray	Loughborough
Joanna Fawcus	Loughborough
Christine Scutt	Loughborough
Wendy Daniels	Loughborough
Anthony Kidger	Queniborough
Mr Andrew McKaig	Quorn
Prakash Raja	Syston
Megan Dimitrov	Loughborough

CHARNWOOD TOGETHER FORUM

Charnwood 2021 Core Strategy and Science Park Preferred Options  
Tuesday 14th March 2006

ATTENDANCE LIST

Name	Organisation
David Nock	Highways Agency
Younus Seedat	Leicestershire County Council
Robin Dent	Rothley Parish Council
Ruth Youngs	Action for a Better Charnwood

Chris Calvert	Pegasus Planning Group
Roy Dann	Hathern Parish Council
Cllr Cameron MacLeod	Lead Member for Development, Charnwood Borough Council
Alison Williams	Anstey Parish Plan
Patrick Youell	Forum for Mental Health
Chris Emmett	Mariners Quay Residents Association
Lesley Tyers	Seagrave Parish Council
John Coleman	William Davis Ltd
Hazel Fish	Rural Community Council
Mr Bruce	Ashby Road Estates Community Association
David Marsh	Environment Agency
Rama Gupta	Geeta Bhawan
David Walker	Action for a Better Charnwood
Mr Jones	Birstall Parish Council
Dr Andrew Simmonds	Leicestershire County Council
Jonathan Hale	Charnwood Borough Council
Brian McInnes	AstraZeneca
Carol Walker	Walton on the Wolds Parish Council
Cllr Max Hunt	Leader, Charnwood Borough Council
Graham Stocks	CPRE
Mrs Bruce	Ashby Road Estates Community Association
Cllr Ken Jones	Sileby Parish Council
Terence Stirling	Quorn Parish Council
Roger Hill	Action for a Better Charnwood
Cllr Ian Bentley	Charnwood Borough Council
Adrian McInnes	Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Industry