

FULL NAME	DUTY TO COOPERATE	LEGALLY COMPLIANT	SOUND	WHICH PART	WHICH PARAGRAPHS	WHICH POLICY	WHICH POLICY MAP	WHICH DIAGRAM	WHICH TABLE
Mr Jonathan M. Feeley	No	No	No	Paragraph, Policies Map, Diagram	<p>Sustainability Appraisal 2.3.3; There is a lot of concern that is raised about coalescence and identity. If the coalescence is ignored using HA1 you may as well join Charnwood Council to City Council & Oadby & Wigston!</p> <p>There will be no delineation whatsoever between South Wigston and Goscote. Prime agricultural land going for housing when we need to be looking after the environment is totally hypocritical and unacceptable.</p> <p>7.2.3 P83. Landscape, character, green wedge, sensitivity rating moderate to high, coalescence again!</p> <p>7.14.4 P123. Trying to justify the argument for HA1 along with SUE is yet again removing the coalescence! It makes the presumption that social infrastructure will follow? When and where? Within the city boundary? Ah well yes because the coalescence has gone so the residents can walk across the road to the facilities in the city boundary.</p>		<p>HA1 - HA2 - HA3 - HA7. The sites mentioned, if used, will remove all the coalescence that you are concerned about. Not only additional traffic and pollution but the demands on Water Supply and waste management in general are already under strain. Green field sites should not even be considered until brown field sites no longer exist. Traffic's queues into and out of the area will be more polluting due to higher volume of vehicles. Delivery of food from, not local farms because the land has houses on it, will take longer and cost more from distant corners of the UK and beyond. What is the environmental and cost impact of this?</p>	<p>HA1 - HA2 - HA3 - HA7. The sites mentioned, if used, will remove all the coalescence that you are concerned about. Not only additional traffic and pollution but the demands on Water Supply and waste management in general are already under strain. Green field sites should not even be considered until brown field sites no longer exist.</p>	

WHY PLAN NOT SOUND	MODIFICATIONS	HEARINGS	HEARING SESSIONS
<p>At a time when the focus is on the environment it is deemed necessary, to build on agricultural land makes no sense whatsoever. Farmers are struggling to survive without loosing land to the urban sprawl, which appears to progress unabated. We are trying to reduce food miles but when you remove the land the miles will inevitably increase. One week of hot weather at the end of July 2021 and Severn Trent are contacting customers to ask them to reduce their water usage. The National Grid is already talking of potential blackouts in the winter and yet we build more houses and consume more power. CV19 has proved that getting folk out of cars is unlikely, more demand on electricity required for electric cars. You say that infrastructure will be built, but yet hospitals are soon creaking due to demand and lack of staff and funds, but still we build more houses.</p> <p>I can see a time in the not too distant future when we will have the same issues as Southern Ireland with estates of unfinished and unsold houses that either no one can afford or no one wants to buy because there is a glut of housing. [REDACTED] But the way things are going with the removal of coalescence she could well be back in Narborough without even moving house from Syston. Now that is a worrying thought with urban sprawl all the way from South Wigston, Oadby & Narborough through the city to East Goscote and no real delineation between any of them. I would like to think that you don't want this scenario and if so then now is your chance to do something about it, instead of just accepting it and rolling over.</p> <p>(I can remember my father attending a planning meeting in Leeds many years ago when the council proposed to build on a "green field" site. The council could not raise an argument or reasons for allowing it and when asked "so who is getting the backhander then" the panel of planners were silent.) I am not suggesting that this is the case but this is how some members of the population see the outcomes of things that they have fought to protect. Though i am sure you are aware of this.</p> <p>Please do not remove much needed agricultural land for development when we need to feed the locals with produce from the locals delivered locally. Coalescence and the environment are paramount to the wellbeing of the nation and that includes Charnwood.</p> <p>Thanks you Jonathan Feeley</p>	<p>At a time when the focus is on the environment it is deemed necessary, to build on agricultural land makes no sense whatsoever. Farmers are struggling to survive without loosing land to the urban sprawl, which appears to progress unabated. We are trying to reduce food miles but when you remove the land the miles will inevitably increase. One week of hot weather at the end of July 2021 and Severn Trent are contacting customers to ask them to reduce their water usage. The National Grid is already talking of potential blackouts in the winter and yet we build more houses and consume more power. CV19 has proved that getting folk out of cars is unlikely, more demand on electricity required for electric cars. You say that infrastructure will be built, but yet hospitals are soon creaking due to demand and lack of staff and funds, but still we build more houses.</p> <p>I can see a time in the not too distant future when we will have the same issues as Southern Ireland with estates of unfinished and unsold houses that either no one can afford or no one wants to buy because there is a glut of housing. [REDACTED]</p> <p>But the way things are going with the removal of coalescence she could well be back in Narborough without even moving house from Syston. Now that is a worrying thought with urban sprawl all the way from South Wigston, Oadby & Narborough through the city to East Goscote and no real delineation between any of them. I would like to think that you don't want this scenario and if so then now is your chance to do something about it, instead of just accepting it and rolling over.</p> <p>(I can remember my father attending a planning meeting in Leeds many years ago when the council proposed to build on a "green field" site. The council could not raise an argument or reasons for allowing it and when asked "so who is getting the backhander then" the panel of planners were silent.) I am not suggesting that this is the case but this is how some members of the population see the outcomes of things that they have fought to protect. Though i am sure you are aware of this.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>I am concerned about the ever expanding housing developments across the area.</p>
	<p>Please do not remove much needed agricultural land for development when we need to feed the locals with produce from the locals delivered locally. Coalescence and the environment are paramount to the wellbeing of the nation and that includes Charnwood.</p> <p>Thanks you Jonathan Feeley</p>		

At a time when the focus is on the environment it is deemed necessary, to build on agricultural land makes no sense whatsoever. Farmers are struggling to survive without losing land to the urban sprawl, which appears to progress unabated. We are trying to reduce food miles but when you remove the land the miles will inevitably increase. One week of hot weather at the end of July 2021 and Severn Trent are contacting customers to ask them to reduce their water usage. The National Grid is already talking of potential blackouts in the winter and yet we build more houses and consume more power. CV19 has proved that getting folk out of cars is unlikely, more demand on electricity required for electric cars. You say that infrastructure will be built, but yet hospitals are soon creaking due to demand and lack of staff and funds, but still we build more houses. I can see a time in the not too distant future when we will have the same issues as Southern Ireland with estates of unfinished and unsold houses that either no one can afford or no one wants to buy because there is a glut of housing.

But the way things are going with the removal of coalescence she could well be back in Narborough without even moving house from Syston. Now that is a worrying thought with urban sprawl all the way from South Wigston, Oadby & Narborough through the city to East Gosscote and no real delineation between any of them. I would like to think that you don't want this scenario and if so then now is your chance to do something about it, instead of just accepting it and rolling over. (I can remember my father attending a planning meeting in Leeds many years ago when the council proposed to build on a "green field" site. The council could not raise an argument or reasons for allowing it and when asked "so who is getting the backhanders then" the panel of planners were silent.) I am not suggesting that this is the case but this is how some members of the population see the outcomes of things that they have fought to protect. Though I am sure you are aware of this. Please do not remove much needed agricultural land for development when we need to feed the locals with produce from the locals delivered locally. Coalescence and the environment are paramount to the wellbeing of the nation and that includes Charnwood.

Thanks you
Jonathan Feeley