FULL NAME	DUTY TO COOPERATE	LEGALLY COMPLIANT	SOUND	WHICH PART	WHICH PARAGRAPHS	WHICH POLICY	WHICH POLICY MAP	WHICH DIAGRAM	WHICH TABLE
Miss Laura Headley	No	No	No	Policy		Thrussington HA68 and HA67			

WHY PLAN NOT SOUND	MODIFICATIONS	HEARINGS	HEARING SESSIONS
[redacted] I spent time away at university and [redacted] following my studies. I have [redacted] a place which is special to many, with the future very much in mind. My boyfriend and I purchased my childhood home and we hope to live here for many years, having children of our own. I wish for my children and children of all villagers to have the same wonderful childhood I had. In terms of the plans for new houses - I agree - more local housing is sensible. I think it is important that more people can experience what Thrussington has to offer. However, 90 houses is a vast increase. Most modern households have at least 2 cars, therefore a potential increase of 180 cars minimum in the village. This is extremely concerning and that is the 'settled' long term position. Seagrave road and old gate road is already a very dangerous part of the village to navigate as a driver and pedestrian. If the plan goes ahead for 90 houses, that will mean a number of years disruption whilst the homes are being built. There will be two separate developments and therefore, two concentrations of building work and two long term bottlenecks of cars and traffic. It doesn't feel comfortable or safe, not just for children but adults too. I have reviewed and considered the response that the Parish council has put together and I wholeheartedly agree with the salient points of the response. Great care has been taken by the parish council to consider the Charnwood plan as a whole. My message as a villager is modest - I understand the requirement for more housing but 90 homes is too many, it isn't sustainable and for that reason I consider the Charnwood plan relating to Thrussington unsound.	Please see above.	No	