

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
<b>CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION</b>						
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent are generally supportive of the principles outlined within the Plan. We would support the approach outlined in Bullet point1 of the environmental objectives "To promote the prudent use of resources and reduction of waste through patterns of development, design, transport measures, reducing the use of minerals, energy and water, minimising waste and encouraging recycling"		No	Intro
PSLP/254	Steve Beard	Sport England	Sport England supports the objective to build a strong, responsive and competitive economy.		Not stated	Intro
PSLP/001	Alpa Chotai	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland CCGs	The LLR Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) are supportive of the vision set out in your draft plan and would want to work collectively with you to understand in more detail how the local NHS can contribute to its delivery. The CCGs welcome: -actions to support community identity; -maximisation of green space; -development form which maximises physical and mental health; -the provision of range of travel options; -opportunities for active travel; -Reductions in carbon emissions.		Not stated	Intro
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	We completely support your intention to keep new development concentrated near towns, large villages and the city. This has the potential to enable a much larger shift towards public and active transport.		Not stated	Intro
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	Planning policies need to be much stronger when it comes to transport. It is necessary to require development patterns which actively discourage car use and achieve a substantial modal shift A checklist is included which sets out actions.	More strongly worded policies on transport called for.	Not stated	Intro
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	The draft local plan barely mentions climate change in its vision. Given the enormous impact it is going to have locally and across the world, we would like to see it given much more emphasis.	More emphasis to climate change in Vision	Not stated	Intro
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	Our key concern is that the phrasing of your climate and carbon emission related policies throughout the Plan is far too weak, and that development will therefore be given planning consent when it directly opposes and reduces your chances of either reaching net zero or adapting to the impacts of climate change. We believe that under the NPPF, this makes this Plan unsound as it currently stands.	Strengthened wording on climate change called for.	Not stated	Intro
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	We have not found policy which supports higher density housing. As Climate Action we see housing density as a key factor in building climate friendly development. Compact development allows for easy access on foot and bicycle and viable service by public transport. We advocate for a minimum housing density of 70 dwellings per hectare, but the aim should be to provide housing layouts that are compact and easy to access by means other than cars.	We would like to see policy in this plan requiring a mixture of types, tenure, size and cost of housing, with a density of 70dph set as a minimum standard.	Not stated	Intro
PSLP/340	Tony Stott	CPRE	Blanket support for the Strategic Growth Plan is not sound. The SGP was agreed prior to the development of local plans, such as the Leicester Plan. The plan is not new it is was adopted in 2018.  The Introduction is not sound. It is not prepared based on proportionate evidence nor is it consistent with national policy on climate change, sustainable development and brownfield prioritisation.	The Plan should recognise that the SGP was produced some years ago and is now in need of revision as a result changes since its adoption. It should not be supported but its existence should be recognised.	No	Intro
PSLP/081	D Harby		Plan is not justified as the vision, reflected throughout the plan policies, aspires for growth of cities beyond the demographic need for the Charnwood area. The range of local infrastructure are already at capacity. Local business will not grow to the point new housing will be required. Electric vehicles will require specific infrastructure.	Required number of new homes should be based on Charnwood demographic change.  Loss of heritage and ecological sites should be left alone in favour of green spaces.	No	Intro
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	A 4th bullet should be added to the Development Strategy objectives to recognise the role played by sustainable service centres and other settlements in accommodating development. A 5th bullet should be added relating to housing delivery which sets out the need to ensure allocated sites are delivered in a timely manner with infrastructure and policy requirements met.	Add 4th and 5th bullet to Development Strategy objectives.	Yes	Intro
PSLP/559	Sophie Trouth	Pegasus obo Davidsons (Queniborough)	The Vision and Objectives are not justified as they do not refer to the important role played by Other Settlements in meeting housing need.	Give greater recognition in the Vision to the role played by sustainable rural settlements in meeting housing need.	Yes	Intro

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	<p>Profile – increased elderly population will impact on health needs, housing etc. Car ownership indicates air quality and carbon reduction considerations. Further detail could be provided on type of work More detail could be provided on health &amp; economic deprivation. Tourism info is dated. Add map of the location of Charnwood showing key settlements and strategic transport links. Provide profile information in a table.</p> <p>Vision – Does not mention infrastructure to support development. Earlier mention could be made in the Plan to the Strategic Growth Plan and shift in growth due to infrastructure. It may be useful to set out early in the Plan impacts of Covid and how the plan will aid recovery.</p> <p>Objectives – the Plan underplays the transport package necessary to enable growth and a set of transport objectives may be appropriate, including partnership working to deliver transport measures. Objectives should be stronger on climate emergency and decarbonisation. Local infrastructure and health inequality should be mentioned.</p>	Suggested specific amendments are provided for the Profile, Vision and Objectives. Add map of Charnwood’s location to profile. Provide profile information in a table.	Yes	Intro
PSLP/208	Philip D. Sheppard		There should be a bit more ambition about green spaces around Loughborough.	Change to vision called for.	No	Intro
PSLP/356	Mrs Anne Tomalin		<p>The plan certainly does not equate with Charnwood Borough Council's Vision for Charnwood 2037 of “making Charnwood one of the most desirable places to live, work and visit in the East Midlands” as there will be all the associated problems caused by more housing, more people, more traffic, lack of infrastructure, removal of open countryside etc., none of which is conducive for a desirable living place.</p> <p>The plan does not do enough to combat global warming and climate change</p>	Disconnect between vision and policies to achieve that vision.	No	Intro
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The Vision is generally considered appropriate, the edge of the Leicester urban area is the most sustainable location for development. The Objectives focussing housing and employment growth on the edge of Leicester are supported as are those securing design quality, identity of place and high environmental standards.		Yes	Intro
PSLP/738	Nathaniel Bromwich	Rothley Parish Council	<p>A Vision for Charnwood 2037 - This section pledges in Paragraph 6 to protect the individual identity of villages in Charnwood. However, this is not evidenced in the wider plan, with this pledge contrasting with the recognisable determination to deliver large-scale housing developments - to the detriment of the natural environment - in these very same villages. This statement therefore implies that those villages within which boundaries' developments are intended - such as Rothley and Thurmaston - are not 'picturesque' as stated within the Local Plan, with this being notably demeaning to such villages.</p> <p>This same section notes the delivery of 'sustainable urban extensions at Loughborough and Leicester'. This is unproven in its 'sustainable' nature, not least given the longevity of this plan is limited to the 2030s, with no recognisable promise that the cessation of this Local Plan will enable the definitive end to further large housing developments. The sustainable nature of this pledge also fails to recognise the increased road traffic which results from housing developments, as has been developed in recent projects, whereby new communities see recognisable use of polluting vehicles, with limited parking, and increased risks of vehicular accidents, notably with children.</p>	Revisions to the Local Plan should demonstrate that the Local Plan has considered the potential for high-rise living as an alternative to outwards housing expansions.	Yes	Intro
PSLP/575	Sophie Truth	Pegasus obo Davidsons (Anstey)	The Vision focuses housing on Loughborough, the edge of Leicester and Shepshed. Service Centres, including Anstey, play an important role in delivering housing requirements over the plan period.	Amend the Vision to recognise the role played by Service Centres in providing sustainable solutions to housing growth and delivering local benefits.	Yes	Intro
PSLP/595	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey	The vision to direct an element of future housing needs towards Leicester, and the identification of Syston as part of the wider Leicester urban area, is supported.	Policy approach supported	Yes	Intro
PSLP/713	Mrs L.Aspinall	Harborough District Council	Paragraph 1.1: Whilst reference to the Strategic Growth Plan is welcomed, the Pre-Submission Local Plan should make it clear that this is a 'non-statutory' plan.	Additional reference called for.	No	Intro
PSLP/619	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons	Other than in relation to Leicester, the Vision does not consider the opportunity for development in sustainable locations within Charnwood that adjoin settlements in neighbouring districts. Opportunities for sustainable growth on sites in Charnwood but well related to settlements in other districts should be referenced within the Vision.	Comment on Vision	Yes	Intro
PSLP/622	Guy Longley	Pegasus	Other than in relation to Leicester, the Vision does not consider the opportunity for development in sustainable locations within Charnwood that adjoins settlements in neighbouring districts. Opportunities for sustainable growth on sites in Charnwood but well related to settlements in other districts should be referenced within the Vision.	Comment on Vision	Yes	Intro

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/598	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons Developments, Redrow Homes and the Helen Jean Cope Charity	<p>Whilst the vision's recognition of the role of Loughborough as a key focus for growth is supported, this vision is then not translated properly into the subsequent policies setting out the proposed distribution of development over the plan period.</p> <p>The vision for Shepshed is not supported by the available evidence and the plan fails to demonstrate how the proposed scale of growth directed towards the settlement is sustainable, let alone how it will support the Growth Plan's proposals for the International Gateway, secure regeneration of the town or make the most of the surrounding forest and natural environment.</p> <p>We have the same concerns over the stated objectives in relation to the proposals to direct growth towards Shepshed and the failure of the spatial strategy to deliver the objective of focusing growth at Loughborough as the main economic, social and cultural heart of the Borough.</p>	The vision should be amended to properly recognise the role of Loughborough as the main urban area in the Borough and to identify Shepshed as a location for more limited growth to seek to support regeneration initiatives.	Yes	Intro
PSLP/635	I Deverell	Rainer	The vision is not justified or consistent with national policy as paragraph 2.61 and Policy DS2 demonstrate that unmet need it not addressed through the plan, which does not meet NPPF paragraph 61 or the duty to cooperate.		Yes	Intro
<b>CHAPTER 2 - DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</b>						
PSLP/002	Hayley Batson		The Local Plan is not justified because of the joining of Quorn to Loughborough and Mountsorrel, pressure on schools and doctors' surgery, lack of green space, road safety, and flooding.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/005	Paul Niezawitowski		The Local Plan is not justified because roads through Anstey are unfit, and because there are not enough school and doctors places		No	DS1
PSLP/007	Mr Andy Jackson		The Local Plan is not justified because it will result in building on greenfield sites, the destruction of green wedge and the eroding of the famed Leicestershire village life and character.		Yes	DS1
PSLP/011	L D Stevenson		The Local Plan is an instance of top-down government intruding in local affairs, resulting in unwanted development. Shepshed was a thriving community and is now a dormitory town. Growth results in disappearing greenfields, implications for the environment, surgeries, traffic.		No	DS1
PSLP/013	Dr Mark Thistlethwaite		Relate development to settlement size. Only consider infill development. Only build on brownfield sites. Convert unused shops, factories etc.	Relate development to settlement size. Only consider infill development. Build on brownfield sites. Convert unused shops, factories etc.	No	DS1
PSLP/254	Steve Beard	Sport England	The policy should include a reference to the creation of active environments.	Include reference to active environments.	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/041	Mr Richard Palmer		The plan is not justified due to the extra housebuilding. Newtown Linford is swamped by visitors to Bradgate Park. Resident's safety and amenity are compromised, plans need to be in place to control and manage visitors.	Plans needed to manage visitors.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/296	Mr Brian Flynn	Carter Jonas obo LCC Strategic Property Services	Support the principles in the development strategy, the criteria for sustainable development and strategy for employment land needs. However, the strategy is not justified as there is limited supply of industrial space; majority of supply are larger units; there is strong market demand for small/medium sized units; employment allocations are directed to larger centres, with limited supply in service centres; some allocations are constrained or unsuitable for small/medium sized units; there are no allocations in/adjacent to Quorn, despite Quorn NP identifying lack of business units, businesses relocating elsewhere, some support for small business park, and support for employment development. In summary, there is no effective strategy to meet the needs for small/medium sized units.	<p>No changes required to Policy DS1, but additional employment allocations to meet the need for small/medium units in service centres including Quorn should be made.</p> <p>Three additional employment allocations should be made in Quorn for small/medium units at land at Poole Farm and two sites off Barrow Road, Quorn.</p>	No	DS1
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	We would like to see this policy calling for the delivery of a modal shift in transport rather than simply minimising the need to travel by private car, and also explicitly requiring development to reduce carbon emissions and be resilient to climate change.	Policy wording changes called for.	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/065	Bill Kettle		The development around Syston is not justified as doctors surgeries and roads cannot cope.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/066	Adie & Carol Lowen		Objection raised. The development around Barkby and Barkby Thorpe is not justified because it would traffic is at dangerous level, new road will cause noise and disturbance, flooding is an issue, damage to properties from construction traffic and loss of village identity.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/067	Angela Montague		Development around Syston is not justified / deliverable because concern around GP and primary school education and because roads are not good enough for extra traffic. More notice should have been given to the public to enable them to attend virtual meetings.		Not stated	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/228	Owen Bentley	Barkby and Barkby Thorpe Action Group (BABTAG)	BABTAG comments to the draft Local Plan in November 2019 concern about the size of HA1 appear to have been ignored. The Plan is unsound as building in areas of local separation and green wedge is against the stated objectives of the Local Plan. The number of homes in addition to those already planned is disproportionate to the for small area of the borough. No nearby housing sites are on brownfield land. Development of sites HA1,HA2 and HA3 will lead to urban sprawl. BABTAG objects to the decision to build in areas of separation. Development is not justified because of increase in road traffic, homes being built on the flood plain, and burden on local services. BABTAG seeks assurance that amendment to the Local Plan arising from increases in unmet need arising from Leicester excludes Barkby and Barkby Thorpe as the area already is providing a large percentage of Charnwood need.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/080	Trev Stokes		Development in Barkby, Barkby Thorpe, Thurmaston, Syston, Queniborough is not justified because of road congestion and road safety.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/165	Gerry McHugh	McHugh Construction	The settlement limits around 7 Swan Street, Seagrave are not justified having regard to the council's assessment methodology, local plan policies, a council officer report, settlement hierarchy and the NPPF.	Amend the limits to development to include 7 Swan Street, Seagrave	No	DS1
PSLP/103	Paul Goodman	Loughborough Green Party	The plan is not justified because the SUEs are not sustainable and will place strain on existing schools and health care. The data used from Govt for the standard methodology is out of date as births no longer exceed deaths. There is a net outflow of 11,000 commuters which shows the need for housing is in the city and not in Charnwood.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/544	Rob Foers	Hinckley and Bosworth BC	Para 2.30 - there appears to be no proposed growth in the vicinity of Markfield, as such it is recommended that this paragraph is amended to reflect that. If Charnwood Borough Council were considering growth adjacent to Hinckley and Bosworth and the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan Designated Area early engagement and consultation with both parties would be crucial.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/340	Tony Stott	CPRE	Blanket support for the Strategic Growth Plan (Para 2.5) is not sound. The SGP was agreed prior to the development of local plans, such as the Leicester Plan. The plan is not new as it was adopted in 2018. The SGP approach would lock in longer distance car journeys by directing significant levels of development to areas poorly served by cars and increasing car use through large scale road development and is therefore not justified. Reference to the A46 Priority Growth Corridor to be unsound as it will harm the landscape and rural character of sensitive part of the High Leicestershire Landscape Character Area outside of Charnwood. DS1 Climate Change The plan is not consistent with national policy (Para 152 of the NPPF) as there is no specific mention of addressing climate change, there is no goal to reduce climate change, the plan lacks any clear target to reduce carbon emissions and fails the NPPF requirement that 'planning should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.' The plan should include an emissions reduction target. DS1 should also include text that requires developments to directly contribute to a reduction of emissions through the way they are designed and delivered so they are at least net zero, The plan is not justified as it is unclear to what extent the plan will contribute to 'reduce net greenhouse gas emissions, in support of achieving a carbon neutral Borough, and reduce and adapt to the impacts of climate change', many of the proposed developments are likely to increase emissions, certainly from transport. There is a lack of transport initiative to mitigate the resulting growth in car travel and the failure to provide evidence to demonstrate that the plan will lead to a reduction, let alone a radical reduction in climate emissions makes it fundamentally unsound DS1 Housing The plan is not positively prepared because there is no policy in the plan which seeks minimum average densities. We propose a new strategic policy on density. The Council should urgently examine whether a departure using the 2016ONS figures can be justified. They should also reduce the contingency for houses with planning permission to 5%.	The Plan should recognise that the SGP was produced some years ago and is now in need of revision as a result of changes since its adoption. It should not be supported but its existence should be recognised. Consider whether the plan should include an emissions target? Consider adding additional bullet to DS1 - is carbon costed and can demonstrate that it will contribute to directly by way of its design, delivery and access to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and to the achievement of carbon neutral Borough in line with a target to reduce emissions across Charnwood by XX. A new strategic policy on density (see rep for suggested wording).	Yes	DS1
PSLP/162	Mr Geoffrey Prince	Geoffrey Prince Associates Ltd obo Cawrey Ltd	The Plan is not positively prepared or effective as it fails to take account of Leicester's unmet need. 2020 SHELAA site PSH2 Land at Gorse Hill, Anstey is consistent with DS1 criteria.	Allocate PSH2 to help meet Leicester's unmet need.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/365	Peter Wilkinson	Landmark Planning obo Sowden Group	The Limits to Development in the vicinity of Moor Lane, Loughborough are not positively prepared, justified and effective. Land to the south of Moor Lane is developed, land to the north is previously developed and in a sustainable location.	Include land to the north of Moor Lane within settlement limits and allocate for housing.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/366	Stephen Harris	Emery Planning obo Hollins Strategic Land LLP	The Plan is not positively prepared, justified or effective; the housing requirement should be increased to accommodate increased affordable housing provision and provide greater flexibility. Queniborough's position in the settlement hierarchy is supported.	The housing requirement figure should be treated as a minimum and 20% flexibility provided.	Yes	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	Allocation of 937 houses at Anstey is not justified due to the detrimental impact on the village and failure to address transport impacts, especially the village centre. The strategy is a fundamental change, driven by education requirements, with allocations in locations not justified under existing criteria leading to loss of green wedge, area of separation and sensitive landscape.	Reduce housing allocations at Anstey.	No	DS1
PSLP/617	Katie Gulliver	Mulberry Land	The policy is not positively prepared, justified or effective as it does not adequately consider unmet need in the FEMA or qualitative needs. It is over reliant on a small number of strategic sites resulting in delayed delivery and lack of choice and availability for different elements of market.	Allocate additional employment land to boost early supply and provide land on key transport corridors such as the A46; land north of Syston Road, Cossington could meet this provision.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/375	James Beverley	Fisher German LLP obo David Wilson Homes	The policy is not positively prepared, justified or effective as the housing requirement is not sufficient to provide more affordable housing, reduce house price growth and meet Leicester's unmet need. The distribution of growth is skewed towards Shepshed over the Service Centres and doesn't reflect the evidence. The policy undermines para 11 of the NPPF.	Uplift the housing requirement and distribute growth down the settlement hierarchy. Place guidance on para 11 in the supporting text. Allocate land at Cossington Road, Sileby to meet the additional need.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/546	Tamsin Cottle	P&DG obo William Davis Chapman Estates (HA12)	The policy is positively prepared and justified in terms of process followed, the number and spread of new housing. The policy is effective and broadly consistent with national planning policy.		No	DS1
PSLP/378	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Jelsons PNH Properties	The policy is generally supported but is not considered to be positively prepared or effective as there is insufficient flexibility in the housing requirement to manage delivery issues in Charnwood or Leicester's unmet need..	Increase housing requirement and allocate Land at Melton Road, Burton on the Wolds to assist in meeting this need.	No	DS1
PSLP/384	Tim Coleby	Santec obo Barwood	The plan is not consistent with national policy. The Local Plan should cover a longer period because the NPPF requires policies to be set within a minimum 30 year vision and. It is not clear if the plan will be adopted in 2022 therefore the plan period should run until at least 2038 so that it complies with paragraph 22 of the NPPF. It is logical that the plan should accord with the SGP's timeframe as far as possible and therefore it should cover a period beyond 2037. The plan is not positively prepared. Policy DS1 should provide for more than 19,461 new homes because - the Plan should have a longer timeframe, we question the finding that taking into account completions from proposed allocations, there is actually a housing supply of 5.37 years (Appendix 2), the Plan makes insufficient allowance to meet unmet needs from Leicester and the figures in table 1 and 2 don't add up table 1 gives a supply total of 10,603 dwellings and if the residual need figure of 8,951 dwellings in Table 2 is added the total is 19,554 not 19,461, a difference of 93 dwellings. The plan is not justified because the distribution of homes is not the most sustainable pattern of development. The Service Centres, including Sileby, have a scale, population and range of services and facilities such that more than 14% of all new homes should be located there; and by definition, the 'other settlements' and 'small villages and hamlets' are less sustainable, therefore the proposal that they should accommodate over 5% of all new homes is flawed and should be reduced.	Extend the local plan timeframe. Increase the number of homes proposed in the plan. More homes should be allocated to the service centres and less to other settlements, small villages and hamlets.	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/526	Liz Pizer	East Goscote Parish Council	DS1 is inconsistent and contradictory in relation to the Service Centres and the Other Settlements categories and is therefore unsound. The policy directs excessive numbers of dwellings toward these villages and will cause urbanisation and loss of local separation from each other and from the town of Syston. The direction of 45% of all Other Settlement housing toward these settlements directly contradicts the stated aims of policies DS1, DS3, EV3, EV6 and EV9. Healthcare demand is currently beyond the capacity of the two remaining practices in the area and we agree with the local Care Commissioning Group that no development should take place until this capacity problem is first addressed via Government funding as well as by s106 contributions.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/557	Andy Brettle	Rothley Parish Council	The plan is not justified as Rothley has no doctors surgery. The plan needs to show how the 1950 proposed houses on Broadnook SUE and any future allocations of housing in Rothley will have access to local healthcare. The impact of all the proposed site allocations along the A6 corridor will have a serious effect on our road infrastructure locally. The plan does not demonstrate where local secondary school provision is proposed for the increase in education requirements for this age group.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/411	Bethany Carr	Avison Young obo Jelson Davidson	Local Housing Need figure should include a 20% flexibility not 10% to allow for changing circumstances. The SA is incorrect Cotes should not be classified as a new settlement but should be included within Loughborough Urban Centre. There are clear errors in the way in which Cotes has been scored in the Development Strategy matrix. The Council has not selected the most sustainable sites and has not identified a collection of proposed allocations that would deliver a pattern of development that is sustainable and reflective of the Borough's settlement hierarchy.	Amend housing need flexibility.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/084	S Harlow		Plan is not justified or positively prepared as the 1,111 annual requirement for homes is politically motivates to generate economic stimulus rather than meet local demand. Development is not proposed in the villages of Woodhouse Eaves, Woodhouse, Rothley, Cropston, Mountsorrel, Burton on the Wolds, Walton on the Wolds, Seagrave, Newtown Linford, Hoton which is locally politically motivated a these are Conservative party heartlands.	Consider whether housing requirement and distribution is appropriate.	No	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/087	F Tarratt		Plan is not justified as an additional 1500 homes, in addition to 4,500 homes at Thorpebury SUE, exceeds any reasonable need and will add pressure to existing road network and health infrastructure issues, particularly in Queniborough.	No new housebuilding.	No	DS1
PSLP/132	N Martin		Paragraph 2.7, 1st sentence, is not justified as life expectancy fell in 2020 due to the pandemic.	Amend paragraph 2.7 to state life expectancy fell in 2020	No	DS1
PSLP/518	Sarah Clark	P&DG obo Godwin Developments (GC No.37 Ltd)	Support the development strategy and the provision of a variety of sites in terms of size and location. Endorse the development requirement for Shepshed. Welcome the housing provision figure which will need all housing allocations to be brought forward.		Yes	DS1
PSLP/531	Victoria Heath	Fisher German LLP obo Clarendon Land and Development	The policy is not positively prepared, justified or effective as the housing requirement is not sufficient to provide more affordable housing, reduce house price growth and meet Leicester's unmet need. The distribution of 5% growth to Other Settlements will not support their needs. The policy undermines para 11 of the NPPF.	Uplift the housing requirement and distribute 10% of growth to Other Settlements. Place guidance on para 11 in the supporting text.	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The plan is not effective as the local housing needs for Charnwood makes no allowance for employment needs or affordability; relies on strategic sites; and makes no allowance for Leicester's unmet need. The settlement hierarchy is not effective as it does not align with the development strategy. The pattern of development set out in the policy is supported.	An uplift in housing provision of 15-20% is required. Combine top two tiers of settlement hierarchy into a single 'Urban Centres' tier to reflect the development strategy.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/140	L Knapp		The plan is not justified because reducing the need to travel cannot be achieved by building homes in Thrussington. There is no bus service. The roads in and out of the village are already incredibly busy at rush hour so cycling is risk. DS1 also identifies the need to protect the intrinsic character of the countryside, building 90 houses in a small village is not protecting its character or conservation.	Improve bus services	No	DS1
PSLP/106	Rosamund Worrall	Historic England	The plan is not consistent with national policy because Policy DS1 does not reflect the requirements of the NPPF, including footnote 68 in relation to buried archaeology.	The environment section of Policy DS1 should be amended as follows: Development proposals should conserve and enhance the <del>built and</del> natural, <b>built and historic</b> environment, ....	No	DS1
PSLP/542	Joe Bennett	RCA obo Spitfire Homes	The policy is not justified or effective and does not address housing need in the Borough and it should be made clear it is a minimum requirement. A 5YLS is not maintained over the plan period, it drops to 4.88 years by April 2029. The urban extensions delivery rates are overly optimistic.	Additional medium and small housing sites should be allocated. A 5YLS needs to be supplied throughout the plan period.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	The plan sets out an appropriate development strategy. The settlement hierarchy approach and the identification of Cossington as an Other Settlement are supported. The policy is generally supported although it is noted that the provisions in the plan do not quite meet the 10% flexibility allowance.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/200	Samantha Carnall		Development Strategy is not positively prepared or justified given the location on 'Areas of Separation' and 'Green Wedge Land' and the resultant detrimental impact upon Thurmaston, Syston, Barkby and Queniborough, which will be linked in one urban mass to Leicester – leading to loss of identities and huge increases in traffic and congestion. Increasing green spaces and safeguarding wildlife habitat should be prioritised not destroyed. Locating new housing on the floodplain will increase flood risk in the area. The areas of Barkby and Barkby Thorpe are already accommodating more than their fair share of new housing. Brownfield sites should be considered for development as opposed to green spaces. The proposals for extra housing should be withdrawn.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	Broadly support the policy focussing growth at the most sustainable settlements and recognising the need for some growth in service centres and other settlements. However, the housing requirement is not justified, and an uplift is necessary to respond to affordability pressures and mitigate economic impacts of the pandemic. Furthermore, the additional housing supply for flexibility is not sufficient due to over-reliance on delivery from SUEs.	Increase housing requirement to address affordability and economic impacts of Covid-19. Provide 15% flexibility in housing land supply.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/529	J Collins		Anstey cannot take anymore cars, houses or people.		No	DS1
PSLP/534	P Bentley		The plan is not justified as Barrow is not a sustainable location for new homes due to flood risk, increased traffic, lack of car parking, loss of green space, pressure on the health centre and impact on village identity. The number of new homes is purely to justify the new primary school. The plan is contrary to the neighbourhood plan and does not consider the negative impacts of development. The SA suggests 180 homes for Barrow guided by the hybrid strategy.		No	DS1
PSLP/547	Tamsin Cottle	P&DG obo William Davis and Chapman Estates (HA43)	The policy is positively prepared and justified in terms of process followed, the number and spread of new housing. The policy is effective and broadly consistent with national planning policy.		Not stated	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/192	P Smyth		The plan is not justified at over development in Anstey will result in increased traffic and pollution in the Nook; loss of jobs due to the redevelopment of factories; increases in flooding; problems for pedestrians on Bradgate Road; inadequate village parking; and Anstey has already had its fair share of development.	Development should relieve highways issues on the Nook. A footway is needed along Bradgate Road	No	DS1
PSLP/384	Tim Coleby	Santec obo Barwood	The plan is not justified as our clients site at land at Peashill Farm, Sileby should be allocated in DS3 (SHELAA site ref: PSH346) because the site represents an eminently suitable, achievable and deliverable opportunity for sustainable residential development of around 170 dwellings, as a logical second phase of development following the grant of planning permission for 201 dwellings as Peashill Farm Phase 1.	Consider evidence on whether site should be included as an allocation.	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/203	Kylie Batts		Development Strategy is not positively prepared or justified as the proposed development in Anstey would have a detrimental impact on the characteristics of the village and the amenities therein, leading to traffic and pollution problems.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/552	Sophie Truth	Pegasus obo Rothley Temple Estates	The limits to development for Rothley are not justified as they do not reflect recent resolution to grant planning approval P/20/2140/2, subject to S106.	Amend Limits to Development and Area of Local Separation to reflect P/20/2140/2.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/553	Sophie Truth	Pegasus obo Davidsons (Wymeswold)	The limits to development for Wymeswold are not justified as they do not reflect recent resolution to grant planning approval P/20/2044/2, subject to S106.	Amend Limits to Development to reflect P/20/2044/2.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/559	Sophie Truth	Pegasus obo Davidsons (Queniborough)	The Development Strategy towards Other Settlements is supported; however, the scale of housing development is not positively prepared and should be increased to address affordability; support economic growth; and provide greater flexibility. Tables breaking down housing provision by settlement hierarchy should make clear they are minimum numbers.	Increase the housing provision to include 20% flexibility. Make clear number of homes distributed by settlement hierarchy are a minimum.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/554	Andrew Taylor	Thomas Taylor Planning obo Mr Scottorn	The policy is not justified or reflect national policy as it does not give sufficient support to re-use of brownfield or underused land and buildings outside the limits to development.	Amend third bullet to - • protects the intrinsic character of the Countryside <b>where the proposal involves employment development outside Limits to Development in accordance with Policies OS1, C1 or E3 elsewhere in this Plan</b> and ninth bullet to -• makes efficient use of land including using brownfield or underused land and buildings <b>in the Countryside, outside Limits to Development</b>	Yes	DS1
PSLP/560	Nigel Reeves	Nigel Reeves Planning obo Andrew Askey	The Limits to Development for Thrussington are not justified as they do not carry forward amendments proposed in the Settlements Limits to Development Assessment 2018.	Amend to Settlements Limits to Development Assessment and include land between Brook Barn and 18 Seagrave Road.	No	DS1
PSLP/207	D Hitchin		The plan is not justified as large development spoils the character of villages, including Queniborough.	The plan must limit large development to maintain character of villages; maintain gaps between villages; not build on greenfield sites; not overstretch school and GPs.	No	DS1
PSLP/568	Lynsey Reid	Burges Salmon obo Mr and Mrs Proctor	The policy is not justified as the Limits to Development for Queniborough are overly restrictive and inhibit opportunities for sustainable development.	Redraw the limits to development for Queniborough to include the Old Hall. Details supplied.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Supporting text should set out more strongly how evidence has driven the development strategy, eg early transport evidence assisted in arriving at the overall scale of housing growth. The text on location of development underplays the need to maximise sustainable travel to accommodate growth and the scale of transport package and partnership working that is necessary. Reference to the SGP should be expanded to set context. The scale of growth is supported, and spatial distribution is generally supported though less development in Service Centres and Other Settlements would be preferred. Providing residents with access to jobs services and facilities is challenging and leads to wide ranging, cumulative impacts on the highways network. The SUEs will need to be supported to ensure employment land and housing delivery. More emphasis is needed on the role of town centres as hubs for leisure, commerce and tourism. Retail capacity should be reviewed following the pandemic The inclusion of criteria on circumstances where a 5YLS cannot be demonstrated is supported, particularly in relation to infrastructure delivery. No mention is made of supporting sustainable development which is not is not impacted by climate change or increase carbon emissions.	Amendments are suggested.	Yes	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/580		Leicestershire County Council Strategic Property Services	Support further housing, employment and retail development in Service Centres. Additional new homes should be regarded as a minimum. Promotion of individual sites will be addressed separately.	Increase development at Service Centres.	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/214	Gary Freer		Development Strategy is not positively prepared in that it does not adequately tackle climate change.	New development to be carbon zero; local renewable energy generation to be prioritised; and, wording of policies needs to be stronger (i.e. "we will require" ..... "planning permission will only be granted if").	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/212	J Knight		As a resident of Quorn I am horrified by the proposed housing development in the Woodthorpe area. This green field area has already suffered huge over development, without the necessary infrastructure and community facilities. The roads are already dangerously congested, doctors and schools unable to cope, and huge areas of high quality agricultural land have been lost. Further development in this area will see the green wildlife corridor between Loughborough and Quorn virtually disappear, with just one field separating them. This along with the proposed gravel quarry would mean irreversible loss of open space, farm land, wildlife habitat, flora and fauna.	Remove allocations which affect Woodthorpe	No	DS1
PSLP/558	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates and Bowler Family	The plan sets out an appropriate development strategy. The settlement hierarchy approach and the distribution of sites of different sizes through the hierarchy are supported. The policy is generally supported although it is noted that the provisions in the plan do not quite meet the 10% flexibility allowance.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/243	P Thompson		The plan is not justified as it will put strain on local services in Quorn, and towns/villages will lose character and have strained services.		No	DS1
PSLP/261	D Andrews		The plan is not justified at residents object to development in East Goscote; this will exacerbate waiting times for GP services; the proposed entrance to the 'gladman site' is dangerous; the merging of Rearsby and East Goscote is opposed.		No	DS1
PSLP/257	J Weston		Development around Queniborough is not justified as planning applications on HA64 and HA65 have been recently refused due to the area of local separation; paragraph 3.222 states growth in Other Settlements (like Queniborough) should be limited; Surrounding allocations HA1, HA2, HA3, HA4, HA5, HA60 will impact Queniborough's health, school and road infrastructure with a cumulative 1900 additional homes irrespective of Syston's Service Centre status; 4,500 homes at Thorpebury SUE will add traffic and pollution to Queniborough. The plan is not consistent with national policy as PPG states a local plan should take into account the policies of adopted neighbourhood plans.	Queniborough Lodge (site HA4) should be denoted as Quenoborough and not Syston as it is allocated through the Queniborough Neighbourhood Plan. It is unclear why HA64 and HA65 have been split into two sites.	No	DS1
PSLP/241	Miss Kathryn Hill		Development Strategy is not positively prepared in that it pays no regard to the Queniborough Neighbourhood Plan – contrary to requirements of Government Policy.		No	DS1
PSLP/561	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Owl Partnerships Ltd, Nottingham Community Housing Association and Inside	The plan sets out an appropriate development strategy. The settlement hierarchy approach, the distribution of sites of different sizes through the hierarchy and the identification of Sileby as a Service Centre are supported. The policy is generally supported although it is noted that the provisions in the plan do not quite meet the 10% flexibility allowance.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/577	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Penland Estates Ltd, RV Millington Ltd, Sarah Higgins and Gavin Higgins	The plan sets out an appropriate development strategy. The development strategy is based upon a sensible assessment of services and facilities and resultant settlement hierarchy. The plan is not justified as it fails to recognise the opportunities provided by Markfield as a Service Centre in accommodating development. The 19,461 homes provided through Policy DS1 are slightly lower than the 10% flexibility requirement for 19,554 homes.	The site at Ashby Road Markfield (PSH40) should be allocated under Policy DS3.	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/535	Juan Murray	TEP obo Leics County Council	Given the current housing delivery situation within the borough we do not believe this buffer to be high enough, and would welcome a 20% buffer to allow flexibility in delivery.	Change in housing need called for	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/535	Juan Murray	TEP obo Leics County Council	Over reliance on too small a number of sites - we would like to see smaller sites allocated, that can come forward and are deliverable for years one to five of the plan period.	Reconsideration of sites called for.	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/275	D Neville		Proposed development in Hathern is not justified as historic commitments in relation to Garendon Estate were that no development would be proposed in Hathern.		No	DS1
PSLP/270	N Salisbury		The plan is not justified or positively prepared as, although housing is required, the rural landscape has community value including Outwoods and Quorn.	Don't develop the countryside.	No	DS1
PSLP/274	R Turner		Development in Barrow is not justified as 700 homes would impact traffic, congestion at the A6/Quorn roundabouts, flooding, the sewerage system on Bridge St.	Need major infrastructure requirements	No	DS1
PSLP/278	P Johnson		Development in Barrow is not justified as infrastructure for roads, sewage, utilities, doctors, schools cannot support development. Key roads flood during autumn and winter.	Do not build houses in Barrow	No	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/279	R Smith		Development between Barkby and Syston, in particular HA1, HA2 and HA3, are not justified as they will increase traffic, congestion, air pollution, and flooding; there would be a loss of separation between the two settlements; there would be unacceptable demand that would exacerbate issues with health services, education and public transport; the areas is already having 4,500 new homes at Thorpebury SUE; it is contradictory to build in areas of local separation.	Remove allocations HA1, HA2 and HA3	No	DS1
PSLP/273	P Russell		The plan is not justified as areas do not show in the plan are still under threat from development. Support the protection of public rights of way in development	Shame to be building housing near the new burial area.	No	DS1
PSLP/535	Juan Murray	TEP obo Leics County Council	In terms of Policies DS1, DS2 and DS3 will do not believe these to be Sound. In line with the criteria provided at paragraph 35 of the Framework, the policies are not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy.	View of respondent relates to the non allocation of a specific site	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/587	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates	The plan sets out an appropriate development strategy. The settlement hierarchy approach and the distribution of sites of different sizes through the hierarchy are supported. The policy is generally supported although it is noted that the provisions in the plan do not quite meet the 10% flexibility allowance.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/315	P Cleminson		The plan is not justified as Barrow cannot support 703 new homes	Build on brownfield sites	No	DS1
PSLP/302	E Hood		The plan is not psitively prepared as it plans for too many houses considering covid-19 death rates and less EU migration. EU residents leaving following Brexit.	Consider impact of EU residents leaving the area.	No	DS1
PSLP/314	D Buckeridge		The plan is not justified as there is no separation between new development and existing estates and development may impact ancient woodlands	HA15, HA16 and HA17 require substantial separation green/treed between existing and new development	No	DS1
PSLP/311	A Price		The plan is not justified as proposed housing contravenes the aims of protecting heritage and countryside. Extending villages destroys their character. Countryside is only a resource when it is accessible by foot/cycle - vehicles increase emissions.	The plan should plan smaller local developments and not develop next to existing development	No	DS1
PSLP/309	C Gray		The plan is not justified as it sill remove fields in a period of biological disaster; extending hamlets like Woodthorpe from 22 homes to 120 homes is not supported by public transport or facilities;	Do more than identify wildlife corridors, we need to preserve green and wildlife spaces. Develop brownfield sites and empty properties. Plan for multi generational houses. Plan for low energy houses and low rise apartments. Empower women to have fewer children.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/611	Dermot Breen	Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce	The Chamber recognise the growth set out in the policy must be met. It is pleased the Plan recognises how Charnwood growth is closely linked to new growth and opportunities in neighbouring districts and is well equipped to offer its strong knowledge based economic capability and capitalise upon the strengths of the regional location.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/307	D Frost		The plan is not justified or positively prepared as there is no evidence to justify the continuation of Loughborough (HA15/ HA16/ HA17) in addition to the Garendon Estate. This will detriment beauty and the environment	Reconsider the scale of development.	No	DS1
PSLP/303	C Jamieson		The proposals around Anstey are not justified as facilities and infrastructure are overstretched; it will merge Anstey and Groby; increased traffic will devalue existing properties and impact amenity; there are existing parking issues that are not policed; there will be danger to wildlife; there will be increased air pollution;	Require traffic control around Bradgate park; Anstey needs TLC not urbanisation; consider brownfield sites and neglected rental areas; maintain Anstey as a village	Yes	DS1
PSLP/293	R Chandler		The plan is not justified because too much housing has been directed towards Barrow upon Soar, purely on the capacity of primary schools. There will be an adverse impact on settlement identity with loss of valued greenspace for the village. The current bus route journey times would be increased if it was extended to pass through new developments. There would be an increase in traffic through the village and in air pollution. The village is affected by flooding meaning local roads become gridlocked. No flood risk assessment has been completed for surface run off affecting local wildlife sites. The housing proposals are contrary to the Barrow Neighbourhood Plan. There is no spare capacity at existing services in the village e.g. the doctors surgery. The proposed housing sites are a significant distance from the high street and therefore not in accordance with policy H2.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/281	P Herbert		The plan is not justified as there is a disproportionate amount of housing allocated to Barrow upon Soar, this is not sustainable for the village. Local roads are already congested. Only 360 homes are needed for a new school. The plan doesn't take account of the Barrow upon Soar Neighbourhood Plan. Three of the sites are outside the limits to development.		No	DS1
PSLP/701	M Robinson		The plan is not justified as it will not improve Loughborough; impact on wildlife; Charnwood Forest is a recreation asset with health benefits; impact on traffic, pollution and noise; impact on flooding	Other areas are more suitable for housing	No	DS1
PSLP/710	C Moore		The plan is not justified as development in Queniborough (HA64 and HA65) will not conserve the countryside; protect village separation; and would exacerbate capacity issues with schools, GPs and roads.	Remove HA64 and HA65	No	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/712	H Dalby		The plan is not justified as proposed sites in Sileby (HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58) conflict with the Sileby neighbourhood plan; Sileby has had large scale planning applications in the last 10 years which has not been coordinated; the Council only co-operates with those with financial influence (i.e. developers); concern about the consultation (see legal section); development will exacerbate issues with local infrastructure including traffic, parking. (ref. p.37 Development Strategy and site selection topic paper)	Remove allocations HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58.	No	DS1
PSLP/714	S Dalby		The plan is not justified as proposed sites in Sileby (HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58) conflict with the Sileby neighbourhood plan; Sileby has had large scale planning applications in the last 10 years which has not been coordinated; the Council only co-operates with those with financial influence (i.e. developers); concern about the consultation (see legal section); development will exacerbate issues with local infrastructure including traffic, parking. (ref. p.37 Development Strategy and site selection topic paper)	Remove allocations HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58.	No	DS1
PSLP/717	J Cunnington		The plan is not justified as proposed allocations around Grange Farm/ Fairmeadows (i.e. H15, H16, H19) will double the existing estate in size and result in an increase in traffic, noise, pollution, loss of local wildlife, and increase pressure on schools, GPs, dentists; and result in the loss of green space.		No	DS1
PSLP/721	G Wood		The plan is not justified as housing development will destroy views and privacy for existing properties (provided examples of elsewhere in the borough where this has happened)	Develop the chicken farm, south of Melton Road, Burton on the Wolds.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/724	P Cobb		The plan is not justified or positively prepared as the housing requirement is out of date given that EU nationals are returning home; loss of green areas in Loughborough (HA16, HA17, HA18) should prioritise brownfield sites.	Prioritise brownfield sites in Loughborough	No	DS1
PSLP/725	E Palmer		Development in Barrow Upon Soar is not justified as the train station has inadequate car parking and development will exacerbate associated street parking; there is generally inadequate parking in the village; the road/bridge, Slash Lane and the route towards Cotes regularly becomes blocked due to flooding; development will exacerbate existing traffic issues	Prior to development rectify infrastructure issues in relation to flooding, railway station parking and village centre parking.	No	DS1
PSLP/729	C Freer		Development in Queenborough is not justified as the neighbourhood plan set out limits to development and proposed housing which the local plan ill overrule; concern about loss of separation between Queniborough and Syston/ East Goscote; impact on capacity of schools, GPs in Queenborough and surrounding villages, impact on wildlife	Have minimal development that retains green areas of separation, homes wildlife and defends against flooding.	No	DS1
PSLP/358	A Heney		Objects strongly to the amount of development proposed particularly in the Soar Valley and the loss of green space which this entails.	Review of the plan and the approach to development.	No	DS1
PSLP/616	Eri Wong	Highways England	Note the specific additional housing and employment needs identified in the plan. Additional requirements would need to be fully assessed and modelled for impact on the SRN and any mitigation needs.		Yes	DS1
PSLP/180	Mrs Ruth Youngs		Policy encourages increased walking and cycling but need more and better provision of facilities to achieve this such as better lighting and wider pavements, especially along side roads such as from Sileby to Barrow and Barrow to Quorn and L'boro via Cotes Road.		No	DS1
PSLP/356	Mrs Anne Tomalin		The justification for the amount of houses to be built in Charnwood, i.e. 13,940 houses, appears to be a figure with no significant supporting evidence. There are other areas in Leicestershire where housing could be built without infringing on the unique landscape of the Charnwood Forest.	Objection to quantum of housing development.	No	DS1
PSLP/076	Mr James Stabler		This is not justified as the villages will not be able to cope. There will be too much pressure on schools, doctors and amenities. House prices will be de-valued.		No	DS1
PSLP/490	D Cannon		The plan is not justified as an unfair amount of housing has been allocated to Queniborough, East Goscote and Rearsby. There are insufficient services and facilities and people will use their cars to travel out of the villages. The area suffers from flood risk. There is no cohesive community in East Goscote. The plan should address climate change and reuse old unused buildings rather than building new. Development around the three villages significantly compromises the areas of local separation.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/571	Andrew Taylor	Thomas Taylor Planning obo Mr Sbitany	The plan is not justified as it does not provide sufficient small sites to ensure variety, flexibility and delivery. The Limits to Development at Brick Kiln Lane do not reflect the physical or built form of development in the area.	Amend Limits to Development at 34 Brick Kiln Lane to provide a small-scale housing development.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/572	Daniel Hibbard	We Are Define obo Bloor Homes (Laburnum Way)	Broadly support the policy and the spatial strategy and sustainability criteria it sets out. Inclusion of Loughborough as an Urban Centre is supported. In terms of housing requirement, providing a buffer to local housing need is sensible but it should be increased to 20% to provide further flexibility. Capacity of site HA48 should be increased from 422 dwellings to 500 dwellings to achieve that and reflect an efficient use of the site.	Increase housing supply to c. 21,330 to provide 20% buffer above housing requirement. Increasing the capacity of allocation HA16 to 550 dwellings would contribute to this uplift, and achieve an efficient use of the allocation site.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	Support the commitment to meet housing need with a buffer and the focus of housing and employment development on the edge of Leicester. The plan should recognise that it is important to optimise development density in appropriate and sustainable locations, such as the NEoL SUE. The plan should do more to support the role of SUEs and they should be recognised as 'urban settlements' in the settlement hierarchy.	Identify SUEs as Urban Settlements in the settlement hierarchy to reflect that they are sustainable settlements in their own right.	Yes	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/738	Nathaniel Bromwich	Rothley Parish Council	Sustainable development has not been demonstrated within this plan. Furthermore, reasonable alternatives have not been examined such as high rise flats instead of expansive housing expansions. Urban expansion outwards from Loughborough is a short-term solution that fails to guarantee the long-term future of the Charnwood natural area, including the proposed Charnwood Forest Regional Park, and associated natural beauty spots. High-rise living should be pursued as an alternative.	Evidence must be provided that alternatives to outwards urban expansion have been pursued, with these including but not limited to high-rise developments, notably within Loughborough town centre.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/378	Nathaniel Bromwich	Rothley Parish Council	The inclusion of Birstall, Thurmaston, and Syston, within the Leicester Urban Area raises questions about the long-term guarantees to the people of these settlements that they will not be inevitably absorbed into Leicester. There is surely the need for Charnwood Borough Council to guarantee these populations that they will remain separate from Leicester.	Evidence must be provided that alternatives to outwards urban expansion have been pursued, with these including but not limited to high-rise developments, notably within Loughborough town centre	Yes	DS1
PSLP/575	Sophie Truth	Pegasus obo Davidsons (Anstey)	The policy is not positively prepared or justified, whilst development at Service Centres is supported, there are concerns with the overall scale of development proposed and the flexibility provided. The housing requirement does not support economic growth or deal with affordability and does not provide a sufficient flexibility allowance. The identification of Anstey as a Service Centre is supported. Tables breaking down housing provision by settlement hierarchy should make clear they are minimum numbers.	Increase the housing provision to include 20% flexibility. Make clear number of homes distributed by settlement hierarchy are a minimum.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/576	Stephen Mair	Andrew Granger obo Marriot Family	The policy directing housing to Service Centres, including Quorn, is supported. However, to be positively prepared, there should be added flexibility to deal with changing circumstances and uncertainty.	Increase the housing target, including at Service Centres, by allocating additional sites.	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/610	John Kay		The plan is not justified because development north of Quorn is not suitable due to being flood zone 3, the planned gravel extraction plans and the PV application. It will be difficult to provide infrastructure and public transport.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/652	S Rasaiah		The LSEP forms a significant part of the overall development strategy so it would make sense for housing allocations to be located in close proximity to maximise the most of transport links. HA15 and HA16 should be reduced in size and HA18 should be increased as this provides the best proximity to Science Park.		Yes	DS1
PSLP/621	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Hallam Land Management	The plan sets out an appropriate development strategy. The settlement hierarchy approach and the distribution of sites of different sizes through the hierarchy are supported. The policy does not achieve the 10% flexibility allowance that is stated to be sought.	Policy DS1 should be modified to reflect the 10% flexibility identified in Table 2 and the delivery of at least 19,554 homes rather than 19,461 homes.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/631	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land	The plan sets out an appropriate development strategy. The settlement hierarchy approach and the identification of Cossington as an Other Settlement are supported. The policy is generally supported although it is noted that the provisions in the plan do not quite meet the 10% flexibility allowance.		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/579	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelsons	The Local Plan must be capable of enduring and ensuring that 5 years' worth of deliverable housing sites are available at all times. It must be designed to avoid the type of housing land supply issue that the Council is currently facing (and is facing simply because the strategy embedded in the Core Strategy is not robust). To guard against housing land supply issues, the Local Plan must be capable of responding to significant changes in circumstances, including the continuing failure of its major SUEs to deliver new homes, or to deliver them at the rate the Council is forecasting. This means building in an appropriate degree of flexibility and, in the circumstances faced by Charnwood, adding 20%, rather than 10%, to the Councils OAN for housing (plus any uplift that is made to the OAN to address unmet needs). Policy DS1 should be amended so that it properly reflects how the NPPF says that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied. We are also of the view that the Policy should contain out a specific housing requirement for each of the neighbourhood areas, in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF.	Changes to policy proposed.	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/588	Rupert Harrison	Andrew Granger obo Col. And Mrs Martin	Our clients support the overarching policy of a spatial strategy based on urban concentration and intensification. In particular they are supportive of the principal delivery of land for new homes falling on areas that are able to serve such development including the Leicester Urban Area and the service centres including Anstey.		Yes	DS1
PSLP/589	Carl Stott	Nineteen47 obo FN and GT Barber	Supports Policy DS1 Policy DS1 (Development Strategy) of the Emerging Local Plan which sets out the development Strategy for the Borough, proposing that Service Centres accommodate 14% of all new homes across the Plan period, equating to 2,747no. dwellings.		Yes	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/595	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey	<p>The proposals to direct some 7,358 dwellings towards the settlements adjoining Leicester is supported.</p> <p>The Spatial Strategy set out in Policy DS1 reflects the proposed settlement hierarchy set out in Table 4 of the Submission Draft Plan which identifies Syston as one of three urban settlements on the edge of Leicester that will provide some 38% of the proposed housing growth over the plan period. The approach to development in these urban settlements is supported.</p> <p>The policy refers to the provision of 'at least' 19,461 dwellings in the Borough over the plan period. The table breaking down the proposed pattern of development does not make it clear that the numbers for each location therefore represent minimum housing numbers. It would be helpful if the table in the policy is amended to make clear the proposed distribution represents minimum housing numbers.</p>	Amend Table in Policy DS1 to make clear that the number of homes assigned to different levels of the settlement hierarchy represent minimum requirements to provide at least 19,461 dwellings over the plan period.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/615	Laura McCombe	Carter Jonas obo Mr C. Green	<p>The flexibilities contained at paragraph 2.14 and Policy DS1 are not consistent with each other. The policy only appears to propose a buffer of 1,685 dwellings in comparison to the 1,778 referenced at paragraph 2.14. This must be amended to ensure the plan is accurate.</p> <p>Whilst we support the flexibility which is being incorporated into the housing requirement, we strongly contend that 9.5% is not sufficient and fails to meet the test of soundness in terms of being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. It is therefore recommended to ensure the Plan is sound, the Council seek to allocate reserve sites which equate to approximately 20% of the total housing requirement which would be 3,555 dwellings.</p>	Amendment sought.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/213	Mrs L. Aspinall	Harborough District Council	<p>Paragraph 2.5: In referring to the A46 priority growth corridor as set out in the Strategic Growth Plan, there needs to be some recognition that this is dependent on the delivery of significant new strategic infrastructure.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.14: The 10% flexibility allowance for unforeseen changes affecting the delivery of sites is welcomed. It is already known that Leicester City has unmet need with work advancing to establish its scale and apportionment across the Leicestershire local authorities. It should be made clear that this flexibility allowance is not to be counted towards unmet housing need from Leicester. Reference to the on-going preparation of a Statement of Common Ground to apportion Leicester's unmet across the HMA is welcomed. However, the current approved SOCG (March 2021) at para 3.14 states 'the L &amp; L authorities were made aware of the potential scale of Leicester City's unmet need in December 2019'. It is accepted that this has now increased following changes to the standard method for calculating housing need.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.17: The reference to joint evidence and joint working at a L&amp;L level around meeting the need of this sector is supported. However, acknowledgment of the findings and recommendations of the Warehousing and Logistics in L&amp;L: Managing growth and change [April 2021] study could be more explicit. In particular, recognition of the quantum of need and broad Areas of Opportunity most likely for new large warehousing and logistics provision to 2041 is needed. There are Areas of Opportunity impacting on Charnwood borough which suggest that it has a potential part to play in meeting the forecast shortfall in supply to 2041. Explicit recognition of this within the Local Plan would reinforce the commitment to cooperative working on this strategic issue.</p> <p>It is also noted that the approach to strategic distribution, as set out in Chapter 5 (Economy &amp; Regeneration), should be clearly set out as a policy (see HDC comments on Para 5.30-5.35).</p> <p>Paragraph 2.20: There seems to be a significant over-supply (26ha) of employment land even before 73ha for LSEntPark is added and when the need figure already includes a 10ha contingency. The narrative and justification on this issue is not particularly clear at present.</p>	Comments on reasoned justification.	No	DS1
PSLP/713	Mrs L.Aspinall	Harborough District Council	<p>The policy refers to 'supporting success of Charnwood and Leicester' but it is not clear if any of the over-supply is contributing to Leicester's unmet employment need. Also, there are several references to local need and strategic need, which suggest they are different. However, the latter does not appear to be quantified or evidenced. Further clarity would be welcomed.</p>	Further clarity of policy wording called for.	No	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/618	Jon Kirby	Lichfields obo Rebecca Birch, St Philips	<p>St Philips generally supports the Council's approach in Policy DS1 but considers the Council could demonstrate and provide further information in order to ensure the Policy is found wholly sound at examination. The PPG indicates that if previous housing delivery has exceeded the minimum LHN, the Council should consider whether this level of delivery is indicative of greater housing need. The Council should consider if there are "circumstances" in Charnwood to justify a housing requirement above the minimum LHN. It is noted that there is no uplift from the minimum LHN starting point to support economic growth. The NPPF seeks to achieve sustainable development by pursuing economic, social and environmental objectives in mutually supportive ways (para 8). The Council should be seeking to support the long-term sustainability of the Borough by achieving a sustainable balance between employment and housing growth.</p> <p>Although supportive of the Council's proposed housing requirement, St Philips considers that the Council could be more ambitious: a housing requirement above the minimum LHN would support economic growth above a "business as usual" scenario, deliver more affordable housing given the significant identified need and contribute to any unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities including Leicester</p> <p>Before the Local Plan is submitted for examination, the Council should consider a higher housing requirement. St Philips also note that the housing requirement set out in Policy DS1 is not expressed as a minimum figure. Policy DS2 should be amended to set out the Council's housing requirement as a minimum.</p> <p>St Philips advocates as large a contingency as possible to optimise flexibility. Where housing land supply is highly dependent upon one or relatively few large strategic sites and/or localities then greater flexibility is necessary than if HLS is diversified.</p>	More clarity on housing need and jobs / housing balance called for.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/619	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons	<p>The reference at paragraph 2.30 to Markfield having a range of facilities and services consistent with a Service Centre within the supporting text is supported.</p> <p>Table 4 should be amended to include Markfield and Field Head as a Service Centre.</p> <p>It is considered that the plan should look to provide for a scale of development more closely aligned to the mid-growth option in order to support economic growth and deal with real issues of affordability in the Borough.</p> <p>The strategy should therefore be based on the 'mid-point' housing growth strategy with an added flexibility allowance of some 20%. This would require the plan to make new allocations to provide for some 15,000 homes as opposed to the 8,951 homes currently proposed.</p> <p>Policy DS1 refers to the provision of 'at least' 19,461 dwellings in the Borough over the plan period. The table breaking down the proposed pattern of development does not make it clear that the numbers for each location therefore represent minimum housing numbers. It would be helpful if the table in the policy is amended to make clear the proposed distribution represents minimum housing numbers.</p>		Yes	DS1
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	There is an inconsistency between the housing requirement quoted in Table 2 (19,554) and that quoted in the policy (19,461).	The housing requirement should be clarified.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/566	Owen Jones	LRM Planning Limited on behalf of William Davis Homes and Parker Strategic Land	<p>In general, the policy is supported.</p> <p>The housing need is identified using the standard method. In order for the policy to be positively prepared, effective and in accordance with national policy, this should be a minimum figure.</p> <p>The Local Plan's Expert Group (2016) recommended that Local Plan's include a level of flexibility of 20%. This figure could be employed in this Local Plan also given the reliance upon delivery at the Strategic Urban Extension in the plan period.</p> <p>The housing supply strategy can be further strengthened with a modest increase in the proportion of development directed to Loughborough in accordance with the Sustainability Appraisal; Appendix G identified 2,700 new homes as an appropriate amount of housing for Loughborough.</p>	Amend the beginning of the first sentence of the New Homes section of Policy DS1 to read: The housing requirement for Charnwood is <b>at least</b> 17,776 homes between 2021 and 2037 and ...	Yes	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/626	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow Homes	<p>The section on Local Housing Needs in Chapter 2 Development Strategy does not provide explanation of the range of options explored in respect of local housing needs for Charnwood Borough or the needs from adjoining authorities.</p> <p>There is explanation that the Local Housing Need for Charnwood has been calculated using the standard methodology set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance and this shows there is a need for 1,111 new homes a year for the period 2021-2037. This is a total of 17,776 homes. And that the Council has considered whether the Local Housing Need figure needs to be adjusted to take account of economic circumstances in the Borough. Whilst there is mention that the evidence on local housing needs and economic needs indicates that our Local Housing Need figure does not need to be adjusted for economic circumstances there is no explanation as to why not or what the position is with adjoining authorities.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.14 and Table 2 in respect of Flexibility do not provide a clear position by the Council on the NPPF requirement to identify land for homes and maintaining supply and delivery (section 5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes).</p> <p>The proposal for this local plan to plan for a Local Housing Need of 17,776 new homes during the period 2021 to 2037 is not consistent with national policy because of the absence of adequate explanation as to this being a minimum requirement, why a higher amount has not been proposed and because of the absence of a buffer within the proposed figure. Further into the local plan is mention of at least 19,461 dwellings and this needs explaining in this section.</p>	<p>We suggest the following in respect of Local Housing Need:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Accepting that need for 1,111 new homes a year for the period 2021-2037 is a minimum.</li> <li>2. Further explore options for when might it be appropriate to plan for a higher housing need figure than the standard method indicates.</li> <li>3. Further explore the needs from adjoining authorities and implications for Charnwood Borough.</li> <li>4. Explain the outcome of this further and whether by following the NPPF and PPG requirements, the Local Housing Need should increase above 1,111 new homes per year for the period 2021-2037.</li> <li>5. Explain the position in respect of proposing a buffer within the local plan for housing delivery.</li> </ol> <p>We suggest that development strategy complies with the NPPF by making specific reference to growth at Service Centres within the Development Strategy.</p>	Yes	DS1
PSLP/626	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow Homes	<p>The Development Strategy lists Loughborough, the edge of Leicester and Shepshed, as the focus for growth to respond to the demand for housing and employment land.</p> <p>To achieve the objective of sustainable development as per the NPPF, it is necessary for the development strategy to also include Service Centres. The absence of mention of growth at the Service Centres means that the local plan is not consistent with national policy, in the form of the NPPF.</p> <p>There is a need for consistency with Chapter 2: Development Strategy and in particular the proposed settlement hierarchy including Table 4: Charnwood Settlement Hierarchy</p>	<p>We suggest the following in respect of Development Strategy for Homes 2021-37 and Policy DS1:</p> <p>Development Strategy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Further consideration of the distribution of new homes, to address concerns over reliance on delivery from SUE and Loughborough Urban Centre.</li> <li>2. Further explore options for the Service Centres to play a greater role in delivering land for residential-led development, but importantly development that is not solely housing.</li> <li>3. The strategy for homes should make a clear distinction between Service Centres and Other Settlements and that not all Service Centres perform the same on sustainability grounds and there is to be variation in the levels of growth between each Service Centre.</li> <li>4. Delete the proposed criteria for consideration of development proposals where there is insufficient five year housing land supply.</li> </ol>	Yes	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	<p>The policy is not justified or effective as it does not provide a sufficient margin for flexibility, especially given the reliance on delivery from 3 SUEs.</p> <p>The policy identifies a housing need using the standard method. The Council should consider if there are circumstances in Charnwood to justify a housing requirement above the minimum Local Housing Need, for example, the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan.</p> <p>There is no uplift from the minimum Local Housing Need starting point to support economic growth. The Council should be seeking to support the long-term sustainability of the Borough by achieving a sustainable balance between employment and housing growth.</p> <p>The Council's Housing Needs Assessment identifies a rented affordable housing need of 476 dwellings per annum. This is a significant proportion (43%) of the minimum Local Housing Need. The Council has provided no quantitative assessment of the need for affordable homeownership.</p> <p>The Council should also recognise economic benefits of housing development in supporting local communities.</p> <p>The Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes set out in the 2021 NPPF remains.</p>	<p>Policy DS1 should be amended to ensure it provides sufficient flexibility to account for the delivery of the SUEs and to provide for a five year housing land supply.</p> <p>Policy DS1 should be amended to set out the Council's identified housing requirement as a minimum.</p> <p>In addition, a housing requirement above the minimum Local Housing Need would support economic growth above a "business as usual" scenario, deliver more affordable housing given the significant identified need and contribute to any unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities including Leicester.</p>	Yes	DS1
PSLP/622	Guy Longley	Pegasus	<p>The reference at paragraph 2.30 to Markfield having a range of facilities and services consistent with a Service Centre within the supporting text is supported. It is important that the plan considers the links between parts of the Borough and larger sustainable settlements in adjoining districts.</p> <p>It is considered that the plan should look to provide for a scale of development more closely aligned to the mid-growth option in order to support economic growth and deal with real issues of affordability in the Borough. The selection of the appropriate growth strategy fails to properly balance the positive and negative impacts of this alternative scale of growth. It is considered that the Council should pursue a more positive development strategy to support economic growth and help to address the severe affordable housing shortfalls. The strategy should therefore be based on the 'mid-point' housing growth strategy with an added flexibility allowance of some 20%.</p> <p>Policy DS1 refers to the provision of 'at least' 19,461 dwellings in the Borough over the plan period. The table breaking down the proposed pattern of development does not make it clear that the numbers for each location therefore represent minimum housing numbers. It would be helpful if the table in the policy is amended to make clear the proposed distribution represents minimum housing numbers.</p>	<p>Amend the Table at Policy DS1 to make clear that the number of homes distributed to the settlement hierarchy are minimum requirements reflecting the proposal to provide at least 19,461 homes over the plan period; Increase the flexibility allowance to deal with uncertainty to 20%;</p>	Yes	DS1
PSLP/298	Philip Loughton	Queniborough Parish Council	<p>The plan is not sound because development of HA64, HA65 together with HA8 and HA9 will affect the character of Queniborough. Proposed development as well as recently planned development in Queniborough, East Goscote, Rearsby and Syston will put a strain on services and infrastructure, including doctors, parking and roads in the area, and is not likely to meet national air quality standards. The concentration of development is not sustainable. Traffic was number 1 concern in Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p>	<p>New village should be explored.</p>	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/331	Cllr David Snartt	Borough Councillor for Forest Bradgate ward	<p>The plan is not sound because it is not complaint with the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan, in terms of a shift in the focus of development.</p> <p>The Local Plan states that it is not necessary to consider sites in villages and hamlets, but site HA15 completely surrounds the Hamlet of Woodthorpe and is in the parish of Woodhouse, and would cause environmental issues impacting ancient woodland.</p> <p>Sites HA43, HA44, HA12 and HA13 are totally against the SGP because of the increase in the number of dwellings in the village.</p> <p>The Draft Plan does not fit with statement 7.6 of the Plan in terms of protecting the borough's soil resources. The topic paper on site selection excludes ites which result in the loss of 20ha or more of gard 1 or 11 agricultural land.</p> <p>The plan has little regard for brownfield land.</p>		Not stated	DS1
PSLP/570	Max Whitehead	Define Planning obo Bloor Homes	<p>CBC's approach to its spatial strategy and the proposed distribution of development as set out in Policies DS1 and DS3 is considered sound, as it is clearly justified based on proportionate evidence; as required by NPPF paragraph 35b.</p> <p>Bloor Homes (BHL) broadly supports the spatial strategy between 2021 and 2037. he focusing of growth to urban areas such as Loughborough, as well as the most sustainable settlements elsewhere in the Borough including Barrow upon Soar, is entirely reasonable.</p> <p>BHL supports Policy DS1's inclusion of Barrow upon Soar as a 'Service Centre' and BHL supports CBC's recognition that Barrow upon Soar is a sustainable location for growth,</p> <p>Whilst the approach to providing a buffer in CBC's housing supply above its overall requirement is sensible, this buffer should be increased further to reflect the composition of the Borough's housing supply, which is reliant on timely delivery from large sustainable urban extensions that were allocated in the previous plan. Given the historic delays in delivery from those sites as a result of their complex nature, CBC should accommodate an increased buffer to allow for further flexibility.</p>	<p>Whilst the scope of the policy is sound in terms of the spatial strategy pursued and the distribution of growth within the Borough, BHL are of the view that CBC should identify further site allocations so as to provide a 20% buffer above the Borough's housing requirement in order to provide sufficient flexibility in the Borough's land supply.</p>	Yes	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/598	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons Developments, Redrow Homes and the Helen Jean Cope Charity.	The Plan as currently framed is unsound in that it is not positively prepared, justified by the evidence or effective in delivering the required scale of development in the Borough and in the right place. The decision to proceed with a 'low growth' option for meeting housing requirements means that the plan is by definition not positively prepared, justified or effective. The approach does not properly reflect the economic potential in the Borough or address the critical housing affordability issues that need to be addressed. The selection of the chosen growth strategy fails to properly balance the positive and negative impacts of this alternative scale of growth. The appraisal by Pegasus Economics argues that there is a strong case for an increased level of housing growth to support economic growth in the Borough and address critical housing affordability issues. There is a strong case for the Draft Plan to provide for an increased level of housing provision to support economic growth and address affordable housing issues. Directing significant levels of new housing growth towards Shepshed will do nothing to address the affordability issues in Loughborough, and risks exacerbating them.	Increasing the scale of development to be plan for to provide for some 15,000 new homes to support economic growth, address housing affordability issues and provide flexibility to deal with changing circumstances; Adjust the spatial strategy to direct more development towards Loughborough as the most sustainable urban centre to address critical affordable housing needs, including the provision for at least an additional 500 homes to the south-west of Loughborough off Watermead Way;	Yes	DS1
PSLP/624	Ellen Pearce	Inspired Villages	The plan is not positively prepared or effective as it does not make any allocations for specialist housing for older people. This approach is not sufficient to plan for older persons housing needs within the borough, even in combination with the design measures set out at Policy H2.	Further allocations should be made for Use Class C2 outside of strategic development areas such as the Loughborough SUE	No	DS1
PSLP/583	Liberty Stones	Fisher German obo Lone Star	The Development Strategy enables the protection of environmentally sensitive areas whilst providing a pattern of development which provides a balance between homes, jobs and facilities. DS1 is not sound because the housing requirement should be increased because of declining affordability of homes in Charnwood. The housing requirement should also be increased because of unmet need from Leicester, and based upon an even split between districts (excluding Oadby and Wigston) there should be a 15-17% increase in Charnwood's housing requirement. The split in the proportion of homes directed to Other Settlements is too low. The last paragraph of Policy DS1 is unsound as it appears to undermine NPPF paragraph 11.	Increase housing requirement. The last paragraph of DS1 should be explanatory text.	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/630	Carl Stott	Nineteen47 obo Bowbridge Homes	Policy DS1 is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national planning policy because it should include include a higher housing requirement to support sustainable economic growth, to deliver required number of affordable homes, and should be expressed as a minimum. The plan should include flexibility of 15% rather than 10% as Sustainable Urban Extensions account for 43% of overall housing supply. It is not clear whether the Council is wishing to demonstrate a 5 year housing supply through the adoption of the Local Plan as set in para 74b of NPPF.	Increase housing requirement figure and express as a minimum.	Not stated	DS1
PSLP/380	S Newton		Proposed development around Woodthorpe/ Quorn is not justified as these villages would merge with Loughborough; and the impact on schools, medical services and traffic; loss of agricultural land. Also Rothley would merge with Leicester.	Undertake wider consultation	No	DS1
PSLP/385	L Wright		Proposed development in Barrow Upon Soar is not justified or positively prepared as Page 30 states the settlement is a 'service centre' and an additional 1819 dwellings (unfair 38.6% of service centre allocations) would detriment the road network which also increasingly floods and result in additional traffic. This would conflict with the 'good accessibility' description given to service centres.	Reduce the number of houses proposed in the settlement.	No	DS1
PSLP/387	M Powell		Proposed development in Anstey (sites HA12, HA43 and HA44) is not justified as the settlement has had a large amount of development in recent years; An additional 900 homes would be unsustainable; it would exacerbate existing traffic , congestion and parking issues; impact on air pollution and the environment; additional pressure on GPs, pharmacist, and dentist; Anstey needs to retain its rural character.		No	DS1
PSLP/400	M Farmer		Development in Syston is not justified as the area has existing traffic and parking issues; infrastructure including GPs and town centre parking cannot accommodate development; it will impact highway safety; loss of landscape and agricultural production; affordable housing won't be affordable; enough housing has already been built; new homes in Thorpe Anstey are not occupied	Make existing houses affordable as millions of them are empty. Think properly about infrastructure	No	DS1
PSLP/405	P Needham		Development in Barrow Upon Soar is not justified as it will result in traffic congestion especially at the bridge crossing; there are no active travel routes to other centres including Quorn or Loughborough.	Reduce the extent to development in Barrow to that proposed in the previous consultation 2019 draft.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/720	D Keay		Development around East Goscote (including HA60/ para 2.114) is not justified as 270 additional homes amounting to 30% of Other Settlement development is disproportionate especially as it is only considered to have some of the services needed; East Goscote is having more development than some Service Centres; development will change the character of the village; Queniborough and East Goscote collectively will have 66% of Other Settlement development which will have a great impact; proposed development is not consistent with the plan aim of making Charnwood an attractive place to life;	Distribute development amongst the different settlement categories Consider traffic volumes and site accesses	Yes	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/448	L Hambleton		The plan (including DS3, LUC2 and LUC3) is not justified as it will merge Loughborough with Quorn and Shepshed which will reduce countryside access; all new development in Loughborough is ugly and student focussed; build for residents and not students in Loughborough town centre; solar and wind farms detract from open land; development will increase flooding; the science park is awful and destroys the environment; affordable houses to not accommodate people who are low income living alone/ without a disability;	Stop building houses. Make use of existing empty properties. Do not develop the science park. No wind/solar farms.	No	DS1
PSLP/456	C Mason		The proposals in Barrow are not positively prepared as Fishpool Brook along Sileby Road floods and many estates drain into the brook. More developments/ roads will exacerbate flooding issues.	Ensure new development does not drain into the Fishpool Brook.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/486	K+J Herson		The plan is not justified as references to increasing biodiversity conflict with proposals to build on flood plains such as in Sileby, Barrow and Thurmaston (Examples of areas of flooding given); the proposals will impact the character of small towns and villages; additional concrete will store summer heat; concern about the loss of green spaces; concern about the loss of biodiversity; concern about building on grade two farmland.		No	DS1
PSLP/642	D Berry		Proposed development in Anstey is not justified as It will result in increased pollution as a result of only one route to access the settlement; increased traffic will impact the safety of local schools; No evidence of environmental impact has been undertaken.	Build a new access road to manage traffic and pollution ideally to the A50/A46 roundabout	Yes	DS1
PSLP/647	H Staniforth		Proposed development in Anstey is not justified as An additional 1000 houses in the settlement cannot be accommodated by the local GP service; Additional traffic would create more pollution; there would be increased traffic towards Bradgate Park; the village centre has no capacity for parking; the village does not have a bank and only two cash points; the village has limited work opportunities/	Reduce the number of dwellings proposed; and sure affordable houses are built; consider the impact of flooding from Rothley Brook; build houses in smaller villages to enable their growth locally.	No	DS1
PSLP/654	D White		Development in Sileby is not justified as It will exacerbate traffic, parking and congestion issues	Build an access Road along the existing farm track towards Ratcliffe Road	Yes	DS1
PSLP/666	V Brown		The plan and development in Anstey is not justified as Developers historically do not provide their committed contributions and new estates are not well maintained; new sites will not have enough amenities such as health services which will exacerbate existing capacity issues in the village; development will exacerbate traffic, noise and pollution issues Within the site and on surrounding roads; proposal sites all in there is the flood which will exacerbate flooding downstream; nobody will want to live close to the A46; Anstey does not need more housing	Build houses elsewhere and not in Anstey	No	DS1
PSLP/672	E French		The plan, in particular around Sileby, is not justified as It will result in the loss of surrounding fields which is not good for the future of children; do not want to live in a concrete jungle; development will result in children not wanting to live in Charnwood as it will not be a desirable place to live as set out in the vision	Develop brownfield sites	Yes	DS1
PSLP/677	L Brookes		Proposed development in Anstey is not justified as The road network cannot accommodate more traffic, including measures around the Nook; launch vehicles that drive through the village as existing; cumulative traffic from development in Leicester City places additional traffic in Anstey;	Develop brownfield sites in the borough	No	DS1
PSLP/679	S Clarke		The plan is not justified as there is no need to build so many houses in Loughborough (including HA14 and HA16); especially as employment opportunities have not been provided for these new houses	develop brownfield sites and don't develop green fields	Yes	DS1
PSLP/680	R Webb		References in the plan (including para 2.113) is not justified as References to extend Cossington primary school assumes that housing will be developed in the village, but proposed development is out of character and scale for the existing village. Concerned that housing allocations are being made on the basis of a presumptive school extensions; and that development in Cossington is only being supported to enable the school extension	Remove all references to a school extension	No	DS1
PSLP/684	J Faver		The plan is not justified as development generally will exacerbate pressure on GPs, schools, policing, green spaces, traffic, and will have an environmental impact on noise and pollution within villages		No	DS1
PSLP/690	D Carter		Proposed development in Anstey is not justified as the village has had a large amount of development in recent years which has led to increased traffic in the area; the bus stop on Leicester Road has not been relocated to Staddon Road; Increases in noise and air pollution impacting local well being and health; the A46 interchange cannot accommodate additional traffic; local facilities will have additional pressure including GP, dentists, chemist, car parking.	Cropston Road Requires speed cameras, traffic calming measures, pedestrian crossings, a 7.5 ton HGV weight restriction	No	DS1
PSLP/691	C Right		Proposals for Shepshed are not justified as (referring to Growth Bullet 4) Proposed growth is out of proportion for Shepshed compared to the Leicester urban edge and Loughborough; Tickow Lane cannot cope with additional traffic; (referring to Environment Bullet 1 and 3) Fields north of Tickow Lane are productive agricultural fields, prone to flooding, important for wildlife	Develop on brownfield sites; public transport in Shepshed required	No	DS1
PSLP/655	I Nicholson		Policy DS1 is not justified as It is proposing 1685 more homes than the stated housing requirement	HA20 only contributes 30 dwellings to this so it is unclear why it is included in the plan	No	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/660	T Wright		The plan is not justified as (referring to Growth Bullet 4) I proportion of development sites should include fully serviced self build plots; land north of Tickow Lane, Shepshed floods and also is used for recreation. (Referring to Environment Bullet 1 and 5) land north of Tickow Lane, Shepshed is productive farming land and therefore a valuable resource; loss of access to the countryside; (Referring to Community bullet 3, 4 and 5) Support these.	Develop on brownfield sites; public transport in Shepshed Needs to be planned more carefully including links to the railway station	Yes	DS1
PSLP/665	B Mayo		Development in Barrow (namely allocations HA45-49 is not justified as concerned that the village will become too large; Local facilities and infrastructure including GPs, shops, parking and roads will not be improved; Each of the five sites in Barrow have value as green spaces/ views / recreation; The proposals will negatively impact village character.	Remove allocation HA49 as it is not compliant with biodiversity , heritage and highways considerations	No	DS1
PSLP/686	G Foulds		Proposed development in Anstey is not justified as Anstey has a disproportionate amount of service centre growth; no provision is made for Doctors, schools, public transport or traffic mitigation; the definition of service centres should include requiring a bank; Recent development has resulted in traffic and congestion issues which will be further exacerbated by development proposed in the local plan; the proposed development and infrastructure should be carbon neutral in order to be acceptable; development will exacerbate flooding issues on Leicester road and the co op car Paul	Ensure the plan is carbon neutral	No	DS1
PSLP/727	David Prowse	David Wilson Homes	Policy DS1 is not justified, positively prepared or consistent with national policy as the 10% buffer for the housing requirement of 19,461 should be 15-20%; to meet Leicester City's unmet need of 18,435; to address the requirement for affordable housing which has increased from 392 (HEDNA 2017) to 476 (HNA 2020) dwellings per year; PPG establishes that the standard method is a minimum starting point; housing affordability will become an issue overtime due to market trends.	Promoting site 'Land off Barkby Road, Queniborough' for 150 homes (current planning reference P//20/2380/2). Use a buffer of 15-20%	No	DS1
PSLP/704	H Holmes		Development in Barrow is not justified as Development will exacerbate traffic issues particularly on roads that flood; major repairs / improvements are required to the sewage system between Soar Bridge and Barrow Road; Development will exacerbate existing infrastructure problems therefore it is incorrect to justify more development with infrastructure improvements; development will negatively impact village character; Concerned genuinely affordable housing will not be delivered; concerned local residents will not understand the documents to be able to respond to the consultation	Improve existing flooding issues before development takes place; improve existing infrastructure provision before development takes place; introduce affordable housing at a reasonable pace	No	DS1
PSLP/681	Cllr Bains		Proposals for Anstey are not justified as local infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate more than 250 more houses (compared to more than 600 houses as proposed); Impact on traffic on The Nook roundabout, Groby Road, Bradgate Road; Impact on highway safety; No evidence of discussion of highways mitigation; Anstey has already had a large amount of development in recent years resulting in traffic increases; development will increased pressure on local services including doctors, dentists, chemist , car park; concern about impact on views and property prices; Impact upon the village character/ feel which will be lost if the village continues to expand		Yes	DS1
PSLP/597	Robert Shields	Burton On The Wolds PC	Support Burton and other Wolds settlements being defined as 'other settlements'. However the settlement has been vulnerable to speculative development due to a historic lack of five year land supply. Concerned that underdelivery of housing undermines adopted neighbourhood plans	The plan should plan for a substantial oversupply of housing to protect villages from unsustainable development	No	DS1
PSLP/625	A Swann		The plan is not justified as additional housing surrounding Garendon Park will result in additional traffic and exacerbate existing traffic issues.		No	DS1
PSLP/673	J Weaver		Proposed development in Anstey is not justified as the cumulative traffic impact of development proposed within Ashton Green Leicester City has not been taken into account; Anstey will lose its village character; it is unclear whether a new school would be built in Anstey; the GP service in the village cannot be extended; S106 Contributions will be focused in the borough where is Anstey residents use Leicester; there is another bus services to anywhere other than Leicester; previously promised allotments for Anstey were not delivered; the development of HA44 Will destroy the nearby playground and right of way; development will exacerbate existing flooding issues; there is no evidence that Anstey has links with strategic infrastructure such as the M1 or airport due to congestion	Remove allocations HA12, HA13, HA43, and HA44 to another part of the borough and consult with neighbouring authorities.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/676	C Dyson		The plan (paragraph 3.86 and associated paragraphs) is not justified or positively prepared as a more creative plan is required to use empty retail and industrial units; address a lack of amenities including schools and dentists; resolve traffic; increase purpose built student accommodation; enhance tourism; students in family housing leaves them empty and results in unsustainable local businesses and antisocial behaviour	Encourage private investment by creating work hubs, parking and amenities. Create a tourism theme for Loughborough. Encourage jobs near housing which will also address traffic. Properly assess the impact of Brexit and COVID to establish the need of housing location and type; encourage more student accommodation. Consider access to open spaces. consult people who have recently moved to Loughborough to determine how they are using the area	No	DS1
PSLP/664	D Heney		The plan is not justified as development in Loughborough will exacerbate the poor development of the town; issues relating to the loss of local employers; making the town a commuter town to other cities; loss of character; existing traffic and road configuration issues. The plan does not plan for environmental features.	Rethink the plan	No	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/664	D Heney		The plan is not justified as Sileby Is a historic village with existing flooding, traffic and access issues and development will exacerbate these; Sileby be will negatively impacted by developments further up the Soar River	Address flooding in Sileby and acknowledge the impact of developments further up the Soar River.	No	DS1
PSLP/669	J Briggs		Development between Loughborough and Outwoods (Reference made to HA15, HA17 and HA18) is not justified as no consideration has been given to the value of this landscape; the area is used for recreation and is a valued landscape.	Enhance the area, remove allocations and develop to the north and north-west of Loughborough	No	DS1
PSLP/634	K Hubbard		The plan is not justified as developing 1500 houses in Syston, Barkby, Queniborough and Thurmaston will detriment these historic villages; policies do not safeguard the environment; Developments in more remote areas create isolated populations with unsatisfactory infrastructure increasing traffic, pollution and spirit; Concern about the general impact of development on wildlife and protected bird species; concerned that public rights of way will be removed	Develop all brownfield sites before developing Greenfield, habitat's and in villages. Have policies that safeguard the natural environment. Promote high density, carbon zero housing development that integrates green space	No	DS1
PSLP/238	R Parks	Quorn PC	The plan is not justified as infrastructure and transport are required in the context of sustainability and there are no plans for bus routes and traffic congestion is an existing problem. This is required to meet air quality and carbon reduction targets.	Development to the South of Loughborough requires an integrated transport system	Yes	DS1
PSLP/329	M Lane	Thurcaston and Cropston PC	Proposed development in Anstey and Leicester (Ashton Green 'site 580' and Glebelands 'site 261') will have a cumulative impact on traffic, noise, pollution and the area of local separation.	Joint working should take place between both authorities to review cross boundary impacts as set out in paragraph 3.16 of the local plan	No	DS1
PSLP/330	Brenda Snape	Shepshed Town Council	Development in Shepshed requires additional infrastructure including highways improvements, medical provision, education provision and recreation space. housing needs to include sound panels, electric vehicle charging points, recreation routes, and 10% biodiversity.	Why has Cotes not being considered for housing development	No	DS1
PSLP/460	G Goodman		Proposed allocations HA15, HA16, HA17, HA18 are not justified as these would result in the loss of green spaces which are used for recreation. HA15 provides a unique rural setting between Loughborough and Quorn.		No	DS1
PSLP/635	I Deverell	Rainer	Representation promoting 'Land East and West of Iveshead Road, Shepshed' for 133 dwellings. Policy DS1 is not justified as it only provides for a 9.47% buffer for housing supply which is inconsistent with paragraph 2.14 – represents a 93 dwelling shortfall. Assuming adoption in October 2022, the plan period will less than 15 years and therefore inconsistent with NPPF paragraph 22. An additional year plus 10% buffer means a further 1982 dwellings should be planned for. The plan is heavily reliant on large SUEs which require significant infrastructure. The spatial strategy is not justified or deliverable as it is over ambitious for short term delivery on the three SUE's that have historically under delivered, and there is no detailed evidence to support proposed trajectories.	Withdraw local plan until Leicester City unmet needs are met / SOCG is signed. Plan positively for unmet need. Plan should allocate smaller sites to de-risk the plan deliverability	Yes	DS1
PSLP/731	Diana Webster		A 10% buffer has already been needlessly added representing over 1700 homes. Without this unnecessary buffer of 1700 homes, several green field sites could be saved.	Objects to methodology for housing requirements. Population growth statistics need to be revisited	No	DS1
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	The Plan is not justified as Wymeswold has opportunity to allocate its own sites, unlike other settlements actively pursuing neighbourhood plans. Stronger references to the role neighbourhood plans can play are required. Note the allocation of Green Wedge in the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan.	Strengthen references to neighbourhood plans.	No	DS1
PSLP/118	R Palmer		Plan is not justified due to the impact of GP surgeries in Anstey which are oversubscribed		No	DS1
PSLP/133	S Evershed		Support plan. Question the policy approach for the provision of new religious institutions.		No	DS1
PSLP/699	J Davis		The plan is not justified or positively prepared as there is little protection for the area between Leicester City and Charnwood in terms of managing pollution from the A46 and there needs to be separation to prevent the area becoming an extension of the city	Refer in the plan to protecting this area from A46 air pollution; and that wildlife will not be impacted by development	No	DS1
PSLP/730	S Hart		Question whether footpaths and rights of way near sites will be preserved. Question whether open spaces will have biodiversity connectivity. Question whether a reduction in office space requirement has been made given homeworking. Question whether food security and preserving greenfield sites has been given.		No	DS1
PSLP/388	T MacAlister		The plan is not justified as generally it would destroy the countryside and there would be additional traffic and though roads.	Road widening, speed enforcement, and parking restrictions are required	Yes	DS1
PSLP/731	Dina Webster		The Charnwood Retail and Town Centre Study which is a feed in document for this local plan was completed in 2018. Changes to the retail environment caused by the pandemic have not been incorporated nor has any assessment been made to account for changes to planning assumptions needed as a result	Comment	No	DS1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/446	N Hillier		The contents of the 'Summary of the Charnwood Local Plan' document is not justified as the plan should plan for 70-80% affordable housing if it was serious about meeting housing shortages; the vision statement about making Charnwood one of the most desirable places is deluded; environmental proposals will not be met by building on greenfield land and creating additional traffic; there is no plan as to how minimising the need to travel by car or achieving carbon neutrality will happen; any green wedge between Leicester/Loughborough villages will be lost; development isn't directed to the lowest flood risk areas.		Yes	DS1
PSLP/449	R Faulkner		The community section of the Charnwood Local Plan Summary is not justified as a 30% affordable housing requirement is too low.	Require 100% affordable housing. Revise the NPPF so affordable housing is based on public need and not builders need.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/664	D Heney		The plan is not justified as it is impossible to do the environment justice therefore proper examination of the impact on the environment has not been had; There is not enough time for a member of the public to review the Ecology Assessment Report 2019 and 2021 which highlights the ecological value of site allocations, recognises that there will be a negative impact on the environment (i.e. on page 51), the report does not provide details of how the environment will be enhanced or how carbon neutrality will be regulated; there is a lack of vision on the environment	Develop a positive bold and brave plan for the 21st century. Plant 10 million trees over 20 year period in Charnwood working with the Woodland Trust. Develop wetlands that can 'sponge' rainfall between Loughborough and Nottingham. Raise funding for environmental programmes.	No	DS1
PSLP/364	Emma Crowe	Woodhouse Parish Council	Considers that the limits to development have been incorrectly drawn between Loughborough and Woodhouse in the Arup Study of Green Wedges and Areas of Local Separation.	Redraw boundary along line of an ancient track which also acts as a wildlife corridor.	No	DS1
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Paragraph 2.7 states that: Both the UK's and the Borough's populations are increasing with people living longer. The latest figures from Public Health England show that life expectancy fell in 2020.	Provide alternative, corrected data.	Yes	DS1
PSLP/323	Jamie Carr	Oadby and Wigston BC	The Council is content with the wording of the trigger policy.		Not stated	DS2
PSLP/544	Rob Foers	Hinckley and Bosworth BC	Policy DS2 is supported. Hinckley and Bosworth consider a review/trigger mechanism is the most appropriate way to respond to unmet need in advance of an agreed approach to distribution across the HMA.		Not stated	DS2
PSLP/340	Tony Stott	CPRE	The plan is not justified as the Govt has signalled it may abolish the DtC and unmet need in Leicester may not be required until after 2031, therefore it would seem premature to address this immediately in ways which might lead to unsustainable levels of housing in Charnwood. Charnwood should review its housing requirement in the light of updated evidence and policy guidance when it is reasonable to do so and put the emphasis on ensuring a sustainable, brownfield-led approach i.e. the review should be delayed.		No	DS2
PSLP/162	Mr Geoffrey Prince	Geoffrey Prince Associates Ltd obo Cawrey Ltd	The Plan is not positively prepared as the overall housing requirement does not make provision for Leicester's unmet need which now stands at 17,454.	Allocate 2020 Shelaa site PSH2 Gorse Hill, Anstey to contribute to meeting Leicester's unmet need	Yes	DS2
PSLP/366	Stephen Harris	Emery Planning obo Hollins Strategic Land LLP	The Plan is not positively prepared or effective because the policy contains no consequence of not meeting the timetable.	Add wording to introduce a consequence of not meeting the timetable that policies are out of date in accordance with para 11(d) of the NPPF.	Yes	DS2
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	Disappointed more progress hasn't been made in dealing with Leicester's unmet need, this will impact on the Borough's housing need with prospect of an immediate review.		No	DS2
PSLP/539	Ian Nelson	North West Leicestershire District Council	The plan is not positively prepared or effective. The Strategic Distribution Study (2021) forms part of the evidence base for the Charnwood Local Plan. The expectation is that there will be agreement between the Leicester & Leicestershire authorities on how the unmet need will be met and it will be down to individual authorities to make their ascribed provision through their Local Plans. The pre-submission plan does not allocate land for strategic distribution. The plan does not indicate how the council will bring forward land if any strategic B8 need is apportioned to the borough as a result of the Leicester & Leicestershire joint working. The plan should set out the council's approach to allocating land, if required, through a review of the plan	The matter could be addressed by including strategic distribution needs in Policy DS2. NWLDC's proposed modification is shown in underlined text. See suggested wording.	Yes	DS2
PSLP/617	Katie Gulliver	Mulberry Land	The Plan is not positively prepared or effective as the unmet employment needs in the FEMA should be addressed in the current Plan not deferred via an early review policy. This will exacerbate existing employment land shortfalls.	Policy DS2 should be deleted and Leicester's unmet needs accounted for in DS1	Yes	DS2
PSLP/546	Tamsin Cottle	P&DG obo William Davis / Chapman Estates (HA12)	Policy DS2 is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.		No	DS2
PSLP/375	James Beverley	Fisher German LLP obo David Wilson Homes	The policy is not positively prepared, justified or effective, the unmet need is known, and distribution could be agreed now. An uplift to the housing requirement would remove the need for this policy in the short term.	Remove policy and increase housing requirement or delay the plan until SoCG is agreed. Allocate land at Cossington Road, Sileby to meet the additional need.	Yes	DS2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/378	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Jelsons PNH Properties	The full extent of Leicester's unmet need requires further evidencing, for the plan to be positively prepared its housing requirement should be increased.	Increase housing requirement and allocate Land at Melton Road, Burton on the Wolds to assist in meeting this need.	No	DS2
PSLP/384	Tim Coleby	Santec obo Barwood	The plan is not positively prepared. We acknowledge Policy DS2 but in our view the Plan makes insufficient allowance for the need for Charnwood to accommodate a proportion of the unmet housing need of the City of Leicester.	Amend the plan so it makes a sufficient allowance to meet Leicester unmet need.	Not stated	DS2
PSLP/586	Chris Bell	Blaby District Council	Policy DS2 is considered to be broadly consistent with the Leicester and Leicestershire Authorities Statement of Common Ground relating to Housing and Employment Land Needs (March 2021).		Not stated	DS2
PSLP/350	Sarah Legge	Melton Borough Council	MBC are pleased to see the inclusion of this policy, and welcome references to the SoCG in relation to unmet needs from Leicester City. MBC has not identified any significant cross-boundary impacts in relation to housing and employment proposals.		Not stated	DS2
PSLP/582	Grant Butterworth	Leicester City Council	<p>Welcomes the commitment as set out in draft Policy DS2 to positively address unmet need within the HMA post agreement on the SoCG and the commitment of Charnwood to publish a review into its plan within 6 months of the signing of the SoCG.</p> <p>Clarity is required within the policy and/or the supporting text to address any delay to submission or examination of the Charnwood Local Plan, and the SoCG is agreed and signed before this as there may be a potential of the proposed trigger being met before the adoption of the Charnwood Local Plan.</p> <p>We are happy however for this matter to be addressed as a matter between Charnwood Borough Council and the planning inspector rather than suggesting any form of change to the policy wording.</p> <p>Any opportunity to complete the review earlier would be welcomed HMA. It is also noted that there is currently no specific criteria about what trigger a full or partial update to the Charnwood Local Plan, so it would be useful to provide some clarity in the supporting text on under what circumstances a full or partial review would be expected.</p>	<p>Partly dependent on findings of examination inspector.</p> <p>Some changes to policy and supporting text proposed.</p> <p>Suggested modification in bold and underlined.</p> <p>Proposed modification to Paragraph 2.62:  The change in Leicester's housing need on 16 December 2020 (resulting from Government changes to the standard method for calculating housing need) is so significant that additional work is now needed. We will continue to actively engage in the programme of work planned as included in the Statement of Common Ground to address the scale and redistribution of unmet need in the Housing Market Area with the objective of agreeing a further Statement of Common Ground with other authorities across Leicester and Leicestershire</p>	Yes	DS2
PSLP/411	Bethany Carr	Avison Young obo Jelson Davidson	Leicester's unmet needs is likely to be significant meaning that the housing requirement specified in the Plan will need to increase and probably in a substantial way. This is not a matter that can be deferred in the way that the Plan suggests. To defer addressing this issue renders the Plan unsound.	Leicester's unmet need should be addressed now and not deferred.	Yes	DS2
PSLP/115	J Kersey		Plan is not justified as some settlements (e.g. Cossington and Barrow) have disproportionate amounts of proposed development compared to others (e.g. Swithland and Woodhouse Eaves). Rothley has had disproportionate development over many years		No	DS2
PSLP/521	John Bradburn	Montagu Evans obo Beacon Bingo	The plan has not been positively prepared as the policy requires an immediate update to deliver housing and employment requirements; as such it cannot be considered justified or effective.	Undertake a further call for sites to increase housing delivery. The last call for sites took place in a different economic climate and new urban sites could be considered during the examination without too much increase in timescales.	Yes	DS2
PSLP/531	Victoria Heath	Fisher German LLP obo Clarendon Land and Development	The policy is not positively prepared, justified or effective, the unmet need is known, and distribution could be agreed now. An uplift to the housing requirement would remove the need for this policy in the short term.	Remove policy and increase housing requirement or identify reserve sites to be brought forward should they be required.	No	DS2
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	An early review policy is supported; however, the local housing need for Charnwood is not justified or effective as it does not account for Leicester's unmet need (or economic circumstances, affordable housing or the over-reliance on strategic sites).	Increase housing provision by 15-20%.	Yes	DS2
PSLP/542	Joe Bennett	RCA obo Spitfire Homes	The plan is not positively prepared or effective as it does not meet Leicester's unmet need.	Await completion of SoCG and address Leicester's unmet need.	Yes	DS2
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	Comfortable with policy but wish to understand any updated position on unmet need and the re-distribution of homes in the housing market area as the plan proceeds to and through examination.		Not stated	DS2
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	The policy provides a clear mechanism for the plan to be reviewed and updated if necessary, following the redistribution of unmet need.		Yes	DS2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/569	David Hutchinson	Boyer obo Knightwood Developments	The plan is not consistent with national policy (paragraph 25 NPPF) because the plan will be submitted at the expense of further joint working with neighbouring authorities to address Leicester unmet need. The Plan will become immediately out of date on adoption as evidence base will be outdated. The plan does not meet the DtC as there has been no further MoU or SoCG or any indication of when an agreed SoCG will be published. Policy DS2 does not provide any commitment for when the SoCG will be signed and therefore there is no guarantee that there will be an agreed approach	The Plan must comply with a signed SOCG with HMA partners and make provision for accommodating Charnwood's proportion of the Leicester City unmet need for the duration of the plan period.	Yes	DS2
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	Support the policy but agreement on scale and redistribution of Leicester's unmet need should be agreed as soon as possible. To be positively prepared and effective the policy should identify broad locations of growth to meet the unmet need and longer-term development. Six Hills Garden Village could provide such a location.	Identify broad locations for growth on the Policies Map, to be considered through the Local Plan review.	Yes	DS2
PSLP/547	Tamsin Cottle	P&DG obo William Davis (HA43)	Policy DS2 is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.		No	DS2
PSLP/580	Sharron Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The review trigger policy will be utilised following strategic evidence and publication of a SoCG. It could be strengthened by amending to prevent a single partner withholding agreement sand preventing the review. Broadening the review trigger should be considered other situations.	Amend policy to refer to the SoCG being 'published for consideration through respective governance processes' rather than agreement or refer to agreement by the majority. Amend the policy to cover 'other significant changes in circumstances'.	Yes	DS2
PSLP/580		Leicestershire County Council Strategic Property Services	The policy is basically sound but reserve sites should be allocated to shorten process in case additional allocations are required and help maintain 5YLS.	Allocate additional 'reserve' sites.	Not stated	DS2
PSLP/535	Juan Murray	TEP obo Leics County Council	Whilst we note that most Local Authorities are keen to adopt their Plan to allow development to come forward in a controlled manner, rushing the process with a fallback positon of an early review does not give confidence to the market. This in turn is then linked to the relevance on so few large strategic sites to meet the housing need. Market confidence is required on these sites and having a robust plan in place is key to that. Policy not considered to be sound.	Reconsideration of policy called for.	Not stated	DS2
PSLP/616	Eri Wong	Highways England	Note the 35% uplift in Leicester's housing target and additional unmet need. Support the review policy and opportunity to incorporate findings from the joint strategic transport assessment currently underway for the Strategic Growth Plan as well as on-going evidence undertaken by CBC and LCC. Welcome continued proactive engagement as the SoCG for distributing unmet needs progresses.		Yes	DS2
PSLP/629	Michael Davies	Savills obo Wilson Bowden (J23)	he policy is not positively prepared due to the delay in meeting Leicester's unmet housing and employment land need. There is also no evidence the review mechanism would be effective. Urgent need exists for employment land in the East Midlands and land east of M1J23 is a suitable location. It is close to several areas of deprivation, helping address local employment need. The East Midlands vacancy rate for industrial land is low, as is the Charnwood vacancy rate. There is a shortfall in strategic warehousing sites in Leicestershire. More employment land needs to be brought forward in Charnwood. Much of the Borough is in an Area of Opportunity for strategic warehousing, a delay in meeting this need will result in failure to plan properly for the Borough.	Meet the need for employment land now, not in the next plan period by allocating additional land such as at M1J23.	Yes	DS2
PSLP/583	Liberty Stones	Fisher German obo Lone Star	The policy is not positively prepared, justified or effective, the unmet need is known, and distribution could be agreed now. The policy will cause delay in meeting unmet need. An uplift to the housing requirement would remove the need for this policy in the short term.	Remove policy and increase housing requirement or delay the plan until SoCG is agreed.	Not stated	DS2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/593	Darren Oakley	RPS obo IM Land	<p>PSLP/593 Darren Oakley RPS obo IM Land</p> <p>It is clear that national policy and guidance directs the Council to address the strategic priorities of its own area, and the unmet housing needs of its neighbours. It also makes clear that those matters should be addressed now, and not decanted to future plan reviews to deal with. This is what the Local Plan Inspector will expect to see if they are able to find the CLP sound on examination. RPS contends that without defining when the 6 month 'trigger' is likely to occur, then the policy is too vaguely written and so is not soundly-based.</p> <p>It is not yet clear when the revised SOCG will be signed. The latest SOCG March 2021 (paragraph 3.22 refers) suggests this could be by the winter of 2021/22, adding potentially another 6 months on to the delay. This would mean that the revised CLP could be submitted by the end of 2026 (5 years from the signing of the SOCG), but there is no certainty available on this either at this point. Charnwood District Council has not presented any evidence to demonstrate that accommodating some of the shortfall in Charnwood would undermine the delivery of sustainable development. By pursuing draft Policy DS2, RPS contend that the Council is simply trying to delay taking the positive action it needs to take now in order to address this worsening strategic matter. Such a policy, as drafted, is not positively prepared and so is contrary to national policy and guidance.</p>	Objects to policy.	Not stated	DS2
PSLP/615	Laura McCombe	Carter Jonas obo Mr C. Green	<p>In principle we support the inclusion of Policy DS2. However, given the advanced stage of the unmet need arising from Leicester City, it is not 'sound' for Charnwood Borough Council to solely rely on a Local Plan Review and not consider allocating some of that need in this Local Plan. This is contrary to the Framework (2021) which seeks to support sustainable development and significantly boost the supply of homes. If the unmet need was equally distributed across the 8 other Authorities, including Charnwood Borough Council, this would amount to 2,187 dwellings each. It is however anticipated that given the availability of sustainable sites within Charnwood and its southern boundaries close proximity and relationship to Leicester City, the origin of the unmet need, Charnwood will need to accommodate more than 2,187 dwellings.</p> <p>We therefore recommend for the Plan to be considered 'sound', the Council must allocate additional land. The Council should particularly focus on sites which are situated in a sustainable location within a close proximity to Leicester City.</p> <p>Given the recommendations above, we suggest that Charnwood Borough Council reconsider Land East of Thurcaston which is being promoted for 585 dwellings and is assessed under site reference PSH120 of the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Available Assessment (2020).</p> <p>Thus, in order to address issues relating to the proposed 9.5% flexibility and the lack of addressing the unmet housing need arising from Leicester City Council, we strongly contend that Land East of Thurcaston is allocated for residential development.</p>	Additional site proposed to meet housing need.	Yes	DS2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/713	Mrs L. Aspinall	Harborough District Council	<p>Whilst the inclusion of Policy DS2 is welcomed in principle, it is considered unsound for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In allowing 6 months for a review (from agreeing a SoCG) and then a further 48 months from the publication of the review, the timeframe for preparing an updated Local Plan is lengthy and not positively prepared. The need for a speedier review is important given the potential scale and urgency of Leicester's unmet need. The initial scale of this unmet need was first quantified at the end of 2019 and following changes to the Standard Method in December 2020 it has been know that this unmet need is likely to increase significantly. A similar policy in the Harborough Local Plan allows 36 months from adoption of the SOCG to submission. It is considered that a more ambitious timetable which reflects the immediacy of accommodating Leicester's unmet need is required in the interests of effective strategic, cross-boundary planning.</li> <li>The policy risks being ineffective as there is no fallback position should the SOCG not be agreed by all or some of the partners, assuming Leicester City still has significant, evidenced unmet need. In the absence of an adopted SOCG, there should be a requirement for an update to the Charnwood Local Plan linked to the date of the publication of a Leicester City Local Plan (Regulation 19) that includes satisfactory evidence of an unmet need for housing. This would ensure that a review and potential update to the Local Plan, to deal with the issue of accommodating unmet need, is not solely dependent on all partners agreeing a SOCG. Such an approach would reflect Harborough Local Plan (2019) Policy IMR1 Implementation, monitoring and review.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, the policy also assumes a single SoCG will be prepared which addresses apportionment of housing and employment needs. It may transpire that two SoCG need to be prepared and the policy should allow for this eventuality.</p> <p>Policy DS2 could also usefully include a criterion to reflect the strategic matter of warehousing and distribution, which commits to an early review of the Plan should collaborative work (under the DtC) result in the distribution of L&amp;L shortfall to an Area of Opportunity impacting the borough (see HDC comments on Para 5.30-5.35).</p>		No	DS2
PSLP/618	Jon Kirby	Lichfields obo Rebecca Birch, St Philips	<p>St Philips generally supports the Council's approach in Policy DS2 but considers the Council could demonstrate and provide further information in order to ensure the Policy is found wholly sound at examination.</p> <p>The Council should demonstrate joint working by the preparation and maintenance of one or more SoCG identifying the cross-boundary matters to be addressed and the progress of co-operation in addressing these matters.</p> <p>St Philips considers it unfortunate that the Council and counterpart Leicestershire authorities have agreed for Charnwood to defer its apportionment of housing being agreed. There is every possibility that reaching a consensus on meeting Leicester's unmet housing needs across the remaining L&amp;LHMA authorities will be a lengthy process.</p>	Comments on approach.	Yes	DS2
PSLP/566	Owen Jones	LRM Planning Limited on behalf of William Davis Homes and Parker Strategic Land	The policy is supported as to delay preparation of this Local Plan whilst additional work is being undertaken would be harmful to the Borough Council's ability to meet its own housing need.		Yes	DS2
PSLP/626	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow Homes	<p>We agree that it is appropriate to define with clear stages and timing, the areas and the process that will trigger a review of this yet to be adopted local plan.</p> <p>Whilst accepting that the section on preparing and reviewing plans in the NPPF does not specifically address the issue of unmet needs and a review, it is the case that Policy DS2 is in not effective or positively prepared.</p> <p>A worked example and/or timeline is necessary to illustrate what is meant by this policy.</p> <p>Policy DS2 is unclear and it could work out that submission of an updated local plan is at least 54 months beyond agreement of the relevant authorities on a Statement of Common Ground for the apportionment of unmet housing and employment need. This is in effect 5 years from now.</p> <p>Reviews at least every five years are already a legal requirement for all local plans under Regulation 10A of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.</p> <p>Policy DS2 does not propose any acceleration ahead of this already legal requirement and if anything the lack of certainty over timing for the relevant authorities to reach agreement on a Statement of Common Ground for the apportionment of unmet housing and employment need means that progress on a review of the local plan could be no sooner than would otherwise be the case.</p>	Policy DS2: Leicester and Leicestershire Unmet Needs, has to be comprehensively reviewed, a new set of clear proposals with timed stages laid-out. (	Yes	DS2
PSLP/598	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons Developments, Redrow Homes and Helen Jean Cope Charity	The policy does not deal with the situation where, for whatever reason, the Statement of Common Ground is delayed. There is a real concern that in the absence of a commitment to jointly sign a Statement of Common Ground within a prescribed period, there is little commitment for the HMA authorities to finally deal with this critical issue.	Review of policy called for.	Yes	DS2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	The plan is not consistent with national policy or positively prepared as it postpones dealing with the apportionment of Leicester's unmet need. The Council is under a Duty to Co-operate with other local authorities on strategic matters. While there is evidence of engagement there is no outcome from this engagement in relation to the strategic cross-boundary matter of redistribution of unmet housing needs from Leicester. These matters should have been dealt with directly as part of the local plan through a statement of common ground. The plan should be accompanied by a Statement of Common Ground dealing with unmet need. The Local Plan is not accompanied by a Statement of Common Ground.	The plan should be accompanied by a joint statement of common ground which sets out precisely where Leicester's unmet housing needs will be met by neighbouring authorities up to 2036/37.	Yes	DS2
PSLP/630	Carl Stott	Nineteen47 obo Bowbridge Homes	The plan should be accompanied by a Statement of Common Ground dealing with unmet need. The Local Plan is not accompanied by a Statement of Common Ground.	The plan should be accompanied by a Statement of Common Ground dealing with unmet need.	Not stated	DS2
PSLP/727	David Prowse	David Wilson Homes	Policy DS2 is not justified, effective or consistent with national policy as the review mechanism he's not realistic and will potentially take over five years to prepare and updated local plan one more urgent action is required.	Promoting site 'Land off Barkby Road, Queniborough' for 150 homes (current planning reference P//20/2380/2). Use a buffer of 15-20%	No	DS2
PSLP/711	R Thomas		Policy DS2 is not positively prepared/ effective as anticipating an early review has an influence on the councils ability to maintain a five year housing land supply.	Allocate site PSH248	Yes	DS2
PSLP/635	I Deverell	Rainer	Policy DS2 is not positively prepared as it does not meet unmet need.	An approach similar to that of the Coventry and Warwickshire HMA should be taken.	No	DS2
PSLP/572	Daniel Hibbard	We Are Define obo Bloor Homes (Laburnum Way)	Commitment to a future review of Local Plan appears appropriate, as delaying plan would appear counter-intuitive. Some concerns regarding timescales. Policy DS2 should commit to shorter timescales to ensure there is not a lag between the agreement of an SoCG / MoU and the delivery of housing to remedy the shortfall.	Reconsider approach to meeting unmet needs and consider the merits of a partial / focused review to deal with the matter. Timescales set out in Policy DS2 should be refined.	Yes	DS2
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	In order to support people to move away from car use as well as promoting better physical and mental health, in the larger areas of new development additional secondary schools would also be helpful		Not stated	DS3
PSLP/340	Tony Stott	CPRE	This policy is not justified - the shortfall may only be 5,516 based on the 2016ONS figures. All the houses with planning permission on the North East of Leicester Urban Extension should be included in the plan, reducing the need to 4,157. A further contribution will inevitably also be found from windfall sites. This would significantly reduce the need for Green Field sites to be allocated. Not only would this protect the countryside and reduce traffic growth but also reduce carbon emissions. Overall Leicestershire CPRE considers a shortfall of 3,037 (compared to 8,858 in the plan).	Modification of the table in DS3 and proposals in policies LUA2 and policies DS3 (HA1) through to DS (HA69) to take account of the contribution of windfalls and changes to density requirements in line with the density policy CPRE is proposing.	Yes	DS3
PSLP/162	Mr Geoffrey Prince	Geoffrey Prince Associates Ltd obo Cawrey Ltd	The Plan is not positively prepared as it fails to take account of Leicester's unmet need.	Allocate PSH2 Land at Gorse Hill, Anstey to help accommodate additional need.	Yes	DS3
PSLP/365	Peter Wilkinson	Landmark Planning obo Sowden Group	Land to the north of Moor Lane, Loughborough is previously developed and in a sustainable location, satisfying all criteria in DS1. It would not impact on the intrinsic character of the countryside, Area of Separation or Green Wedge.	Allocate land to the north of Moor Lane, Loughborough for housing.	Yes	DS3
PSLP/627	Loughborough University	Avison Young	Support allocation of site HA17 (Moat Farm). However no justification in supporting text or evidence to support restricting development to the northern corner of the site. The developable area should be informed by the promoter's Green Infrastructure Strategy and Landscape Assessment, to be commissioned shortly. Concern there is no evidence to support the requirement for (1) biodiversity net gain on the site or (2) the paragraph 2.86 statement that HA17 is a strategically important wildlife network link with Charnwood Forest and the Soar Valley. The Sustainability Appraisal for the site notes it is of 'limited biodiversity value'. Request both references are deleted.	Amend HA17 boundary informed by the promotor's future Green Infrastructure / Lanscape Assessment. Remove paragraph 2.86 reference to the site being a strategically important wildlife link. Remove requirement for net gain on the site.	No	DS3
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy and the recognition that after years of development Mountsorrel has reached capacity.		No	DS3
PSLP/687	Colin Wilkinson	Barrow PC	Contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, the policies of the Charnwood Local Plan 2021-37 are not underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence, particularly in relation to community, transport and foul drainage infrastructure. Nor does the Local Plan align the proposals for 703 dwellings in Barrow upon Soar with the necessary improvements in community and transport infrastructure.	Without improvements in education provision, a community hall, open space, indoor and outdoor sports facilities, highway and public transport improvements, and the public sewerage system, the Local Plan's proposals for 703 dwellings in Barrow upon Soar do not constitute sustainable development.	Yes	DS3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/411	Bethany Carr	Avison Young obo Jelson and Davidsons	Riggets Green, Cotes should be included as an allocation because the site is in a highly sustainable location; the development would be large enough to sustain many of the services and facilities that future residents would need on a day to day basis; this site does not form part of a valued landscape in NPPF terms and is not within a Green Wedge or Area of Separation; the site has relatively little ecological value; the amount of Grade 3a and 2 land that would be lost to the proposed development is not significant in the Charnwood context; the proposed development would not have a direct, physical impact on any of these designated heritage assets and would have only a modest impact on their settings; the proposed buildings would all be sited within Flood Zone 1 and the proposed development poses no threat in terms of flood risk off site; and there has never been an objection to the proposals in traffic / transportation terms.	Allocate Riggets Green, Cotes for housing.	Yes	DS3
PSLP/101	A Martin		Plan is not sound as allocations are proposed on flood plains in Quorn, Barrow, Sileby and Woodhouse. No flooding infrastructure proposed.	Need new shops, better roads and green spaces. Do not need new affordable homes.	No	DS3
PSLP/114	P Smart		Plan is not justified as there is no analysis of road flooding along Slash Lane and resulting impact on traffic in Sileby and Barrow. Additional development in Barrow will exacerbate this issue.	Address issue.	No	DS3
PSLP/124	J Bradshaw		Plan is not justified as housing in Barkby, Barkby Thorpe and Thurmaston will exacerbate traffic issues, result in air pollution, result in the loss of green fields and will increase flood risk through building on flood plains.		No	DS3
PSLP/126	A Brassey		Plan is not justified as Shepshed requires improvement to its shopping centre beyond cosmetic, health, schools and highways (including use of Tickow Lane by HGVs not suitable. Shepshed is used as a rat run when the M1 is clocked).	Improve proposals	No	DS3
PSLP/518	Sarah Clark	P&DG obo Godwin Developments (GC No.37 Ltd)	Support policy.		Yes	DS3
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The allocation of land southeast of Syston is supported.		Yes	DS3
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	The policy is not justified or consistent with national policy because each allocation is for a specific number of dwellings.	Each allocation should be described as being for 'approximately' or 'around' the given number of dwellings. The following additional text could be added through a modification to DS3 to read: The final number of dwellings on each of the allocated sites will be established at the planning application stage, following consideration of site specific detailed design matters and any other relevant planning considerations through a constraints - led masterplan process.	Not stated	DS3
PSLP/158	P Edgely		The plan is not justified as it makes several references to an extension to Cossington Primary School which assumes a school site will be provided through the planning application P/20/2393/2 (Land off Humble Lane). This is prejudicial to the outcome of an undetermined planning application.	Amend referenced to an implied assumption (in paras 2.108-2.113, 3.204 and Appendix 3) that P/20/2393/2 will be granted.	No	DS3
PSLP/182	A Bryne		The plan is not justified as significant development in other settlements are supported by few services and will be car dependent, in particular in Rearsby and Thrussington. The combination of site HA66 and development in East Goscote will reduce the area of separation which is already narrow. The Rearsby Neighbourhood Plan proposes to protect this area, and heritage assets / historic character of Rearsby should be protected. Also concern that increased traffic from development will detract from the conservation area.		No	DS3
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	The policy provides a good range of sites across the Borough and avoids over concentration of development.		Yes	DS3
PSLP/559	Sophie Trouth	Pegasus obo Davidsons (Queniborough)	To provide greater flexibility further allocations should be supported in sustainable locations such as Queniborough. Land off Boonton Meadows Way, Queniborough, the subject of application P/20/2349/2 should be allocated as such.	Amend policy to allocate Land off Boonton Meadows Way, Queniborough for 50 dwellings. Details provided.	Yes	DS3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The policies for specific sites vary in structure, content and detail and in some cases seek to deal with cumulative impact in education provision. Developer funding will also need to be secured similarly for cumulative transport impacts across the Borough (including infrastructure & sustainable travel). Comprehensive master planning should be secured for key clusters of sites to create 'mini SUEs' and allow a more coordinated approach for securing transport infrastructure/mitigation and reduce challenges from dispersed development. Reducing site capacity on some to maintain Green Wedge function is supported. Consider SPD documents for large sites rather than masterplans at outline stage to secure infrastructure. Ensure education requirements in policy match those of LCC education. Reference should be made to Health Impact Assessments for large settlements. Several allocations are within mineral safeguarding zones (listed).	Amend the plan to ensure cumulative transport impacts secure developer funding. Amend policy to seek comprehensive masterplan for key sites. -south & east of Syston: HA1/HA2/HA3 and possibly HA5, HA7 and HA8 -south-west Loughborough: HA16/HA17/HA19 -east Shepshed: HA32/HA34 and possibly HA31 -south of Shepshed: HA39/HA40/HA41 -north of Queniborough: HA64/HA65	Yes	DS3
PSLP/580		Leicestershire County Council Strategic Property Services	Allocations are not spread evenly across the Service Centres; Quorn appear disproportionately low.	Allocate additional housing at Land at Farley Way, Quorn	Not stated	DS3
PSLP/558	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates and Bowler Family	The policy is not justified or consistent with national policy because each allocation is for a specific number of dwellings.	Each allocation should be described as being for 'approximately' or 'around' the given number of dwellings. The following additional text could be added through a modification to DS3 to read: The final number of dwellings on each of the allocated sites will be established at the planning application stage, following consideration of site specific detailed design matters and any other relevant planning considerations through a constraints - led masterplan process.	Not stated	DS3
PSLP/561	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Owl Partnerships Ltd, Nottingham Community Housing Association and Inside	The policy is not justified or consistent with national policy because each allocation is for a specific number of dwellings.	Each allocation should be described as being for 'approximately' or 'around' the given number of dwellings. The following additional text could be added through a modification to DS3 to read: The final number of dwellings on each of the allocated sites will be established at the planning application stage, following consideration of site specific detailed design matters and any other relevant planning considerations through a constraints - led masterplan process.	Not stated	DS3
PSLP/535	Juan Murray	TEP obo Leics County Council	Policy is not considered by the respondent to be sound. Same comment is made for policies DS1 and DS2. Justification for this assertion is lack of sites, insufficient flexibility and specific comments regarding lack of allocation of Farley Way.	Soundness issue raised.	Not stated	DS3
PSLP/587	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates	The policy is not justified or consistent with national policy because each allocation is for a specific number of dwellings.	Each allocation should be described as being for 'approximately' or 'around' the given number of dwellings. The following additional text could be added through a modification to DS3 to read: The final number of dwellings on each of the allocated sites will be established at the planning application stage, following consideration of site specific detailed design matters and any other relevant planning considerations through a constraints - led masterplan process.	Not stated	DS3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/326	P Green		The plan is not justified or positively prepared as around Barkby 1500 houses are proposed in addition to the 4500 already approved. Object to the development of greenfield sites including HA1, HA2, HA3 which will coalesce settlements. Increases in road traffic, air pollution and impacts on schools and health services will detriment Barkby	Remove allocations HA1, HA2, HA3	No	DS3
PSLP/338	D Preston		Proposed development around Anstey is not justified as it will turn Anstey into a town; increased traffic and resultant pollution and noise (particularly on Bradgate Road); policing is strained; HA43 will spoil people's views and house values; wildlife will be destroyed; the Leicester and Leicestershire 2050 Plan states that development will be built on small/medium sites; communities are overwhelmed; Anstey has had its fair share of development	Do not support development in Anstey. Anstey needs more shops, schools, doctors, dentists etc.	No	DS3
PSLP/352	P Herbert		The plan is not legally compliant at stakeholders have not been consulted on changes following the original consultation (e.g. HA48 was not originally proposed/ 3 sited were proposed in Barrow). The site selection is not justified. HA48 was selected despite being a 'C' site which is lower suitability than other site. PSH410 was not selected due to 'incongruous urban edge' which suggests prioritisation was given to sited that were not visible over the residents of Willow Road, Barrow, who will lose uninterrupted views as a result of HA48 and Willow Road will have increased traffic.	See site selection point about HA48 vs PSH410.	Yes	DS3
PSLP/616	Eri Wong	Highways England	Each site allocation policy has been reviewed and support the general approach of promoting sustainable travel and measures to reduce the demand for travel. Welcome requirements for individual transport assessments to identify impacts on SRN and mitigate where necessary. Allocations in close proximity to the SRN will be impacted by noise and pollution with potential for exceeding air quality standards. Requirement for appropriate measures to mitigate noise and air quality impact should be applied to HA12, HA30, HA43, HA69, LUA3, LUC3 and ES9.		Yes	DS3
PSLP/321	Mrs Judith Rodgers		The transport model doesn't address detailed traffic problems in key locations in Barrow. eg Soar Bridge; Slash Lane; Grove Lane/South St junction; Cotes Rd/High St junction. It is an inadequate basis for the modelling. Housing numbers have been selected which will just achieve a new school. The impact on the transport network is not considered. Inevitably then, the Local Plan will not achieve a sustainable development and is therefore not legally compliant because it is unsound. The draft plan policy would not achieve sustainable development and is therefore illegal. This policy DS3 has not worked through the implications of its draft plans in this area and would not achieve sustainable development.	If Barrow is to remain a viable Service Centre there need to be very major improvements to the transport network including the creation of a bypass. More infrastructure needed to enable Barrow to cope with more housing The modifications needed to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound in respect of Barrow upon Soar are so fundamental and extensive that Barrow should be removed as a viable service centre for new housing.	No	DS3
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Although we understand that this site is no longer identified in the Local Plan as one for development, we are concerned that the promoters may put forward this site again. Consequently, following advice from Council Officers we have included our case to protect this site. Should the site not be promoted, you do not to consider this submission.	If this land at the top of Leconfield Road is promoted for inclusion in the Local Plan it can be refuted using evidence submitted..	Yes	DS3
PSLP/463	David Hayes		The plan is not justified as site proposals contradict the Council's open space strategy and the NPPF requires they are considered further. Parish boundaries are not respected with parishes joined together and losing local communities.	Reconsider sites in context of open spaces strategy and NPPF. Consider parish boundaries in site assessments.	Not stated	DS3
PSLP/571	Andrew Taylor	Thomas Taylor Planning obo Mr Sbitany	An additional small-scale housing allocation should be made at 34 Brick Kiln Lane, Shepshed. The site is in a sustainable location with strong, defensible boundaries and would round off the edge of the settlement without impacting upon the character and appearance of the area.	Allocate land at 34 Brick Kiln Lane, Shepshed (details provided)	Yes	DS3
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	Recognise the need for housing development in the Borough but are concerned with the scale of allocations at Syston and Thurmaston (HA1, HA2, HA3, HA5, HA7 & HA8). This could undermine delivery of the NEoL SUE and should be subject to independent design reviews to ensure relationships are properly assessed.	Ensure requirements are sufficiently identified for housing allocations at Syston and Thurmaston. Ensure allocations in these locations are subject to independent design reviews.	Yes	DS3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/621	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Hallam Land Management	The policy is not justified or consistent with national policy because each allocation is for a specific number of dwellings.	Each allocation should be described as being for 'approximately' or 'around' the given number of dwellings. The following additional text could be added through a modification to DS3 to read: The final number of dwellings on each of the allocated sites will be established at the planning application stage, following consideration of site specific detailed design matters and any other relevant planning considerations through a constraints and opportunities - led masterplan process.	Yes	DS3
PSLP/576	Stephen Mair	Andrew Granger obo Marriot Family	The plan is not positively prepared or justified due to the need for further allocations. A site is available, deliverable and developable at Chaveney Rd, Quorn for up to 20 dwellings.	Allocate land for up to 20 dwellings at Chaveney Rd, Quorn (illustrative layout provided).	Not stated	DS3
PSLP/631	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land	The policy is not justified or consistent with national policy because each allocation is for a specific number of dwellings.	Each allocation should be described as being for 'approximately' or 'around' the given number of dwellings. The following additional text could be added through a modification to DS3 to read: The final number of dwellings on each of the allocated sites will be established at the planning application stage, following consideration of site specific detailed design matters and any other relevant planning considerations through a constraints - led masterplan process.	Not stated	DS3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/579	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelsons	<p>In order for the Local Plan to be sound it must provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward, and at a sufficient rate, to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period. Because the Council must also identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement, the Plan is also required to identify specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period and then sufficient developable sites, or broad areas of growth, for the remainder of the plan period.</p> <p>The Council has taken the view that, in order to guard against housing land supply related risks, it should identify specific sites to satisfy the entirety of its housing requirement. We agree that this is appropriate and necessary.</p> <p>There is no evidence in the Plan or the SHLAA that confirms or explains why the Council has taken the decision to increase the potential capacity of certain sites. This needs to be confirmed.</p> <p>The plan does not contain any reasoned justification in the Plan to support the assumptions the Council has made about the timescales in which each site is likely to come forward. This needs to be clarified.</p> <p>There are certain draft housing allocations in the Plan that do not reflect the scale of development proposed in applications for planning permission that Council has received. This needs to be corrected.</p> <p>A number of the sites that are proposed to be allocated are not deliverable and are not demonstrably developable either.</p> <p>The Council is relying on its three main SUEs to deliver 47% of the new homes that the Borough needs. This comprises an inherently risky housing strategy. Rates of delivery are challenged. It is stated that this risk must be taken out of the Plan by allocating additional land in sustainable locations.</p> <p>It is calculated that the Plan allocates land that is capable of delivering just 8,285 new homes – 666 fewer than the Council says that the Plan should make the provision for (8,951 net).</p> <p>The Plan does not allocate sufficient specific deliverable sites for years 1-5 of the plan period to enable the Council to achieve a 5 year housing land supply, against the housing requirement expressed in the Plan's strategic housing policies, upon adoption of the Plan</p>	Changes to policy proposed.	Not stated	DS3
PSLP/579	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelsons	<p>The following non allocated sites are promoted in the representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Land at Hallstaead Road, Montsorrel</li> <li>-Development at Burton on the Wolds and Rearsby</li> <li>-Land off Loughborough Road, Burton on the Wolds</li> <li>-Land off Melton Road, Rearsby</li> </ul>	Alternative allocations proposed.	Not stated	DS3
PSLP/633	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land, St Philips, William Davis and Swithland Homes	The policy is not justified or consistent with national policy because each allocation is for a specific number of dwellings.	<p>Each allocation should be described as being for 'approximately' or 'around' the given number of dwellings.</p> <p>The following additional text could be added through a modification to DS3 to read:</p> <p>The final number of dwellings on each of the allocated sites will be established at the planning application stage, following consideration of site specific detailed design matters and any other relevant planning considerations through a constraints - led masterplan process.</p>	Not stated	DS3
PSLP/619	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons	In terms of the proposed allocations as set out at Policy DS3, there are concerns about the suitability and deliverability of a number of the proposed allocations, which demonstrates the need for the Council to review its proposed allocations.	For land off Markfield Lane, Field Head, there is the opportunity to allocate the site to provide some 50 new dwellings, to include much needed affordable housing. Policy DS3 Housing Allocations should be amended to include the site as an additional allocation.	Yes	DS3
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The intention of allocating a variety of sites across the Borough to enable choice in the market and meet guidance set out in paragraphs 68 and 69 of the NPPF is supported		Yes	DS3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/626	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow Homes	<p>There is a danger of over-reliance on new homes at the Leicester Urban Area</p> <p>We consider that greater clarity is needed on the ability of delivery of the site commitments within the plan-period which are seemingly first deducted from the proposed housing need under Policy DS1 to arrive at the proposed allocations under Policy DS3. This is because under-provision against the forecast on commitments could then lead to an under-provision on the proposed sites to the detriment of the Borough.</p> <p>We consider there is sufficient scope, in the search to provide sustainable development, for the Service Centres to play a greater role in delivering land for residential-led development, but importantly development that is not solely housing.</p> <p>Out of the Service Centres Sileby and Barrow Upon Soar have train stations. Anstey is not on a train line and Rothley, Mountsorrel and Quorn are only on the Great Central Railway, with stations only at Rothley and Quorn.</p> <p>In view of the train station and the ability to provide land for an additional 2-form entry primary school, we consider that Sileby is a sustainable location capable of accommodating more than 345 dwellings through proposed allocations.</p> <p>Identification of the site off Ratcliffe Road, Sileby for residential-led development, including land for a primary school, would form a logical progression of the village, which in part adjoins proposed allocation site reference: HA56 Land off Kendal Road (South of Butler Way and Gray Lane), Sileby.</p> <p>This request is supported by a site specific evidence base submitted with these representations including a vision document and masterplanning underpinned by technical and environmental evidence. See cover letter from Savills.</p>	Identification of the site off Ratcliffe Road, Sileby for residential-led development, including land for a primary school, would form a logical progression of the village, which in part adjoins proposed allocation site reference: HA56 Land off Kendal Road (South of Butler Way and Gray Lane), Sileby.	Yes	DS3
PSLP/622	Guy Longley	Pegasus	<p>Although paragraph 2.30 confirms that potential growth at Markfield has been considered in the context of the range of services and facilities being consistent with a Service Centre, no housing allocations are proposed at this location. This representation have been prepared in relation to land to the south of Markfield Lane, Field Head which has the potential to provide some 50 homes in a sustainable location, that is well related to the existing settlement form.</p>	Policy DS3 Housing Allocations should be amended to include the site as an additional allocation.	Yes	DS3
PSLP/598	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons Developments, Redrow Homes and Helen Jean Cope Charity	<p>It is considered that the proposals for allocation of sites at Loughborough is unsound and is not adequately justified or effective. The approach has failed to consider the opportunity for a more strategic approach to growth to the south and south-west of Loughborough, including additional land in our client's control that could deliver important wider benefits. Our clients have interests in land south of Watermead Way, assessed under site reference PSH467 in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The Council has failed to properly appraise a reasonable option of more comprehensive and coordinated development to the south-west of Loughborough that would secure important benefits that are not secured through the proposed allocations.</p> <p>The inclusion of land at Watermead Way would help to rebalance the spatial strategy by refocusing development on Loughborough and would offer a more comprehensive development solution for south-west Loughborough by providing extensive areas of new woodland planting as an extension to the Outwoods, a new Forest Gateway Hub providing improved facilities for recreational access to the Forest, along with the scope for improvements to sustainable transport to serve the proposed residential developments.</p>	Include land off Watermead Way as a new housing allocation in Policy DS3 to provide for at least 500 homes. (Detailed policy wording suggested in representation)	Yes	DS3
PSLP/583	Liberty Stones	Fisher German obo Lone Star	<p>DS3 is not justified because there is a significant disparity in the amount of development within individual 'Other Settlements'. It is unclear why Sturdee Poultry Farm, Burton on the Wolds has not been included particularly because it is sequentially preferable over other allocated sites as a brownfield sites</p>	Include Sturdee Poultry Farm, Burton on the Wolds as an allocation in the Local Plan.	Not stated	DS3
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	<p>The policy is not consistent with national policy as it does not clearly identify that 10% of housing need is being met from sites no larger than one hectare.</p>		Yes	DS3
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	<p>The policy is not effective as the number of homes proposed for HA32 is an estimate and subject to finalisation through more detailed design week.</p>	Amend the number of homes for HA32 to clarify that is indicative.	Yes	DS3
PSLP/572	Daniel Hibbard	We Are Define obo Bloor Homes (Laburnum Way)	<p>Welcomes and supports proposed allocation of Laburnum Way, Loughborough (HA16), which reflects its clear credentials for future development. Site is located in an entirely suitable location, is not subject to any insurmountable technical or environmental constraints, and can accommodate a high-quality residential development. Allocation should be increased to 500 dwellings to achieve efficient use of land. More clarity required in relation to mechanism for delivering school.</p>	Increase capacity of allocation HA16 to 500 dwellings. Provide further clarity in relation to the mechanism for the delivery of the proposed school in site HA15.	Yes	DS3
PSLP/296	Mr Brian Flynn	Cartar Jonas obo LCC Strategic Property Services	<p>Policy DS4 is not positively prepared as there is strong market demand for small/medium units in the service centres, which would not be met by the proposed allocations or existing protected employment sites. Allocations should be made to meet this specific identified need in an Industrial Market Appraisal Report. LCC owned land can be developed to meet this need and three allocations should be made, one at land at Poole Farm and two at land off Barrow Road, Quorn, location plans supplied.</p>	Two additional employment allocations should be included at Quorn and added to the policies map for small/medium sized units at: Area 1: Land north of A6 and east of Barrow Road, Quorn Area 2: Land north of Barrow Road, Quorn Area 3: Land at Poole Farm, Quorn	No	DS4

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/056	Mr Frank Cooper		Allocation of employment land at Dishley Grange is not justified as it does not ensure adequate separation between Loughborough and Hathern and maintain Hathern's village identity.	Remove allocation	No	DS4
PSLP/340	Tony Stott	CPRE	8,900 jobs to 2037 is mentioned in the Exec Summary on the Council's website but not in the plan. It is unclear to us what is the basis for additional employment site allocations beyond the already existing allocations for West of Loughborough, North of Leicester, North of Birstall sites mentioned in Table 3. The plan is not justified as we have concerns over the data that has been used. Figure appears to come from Employment Land Review. Total forecast 18,500 appears to come from HEDNA - these figures are out of date and unreliable. There is no indication of what level of growth is forecast and therefore whether existing supply commitments do actually meet or exceed needs. These are not identified with quantitative data and so it is not clear whether or not whether the translation of the jobs required into land allocations is based on a flawed calculation or not. The forecast requirement for new offices must take into account the changes that Covid-19 has brought about in flexible working. the policy is unsound. The basis on which the requirement for land has been calculated is unclear and confusing. Generalised statements about evidence are not helpful.	Clarification of the basis for calculating the employment need and how the translation of the number of jobs into land allocations was arrived at is required.	No	DS4
PSLP/617	Katie Gulliver	Mulberry Land	The Plan is not positively prepared, justified or effective due to amount and timescales for delivery of employment land. Land north of Syston Road, Cossington is suitable for development with no technical constraints, close to the SRN.	Allocate land north of Syston Road, Cossington	Yes	DS4
PSLP/113	J.Belton	Loughborough FC	The plan contradicts itself, in one section it commits to protecting open spaces particularly football pitches while in another section it commits to a section of the Derby Road Playing Fields being taken for industrial development. CBC has accepted a planning application from the Brackley Property Development Company to industrialise a section of the Derby Road Playing Fields taking out three football pitches. The new local plan has removed the "retain or relocate" clause on the clubs no league stadium which was inserted in the local plan originally. It is necessary and logical to review the employment land area at Dishley that extends onto the Derby Road Playing Fields and takes out the pitches etc. Release the section of the Derby Road Playing Fields to remain what it is supposed to be a sports ground. Failing this the "retain or relocated" clause on the football ground as it is now should be replaced in the new local plan. As the new local plan stands the developers can take out the section of the sports ground with replacing it.	Concerned with employment allocation ES5	Yes	DS4
PSLP/580		Leicestershire County Council Strategic Property Services	Allocation of employment land should consider opportunities within or adjacent to all Service Centres to support economic growth and reduce car travel.	Introduce a general presumption in support of employment growth in all major settlements.	Not stated	DS4
PSLP/535	Juan Murray	TEP obo Leics County Council	We would recommend the Council re-evaluate their position on employment allocations within Quorn, to avoid future issues, by way of more flexible allocations / zones of development.	Reconsideration of employment allocations called for.	Not stated	DS4
PSLP/412	Paul Mizen		The plan is not justified as the employment allocation at the LSEP should be removed as the University should make better use of its existing employment space. There should be restrictions on the design of grey sheds. The allocation at Burleigh Wood will spoil a lovely area used by locals to walk, this area should be preserved as GW.	Remove LSEP from the plan.	Not stated	DS4
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	Allocation ES10, employment land at NEoL SUE includes provision at district & local centres, this should be clarified on the Policies map, including that the land may not come forward solely for employment uses.	Ensure policies map identifies employment land at district & local centres.	Yes	DS4
PSLP/741	Tom Belton	Loughborough FC	Loughborough Football Club does not believe that the proposed local plan is legally compliant in relation to paragraph ES5 – Employment Land at Dishley Grange. The Loughborough Football Club ground is clearly not surplus to requirements. There are no proposals for "equivalent or better provision". It is not justified because it is not reasonable or lawful to build on Loughborough Football Club's ground without plans to replace it, nor is it appropriate to build a warehouse on the land and relocate the football ground when the warehouse could be built on any proposed new site. ES5 will not be effective because the plan to build on the Loughborough Football Club ground is not deliverable over the plan period.	Objects to allocation	Yes	DS4

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/713	Mrs L.Aspinall	Harborough District Council	Whilst the allocation of sites of employment land is an important issue, it is not easily apparent from the Local Plan evidence if consideration has been given to whether the employment provision proposed in the Plan creates a need for an economic uplift of the housing number. Clarity on this issue would be helpful, particularly to aid understanding about how this relates to the level of employment provision, and potential job creation, with its aim to be heavily knowledge, R&D and office based. It is currently not sufficiently clear how this has been reflected in or balanced with housing provision. Similarly, further clarity on whether any of the economic land over-supply is contributing to Leicester's unmet employment need would be helpful. The Plan should make it clear if there is any contribution to the strategic need or to need beyond 2037.	Greater clarity on employment land called for.	No	DS4
PSLP/636	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Trustees of Garendon Estate	The policy is supported and site ES8 (Land off Fairway Road, Shepshed) is a deliverable option for a mixed use scheme comprising housing and employment uses.		Yes	DS4
PSLP/620	Tarmac		Employment Allocation ES1 is supported and future extension of the site is possible. Wider landholdings in flood risk areas can be used to provide net gain		No	DS4
PSLP/664	D Heney		The plan is not justified as there is no significant employer in Charnwood therefore allocations are shortsighted; allocating Loughborough University for employment will only produce a small number of academic staff; allocating employment land counteracts the environmental policies	Allocate an equivalent amount of environmental land as employment land	No	DS4
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	Policy DS3 should require both net zero carbon for new development and high specified standards of climate resilience so that the resulting buildings are fit to live and work in in the future.	Strengthened policy wording called for.	Not stated	DS5
PSLP/180	Mrs Ruth Youngs		This policy is predicted to have minor positive effects in terms of climate change adaptation. The effects could potentially be significant in the longer term depending upon the nature of habitat enhancements, the location and scale of tree planting, and the application of design standards to ensure that new development is resilient to anticipated changes in climate. This depends upon developers responding to the Plan policies proactively which they should be required to do when planning permission is granted.		No	DS5
PSLP/410	Roslyn Deeming	Natural England	Policy DS5 (High Quality Design) – requires greater emphasis upon biodiversity	Policy wording	No	DS5
PSLP/340	Tony Stott	CPRE	Density This policy is unsound because it does not include a minimum density requirement. DS1 sets out the need for 'efficient use of land', but this cannot be achieved without a density policy. While that could be incorporated into DS5 we believe it would have greater weight and ensure that aspect of the plan was deliverable if a specific policy were included. Such a Policy, linked to DS1, DS5, H1 and other relevant policies, is required to make the plan sound. Design Reference to local design codes requires clarification. It is unclear how these will relate to existing codes established within Neighbourhood Plans, Village Design Statements, BfHI or National Codes or how the new codes will be set up and monitored. The plan is not justified - no reference to the effect of the pandemic on design strategy mindful that more people are working from home and many offices are closing thereby releasing potential sites for brownfield residential development. A reference to biodiversity and nature is absent from the list of design requirements for developments set out in DS5 and should be added to the list. Appendix 4 – Design Relies too much on words should use more photos. Some of the illustrations are unclear, confuse rather than enlighten and are open to interpretation.	Consider new density policy (see suggested wording in rep from Hinkley & Bosworth). Design Codes require interpretation and monitoring by a senior design professional within the planning department Include reference to enhancing biodiversity (in line with EV6) in the list of design requirements in DS5	Yes	DS5
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	DS5
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	The policy is supported but should be amended to acknowledge that new development should also comply with design criteria and requirements expressed in relevant Neighbourhood Plans.	Consider suggested amendment to neighbourhood plans.	Yes	DS5
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is not effective as no guidance is provided on the independent design review process.	Set out the requirements for the independent design review process.	Yes	DS5
PSLP/542	Joe Bennett	RCA obo Spitfire Homes	Generally supportive of the policy but use of an independent design review panel introduces expense and delay, also there is not enough guidance on their use.	Add guidance on use of independent design review.	Yes	DS5
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Health Impact Assessments should be included in place-making guidance. Use of independent design reviews and developer funding is supported. Including spaces for nature as well as places being attractive is important. Community spaces for interaction and ensuring they are accessible for all is important	Include references to making a place healthier; space for nature; and community interaction	Yes	DS5

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/580		Leicestershire County Council Property Services	The policy is supported.		Not stated	DS5
PSLP/208	Philip D. Sheppard		Comments on the colour of brick which should enable integration of a development into the landscape.	General comment.	No	DS5
PSLP/413	H Johnson		There is a mismatch in design standards across the Borough for new housing estates. Quality of design and building materials need to be consistent across the Boroughs developments with good design and build finish not just isolated to cherry picked areas.		Not stated	DS5
PSLP/713	Mrs L. Aspinall	Harborough District Council	It would be useful for the supporting text for policy DS5 to refer to the work and output of the L & L Healthy Place Making group. There will be an interactive searchable web resource with examples and ideas. Para 2.135 would seem to be a sensible place to flag the existence of this tool <a href="http://www.healthyplacemaking.co.uk/home">http://www.healthyplacemaking.co.uk/home</a> .	Additional reference called for in text.	No	DS5
PSLP/597	Robert Shields	Burton On The Wolds PC	Policy DS5 is not effective as developers seek to developed standard design and the policy has no rigour	The policy should require a comprehensive design guide for every development that engages local town	No	DS5
PSLP/664	D Heney		The plan is not justified as It does not mention how new housing will be designed in order to hold developers to account.	I requirement for every house to have trees and bushes including in the street scene should be included. Open spaces should be planned for within housing developments	No	DS5
PSLP/572	Daniel Hibbard	We Are Define obo Bloor Homes (Laburnum Way)	Recognise intention of Policy DS5 and notes importance of ensuring high-quality design. Notes that Policy DS5 requires an 'independent design review' for large schemes including HA16, and looks forward to discussing the emerging scheme.	None	Yes	DS5
<b>CHAPTER 2 - DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY - HOUSING SITES</b>						
PSLP/015	Ms Carla Cunningham-Atkins	Barkby Parish Council	Allocation is not justified because it is a greenfield site in the green wedge/area of local separation between Barkby and Syston. Its development would lead to coalescence which is contrary to the plan's aim "to protect landscape character and settlement separation".	Remove or reduce scale of allocation	Yes	HA1
PSLP/015	Ms Carla Cunningham-Atkins	Barkby Parish Council	Allocation is not justified because its development would lead to traffic and air and noise pollution, flooding and burden on local services	Remove or reduce scale of allocation	Yes	HA1
PSLP/016	Mr Christopher Thompson	Barkby Parish Councillor	Housing development in the Barkby and Barkby Thorpe area is not justified due to traffic pollution, lack of services and infrastructure, and the loss of village identity and rural character. No further development was promised in the area after the SUE. Brownfield sites in the City should be developed not green areas.	Remove allocation.	No	HA1
PSLP/175	A.Calyles and S.Carter		We cannot support this proposed plan as the effect it will have on us directly and the immediate area is not one that is good for current residents or the beautiful unspoilt countryside and environment.		No	HA1
PSLP/033	Mr & Mrs G. Braybrook		Allocations in this location are not justified as it will remove areas of green wedge, farmland and areas of separation between Syston, Barkby, Queniborough and Thurmaston. Will increase road traffic, air pollution, flooding and pressure on GPs and schools. Will reduce land's carbon storage.	Remove allocation	No	HA1
PSLP/055	Mr Adam Broome		The allocation is not justified as Syston is overpopulated with lack of schools, doctors and dentists and ever increasing traffic congestion.	Remove allocation	No	HA1
PSLP/058	David & Rosemary Leavesley		Allocations which affect Barkby are not justified as new sites will overwhelm the small rural community already taking 4,500 new houses at Thorpebury. Roads are congested adding to air pollution and there are not enough amenities to cope. Existing flooding will be exacerbated, grade A farmland will be lost, and there will be more antisocial behaviour, littering and dog fouling.	Remove allocation	No	HA1
PSLP/059	Janet Gillett		Sites in the Barkby and Barkby Thorpe area are not justified due to impacts on the environment, flooding, wildlife and wildlife corridors, traffic and air pollution. Infrastructure is not adequate. A variety of homes with space, and affordable housing is needed.	Remove allocation	No	HA1
PSLP/061	Mark & Maggie Weller		Sites close to Barkby and Barkby Thorpe are not justified as they disregard the separation of the villages from surrounding areas making a 'greater Leicester'. Green wedges and areas of separation are a joke. Roads and services will not cope.	Remove allocation	No	HA1
PSLP/062	Altaf Patel		Sites around Barkby, Barkby Thorpe, Syston and Thurmaston are not justified as the area is already heavily populated with houses and will destroy greenfield sites and farmland	Remove allocation	No	HA1
PSLP/068	Trevor Jones		Development of HA1 should include visual and security compensation, and should include a holistic approach to access is required with direct access to Melton Road over the railway line,		Not stated	HA1
PSLP/228	Owen Bentley	Barkby and Barkby Thorpe Action Group (BABTAG)	BABTAG comments to the draft Local Plan in November 2019 concern about the size of HA1 appear to have been ignored. Development of sites HA1, HA2 and HA3 will lead to urban sprawl		Not stated	HA1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/366	Mrs Alixe Taylor	Thurmaston Parish Council (Parish Manager)	The allocation is not justified as any additional housing on Barkby Thorpe Lane will increase traffic problems.	Remove allocation	No	HA1
PSLP/441	Colin Parks	Beeby Parish Meeting	The allocation is not justified as it is a greenfield site and will impact on landscape character and settlement separation; it is a flood plain; increase in traffic volume, noise, pollution and hazards; and additional pressure on local services.	Remove allocation	No	HA1
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	Additional policy wording proposed: "Opportunity for enhanced upstream storage benefitting the Barkby Brook in Syston".	Additional wording to policy	Not stated	HA1
PSLP/069	R Walton		Allocation H1 not justified due to inadequate local highways, town centre health and community infrastructure.	Dwellings on H1 should have an appropriate buffer with Oak Drive and not exceed 2 storey. Propose several specific highways improvements to the local roads and pavements. Propose several priority projects for Syston town centre. Propose a new health and community centre.	No	HA1
PSLP/088	Dwayne Toon		The plan is not justified and HA1 and HA8 should be removed from the plan because the proposals will put Barkby's unique identity at risk. Building in this area would ruin the aspect, character and quality of the approach to Barkby. There is risk of flooding in this area. The road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional amount of traffic. Roads are already busy but congestion and pollution will increase. Housing density is too high in the area. There are many endangered species of birds and animals in this surrounding area. There are rapidly falling birth rates in Leicestershire therefore this amount of homes is not needed.	Remove allocation from plan.	No	HA1
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The allocation is supported, and a vision document and concept masterplan have been produced. Criteria 2 refers to the Exception Test, development will not be within Flood Zone 3 as shown on the masterplan; therefore, mention of the Exception Test in the policy is not consistent with national policy.	Remove reference to Exception Test in policy.	Yes	HA1
PSLP/209	Jaqueline Sheridan		The proposed housing site (HA20) is not positively prepared or justified having regard to the adverse effect upon wildlife and their habitat; and, traffic problems/pollution.		No	HA1
PSLP/268	S Thorne		Allocations HA1, HA2 and HA3 and paragraph 3.195 are not justified as it would deplete the Area of Local Separation between Syston and Barkby/Thurmaston and will result in the community being absorbed into Leicester City.	Remove HA1	No	HA1
PSLP/064	Mr Jonathon M. Feeley		The site is not justified due to coalescence between settlements; additional traffic, congestion and pollution; demands on water supply and waste management; loss of greenspace; loss of agricultural land; impact on the environment; increased demand for power supplies; lack of infrastructure and hospital places; increased urban sprawl; a lack of transparency; and an oversupply of housing with lack of affordability reducing demand.	Remove allocation and prioritise brownfield sites above greenfield ones.	Yes	HA1
PSLP/070	Mrs Dianne weaver		The allocation is not justified due to erosion of areas of separation and green wedge; impact on landscape character and settlement separation; disproportionate development for such a small area; development of greenfield sites leading to coalescence and urban sprawl; increased traffic and air pollution; increased flooding; and the impact on local services.	Remove or reduce scale of allocation	No	HA1
PSLP/423	K Hill		The plan is not justified as HA1, HA2 and HA3 will have a massive impact on Queniborough in terms of traffic, air pollution and will leave no proper area of separation between Syston and Queniborough.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA1
PSLP/713	Mrs L. Aspinall	Harborough District Council	Paragraph 2.66: There are frequent references in the site allocations to the capacity of the site being reduced. It is not clear to what previous iteration of the site this reduction is referring. Further clarity would be welcomed.	Comment on text	No	HA1
PSLP/469	H Solanki		Allocations HA1, HA2 and HA3 are not Positively prepared as they are over concentrated with no green corridors or separation from existing housing; there is a need for more schools GP surgeries and road infrastructure; Development will result in additional flooding in the area.	Ensure that green wedges/ wildlife separating sites HA1, HA2 and HA3 from existing development are incorporated. (similar to HA8 site diagram)	No	HA1
PSLP/015	Ms Carla Cunningham-Atkins	Barkby Parish Council	Allocation is not justified because it is a greenfield site in the area between Barkby, Queniborough and Syston. Its development would lead to coalescence which is contrary to the plan's aim "to protect landscape character and settlement separation".	Remove or reduce scale of allocation	Yes	HA2
PSLP/015	Ms Carla Cunningham-Atkins	Barkby Parish Council	Allocation is not justified because its development would lead to traffic and air and noise pollution, flooding and burden on local services	Remove or reduce scale of allocation	Yes	HA2
PSLP/016	Mr Christopher Thompson	Barkby Parish Councillor	Housing development in the Barkby and Barkby Thorpe area is not justified due to traffic pollution, lack of services and infrastructure, and the loss of village identity and rural character. No further development was promised in the area after the SUE. Brownfield sites in the City should be developed not green areas.	Remove allocation	No	HA2
PSLP/175	A.Calyles and S.Carter		We cannot support this proposed plan as the effect it will have on us directly and the immediate area is not one that is good for current residents or the beautiful unspoilt countryside and environment.		No	HA2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/033	Mr & Mrs G. Braybrook		Allocations in this location are not justified as it will remove areas of green wedge, farmland and areas of separation between Syston, Barkby, Queniborough and Thurmaston. Will increase road traffic, air pollution, flooding and pressure on GPs and schools. Will reduce land's carbon storage.	Remove allocation	No	HA2
PSLP/055	Mr Adam Broome		The allocation is not justified as Syston is overpopulated with lack of schools, doctors and dentists and ever increasing traffic congestion.	Remove allocation	No	HA2
PSLP/058	David & Rosemary Leavesley		Allocations which affect Barkby are not justified as new sites will overwhelm the small rural community already taking 4,500 new houses at Thorpebury. Roads are congested adding to air pollution and there are not enough amenities to cope. Existing flooding will be exacerbated, grade A farmland will be lost, and there will be more antisocial behaviour, littering and dog fouling.	Remove allocation	No	HA2
PSLP/059	Janet Gillett		Sites in the Barkby and Barkby Thorpe area are not justified due to impacts on the environment, flooding, wildlife and wildlife corridors, traffic and air pollution. Infrastructure is not adequate. A variety of homes with space, and affordable housing is needed.	Remove allocation	No	HA2
PSLP/061	Mark & Maggie Weller		Sites close to Barkby and Barkby Thorpe are not justified as they disregard the separation of the villages from surrounding areas making a 'greater Leicester'. Green wedges and areas of separation are a joke. Roads and services will not cope.	Remove allocation	No	HA2
PSLP/062	Altaf Patel		Sites around Barkby, Barkby Thorpe, Syston and Thurmaston are not justified as the area is already heavily populated with houses and will destroy greenfield sites and farmland	Remove allocation	No	HA2
PSLP/441	Colin Perks	Beeby Parish Meeting	The allocation is not justified as it is a greenfield site and will impact on landscape character and settlement separation; it is a flood plain; increase in traffic volume, noise, pollution and hazards; and additional pressure on local services.	Remove allocation	No	HA2
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	HA2
PSLP/241	Miss Kathryn Hill		The proposed housing site (HA2) is not positively prepared or justified as the allocation retains no separation between Queniborough and Syston – leading to increased traffic and pollution.		No	HA2
PSLP/032	Mrs Patricia Wherton		Housing development on farmland in Syston is not justified because of impact on wildlife invasion of privacy and damage to outlook for existing residents.	Consider impact of development on existing residential properties.	Yes	HA2
PSLP/064	Mr Jonathon M. Feeley		The site is not justified due to coalescence between settlements; additional traffic, congestion and pollution; demands on water supply and waste management; loss of greenspace; loss of agricultural land; impact on the environment; increased demand for power supplies; lack of infrastructure and hospital places; increased urban sprawl; a lack of transparency; and an oversupply of housing with lack of affordability reducing demand.	Remove allocation and prioritise brownfield sites above greenfield ones.	Yes	HA2
PSLP/070	Mrs Diane Weaver		The allocation is not justified due to erosion of areas of separation and green wedge; impact on landscape character and settlement separation; disproportionate development for such a small area; development of greenfield sites leading to coalescence and urban sprawl; increased traffic and air pollution; increased flooding; and the impact on local services.	Reduce or remove allocation	No	HA2
PSLP/423	K Hill		The plan is not justified as HA1, HA2 and HA3 will have a massive impact on Queniborough in terms of traffic, air pollution and will leave no proper area of separation between Syston and Queniborough.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA2
PSLP/579	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelsons	Jelson welcomes the Council's proposal to allocate its site at Barkby Road in Syston for development in the Plan and the adjusted capacity figure which reflects the initial masterplanning work. This shows that the site is capable of accommodating 270 dwellings without giving rise to any unacceptable adverse impacts.		Not stated	HA2
PSLP/015	Ms Carla Cunningham-Atkins	Barkby Parish Council	Allocation is not justified because it is a greenfield site in the area between Barkby, Queniborough and Syston. Its development would lead to coalescence which is contrary to the plan's aim "to protect landscape character and settlement separation".	Remove or reduce scale of allocation	Yes	HA3
PSLP/015	Ms Carla Cunningham-Atkins	Barkby Parish Council	Allocation is not justified because its development would lead to traffic and air and noise pollution, flooding and burden on local services	Remove or reduce scale of allocation	Yes	HA3
PSLP/016	Mr Christopher Thompson	Barkby Parish Councillor	ousing development in the Barkby and Barkby Thorpe area is not justified due to traffic pollution, lack of services and infrastructure, and the loss of village identity and rural character. No further development was promised in the area after the SUE. Brownfield sites in the City should be developed not green areas.	Remove allocation	No	HA3
PSLP/175	A.Calyles and S.Carter		We cannot support this proposed plan as the effect it will have on us directly and the immediate area is not one that is good for current residents or the beautiful unspoilt countryside and environment.		No	HA3
PSLP/033	Mr & Mrs G. Braybrook		Allocations in this location are not justified as it will remove areas of green wedge, farmland and areas of separation between Syston, Barkby, Queniborough and Thurmaston. Will increase road traffic, air pollution, flooding and pressure on GPs and schools. Will reduce land's carbon storage.	Remove allocation	No	HA3
PSLP/055	Mr Adam Broome		The allocation is not justified as Syston is overpopulated with lack of schools, doctors and dentists and ever increasing traffic congestion.	Remove allocation	No	HA3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/058	David & Rosemary Leavesley		Allocations which affect Barkby are not justified as new sites will overwhelm the small rural community already taking 4,500 new houses at Thorpebury. Roads are congested adding to air pollution and there are not enough amenities to cope. Existing flooding will be exacerbated, grade A farmland will be lost and there will be more antisocial behaviour, littering and dog fouling.	Remove allocation	No	HA3
PSLP/059	Janet Gillett		Sites in the Barkby and Barkby Thorpe area are not justified due to impacts on the environment, flooding, wildlife and wildlife corridors, traffic and air pollution. Infrastructure is not adequate. A variety of homes with space, and affordable housing is needed.	Remove allocation	No	HA3
PSLP/061	Mark & Maggie Weller		Sites close to Barkby and Barkby Thorpe are not justified as they disregard the separation of the villages from surrounding areas making a 'greater Leicester'. Green wedges and areas of separation are a joke. Roads and services will not cope.	Remove allocation	No	HA3
PSLP/062	Altaf Patel		Sites around Barkby, Barkby Thorpe, Syston and Thurmaston are not justified as the area is already heavily populated with houses and will destroy greenfield sites and farmland	Remove allocation	No	HA3
PSLP/441	Colin Perks	Beeby Parish Meeting	The allocation is not justified as it is a greenfield site and will impact on landscape character and settlement separation; it is a flood plain; increase in traffic volume, noise, pollution and hazards; and additional pressure on local services.	Remove allocation	No	HA3
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	HA3
PSLP/241	Miss Kathryn Hill		The proposed housing site (HA3) is not positively prepared or justified as the allocation retains no separation between Queniborough and Syston – leading to increased traffic and pollution.		No	HA3
PSLP/064	Mr Jonathon M. Feeley		The site is not justified due to coalescence between settlements; additional traffic, congestion and pollution; demands on water supply and waste management; loss of greenspace; loss of agricultural land; impact on the environment; increased demand for power supplies; lack of infrastructure and hospital places; increased urban sprawl; a lack of transparency; and an oversupply of housing with lack of affordability reducing demand.	Remove allocation and prioritise brownfield sites above greenfield ones.	Yes	HA3
PSLP/070	Mrs Diane Weaver		The allocation is not justified due to erosion of areas of separation and green wedge; impact on landscape character and settlement separation; disproportionate development for such a small area; development of greenfield sites leading to coalescence and urban sprawl; increased traffic and air pollution; increased flooding; and the impact on local services.	Reduce or remove allocation	No	HA3
PSLP/423	K Hill		The plan is not justified as HA1, HA2 and HA3 will have a massive impact on Queniborough in terms of traffic, air pollution and will leave no proper area of separation between Syston and Queniborough.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA3
PSLP/595	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey	The draft allocation is supported. Taylor Wimpey (UK) Limited also control land South East of Syston (Policy HA1) to the south of Barkby Road. The two sites will be masterplanned and delivered by Taylor Wimpey (UK) Limited as part of a comprehensive development, however separate representations are submitted in relation to those land interests. Paragraph 2.68 suggests that there is a need for two points of access to the site due to evidence on surface water flooding and ponding. This does not reflect the findings of the SFRA, or the Flood Risk Assessment and modelling exercise undertaken, as set out above. Furthermore, Taylor Wimpey (UK) Limited does not have ownership along the northern and western site boundaries, and whilst footpaths and drainage connections can be provided, vehicular access to Site HA2 is not deliverable. For these reasons, the reference to requiring two points of access within policy commentary should be removed. The proposed allocation north of Barkby Road represents a deliverable opportunity which can commence delivery on site within the five-year period. The proposed allocation is sound, and the site should be retained as an allocation within the Local Plan to provide for 195 dwellings.	Change to wording regarding access in para 2.68.	Yes	HA3
PSLP/598	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons Developments, Redrow Homes and Helen Jean Cope Charity	From a review of the Housing Needs Assessment Update Report, 2021, the Council has failed to provide sufficient local evidence of need or viability to justify the policy and it should therefore be deleted.	If the Council decides to proceed with the policy, transitional arrangements for its implementation should be set out, allowing sites to move through the planning system before any policy requirements are enforced.	Yes	HA3
PSLP/634	K Hubbard		Concern that allocation HA3 is prone to flooding (photography provided) and supports wildlife		No	HA3
PSLP/033	Mr & Mrs G. Braybrook		Allocations in this location are not justified as it will remove areas of green wedge, farmland and areas of separation between Syston, Barkby, Queniborough and Thurmaston. Will increase road traffic, air pollution, flooding and pressure on GPs and schools. Will reduce land's carbon storage.	Remove allocation	No	HA4
PSLP/055	Mr Adam Broome		The allocation is not justified as Syston is overpopulated with lack of schools, doctors and dentists and ever increasing traffic congestion.	Remove allocation	No	HA4
PSLP/062	Altaf Patel		Sites around Barkby, Barkby Thorpe, Syston and Thurmaston are not justified as the area is already heavily populated with houses and will destroy greenfield sites and farmland	Remove allocation	No	HA4

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/537	Neil Cox	Evolve obo Bloor Homes	The allocation of the site at Queniborough Lodge for 132 homes is supported as sound.		Yes	HA4
PSLP/128	C Chapman		The allocation HA4 is not justified as it will have a negative impact on Queniborough's infrastructure.		No	HA4
PSLP/241	Miss Kathryn Hill		The proposed housing site (HA4) is not positively prepared or justified as no regard is paid to the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). The site is incorrectly referred to as Syston not Queniborough where the NP applies.		No	HA4
PSLP/054	Mrs Elaine M. Jordan		Allocation is not justified due to lack of consideration of residents' opinions; loss of land separating Syston, Queniborough and East Goscote; loss of village identity and lack of facilities and infrastructure to support development. Queniborough has already been overdeveloped. The site falls under Queniborough and not Syston as the plan states.	Remove or reduce scale of allocation	No	HA4
PSLP/423	K Hill		The plan is not justified because HA4 - Queniborough Lodge is not in Syston, it is in Queniborough. The site has also been allocated in the Queniborough Neighbourhood Plan and this should be noted.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA4
PSLP/075	Mr Anthony Bennett		The allocation is not justified due to erosion of the character of the village; loss of agricultural land and habitat; erosion of separation from East Goscote; lack of infrastructure and employment; increased traffic, noise and air pollution; full schools and doctors; overstretched emergency services; restricted access and an increase in crime.	Remove allocation	No	HA4
PSLP/426	Barry Reeves		The allocation is not justified as the scale of development, when combined with other allocations in Queniborough, is not suitable for the village. Doctors, schools are oversubscribed. There is no increased employment proposed which will increase commuting and is unsustainable. The site is in Queniborough parish not Syston.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA4
PSLP/579	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelsons	In Jelson's view draft housing allocations HA4, should be deleted from Policy DS3 given there is little prospect of the site coming forward for housing during the plan period.	Delete allocation	Not stated	HA4
PSLP/055	Mr Adam Broome		The allocation is not justified as Syston is overpopulated with lack of schools, doctors and dentists and ever increasing traffic congestion.	Remove allocation	No	HA5
PSLP/055	Mr Adam Broome		The allocation is not justified as Syston is overpopulated with lack of schools, doctors and dentists and ever increasing traffic congestion.	Remove allocation	No	HA6
PSLP/033	Mr & Mrs G. Braybrook		Allocations in this location are not justified as it will remove areas of green wedge, farmland and areas of separation between Syston, Barkby, Queniborough and Thurmaston. Will increase road traffic, air pollution, flooding and pressure on GPs and schools. Will reduce land's carbon storage.	Remove allocation	No	HA7
PSLP/058	David & Rosemary Leavesley		Allocations which affect Barkby are not justified as new sites will overwhelm the small rural community already taking 4,500 new houses at Thorpebury. Roads are congested adding to air pollution and there are not enough amenities to cope. Existing flooding will be exacerbated, grade A farmland will be lost, and there will be more antisocial behaviour, littering and dog fouling.	Remove allocation	No	HA7
PSLP/059	Janet Gillett		Sites in the Barkby and Barkby Thorpe area are not justified due to impacts on the environment, flooding, wildlife and wildlife corridors, traffic and air pollution. Infrastructure is not adequate. A variety of homes with space, and affordable housing is needed.	Remove allocation	No	HA7
PSLP/061	Mark & Maggie Weller		Sites close to Barkby and Barkby Thorpe are not justified as they disregard the separation of the villages from surrounding areas making a 'greater Leicester'. Green wedges and areas of separation are a joke. Roads and services will not cope.	Remove allocation	No	HA7
PSLP/062	Mr Altaf Patel		Sites around Barkby, Barkby Thorpe, Syston and Thurmaston are not justified as the area is already heavily populated with houses and will destroy greenfield sites and farmland	Remove allocation	No	HA7
PSLP/367	Mrs Alixe Taylor	Thurmaston Parish Council (Parish Manager)	The allocation is not justified as any additional housing on Barkby Thorpe Lane will increase traffic problems.	Remove allocation	No	HA7
PSLP/522	Mrs Rawle		There are concerns about flooding on the development.		Not stated	HA7
PSLP/590	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Bellway	Policy DS3 (HA7) is not justified because it is not clear how the quantum of development has been arrived at and it is not clear whether the capacity is absolute a minimum or a maximum. The amount of development within withdrawn (P/14/1670/2) application (225 homes) suggest that quantum in housing allocation is significantly off the mark. The amount of development should be sufficiently flexible to allow for the funding of new infrastructure. There is no justification for the housing site areas identified in diagram at paragraph 2.71 and is overly restrictive, and should be led by constraints led master planning exercise. Policy wording "extensive tree planting" and "enhance the visual separation between settlements" is not based upon evidence. Policy DS3 (HA7) is not effective as penultimate bullet point refers to delivery and phasing arrangements for the whole allocation and objection to the delivery of HA7 relying on an agreed masterplan and delivery/phasing arrangement across the North East of Leicester SUE.	Proposed modifications to Policy DS3 (HA7) : "are accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, or similar document, that sets seeks to minimise the impact of the development on the settlement identities of Thurmaston and Syston, safeguards the route of the road that will serve the North East of Leicester Sustainable Urban Extension and incorporates appropriate landscaping to support the visual separation between the settlements."	Not stated	HA7

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/064	Mr Jonathon M. Feeley		The site is not justified due to coalescence between settlements; additional traffic, congestion and pollution; demands on water supply and waste management; loss of greenspace; loss of agricultural land; impact on the environment; increased demand for power supplies; lack of infrastructure and hospital places; increased urban sprawl; a lack of transparency; and an oversupply of housing with lack of affordability reducing demand.	Remove allocation and prioritise brownfield sites above greenfield ones.	Yes	HA7
PSLP/070	Mrs Diane Weaver		The allocation is not justified due to erosion of areas of separation and green wedge; impact on landscape character and settlement separation; disproportionate development for such a small area; development of greenfield sites leading to coalescence and urban sprawl; increased traffic and air pollution; increased flooding; and the impact on local services.	Reduce or remove allocation	No	HA7
PSLP/175	A.Calyles and S.Carter		We cannot support this proposed plan as the effect it will have on us directly and the immediate area is not one that is good for current residents or the beautiful unspoilt countryside and environment.		No	HA8
PSLP/033	Mr & Mrs G. Braybrook		Allocations in this location are not justified as it will remove areas of green wedge, farmland and areas of separation between Syston, Barkby, Queniborough and Thurmaston. Will increase road traffic, air pollution, flooding and pressure on GPs and schools. Will reduce land's carbon storage.	Remove allocation	No	HA8
PSLP/062	Altaf Patel		Sites around Barkby, Barkby Thorpe, Syston and Thurmaston are not justified as the area is already heavily populated with houses and will destroy greenfield sites and farmland	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA8
PSLP/088	Dwayne Toon		The plan is not justified and HA1 and HA8 should be removed from the plan because the proposals will put Barkby's unique identity at risk. Building in this area would ruin the aspect, character and quality of the approach to Barkby. There is risk of flooding in this area. The road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional amount of traffic. Roads are already busy but congestion and pollution will increase. Housing density is too high in the area. There are many endangered species of birds and animals in this surrounding area. There are rapidly falling birth rates in Leicestershire therefore this amount of homes is not needed.	Remove allocation from plan.	No	HA8
PSLP/579	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelsons	Jelson supports the inclusion of its land holdings at Woodgate Nurseries in the Plan. However, it notes that the corresponding policy says that the site could accommodate 39 dwelling, whereas, Jelson has undertaken its own detailed site assessment which suggests that the site would be capable of accommodating 46 dwellings without giving rise to any severe adverse impacts	Supports allocation but with a higher housing figure.	Not stated	HA8
PSLP/026	Cllr Deborah Taylor	Borough and County Councillor	The allocation is not justified, Anstey has already taken a large amount of housing giving rise to substantial traffic causing queuing on Cropston Road at The Nook. More housing on Groby Road will send traffic to The Nook on Bradgate Road causing more queuing. Increasing pressure on services (doctors, dentists, chemists etc.) with expansion limited by car park capacity. Fewer buses serve the area than previously, and developer funded services will stop after time. No bank in village. Only one way in and out of Anstey, unlike other service centres. Anstey is used to access other villages, as the gateway to Charnwood Forest needs to retain its rural and village feel, it is becoming an urban centre. Ashton Green built in the city, will affect traffic congestion along with Leicester city's plans to develop at Thurmaston. Opening the A50 junction could provide some mitigation but would use blind junction at Groby Rd/Bradgate Rd. Anstey cannot take 900 more houses and growth is unsustainable. Plan is not viable, sound or innovative.	Remove allocation. Consider SUE not additional development at villages where roads and services cannot cope. No guarantee infrastructure can be secured so plan cannot prove it is deliverable. SUE infrastructure costs would be less than adding to existing villages.	No	HA12
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	The plan is not justified as the allocation is assigned to Glenfield but falls within Anstey parish and should be recorded as such. The scale of development in Anstey will have a detrimental impact on the village and exacerbate severe traffic situation. The Plan is not justified without an assessment of the impact of additional traffic on Anstey village centre.	Assign allocation to Anstey and consider removal due to impact.	No	HA12
PSLP/546	Tamsin Cottle	P&DG obo William Davis / Chapman Estates	DS3 HA12 is not positively prepared as numbers for each site should be approximate and final numbers informed by high quality masterplanning. The reference to poor accessibility / and not within or in close proximity to a large urban area in topic paper and Chapter 6 of SA report regarding site PSH144 is not accurate and not consistent with table 6.2 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report. The assessment of heritage impact in the SA report of site in the SA report are not justified. Site HA12 is single ownership with single housebuilder and deliverable. The policy requirement for 1FE primary school is not justified having regard to capacity within existing primary schools in Anstey, their potential to expand, and also to primary school provision in neighbouring areas. The policy requirement for 1FE primary school is not effective as DfE recommends 2FE primary schools for viability reasons. Site HA12 must not be tied to the delivery of cross boundary sites notwithstanding recognised need for good connectivity and comprehensive development.	2nd bullet point insert "other than for the provision of necessary infrastructure" after landscape and before retain the Park Pale. 4th bullet start of bullet insert "if required and justified taking into account potential capacity and provision in the wider area. A 4th bullet insert at end of bullet: "including adjoining development in Blaby and Leicester".	No	HA12

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/586	Chris Bell	Blaby District Council	The policy should explicitly state that the masterplan should include the parts of the site within Blaby District and Leicester City, should those local planning authorities look to bring forward land within their area, as well as the area within Charnwood Borough. This would ensure that there is comprehensive development across the administrative boundaries. Policy needs to have a stronger requirement for proposals to incorporate the Green Wedge function on this site. Blaby District Council is supportive of joint working to develop the emerging concept masterplan and the appropriate extent of Green Wedge and other designations. It is noted that the HA12 'Key Diagram' is for illustrative purposes only.	The policy should state: ".....a masterplan to be agreed which includes delivery and phasing arrangements for the whole allocation, including those areas within Blaby District and Leicester City, if allocated in their respected local plans, in order to achieve comprehensive development;....."	Not stated	HA12
PSLP/374	R West		Diagram HA12 shows the proposed land allocation of sectors HA12 and HA13. These are within the parish of Anstey and the borough of Charnwood but the plan states part of this allocation is within the parish of Glenfield, this is incorrect.		Not stated	HA12
PSLP/123	Carole West		The HA12, HA13, HA43 and HA44 are not justified, no infrastructure has been put in place for applications already approved near HA43. Infrastructure will come forward in a piecemeal fashion. Local roads are narrow, dangerous and parking is insufficient. There is already congestion at the Nook and little opportunity to cycle. There are limited local services and facilities and where there is, they are oversubscribed. The proposals will impact on biodiversity, ancient hedgerows and wildlife and result in a loss of farmland. There is risk of flooding and the sewers will not be able to cope. The proposals will destroy the sense of community and local character of Anstey.	Remove allocations	Not stated	HA12
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The policy does not indicate the site is part of a wider 'cross-boundary' development and should cover the development in its entirety.	Amend policy to ensure 'cross-boundary' masterplanning.	Yes	HA12
PSLP/318	M Molesdale		Allocation HA12 is not justified as it will destroy ancient ridge and furrow.	Develop brownfield sites and don't destroy green field and habitats.	Yes	HA12
PSLP/357	H. Molesdale		Building on a flood plain where the Rothley Brook runs will damage important habitats and have detrimental affects further downstream. Anstey will be overwhelmed by the additional housing making roads unsafe and put additional pressure on health services, schools and local shops/amenities. The local SSSIs and Sheet Hedges Wood will be adversely affected as will ancient ridge and furrow features. Traffic infrastructure is not sufficient to deal with more use and the A50 junction is already dangerous.	A range of objections to the allocation.	No	HA12
PSLP/588	Rupert Harrison	Andrew Granger obo Col. And Mrs Martin	Amendment to site proposed which would provide greater flexibility for the delivery of housing numbers across the site, will enable a comprehensive approach to be taken to boundary treatment, landscaping etc. for the whole of the site area adjoining Anstey Lane and will also allow for delivery of more efficient and comprehensive layout.	Site boundary for proposed allocation HA12 should be extended to incorporate our client's field.	Yes	HA12
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The allocation is supported.		Yes	HA12
PSLP/026	Cllr Deborah Taylor	Borough and County Councillor	The allocation is not justified, Anstey has already taken a large amount of housing giving rise to substantial traffic causing queuing on Cropston Road at The Nook. More housing on Groby Road will send traffic to The Nook on Bradgate Road causing more queuing. Increasing pressure on services (doctors, dentists, chemists etc.) with expansion limited by car park capacity. Fewer buses serve the area than previously, and developer funded services will stop after time. No bank in village. Only one way in and out of Anstey, unlike other service centres. Anstey is used to access other villages, as the gateway to Charnwood Forest needs to retain its rural and village feel, it is becoming an urban centre. Ashton Green built in the city, will affect traffic congestion along with Leicester city's plans to develop at Thurcaston. Opening the A50 junction could provide some mitigation but would use blind junction at Groby Rd/Bradgate Rd. Anstey cannot take 900 more houses and growth is unsustainable. Plan is not viable, sound or innovative.	Remove allocation. Consider SUE not additional development at villages where roads and services cannot cope. No guarantee infrastructure can be secured so plan cannot prove it is deliverable. SUE infrastructure costs would be less than adding to existing villages.	No	HA13
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	The plan is not justified as the allocation is assigned to Glenfield but falls within Anstey parish and should be recorded as such. The scale of development in Anstey will have a detrimental impact on the village and exacerbate severe traffic situation.	Assign allocation to Anstey and consider removal due to impact.	No	HA13
PSLP/123	Carole West		The HA12, HA13, HA43 and HA44 are not justified, no infrastructure has been put in place for applications already approved near HA43. Infrastructure will come forward in a piecemeal fashion. Local roads are narrow, dangerous and parking is insufficient. There is already congestion at the Nook and little opportunity to cycle. There are limited local services and facilities and where there is, they are oversubscribed. The proposals will impact on biodiversity, ancient hedgerows and wildlife and result in a loss of farmland. There is risk of flooding and the sewers will not be able to cope. The proposals will destroy the sense of community and local character of Anstey.	Remove allocations	Not stated	HA13
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The allocation is supported.		Yes	HA13
PSLP/040	Mr Simon D. Blackburn		The allocation is not justified as it does not take account of narrow access of Cliffe Rd and Henson Close. Cliffe Rd, railway bridge and sections of Park Rd private unadopted roads. Road surface and load bearing capacity unsuitable.	Remove allocation	No	HA14
PSLP/060	Mrs J.A. Headley		The allocation is not justified as Henson Close and Cliffe Rd are small roads which will not support the heavy traffic; increased pollution; risk of accidents; and destroy the landscape and wildlife. Development not needed, can be built on brownfield land.	Remove allocation	No	HA14

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/098	Mrs Victoria Featherstone		Oppose the allocation of HA14 as it is an important green barrier between the city and county, loss of green space for wellbeing, loss of wildlife, increased demand on schools, doctors and roads, impact on parking on Cliffe Road, highway safety including additional traffic on Green Gate Lane.	Remove Allocation	No	HA14
PSLP/082	R Irish		Allocation of HA14 not justified as this is Green Wedge, historic ridge and furrow, historic hedge row, and rich in wildlife. Access via Henson Close/Cliff Road is restricted by covenant - the only suitable access is via Park Road which is unadopted highway.	Remove allocation. Use this south facing land as a solar installation	No	HA14
PSLP/102	D Young		Allocation of HA14 is not justified as it provides separation between Birstall and Leicester City, its development is contrary to the Ashton Green Masterplan, and contains many recorded and unrecorded rights of way. A DMMO application will be made to recognise several walking/ cycling routes.	Remove Allocation	Yes	HA14
PSLP/137	J Beckett		Allocation of H14 is not justified as loss of undeveloped area will deprive locals of relaxation, proposed access via Park Road, Fielding Road and Cliffe Road is unadopted highway; Henson Road and Cliffe Road are too narrow, underground water mains run through the site	Remove allocation	No	HA14
PSLP/159	T Twell		Allocation of H14 is not justified as Paragraph 6.3.14 of the Sustainability Appraisal states HA14 scores poorly on accessibility, which is not emphasised in the Plan. Roads surrounding HA14 are not suitable due to Cliffe Road being unadopted; unsuitable width of 5.5m; existing parking issues; not suitable for construction traffic. HA14 becomes marshy in the winter due to the stream on Birstall golf course.	Remove allocation HA14	No	HA14
PSLP/169	B Cutler		Allocation of H14 is not justified as the site provides separation between Charnwood and Leicester City; the footpaths provide recreation and wellbeing; wildlife uses the site; Park Road and Cliffe Road are unadopted and cannot support the development including construction traffic; the Great Central Railway Bridge is unsuitable to support development; local health infrastructure is at capacity.	Additional access points via Ashton Green Road or Greengate Lane should be considered.	No	HA14
PSLP/187	R Irish	Residents of Henclyff Park	Allocation of HA14 not justified as this is Green Wedge, historic ridge and furrow, historic hedge row, and rich in wildlife. Access via Henson Close/Cliff Road is restricted by covenant - the only suitable access is via Park Road which is unadopted highway.	Remove allocation. Use this south facing land as a solar installation	No	HA14
PSLP/240	Mrs Elizabeth Pell		The proposed housing site (HA14) is not positively prepared or justified by virtue of the detrimental impact of increased traffic (including construction traffic) upon the existing road network and the disturbance to local residents. Moreover, the Green Wedge land should be retained as an area of separation and in the interests of wildlife and their habitat.	Remove this policy from the Plan.	No	HA14
PSLP/282	S Snow		Allocation HA14 is not justified as there has been no public consultation; it will half the size of an existing green wedge reducing its open space value; access via unadopted roads Cliffe Rd and Henson Close will exacerbate access and parking issues including for refuse and pedestrians; loss of wildlife and protected trees	Remove HA14	No	HA14
PSLP/283	L Hazlewood		Allocation HA14 is not justified as surrounding access roads are not wide enough to support access or traffic including for emergency services; access would be via unadopted roads which are maintained by residents who need to be consulted; the Park Road GCR bridge could weaken the structure; it will impact the quiet character of the area; there would be a loss of green space/ wildlife/ trees which absorb pollution	Remove HA14	No	HA14
PSLP/268	S Thorne		Allocation HA14 and paragraph 2.76 are not justified as it would overturn a previous decision to have a Green Wedge between Birstall and Leicester City; would cross a public footpath and encroaches on a local wildlife site.	Remove HA14 and retain green wedge	No	HA14
PSLP/272	Peter Greswell		The plan is not justified because there is not sufficient parking available at HA14. There is difficulty for service vehicles to pass through and it is unsafe for pedestrians. Cliffe Road is totally unsuitable for the purpose of access to the proposed site. The site appears to be in an area of local separation as per EV3. The development will not maintain separate identities of our towns and cities as per EV1.	Remove HA14 from the plan.	No	HA14
PSLP/301	J Middleton		Allocation HA14 is not justified as access is via Park Road which is unadopted highway which residents maintain at their own cost; Park Road is not suited for increased traffic including emergency services.		Yes	HA14
PSLP/312	R Pugsley		Allocation of HA14 is not justified or consistent with national policy as it is against government advice of prioritising brownfield sites; Cliffe Road is unadopted and maintained by residents; the remaining Green Wedge is important to separate Birstall from Beaumont Leys.	Remove allocation HA14	Yes	HA14
PSLP/050	Mr Christopher J. Rollings		Allocation is not justified due to narrow, unsuitable, dangerous access; disruption of green belt; and loss of green space. Brownfield sites which do not destroy the environment should be used.	Remove allocation	Yes	HA14
PSLP/052	Mrs Susan Hind		Allocation is not justified due to loss of green space for recreation and reduced separation between residential areas; negative impact on community recreation and wellbeing; loss of unique character of Victorian housing; and inadequate, unadopted access road causing safety issue, congestion and air pollution.	Remove allocation and build on the field near the Ashton Green development to reduce impacts on local people and the environment.	No	HA14
PSLP/480	Jane Anger & Jane Watts		The allocation is not justified as it is not sustainable development. It will build on Green Wedge, destroying green space and wildlife habitat. The development will contribute to flood risk; overflow of drains and sewerage infrastructure; and loss of natural green space for recreation. It is contrary to Policy LUA1 and DS1 due to impact on the Green Wedge. It should be viewed in the context of development in the city. There are not good public transport links as buses are unreliable. Birstall does not have good leisure facilities.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA14

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/517	C Mayoh		The plan is not justified because there is unacceptable traffic around HA14. Parking and road safety are an issue. The character of that area will be lost for ever. This is the historic area of the village which will disappear. There will be an increase in noise, loss of green space and wildlife. There is a flood risk issue. Health care and schools won't be able to cope.		No	HA14
PSLP/726	Cllr Ann Marshall	Birstall Parish Council	It is vital to preserve green spaces - the value of these has been highlighted during the pandemic. Is it worth building 35 houses in a field in Birstall? Low numbers in the scheme of things and loss of valuable green space and separation. Residents like to feel a sense of community rather than being part of an urban sprawl. Wildlife habitat and valuable footpaths for exercise and outdoor environment need to be preserved.	Objects to allocation	No	HA14
PSLP/579	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelsons	Jelson welcomes the Council's proposal to allocate its site at Cliffe Road / Henson Close for development in the Plan, however, there does not appear to be any evidence that underpins the conclusions that the Council has reached in respect of the need to restrict development to the south east corner of the site. In this respect the Plan is not justified, and we would propose modifications so that it meets the tests of soundness.	Consider site boundaries. Discussions sought with Council.	Not stated	HA14
PSLP/389	J Palmer		Allocation HA14 is not justified as it would cause unnecessary disruption in addition to the Broadnook development; and the land provides an area of separation from Ashton Green	Remove allocation	No	HA14
PSLP/452	S Young		Allocation HA14 is not justified as the site supports wildlife; access would be via an unadopted road which is maintained by residents and could not accommodate additional traffic/ construction; the access road is not wide enough; GP services in Birstall are over subscribed; a large amount of development is already proposed in Birstall; Development will detriment the quiet character of the area		No	HA14
PSLP/453	A Marlow		Allocation HA14 is not justified as development will compromise the green wedge and area of local separation between Leicester and Ashton Green; lots of recreation area; increased pressure on community infrastructure and road network; lots of distinctive community of Birstall	Remove allocation HA14 and develop brownfield sites	No	HA14
PSLP/455	D Hazlewood		Allocation HA14 is not justified as access would be via an unadopted road which is maintained by residents and could not accommodate additional traffic/ construction; the access road is not wide enough; Development could compromise the structure of the railway bridge; the area cannot accommodate additional traffic; cycle route 6 ends on Park Rd and cyclists could face additional danger from traffic; loss of character of the area; The field is important to wildlife and the environment including climate change; increased air pollution will impact public health; the site is boggy and therefore a potential flood risk	Remove allocation HA14	No	HA14
PSLP/644	A Monckton		Allocation HA14 is not justified as Loss of green wedge will be a loss to the local environment and amenities; the area provides separation between the city and Birstall; detrimental to this wildlife corridor including boundary hedges; the field is used for recreation ; proposed mitigation is inadequate	remove allocation HA14	No	HA14
PSLP/658	A Hing		Allocation HA14 is not justified as Cliffe Road Is unadopted with significant on street parking problems and poor road configuration making it incapable of being able to accommodate additional traffic; lorries emergency and large vehicles struggle to access the street; page 55 of the local plan states that the site scores poorly in relation to accessibility	remove allocation HA14	Yes	HA14
PSLP/685	M Pepper		Allocation HA14 is not justified as Cliffe Road Has existing parking issues ; the road is not in a good state; additional traffic cannot be accommodated safely		No	HA14
PSLP/014	Mr William David Coates		Part of Charnwood Forest. Views of Mucklin Wood should be maintained. Support provision of structural landscaping, retention of existing trees. Habitat network between Forest and Soar Valley important.	Should be additional tree and shrub planting. Planting schemes should be maintained.	No	HA15
PSLP/037	Mr Nick Samuels		The allocation is not justified due to the significant increase in private car use and local traffic; lack of meaningful walking and cycling provision; local school provision and health impact on young people; removal of greenspace and wildlife corridors; loss of iconic Outwoods views; and limited key services provision.	Remove allocation and consider sites to north and east of Loughborough. Consider sites in rural areas. Improve access, cycling, footways, wildlife corridors and provide extra services.	No	HA15
PSLP/042	Mr Richard Earle		The plan is not justified due to the adverse impact of 1,300 new homes to the south of Loughborough.	Remove allocation	No	HA15
PSLP/180	Mrs Ruth Youngs		Encouraging public transport into new settlements won't happen unless these areas are joined to larger settlements and there is a demand for the service.		No	HA15
PSLP/096	Mrs Reena Patel		Concern that existing schools, roads, amenities and healthcare are over capacity. Concern infrastructure won't be delivered.		No	HA15
PSLP/377	Dr Satbir Jassal	Woodthorpe Resident Association	The allocation is not justified due to the contradiction with the L&L Strategic Growth Plan; a lack of education provision; GP surgeries are overwhelmed; pressure on existing infrastructure; traffic congestion; air pollution; dependency on the car; loss of good quality agricultural land; impact on local heritage; loss of settlement identity; impact on wildlife corridors, green wedge and area of separation; loss of recreational facilities and resource; and the impact on footpaths. LCC Highways identify the site as no suitable safe access and egress.	Remove allocation.	No	HA15
PSLP/078	Elizabeth Clough		Site HA15 not justified as there will be a loss of separation between Quorn and Loughborough; a lack of road, bus, recreational, leisure, school, health and open space infrastructure; and the potential impact on wildlife, air quality, crime and loss of good agricultural land.		No	HA15

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/092	A Hubbard		Site HA15 not justified as there will be a loss of separation between Quorn and Loughborough; a lack of road, bus, recreational, leisure, school, health and open space infrastructure; and the potential impact on wildlife, air quality, crime, loss of good agricultural land and loss of Woodthorpe as a heritage hamlet.		No	HA15
PSLP/109	J Crookes		Proposed allocation of HA15, HA16 and HA17 are not justified as these green spaces are key to promoting physical and mental wellbeing,	Remove allocations HA15, HA16 and HA17 and develop on brownfield land, such as adjacent to HA20.	No	HA15
PSLP/110	R Sims		Proposed allocation of HA15, HA16 and HA17 are not justified as local schools are at capacity; new infrastructure including schools, health and shops are required; local green and recreation space will be lost; and reduced local bus serviced will increase isolation/unemployment for these new estates.	Need to consider impact on local amenities and transport and build on all brownfield land before developing HA15, HA16 and HA17.	No	HA15
PSLP/125	D Hubbard		Proposed allocation of HA15, HA16 and HA17 are not justified as there will be a loss of separation between Quorn and Loughborough; a lack of road, bus, recreational, leisure, school, health and open space infrastructure; and the potential impact on wildlife, air quality, crime, loss of good agricultural land and loss of Woodthorpe as a heritage hamlet.	Remove allocations HA15, HA16 and HA17 and develop on brownfield land	No	HA15
PSLP/145	S Coles		The plan is not justified. SA May 2020 states "increase growth in Loughborough is limited by the Charnwood Forest to the southwest and settlement identity considerations to the south...it ought to be possible to accommodate between 300-700 further dwellings without triggering any significant negative effects." The plan proposed significantly more houses (1,350) than this at HA15, HA16 and HA17. The plan is not consistent with national policy as it proposed building in what it classes as 'sensitive and valued landscape'. Development at HA15, HA16 and HA17 will ruin the aesthetics of the area and have a significant impact on wildlife. Development will impact on the ancient woodland & disrupt use and enjoyment.	Reduce the number of houses allocated at HA16, HA16 and HA17. Reconsider and implement NPPF and own environmental policies in the plan.	No	HA15
PSLP/148	D Coles		The plan is not justified or consistent with national policy. SA underestimates impact of development in this area - HA15, HA16, HA17. The plan proposes a far larger amount of development than the SA considers. Impact on sensitive landscape and biodiversity has not been reviewed properly. The NPPF sustainability criteria have not been applied.	HA16, HA17 and HA18 should be removed from the plan and HA15 reduced to 450 houses. LSEP boundary should be amended to provide greater distance to ancient woodland. Development should be in a new settlement which if carefully chosen, would minimise landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity degradation which the proposed draft plan would do.	No	HA15
PSLP/550	Bob Newnham	Hathern Way Residents Association	The plan is not justified because the sites were previously considered unsuitable for large scale development, there is a lack of local separation, there will be a detrimental impact to the hamlet of Woodthorpe including its distinctive character, the lack of provision of facilities like a doctor's surgery and local school facilities. The plan is ineffective because the infrastructure should be built first before the houses. A secondary school is required as well as a primary school. The plan doesn't detail how a bus service will be provided, this should be subsidised by the developer. There is no outdoor open space provision for HA15 and HA16. The proposed access for HA15 and HA16 are not suitable.	A separate road access from Terry Yardley Way into the HA15 development including traffic light control should be mandated, to ensure safe use of the surrounding roads and protect the hamlet of Woodthorpe. The area of separation should be increased. Historic hamlet of Woodthorpe should be included in Design Review. Additional infrastructure should be added for HA15, HA16 and HA17. Provision should be made for side by side off street parking.	No	HA15
PSLP/210	Damian K Kirk		The proposed housing site (HA15) is not positively prepared or justified by virtue of a complete disregard for the environment, natural habitats, lack of infrastructure and local residents opinion. There appears to be a far greater need to satisfy government targets than there is to satisfy the health and wellbeing of residents and the environment.		Yes	HA15

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/558	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates and Bowler Family	The allocation of the site is appropriate and justified. The allocation for housing with provision of land for a 2 form entry primary school and the boundaries of the Area of Separation to the north and to the east of the allocation are all supported The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24 and HA29 as well as HA15).  Th requirement to provide a masterplan for the whole site before any permissions for the site are granted is supported.	Add wording to the final sentence of the third main bullet point of DS3(HA15) as follows: We will expect the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of making this provision to be shared amongst the developments that it would serve.	Not stated	HA15
PSLP/223	Morag Bell		The scale of growth proposed in HA15 is unsustainable in the area and unacceptable. Not only will it destroy the character of Woodthorpe as a heritage hamlet. It will have a negative impact on other communities East of Loughborough. These negative impacts are fundamentally in opposition to some of the key objectives of the Draft Plan which include retention of community identity; environmental and social sustainability; improved health and well-being of residents; support for farming and the diversification of farm use that encourages biodiversity and green energy.	Objects to allocation.	No	HA15
PSLP/333	Dean Wood		This will not only remove amenity land and a pleasant section of countryside used by numerous people to walk and exercise dogs and is an area vital for mental wellbeing, but it will also remove the habitat for many animals , birds and insects. It will also have a massive impact upon traffic and the highways really aren't geared to more housing and the resulting number of vehicles using already heavily congested roads. The proposal really doesn't look at the impact it will have on the local community and a beautiful historical hamlet dating back to before the doomsday book, will be completely enveloped and destroyed forever.	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA15
PSLP/334	Mr F Kerr		The use of land identified as HA15 in the local plan cannot be allowed for the following reasons: HIGHWAYS - the Highways agency have stated that access to the proposed development cannot be achieved. HISTORY - Woodthorpe is one of the remaining few hamlets in Leicestershire. It is steeped in history which why so may people like to visit and walk through - simply to appreciate. Build here and you destroy history. Your own plans highlight the need to preserve such areas!! HABITAT - the proposed land is prima arable land that consistently grows much needed crops. The surrounding hedgerows and copses support key ecosystems. DESIGN - Grange Park is already big enough and an eyesore on the landscape with no supporting services such as doctors or schools. To double the size of it with poorly designed housing would be a travesty. POLICY - your own policies state that areas such as Woodthorpe should be preserved. Adhere to them! Do not destroy this area! Thousands of local people dobt want it - listen to them!	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA15
PSLP/348	J Wing		Allocation HA15 is not justified as there will be little separation between Quorn and Loughborough; it will exacerbate pressure on traffic (especially at roundabouts and Terry Yardley Way) and services; loss of recreation space; Woodthorpe is a heritage hamlet; wildlife and footpaths will be lost; it will impact agricultural output	Develop brownfield sites; invest in student areas as students move to purpose built accommodation.	No	HA15
PSLP/609	J+B Cox		Allocation HA15 is not justified as it does not protect the hamlet of Woodthorpe which contravenes policy EV/3 which provides for separation and landscaping; the area is used for recreation (unlike the area between HA15 and HA50 which is not proposed for housing and direct access to the roundabout); the One Ash Roundabout is congested at peak times;	Allocation is unsustainable and must be changed.	No	HA15
PSLP/306	Mr Ian Briggs		Should be removed the site a site is unsustainable and questions about deliverability. Development would cause significant harm to existing communities, the road network, the quality of the local landscape and the general environment.	Allocation is unsustainable and should be deleteted.	No	HA15
PSLP/189	Mr David Sangwine		Strongly object to this proposal. It contradicts the policies of Strategic Growth Plan and Leicestershire Highways Authority has issued a highly critical report citing, amongst other issues, the Principle of the Access Strategy in access and egress to HA15. 1. Developments in this area are not sustainable. School placing and availability is compromised and Doctor's surgeries are already overwhelmed. 2. Excessive pressures from the development on the existing infrastructure will occur. No plans are in place to invest in new infrastructure. 3. Traffic congestion is significant and developments in this area will add to this issue. 4. The development will add to dependency on car use and no plans exist for bus route extension, or additional bus operator routes. 5. Good quality agricultural land will be lost. 6. Maintenance of local heritage will be lost. 7. Wildlife corridors, green wedges and areas of local separation and the prevention of merging of settlements, will be totally compromised. 8. Recreational facilities will be lost for the wider community.	Strongly objects to allocation.	Yes	HA15

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/356	Mrs Anne Tomalin		<p>Creating such a big development on the south of Loughborough would cause increased traffic, poor air quality, lack of access to countryside etc.</p> <p>The site infringes on the Charnwood Regional Park. This area should be a buffer for the Outwoods, Beacon Hill and other such areas. The area is home to wildlife Many mature trees and hedges would be felled and felling an old tree or hedge, or the loss of fields means the loss of established ecosystems and biodiversity. No amount of new tree planting and offsetting will replace the ecosystems and wildlife which will be lost.</p> <p>Objects to the loss of agricultural land. Brownfield sites should be prioritised.</p> <p>People need access to open countryside for walking and jogging. This is important for well-being and mental health.</p>	Objects to scale of development.	No	HA15
PSLP/319	Mr Ramsey Pollock		<p>The Charnwood Local plan is not sound and is not in keeping with its own sustainability appraisal for the allocation of such large numbers of houses in South Loughborough.</p> <p>The development plans are on areas of outstanding beauty whose landscapes contribute to the health and wellbeing of the community. Development of this area would pose a severe risk to local health and wellbeing and the degradation of the environment and wildlife. Development plans are out of kilter with Charnwood's own policies to improve partnership to improve the health of Charnwood people.</p>	<p>Objects to allocation particularly at the scale proposed.</p> <p>HA15 should be reduced to 450 housing allocation in the line the Sustainability report.</p>	No	HA15
PSLP/317	Miss Abigail Coles		<p>The Charnwood Local plan is not sound and is not in keeping with its own sustainability appraisal for the allocation of such large numbers of houses in South Loughborough.</p> <p>The development plans are on areas of outstanding beauty whose landscapes contribute to the health and wellbeing of the community. Development of this area would pose a severe risk to local health and wellbeing and the degradation of the environment and wildlife. Development plans are out of kilter with Charnwood's own policies to improve partnership to improve the health of Charnwood people.</p>	<p>Objects to allocation particularly at the scale proposed.</p> <p>HA15 should be reduced to 450 housing allocation in the line the Sustainability report.</p>	No	HA15
PSLP/316	Mrs Denise Coles		<p>The Charnwood Local plan is not sound and is not in keeping with its own sustainability appraisal for the allocation of such large numbers of houses in South Loughborough.</p> <p>The development plans are on areas of outstanding beauty whose landscapes contribute to the health and wellbeing of the community. Development of this area would pose a severe risk to local health and wellbeing and the degradation of the environment and wildlife. Development plans are out of kilter with Charnwood's own policies to improve partnership to improve the health of Charnwood people.</p>	<p>Objects to allocation particularly at the scale proposed.</p> <p>HA15 should be reduced to 450 housing allocation in the line the Sustainability report.</p>	No	HA15
PSLP/414	David Waymont		<p>Housing Allocations H15 HA16 and HA17 contradict Policy DS1 because they don't protect the intrinsic nature of the countryside, don't maintain GW or ALS, do not safeguard and deliver a net gain in biodiversity, they don't protect environmental resources including local air quality and the most versatile agricultural land, they don't protect and enhance the biodiversity of the Charnwood Forest Regional Park. Housing Allocations H15 HA16 and HA17 contradict Policy DS1 contradict all the bullets in policy EV6.</p> <p>Housing Allocations H15 HA16 and HA17 contradict Policy LUC1 because they don't provide urban form which integrates with the wider landscape or respond positively to landscape character areas. They don't protect the predominantly open and undeveloped character of ALS, Charnwood Forest, River Soar or strategically important links in the wildlife networks which connect them. The SA also identified a number of issues during the scoping process. There is also a lack of health care facilities in Loughborough.</p>	Sites should be reviewed and appropriate mitigation put in place so that all SA criteria are neutral.	No	HA15
PSLP/362	Gill Bolton		<p>Objects to the allocation for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) lack of alignment with the Strategic Growth Plan</li> <li>b) lack of Provision of Key Services to Current and Future Residents Medical Services</li> <li>c) lack of Provision of Public Transport Leading to Greater Car Usage</li> <li>d) road Infrastructure</li> <li>e) Insufficient Car Parking Spaces</li> <li>f) loss of Wildlife Corridors, Green Space and Arable Farmland</li> <li>g) Loss of Local Heritage</li> <li>h) loss of green credentials</li> <li>i) anti social behaviour</li> <li>j) maintenance of areas of separation</li> </ul> <p>Also references the very large increase in housing numbers since earlier local plan consultation.</p>	Objects to allocation.	No	HA15
PSLP/364	Emma Crowe	Woodhouse Parish Council	Objects to allocation on the grounds of its impact on landscape, wildlife and loss of agricultural land.	Objects to allocation	No	HA15
PSLP/420	H & H Jassal		The plan is not justified because HA15 would lead to the destruction of local heritage, loss of the villages character and uniqueness, traffic congestion, no local bus service, there isn't enough infrastructure in the area to support new development (schools, GP). There will be a serious negative impact on wildlife and green spaces.	Remove allocation.	Not stated	HA15

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/409	Clare Hudson		Objects to allocation because the proposed allocation contradicts the Council's own stated objectives of creating a 'thriving economy with healthy communities and environmental safeguards', and instead threatens already over-stretched local services as well as the precious natural environment	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA15
PSLP/390	Daniel Sage		The development of HA 15, 16, 17 and 19 will extend Loughborough towards the Outwoods with a much smaller buffer of open farmland. This will materially reduce the physical isolation of Outwoods and permanently reduce its character as a distinct ancient woodland. Moreover, there is a risk that future housing development will then extend beyond the planned perimeter in the Local Plan and Outwoods will become connected to Loughborough.	Reconsider the scale of development.	No	HA15
PSLP/436	Mr J Adams		CBC's opening statement of making Charnwood one of the most desirable places to live, work and visit in the East Midlands has to be questioned given the proposals to yet again develop on green field sites which require the removal forever of productive agricultural land and amenity, together with unacceptable disruption to daily life of residents most affected by the proposed developments.	Review allocation	Yes	HA15
PSLP/439	Neil R Lambert		Regrettably, the plan is presented by planners for planners and simply sets out it's own rules and definitions to self-satisfy government requirements. We are therefore presented with a cynical lack of care for local residents, in my case, on the edge of Loughborough, and regarding HA15, HA16 and HA17 I'm shocked by proposed numbers of houses, over 700, 400 and 200 respectively, and fear the density which is being squeezed in. Although an area of local separation is mentioned, I do not trust that this will be adequate, given recent developments in south of Loughborough already. My reading of the plan is that we will end up with more houses in current green fields and open spaces, making a reduction in my quality of life and those in my local area	Objects to scale of development.	No	HA15
PSLP/516	Rob Griffiths		The allocation is not justified due to the impact on a scenic retreat for existing residents; impact on the green barrier between Quorn and Loughborough; destruction of farmland; and the increased traffic and congestion with increased noise and air pollution.	Remove allocation and develop brownfield rather than greenfield sites.	Not stated	HA15
PSLP/731	Diana Webster		The important greenfield area which acts a protective buffer to the Outwoods, which is a site of special scientific interest. This area was rejected in the 2011-28 plan under local consensus Schooling and other social needs should be considered again. New schools are based out in the villages: Where are the children from the 1000+ additional houses to the South of Loughborough to be schooled?	Objects to allocation	No	HA15
PSLP/652	S Rasaiah		The plan is not justified because there is not sufficient sewerage infrastructure for HA15 Land South of Loughborough. Woodthorpe is a separate village and its character should be safeguarded.		Yes	HA15
PSLP/678	P Toon		The plan is not justified because HA15 will cause a negative impact on the character and setting of Woodthorpe and will encroach on Woodthorpe and Quorn. It will ruin the ridge line and destroy important views. The policy contradicts EV1. There is already an oversupply of homes and therefore no overriding reason why HA15 should be included.		No	HA15
PSLP/694	M Gilbert		HA15 is not justified because the area between Loughborough and Quorn should be protected. There will be a loss of settlement identity and a negative impact on the ecological network, and the maintenance of links between Charnwood Forest and the River Soar. Woodthorpe will be overwhelmed with the amount of proposed housing. PROW, agricultural land and the environment irrevocably damaged. Woodthorpe will become a suburb of Loughborough and the proposed area of separation is too small.		No	HA15
PSLP/592	Cllr Ted Parton		The land adjacent to Terry Yardley Way /Woodthorpe Hamlet, is unusable, due to highways issues related to access and transport impacts. The development would place the secondary schools places into deficit. What is the reason the document does not outline exactly when school places /new schools are built, in relation to the timing of the house building? Surely a school building should be ready for the first residents moving in? I would request far clearer wording over the school placement policy in the formal local plan – something I shall refer to the inspector.	Objects to allocation.	Yes	HA15
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The allocation is supported.		Yes	HA15

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/566	Owen Jones	LRM Planning Limited on behalf of William Davis Homes and Parker Strategic Land	The allocation of the site is supported. Scope exists to increase the capacity of the site. For example, increasing the average density from 32dph to 35dph would increase the number of new homes that could be provided to circa 800. In order for the policy to be positively prepared, justified and effective, the capacity of 723 homes identified in the plan should be framed as a minimum figure. The various policy criteria are sound and appropriately reflect the site's location and characteristics. However, in order to be effective, a pragmatic approach should be taken to the timing and detail of seeking agreement on design matters for the site as a whole, reflecting the inevitable phased delivery of the site. Accordingly, the requirement to provide a masterplan for the entirety of the site before the grant of permission in respect to any individual parcel is resisted. The diagram that illustrates the policy is based on masterplanning work that has subsequently been updated. The separation between the development parcel and Mucklin Wood is substantially greater than that referred to in Natural England's Standing Advice.	The site capacity listed for Policy DS3(HA15) should be amended to "at least 723 new homes". Alternative options to securing a consistent and coherent approach to the design of the site as a whole, such as the use of conditions on any outline consent which require the submission and approval of masterplans and design codes for each phase, prior to or concurrently with the submission of reserved matters. The illustrative diagram should be updated to reflect the detailed design work on the northern-most parcel (details provided).	Yes	HA15
PSLP/311	Cllr David Snartt	Borough Councillor for Forest and Bradgate Ward	The Local Plan states that it is not necessary to consider sites in villages and hamlets, but site HA15 completely surrounds the Hamlet of Woodthorpe and is in the parish of Woodhouse, and would cause environmental issues impacting ancient woodland.		Not stated	HA15
PSLP/709	M Cox		Allocation HA15 is not justified as the density is not appropriate or sustainable in this area; it will merge Quorn and Loughborough; increased traffic at nearby roundabouts; increase in anti social behaviour; will exacerbate car dependency and reduce road safety; loss of recreation facilities in Woodthorpe; lack of school and GP infrastructure and local amenities are already overwhelmed; loss of Woodthorpe as a heritage hamlet; it will exacerbate flooding issues	Use empty properties and student properties. Develop brownfield sites.	No	HA15
PSLP/442	I Schofield		Allocation HA15. Paragraph 2.78 is not justified as it will result in the loss of an area of local separation which does not comply with the neighbourhood plan or paragraph 4.20 of the Core Strategy; the footpath along the site is protected by policy T3 of the neighbourhood plan; the accumulation of development across the plan will increase flood risk; development will exacerbate traffic problems.	Remove allocation HA15	No	HA15
PSLP/445	S Yeoh		Allocations HA15 and HA16 are not justified as they are disproportionately larger than development proposed in other areas and over density will strain local services/ facilities.	Remove allocations HA15 and HA16 and designate them as areas of nature.	No	HA15
PSLP/649	I Yoxen		Allocation HA15 is not justified as it will combine the heritage village of Woodthorpe with Loughborough; it will reduce separation between Loughborough and Quorn; it is a local recreation green space facility; it is difficult for school children to travel by bicycle to school to you too difficult road crossings.	More schools are needed in Loughborough; better road crossings and cycle lanes between Loughborough and villages like Quorn; incorporate recreation areas for walking within site HA15.	No	HA15
PSLP/651	T Birkinshaw		Allocation HA15 is not justified as paragraph 2.78-2.80 Acknowledge the importance of the separation between Loughborough and Quorn but this site would reduce that separation (including cumulatively with HA58); The site is on rising ground which will dominate views from surrounding settlements and cannot be mitigated by landscaping; the site is high biodiversity value and links to the ancient woodland Mucklin Wood the wildlife area by Woodthorpe Brook; the site has limited access to Loughborough without breaking a green corridor; for these reasons Policies EV3, EV8 and CC5 are relevant		No	HA15
PSLP/711	R Thomas		Promoting site PSH248 as an extension to HA15. The urban concentration strategy is supported and allocation HA15 is strategically important to this. Given that policy DS2 indicates potential future weakness in maintaining a five year housing land supply, site PSH248 should also be allocated to enable joint masterplan working to deliver a comprehensive site that Protect the area of local separation, and delivers a superior green infrastructure/landscaping strategy, delivers an optimum quantum of high quality design new houses	Allocate site PSH248	Yes	HA15
PSLP/014	Mr William David Coates		Proposed planting of large canopy native species supported. Support structural landscaping and retention of existing trees and hedgerows. Note the importance of habitats and corridors between Charnwood Forest and the Soar Valley.	Planting schemes should be maintained.	No	HA16
PSLP/024	Mr Simon Glover		The plan is not justified as building on areas of natural beauty is unnecessary and an environmental concern. Should be protected green belt not developed with housing. Object to reduction in green space around Loughborough.	Remove allocation.	No	HA16
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	It is noted that several site specific policies include a statement to: "Support measures to mitigate flood risk including contributions towards flood alleviation works in the wider catchment of the Wood Brook or other watercourses flow through or adjacent to Loughborough" Severn Trent are generally supportive of this approach, and would recommend that any development within this catchment also looks to ensure that surface water is discharged to a sustainable outfall in line with the Drainage Hierarchy to prevent overloading of the sewers in storm events.		Not stated	HA16

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/037	Mr Nick Samuels		The allocation is not justified due to the significant increase in private car use and local traffic; lack of meaningful walking and cycling provision; local school provision and health impact on young people; removal of greenspace and wildlife corridors; loss of iconic Outwoods views; and limited key services provision.	Remove allocation and consider sites to north and east of Loughborough. Consider sites in rural areas. Improve access, cycling, footways, wildlife corridors and provide extra services.	No	HA16
PSLP/042	Mr Richard Earle		The plan is not justified due to the adverse impact of 1,300 new homes to the south of Loughborough.	Remove allocation	No	HA16
PSLP/046	Dr Steven Coles		The allocation is not justified due to concerns over increased flood risk; damage to wildlife; and changes to the landscape.	Remove allocation	No	HA16
PSLP/057	Stuart Weller		HA16 is not justified due to impact on flooding; the topography is a natural bowl and development would create peak run offs overwhelming existing drainage (gradient & water flow details provided). There will be detrimental impact on the existing community and the loss of beautiful countryside.	Remove allocation	No	HA16
PSLP/407	Johan Kruger	Bramcote Road Flood Action Group	The allocation is not justified due to flood risk and lack of any mitigation.	Ensure adequate flood mitigation or remove allocation	No	HA16
PSLP/543	N.Maden	Bramcote Road Flood action Group	Objects to development because of the likely effects that it will have on the flood risk in the area, especially in a high risk flood area. Objection includes flood risk evidence.	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA16
PSLP/090	E Tegg		Plan is not justified as development is encroaching on Outwoods. Object to development removing ancient hedgerows situated on the bridle path between Valley Road/Beacon Road and Outwoods.	Remove allocations near Outwoods	No	HA16
PSLP/093	G Robinson		Plan is not justified as HA16 and HA17 provide recreation space, wildlife habitat including buzzards, and stunning views.	Remove HA16 and HA17	No	HA16
PSLP/149	S Damon		Plan is not justified as HA16 and HA17 are situated on Outwoods, the most beautiful part of the borough which promotes wellbeing, recreation and peace; Skylarks, Buzzards and Egrets nest on these sites.	Remove HA16 and HA17. Plant trees	No	HA16
PSLP/150	P Donnelly		Plan is not justified as HA16 and HA17 are a buffer between Loughborough and Outwoods and are used for visual beauty and recreation	Remove HA16 and HA17	No	HA16
PSLP/145	S Coles		The plan is not justified. SA May 2020 states "increase growth in Loughborough is limited by the Charnwood Forest to the southwest and settlement identity considerations to the south...it ought to be possible to accommodate between 300-700 further dwellings without triggering any significant negative effects." The plan proposed significantly more houses (1,350) than this at HA15, HA16 and HA17. The plan is not consistent with national policy as it proposed building in what it classes as 'sensitive and valued landscape'. There is significant flood risk, the area is well used by locals, development will ruin the aesthetics of the area and will impact on wildlife.	Reduce the number of houses allocated at HA16, HA16 and HA17. Reconsider and implement NPPF and own environmental policies in the plan	No	HA16
PSLP/148	D Coles		The plan is not justified or consistent with national policy. SA underestimates impact of development in this area - HA15, HA16, HA17. The plan proposes a far larger amount of development than the SA considers. Impact on sensitive landscape and biodiversity has not been reviewed properly. The NPPF sustainability criteria have not been applied.	Development should be in a new settlement which if carefully chosen, would minimise landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity degradation which the proposed draft plan would do. HA16, HA17 and HA18 should be removed from the plan and HA15 reduced to 450 houses. LSEP boundary should be amended to provide greater distance to ancient woodland.	No	HA16

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/550	Bob Newnham	Hathern Way Residents Association	The plan is not justified because the sites were previously considered unsuitable for large scale development, there is a lack of local separation, there will be a detrimental impact to the hamlet of Woodthorpe including its distinctive character, the lack of provision of facilities like a doctor's surgery and local school facilities. The plan is ineffective because the infrastructure should be built first before the houses. A secondary school is required as well as a primary school. The plan doesn't detail how a bus service will be provided, this should be subsidised by the developer. There is no outdoor open space provision for HA15 and HA16. The proposed access for HA15 and HA16 are not suitable.	A separate road access from Terry Yardley Way into the HA15 development including traffic light control should be mandated, to ensure safe use of the surrounding roads and protect the hamlet of Woodthorpe. The area of separation should be increased. Historic hamlet of Woodthorpe should be included in Design Review. Additional infrastructure should be added for HA15, HA16 and HA17. Provision should be made for side by side off street parking.	Not stated	HA16
PSLP/210	Damian K Kirk		The proposed housing site (HA16) is not positively prepared or justified by virtue of a complete disregard for the environment, natural habitats, lack of infrastructure and local residents opinion. There appears to be a far greater need to satisfy government targets than there is to satisfy the health and wellbeing of residents and the environment.		Yes	HA16
PSLP/558	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates and Bowler Family	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24 and HA29 as well as HA15).	Add wording to the bullet point relating to education contributions from DS3(HA16) as follows: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new 2 form entry primary school located at site HA15.	Not stated	HA16
PSLP/235	C Shelton		The proposed housing sites HA16 and HA17 are not justified as Outwoods wildlife will be impacted by people, pollution and cats. The area is needed for mental health and joy.	Remove allocations HA16 and HA17	No	HA16
PSLP/248	E McKain		Allocation HA16 is not justified as Laburnum Way will become a through road; the Buttercup Road/ Laburnum Way junction will become unsafe; noise from traffic and construction will be disturbing; it will infringe on the countryside which is used for physical and mental health and wildlife.		No	HA16
PSLP/265	K Darmon		The proposed housing sites HA16 and HA17 are not justified as Loughborough cannot sustain any more large development; the proposed sites are beautiful; local people have not been part of the development of the plan.	Develop other areas of Loughborough that wouldn't impact wellbeing; develop areas near the train station which have better transport connections;	No	HA16
PSLP/342	S Hague		Proposed allocations HA16 and HA17 are not justified as this land is arable fields that produce crops; loss of hedgerows, trees and wildlife; loss of Green Wedge/ Area of Separation; the sites are identified as 'highly sensitive' and a 'gateway to Charnwood' in the Charnwood Landscape Character Assessment; up to 2,242 new houses would impact the environment including increased surface water flooding in particular Forest Road; increase in traffic including for construction; increase in pollution; loss of space for physical and mental wellbeing; there is a need to balance ecosystems		No	HA16
PSLP/355	Mr D. Waymont		This policy is not sound as it does not take enough account of the Sustainability Appraisal Report. Specific comments are made with respect to landscape, biodiversity and nature conservation, agricultural land, traffic, air quality and health	Objects to allocation.	No	HA16
PSLP/306	Mr Ian Briggs		Should be removed as the site is unsustainable and questions deliverability. Development would cause significant harm to existing communities, the road network, the quality of the local landscape and the general environment.	Allocation is unsustainable and should be deleted	No	HA16
PSLP/356	Mrs Anne Tomalin		Creating such a big development on the south of Loughborough would cause increased traffic, poor air quality, lack of access to countryside etc. The site infringes on the Charnwood Regional Park. This area should be a buffer for the Outwoods, Beacon Hill and other such areas. The area is home to wildlife Many mature trees and hedges would be felled and felling an old tree or hedge, or the loss of fields means the loss of established ecosystems and biodiversity. No amount of new tree planting and offsetting will replace the ecosystems and wildlife which will be lost. Objects to the loss of agricultural land. Brownfield sites should be prioritised. People need access to open countryside for walking and jogging. This is important for well-being and mental health.	Objects to allocation.	No	HA16

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/319	Mr Ramsey Pollock		The Charnwood Local plan is not sound and is not in keeping with its own sustainability appraisal for the allocation of such large numbers of houses in South Loughborough. The development plans are on areas of outstanding beauty whose landscapes contribute to the health and wellbeing of the community. Development of this area would pose a severe risk to local health and wellbeing and the degradation of the environment and wildlife. Development plans are out of kilter with Charnwood's own policies to improve partnership to improve the health of Charnwood people. There is significant flood risk. The development of Beck Crescent has shown an increase in flood risk in the area. This has occurred even with flood mitigation.	Objects to allocation particularly scale of development together with other allocations in South Loughborough. Deletion of allocation called for.	No	HA16
PSLP/317	Miss Abigail Coles		The Charnwood Local plan is not sound and is not in keeping with its own sustainability appraisal for the allocation of such large numbers of houses in South Loughborough. The development plans are on areas of outstanding beauty whose landscapes contribute to the health and wellbeing of the community. Development of this area would pose a severe risk to local health and wellbeing and the degradation of the environment and wildlife. Development plans are out of kilter with Charnwood's own policies to improve partnership to improve the health of Charnwood people. There is significant flood risk. The development of Beck Crescent has shown an increase in flood risk in the area. This has occurred even with flood mitigation.	Objects to allocation particularly scale of development together with other allocations in South Loughborough. Deletion of allocation called for.	No	HA16
PSLP/316	Mrs Denise Coles		The Charnwood Local plan is not sound and is not in keeping with its own sustainability appraisal for the allocation of such large numbers of houses in South Loughborough. The development plans are on areas of outstanding beauty whose landscapes contribute to the health and wellbeing of the community. Development of this area would pose a severe risk to local health and wellbeing and the degradation of the environment and wildlife. Development plans are out of kilter with Charnwood's own policies to improve partnership to improve the health of Charnwood people. There is significant flood risk. The development of Beck Crescent has shown an increase in flood risk in the area. This has occurred even with flood mitigation.	Objects to allocation particularly scale of development together with other allocations in South Loughborough. Deletion of allocation called for.	No	HA16
PSLP/414	David Waymont		Housing Allocations H15 HA16 and HA17 contradict Policy DS1 because they don't protect the intrinsic nature of the countryside, don't maintain GW or ALS, do not safeguard and deliver a net gain in biodiversity, they don't protect environmental resources including local air quality and the most versatile agricultural land, they don't protect and enhance the biodiversity of the Charnwood Forest Regional Park. Housing Allocations H15 HA16 and HA17 contradict Policy DS1 contradict all the bullets in policy EV6. Housing Allocations H15 HA16 and HA17 contradict Policy LUC1 because they don't provide urban form which integrates with the wider landscape or respond positively to landscape character areas. They don't protect the predominantly open and undeveloped character of ALS, Charnwood Forest, River Soar or strategically important links in the wildlife networks which connect them. The SA also identified a number of issues during the scoping process. There is also a lack of health care facilities in Loughborough.	Sites should be reviewed and appropriate mitigation put in place so that all SA criteria are neutral.	No	HA16
PSLP/362			Objects to the allocation for the following reasons: a) lack of alignment with the Strategic Growth Plan b) lack of Provision of Key Services to Current and Future Residents Medical Services c) lack of Provision of Public Transport Leading to Greater Car Usage d) road Infrastructure e) Insufficient Car Parking Spaces f) loss of Wildlife Corridors, Green Space and Arable Farmland g) Loss of Local Heritage h) loss of green credentials i) anti social behaviour j) maintenance of areas of separation Also references the very large increase in housing numbers since previous consultation of the local plan.	Objects to allocation	No	HA16
PSLP/364	Emma Crowe	Woodhouse Parish Council	Objects to allocation on the grounds of its impact on landscape, wildlife and loss of agricultural land.	Objects to allocation	No	HA16
PSLP/421	T Coleman		The plan is not justified because HA16 and HA17 will be built on land which is used by residents for exercise and leisure. There is no policy to address the shortfall in open space. EV9 has no approach for meeting the needs of the whole community in areas where there is a shortfall in the first place. This is in conflict with paragraphs 35 and 96 of the NPPF.		No	HA16
PSLP/409	Clare Hudson		Objects to allocation because the proposed allocation contradicts the Council's own stated objectives of creating a 'thriving economy with healthy communities and environmental safeguards', and instead threatens already over-stretched local services as well as the precious natural environment	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA16

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/390	Daniel Sage		<p>HA 16 borders the Rainbows hospice for children and young people. The development of farmland on HA 16 will mean that Rainbows hospice will become completely surrounded by housing development. This will inevitably create a more suburban and less rural atmosphere in and around the site. The Local Plan has not at all considered the negative impact of HA16 on Rainbows and the long-term care and wellbeing of terminally ill children and their families in the hospice.</p> <p>The development of HA 15, 16, 17 and 19 will extend Loughborough towards the Outwoods with a much smaller buffer of open farmland. This will materially reduce the physical isolation of Outwoods and permanently reduce its character as a distinct ancient woodland.</p> <p>HA 16 is also mentioned in the plan in relation to impacts on wildlife and the need for careful biodiversity management within the site.</p>	HA16 should not be considered for relatively large-scale housing development. This will preserve the peaceful atmosphere of rainbows, protect the distinct character of the Outwoods ancient woodland for future generations and safeguard wildlife.	No	HA16
PSLP/436	Mr J Adams		<p>CBC's opening statement of making Charnwood one of the most desirable places to live, work and visit in the East Midlands has to be questioned given the proposals to yet again develop on green field sites which require the removal forever of productive agricultural land and amenity, together with unacceptable disruption to daily life of residents most affected by the proposed developments.</p> <p>HA16 is expected to involve significant impact on the immediate local community with anticipated access to the site through unsuitable highways and passing two schools and a number of established residential properties.</p>	Unable to comment based on the legal jargon provided, but would suggest the removal of area HA16 from the plan and a review of the impact of HA15 and HA17.	Yes	HA16
PSLP/439	Neil R Lambert		<p>Regrettably, the plan is presented by planners for planners and simply sets out it's own rules and definitions to self-satisfy government requirements.</p> <p>We are therefore presented with a cynical lack of care for local residents, in my case, on the edge of Loughborough, and regarding HA15, HA16 and HA17.</p> <p>I'm shocked by proposed numbers of houses, over 700, 400 and 200 respectively, and fear the density which is being squeezed in. Although an area of local separation is mentioned, I do not trust that this will be adequate, given recent developments in south of Loughborough already</p> <p>My reading of the plan is that we will end up with more houses in current green fields and open spaces, making a reduction in my quality of life and those in my local area</p>	Objects to the scale of development.	No	HA16
PSLP/493	A Bertram & J Golding		<p>The plan is not justified because HA16 and HA17 will bring development closer to the Outwoods and Jubilee Woods which are SSSI's. There will be a significant loss of peace and tranquillity. There is significant flood risk in the area and roads are already heavily congested.</p>	Remove HA16 and HA17.	Not stated	HA16
PSLP/731	Diana Webster		<p>The important greenfield area which acts a protective buffer to the Outwoods, which is a site of special scientific interest. This area was rejected in the 2011-28 plan under local consensus.</p> <p>Schooling and other social needs should be considered again. New schools are based out in the villages: Where are the children from the 1000+ additional</p>	Objects to allocation	No	HA16
PSLP/735	Maggie Taylor		<p>Once this established wild space is gone, it's gone for ever. These fields provide a buffer zone between town and woods, the hedges offering protection and home to wildlife.</p> <p>The plan talks about an environmental net benefit but how can this well-used and loved area be replaced. How will that net benefit be enforced?</p> <p>There are places on the map where the development will be within 200 metres of the Outwoods. A green screen of trees is paying lip service to the protection of an established wild area that is loved and used by the whole community.</p> <p>We believe that there is a weak area in the planning generally, where, through planning, there is a responsibility to protect the natural environment but Charnwood don't seem to have a clear plan to do this. We want to see clear objectives and targets to 'improve the natural local environment' (Environmental Policy) applied to the local plan.</p>	Objects to allocation	Yes	HA16
PSLP/652	S Rasaiah		<p>The plan is not justified because HA16 will have a negative impact on the views towards Charnwood Forest. Its impact on the open countryside should be considered. The scale of development is also too much.</p>		Yes	HA16
PSLP/668	Paul Conway		<p>HA16 is not legally compliant because skylarks are a protected species and are present on the site and have not considered this aspect.</p> <p>HA16 is not sound because a holistic view of sustainability has not been provided in terms of CO2 impact of the development, increased road traffic, the site is not within walking distance of bus route or employment centre, reduced headcount of Loughborough University as result of Covid19.</p>	Sustainability Appraisal should be more holistic. Post Covid working practices should be addressed.	No	HA16

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/397	K Brewin		Allocations HA16 and HA17 are not justified as this would result in a loss of areas of outstanding natural beauty and wildlife; these green spaces are essential for health and wellbeing; replacing with sterile featureless green spaces is not satisfactory; development will exacerbate existing traffic issues in Loughborough in particular Epinal Way and at schools, the plan refers to temporary bus passes for new residents which will not resolve long term issues with the public transport system to the east of Loughborough; development will result in flooding in the area; HA16 attempts to retain a green vista to Outwoods whereas HA17 maximises development causing unacceptable harm	Need to strengthen referenced in the plan to preserving natural beauty. The difference between the policies map and site diagrams need clarifying – developers may seek to maximise builds based on policy map boundaries. Reconsider boundary of HA17 as it cuts off the last remaining green corridor from the town by extending down to Moat House Focus development on former Wymeswold airfield which has good transport and facility links.	No	HA16
PSLP/447	G Hanlon		Allocations HA16 and HA17 are not justified as development above the level of Wood Brook will impact views of Outwoods; these sites will enable future development and the resulting loss of recreational area; during elections politicians objected to this development; the proposal would increase flood risk at Wood Brook.	Remove allocation HA16 and HA17. Undertake further consultation. Remove Cllrs with conflicts of interest form planning committees	No	HA16
PSLP/648	A Dakin		Allocation HA16 is not justified if access if via Spindle Road as it is too narrow to accommodate construction and regular traffic		No	HA16
PSLP/662	D Jobling		Allocations HA16 and HA17 are not justified as it will result in additional traffic; the loss of recreation area; detriment to wildlife; lots of views towards the outwards; new houses are not needed	Remove allocations HA16 and HA17	Yes	HA16
PSLP/693	E Glasius		The is not justified as Outwoods is not mentioned which is an accessible and important recreation , well being , wildlife asset that will be encroached on by development	Avoid encroaching on Outwoods	No	HA16
PSLP/696	D Thompson		Allocations HA16 and HA17 are not justified as Both sites are located in sensitive and value landscape meaning development should not be permitted; it would result in the loss of accessible open space which is used for recreation and is accessible by foot; the proposals will damage the environment around the Beacon and Outwoods	Remove allocations HA16 and HA17	No	HA16
PSLP/697	A Johnson		Allocations HA16 and HA17 are not justified as Both sites are important for biodiversity including supporting Outwoods, Jubilee Wood and Beacon Hill; Existing services including healthcare, outdoor community spaces, parking spaces, transport routes, bus and cycle networks or not adequate;	Remove allocations HA16 and HA17 Consider increasing housing in villages outside of Loughborough including Woodhouse, Woodhouse Eaves, Swithland, Cropston, Rothley, Seagrave, Wymeswold	No	HA16
PSLP/695	D Matthewman		Allocations HA16 and HA17 are not justified as development will exacerbate flooding on Priory Road; loss of recreational space; loss of wildlife; impact on health and school infrastructure; Concerned that the site boundary on the proposals map is larger than the area to be developed which is unclear	Only developed approximately 400 houses on HA16 and 200 houses on HA17 without cutting existing properties from the countryside	No	HA16
PSLP/572	Daniel Hibbard	We Are Define obo Bloor Homes (Laburnum Way)	Welcomes and supports proposed allocation of Laburnum Way, Loughborough (HA16), which reflects its clear credentials for future development. Site is located in an entirely suitable location, is not subject to any insurmountable technical or environmental constraints, and can accommodate a high-quality residential development. Allocation should be increased to 500 dwellings to achieve efficient use of land. More clarity required in relation to mechanism for delivering school.	Increase capacity of allocation HA16 to 500 dwellings. Provide further clarity in relation to the mechanism for the delivery of the proposed school in site HA15.	Yes	HA16
PSLP/014	Mr William David Coates		Proposed planting of large canopy native species supported. Support structural landscaping and retention of existing trees and hedgerows. Note the importance of habitats and corridors between Charnwood Forest and the Soar Valley.	Planting schemes should be maintained.	No	HA17
PSLP/172	Norman and Moira Usher		Selecting site PSH025/HA17 is inconsistent with Charnwood Council's stated intent to "create healthier communities", to take "careful consideration of the effects of climate change and to manage the risk of flooding" and "protection of the intrinsic character of the countryside". The plan is therefore in contravention of the NPPF. Loss of open space - the area is predominantly within the National Forest boundary. It is a much-used green space, containing several footpaths. Biodiversity - This area is frequented by a wide variety of wildlife. Transport and Air Quality - There is no evidence that traffic levels have been considered. Loughborough cannot accommodate an increase in housing of this magnitude without severe harm to the already stressed traffic situation and consequently the air quality. Lack of weighting of criteria - No weighting has been applied to any of the criteria. There is inadequate consideration of health provision.		Not stated	HA17
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	It is noted that several site specific policies include a statement to: "Support measures to mitigate flood risk including contributions towards flood alleviation works in the wider catchment of the Wood Brook or other watercourses flow through or adjacent to Loughborough" Severn Trent are generally supportive of this approach and would recommend that any development within this catchment also looks to ensure that surface water is discharged to a sustainable outfall in line with the Drainage Hierarchy to prevent overloading of the sewers in storm events.		Not stated	HA17
PSLP/031	Jenny Walker		The allocation is not justified as it will increase surface water flood risk to adjacent properties on The Widon. Also, object to access and availability of schools and doctors.	Remove allocation	No	HA17

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/042	Mr Richard Earle		The plan is not justified due to the adverse impact of 1,300 new homes to the south of Loughborough.	Remove allocation	No	HA17
PSLP/046	Dr Steven Coles		The allocation is not justified due to concerns over increased flood risk; damage to wildlife; and changes to the landscape.	Remove allocation	No	HA17
PSLP/057	Stuart Weller		HA16 is not justified due to impact on flooding; the topography is a natural bowl and development would create peak run offs overwhelming existing drainage (gradient & water flow details provided). There will be detrimental impact on the existing community and the loss of beautiful countryside.	Remove allocation	No	HA17
PSLP/407	Johan Kruger	Bramcote Road Flood Action Group	The allocation is not justified due to flood risk and lack of any mitigation.	Ensure adequate flood mitigation or remove allocation.	No	HA17
PSLP/543	N.Maden	Bramcote Road Flood action Group	Objects to development because of the likely effects that it will have on the flood risk in the area, especially in a high risk area. Objection includes flood risk evidence.	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA17
PSLP/140	S Coles		The plan is not justified. SA May 2020 states "increase growth in Loughborough is limited by the Charnwood Forest to the southwest and settlement identity considerations to the south...it ought to be possible to accommodate between 300-700 further dwellings without triggering any significant negative effects." The plan proposed significantly more houses (1,350) than this at HA15, HA16 and HA17. The plan is not consistent with national policy as it proposed building in what it classes as 'sensitive and valued landscape'. Development at HA15, HA16 and HA17 will ruin the aesthetics of the area and have a significant impact on wildlife.	Reduce the number of houses allocated at HA16, HA16 and HA17. Reconsider and implement NPPF and own environmental policies in the plan.	No	HA17
PSLP/148	D Coles		The plan is not justified or consistent with national policy. SA underestimates impact of development in this area - HA15, HA16, HA17. The plan proposes a far larger amount of development than the SA considers. Impact on sensitive landscape and biodiversity has not been reviewed properly. The NPPF sustainability criteria have not been applied.	Development should be in a new settlement which if carefully chosen, would minimise landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity degradation which the proposed draft plan would do. HA16, HA17 and HA18 should be removed from the plan and HA15 reduced to 450 houses. LSEP boundary should be amended to provide greater distance to ancient woodland.	No	HA17
PSLP/550	Bob Newnham	Hathern Way Residents Association	The plan is not justified because the sites were previously considered unsuitable for large scale development, there is a lack of local separation, there will be a detrimental impact to the hamlet of Woodthorpe including its distinctive character, the lack of provision of facilities like a doctor's surgery and local school facilities. The plan is ineffective because the infrastructure should be built first before the houses. A secondary school is required as well as a primary school. The plan doesn't detail how a bus service will be provided, this should be subsidised by the developer.	The area of separation should be increased. Historic hamlet of Woodthorpe should be included in Design Review. Additional infrastructure should be added for HA15, HA16 and HA17.	No	HA17
PSLP/551	P & M Ackers		The plan is not justified because HA17 will result in the destruction of the natural countryside around the Outwoods. This has happened with previous developments at Moat Lane and Brush Playing Fields. This area of Loughborough is important for wildlife. There is no evidence the development will be designed to meet the needs of low income families and there will be an increase in traffic.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA17
PSLP/210	Damian K Kirk		The proposed housing site (HA17) is not positively prepared or justified by virtue of a complete disregard for the environment, natural habitats, lack of infrastructure and local residents opinion. There appears to be a far greater need to satisfy government targets than there is to satisfy the health and wellbeing of residents and the environment.		Yes	HA17
PSLP/558	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates and Bowler Family	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24 and HA29 as well as HA15).	Add wording to the final sentence of the bullet point relating to education contributions from DS3(HA17) as follows: contribute to the reasonable land and build costs of the provision of a new 2 form entry primary school located at site HA15.	Not stated	HA17
PSLP/336	Philip Makepaeace (plus siganatories to petition)		Selecting site HA17 is inconsistent with Charnwood Council's stated intent to: "create healthier communities", to take "careful consideration of the effects of climate change and how to manage the risk of flooding" and "protection of the intrinsic character of the countryside". If these criteria had been applied correctly, PSH025/HA17 would be deemed inappropriate for development. Also, the criteria should be weighted. There are 200 houses allocated to this site with other more suitable sites excluded for less significant reasons. The plan is in contravention of the NPPF as outline above.	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA17
PSLP/736	T Samuels		Allocation HA17 is not justified as consideration as the site is an area of flood risk - (1) the Government website shows the areas is at flood risk; (2) the Council's SFRA 2018 'Appendix A Geo PDF Index Grid B2' shows this area is at risk of flooding. Also the site is used as breeding habitat by protected Skylark. Swallows, Swifts and House Martins also use the site. This is at conflict with statement sin the plan to protect biodiversity.	Remove HA17 and keep undeveloped	No	HA17
PSLP/355	Mr D. Waymont		This policy is not sound as it does not take enough account of the Sustainability Appraisal Report. Specific comments are made with respect to landscape, biodiversity and nature conservation, agricultural land, traffic, air quality and health.	Objects to allocation	No	HA17

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/306	Mr Ian Briggs		I object to HA17 for the impacts on Valued Landscape Local highway network - specifically the traffic on Park Road, Nanpantan Road and the One Ash roundabout / Leicester Road area and Green Space	Objects to allocation	No	HA17
PSLP/356	Mrs Anne Tomalin		Creating such a big development on the south of Loughborough would cause increased traffic, poor air quality, lack of access to countryside etc. The site infringes on the Charnwood Regional Park. This area should be a buffer for the Outwoods, Beacon Hill and other such areas. The area is home to wildlife Many mature trees and hedges would be felled and felling an old tree or hedge, or the loss of fields means the loss of established ecosystems and biodiversity. No amount of new tree planting and offsetting will replace the ecosystems and wildlife which will be lost. Objects to the loss of agricultural land. Brownfield sites should be prioritised. People need access to open countryside for walking and jogging. This is important for well-being and mental health.	Objects to allocation	No	HA17
PSLP/319	Mr Ramsey Pollock		The Charnwood Local plan is not sound and is not in keeping with its own sustainability appraisal for the allocation of such large numbers of houses in South Loughborough. The development plans are on areas of outstanding beauty whose landscapes contribute to the health and wellbeing of the community. Development of this area would pose a severe risk to local health and wellbeing and the degradation of the environment and wildlife. Development plans are out of kilter with Charnwood's own policies to improve partnership to improve the health of Charnwood people.	Objects to allocation, and impacts of cumulative scale of development in South Loughborough. Deletion of allocation called for.	No	HA17
PSLP/317	Miss Abigail Coles		The Charnwood Local plan is not sound and is not in keeping with its own sustainability appraisal for the allocation of such large numbers of houses in South Loughborough. The development plans are on areas of outstanding beauty whose landscapes contribute to the health and wellbeing of the community. Development of this area would pose a severe risk to local health and wellbeing and the degradation of the environment and wildlife. Development plans are out of kilter with Charnwood's own policies to improve partnership to improve the health of Charnwood people.	Objects to allocation, and impacts of cumulative scale of development in South Loughborough. Deletion of allocation called for.	No	HA17
PSLP/316	Mrs Denise Coles		The Charnwood Local plan is not sound and is not in keeping with its own sustainability appraisal for the allocation of such large numbers of houses in South Loughborough. he development plans are on areas of outstanding beauty whose landscapes contribute to the health and wellbeing of the community. Development of this area would pose a severe risk to local health and wellbeing and the degradation of the environment and wildlife. Development plans are out of kilter with Charnwood's own policies to improve partnership to improve the health of Charnwood people.	Objects to allocation, and impacts of cumulative scale of development in South Loughborough. Deletion of allocation called for.	No	HA17
PSLP/414	David Waymont		Housing Allocations H15 HA16 and HA17contradict Policy DS1 because they don't protect the intrinsic nature of the countryside, don't maintain GW or ALS, do not safeguard and deliver a net gain in biodiversity, they don't protect environmental resources including local air quality and the most versatile agricultural land, they don't protect and enhance the biodiversity of the Charnwood Forest Regional Park. Housing Allocations H15 HA16 and HA17contradict Policy DS1 contradict all the bullets in policy EV6. Housing Allocations H15 HA16 and HA17contradict Policy LUC1 because they don't provide urban form which integrates with the wider landscape or respond positively to landscape character areas. They don't protect the predominantly open and undeveloped character of ALS, Charnwood Forest, River Soar or strategically important links in the wildlife networks which connect them. The SA also identified a number of issues during the scoping process. There is also a lack of health care facilities in Loughborough.	Sites should be reviewed and appropriate mitigation put in place so that all SA criteria are neutral.	No	HA17
PSLP/420	T Coleman		The plan is not justified because HA16 and HA17 will be built on land which is used by residents for exercise and leisure. There is no policy to address the shortfall in open space. EV9 has no approach for meeting the needs of the whole community in areas where there is a shortfall in the first place. This is in conflict with paragraphs 35 and 96 of the NPPF.		No	HA17
PSLP/409	Clare Hudson		Objects to allocation because the proposed allocation contradicts the Council's own stated objectives of creating a 'thriving economy with healthy communities and environmental safeguards', and instead threatens already over-stretched local services as well as the precious natural environment	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA17
PSLP/390	Daniel Sage		The development of HA 15, 16, 17 and 19 will extend Loughborough towards the Outwoods with a much smaller buffer of open farmland. This will materially reduce the physical isolation of Outwoods and permanently reduce its character as a distinct ancient woodland. Moreover, there is a risk that future housing development will then extend beyond the planned perimeter in the Local Plan and Outwoods will become connected to Loughborough.	Most of the south of H17 should not be considered for relatively large-scale housing development. This will preserve the peaceful atmosphere of rainbows, protect the distinct character of the Outwoods ancient woodland for future generations and safeguard wildlife.	No	HA17
PSLP/436	Mr J Adams		CBC's opening statement of making Charnwood one of the most desirable places to live, work and visit in the East Midlands has to be questioned given the proposals to yet again develop on green field sites which require the removal forever of productive agricultural land and amenity, together with unacceptable disruption to daily life of residents most affected by the proposed developments.	Review allocation	Yes	HA17

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/439	Neil R. Lambert		Regrettably, the plan is presented by planners for planners and simply sets out it's own rules and definitions to self-satisfy government requirements. We are therefore presented with a cynical lack of care for local residents, in my case, on the edge of Loughborough, and regarding HA15, HA16 and HA17 I'm shocked by proposed numbers of houses, over 700, 400 and 200 respectively, and fear the density which is being squeezed in. Although an area of local separation is mentioned, I do not trust that this will be adequate, given recent developments in south of Loughborough already. My reading of the plan is that we will end up with more houses in current green fields and open spaces, making a reduction in my quality of life and those in my local area	Objects to the scale of development	No	HA17
PSLP/493	A Bertram & J Golding		The plan is not justified because HA16 and HA17 will bring development closer to the Outwoods and Jubilee Woods which are SSSI's. There will be a significant loss of peace and tranquillity. There is significant flood risk in the area and roads are already heavily congested.	Remove HA16 and HA17	Not stated	HA17
PSLP/520	F Phipps		The plan is not justified because HA17 will have a negative impact on the landscape and ecology/ biodiversity including Charnwood Forest. There are traffic issues and no detail on how access will be made. There is flood risk to homes and gardens in the area already. The SA assessment of the site has not been undertaken correctly.	Revisit SA assessment of site and consider removing allocation.	No	HA17
PSLP/596	Joshua Vande Hey		The allocation is not justified due to landscape sensitivity; recreational use of land; loss of natural space; and a considerable loss of amenity.	Remove allocation	Yes	HA17
PSLP/731	Diana Webster		The fields at HA17, which have been allocated as housing zones are nesting sites for red-listed birds such as sky larks and yellowhammers as well as for bats. These fields are the heart and lungs of the town of Loughborough and are being treated with little care. The Ecological Assessment report is largely based on an outdated survey from 2011. HA17 is bounded by what is described as protected green space which is not really protected if a road runs through it. HA17 is a large area of what is currently two productive arable fields. The housing within the allocation is shoe-horned into one corner representing less than one third of these fields, suggesting that this is a disingenuous way to subsequently increase the number of houses	Objects to allocation. Access points to designated housing areas need to be outlined and defined. References to the correct housing allocations on the current plan should be clearer. The Ecological report uses defunct references so is very confusing	No	HA17
PSLP/735	Maggie Taylor		Once this established wild space is gone, it's gone for ever. These fields provide a buffer zone between town and woods, the hedges offering protection and home to wildlife. The plan talks about an environmental net benefit but how can this well-used and loved area be replaced. How will that net benefit be enforced? There are places on the map where the development will be within 200 metres of the Outwoods. A green screen of trees is paying lip service to the protection of an established wild area that is loved and used by the whole community. We believe that there is a weak area in the planning generally, where, through planning, there is a responsibility to protect the natural environment but Charnwood don't seem to have a clear plan to do this. We want to see clear objectives and targets to 'improve the natural local environment' (Environmental Policy) applied to the local plan.	Objects to allocation	Yes	HA17
PSLP/668	Paul Conway		HA17 is not legally compliant because skylarks are a protected species and are present on the site and have not considered this aspect. HA17 is unsound because it has insufficient flood risk provisions and provisions are of diminished quality since draft circulated 3 years ago. A flood risk assessment for a local property has been submitted as additional evidence. HA17 is not sound because a holistic view of sustainability has not been provided in terms of CO2 impact of the development, increased road traffic, the site is not within walking distance of bus route or employment centre, reduced headcount of Loughborough University as result of Covid19.	Sustainability Appraisal should be more holistic. Post Covid working practices should be addressed	No	HA17
PSLP/461	AF-Hughes		Allocation HA17 is not justified as The proposals would impact the environment and not result in net gain in biodiversity; loss of recreation area will impact health and well being; the proposal will result in more traffic; health and education infrastructure is overstretched.	Develop brownfield sites; considered the provision of secondary education and healthcare; develop areas with existing roads	No	HA17
PSLP/472	R Sharp		Allocation HA17 is not justified as The site will exacerbate surface flooding issues on The Widon; page 125 States that the area is not within flood area zones however this is incorrect compared to government flood warning service mapping; The site is arable land and therefore is not suitable for development; development of the site wood increased local traffic and exacerbate the availability of GP services and schools.	Remove allocation HA17	No	HA17
PSLP/659	E Cerny		Allocation HA17 is not justified as the surrounding area is prone to flooding and the site is at a higher elevation and development will therefore exacerbate this issue; surrounding roads are already congested and development will exacerbate this issue. Similar issues arise from HA16	Replace local sewers; create a plan to deal with increased traffic and reducing risk to cyclists	No	HA17
PSLP/682	J Dwyer		Allocation HA17 is not justified as The site and adjacent land is prone to flooding; development would be a reckless disregard to life and property		Yes	HA17

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/645	P Woolley		Allocation HA17 is not justified or consistent with national policy as It is not consistent with NPPF paragraph 8c, 9, 11a, 20b, 35b, 38, 99, 100, 113, 159; The site is identified in an area of high risk surface water flooding and therefore development is not being directed to areas of lowest flood risk; Development will exacerbate flood risk on Brook Lane and Priory Road, Hold Drive, Kingfisher Way; Building the site next to a proposed new burial ground what remove the peace required for that space; Policy DS1 and DS3 do not specify where access would be obtained add access through a Green Wedge would contravene policy EV2 which aims to safeguard these green assets; The site would be 75-100% more dance than surrounding development which would contravene policy DS5; the site is not in close proximity to bus routes which will increase car dependency; there is no evidence that traffic and impact on local road network has been assessed; the site is adjacent to the National Forest boundary and outwards which should discount it for development	Remove allocation HA17	Yes	HA17
PSLP/612	S Salt		Allocation HA17 is not positively prepared, effective, justified or consistent with national policy as the plan at paragraphs 2.85-2.87, the Charnwood landscape visibility assessment 2021, and the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment of SHLAA Sites 2018 recognise that the site has landscape value - significantly concluding that development of the site would adversely impact the setting of the character and appearance for Outwoods / Charnwood Forest; the site is an important green space that supports public wellbeing and High quality open spaces should be protected from development (ref NPPF para 92, 93, 99); Failure to protect the site for its therapeutic and landscape credentials does not meet the areas objective needs for well being and the plan does not set out any local health priorities in relation to green space (an approach supported by Public Health England); The plan doesn't comply with NPPF paragraph 99 as it does not assess whether the site is surplus to requirement for open space or any other such evidence; the site is set at a significant gradient and development well increase surface water flooding to existing properties - the proposed approach to assess this through a planning application causes future tension; The creation of SUDS running parallel with the existing footpath on the boundary of the site will further detriment the visual credentials of the site; The site lies outside of the urban area of Loughborough and therefore is not intensification of existing areas; Even if new medical infrastructure was developed there is a medical staffing shortage; securing new infrastructure is not a sound reason to permit development on green field land;	Remove allocation HA17	No	HA17
PSLP/613	G Abraham		Allocation HA17 is not positively prepared, effective, justified or consistent with national policy as the plan at paragraphs 2.85-2.87, the Charnwood landscape visibility assessment 2021, and the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment of SHLAA Sites 2018 recognise that the site has landscape value - significantly concluding that development of the site would adversely impact the setting of the character and appearance for Outwoods / Charnwood Forest; the site is an important green space that supports public wellbeing and High quality open spaces should be protected from development (ref NPPF para 92, 93, 99); Failure to protect the site for its therapeutic and landscape credentials does not meet the areas objective needs for well being and the plan does not set out any local health priorities in relation to green space (an approach supported by Public Health England); The plan doesn't comply with NPPF paragraph 99 as it does not assess whether the site is surplus to requirement for open space or any other such evidence; the site is set at a significant gradient and development well increase surface water flooding to existing properties - the proposed approach to assess this through a planning application causes future tension; The creation of SUDS running parallel with the existing footpath on the boundary of the site will further detriment the visual credentials of the site; The site lies outside of the urban area of Loughborough and therefore is not intensification of existing areas; Even if new medical infrastructure was developed there is a medical staffing shortage; securing new infrastructure is not a sound reason to permit development on green field land;	Remove allocation HA17	No	HA17
PSLP/614	R Abraham		Allocation HA17 is not positively prepared, effective, justified or consistent with national policy as the plan at paragraphs 2.85-2.87, the Charnwood landscape visibility assessment 2021, and the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment of SHLAA Sites 2018 recognise that the site has landscape value - significantly concluding that development of the site would adversely impact the setting of the character and appearance for Outwoods / Charnwood Forest; the site is an important green space that supports public wellbeing and High quality open spaces should be protected from development (ref NPPF para 92, 93, 99); Failure to protect the site for its therapeutic and landscape credentials does not meet the areas objective needs for well being and the plan does not set out any local health priorities in relation to green space (an approach supported by Public Health England); The plan doesn't comply with NPPF paragraph 99 as it does not assess whether the site is surplus to requirement for open space or any other such evidence; the site is set at a significant gradient and development well increase surface water flooding to existing properties - the proposed approach to assess this through a planning application causes future tension; The creation of SUDS running parallel with the existing footpath on the boundary of the site will further detriment the visual credentials of the site; The site lies outside of the urban area of Loughborough and therefore is not intensification of existing areas; Even if new medical infrastructure was developed there is a medical staffing shortage; securing new infrastructure is not a sound reason to permit development on green field land;	Remove allocation HA17	No	HA17

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/718	A Lawton Devine		Allocation HA17 is not Consistent with national policy as it does not: protect the natural environment (NPPF 8C, 1La); Improve biodiversity (NPPF 8C, 1La); mitigate or adapt to climate change (NPPF 8C); take local circumstances to reflect character, needs and opportunities (NPPF 9); Sufficiently provide for flood risk (NPPF 20b); provide proportionate evidence (NPPF 35b); improve economic, social and environmental conditions (NPPF 38); Existing open spaces should not be built upon (NPPF es); policies should protect public rights of way (NPPF 100); all developments should require a transport plan (NPPF 113); development in areas of flood risk should be directed to areas of less risk (NPPF L59) [unclear where lettered references are from]	Remove Allocation HA17	No	HA17
PSLP/006	J Crowe		The Local Plan is not justified because the Loughborough Science and Enterprise Park and H18 are prone to flooding and provide a valuable wildlife barrier.	H18 planted with trees and LSEP split between employment, housing and green land	No	HA18
PSLP/025	Mrs Anna Rowlands		HA18 is not justified as it is next to ancient woodland and a huge amount of employment land. The fields collect water and should be planted as additional woodland to protect residents and wildlife.	Remove housing allocation and allocate for tree planting.	No	HA18
PSLP/177	Mrs Anna Lake		Snell's Nook Lane (HA18) indicative plan does not include tree planting and is therefore not in accordance with Paragraph 2.89, Policy DS3 (HA18), EV4 Charnwood Forest and the National Forest According to the National Forest Planting Guidelines 20% of the site should be planted. The outline map of the site in paragraph 2.89 shows no planting.	Modify the plan to show 20% tree planting. A15m buffer to the ancient wood should be set out.	No	HA18
PSLP/095	Mrs Saaima Muktar		Concern that the capacity of HA18 remains at 120 dwellings, as was the case in the 2019 draft. Paragraph 3.80 is incorrect as appropriate mitigation has not been achieved between the drafts.	Reduce capacity of HA18 from 120 to 50 dwellings.	No	HA18
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	Additional policy wording proposed: "Support measures to mitigate flood risk including contributions towards flood alleviation works in the wider catchment of the Burleigh Brook or other water courses flowing through or adjacent to Loughborough	Additional policy wording proposed	Not stated	HA18
PSLP/135	Rebecca Black		Paragraph 3.80 identifies the presence of ecological networks in the vicinity of Burleigh and Holywell Woods. The plan is not justified as it has not used the correct data to assess the ecological network around Holywell ad Burleigh Woods. By not doing so the plan is at odds with NPPF para 35(a) and therefore not consistent with national policy.	Amend paragraph 3.80 to refer to the Defra Woodland Priority Habitat Networks Map to clarify the locations of the ecological networks that must be protected in the vicinity of Burleigh and Holywell Woods.	No	HA18
PSLP/148	D Coles		HA18 LSEP does not accommodate wildlife/ consider damage to wildlife, is too close to ancient woodland, doesn't take account of environmental impact or aesthetics and beauty of the site. There is limited open space in this area, the site does not meet sustainability criteria or concerns of local residents.	Development should be in a new settlement which if carefully chosen, would minimise landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity degradation which the proposed draft plan would do. HA16, HA17 and HA18 should be removed from the plan and HA15 reduced to 450 houses. LSEP boundary should be amended to provide greater distance to ancient woodland.	No	HA18
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Policy and diagram refer to safeguarding future access route to LSEP. County Highways are not aware of any proposal and it appears to end without linking to Nanpantan Road. Evidence of potential traffic impacts would be required to develop.		Yes	HA18
PSLP/258	A Ketley		Allocation HA18 is not justified as access via Parklands Drive would result in unsafe levels of traffic which the drive is too narrow to accommodate; any widening of the drive would remove feature mature trees; loss of trees/grass will exacerbate flooding issues; local wildlife use the site; the old landfill site would be smelly when top soil is lifted.	Remove allocation HA18, especially access via Parkland Drive	No	HA18
PSLP/285	R Johnstone		Allocation HA18 is not positively prepared or justified as it is not afforded 'parkland setting' status as LSEP is on paragraph 3.147 even though it is the same area of land	Remove allocation HA18.	No	HA18
PSLP/305	A Lundie		The plan is not justified as there is a 5ha shortfall of green space in Nanpantan. The Council has failed to meet current and future needs. NWRA is keen to work with the Council to manage, protect and acquire the open space. The plan is not sustainable and Leconfield Road and HA18 should not be developed.	Remove allocation HA18. Designate Leconfield Road as LGS.	No	HA18
PSLP/310	Dr Karen Henderson		The land at Snell's Nook Lane (HA18) must be protected for the open space needs of the community.	Greater consideration of open space needs called for.	No	HA18
PSLP/319	Mr Ramsey Pollock		Development will irreversibly damage and alter the beauty of the landscape, the enjoyment of the area. This is also a significant area for wildlife, planned development will bring catastrophic damage to the nature of Charnwood and the well-being and importance this brings to the area.	Deletion of allocation called for.	No	HA18
PSLP/317	Miss Abigail Coles		Development will irreversibly damage and alter the beauty of the landscape, the enjoyment of the area. This is also a significant area for wildlife, planned development will bring catastrophic damage to the nature of Charnwood and the well-being and importance this brings to the area.	Deletion of allocation called for.	No	HA18

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/316	Mrs Denise Coles		Development will irreversibly damage and alter the beauty of the landscape, the enjoyment of the area. This is also a significant area for wildlife, planned development will bring catastrophic damage to the nature of Charnwood and the well-being and importance this brings to the area.	Deletion of allocation called for	No	HA18
PSLP/019	Mr Garry Willis		Allocation is not justified on land linking Burleigh Wood to the National Forest because of impact on valuable habitat for wildlife and traffic congestion.	The town centre could accommodate the housing.	No	HA18
PSLP/051	Mr Derek Cranage		Allocation is not justified because development would be too close to the Charnwood Forest Canal Footpath. Developments may damage steep banks supporting trees and the footpath.	Amend diagram to move site away from canal and note requirement to protect canal footpath in supporting text.	No	HA18
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Land referenced in paragraph 3.80 as being 'an ecological network' can in fact be determined in a far more fine-grained manner by using data readily available from Government sources. The specific areas of land in the vicinity of Burleigh and Holywell Woods that are ecologically important can then be determined and identified for specific protection. By not including these readily-available data relating to ecological networks, the Local Plan is clearly at odds with NPPF 35(a) by not meeting the area's objectively assessed needs.	Paragraph 3.80 must refer to the Defra Woodland Priority Habitat Networks Map to clarify the locations of the ecological networks that must be protected in the vicinity of Burleigh and Holywell Woods.	Yes	LUC1
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Snell's Nook Lane (HA18) development cannot be justified. HA18 is in the same attractive landscape as the LSEP, but HA18 does not give the same outstanding economic advantage (it is also not shown to be in a parkland setting in paragraph 2.89). The Council states that development in this area is only acceptable if certain reasons apply. HA18 is in this area and the reasons do not apply. Therefore, HA18 must not be developed.	Remove HA18 from the Local Plan as a site for development.	Yes	HA18
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The capacity of HA18 has not been reduced from that set out in Draft Local Plan and should be. The text indicates that it has been. The site is in the Charnwood Forest and 20% of the site should be planted with trees in accordance with National Forest Planting Guidelines. A suitable buffer should be provided to the ancient woodland.	Reduce capacity to 50 homes, and provide for 20% of site to be planted with trees and a suitable buffer to the ancient woodland in the site policy.	Yes	HA18
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The diagram accompanying site allocation HA18 does not show a right of way to provide a corridor to connect fragmented parts of Charnwood Forest	Add a path to the diagram of the site in paragraph 2.89 so that wildlife and human connections can be created between the Charnwood Forest sites in Nanpantan and those to the south-west of Loughborough	Yes	HA18
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Open space shortfalls for Nanpantan are calculated in the Open Spaces Strategy document, but, due to the 73ha of greenfield land that has been allocated to the Loughborough Science and Enterprise Park, insufficient physical land is available in Nanpantan to address the shortfalls. In fact, only Leconfield Road remains as land unallocated in the residential area. Further, the land at Snell's Nook Lane (HA18) that has been designated in the Local Plan as a housing site must instead be used to address the shortfalls.	The land at Snell's Nook Lane (HA18) must also be protected for the open space needs of the community.	Yes	HA18
PSLP/428	Ana Blanco Alvarez		The allocation is not justified as the site forms part of a wider ecological network in the vicinity of Burleigh and Holywell Woods that must be protected.	Remove allocation and identify and protect ecological network using information from Government sources.	No	HA18
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The allocation is supported. Elements of the policy are not effective as the illustrative diagram accompanying it could become a constraint that closes off alternative solutions to deliver the requirements of the policy. In addition, the final bullet point in relation to the Loughborough Science and Enterprise Park could be better worded.	Remove diagram as policy wording is sufficient to enable delivery. Amend final bullet point of DS3(HA18) to read: <del>ensure that the ability to provide</del> <b>not prejudice</b> suitable, <b>and</b> safe access to the Loughborough Science and Enterprise Park, <del>should this be required, is safeguarded, and that the development does not otherwise compromise the delivery of the Loughborough Science and Enterprise Park.</del>	Yes	HA18
PSLP/401	S Jasper		Allocation HA18 is not positively prepared or justified as it is not afforded 'parkland setting' status as LSEP is on paragraph 3.147 even though it is the same area of land	Remove allocation HA18.	No	HA18
PSLP/482	D Potter		Allocation HA18 is not positively prepared or justified as it is not afforded 'parkland setting' status as LSEP is on paragraph 3.147 even though it is the same area of land. HA18 is also not shown to be parkland setting in paragraph 2.89.	Remove allocation HA18.	No	HA18
PSLP/483	D Potter		Allocation HA18 is not positively prepared or justified as it is not afforded 'parkland setting' status as LSEP is on paragraph 3.147 even though it is the same area of land. HA18 is also not shown to be parkland setting in paragraph 2.89.	Remove allocation HA18.	No	HA18

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/484	S Potter		Allocation HA18 is not positively prepared or justified as it is not afforded 'parkland setting' status as LSEP is on paragraph 3.147 even though it is the same area of land. HA18 is also not shown to be parkland setting in paragraph 2.89.	Remove allocation HA18.	No	HA18
PSLP/488	L Potter		Allocation HA18 is not positively prepared or justified as it is not afforded 'parkland setting' status as LSEP is on paragraph 3.147 even though it is the same area of land. HA18 is also not shown to be parkland setting in paragraph 2.89.	Remove allocation HA18.	No	HA18
PSLP/489	J Bateman		Allocation HA18 is not positively prepared or justified as it is not afforded 'parkland setting' status as LSEP is on paragraph 3.147 even though it is the same area of land. HA18 is also not shown to be parkland setting in paragraph 2.89.	Remove allocation HA18.	No	HA18
PSLP/683	R Phillips		Allocation HA18 is not justified as the document at paragraph 3.80 recognises that the site has ecological constraints and this hasn't been factored into the number of dwellings proposed which remains at 120, even though the size of the site has been halved since 2019. the site contributes to nearby ancient Woodlands Holywell and Burleigh Woods and mitigation is therefore required. Allocation HA18 is not positively prepared or justified as it is not afforded 'parkland setting' status as LSEP is on paragraph 3.147 even though it is the same area of land	The capacity of the HA18 should be reduced from 120 and 50 Remove Allocation HA18	No	HA18
PSLP/396	B Singer		Allocation HA18 is not positively prepared as paragraph 3.80 does not include a source reference for identifying an ecological network and should make use of detailed evidence such as the Woodland Priority Habitats Network DEFRA mapping to protect ecology surrounding Burleigh and Holywell Woods.		No	HA18
PSLP/210	Damian K Kirk		The proposed housing site (HA19) is not positively prepared or justified by virtue of a complete disregard for the environment, natural habitats, lack of infrastructure and local residents opinion. There appears to be a far greater need to satisfy government targets than there is to satisfy the health and wellbeing of residents and the environment.		Yes	HA19
PSLP/558	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates and Bowler Family	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24 and HA29 as well as HA15).	Add wording to the final sentence of the bullet point relating to education contributions from DS3(HA19) as follows: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new 2 form entry primary school located at site HA15.	Not stated	HA19
PSLP/390	Daniel Sage		The development of HA 15, 16, 17 and 19 will extend Loughborough towards the Outwoods with a much smaller buffer of open farmland. This will materially reduce the physical isolation of Outwoods and permanently reduce its character as a distinct ancient woodland. Moreover, there is a risk that future housing development will then extend beyond the planned perimeter in the Local Plan and Outwoods will become connected to Loughborough.	Scale of development should be reconsidered.	No	HA19
PSLP/010	Jose Goncalves		Object to development of HS20. Access should be prevented from Parkland Drive due to congestion and increased traffic hazards. It is a wildlife haven with protected species. Increased risk of burglaries and theft. Misleading description with unexpected access.	Remove allocation Restrict access	No	HA20
PSLP/372	Dubheasa Mullins		The plan is not justified and HA20 should be removed because of lack of direct access, poor visibility, already congested road, road safety for younger children, increase in air pollution because of more cars, close proximity to a landfill site, loss of mature trees and biodiversity, flood risk and lack of school places.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA20
PSLP/104	Mr and Mrs Wilshee		The plan is not justified and HA20 should be removed from the plan. The access should be from Beacon Road and not Parklands Drive. There are safety concerns, the road is narrow and visibility from a junction on the road would be poor due to parked cars. Additional vehicles would result in increased air pollution particularly if causing queues at peak times. The land is non-draining clay geology and any additional hard surfacing is likely to increase the chance of flooding down the site slope. The site is located close to a closed landfill site. The site has become a natural habitat for wildlife, often observed by residents on Parklands Drive, such as bats, badgers and Great Crested newts, all of which, are species protected by law.	Remove allocation from the plan.	No	HA20
PSLP/166	L Smith		Site HA20 is not justified as it will exacerbate traffic and parking issues on Parkland Drive which also has poor visibility with a 90 degree bend. Previously did not comment as had assumed access was via Beacon Road.	Either remove allocation HA20 or restrict access to the site via Parkland Drive.	No	HA20
PSLP/530	J Hawker		The plan is not justified as there is a risk of regular flooding at HA20. There will be increased traffic causing further congestion and safety issues on Parklands Drive. The road is inaccessible to construction vehicles. The site is full of wildlife and biodiversity including newts, bats, badgers and foxes.		No	HA20

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/206	Marion Martin		The policy title address is misleading. The proposed housing site (HA20) is not positively prepared or justified for several reasons, inclusive of traffic, provision of utilities, environmental impact and schooling. However, the ground conditions are such that the implications for foul and surface water drainage render the site unsuitable for any form of housing development.	Remove allocation (HA20) from the Plan.	Not stated	HA20
PSLP/210	Damian K Kirk		The proposed housing site (HA20) is not positively prepared or justified by virtue of a complete disregard for the environment, natural habitats, lack of infrastructure and local residents opinion. There appears to be a far greater need to satisfy government targets than there is to satisfy the health and wellbeing of residents and the environment.		Yes	HA20
PSLP/558	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates and Bowler Family	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24 and HA29 as well as HA15).	Add wording to the bullet point relating to education contributions from DS3(HA20) as follows: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new 2 form entry primary school located at site HA15.	Not stated	HA20
PSLP/269	K Hillier		Allocation HA20 is not justified or positively prepared as contributions for schools are not a priority rather securing suitable road access is; additional traffic on Parkland Drive or Cross Hill Lane would result in intolerable cut throughs.	The allocation should be accessed via Beacon Road	Yes	HA20
PSLP/306	Mr Ian Briggs		Key information necessary to understand how HS20 is to be developed is not present in the draft plan; HS20 has some significant environmental constraints that threaten its delivery.	Would like to see HS20 removed from the plan or at the very least, it be made clear that access must be via Beacon Road and not Parklands Drive / Cross hill Lane.	Yes	HA20
PSLP/581	Jane Hubter		The allocation is not justified as Parklands Drive is an unsuitable access as it is narrow; has very poor visibility; is accessed from Park Road which already has traffic queues; has cars parking on the pavement; is a residential street with children causing safety issues. Development would raise issues as loss of trees would impact the character of the area; it is a former landfill which could pollute water courses; increased flooding; and the impact on wildlife and habitats.	Remove allocation or at least restrict access from Parklands Drive.	Not stated	HA20
PSLP/584	Claire Verona		The allocation is not justified due to increased noise in the area; access from Parkland Drive is unsuitable and will have safety issues; increased flooding and water run-off; loss of trees impacting noise, air pollution and mental well-being; impact on existing properties from a high water table; an inadequate sewerage system; and the loss of biodiversity	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA20
PSLP/735	Maggie Taylor		This area of land is important for many animals. The local plan makes an assumption that all green spaces are the same. This is not true. The Cross Hill Lane green space is a very established wild life haven It has already been objected to by the Environment Agency for building. It is a former landfill site and there is a risk of harmful substances being released if it is disturbed. The latest plan is for Parklands Drive to be used for access to HA20 for construction and eventual residents. Parklands Drive is unsuitable for the additional traffic generated by the presence of new homes. The street often has many parked cars. The corner at the North end of the street has poor visibility, which increased traffic would worsen. Leicestershire County Council Highways have objected to the allocation of HA20 due to a lack of direct access to an existing road. If Parklands Drive is widened in order to improve traffic issues this would necessitate the removal of several mature trees and grass verges, irreversibly and negatively changing the character of the street and increasing the further risk of flooding, already seen at the bottom of Parklands Drive.	Objects to allocation	Yes	HA20
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The allocation is supported. The reference to site HA15 in terms of school provision is not effective as there may be more appropriate schools when the site is delivered.	Amend Policy DS3(HA20) to read: We will support development proposals at site HA20 that <b>fairly and reasonably</b> contribute to the provision of necessary infrastructure <del>reasonable costs of the provision of a new 2 form entry primary school located at HA15, as necessary.</del>	Yes	HA20

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/708	J Browne		Allocation HA20 is not justified as Parkland Drive is not suitable to support extra development due to parking/ configuration; traffic issues in the area will be exacerbated; do not support the removal of mature trees/ grass verges which ass the street character; County Highways object to the allocation on highways grounds and have previously been refused; the site is a former landfill and disturbance could harm human health; development will exacerbate flooding issues; impact on wildlife	Do not allow access to HA20 via Parklands Drive.	No	HA20
PSLP/487	M+S Parkins		Allocation HA20 is not justified as This site has previously been refused on highway grounds; concerned that additional traffic would reduce safety of nearby school children; the access road his unsuitable do you two on street parking; Additional traffic will result in congestion; the site has existing flooding issues including a high water table and development will exacerbate this.	Remove allocation HA20 or ensure that access is from Parklands Drive	No	HA20
PSLP/655	I Nicholson		Allocation HA20 is not justified as The site has no direct access to the road network (as raised by Leicestershire County Council); The site is proposed to be accessed from Parklands Drive not Beacon Road; Parklands Drive Is unsuitable for additional traffic due to its configuration and existing traffic issues; lots of grass verges and trees along Parklands Drive Would have a negative impact on the character of the street and impact local flooding; there will be cumulative traffic impact from HA16, HA17 and HA19 Which is not referred to in the transport assessment PTRMv2; concern that the 2019 environmental assessment report is superficial and that the site hasn't been assessed in the Phase 1 Habitat Assessment 2012; Concerned that the site is a former landfill site and that the Environment Agency expressed extreme caution in developing this site due to the release of hydrogen sulphide; The plan already over provides for the amount of housing required	remove allocation HA20 as the plan over provides for housing; If the site is allocated ensure that it cannot be accessed from Parkland's Drive, that a flood risk assessment is conducted, hand that the ex landfill element of the site is maintained to achieve 10% biodiversity net gain	No	HA20
PSLP/656	M Parkins		Allocation HA20 is not justified as The site has previously been challenged on highways grounds; Concern that access from Parkland's Drive would increase traffic along this street which has existing parking, traffic and configuration problems; The site provides habitats for wildlife; development of the site will remove natural drainage and exacerbate local flooding issues Particularly towards lower ground	Access from Beacon Road Would be the best option given the recent relocation of Ashmount school And existing traffic issues along Parkland's Drive	Yes	HA20
PSLP/670	G Parkins		Allocation HA20 is not justified as access from Parklands Drive is unsuitable as it is a narrow residential street and the resulting additional volume of traffic exacerbating existing traffic/ road configuration issues in the local area; access from Parklands Drive would result in 3 good quality existing homes being demolished; the allocation would make way for future development as the local green space assessment has not designated the land as such; Impact on wildlife habitat that exists on the site; development will exacerbate existing flooding issues in the area; concerned that the land is former landfill and development may potentially release hydrogen sulphide impacting public health (Environment Agency concerns); Concern that This site is being used to fund a new school in Woodthorpe	Developer contributions for education should be invested in extending Mountfields primary school	No	HA20
PSLP/669	J Briggs		Allocation HA20 is not justified or positively prepared as suitable alternatives have not been considered; the 'Beacon Road' names of HA20 is misleading as it will be accessed from Parklands Drive which will exacerbate traffic issues on this and surrounding roads towards Tesco/ Epinal Way roundabouts; the tree/ wide verge character of Parkland Drive could be at risk form increased traffic; Concerned development will disturb the landfill site; concern about loss of wildlife and hedgerows; concern that development will exacerbate flooding	Remove allocation HA20 and allocate development to the West / North-West of Loughborough	Yes	HA20
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	It is noted that several site specific polices include a statement to: "Support measures to mitigate flood risk including contributions towards flood alleviation works in the wider catchment of the Wood Brook or other watercourses flow through or adjacent to Loughborough" Severn Trent are generally supportive of this approach, and would recommend that any development within this catchment also looks to ensure that surface water is discharged to a sustainable outfall in line with the Drainage Hierarchy to prevent overloading of the sewers in storm events.		Not stated	HA22
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	It is noted that several site specific polices include a statement to: "Support measures to mitigate flood risk including contributions towards flood alleviation works in the wider catchment of the Wood Brook or other watercourses flow through or adjacent to Loughborough" Severn Trent are generally supportive of this approach, and would recommend that any development within this catchment also looks to ensure that surface water is discharged to a sustainable outfall in line with the Drainage Hierarchy to prevent overloading of the sewers in storm events.		Not stated	HA23
PSLP/558	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates and Bowler Family	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24 and HA29 as well as HA15).	Add wording to the bullet point relating to education contributions from DS3(HA24) as follows: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new 2 form entry primary school located at site HA15.	Not stated	HA24

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	It is noted that several site specific polices include a statement to: "Support measures to mitigate flood risk including contributions towards flood alleviation works in the wider catchment of the Wood Brook or other watercourses flow through or adjacent to Loughborough" Severn Trent are generally supportive of this approach, and would recommend that any development within this catchment also looks to ensure that surface water is discharged to a sustainable outfall in line with the Drainage Hierarchy to prevent overloading of the sewers in storm events.		Not stated	HA26
PSLP/735	Maggie Taylor		We would like to be reassured that the plan has identified and maximised the development of all usable brown field sites. These are likely to be closer to the centre of the town and therefore have fewer transportation needs in order for residents to access facilities. The development of the sites at the old main post office and land at Limehurst Avenue is welcomed.	Comment – policy is supported.	Yes	HA26
PSLP/579	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelsons	In Jelson's view draft housing allocations HA26 should be deleted from Policy DS3 given there is little prospect of the site coming forward for housing during the plan period.	Delete allocation	Not stated	HA26
PSLP/692	S Naik		Allocation HA26 is not justified as Limehurst Avenue Cannot cope with more cars without appropriate parking provision	Ensure that two parking spaces per home are provided	No	HA26
PSLP/735	Maggie Taylor		We would like to be reassured that the plan has identified and maximised the development of all usable brown field sites. These are likely to be closer to the centre of the town and therefore have fewer transportation needs in order for residents to access facilities. The development of the sites at the old main post office and land at Limehurst Avenue is welcomed.	Policy is welcomed	Yes	HA27
PSLP/221	Chris Brampley	Severn Trent Water	It is noted that several site specific polices include a statement to: "Support measures to mitigate flood risk including contributions towards flood alleviation works in the wider catchment of the Wood Brook or other watercourses flow through or adjacent to Loughborough" Severn Trent are generally supportive of this approach, and would recommend that any development within this catchment also looks to ensure that surface water is discharged to a sustainable outfall in line with the Drainage Hierarchy to prevent overloading of the sewers in storm events.		Not stated	HA28
PSLP/558	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates and Bowler Family	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24 and HA29 as well as HA15).	Add wording to the bullet point relating to education contributions from DS3(HA29) as follows: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new 2 form entry primary school located at site HA15.	Not stated	HA29
PSLP/636	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Trustees of Garendon Estate	The policy is supported and the site is a deliverable option for a mixed use scheme comprising housing and employment uses.		Yes	HA30
PSLP/330	Brenda Snape	Shepshed Town Council	Allocation HA30 should be part residential, part extension of employment land due to proximity with the M1.	See comment	No	HA30
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	In order for the policy to be consistent with national policy it should be clearer that the allocations in Shepshed that would make use of the new primary school at HA32 would need to contribute to both the land and build costs of the new school.	That the final bullet point of Policy DS3(HA30) be amended to: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new <del>3 form entry</del> primary school located at site HA32.	Yes	HA30
PSLP/330	Brenda Snape	Shepshed Town Council	Allocation HA31 requires substantial highways improvements at the A512 junction. Development will exacerbate surface	Allocation HA31 requires substantial highways improvements at the A512 junction. Development will exacerbate surface	No	HA31
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	In order for the policy to be consistent with national policy it should be clearer that the allocations in Shepshed that would make use of the new primary school at HA32 would need to contribute to both the land and build costs of the new school.	That the final bullet point of Policy DS3(HA31) be amended to: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new <del>3 form entry</del> primary school located at site HA32.	Yes	HA31
PSLP/539	Ian Nelson	North West Leicestershire District Council	The Council believes that the plan would be more effective if policies HA32 to HA35 were to include a specific requirement to addressing any impacts upon both the local and strategic road network, and where such measures are known they should be specified.	Add fourth bullet to policy - "incorporates the provision of necessary offsite mitigation measures to address any adverse impacts upon the local and strategic highway network"	Yes	HA32
PSLP/578	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu and Longcliffe Estates	Supports allocation and sets out further details of delivery.		Not stated	HA32
PSLP/330	Brenda Snape	Shepshed Town Council	Support provision of a primary school within allocations HA32 and HA34. Tickow Lane requires road repairs to make it serviceable. The Blackbrook should be retained for wildlife.	See comment	No	HA32

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	The principle of the allocation is supported. The provision of a new primary school on the site is supported. In order for the policy to be consistent with national policy it should be clearer that the other allocations that would make use of the provision would need to contribute to both the land and build costs of the new school. Negotiation are still ongoing in relation to the appropriate size of the school to be provided. The policy is not positively prepared, justified or effective as it requires a specific size of school.	Paragraph 2.97 should be amended as follows: Site HA32 Land off Tickow Lane (south), Shepshed is one of four sites located in close proximity to the Black Brook which is a strategically important link in the wildlife network. The other three sites are HA33, HA34 and HA35. The <del>development</del> <b>allocation</b> will provide a site for a new primary school that will meet the needs of this development and other development in Shepshed. The second bullet point of Policy DS3(HA32) should be amended as follows: provide the site for a new <del>3-form-entry</del> primary school located on land within the allocated site boundaries and of a size and specification which meets Leicestershire County Council's requirements. We will expect the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of making this provision to be shared amongst the developments that it would serve.	Yes	HA32
PSLP/539	Ian Nelson	North West Leicestershire District Council	The Council believes that the plan would be more effective if policies HA32 to HA35 were to include a specific requirement to addressing any impacts upon both the local and strategic road network, and where such measures are known they should be specified.	Add fourth bullet to policy - "incorporates the provision of necessary offsite mitigation measures to address any adverse impacts upon the local and strategic highway network"	Yes	HA33
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	Additional policy wording: "Opportunity for enhanced upstream storage benefitting the Black Brook".	Additional policy wording proposed	Not stated	HA33
PSLP/562	Beth Evans	DLP obo Gloebal (Oakley Road)	The allocation is supported but it is not considered justified as there is no indication whether the 133 homes allocated is indicative or a ceiling. A site layout is provided for an imminent planning application indicating provision of 204 homes on the site.	Amend allocation to 204 homes and confirm figures in the plan are indicative not a ceiling. Also, to be consistent with other allocations in the vicinity the boundary on the Policies Map should be taken to the Black Brook.	Yes	HA33
PSLP/330	Brenda Snape	Shepshed Town Council	Allocation HA33 is not justified as development alongside recent developments will exacerbate flooding issues on Grade II Listed Shepshed Watermill – no evidence this has been assessed, concern flooding run off from the Mill will release nitrates which are understood to be present due to and overflowing sewage holding tank on Anson Road all of which will impact wildlife;		No	HA33
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	In order for the policy to be consistent with national policy it should be clearer that the allocations in Shepshed that would make use of the new primary school at HA32 would need to contribute to both the land and build costs of the new school.	That the final bullet point of Policy DS3(HA33) be amended to: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new <del>3-form-entry</del> primary school located at site HA32.	Yes	HA33
PSLP/539	Ian Nelson	North West Leicestershire District Council	The Council believes that the plan would be more effective if policies HA32 to HA35 were to include a specific requirement to addressing any impacts upon both the local and strategic road network, and where such measures are known they should be specified.	Add fourth bullet to policy - "incorporates the provision of necessary offsite mitigation measures to address any adverse impacts upon the local and strategic highway network"	Yes	HA34
PSLP/578	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu and Loncliffe Estates	Allocation is supported. Representation includes further details of delivery.	Allocation is supported.	Not stated	HA34
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The allocation is supported.		Yes	HA34
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	In order for the policy to be consistent with national policy it should be clearer that the allocations in Shepshed that would make use of the new primary school at HA32 would need to contribute to both the land and build costs of the new school.	That the final bullet point of Policy DS3(HA34) be amended to: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new <del>3-form-entry</del> primary school located at site HA32.	Yes	HA34

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/539	Ian Nelson	North West Leicestershire District Council	NWDC believes nonetheless that Policy HA35 would be more effective if it included specific landscape mitigation for this site in view of its overall sensitivity. In particular, landscaping should be incorporated along the northern and western site boundaries to minimise its visual impact, including in views from the north, and to reflect the wider area's rural character. The Council believes that the plan would be more effective if policies HA32 to HA35 were to include a specific requirement to addressing any impacts upon both the local and strategic road network, and where such measures are known they should be specified.	Add a new third bullet - <i>incorporate significant landscaping, including along the site's north and west boundaries, which reflects the site's rural location and to help assimilate the development in views from the north and west.</i> Add fourth bullet to policy - "incorporates the provision of necessary offsite mitigation measures to address any adverse impacts upon the local and strategic highway network"	Yes	HA35
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	Additional policy wording proposed: "Opportunity for enhanced upstream storage benefitting the Black Brook".	Additional policy wording proposed.	Not stated	HA35
PSLP/563	Beth Evans	DLP obo Gloeбал (Hallamford Road)	The allocation is supported but it is not considered justified as there is no indication whether the 250 homes allocated to the site is indicative or a ceiling. site layout is provided for an imminent planning application indicating provision of 350 homes on the site, including a primary school and local centre. The site would provide a good location for a school, well-linked to existing and proposed housing by sustainable transport modes. However, if a school is not required in this location a further masterplan has been produced showing 408 homes and a local centre could be provided on the site.	Amend allocation to 350 homes a school and a local centre or 408 homes and a local centre. Confirm in the plan figures are indicative not a ceiling. Also, to be consistent with other allocations in the vicinity the boundary on the Policies Map should be taken to the Black Brook.	Yes	HA35
PSLP/036	Mr Roger E. Collier		The allocation is not justified. The Black Brook forms a natural boundary, and this site crosses it. The road network is narrow roads are unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists. Footpaths cannot be widened.	Remove allocation.	No	HA35
PSLP/330	Brenda Snape	Shepshed Town Council	Allocation HA35 is not justified as the site is prone to flooding and the site contains hedgerows/ trees that provide wildlife habitats.		No	HA35
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	In order for the policy to be consistent with national policy it should be clearer that the allocations in Shepshed that would make use of the new primary school at HA32 would need to contribute to both the land and build costs of the new school.	That the final bullet point of Policy DS3(HA35) be amended to: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new <del>3 form entry</del> primary school located at site HA32	Yes	HA35
PSLP/330	Brenda Snape	Shepshed Town Council	Allocations HA36, HA37 and HA38 have already been granted planning permission.	Access should be provided via Monastery Gardens estate, instead of via Moscow Lane or Brick Kiln Lane	No	HA36
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	In order for the policy to be consistent with national policy it should be clearer that the allocations in Shepshed that would make use of the new primary school at HA32 would need to contribute to both the land and build costs of the new school.	That Policy DS3(HA36) be amended to: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new <del>3 form entry</del> primary school located at site HA32.	Yes	HA36
PSLP/004	Mr John Eckersley		Policy is not justified because planning permission was approved in March 2021		No	HA37
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	In order for the policy to be consistent with national policy it should be clearer that the allocations in Shepshed that would make use of the new primary school at HA32 would need to contribute to both the land and build costs of the new school.	That Policy DS3(HA37) be amended to: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new <del>3 form entry</del> primary school located at site HA32.	Yes	HA37
PSLP/330	Brenda Snape	Shepshed Town Council	Allocations HA39 and HA40 are situated along a fast road with no restrictions	Incorporate road safety improvements along Ingleberry Road. CBC should approach the landowners to provide sport facilities on this site.	No	HA39
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	In order for the policy to be consistent with national policy it should be clearer that the allocations in Shepshed that would make use of the new primary school at HA32 would need to contribute to both the land and build costs of the new school.	That the final bullet point of Policy DS3(HA39) be amended to: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new <del>3 form entry</del> primary school located at site HA32.	Yes	HA39
PSLP/587	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates	The allocation of the site is appropriate and justified.		Not stated	HA40
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	In order for the policy to be consistent with national policy it should be clearer that the allocations in Shepshed that would make use of the new primary school at HA32 would need to contribute to both the land and build costs of the new school.	That the final bullet point of Policy DS3(HA40) be amended to: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new <del>3 form entry</del> primary school located at site HA32.	Yes	HA40

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/518	Sarah Clark	P&DG obo Godwin Developments (GC No.37 Ltd)	Fully support the allocation of HA41. The site is suitable, available and achievable and will contribute to meeting housing need. It will support Shepshed's regeneration, is located close to public transport and local amenities, and the site is being actively promoted.		Yes	HA41
PSLP/330	Brenda Snape	Shepshed Town Council	Allocation HA41 is within Charnwood Forest and employment provision should be industrial, not warehousing	See comment	No	HA41
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	In order for the policy to be consistent with national policy it should be clearer that the allocations in Shepshed that would make use of the new primary school at HA32 would need to contribute to both the land and build costs of the new school.	That the final bullet point of Policy DS3(HA41) be amended to: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new <del>3 form entry</del> primary school located at site HA32.	Yes	HA41
PSLP/330	Brenda Snape	Shepshed Town Council	This site should be used for a small business complex	See comment	No	HA42
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	In order for the policy to be consistent with national policy it should be clearer that the allocations in Shepshed that would make use of the new primary school at HA32 would need to contribute to both the land and build costs of the new school.	That Policy DS3(HA42) be amended to: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new <del>3 form entry</del> primary school located at site HA32.	Yes	HA42
PSLP/026	Cllr Deborah Taylor	Borough and County Councillor	The allocation is not justified, Anstey has already taken a large amount of housing giving rise to substantial traffic causing queuing on Cropston Road at The Nook. More housing on Groby Road will send traffic to The Nook on Bradgate Road causing more queuing. Increasing pressure on services (doctors, dentists, chemists etc.) with expansion limited by car park capacity. Fewer buses serve the area than previously, and developer funded services will stop after time. No bank in village. Only one way in and out of Anstey, unlike other service centres. Anstey is used to access other villages, as the gateway to Charnwood Forest needs to retain its rural and village feel, it is becoming an urban centre. Ashton Green built in the city, will affect traffic congestion along with Leicester city's plans to develop at Thurcaston. Opening the A50 junction could provide some mitigation but would use blind junction at Groby Rd/Bradgate Rd. Anstey cannot take 900 more houses and growth is unsustainable. Plan is not viable, sound or innovative.	Remove allocation. Consider SUE not additional development at villages where roads and services cannot cope. No guarantee infrastructure can be secured so plan cannot prove it is deliverable. SUE infrastructure costs would be less than adding to existing villages.	No	HA43
PSLP/027	Mr J H Whait		HA43 is not justified as the land between Groby Road and A46 floods; is overflowed by high voltage cables; and contains main Severn Trent sewer. Village facilities need increasing and access to village is an issue.	Remove allocation.	No	HA43
PSLP/178	Mr David Gliddon		The land at High Leys farm provides a vital area of greenspace for wildlife. The allocation for housing is not well justified.	Remove or modify allocation	No	HA43
PSLP/077	Mr & Mrs Holland		The allocation is not justified - The Nook is already struggling with extra traffic created by recent housing developments - a potential 3,000 extra cars and vans and lorries will just make life worse. The access into the field on Bradgate Road (numbers 176-178) is totally insufficient for possible amount of traffic even with a further access along Bradgate Road or further access out onto Groby Road. This development would have major impact on local services, car parks, shops, doctors, to which are already at breaking point. The Doctors Surgery in Anstey cannot cope now. Developers only build infrastructure after houses. There is an area of natural beauty and we were led to believe trees with preservation orders on them. There is a likelihood of all these being destroyed. These trees are inhabited by bats and owls. Across the road from the access is conservation land having old established Oak trees with protection orders on. The fields behind Bradgate are historically grazing land, surely that should not be built on. The large field behind Bradgate Road should be considered for a woodland proposal as at Hathern? Anstey is one village highlighted, but what of the 'pretty villages' couldn't this need be shared more equally? I'm unsure whether this local plan is legally compliant as could ruin the wellbeing of Anstey residents.	Remove allocation.	Not stated	HA43
PSLP/544	Rob Foers	Hinckley and Bosworth BC	The edges of the allocation should be softened through green infrastructure interventions to limit a hardened edge to the green wedge. The allocation is larger in size than that proposed in the previous consultation draft of the local plan. In particular it is noted that the development will now provide a primary school and this is welcomed.	Include reference to landscaping	Not stated	HA43
PSLP/343	Edward Argar MP	Member of Parliament for Charnwood	Questions the scale of development given previous significant development and pressure on infrastructure.		No	HA43
PSLP/373	Liz Hamkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	The allocation is not justified as, whilst environmental requirements are noted, it is within Green Wedge and removes this designation. The policy should a timescale for the school completion. A masterplan needs completion before outline consent is granted and should include a transport study. Suitable mitigation for transport impacts is not demonstrated.	Remove allocation	No	HA43
PSLP/404	Hannah Shaw	Newtown Linford Parish Council	The plan is not justified as the large expansion planned for West Anstey will increase the pressure on the surrounding roads and junctions. This large expansion will also create problems for the existing Doctors surgeries – there is little space in the Anstey practice already.	Remove allocation	No	HA43
PSLP/156	Avison Young	National Grid	Site is crossed by an 400kv overhead transmission line.	For information	Not stated	HA43
PSLP/084	S Harlow		Allocation of HA43 is not justified as access via Bradgate Road is reliant on a blind junction. HA43 is also on a flood plain.	Road upgrades are required.	No	HA43

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/374	R West		The plan is not justified. The diagram for HA43 is misleading as there is another road, Staddon Road, a bus route feeding into the centre from the north-west. Anstey will lose its separate identity if HA 12, HA13 and HA43 are included in the plan. The road systems in Anstey are inadequate for the proposed extra vehicles envisioned by the LP. Congestion and pollution will increase. Additional traffic from HA43 will make Groby road dangerous. Public car parks in Anstey are inadequate. Development at HA43 will destroy historic ridge and furrow grassland. There will be a loss of viable farmland which should be used for open space. There are poor services and facilities in Anstey. There is flood risk from the Rothley Brook.		Not stated	HA43
PSLP/146	D Woodward		Proposed site HA43 is not justified as Anstey does not have appropriate health, school, parking infrastructure, and access via The Nook and Leicester Road is congested regularly. The proposed strategy does not comply with the Strategic Growth Plan states how communities feel overwhelmed with the speed and scale of development		No	HA43
PSLP/183	E Tilbury		Proposed site HA43 is not justified at it will exacerbate traffic along Bradgate Road; reduced green space will impact on local wellbeing, air and environment.	Developers should live in the area. Remove Allocation HA43	No	HA43
PSLP/184	K & C Knowles		Proposed site HA43 is not justified at it will exacerbate traffic and congestion along Bradgate Road.		No	HA43
PSLP/547	Tamsin Cottle	P&DG obo William Davis (HA43)	The policy is not positively prepared, numbers for each site should be approximate with final numbers informed by high quality masterplanning. Reference to poor accessibility / not within or close to a large urban area in topic paper and Chapter 6 of SA report regarding site PSH387 & 388 is not accurate or consistent with table 6.2 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report. The allocation is not considered justified as it has been constrained in size but the promoter's landscape and ecology evidence consider a larger site is developable. A masterplan is available showing this and new location for primary school. To be effective the allocation should be split into two separate sites (north & south) to improve delivery.	Consider allocation home numbers to be approximate. Consider larger site for development. Split allocation into two separate sites. Policy rewording suggested	Not stated	HA43
PSLP/190	R Gray		Allocation HA43 is not justified as it will result in Anstey having traffic congestion in the village centre; will overwhelm the GP and chemist; and a proposed school on Bradgate Road will have vehicle access and parking issues.		No	HA43
PSLP/123	Carole West		The HA12, HA13, HA43 and HA44 are not justified, no infrastructure has been put in place for applications already approved near HA43. Infrastructure will come forward in a piecemeal fashion. Local roads are narrow, dangerous and parking is insufficient. There is already congestion at the Nook and little opportunity to cycle. There are limited local services and facilities and where there is, they are oversubscribed. The proposals will impact on biodiversity, ancient hedgerows and wildlife and result in a loss of farmland. There is risk of flooding and the sewers will not be able to cope. The proposals will destroy the sense of community and local character of Anstey.	Remove allocations	Not stated	HA43
PSLP/194	Linda Holland		The plan is not justified because of HA43. The development will overlook our property resulting in a loss of privacy and daylight. The scale of the proposal is too big and would dominate the village and cause too much traffic particularly at the Nook. More traffic would increase air pollution. The proposals would impact on the character of the area, trees, wildlife and nature conservation. Existing services and facilities do not have enough capacity for additional development. The Strategic Growth Plan should be taken into consideration. There has already been too much housing in Anstey and new housing should be provided nearer to the city centre.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA43
PSLP/211	K Holland		The plan is not justified and HA43 should be removed the development will overlook our property resulting in a loss of privacy and daylight. The scale of the proposal is too big and would dominate the village and cause too much traffic particularly at the Nook. More traffic would increase air pollution and cause highway safety issues. There is a need for more car parking for people to shop local. The proposals would impact on the character of the area, trees, wildlife, nature conservation and air pollution. Existing services and facilities do not have enough capacity for additional development. The Strategic Growth Plan should be taken into consideration. There has already been too much housing in Anstey and new housing should be provided nearer to the city centre. Brownfield sites should be developed first.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA43
PSLP/245	J Pole		The proposals map is not clear enough to determine the impact of HA43 to make comments	Provide link to a detailed visual	No	HA43
PSLP/290	W & J Suschitzky		Allocation HA43 is not justified as this will increase traffic and reduce highway safety on Bradgate Road which is well used for access to Bradgate Park; cumulative development in Anstey will increase congestion; public transport and cycle lanes are insufficient		No	HA43

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/335	Ann Woodward		The location of HA43 is inappropriate/ unsound. The location of this proposed development takes no account of the destruction of the immediate natural surroundings. There is nothing stated in the plan as regards the consideration of Land Drainage as it exists and the obvious consequences that will result from "Concreting Over" the fields immediately below High Leys Farm. The proposed developments will cause the rain water (which can no longer access the once field drainage), to "run off" the development hard surfaces, straight into the rear gardens of the existing Bradgate Road properties. The only compromise to prevent this, would be to move HA43 a good 100M further away i.e. to the south west and thus create a Green Corridor the entire length of the existing Bradgate Housing, thus not merely at the very top end immediately below High Leys Farm, as currently shown on the proposed HA43.	Considers allocation to be inappropriate.	Not stated	HA43
PSLP/318	M Molesdale		Allocation of HA43 is not justified as building on the Rothley Brook flood plain will damage habitats and affect downstream; roads, health, school and shops in Anstey will be overwhelmed; local SSSIs, Sheet Hedges Wood and other wildlife sites will be depleted; veteran trees will be destroyed.		Yes	HA43
PSLP/308	M Smith		Allocations HA43 and HA44 are not justified as Anstey's infrastructure cannot cope; object to road access to HA44 via Pollards Road due to the sharp bend of the road and impact on highway safety	Scale back development in Anstey. Remove allocation HA44	No	HA43
PSLP/354	C.Triffitt		There is no consideration of the 'character' of the place which overdevelopment threatens. or historic and archeological problems of sites. There is no protection of Environment - Green wedges and belts are to be built on. No wedge at all appears in the parish on Groby road. Wildlife cut off by it from any in next area. Infrastructure Other concerns expressed about traffic, access to medical services. No justification for loading an inequitable number of dwellings on an area whose environment is especially at risk by virtue of its position between City, and Bradgate park.	Objects to allocation.	No	HA43
PSLP/353	Mr John Morley		Landscape considerations have not been given sufficient recognition. Object to the loss of open countryside and the scale of development. Lack of consideration has been given to infrastructure. The existing roads and junctions cannot cope with the volume of traffic currently and would cause huge problems for the volume of traffic these developments would generate. The Local Plan goes straight from high-level policy-making to drawing lines around particular development sites, without proper consideration of the sites or any integrated thinking concerning sustainability, the environment or transport. Far more site analysis and consideration of infrastructure proposals is necessary to make the proposed Local Plan a sound document.	Objects to the allocation.	Yes	HA43
PSLP/339	Ken Triffitt		There has been a lack of consultation on the significant changes to the Plan for housing allocation for Anstey. The allocation of housing could be in smaller packets to support villages and areas where there are school places and falling numbers. Some smaller settlements where shops and services are struggling could benefit from carefully managed small developments.	Objects to housing proposals for Anstey and inadequate consultation.	No	HA43
PSLP/074	Mr John Denoon		Housing development is not justified due to habitat destruction; damage to biodiversity; increased flooding; increased traffic. Anstey will become a town, and currently lacks services.	Reduce or remove allocation.	No	HA43
PSLP/381	Martin and Penny Broomhead		A masterplan for area HA43 should be prepared before any development is allowed to indicate how future traffic will be diverted away from existing congested roads within Anstey. It is disappointing that development of this site removes the Green Wedge, which is at odds to the environmental requirements. There is concern that development envisaged will have a major impact on local services, in particular Schools; Medical facilities including the GP surgery, dentists, opticians, etc. and community facilities.	Concerns relate more to mitigation.	Not stated	HA43
PSLP/450	Sheila Dutton		The allocation is not justified due to impact on the character of the village in which six large housing developments have been recently built. Increased traffic, causing pollution, congestion and gridlock in the centre at peak times. Lack of facilities in Anstey, with no leisure centre or health centre.	Reduce the amount of development in Anstey. Consider new slip roads off the A46. Consider providing a health centre and leisure centre.	No	HA43
PSLP/430	Eileen Pearson		Already the village is "gridlocked" in the Nook and cannot cope with the extra volume of cars which has occurred over the past few years with numerous developments in the village. The natural surroundings and wildlife are being detrimentally affected and there isn't the capacity at the local health services to cope efficiently with the extra demand created.		No	HA43
PSLP/434	Kevin Pearson		Strongly object to policy. The continual residential development of Anstey is causing a number of issues to the already overburdened services and residents within our Village. What was once a Village in the Charnwood District of the County is now becoming an extension of a City suburb and is causing many anxieties for local residents, namely; the impact on the environment and wildlife habitats, health and safety of the local population by the ever increasing numbers of vehicles on local roads as well as impacts on schools and health centres	Objects to allocation	No	HA43

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/498	Rob Hughes		The allocation is not justified due to lack of sufficient road infrastructure; congestion; impact on road safety; increased demand for services; impact of traffic upon the Conservation Area; lack of village centre car parking; and impact on the availability of GP services.	Reconsider allocation and reallocate homes to sites with better transport infrastructure.	Not stated	HA43
PSLP/575	Sophie Truth	Pegasus obo Davidsons (Anstey)	The allocation is supported, it has been robustly justified and is supported by evidence. Davidsons have interests in part of the allocation and are collaborating with other stakeholders to bring the site forward.		Yes	HA43
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The allocation is supported.		Yes	HA43
PSLP/471	C Tilbury		Proposed sites in Anstey (including allocation HA43) is not justified / positively prepared as there has been at least four developments in Anstey in recent years; Traffic along Bradgate Road is already high; Concern about the loss of green space and impact on well being, air quality and the environment.	Remove allocation HA43	No	HA43
PSLP/643	H Nightingale		Allocation HA43 is not justified as Anstey Has had substantial development in recent years; existing health and parking facilities are at capacity; increasing the village population by 30% is unsustainable; development will exacerbate existing traffic issues; Bradgate Road Will have additional Traffic Safety issues; loss of rural character.		No	HA43
PSLP/650	G McMillan		Allocation HA43 is not justified as development in Anstey Results in the loss of village character; impact on services including GP, chemist, dentist and schools; The road system as existing floods; that is congestion at several points in the village and this will be exacerbated; Development will exacerbate flooding issues downstream; local residents do not want development and should be consulted		No	HA43
PSLP/653	A Stenhouse		Allocation HA43 is not justified as Development will not be proportionate to Anstey which is a village; development will exacerbate traffic and highway safety issues; all vehicles will use The Nook as a drive through; Flooding, schools and doctors issues need to be addressed; Resident well being will be affected due to the impact on the environment	Build a new village with pre planned roads and facilities instead; and better consideration of biodiversity	No	HA43
PSLP/675	I Digby		Allocation HA43 is not justified as it will exacerbate existing traffic and flooding problems in Anstey, both of which cannot be solved ; development will destroy village character; concerned that the village infrastructure cannot accommodate additional traffic, sewage, light pollution, flooding, construction traffic; concerned that new homes will not use air source heat pumps ; concerned that use of electric cars will result in power cuts;	Withdraw the plan and start again	Yes	HA43
PSLP/702	C Bosley		Allocation HA43 is not justified as It does not conform with Policy DS1 objective to protect village character; safe cycle routes are not addressed by the plan; Additional traffic, noise and pollution will have a negative impact on village character; the local plan forecasting report (May 2021) predicts significant increases in traffic flow on all roads into Anstey Which are not designed for high volumes of traffic as stated in local plan mitigation paragraphs 3.2.1.5, 3.3.1.8, 3.14; Impact of traffic on the Nook conservation area ; the Leicester City local plan includes 611 houses close to Anstey service centre which will also have impact upon the road network; The Charnwood air quality annual status report does not provide a measurement for The Nook; All cycle routes through the village will have increased traffic as a result of development; Impact on the character and safety of Groby Road/ Bradgate Road as a result of additional traffic (Ref Local Plan Forecasting Report Section 3); Additional lanes/ junctions as per Local Plan Mitigation Appendix C would turn Groby Road/ Anstey Road into an access road; The Sustainable Transport Study Figure 15 is misleading suggesting 70-80% car drivers when it is more likely to be 90% considering Census 2011 data, proximity to strategic roads and lack of bus service; The Sustainable Transport Study Figure 7 Confirms that Anstey is not connected to the rest of the borough by public transport	Development should be phased over the planned period to ensure dangerous spikes in air pollutants don't occur as electronic vehicles become more popular Add the condition "are accompanied by a costed and implementable highways plan, prepared in consultation with the local highways authority, to ensure the traffic generated by the development does not add to congestion on roads and junctions through the Anstey conservation area and enhances safe active travel on the roads serving the development	Yes	HA43
PSLP/026	Councillor Deborah Taylor	Borough and County Councillor	The allocation is not justified, Anstey has already taken a large amount of housing giving rise to substantial traffic causing queuing on Cropston Road at The Nook. More housing on Groby Road will send traffic to The Nook on Bradgate Road causing more queuing. Increasing pressure on services (doctors, dentists, chemists etc.) with expansion limited by car park capacity. Fewer buses serve the area than previously, and developer funded services will stop after time. No bank in village. Only one way in and out of Anstey, unlike other service centres. Anstey is used to access other villages, as the gateway to Charnwood Forest needs to retain its rural and village feel, it is becoming an urban centre. Ashton Green built in the city, will affect traffic congestion along with Leicester city's plans to develop at Thurcaston. Opening the A50 junction could provide some mitigation but would use blind junction at Groby Rd/Bradgate Rd. Anstey cannot take 900 more houses and growth is unsustainable. Plan is not viable, sound or innovative.	Remove allocation. Consider SUE not additional development at villages where roads and services cannot cope. No guarantee infrastructure can be secured so plan cannot prove it is deliverable. SUE infrastructure costs would be less than adding to existing villages.	No	HA44
PSLP/343	Edward Argar MP	Member of Parliament for Charnwood	Questions the scale of development given previous significant development and pressure on infrastructure.		No	HA44

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/220	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Jelson Homes	<p>1. The allocation of HA44 for the provision of around 47 homes is appropriate and justified.</p> <p>2. In order to be justified and consistent with the NPPF, any quantum figures referred to within Policy DS3 for the allocation should be regarded as indicative only. The most appropriate way of determining the site's overall capacity is through the development management process via submission of a planning application where the provisions of paragraph 124 of the NPPF can be properly considered</p> <p>3. Policy DS3(HA44) is not justified as there is insufficient up to date evidence to require the buffers between the development and the woodland and stream adjacent to the site.</p> <p>4. Policy DS3(HA44) is not justified as it overly restricts developer contributions for primary education to the provision of a new school.</p> <p>5. There are errors in the SA report in relation to the proximity of areas suitable for wind energy generation and distances to facilities</p>	<p>1. Policy DS3(HA44) should be amended to clarify that the capacity of the site is indicative and that the actual capacity should be determined through the development management process.</p> <p>2. Policy DS3 (HA44) should be amended to be less prescriptive and should read as follows: "where shown to be necessary, include an appropriate buffer between the built form of the development and both the stream to the north of the site and the woodland to the west of the site".</p> <p>3. The wording of Policy DS3 (HA44) should be amended to "contribute to the reasonable costs of the provision of a new 1 form entry primary school located at site HA43. If this is shown not to be feasible or appropriate at the time, proposals should contribute towards the reasonable costs of expansion of existing schools" - or words to that effect.</p>	No	HA44
PSLP/123	Carole West		The HA12, HA13, HA43 and HA44 are not justified, no infrastructure has been put in place for applications already approved near HA43. Infrastructure will come forward in a piecemeal fashion. Local roads are narrow, dangerous and parking is insufficient. There is already congestion at the Nook and little opportunity to cycle. There are limited local services and facilities and where there is, they are oversubscribed. The proposals will impact on biodiversity, ancient hedgerows and wildlife and result in a loss of farmland. There is risk of flooding and the sewers will not be able to cope. The proposals will destroy the sense of community and local character of Anstey.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA44
PSLP/705	J Dickinson		Allocation HA44 is not justified as planning appeal APP/X2410/W/16/3163501 should be upheld; Pollards road cannot support additional traffic due to its configuration and existing parking issues; access would dissect a public footpath which is well used; there is no dropped pavement and insufficient parking on Greys View; impact on wildlife; impact on road safety for cyclists; Anstey will become congested with traffic; existing services including GP are insufficient; it will impact local quality of life	Uphold appeal, Remove HA44	No	HA44
PSLP/723	S Kapadia		Allocation HA44 is not justified as Pollards Road cannot support additional traffic due to its configuration; access will cut across an established foot path; impact on wildlife; the local school and GP are at capacity; loss of views of landscape; no parking as existing; pollution would upset residents.	Remove HA44	No	HA44
PSLP/354	Mrs C. Triffitt		<p>There is no consideration of the 'character' of the place which overdevelopment threatens. or historic and archaeological problems of sites.</p> <p>There is no protection of Environment - Green wedges and belts are to be built on. No wedge at all appears in the parish on Groby road. Wildlife cut off by it from any in next area.</p> <p>Infrastructure</p> <p>Other concerns expressed about traffic, access to medical services.</p> <p>No justification for loading an inequitable number of dwellings on an area whose environment is especially at risk by virtue of its position between City, and Bradgate park.</p>	Objects to allocation	No	HA44
PSLP/339	Mr Ken Triffitt		<p>There has been a lack of consultation on the significant changes to the Plan for housing allocation for Anstey.</p> <p>The allocation of housing could be in smaller packets to support villages and areas where there are school places and falling numbers.</p> <p>Some smaller settlements where shops and services are struggling could benefit from carefully managed small developments.</p>	Objects to allocations in Anstey and objects to inadequate consultation.	Not stated	HA44
PSLP/074	Mr John Denoon		Housing development is not justified due to habitat destruction; damage to biodiversity; increased flooding; increased traffic. Anstey will become a town, and currently lacks services.	Reduce or remove allocation.	No	HA44
PSLP/450	Sheila Dutton		The allocation is not justified due to impact on the character of the village in which six large housing developments have been recently built. Increased traffic, causing pollution, congestion and gridlock in the centre at peak times. Lack of facilities in Anstey, with no leisure centre or health centre.	Reduce the amount of development in Anstey. Consider new slip roads off the A46. Consider providing a health centre and leisure centre.	No	HA44

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/458	Laura Bates		The allocation is not justified due to the considerable recent growth in Anstey; huge demand for public services such as doctors and a lack of local amenities and services; concerns over access to schools and lack of secondary school provision; increased flooding; and increased traffic on roads which are already congested and dangerous.	Reduce/remove allocations and focus development on other areas of Charnwood which have highways already in place to cope with traffic.	Yes	HA44
PSLP/402	J Wood		Allocation HA44 is not justified as the existing estate cannot cope with additional traffic / parking; the access would cut a public footpath; there would be highway safety issues. HA44 is not using an up to date boundary on the policy map which is misleading.		Yes	HA44
PSLP/671	A Foulds		Allocation HA44 is not justified as wildlife has only just started to recover from 4+ years of development ; Pollards Road Is not appropriately configured to accommodate additional traffic safely; the access Rd to the site would dissect a path used by a range of pedestrian and crosses children's playgrounds resulting in safety concerns; The nearest bus route is at Anstey Nook which will result in car dependency; that not enough health services, local jobs or access to commuter routes to accommodate development		No	HA44
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	The site is currently being progressed through a planning application and is supported by detailed technical information. It is immediately available and can contribute to the 5-year supply.		Yes	HA45
PSLP/020	Mr Michael J Anderson		Housing development in Barrow upon Soar is not justified because of the scale of population growth; strain upon health, road, foul drainage and school infrastructure capacity and increased pollution.	Remove or reduce scale of allocation.	No	HA45
PSLP/034	Ms Karen Ransome		Allocation is not justified in Barrow because of overcrowding of a small village; traffic congestion; flooding; the single-track bridge on commuting route, which often suffers issues and environmental harm. Amenities, older persons facilities and larger properties to allow for downsizing are needed for current residents.	Utilise brownfield sites that do not increase car use or harm the environment.	No	HA45
PSLP/049	Miss Claire Roberts		The allocation is not justified due to a lack of infrastructure and flooding, which will be exacerbated by development. The road network is significantly impacted by flooding. Infrastructure will not be installed until after the development, which does not take into account existing problems.	Flood prevention should be installed before development to protect homes and infrastructure.	No	HA45
PSLP/440	Maggie McHenry		The infrastructure of the village will not safely sustain another 700 houses- GP already over subscribed as are the schools. Alos concerned about impact on flooding. There is extremely limited parking in the village centre and its not enough for the current size of the village let alone another 700 houses. Barrow will lose community cohesion and lose its identity as a village.	Objects to scale of development	No	HA45
PSLP/737	Clare Hubbard		Concern about transport considerations. For many people the Melton Road area of Barrow-upon-Soar would not be a walkable distance to many of the village amenities, causing extra traffic and parking pressure. Additionally, from that proposed development area vehicular access to the A6 would have to go through the busy village centre and then via Barrow Road, which is narrow and subject to flooding.	To make the Local Plan sound, policy DS3 should be modified as follows: Include consideration of how the local transport needs of residents in the proposed 268 houses would be met without car journeys being required and for this to be one of the clauses for approval of any development proposals	No	HA45
PSLP/631	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA45, HA46, HA47, HA48 and HA49).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA45) as follows: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new 1 form entry primary school located at site HA49.	Not stated	HA45
PSLP/633	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land, St Philips, William Davis and Swithland Homes	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA45, HA46, HA47, HA48 and HA49).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA45) as follows: contribute to the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of the provision of a new 1 form entry primary school located at site HA49	Not stated	HA45
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	The site is currently being progressed through a planning application and is supported by detailed technical information. It is immediately available and can contribute to the 5-year supply. However, it is considered the site can accommodate 135 dwellings, not 120 as allocated in the plan.	Increase number of homes in allocation to 135.	Yes	HA46
PSLP/020	Mr Michael J. Anderson		Housing development in Barrow upon Soar is not justified because of the scale of population growth; strain upon health, road, foul drainage and school infrastructure capacity and increased pollution.	Remove or reduce scale of allocation.	No	HA46
PSLP/034	Ms Karen Ransome		Allocation is not justified in Barrow because of overcrowding of a small village; traffic congestion; flooding; the single-track bridge on commuting route, which often suffers issues and environmental harm. Amenities, older persons facilities and larger properties to allow for downsizing are needed for current residents.	Utilise brownfield sites that do not increase car use or harm the environment.	No	HA46
PSLP/049	Miss Claire Roberts		The allocation is not justified due to a lack of infrastructure and flooding, which will be exacerbated by development. The road network is significantly impacted by flooding. Infrastructure will not be installed until after the development, which does not take into account existing problems.	Flood prevention should be installed before development to protect homes and infrastructure.	No	HA46

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/440	Maggie McHenry		The infrastructure of the village will not safely sustain another 700 houses- GP already over subscribed as are the schools. Alos concerned about impact on flooding. There is extremely limited parking in the village centre and its not enough for the current size of the village let alone another 700 houses. Barrow will lose community cohesion and lose its identity as a village.	Objects to the scale of development	No	HA46
PSLP/737	Clare Hubbard		Concern that the Local Plan states that development proposals would be granted 'that contribute to the reasonable costs of the provision of a new 1 form entry primary school located at site HA49', with no mention made of a decision also being subject to transport considerations. For many people the Melton Road area of Barrow-upon-Soar would not be a walkable distance to many of the village amenities, causing extra traffic and parking pressure. Additionally, from that proposed development area vehicular access to the A6 would have to go through the busy village centre and then via Barrow Road, which is narrow and subject to flooding.	To make the Local Plan sound, policy DS3 should be modified as follows: Include consideration of how the local transport needs of residents in the proposed 268 houses would be met without car journeys being required and for this to be one of the clauses for approval of any development proposals	No	HA46
PSLP/631	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA45, HA46, HA47, HA48 and HA49).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA46) as follows: contribute to the reasonable land and build costs of the provision of a new 1 form entry primary school located at site HA49.	Not stated	HA46
PSLP/633	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land, St Philips, William Davis and Swithland Homes	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA45, HA46, HA47, HA48 and HA49).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA46) as follows: contribute to the reasonable land and build costs of the provision of a new 1 form entry primary school located at site HA49.	Not stated	HA46
PSLP/703	G Morgan		Allocation HA46 are not justified as it is close to existing green space, for example Millennium Park which is a wildlife corridor		No	HA46
PSLP/020	Mr Michael J. Anderson		Housing development in Barrow upon Soar is not justified because of the scale of population growth; strain upon health, road, foul drainage and school infrastructure capacity and increased pollution.	Remove or reduce scale of allocation.	No	HA47
PSLP/034	Ms Karen Ransome		Allocation is not justified in Barrow because of overcrowding of a small village; traffic congestion; flooding; the single-track bridge on commuting route, which often suffers issues and environmental harm. Amenities, older persons facilities and larger properties to allow for downsizing are needed for current residents.	Utilise brownfield sites that do not increase car use or harm the environment.	No	HA47
PSLP/049	Miss Claire Roberts		The allocation is not justified due to a lack of infrastructure and flooding, which will be exacerbated by development. The road network is significantly impacted by flooding. Infrastructure will not be installed until after the development, which does not take into account existing problems.	Flood prevention should be installed before development to protect homes and infrastructure.	No	HA47
PSLP/440	Maggie McHenry		The infrastructure of the village will not safely sustain another 700 houses- GP already over subscribed as are the schools. Alos concerned about impact on flooding. There is extremely limited parking in the village centre and its not enough for the current size of the village let alone another 700 houses. Barrow will lose community cohesion and lose its identity as a village.	Objects to scale of development	No	HA47
PSLP/737	Clare Hubbard		Concern that the Local Plan states that development proposals would be granted 'that contribute to the reasonable costs of the provision of a new 1 form entry primary school located at site HA49', with no mention made of a decision also being subject to transport considerations. For many people the Melton Road area of Barrow-upon-Soar would not be a walkable distance to many of the village amenities, causing extra traffic and parking pressure. Additionally, from that proposed development area vehicular access to the A6 would have to go through the busy village centre and then via Barrow Road, which is narrow and subject to flooding.	To make the Local Plan sound, policy DS3 should be modified as follows: Include consideration of how the local transport needs of residents in the proposed 268 houses would be met without car journeys being required and for this to be one of the clauses for approval of any development proposals	No	HA47
PSLP/631	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA45, HA46, HA47, HA48 and HA49).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA47) as follows: contribute to the reasonable land and build costs of the provision of a new 1 form entry primary school located at site HA49.	Not stated	HA47

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/594	Andrew Thomas	Thomas Taylor Planning obo Mr W Murdoch	The draft Plan's Development Strategy and intention to distribute an element of housing provision throughout the Service Centres including Barrow upon Soar is supported. Furthermore, proposed Housing Allocation DS1 HA47 (Land adj. 84 Melton Road, Barrow upon Soar) is supported. Proposed Housing Allocation HA47 amounts to approximately 0.8Ha (gross) although the net developable area is less reflecting the land occupied by the existing house. Having regard to its surroundings, redevelopment of 84 Melton Road, together with its extensive curtilage and range of outbuildings would result in a sensitive "rounding off" on the eastern edge of the settlement	Draft Policy LP3 should be amended to refer to a development of "up to" 18 dwellings to reflect site constraints and net developable area.	Yes	HA47
PSLP/633	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land, St Philips, William Davis and Swithland Homes	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA45, HA46, HA47, HA48 and HA49).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA47) as follows: contribute to the reasonable land and build costs of the provision of a new 1 form entry primary school located at site HA49.	Not stated	HA47
PSLP/020	Mr Michael J. Anderson		Housing development in Barrow upon Soar is not justified because of the scale of population growth; strain upon health, road, foul drainage and school infrastructure capacity and increased pollution.	Remove or reduce scale of allocation.	No	HA48
PSLP/034	Ms Karen Ransome		Allocation is not justified in Barrow because of overcrowding of a small village; traffic congestion; flooding; the single-track bridge on commuting route, which often suffers issues and environmental harm. Amenities, older persons facilities and larger properties to allow for downsizing are needed for current residents.	Utilise brownfield sites that do not increase car use or harm the environment.	No	HA48
PSLP/049	Miss Claire Roberts		The allocation is not justified due to a lack of infrastructure and flooding, which will be exacerbated by development. The road network is significantly impacted by flooding. Infrastructure will not be installed until after the development, which does not take into account existing problems.	Flood prevention should be installed before development to protect homes and infrastructure.	No	HA48
PSLP/440	Maggie McHenry		The infrastructure of the village will not safely sustain another 700 houses- GP already over subscribed as are the schools. Alos concerned about impact on flooding. There is extremely limited parking in the village centre and its not enough for the current size of the village let alone another 700 houses. Barrow will lose community cohesion and lose its identity as a village.	Objects to scale of development	No	HA48
PSLP/631	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA45, HA46, HA47, HA48 and HA49).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA48) as follows: contribute to the reasonable land and build costs of the provision of a new 1 form entry primary school located at site HA49.	Not stated	HA48
PSLP/633	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land, St Philips, William Davis and Swithland Homes	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA45, HA46, HA47, HA48 and HA49).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA48) as follows: contribute to the reasonable land and build costs of the provision of a new 1 form entry primary school located at site HA49.	Not stated	HA48
PSLP/570	Max Whitehead	Define Planning obo Bloor Homes	On the basis of that spatial strategy, Policy DS1 sets out the criteria under which Charnwood Borough Council (CBC) will support sustainable development. Those requirements are recognised by BHL, who consider such principles to be testament to good planning and urban design. Furthermore, the proposed residential allocation at Land off Willow Road, Barrow upon Soar (allocation reference HA48) would assist in meeting these objectives. It is also noted, for reference, that BHL's response to Policies DS3 / DS3(HA48) sets out the merit of extending the boundaries of the proposed allocation site at 'Land off Willow Road, Barrow upon Soar' (allocation reference DS3(HA48)) to reflect the natural and logical extent of the proposed allocation site and its true development capacity. That modification would allow the site to be accessed from Cotes Road and facilitate the creation of a high-quality development that incorporates an attractive new gateway to the settlement when travelling from the north; thus bringing about additional benefits from the site's development. As a consequence, Policy DS1 would also require a minor amendment to the dwelling number set out in the table to reflect this.	Amendment to site boundaries called for.	Yes	HA48
PSLP/276	G Healy		The plan is not justified because Cotes Road is a narrow road, it is heavily congested. The footpaths are not wide enough, especially when it is pick up and drop off at school and it is unsafe. There will be destruction of wildlife as the fields around Barrow upon Soar are the only areas of wildlife left. There will be loss of farmland. The residents of Cotes Road will be sandwiched between two large housing developments, there will be a loss of a vista over the Soar Valley and the housing will have a negative impact on the cemetery.		No	HA49
PSLP/733	D Hurst		The plan and HA49 are not positively prepared or justified as additional housing without infrastructure is flawed; commuters from new development will exacerbate traffic, congestion and parkin issues; the propose primary school on HA49 would be unsafe due to proximity to Humphry Perkins; there is limited cemetery capacity and this development would restrict future space.	Reduce overall housing numbers. Relocate HA48 primary school. Encourage new companies for local jobs	Yes	HA49

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/020	Mr Michael J. Anderson		Housing development in Barrow upon Soar is not justified because of the scale of population growth; strain upon health, road, foul drainage and school infrastructure capacity and increased pollution.	Remove or reduce scale of allocation.	No	HA49
PSLP/034	Ms Karen Ransome		Allocation is not justified in Barrow because of overcrowding of a small village; traffic congestion; flooding; the single-track bridge on commuting route, which often suffers issues and environmental harm. Amenities, older persons facilities and larger properties to allow for downsizing are needed for current residents.	Utilise brownfield sites that do not increase car use or harm the environment.	No	HA49
PSLP/049	Miss Claire Roberts		The allocation is not justified due to a lack of infrastructure and flooding, which will be exacerbated by development. The road network is significantly impacted by flooding. Infrastructure will not be installed until after the development, which does not take into account existing problems.	Flood prevention should be installed before development to protect homes and infrastructure.	No	HA49
PSLP/440	Maggie McHenry		The infrastructure of the village will not safely sustain another 700 houses- GP already over subscribed as are the schools. Alos concerned about impact on flooding. There is extremely limited parking in the village centre and its not enough for the current size of the village let alone another 700 houses. Barrow will lose community cohesion and lose its identity as a village.	Objects to scale of development	No	HA49
PSLP/475	Sam Armstead		The plan for a new school based on 700 around the village is not justified. It will lead to a two-tier school system, splitting investment and family children, lead to poorer educational facilities and will have no public support from Hall Orchard school.	Reduce housing to match Hall Orchard school's capacity or fund building of new primary school to deal with all requirements at one school.	Yes	HA49
PSLP/631	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land	The allocation of the site is appropriate and justified and the site is deliverable with land for a 1FE school. The first bullet point of the policy is not consistent with national policy as it ignores the opportunities for SuDS features to enhance the Local Wildlife Sites. The fifth bullet point of the policy is not justified as only a small part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The final bullet point of the policy in relation to the new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA45, HA46, HA47 and HA48 as well as HA49).	Amend the first bullet point of DS3(HA49) as follows: ensure <del>that surface water runoff will not detrimentally affect the Local Wildlife Sites and</del> <del>locate</del> SuDS features <del>away from</del> <b>maintain or enhance</b> the Local Wildlife Sites; Amend the fifth bullet point of DS3(HA49) as follows: are accompanied by a flood risk assessment which responds to the evidence of flood risk on the site and demonstrates how mitigation of those risks, <del>including securing appropriate site access arrangements,</del> can be satisfactorily achieved. <del>so as to meet the Exception Test;</del> <b>An Exception Test will be required should vulnerable uses be proposed within areas of flood risk;</b> and Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA49) as follows: We will expect the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of making this provision to be shared amongst the developments that it would serve.	Not stated	HA49
PSLP/633	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land, St Philips, William Davis and Swithland Homes	The allocation of the site is appropriate and justified and the site is deliverable with land for a 1FE school. It may be unnecessary to include some of the aspects of the policy as the criteria are covered by topic based polices elsewhere in the plan. The first bullet point of the policy is not consistent with national policy as it ignores the opportunities for SuDS features to enhance the Local Wildlife Sites. The fifth bullet point of the policy is not justified as only a small part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The final bullet point of the policy in relation to the new primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA45, HA46, HA47 and HA48 as well as HA49).	Amend the first bullet point of DS3(HA49) as follows: ensure <del>that surface water runoff will not detrimentally affect the Local Wildlife Sites and</del> <del>locate</del> SuDS features <del>away from</del> <b>maintain or enhance</b> the Local Wildlife Sites; Amend the fifth bullet point of DS3(HA49) as follows: are accompanied by a flood risk assessment which responds to the evidence of flood risk on the site and demonstrates how mitigation of those risks, <del>including securing appropriate site access arrangements,</del> can be satisfactorily achieved. <del>so as to meet the Exception Test;</del> <b>An Exception Test will be required should vulnerable uses be proposed within areas of flood risk;</b> and Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA49) as follows: We will expect the reasonable <b>land and build</b> costs of making this provision to be shared amongst the developments that it would serve.	Not stated	HA49

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/618	Jon Kirby	Lichfields obo Rebecca Birch, St Philips	St Philips's representation to Policy DS3 is contained within representations prepared by Marrons Planning on behalf of Rosconn Strategic Land, St Philips, William Davis and Swithland Homes. Rosconn Strategic Land, St Philips, William Davis and Swithland Homes are working together to promote land at Cotes Road, Barrow for residential development through draft allocation HA49 and their collective representation sets out their joint position to Policy DS3 and HA49 accordingly.	Clarification on representations.	No	HA49
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The allocation is supported.		Yes	HA49
PSLP/405	P Needham		Allocation HA49 is not justified as development of the northern section of the site will have an adverse visual impact from Willow Way roundabout;		Yes	HA49
PSLP/663	S Mayo		Allocation HA49 is not justified as Development within the setting of the cemetery which is a non designated heritage asset will detract from its tranquilly and countryside setting; The site includes two local wildlife sites And their loss would not leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than it currently is in; surface water run off also should not impact the local wildlife sites; the site is used for recreation; the overall amount of development proposed in Barrow is too large for the village; the policy states that the site is non compliant with traffic/highways requirements	Remove allocation HA49 as it is not compliant with biodiversity , heritage and highways considerations	No	HA49
PSLP/703	G Morgan		Allocation d HA49 are not justified as it is close to existing green space, for example Millennium Park which is a wildlife corridor		Yes	HA49
PSLP/698	S Addison		Allocation HA49 is not justified or consistent with national policy as the site has significant flooding issues as demonstrated in the SFRA 2021 and not reflected in the HA49 masterplan (para 2.107); Development will increase surface waterflooding on surrounding properties and the nearby local wildlife site; the Ecological Assessment Report 2019 and Addendum 2021 highlight 'significant ecological constraints that require a Significant reduction in developable area in order to avoid a net loss in biodiversity (ref para 4.15 of 2019 report); Due to the biodiversity loss in developing the site it therefore does not accord with paragraphs 174 and 179 of the NPPF; 220 Dwellings cannot be accommodated on the site alongside ecological concerns and 20 metre buffer seems understated; Concerned that the site is not deliverable did you two at least eight different landowners; Concern about the impact of additional traffic and parking as a result of new development and school;	Remove allocation HA49, or reduce its size/ relocate the school In order to address highways, flooding and ecology concerns	No	HA49
PSLP/254	Steve Beard	Sport England	The southern boundary of allocation HA49 abuts a playing field area which included cricket. This will require a ball strike assessment to understand the need for mitigation of any impacts from development para 187 NPPF 2021		Not stated	HA49
PSLP/210	Damian K Kirk		The proposed housing site (HA50) is not positively prepared or justified by virtue of a complete disregard for the environment, natural habitats, lack of infrastructure and local residents opinion. There appears to be a far greater need to satisfy government targets than there is to satisfy the health and wellbeing of residents and the environment.		Yes	HA50
PSLP/535	Juan Murray	TEP obo Leics County Council	The current allocation for the site is Policy C1 Countryside, which is at odds with the surrounding uses We would like to see the site classified as being within the settlement boundary and removed from the designation of countryside which does not suit its locality within Quorn	Reconsideration of countryside boundary called for.	Not stated	HA50
PSLP/442	I Schofield		HA50 is not justified as paragraph 4.12 of the Development Strategy and Site Selection states the site is unsuitable for allocation on flooding grounds.		No	HA50
PSLP/028	Mr Percy C. Hartshorn		Listed building at Woodcock Farm in area for development.	Consider listed building	No	HA51
PSLP/557	Andy Brettle	Rothley Parish Council	The plan is not justified planning application P/20/2014/2 granted permission for 70 homes which has not been included in the local plan figures. This amount exceeds the total of HA51 /and HA52, and the allocation for Rothley has already been fulfilled. There is also a listed building on the site HA51 which needs to be retained as a community asset	Remove HA51/ HA52. Consider listed building	Not stated	HA51
PSLP/139	B Simons		Allocations HA51 and HA52 are not justified as 70 houses have already been granted through the school extension plus the Broadnook SUE; and the impact on local infrastructure, services and transport should be et before development.	Remove HA51/HA52	No	HA51
PSLP/740	Bert Pollheimer		The impact of further housing has not been considered in the forecast for school capacity at Rothley School. The pressure on the Crossroads at Cossington Lane and Loughborough Road, the Red Lion Crossroads will be untenable and unsafe.	Objects to allocation	No	HA51
PSLP/589	Carl Stott	Nineteen47 obo FN and GT Barber	Our Client is supportive of the element of Policy DS3 that allocates land to the north of Cossington Lane, Rothley for new housing development under allocation HA51. Our Client is the sole owner of land located to the south of Cossington Lane, which is also included in HA51 allocation. However, our Client no longer wishes to make this particular land to the south of Cossington Lane available for residential development as part of the Local Plan process and instead requests that it is removed from the HA51 allocation.	Delete part of allocation.	Yes	HA51
PSLP/028	Mr Percy C. Hartshorn		Allocation is not justified as the access is not wide enough for 9 houses.	Remove allocation or revise access.	No	HA52
PSLP/557	Andy Brettle	Rothley Parish Council	The plan is not justified planning application P/20/2014/2 granted permission for 70 homes which has not been included in the local plan figures. This amount exceeds the total of HA51 /and HA52, and the allocation for Rothley has already been fulfilled.	Remove HA51 and HA52.	Not stated	HA52

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/740	Bert Pollheimer		The impact of further housing has not been considered in the forecast for school capacity at Rothley School. The pressure on the Crossroads at Cossington Lane and Loughborough Road, the Red Lion Crossroads will be untenable and unsafe	Objects to allocation	No	HA52
PSLP/039	Mrs Caroline Richardson		HA53 is not justified due to impact on water courses, flood plain and water runoff increasing flooding. Secondly, the local roads cannot cope with the volume of traffic, made worse by parking, especially at school drop-off. Consultation is complicated and off-putting.	Remove allocation. More evidence needed will not increase flood risk and local area can handle additional needs	No	HA53
PSLP/384	Tim Coleby	Santec obo Barwood	The plan is not justified. Site HA53 should not be included due to its location on sloping land adjacent to Sileby Brook and in an area of higher landscape sensitivity.	Consider whether HA53 should be removed.	Not stated	HA53
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	Additional policy wording proposed:“ Opportunity for enhanced upstream storage benefitting the Sileby Brook in Sileby”.	Additional policy wording proposed	Not stated	HA53
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	HA53 should not be allocated for the reasons set out in the response SPC provided to the recent planning application (Ref. Ref P/21/0738/2 – copy attached). Education provision should be made within Sileby where the need will arise rather than Cossington.	The policy should be amended to require education provision in Sileby and not Cossington. Policy HA53 should refer to policy G2 in Sileby NP.	Yes	HA53
PSLP/072	Jim Smith		The plan is not justified ad HA53 should be removed from the plan. The housing requirement for Sileby has already been met. A planning application has already been refused for HA53 and an appeal Inspector noted that the Service Centres already have an excessive level of housing commitments. The piece of land is outside the development envelope of the village and it is productive farmland which supports the wildlife environment.	Remove allocation from the plan.	No	HA53
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	The policy wording for the site in relation to the extension to Cossington primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58 and HA59).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA53) as follows: contribute to the reasonable land and build costs of the provision of a 0.5 form entry extension of Cossington Primary School located at site HA59, as necessary.	Not stated	HA53
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	The site is currently being progressed through a planning application and is supported by detailed technical information. It is immediately available and can contribute to the 5-year supply.		Yes	HA53
PSLP/398	Beverly Burton		This development and the other five proposed will create even more traffic problems in Sileby which is already suffering from too many houses and people using too little infrastructure.	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA53
PSLP/384	Tim Coleby	Santec obo Barwood	The plan is not justified. Site HA54 should not be included due its location on sloping ground and in an area which is important for maintaining the separate identities of Sileby and Barrow on Soar; and Suc concerns have resulted in the site being the subject of several refused applications and dismissed appeals in previous years.	Consider whether HA54 should be removed.	Not stated	HA54
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	HA54 should not be allocated for the reasons set out in the response SPC provided to the recent planning application (Ref. P/21/0535/2 – copy attached). SPC requires the proposed allocation to be removed. The site is land previously designated as “Area of Separation. Education provision should be made within Sileby where the need will arise rather than Cossington. Delivering 100% affordable housing represents the needs of the whole borough rather than an established and objectively justified local need for Sileby itself. HA54 is a departure from policy H5 and there is no evidence to support this. Loss of greenfield land outside existing Limits to Development is unjustified. The plan doesn’t recognise/ reflect the importance of settlement identity. If this is to be properly recognised then HA54 should be deleted.	Allocation be removed from the plan. If the allocation remains, policy should be amended to require education provision in Sileby and not Cossington. Policy HA54 should refer to policy G2 in Sileby NP.	Yes	HA54
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	The policy wording for the site in relation to the extension to Cossington primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58 and HA59).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA54) as follows: contribute to the reasonable land and build costs of the provision of a 0.5 form entry extension of Cossington Primary School located at site HA59, as necessary.	Not stated	HA54
PSLP/561	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Owl Partnerships Ltd, Nottingham Community Housing Association and Inside	The allocation of the site is appropriate and justified, and would address the identified need for affordable homes.		Not stated	HA54
PSLP/714	H Dalby		Allocation HA54 is not justified as standalone social housing development is not socially sustainable	Social housing should be integrated within development	No	HA54
PSLP/714	S Dalby		Allocation HA54 is not justified as standalone social housing development is not socially sustainable	Social housing should be integrated within development	No	HA54

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/398	Bevly Burton		There will be a loss of local environment hedgerows, wildlife, long standing markers in farming fields. This development and the other five proposed will create even more traffic problems in Sileby which is already suffering from too many houses and people using too little infrastructure.	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA54
PSLP/384	Tim Coleby	Santec obo Barwood	The plan is not justified. HA55 should not be included as an allocation because it is situated on low lying land adjacent to Sileby Brook and partly with Flood Zone 2/3; There is no apparent evidence that the site owners are willing for the site to be redeveloped, nor that there is any current interest from developers. Planning permission for residential redevelopment of the site was previously granted but this was not implemented and the permission has lapsed, suggesting that residential development of this site is not viable or deliverable; and	Review whether HA55 should be removed.	Not stated	HA55
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	The plan is not justified because education provision should be made within Sileby where the need will arise rather than Cossington. It is not clear if the necessary sequential approach for flood risk has been undertaken.	The policy should be amended to require education provision in Sileby and not Cossington. The policy should be amended to refer to the need for any development to demonstrate that it will not increase flood risk elsewhere in terms of displacement of flooding. Policy HA55 should refer to policy G2 in Sileby NP.	Yes	HA55
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	The policy wording for the site in relation to the extension to Cossington primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58 and HA59).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA55) as follows: contribute to the reasonable land and build costs of the provision of a 0.5 form entry extension of Cossington Primary School located at site HA59, as necessary.	Not stated	HA55
PSLP/398	Beverly Burton		This development and the other five proposed will create even more traffic problems in Sileby which is already suffering from too many houses and people using too little infrastructure.	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA55
PSLP/384	Tim Coleby	Santec obo Barwood	The plan is not justified. Site HA56 should not be allocated because about half of the site is covered by the National Forest Inventory Map and it contains an orchard with ecological and heritage; the site appears to have no frontage to an adopted highway and there is no evidence that access rights are available from Kendal Road; There is no evidence that the site is owned or being promoted by a developer with an intention to develop it.	Consider whether HA56 should be removed.	Not stated	HA56
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	The plan is not justified because education provision should be made within Sileby where the need will arise rather than Cossington.	The policy should be amended to require education provision in Sileby and not Cossington. Policy HA56 should refer to policy G2 in Sileby NP.	Yes	HA56
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	The policy wording for the site in relation to the extension to Cossington primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58 and HA59).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA56) as follows: contribute to the reasonable land and build costs of the provision of a 0.5 form entry extension of Cossington Primary School located at site HA59, as necessary.	Not stated	HA56
PSLP/398	Beverly Burton		This development and the other five proposed will create even more traffic problems in Sileby which is already suffering from too many houses and people using too little infrastructure.	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA56
PSLP/384	Tim Coleby	Santec obo Barwood	The plan is not justified. HA57 should not be included as it is in active employment use as an industrial unit and there is no evidence that a site for relocation of the current use has been investigated or found. Loss of employment is contrary to adopted Charnwood BC planning policy and would have a harmful effect on the local economy in Sileby; no evidence that the site owners are willing for the site to be redeveloped, nor that there is any interest from developers; highway access improvements are required and there is no apparent evidence that these are achievable, nor that they can be undertaken without impinging on third party land; No assessment of site contamination or the extent of remediation required appears to have been made, this being particularly pertinent given the site's industrial use; No assessment appears to have been made of whether the building could be converted to residential use or if not, the costs or technical specification involved in its demolition; Planning permission for residential redevelopment of the site was granted in 2007 (P/07/3202/2) but this was not implemented and the permission has lapsed, suggesting residential development of this site is not viable or deliverable.	Consider whether HA57 should be removed from the plan.	Not stated	HA57

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	The plan is not justified because education provision should be made within Sileby where the need will arise rather than Cossington.	The policy should be amended to require education provision in Sileby and not Cossington. Policy HA57 should refer to policy G2 in Sileby NP.	Yes	HA57
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	The policy wording for the site in relation to the extension to Cossington primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58 and HA59).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA57) as follows: contribute to the reasonable land and build costs of the provision of a 0.5 form entry extension of Cossington Primary School located at site HA59, as necessary.	Not stated	HA57
PSLP/398	Beverly Burton		This development and the other five proposed will create even more traffic problems in Sileby which is already suffering from too many houses and people using too little infrastructure.	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA57
PSLP/384	Tim Coleby	Santec obo Barwood	The plan is not justified. HA58 should not be included because it is in active employment use as a garage and there appears to be no evidence that a site for relocation of the current use has been investigated or found. Indeed, the site occupiers have recently signed a 10 year lease; loss of employment is contrary to adopted Charnwood BC planning policy and would have a harmful effect on the local economy in Sileby; the site has multiple owners and there appears to be no evidence that the various owners are willing for the site to be redeveloped, nor that there is any interest from developers; highway access improvements are required and there appears to be no evidence that these are achievable, nor that they can be undertaken without impinging on third party land; no assessment of site contamination or the extent of remediation required appears to have been made, this being particularly pertinent given the site's use as a garage; no assessment appears to have been made of whether the building could be converted to residential use or if not, the costs or technical specification involved in its demolition; its location by the railway is likely to result in significant noise and potential odour nuisance, suggesting this is not a suitable environment for residential use.	Consider whether HA58 should be removed from the plan.	Not stated	HA58
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	The plan is not justified because education provision should be made within Sileby where the need will arise rather than Cossington.	The policy should be amended to require education provision in Sileby and not Cossington. Policy should be amended to cross reference to Policy G2: Design contained within the Sileby Neighbourhood Plan.	Yes	HA58
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	The policy wording for the site in relation to the extension to Cossington primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58 and HA59).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA58) as follows: contribute to the reasonable land and build costs of the provision of a 0.5 form entry extension of Cossington Primary School located at site HA59, as necessary.	Not stated	HA58
PSLP/398	Beverly Burton		This development and the other five proposed will create even more traffic problems in Sileby which is already suffering from too many houses and people using too little infrastructure.	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA58
PSLP/012	Debra Marshall		Object to development of HA59 due to impact on character and appearance of the area; loss of greenfield; habitat loss; biodiversity impact. Area is subject to flooding. Dangerous access. Scale of development inappropriate in Cossington. Lack of services and increased pressure on those nearby. Lack of employment increasing commuting. Within Area of Local Separation. Impact on social history and heritage. Previous applications removed. Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan. Strong village objections.	Remove allocation	No	HA59
PSLP/179	Mr Richard Plant		There is no reasoning for removing HS65 from the Draft Charnwood Local Plan 2019-36 and moving the whole allocation for Cossington onto HA59, previously HS66, to maintain the 124 total allocation for Cossington. HS65 is being put forward for planning permission regardless of Charnwood's allocation. This effectively increases the allocation in Cossington to 181 and not the 124 detailed in the Draft Plan.If this is not the case can Charnwood explain where the 57 homes now submitted for planning P21/1446/2 are counted in Table 5 on page 27 of the draft plan. To maintain the 124 allocation HA59 should be moved back to a maximum of 70 as per the 2019-36 plan. Charnwood Bc's actions have actually increased Cossington's allocation from 124 to 181 by stealth.	HA59 must be amended back to the 70 houses previously identified and HS65 reinstated in the plan.	Yes	HA59
PSLP/363	Emma Crowe (Clerk)	Cossington Parish Council	The allocation is not justified as 124 homes in the location proposed would alter the character of the village and remove the separation from Sileby. The site access is liable to flooding and on a dangerous bend. No capacity on sewage/drainage system. Lack of footpaths and suitable roads in area. No reasoning behind the removal of previous allocation (HS65) which is viewed more favourably than current allocation due to better access and less impact on the village.	Remove allocation/Replace allocation with HS65	No	HA59

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/384	Tim Coleby	Santec obo Barwood	The plan is not justified. Site HA59 should not be included because Cossington is a very small settlement with very few services or facilities, making it unsuitable and unsustainable as a location for housing development of this scale.	Consider removing HA59	Not stated	HA59
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	The plan is not justified - HA59 should not be included as it lies outside the limits to development.	Consider removing HA59.	Yes	HA59
PSLP/107	Alison Armstrong		HA 59 should not be allocated because of highway safety issues, the school is full and it will be impossible to enforce a 10% reduction in traffic.	Consider removing HA59	No	HA59
PSLP/542	Joe Bennett	RCA obo Spitfire Homes	The allocation has been increased in numbers whilst a site at Main St/Syston Rd, Cossington has been lost. The removed site performs better than HA59 in the site selection paper. A school expansion is proposed in Cossington, the removed site is nearer to this than sites in Sileby. Details of the omitted site are supplied.	The omitted site should be allocated for development.	Yes	HA59
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	The allocation of the site is appropriate and justified. The policy wording for the site in relation to the extension to Cossington primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57 and HA58 as well as HA59).	Add wording to the final sentence of the final bullet point of DS3(HA59) as follows: We will expect the reasonable land and build costs of making this provision to be shared amongst the developments that it would serve.	Not stated	HA59
PSLP/205	Simon & Clare Pearson		The proposed housing site (HA59) for Cossington is not positively prepared or justified having regard to sustainability (i.e. access to transport, shops, healthcare, leisure, education, childcare); highway safety (proposed site access is inappropriate); the detrimental impact upon the historic character of the village and wildlife; and, increased flood risk.		Not stated	HA59
PSLP/249	N Johnson		Allocation HA59 is not justified as it atts 124 homes to a 186 home village which is disproportionate; it will change the character of the village; there are not enough local facilities; increasing traffic on roads is unsafe for existing users in particular Humble Lane; it involved building on agricultural land; the ancient Polly Pegs/ Crab Tree foot path and associated wild flowering, trees and habitats would be lost;	Parish Council has identified a more suitable development site on the corner of Main Street / Syston Road which would have less impact on the vilage.	No	HA59
PSLP/325	P Weston-Webb		Allocation HA59 is not justified as Cossington does not need a larger school; Main Street floods; additional traffic from Sileby is n existing issue for the village;	There should be a larger number of houses in Syston and schools in Syston should be expanded instead of the Cossington school. Platts Charity land on Syston Road are willing to develop for housing. Development in Cossington should be closer to the A6, A46 and M1 to avoid village traffic issues and this area does not flood. Remove allocation HA59.	No	HA59
PSLP/737	Clare Hubbard		Cconcern that the Local Plan states conditions under which development proposals would be granted that make no mention of transport considerations. This is especially concerning as the primary school extension which is a condition of any development proposal is intended to include capacity not just for Cossington but also Sileby. Most of the planned developments in Sileby are over 1.5 miles from Cossington Primary School and so this would be likely to result in many more car journeys between Sileby and Cossington and all the associated congestion and emission risks. In addition, HA59 does not make reference to enhanced public transport or road facilities to accommodate the transport needs of 124 houses.	To make the Local Plan sound, policy DS3 should be modified as follows: Consider the additional transport pressures on Cossington's current Main Street from an additional 124 houses and from the potential extra school traffic and include mitigating actions from these consideration as conditions for the acceptance of any development proposals	No	HA59
PSLP/626	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow Homes	We object to the proposal to provide additional primary school provision at Cossington to serve Sileby. There is insufficient evidence on the suitability of a strategy to delivery part of a school expansion at Cossington, not being a Service Centre for children that will in part live at Sileby. The strategy should follow the evidence by deleting HA59 and instead identifying land south of Sileby for a residential-led development including land for a primary school Cossington is within the Other Settlements part of the proposed settlement hierarchy.Cossington has been signed-out for special treatment in the form of a proposed allocation for 124 dwellings. Out of the proposed 815 dwellings proposed at Other Settlements within Appendix 2 of the local plan, only East Goscote has a proposed site with a greater amount of dwellings proposed. The justification based on a primary school expansion is not supported in evidence terms. There is no evidence of masterplanning and there is no diagram proposed as part of the proposed allocation. The site is heavily constrained and should not be considered a candidate for an allocation	The proposed allocation Site Policy DS3(HA59) Land to rear of Derry's Garden Centre, Cossington, is not soundly based, it does not comply with national policy and it should be deleted as a proposed allocation.	Yes	HA59
PSLP/391	B Somi		Allocation HA59 is not justified as the footpaths Polly Pegs and Crab Tree Lane are heritage assets; the pub cannot cope with more residents ; Cossington has flooding issues including the road network; Many of the surrounding roads or not configured to support additional traffic; residents will be reliant on facilities in Sileby; the primary school is oversubscribed; impact on quality of life	Improvements are required to the roads, flood prevention, increased bus services	No	HA59
PSLP/392	P Somi		Allocation HA59 is not justified as the footpaths Polly Pegs and Crab Tree Lane are heritage assets; the pub cannot cope with more residents ; Cossington has flooding issues including the road network; Many of the surrounding roads or not configured to support additional traffic; residents will be reliant on facilities in Sileby; the primary school is oversubscribed; impact on quality of life	Improvements are required to the roads, flood prevention, increased bus services	No	HA59

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/728	M Smith		Allocation HA59 is not justified as it will undermine the plan vision at paragraph 1.24 (environmental aspect of vision); it will create additional traffic; there are limited public serviced near the site; the transport assessment does not take account of the number of dwellings proposed; "The "hybrid" option being proposed is not clearly supported but the evidence and the methodology for evaluating sustainable distribution and growth seems to take a very low level view of impact of additional car journeys, creating noise, dust and air pollution."; HA59 is only included to enable additional development in Sileby in order to provide a 0.5 FE primary school to accommodate Sileby based students.	Hybrid option should evaluate the environmental cost of additional car journeys to service centres / urban areas.	Yes	HA59
PSLP/451	A Gerrard		In place of Allocation HA59, allocate 102 Main Street Cossington (P/21/1446/2) which would have better traffic access towards the A6/M1; this area floods less than HA59; developing this area instead would better connect the Platts Lane playing fields with the village.	Allocate 102 Main Street Cossington (P/21/1446/2) instead of HA59	No	HA59
PSLP/462	C Gerrard		In place of Allocation HA59, allocate 102 Main Street Cossington (P/21/1446/2) which would have better traffic access towards the A6/M1; this area floods less than HA59; developing this area instead would better connect the Platts Lane playing fields with the village.	Allocate 102 Main Street Cossington (P/21/1446/2) instead of HA59	No	HA59
PSLP/667	E Jenkin		Allocation HA59 is not justified as The number of houses is disproportionate with the village of Cossington; Additional traffic will be dangerous for school children who will have to cross the access to the site; the local plans should support historic villages	Villages should only increase by 10% in size and built on the outer edges of the village	No	HA59
PSLP/526	Liz Pizer	East Goscote Parish Council	The plan is not justified or consistent with national policy. HA60 is a landfill site, associated with war time use by two large factories including a munitions factory. The Council is obliged to follow NPPF directions that before outline permissions can be granted, they must be certain that it will be able to give final permission. This requires them to be sure that the land is safe to develop. Inaccurate evidence has been used in several sections relating to HA60 concerning the safety and the viability of development. The Council has a duty as to ensure development is safe and does not harm the existing residents of housing just 5 metres away. HA60 should be withdrawn from the plan until the nature of the landfill area is properly assessed. The current proposal for 223 dwellings in the local plan and the Gladman proposal of 270 would create a fourth larger island of housing with poor integration with the rest of the village. Any plan put forward must help develop the village into an integrated community, where all parts are properly connected with each other by foot and bicycle. The current isolation of developments from each other encourages wasteful car journeys.	HA60 should be removed from the plan.	Not stated	HA60
PSLP/128	C Chapman		The allocation HA60 is not justified as it will have a negative impact on Queniborough's infrastructure.		No	HA60
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	The site is currently being progressed through a planning application and is supported by detailed technical information. It is immediately available and can contribute to the 5-year supply. However, the site can accommodate 270 dwellings, not the 223 allocated.	Increase the allocation to 270 dwellings.	Yes	HA60
PSLP/289	D Burton		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified the size of development is disproportionate; they will overwhelm schools and GPs; increase in traffic; loss of separation between East Goscote and Rearsby; the houses will not be starter homes with gardens.		No	HA60
PSLP/018	Mr John Malpus		Allocation is not justified due to land contamination from the Ordnance depot; flood risk; damage to biodiversity; increased traffic, nitrogen pollution and loss of agricultural land. Not all of the development will be 1200m from a school and no bus service to the school.	Remove allocation	No	HA60
PSLP/047	David F. Hewitt		The allocation is not justified due to impact on the separation with Rearsby; additional traffic and road safety; lack of cycle path; flooding; impact on landscape and the environment; and a lack of infrastructure.	Remove allocation.	No	HA60
PSLP/423	K Hill		The plan is not justified as HA60 will have a massive impact on Queniborough in terms of traffic that will pass through the village. There is only one new primary school in the area and no proposals to increase medical facilities and policing.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA60
PSLP/474	Janet Cannon		The allocation is not justified; East Goscote, Queniborough and Rearsby account for over 50% of homes allocated to Other Settlements. Facilities are limited and will force residents to use private transport. Development in the area will increase flooding; reduce areas of separation between settlements losing identity and character; the site contains known and suspected contaminants with remediation not possible; construction traffic will use a single narrow access road to the site; a lack of community cohesion with the existing settlement and core village; and a lack of access to healthcare.	Remove or reduce allocation. Consider the opportunity to provide high standard housing for the ageing population, allowing downsizing, combined with starter homes to create a cohesive community.	Not stated	HA60
PSLP/490	D Cannon		There is a WW11 landfill site adjacent to H60 which is dangerous and no viable and practical remediation is apparent. If the site does remain in the plan the local community will suffer years of remediation and construction traffic via the narrow single access road to the site.		Not stated	HA60
PSLP/514	Andrew McKenna		The allocation is not justified due to the traffic safety issues caused by access onto Melton Rd. There is a lack of alternative access and using Melton Rd will replicate historic highway issues.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA60
PSLP/477	B Pinncock		Allocation HA60 not justified as The development would result in traffic safety problems along Melton Road; loss of vegetation and wildlife; loss of separation between villages; the land is contaminated due to Jelson moving soil; The land floods during heavy rain; GP, dental school and road services are overstretched; there is no parking in East Goscote and Syston centre.	Remove allocation HA60	No	HA60

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/638	M Sim		Allocation HA60 is not justified as development in East Goscote over the past 20 years has Created flooding issues that will be exacerbated by more development; The proposal will therefore result in Charnwood not being a desirable place to live	Remove allocation HA60	No	HA60
PSLP/136	B Haswell		HA63 is supported but could be improved by retaining and enhancing hedgerows, move the orchard/ green space to between Daisy Bank and the proposed estate, have the proposed 'Open market' housing next to the existing 'open market' housing as per the existing Daisy Bank estate, reduce the number of houses to enhance nature and reduce pressure on infrastructure and make sure there is an accessible dog waste bin.	Amend site plan as suggested.	Not stated	HA63
PSLP/567	Simon Hill		Understand the need for new housing which should be sympathetic to existing dwellings. The development should retain existing hedgerows; reduce paths through hedges; amend layout to be more sympathetic to Daisy Bank residents; reconsider housing mix and introduce bungalows; and ensure provision of dog waste bins.	Amend final layout of the proposal	Not stated	HA63
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The allocation is supported. Part of the policy is not effective as seeking to maximise linkages between the development and the settlement may not be the most effective way of promoting sustainable movement and may be at odds with other factors such as landscape and biodiversity.	Change Policy DS3(HA63) to read: We will support development proposals at site HA63 that <del>maximise</del> <b>improve</b> the linkages between the development and the existing settlement, using features such as streets, active travel routes, landscaping and design.	Yes	HA63
PSLP/128	C Chapman		Proposed allocations HA64 and HA65 are not justified as they will result in Queniborough becoming a suburb of Leicester; these sites have bene refused planning permission previously; local schools and doctors are at capacity; Melton Road is too busy and therefore unsuitable access; the neighbourhood plan should have bearing on the decision to/not to allocate.		No	HA64
PSLP/241	Miss Kathryn Hill		The proposed housing site (HA64) is not positively prepared or justified as planning applications have been repeatedly refused on this site and the Neighbourhood Plan precludes the development of this site.		No	HA64
PSLP/054	Mrs Elaine M. Jordan		Allocation is not justified due to lack of consideration of residents' opinions; loss of land separating Syston, Queniborough and East Goscote; loss of village identity and lack of facilities and infrastructure to support development. Queniborough has already been overdeveloped.	Remove or reduce scale of allocation	No	HA64
PSLP/423	K Hill		The plan is not justified because planning permission has already been refused for HA64 and HA65: The sites are not in conformity with the Queniborough Neighbourhood Plan and with the area of local separation.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA64
PSLP/075	Mr Anthony Bennett		The allocation is not justified due to erosion of the character of the village; loss of agricultural land and habitat; erosion of separation from East Goscote; lack of infrastructure and employment; increased traffic, noise and air pollution; full schools and doctors; overstretched emergency services; restricted access and an increase in crime.	Remove allocation	No	HA64
PSLP/426	Barry Reeves		The allocation is not justified as the scale of development, when combined with other allocations in Queniborough, is not suitable for the village. Doctors, schools are oversubscribed. There is no increased employment proposed which will increase commuting and is unsustainable. Erosion of separation and settlement identity. Planning permission has been refused twice on the site.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA64
PSLP/408	Christine O'Brien		Objects to allocation as a result of impacts on traffic, schools, doctors' appointments and settlement coalescence. with Syston and East Goscote.	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA64
PSLP/474	Janet Cannon		The allocation is not justified; East Goscote, Queniborough and Rearsby account for over 50% of homes allocated to Other Settlements. Facilities are limited and will force residents to use private transport. Development in the area will increase flooding; reduce areas of separation between settlements losing identity and character; and there is a lack of access to healthcare.	Reduce or remove allocation	Not stated	HA64
PSLP/621	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Hallam Land Management	The allocation of the site is appropriate and justified. The requirement to restrict development to the southern part of the site and the scale of development to 100 homes is not justified or consistent with national policy in relation to the efficient use of land.	Amend the table in Policy DS3 so that the allocation is for approximately 200 homes. Policy DS3 (HA64) should be modified to read: We will support development proposals at site HA64 that: <del>restrict development to the southern part of the site; and</del> <del>through their masterplanning approach design and layout</del> will include appropriate design and landscape treatment adjacent to the Area of Local Separation and Policy EV3 clearly maintains the physical and perceptual separation between Queniborough and East Goscote and preserves the separate identity of those settlements.	Yes	HA64

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/298	Philip Laughton	Queniborough Parish Council	HA64 is not justified. Planning application P/18/0611/2 was refused permission because the site was outside the limits to development, was in an 'Other Settlement', the development was not 'small scale', a housing need had not been demonstrated and because it would cause substantive and significant harm to an Area of Local Separation. The Parish Council considers that the situation is unchanged, and sites are not sustainable.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA64
PSLP/706	C Parker		Allocations HA64 and HA65 are not justified as Development of these sites will not preserve the countryside, will not protect an area of local separation, would not be supported by infrastructure especially as existing schools, health and roads are under pressure;	Remove Allocations HA64 and HA65	No	HA64
PSLP/366	Stephen Harris	Emery Planning obo Hollins Strategic Land LLP	Support the allocation and site assessment; however, seek flexibility in the developable area once detailed design is prepared.	Remove the restriction on developing the southern part of the site; introduce a 55 dwelling minimum on the site and for the scale of development to be considered at the detailed design stage.	Yes	HA65
PSLP/241	Miss Kathryn Hill		The proposed housing site (HA65) is not positively prepared or justified as it leaves no area of separation between Queniborough and East Goscote.		No	HA65
PSLP/054	Mrs Elaine M. Jordan		Allocation is not justified due to lack of consideration of residents' opinions; loss of land separating Syston, Queniborough and East Goscote; loss of village identity and lack of facilities and infrastructure to support development. Queniborough has already been overdeveloped. The site falls under Queniborough and not Syston as the plan states.	Remove or reduce scale of allocation	No	HA65
PSLP/423	K Hill		The plan is not justified because planning permission has already been refused for HA64 and HA65: The sites are not in conformity with the Queniborough Neighbourhood Plan and with the area of local separation.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA65
PSLP/071	Mr Anthonty Bennett		The allocation is not justified due to erosion of the character of the village; loss of agricultural land and habitat; erosion of separation from East Goscote; lack of infrastructure and employment; increased traffic, noise and air pollution; full schools and doctors; overstretched emergency services; restricted access and an increase in crime.	Remove allocation	No	HA65
PSLP/426	Barry Reeves		The allocation is not justified as the scale of development, when combined with other allocations in Queniborough, is not suitable for the village. Doctors, schools are oversubscribed. There is no increased employment proposed which will increase commuting and is unsustainable. Development would reduce separation between villages.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA65
PSLP/408	Christine O'Brien		Objects to allocation as a result of impacts on traffic, schools, doctors' appointments and settlement coalescence. with Syston and East Goscote	Objects to allocation	Not stated	HA65
PSLP/474	Janet Cannon		The allocation is not justified; East Goscote, Queniborough and Rearsby account for over 50% of homes allocated to Other Settlements. Facilities are limited and will force residents to use private transport. Development in the area will increase flooding; reduce areas of separation between settlements losing identity and character; and there is a lack of access to healthcare.	Reduce or remove allocation	Not stated	HA65
PSLP/298	Philip Laughton	Queniborough Parish Council	HA65 cannot be included in the Charnwood Local Plan because of the reasons for refusal of planning application at site HA64, and the NPPF emphasis on sustainability.	Remove allocation.	Not stated	HA65
PSLP/119	R Palmer		The site HA66 is not justified as Rearsby has a lack of services, drain capacity is exceeded, proposed access onto Gaddesby Lane will impact highway safety at the old A607 junction.	Remove HA66 allocation	Yes	HA66
PSLP/531	Victoria Heath	Fisher German LLP obo Clarendon Land and Development	The allocation is supported. It is in close proximity to village facilities and public transport. There will be a neutral impact on heritage; it is of low ecological value and trees will be protected. Access is acceptable and an illustrative masterplan has been prepared. The Local Plan allocates 47 dwellings to the site there is potential for this to be increased.	Make clear allocation dwelling numbers are not a maximum. Increase likely allocation to 65 dwellings.	No	HA66
PSLP/267	J Finnemore		Allocation HA66 is not justified as the proposed access is unsafe due to the bend on Melton Road; increased traffic and construction traffic would be unsafe; the proposal would remove an area of recreational use including the cycle/ bridle path on Gaddesby Lane; there is no GP, shop or school to accommodate further need; the development would reduce the separation area between Rearsby and East Goscote		No	HA66
PSLP/284	R Loveday		Allocations HA60 and HA66 are disproportionate to Rearsby given that other nearby villages do not have allocations; HA60 reduces the separation area between Rearsby and East Goscote;	Future development should be directed to other areas to avoid ribbon development	No	HA66
PSLP/047	Mr David F. Hewitt		The allocation is not justified due to impact on the historic environment and its setting; loss of agricultural land; additional traffic and road safety; pedestrian safety; lack of cycle path; flooding; impact on landscape and the environment; and a lack of infrastructure.	Remove allocation	No	HA66
PSLP/474	Janet Cannon		The allocation is not justified; East Goscote, Queniborough and Rearsby account for over 50% of homes allocated to Other Settlements. Facilities are limited and will force residents to use private transport. Development in the area will increase flooding; reduce areas of separation between settlements losing identity and character; and there is a lack of access to healthcare.	Reduce or remove allocation	Not stated	HA66

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/646	S Norledge	Rearsby PC	Allocation HA66 is not justified as The site is outside of limits to development; proposed access on to Melton Road his difficult; increased vehicle movements will detract from the conservation area; the site will reduce the area of local separation with East Goscote; Merging these two villages is not consistent with the heritage credentials of Rearsby. Proposed developments in 'other settlements' will result in over reliance on private vehicles and are therefore not sustainable.		No	HA66
PSLP/013	Dr Mark Thistlethwaite		Site is outside of existing settlement limits; is not small scale; is not infill. Impact of traffic on Old Gate Road Completely against neighbourhood plan so is not legally compliant. Increased pollution from vehicles.	Relate development to settlement size. Only consider infill development. Only build on brownfield sites. Convert unused shops, factories etc.	No	HA67
PSLP/017	Emma Ford		Allocations in Thrussington are not justified due to impact of traffic and parking; poor roads; sewage and water systems are inadequate; poor wifi; no buses; no children's play area.	Remove allocation.	No	HA67
PSLP/017	Emma Ford		Allocations in Thrussington are not justified due to impact of traffic and parking; poor roads; sewage and water systems are inadequate; poor wifi; no buses; no children's play area.	Remove allocation.	No	HA67
PSLP/173	L. Watson		The inclusion of Thrussington is baffling as the village does not meet key elements of Charnwood's own criteria; accessibility and sustainability. Thrussington has no bus service therefore any new housing developments would result in a massive increase in car use. The Local plan for Charnwood requires new housing to be close to amenities. Thrussington does not meet these requirements. Issues such as road safety, parking and congestion within Thrussington have not been taken into account. Although the majority of the plan seems sound the inclusion of Thrussington is unsound.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA67
PSLP/043	Elaine Donaghy		The allocation is not justified due to the old sewer system and poor drainage, and insufficient parking in village.	Remove allocation	No	HA67
PSLP/213	James Bentley	James Bentley & Sons	The Plan is not justified due to the allocation, a 40% increase in dwellings for the village. Not a sustainable location due to lack of bus service, convenience store, GPs, infrastructure. Adverse impact on character and appearance of village. Increased traffic on narrow roads, lack of parking, safety concerns. Impact on wildlife corridors. Increased flood risk from run-off.	Remove allocation	No	HA67
PSLP/343	Edward Argar MP	Member of Parliament for Charnwood	The Plan is not justified as the site is a late inclusion with no advance consultation. Scale of development, along with HA68, is a significant increase to the village impacting on its unique character. Development would be outside the settlement boundary on a green field site. There is no regular bus service. Significant issues of traffic volume, parking and road safety. Increased pressure on local infrastructure and services. Appropriate regard has not been paid to the Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan.	Remove allocation	No	HA67
PSLP/153	Nigel Hainsworth	Thrussington Parish Councillor	The allocation is not justified because of the lack of public transport serving the village, the distance to facilities, and the effects of increased traffic and the adverse impact on the character and appearance of the village caused by the proposed 40% expansion in the size of the village (when combined with HA68). There are factual errors in the information relating to the existence of a bus service and the presence of a GP in East Goscote	Remove allocation	Yes	HA67
PSLP/361	Cllr James Poland	Borough Councillor	The allocation is not justified as due to the impact on the character and infrastructure of the village. There is no suitable highway access to the village for the extra traffic. Already struggling sewage and water infrastructure will not cope with the extra houses. Development at this scale would harm the character and appearance of the village and surrounding countryside. Thrussington is not a sustainable location as there is no bus service; a lack of shops; no GP surgery; a lack of employment; no children's play area or sports field.	Remove allocation	No	HA67
PSLP/099	A Tumova		Development in Thrussington (HA67 and HA68) is not justified as the impact upon traffic, parking, additional road demand on the A46 junction, school capacity and wildlife is not acceptable. Local community have had no previous consultation.	Remove allocations HA67 and HA68	No	HA67
PSLP/100	J Arnold		Development in Thrussington (HA67 and HA68) is not justified as the impact upon traffic, parking, additional demand on the A46 junction, wildlife, schools, lack of public transport, air pollution is not acceptable.	Remove allocations HA67 and HA68	No	HA67
PSLP/121	D J Holloway		Development in Thrussington (HA67 and HA68) is not justified as the proposed development would be disproportionate to the character of the existing village; the sites are outside of the village boundary and contradict the neighbourhood plan, they would have an impact on public services facilities, traffic and highway safety, they would impact wildlife.	Build 20-30 homes in Thrussington rather than 90	No	HA67
PSLP/379	D & C Gamble		The plan is not justified as HA67 and HA68 will have an adverse effect on the appearance and character of the village, there is no public transport, bank or post office, GP surgery/ dentist or convenience store. Traffic is already bad and congestion is an issue. Old Gate Road will be dangerous with all the traffic. The drains flood, internet connection is dire. Both new developments will affect important wildlife corridors around Thrussington and there are no play facilities for children.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA67
PSLP/142	R Olley		Development in Thrussington (HA67 and HA68) is not justified as the sites are outside of the settlement boundary which would contradict the neighbourhood plan, there would in increased traffic and highway safety issues at Old Gate Road and Regent Street, and would impact wildlife corridors protected in the neighbourhood plan	Remove allocations HA67 and HA68	No	HA67

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/143	M Hynds		Development in Thrussington (HA67 and HA68) is not justified as this would exacerbate village parking issues; the village has few facilities; the character and wildlife of the village would be impacted and the sites/ level of growth was not anticipated in the neighbourhood plan.		No	HA67
PSLP/155	M Duggan		Development in Thrussington (HA67 and HA68) is not justified as the scale of development would devastate the rural village character of the village; and would impact the environment, traffic, safety, transport and local services.		No	HA67
PSLP/140	L Knapp		The plan is not justified as building in Thrussington is not sustainable, there is no bus service and is not in close proximity to a GP surgery, a convenience store or other amenities. The development would mean additional cars which would increase on-street parking, reduce visibility and safety (for both children and cyclists). The development would impact on the village's beauty and wildlife.		No	HA67
PSLP/160	S Watson		Sites HA67 and HA68 are not justified as the Sustainability Appraisal at paragraph 6.2.8 demonstrated that these sites are only acceptable through relaxing sustainability criteria – access to bus, secondary school and healthcare are all negative red on table 6.9. Both sites will also have the negative impacts of exacerbating traffic issues (passing the primary school and Old Gate Road); adversely impacting village character (particularly on approach from Seagrave Road); and impacting wildlife and historic ridge and furrow.		No	HA67
PSLP/161	M Heggs		Development in Thrussington (HA67 and HA68) is not justified as it will alter village character and exacerbate traffic and highway safety issues.	Social housing requires appropriate public transport. Traffic problems should be resolved	No	HA67
PSLP/201	Liam Tailby		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; the resultant increase in traffic would exacerbate existing safety concerns; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and, the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		Yes	HA67
PSLP/202	Elizabeth Collingham		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; the resultant increase in traffic would exacerbate existing safety concerns; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and, the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		Yes	HA67
PSLP/185	J Butterley		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as the roads and footpaths are historically constrained; these will exacerbate parking and traffic issues; the impact on village character/ heritage; and loss of natural and open countryside.	Object to allocating HA67 and HA68. Provide a risk assessment of the impact of road traffic, parking and safety in Thrussington.	No	HA67
PSLP/188	D E Young		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as this would harm the character of the village; PINS refused an application on these sites in 1992 on the grounds of loss of character (ref P/91/0397/2); it will exacerbate read traffic issues particularly at key junctions; it conflicts with wildlife corridors proposed in the neighbourhood plan; it risks additional surface water run off from the Wreake river; there are no bus, GP or convenience store to support development (contrary to Sustainability Appraisal)	Object to allocating HA67 and HA68. Develop brownfield sites.	Yes	HA67
PSLP/524	R & H O'Neill		The plan is not justified because there is no bus service in Thrussington, GP surgery and convenience store are miles away. Development would adversely affect the character of the village. The local roads are narrow and there would be an increase in traffic. The proposals don't take account of wild corridors identified in the neighbourhood plan.	Remove HA67 and HA68 from the plan.	Yes	HA67
PSLP/527	K Roberts		The plan is not justified HA67 and HA68 will have a detrimental impact on the historical character of Thrussington and are not sustainable. Local roads are narrow and there would be increased congestion. There is a lack of public transport. Flooding is a risk in itself which could also worsen congestion. There are poor local facilities including lack of convenience store, play facilities bus route, or GP surgery. The primary school is unlikely to be able to cope. The proposals will impact on ancient hedgerows, wildlife corridors and biodiversity.	Remove HA67 and HA68.	Yes	HA67
PSLP/528	R & C Sandilands		The plan is not justified as risk of flooding is of great concern. There is no bus service in the village meaning there will be a higher volume of traffic and congestion. There would be more cars parking around the Green causing a danger for pedestrians and cyclists. The development would change the character of the village and the wildlife corridors which are in the neighbourhood plan.	Remove HA67 and HA68 from plan.	Yes	HA67
PSLP/532	P & S Gee		HA 67 and HA 68 are not justified as it does not take account of the neighbourhood plan, there is no bus service, there is no GP surgery, roads are already congested with dangerous junctions & speeding traffic.	Remove HA67 and HA68 from plan	No	HA67
PSLP/204	Patrick & Frances Rendall		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service, convenience store, GP surgery and no assessment of village infrastructure); traffic/congestion (no traffic assessment); the detrimental impact upon the historic character of the village (development previously found to be unsound under planning references P/91/0397/2, P/12/0997/2, P/01/0243/2, P/05/3791/2) and the environment (i.e. damage to wildlife corridors and flooding); and, no evidence issues and policies of 2018 Neighbourhood Plan have been considered.		Yes	HA67

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/549	J Johnston		The plan is not justified because of the inclusion of HA67 and HA68. There is no bus service in Thrussington, GP surgery or convenience store. The allocations would adversely affect the character of the village. The local roads are narrow and there is limited parking, the allocations would increase the number of vehicles causing further congestion and road safety issues. The allocations take no account of the neighbourhood plan or the wildlife corridors. There is also a risk from flooding.	Remove allocations	Yes	HA67
PSLP/195	I Brockhurst		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and, the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.	Reduce the number of proposed dwellings from 90 to 30. Redesign the A46 road junction to improve safety measures. Improve road safety measures outside Thrussington Primary School. Undertake an environmental impact assessment of the impact on flooding and wildlife. Direct funding to broadband and healthcare,	No	HA67
PSLP/548	G & S Morgan		The plan is not justified because the scale of HA67 and HA68 is too great. There is no bus service, no GP surgery. The proposals would increase the use of cars and cause more traffic. The local roads are not wide enough. There would need to be additional utilities which would cause disruption and be disproportionately costly. There is flooding from the River Wreake and surface run off. These developments will impact on farming and local conservation initiatives. Thrussington would lose its local character.	Remove allocations	Not stated	HA67
PSLP/196	N Brockhurst		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and, the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.	Reduce the number of proposed dwellings from 90 to 30. Redesign the A46 road junction to improve safety measures. Improve road safety measures outside Thrussington Primary School. Undertake an environmental impact assessment of the impact on flooding and wildlife. Direct funding to broadband and healthcare. Build on brownfield sites.	No	HA67
PSLP/197	R Osborne		The proposed housing sites for Thrussington (being HA67 & HA68) are not justified as there is no public transport, convenience store, play area or medical facilities; access would be from narrow roads resulting in traffic, safety and parking issues; it will exacerbate issues with sewerage; and is out of proportion with the existing village.		No	HA67
PSLP/198	F Bashford		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified as it disregards the Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan; it will exacerbate traffic and parking issues in the village particularly on Old Gate Road junctions and Hoby Road; concern that development will be car dependent to access services; concern flooding issues related to the Wreake will be exacerbated; the character of the village will be destroyed; the sites were added to the plan at the last minute.		No	HA67
PSLP/199	I Bentley		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/222	D Alton		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/215	D&L Wright		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified as it does not accord with Cop26 principles of taking positive action on climate change; it will remove biodiversity assets; HA68 comprises grassland that absorbs heavy rainfall on high ground; there is no public transport that connects to Thrussington; there is no local convenience store, post office or NHS walk-in; there will be an increase in cars with no capacity to electric vehicle charging points which will exacerbate current outages; Old Gate Road is too narrow to support development; Regent Street is a difficult access road for HA68; the access route for HA67 will use the village as a cut-through; there is no open/ play space in the village; local internet and phone signals cannot support development.	The village needs investment in infrastructure and public transport, tree re-planting to compensate for increases in surface run-off; improvements in amenity.	No	HA67

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/216	G+T Freestone		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as it would exacerbate water run off onto the properties at the bottom of Back Lane. Also support 16 items of the Parish Council Working Group.	Refuse application	No	HA67
PSLP/217	K Bragg		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as Thrussington should remain a village.		No	HA67
PSLP/218	Mr Mrs Cross		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/219	M&C Harris		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as this would destroy village character; exacerbate parking and traffic issues; and will impact wildlife.		No	HA67
PSLP/224	P Alton		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/225	T Collins		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/227	A Mason		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/229	V Brightwell		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as it will exacerbate parking issues in particular on Ratcliffe Road; exacerbate sewage flooding issues; there are no bus services; excess rainfall is catered for by the culvert at the bottom end of the Green which can drain onto surrounding properties; Old Gate Road and Regent Street flood.		No	HA67
PSLP/230	A Daniels		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified there are no GP or bus services to facilitate sustainable development ; there are existing issues that Severn Trent regularly deal with; the impact upon traffic, highway safety and parking including exacerbating queues onto the A46; it will alter village character – applications for HA68 have been refused for this reason before.	Has a feasibility study been undertaken regarding the sustainability/ impact on village infrastructure?	No	HA67
PSLP/231	T Bourne		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as there are no GP or bus services to facilitate sustainable development (Ref para 6.2.8 of the Sustainability Appraisal, page 32-41 of the Site Selection Topic Paper, and page 15 and para 2.4 of the draft Local Plan); there is no assessment of impact on infrastructure and utilities; both sites will exacerbate surrounding parking issues (ref Transport Assessment May 2021); the HA68 development will exacerbate flooding issues; the sewage system overflows during flooding; it conflicts with the limits to development and wildlife corridors identified in the Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan; the sites are not within 400m of a public transport stop in accordance with draft policy CC5; historic planning applications have been refused on the grounds that development in HA68 would harm village character.	Create a regular bus service in Thrussington; widen Old Gate Road and install a new drainage system; upgrade the A46 junction with Seagrave Road; ensure new developments maintain village character and have sufficient parking; rectify existing sewage flooding issues; include low cost housing to support local people; include a convenience store in the village.	No	HA67
PSLP/232	V Worthy		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/244	L Headley		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as 90 dwellings is too big an increase; additional cars will exacerbate safety issues on Seagrave Road and Old Gate Road; the construction period will be disruptive. Endorse Parish Council response	Less houses in Thrussington	No	HA67
PSLP/250	P Jinks		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as there will be increased traffic and car parking issues; there is no village bus service; the watercourse drainage system will be overloaded.		No	HA67
PSLP/251	Reeve Family		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as this will cause parking issues; there is no bus service; there are limited services in the village; Old Gate Road is too narrow to accommodate traffic and is currently used for agricultural vehicles; local wildlife would be destroyed;	Remove allocations HA67 and HA68 and build on brownfield sites.	No	HA67
PSLP/252	J Lawrenson		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as they are out of proportion and character with the village; the proposals will exacerbate traffic, water, sewerage, parking, road safety and infrastructure issues; the proposals are do not accord with the neighbourhood plan; it will impact wildlife, seasonal flooding, raw sewage overflow; Thrussington has seen its 'fair share of development; there is no bus service to the village.		No	HA67
PSLP/253	S Parker		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/255	S Wells		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/256	S Lawrence		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/259	S Heggs		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as traffic generated will endanger life near the Hoby Road School; local traffic calming measures do not work; oppose changing the character of an historic old gated road; there is no proposed affordable housing; there is no bus service; the road between Thrussington and Rearsby floods; development may exacerbate local short power cuts.	Need traffic calming measures, improved sewerage and drainage systems, and improvements to walk ways towards the school. Infill within villages is preferable.	No	HA67
PSLP/260	L Newcombe		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/264	D Moss		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/247	K Boyden		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as the proposed scale of development is disproportionate to the village; it will exacerbate traffic and parking issues and create highway safety issues at several junctions (all detailed in rep); there is no village bus service, general convenience store or GP to accommodate development; it is not consistent with protective policies in the neighbourhood plan; it would decimate village character.		No	HA67
PSLP/277	C Patterson		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as it will result in traffic, congestion and parking issues especially at the village green/ school; roads cannot accommodate construction traffic; the school cannot accommodate more students; there is no bus service; the environment, wildlife and climate change will be impacted; it will result in the loss of village character.	Remove HA67 and HA68	No	HA67

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/291	D Riley		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as utilities cannot cope; there is no bus service, GP; impact on traffic, safety, congestion, parking appearance, wildlife, climate change, social life, school provision.		No	HA67
PSLP/286	J Leaf		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/287	D&S Burnham		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/288	DC+LM Healey		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/292	DM Clarke		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/234	Suzan Rubins		The plan is not justified because the scale of proposed housing at Thrussington is not sustainable and the area is at risk of flooding. There is no public transport, no GP surgery or convenience store and utilities haven't been assessed for the additional 90 houses. There has been no traffic assessment for Thrussington and congestion will increase. Local roads are dangerous, there is excessive on street parking. There will be a loss of local character and the proposals do not take account of the wildlife corridors or key views in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Remove allocations.	No	HA67
PSLP/499	Belderbos		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/500	C Bentley		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/501	C Bobe		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/502	B Brigstock		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/503	C Holmes		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/504	N Elin		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/505	C Heath		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/506	S Kemp		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/507	L Mee		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/508	J&P O'Flynn		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/509	P Holmes		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/510	B Pendle		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/511	N Porter		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/512	J Saunders		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/513	Mr Mrs Schulze		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/602	B Kerans		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/605	B Patel		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/637	M Porter		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/639	R Hartshorn		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified as no bus/ GP and strained infrastructure/ drainage are sustainability issues; it will later village character; rounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety and parking issues for a range of users; the sites ignore the neighbourhood plan;		No	HA67
PSLP/603	S Whyld		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified as they were introduced at a late stage during the pandemic when people are less engaged; having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery, recreation area or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; it will result in parking issues in the village; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/604	R Whyld		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified as they were introduced at a late stage during the pandemic when people are less engaged; having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery, recreation area or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; it will result in parking issues in the village; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/606	S McAlpine		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified as it is disproportionate to the existing village; council and police budgets will need amending; Thrussington does not have a GP, public transport, pavements on key routes, convenience store, public car parking, recreation facilities; there has been no traffic assessment; increases in traffic which will impact highway safety, congestion and pollution.		No	HA67
PSLP/327	T & V Westwood		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified as they disregard the neighbourhood plan; they will alter village character; there is no public transport serving the village; more traffic would discourage cycling; there are existing parking issues from houses that do not have private parking and the Star Pub; several roads need upgrading with new road markings / visibility provision; the school has no more capacity and parking issues; the sewage system has capacity issues; there are no local health, nursery, secondary school or family food shop provisions; it will detriment wildlife corridors.	New homes need 2 parking spaces per household	No	HA67
PSLP/368	J Butterley		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified as the proposals are disproportionate to the village; the road network/ foot paths are historically constrained; it will impact wildlife corridors; it will not fulfil the preservation of heritage assets; oppose the loss of countryside.	Provide a risk assessment for safety, traffic, and parking in Thrussington/	No	HA67
PSLP/369	Mr & Mrs Birch		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the electricity system will not cope with additional EV car/ internet demands; the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/370	W Johnson		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as the proposals are disproportionate to the village; there is no bus service, major shops, additional GP service to support development; it does not take account the neighbourhood plan; the road network is narrow with restricted views.		No	HA67
PSLP/226	Barry Sandilands		Consider it has not been thought through objectively and is based on a number of false assumptions making it unsound, not suitable for Thrussington, and will increase dangers to Thrussington residents and cause environmental harm. The Draft Local Plan has sustainability at its heart and Thrussington does not meet the Council's own criteria for sustainability. Lack of recognition given to the Neighbourhood Plan. Concern is expressed about the transport implications at specific locations.	Review allocation	No	HA67
PSLP/332	Rob Iliffe		Objects to allocation for reasons of sustainability, village settlement, character and wildlife, flooding and the lack of recognition given to the Neighbourhood Plan.	Objects to allocation.	Not stated	HA67
PSLP/295	C Comber		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery, internet connections, recreation space); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; it will result in parking issues in the village; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding; the construction period will be disruptive to the environment; it does not comply with Policy CT1	Make reports of external public bodies available, i.e. the Highways Authority and Environment agency	No	HA67
PSLP/297	R Comber		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery, internet connections, recreation space); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; it will result in parking issues in the village; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding; the construction period will be disruptive to the environment; it does not comply with Policy CT1	Make reports of external public bodies available, i.e. the Highways Authority and Environment agency	No	HA67
PSLP/294	A Watts		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/322	S Hancock		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/328	S Hancock		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/337	R McNeil		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/346	S Henson & B Squires		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/359	Mr R. Valden		Comments refer to both HA67 and HA68 at Thrussington. Plan is not compliant with several of the Sustainability criteria, principally in respect of the lack of a bus service through the village, but also with regard to excessive distance to access convenience shopping and GP/clinic and other services. The proposed development is unsound in being excessive and wholly inappropriate to the size and layout of the village. Concerns are expressed about car parking and traffic. While recognising the need for housing, in particular for affordable starter homes, I submit that these two proposals are excessive for the sites identified and should be drastically reduced.	Concern with the scale of proposed allocations and their impacts.	No	HA67
PSLP/732	N Wright		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as the sites are outside of the neighbourhood plan limits to development; the land is designated Green Belt; the sewer and electricity supply system are inadequate to support development; schools and NHS services cannot accommodate development; there would be air pollution; the sites are ridge and furrow; roads cannot accommodate additional traffic.	Align proposals with the Neighbourhood Plan. Focus the attention of development on the borough's declining town centres	No	HA67
PSLP/193	Mr Christopher Bennett		Measure to mitigate these points must be put in place before any development takes place so the village is sure they will be done. If the development is to take place then the following issues need to be taken into account : Traffic movements particularly on the already dangerous A46 junction. The inclusion of the farm at the bottom of Old Gate Road as this is clearly a brown field site which could be used to increase the frontage and reduce the depth of the development and the green field take. Flooding and flood risk. Electricity supply reinforcement , particularly if the new development encompasses the move to electric and electric cars. Cumulative impacts of development on the connecting green fields further destroying the environment and biodiversity. Impact on the character of the conservation area. The availability of local services and facilities, particularly health care facilities which are already under pressure.	A range of detailed considerations concerning the site's development	No	HA67
PSLP/416	Steve Clarke		The plan is not justified because there has not been a proper assessment of the suitability and sustainability of Thrussington for housing development. There are no public transport links, extra housing will place strain on the primary school. Roads are narrow and there are safety issues for pedestrians/ cyclists.		Not stated	HA67
PSLP/417	R & M Allsop		The plan is not justified because the current drainage system cannot cope, there is regular flooding between Thrussington and Rearsby, there are regular power cuts, water pressure is low, there is no bus service and no convenience store. Road surface is poor, single track roads are dangerous for pedestrians, there are road safety concerns and congestion will increase. There's no doctors surgery and no open space for youngsters.	Remove the allocations.	Not stated	HA67
PSLP/048	Mr Richard Hartshorne		The allocation is not justified due to environmental impact; lack of infrastructure; poor public transport; increased commuting; and flood risk.	Remove allocation and direct development to Loughborough utilising existing infrastructure.	Yes	HA67
PSLP/419	S & H Bradshaw		The plan is not justified as the proposed housing in Thrussington is not sustainable. There are sewerage and flooding problems. There is already too much traffic and there are road safety concerns. There is no bus service, new housing will impact on the environment and will ruin the character of the village.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA67

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/425	David and Jane Collingham		The allocation is not justified due to road safety issues; increased traffic; parking issues; environmental impact; problems with existing infrastructure; and increased flood risk. Any development should provide a children's play area, additional parking, footpaths and traffic calming.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA67
PSLP/418	Mark Walker		Concerned because of its impact on wild life that removing hedges and mature trees will have, flood risk, traffic and infrastructure including services, water electricity gas sewage doctors shops, child care, school, policing and recreation.	Objects to allocation	No	HA67
PSLP/429	Robert Smith & Lucy England		The allocation is not justified as the site is not sustainable, there is no bus service and convenience stores, and GP surgeries are miles away. It will adversely affect the character of the village. The roads are not suitable for additional traffic and there are concerns over safety, congestion and parking. The development ignores wildlife corridors and will increase flood risk.	Remove allocation	Yes	HA67
PSLP/435	Jan Leaf		Objects to allocation of two sites in Thrussington when sites with better access are available.	Objects to allocation	No	HA67
PSLP/465	Janet Heath		The allocation is not justified, planning permission has previously been refused on the site and reasons for refusal are still valid. The site is in direct contradiction to the neighbourhood plan. Flood risk will increase, and the sewage system is inadequate. Development will harm the environment and character and appearance of the village and countryside; increase traffic on narrow roads; lacks bus service; poor broadband and unreliable electricity provision; limited employment opportunities and lack of services.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA67
PSLP/468	Keith Lockton (Ron & Marion Allsop)		The plan is not justified because the current drainage system cannot cope, there is regular flooding between Thrussington and Rearsby, there are regular power cuts, water pressure is low, there is no bus service and no convenience store. Road surface is poor, single-track roads are dangerous for pedestrians, there are road safety concerns and congestion will increase. There's no doctors surgery and no open space for youngsters.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA67
PSLP/494	N Riley		The plan is not justified because HA67 and HA68 are not sustainable. There is no bus service, no healthcare facilities, no general store, no school capacity and poor electricity supply. There will be a loss of green belt, congestion and pollution will increase. There are serious road safety concerns. The proposals would change the entry to the village on two routes, ruin the village green and make the village feel unsafe.	Remove HA67 and HA68	Not stated	HA67
PSLP/519	D R Cuckow		The allocation is not justified due to the disregard for the neighbourhood plan; the 40% increase in housing and population; increased traffic with risk of accidents and congestion; increased flooding; inadequate facilities; effect on agricultural vehicle movements; impact on wildlife; effects on local businesses due to conflict with new residents; pollution; and noise complaints for existing shooting site and the breach of contract with Thrussington residents.		Yes	HA67
PSLP/600	Angela Northrose		The allocation is not justified as it would be a significant increase of houses in the village; lack of accessibility and public transport; lack of GP surgery and local shops; conflict with the neighbourhood plan; impact on the character and appearance of the village; increase in vehicles causing congestion, safety and parking issues; and the impact on the environment, climate change and wildlife.	Reduce or remove allocation.	Not stated	HA67
PSLP/345	K Sedgwick		Development in Thrussington (HA67 and HA67) are not justified as it would impact historic village character and appearance; the sites are outside of development limits; impact on farmland, countryside, wildlife, increased traffic, increased parking around village green/school; lack of village services including bus, GP, grocery; the neighbourhood plan has not been considered; concern about potential hazards in relation to highway safety along Rearsby Road including parking, traffic, horse riders, narrow paths; flooding; increase of commercial vehicles	Remove HA67 and HA68	No	HA67
PSLP/382	D Pratt		Development in Thrussington (HA67 and HA67) are not justified as there is no bus service in Thrussington which is contrary to the sustainability appraisal; there is no GP or convenience store; increase in traffic around the village and both sites both of which have existing issues; village infrastructure is inadequate including sewage and water pressure; impact on village character; the proposals ignore the neighbourhood plan and wildlife corridors it identifies; it will exacerbate water runoff flooding and overload the watercourse system		No	HA67
PSLP/383	J+M Prior		Development in Thrussington (HA67 and HA67) are not justified as the proposals ignore the neighbourhood plan; there is no bus service, GP, convenience store as required by the Sustainability Assessment; there has been no traffic assessment and local roads are narrow and constrained; development would exacerbate existing flooding issues.		No	HA67
PSLP/386	F Walters		Development in Thrussington (HA67 and HA67) are not justified as the proposed number of houses is disproportionate to the village and will impact its character; Old Gate Road, the school and the village generally is unsuitable for additional traffic and parking; the village has run off flooding issues; the sewerage system is limited; there is no bus service, GP, convenience store.		No	HA67
PSLP/394	S Smith		Support policy which provides additional housing and residents to support businesses and services		No	HA67

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/399	D Arthur		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/403	A Hughes		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not justified as there is no public transport, little parking; it would result in congestion; and 90 homes would change the nature of the village	A small amount of affordable housing and some small bungalows would be supported	No	HA67
PSLP/464	B Taylor		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/467	F Cheadle		Allocations HA67 and HA68 are not justified as Seagrave Road and Old Gate Road Are frequently used by large agricultural vehicles making the roads unsuitable for additional traffic; noise pollution the proposed development is disproportionate to the existing village; respondent concurs with parish councils comments.	remove allocations HA67 and HA68.	No	HA67
PSLP/470	K Hancock		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; surrounding roads could not accommodate resultant increases in traffic without creating safety issues, particularly on Old Gate Road; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		No	HA67
PSLP/341	H Chadwick	Thrussington PC	Allocations HA67 and HA68 are not justified as the Sustainability Appraisal criteria for public transport were relaxed to justify these allocations (there is no bus service in the village); the proposal will not meet the local plan requirements of reducing car use and directing development to locations with jobs, services and facilities given that the village has no bus service, convenience store, GP, resulting additional vehicle movements; the Transport Assessment May 2021 does not assess traffic in Thrussington and the resulting additional traffic from development cannot be safely accommodated due to the surrounding road configuration, existing parking and speeding problems in the village, impact on horse riders, increased traffic near the school , impact on the pleasant deli shop; HA68 Is situated on 'moderate' great landscape (as defined in the landscape character assessment); and the neighbourhood plan seeks to protect village character and states that development should be within the settlement boundary; the child would housing delivery study (2017) states that new development within 'Other Settlements' should be within the settlement boundary; historic applications for both sites Have previously been refused (P/91/0397/2 and P/01/0243/2); the sites are within and with damage wildlife corridors identified in the neighbourhood plan; the sites are further than 400m from a public transport stop meaning they don't accord with policy CC5; No evidence that the neighbourhood plan has been considered in preparing the local plan.	Remove Allocations HA67 and HA68	No	HA67
PSLP/013	Dr Mark Thistlethwaite		The allocation is not justified as the site is outside of existing settlement limits; is not small scale; is not infill. Impact of traffic on Old Gate Road Completely against neighbourhood plan so is not legally compliant. Increased pollution from vehicles.	Relate development to settlement size. Only consider infill development. Only build on brownfield sites. Convert unused shops, factories etc.	No	HA68
PSLP/173	L.Watson		The inclusion of Thrussington is baffling as the village does not meet key elements of Charnwood's own criteria; accessibility and sustainability. Thrussington has no bus service therefore any new housing developments would result in a massive increase in car use. The Local plan for Charnwood requires new housing to be close to amenities. Thrussington does not meet these requirements. Issues such as road safety, parking and congestion within Thrussington have not been taken into account. Although the majority of the plan seems sound the inclusion of Thrussington is unsound.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA68

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/017	Emma Ford		Allocations in Thrussington are not justified due to impact of traffic and parking; poor roads; sewage and water systems are inadequate; poor wifi; no buses; no children's play area.	Remove allocation	No	HA68
PSLP/043	Elaine Donaghy		The allocation is not justified due to the old sewer system and poor drainage, and insufficient parking in village.	Remove allocation	No	HA68
PSLP/213	James Bentley	James Bentley & Sons	The Plan is not justified due to the allocation, a 40% increase in dwellings. Not a sustainable location due to lack of bus service, convenience store, GPs, infrastructure. Adverse impact on character and appearance of village. Increased traffic on narrow roads, lack of parking, safety concerns. Impact on wildlife corridors. Increased flood risk from run-off.	Remove allocation	No	HA68
PSLP/324	Paul Clarke	Brown & Co obo Mr R Clarke	Supports the draft plan as sound and the strategy is justified and effective. The allocation accords with the Plan's objectives and is a sustainable location for development.		No	HA68
PSLP/343	Edward Argar MP	Member of Parliament for Charnwood	The Plan is not justified as the site is a late inclusion with no advance consultation. Scale of development, along with HA67, is a significant increase to the village impacting on its unique character. Development would be outside the settlement boundary on a green field site. There is no regular bus service. Significant issues of traffic volume, parking and road safety. Increased pressure on local infrastructure and services. Appropriate regard has not been paid to the Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan.	Remove allocation	No	HA68
PSLP/153	Nigel Hainsworth	Thrussington Parish Councillor	The allocation is not justified because of the lack of public transport serving the village, the distance to facilities, and the effects of increased traffic and the adverse impact on the character and appearance of the village caused by the proposed 40% expansion in the size of the village (when combined with HA68). There are factual errors in the information relating to the existence of a bus service and the presence of a GP in East Goscote	Remove allocation	Yes	HA68
PSLP/361	Cllr James Poland	Borough Councillor	The allocation is not justified as due to the impact on the character and infrastructure of the village. There is no suitable highway access to the village for the extra traffic. Already struggling sewage and water infrastructure will not cope with the extra houses. Development at this scale would harm the character and appearance of the village and surrounding countryside. Thrussington is not a sustainable location as there is no bus service; a lack of shops; no GP surgery; a lack of employment; no children's play area or sports field.	Remove allocation	No	HA68
PSLP/379	D & C Gamble		The plan is not justified as HA67 and HA68 will have an adverse effect on the appearance and character of the village, there is no public transport, bank or post office, GP surgery/ dentist or convenience store. Traffic is already bad and congestion is an issue. Old Gate Road will be dangerous with all the traffic. The drains flood, internet connection is dire. Both new developments will affect important wildlife corridors around Thrussington and there are no play facilities for children.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA68
PSLP/140	L Knapp		The plan is not justified as building in Thrussington is not sustainable, there is no bus service and is not in close proximity to a GP surgery, a convenience store or other amenities. The development would mean additional cars which would increase on-street parking, reduce visibility and safety (for both children and cyclists). The development would impact on the village's beauty and wildlife.		No	HA68
PSLP/201	Liam Tailby		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; the resultant increase in traffic would exacerbate existing safety concerns; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and, the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		Yes	HA68
PSLP/202	Elizabeth Collingham		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified, having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service/impact upon village infrastructure, no GP surgery or convenience store); the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the village; the resultant increase in traffic would exacerbate existing safety concerns; no regard is paid to wildlife corridors identified in the village neighbourhood plan; and, the development risks overloading the watercourse system leading to potential flooding.		Yes	HA68
PSLP/524	R & H O'Neill		The plan is not justified because there is no bus service in Thrussington, GP surgery and convenience store are miles away. Development would adversely affect the character of the village. The local roads are narrow and there would be an increase in traffic. The proposals don't take account of wild corridors identified in the neighbourhood plan.	Remove HA67 and HA68 from the plan.	Yes	HA68
PSLP/527	K Roberts		The plan is not justified HA67 and HA68 will have a detrimental impact on the historical character of Thrussington and are not sustainable. Local roads are narrow and there would be increased congestion. There is a lack of public transport. Flooding is a risk in itself which could also worsen congestion. There are poor local facilities including lack of convenience store, play facilities bus route, or GP surgery. The primary school is unlikely to be able to cope. The proposals will impact on ancient hedgerows, wildlife corridors and biodiversity.	Remove HA67 and HA68	Yes	HA68
PSLP/528	R & C Sandilands		The plan is not justified as risk of flooding is of great concern. There is no bus service in the village meaning there will be a higher volume of traffic and congestion. There would be more cars parking around the Green causing a danger for pedestrians and cyclists. The development would change the character of the village and the wildlife corridors which are in the neighbourhood plan.	Remove HA67 and HA68	Yes	HA68

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/532	P& S Gee		HA 67 and HA 68 are not justified as it does not take account of the neighbourhood plan, there is no bus service, there is no GP surgery, roads are already congested with dangerous junctions & speeding traffic.	Remove HA67 and HA68.	No	HA68
PSLP/204	Patrick & Frances Rendall		The proposed housing sites (HA67 & HA68) for Thrussington are not positively prepared or justified having regard to sustainability (i.e. no bus service, convenience store, GP surgery and no assessment of village infrastructure); traffic/congestion (no traffic assessment); the detrimental impact upon the historic character of the village (development previously found to be unsound under planning references P/91/0397/2, P/12/0997/2, P/01/0243/2, P/05/3791/2) and the environment (i.e. damage to wildlife corridors and flooding); and, no evidence issues and policies of 2018 Neighbourhood Plan have been considered.		Yes	HA68
PSLP/548	G & S Morgan		The plan is not justified because the scale of HA67 and HA68 is too great. There is no bus service, no GP surgery. The proposals would increase the use of cars and cause more traffic. The local roads are not wide enough. There would need to be additional utilities which would cause disruption and be disproportionately costly. There is flooding from the River Wreake and surface run off. These developments will impact on farming and local conservation initiatives. Thrussington would lose its local character.	Remove allocations	Not stated	HA68
PSLP/233	M&H Sedgwick		Proposed allocation HA68 is not justified as it will impact the nucleated village character; the site is outside of limits to development; the HA68 land is a prominent countryside view/setting to the village; development will exacerbate flooding on Old Gate Road; development will impact wildlife along Old Gate Road; previous planning application P/92/1243/2 was refused due to the impact on highway safety and there have been no road changes since; parking and traffic issues would be exacerbated; there is no bus service in Thrussington to enable sustainable transport; there are no local convenience store or GP; the proposal does not accord with the wildlife corridors in the Neighbourhood Plan; development will exacerbate flooding issues.		No	HA68
PSLP/234	Suzane Rubins		The plan is not justified because the scale of proposed housing at Thrussington is not sustainable and the area is at risk of flooding. There is no public transport, no GP surgery or convenience store and utilities haven't been assessed for the additional 90 houses. There has been no traffic assessment for Thrussington and congestion will increase. Local roads are dangerous, there is excessive on street parking. There will be a loss of local character and the proposals do not take account of the wildlife corridors or key views in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Remove allocations.	Not stated	HA68
PSLP/607	I Stevens		Allocation HA68 is not justified as planning applications for HA68 have been refused in the past; there are several existing highways issues in the village (listed in rep); Severn Trent Water need to deal with existing surface water issues.	Remove Allocation	No	HA68
PSLP/226	Barry Sandilands		Consider it has not been thought through objectively and is based on a number of false assumptions making it unsound, not suitable for Thrussington, and will increase dangers to Thrussington residents and cause environmental harm. The Draft Local Plan has sustainability at its heart and Thrussington does not meet the Council's own criteria for sustainability. Lack of recognition given to the Neighbourhood Plan. Concern is expressed about the transport implications at specific locations.	Remove allocation.	Not stated	HA68
PSLP/332	Rob Iliffe		Objects to allocation for reasons of sustainability, village settlement, character and wildlife, flooding and the lack of recognition given to the Neighbourhood Plan.	Objects to allocation.	Not stated	HA68
PSLP/359	Mr R. Valden		Comments refer to both HA67 and HA68 at Thrussington. Plan is not compliant with several of the Sustainability criteria, principally in respect of the lack of a bus service through the village, but also with regard to excessive distance to access convenience shopping and GP/clinic and other services. The proposed development is unsound in being excessive and wholly inappropriate to the size and layout of the village. Concerns are expressed about car parking and traffic. While recognising the need for housing, in particular for affordable starter homes, I submit that these two proposals are excessive for the sites identified and should be drastically reduced.	Objects to the scale of the allocations and their impacts.	No	HA68
PSLP/193	Mr Christopher Bennett		Measure to mitigate these points must be put in place before any development takes place so the village is sure they will be done. If the development is to take place then the following issues need to be taken into account : Traffic movements particularly on the already dangerous A46 junction. The inclusion of the farm at the bottom of Old Gate Road as this is clearly a brown field site which could be used to increase the frontage and reduce the depth of the development and the green field take. Flooding and flood risk. Electricity supply reinforcement , particularly If the new development encompasses the move to electric and electric cars Cumulative impacts of development on the connecting green fields further destroying the environment and biodiversity. Impact on the character of the conservation area. The availability of local services and facilities, particularly health care facilities which are already under pressure.	A range of detailed issues for consideration submitted.	No	HA68
PSLP/416	Steve Clarke		The plan is not justified because there has not been a proper assessment of the suitability and sustainability of Thrussington for housing development. There are no public transport links, extra housing will place strain on the primary school. Roads are narrow and there are safety issues for pedestrians/ cyclists.		Not stated	HA68

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/417	R & M Allsop		The plan is not justified because the current drainage system cannot cope, there is regular flooding between Thrussington and Rearsby, there are regular power cuts, water pressure is low, there is no bus service and no convenience store. Road surface is poor, single-track roads are dangerous for pedestrians, there are road safety concerns and congestion will increase. There's no doctors surgery and no open space for youngsters.	Remove allocations	Not stated	HA68
PSLP/048	Mr Richard Hartshorne		The allocation is not justified due to environmental impact; lack of infrastructure; poor public transport; increased commuting; and flood risk.	Remove allocation and direct development to Loughborough utilising existing infrastructure.	Yes	HA68
PSLP/419	S & H Bradshaw		The plan is not justified as the proposed housing in Thrussington is not sustainable. There are sewerage and flooding problems. There is already too much traffic and there are road safety concerns. There is no bus service, new housing will impact on the environment and will ruin the character of the village.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA68
PSLP/425	David and Jane Collingham		The allocation is not justified due to road safety issues; increased traffic; parking issues; environmental impact; problems with existing infrastructure; and increased flood risk.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA68
PSLP/418	Mark Walker		Concerned because of its impact on wildlife that removing hedges and mature trees will have, flood risk, traffic and infrastructure including services, water electricity gas sewage doctor's shops, childcare, school, policing and recreation.	Objects to allocation	No	HA68
PSLP/429	Robert Smith & Lucy England		The allocation is not justified as the site is not sustainable, there is no bus service and convenience stores, and GP surgeries are miles away. It will adversely affect the character of the village. The roads are not suitable for additional traffic and there are concerns over safety, congestion and parking. The development ignores wildlife corridors and will increase flood risk.	Remove allocation	Yes	HA68
PSLP/435	Jan Leaf		Objects to allocation of two sites in Thrussington when sites with better access are available.	Objects to allocation	No	HA68
PSLP/465	Janet Heath		The allocation is not justified, planning permission has previously been refused on the site and reasons for refusal are still valid. The site is in direct contradiction to the neighbourhood plan. Flood risk will increase, and the sewage system is inadequate. Development	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA68
PSLP/468	Keith Lockton (Ron & Marion Allsop)		The plan is not justified because the current drainage system cannot cope, there is regular flooding between Thrussington and Rearsby, there are regular power cuts, water pressure is low, there is no bus service and no convenience store. Road surface is poor, single track roads are dangerous for pedestrians, there are road safety concerns and congestion will increase. There's no doctors surgery and no open space for youngsters.	Remove allocation	Not stated	HA68
PSLP/495	N Riley		The plan is not justified because HA67 and HA68 are not sustainable. There is no bus service, no healthcare facilities, no general store, no school capacity and poor electricity supply. There will be a loss of green belt, congestion and pollution will increase. There are serious road safety concerns. The proposals would change the entry to the village on two routes, ruin the village green and make the village feel unsafe.	Remove HA67 and HA68	Not stated	HA68
PSLP/519	D R Cuckow		The allocation is not justified due to the disregard for the neighbourhood plan; the 40% increase in housing and population; increased traffic with risk of accidents and congestion; increased flooding; inadequate facilities; effect on agricultural vehicle movements; impact on wildlife; effects on local businesses due to conflict with new residents; pollution; and noise complaints for existing shooting site and the breach of contract with Thrussington residents.		Yes	HA68
PSLP/600	Angela Northrose		The allocation is not justified as it would be a significant increase of houses in the village; lack of accessibility and public transport; lack of GP surgery and local shops; conflict with the neighbourhood plan; impact on the character and appearance of the village; increase in vehicles causing congestion, safety and parking issues; and the impact on the environment, climate change and wildlife.	Reduce or remove allocation	Not stated	HA68
<b>CHAPTER 3 - PLACE BASED POLICIES</b>						
PSLP/554	Andrew Taylor	Thomas Taylor Planning obo Mr Scottorn	The policy is not justified or reflect national policy as it does not give sufficient support to re-use of brownfield or underused land and buildings outside the limits to development.	Amend first bullet to -• supporting <b>all forms</b> of rural economic development <b>and employment creation which protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside including those</b> which <b>have</b> a strong relationship with the operational requirements of agriculture, horticulture, forestry and other land-based industries	Yes	C1
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is supported.		Not stated	C1
PSLP/583	Liberty Stones	Fisher German obo Lone Star	Policy C1 is not justified as it is unclear why Sturdee Poultry Farm, Burton on the Wolds is outside the Limits to Development.	Include Sturdee Poultry Farm, Burton on the Wolds within the Limits to Development.	Not stated	C1
PSLP/162	Geoffrey Prince	Geoffrey Prince Associates Ltd obo Cawrey Ltd	The Plan is not positively prepared as it fails to take account of Leicester's unmet need. Allocation of SHELAA site PSH2 would sit well with this policy.	Allocate SHELAA site PSH2	Yes	LUA1
PSLP/404	Hannah Shaw	Newtown Linford Parish Council	We are pleased to see the emphasis of 'green wedges' between existing settlements and would like to see these protected in future.		No	LUA1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/582	Grant Butterworth	Leicester City Council	The draft policy (LUA1) for the Leicester Urban Area is too generic in transport terms and needs to be more focussed. It needs to set out how it will deliver the Policy and who Charnwood Borough Council need to state that it will work in partnership with Leicester City Council, rather than 'cross boundary authorities' to deliver the Policy. The Policy needs to state that further work will be progressed by undertaking an evidence-based strategies.	Policy changes called for. The policy needs to be amended to detail how the Plan will improve connectivity and accessibility to Leicester (including connecting to major retail and employment locations). The Policy also needs to set out specifically the authorities that Charnwood will work with, rather than the generic 'cross boundary authorities' which the policy currently states.	Yes	LUA1
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	LUA1
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Reference to ensuring timely and coordinated delivery of infrastructure, and improving connectivity and accessibility are welcomed; however, the two aspects are split in the policy (and elsewhere in the plan) which does not support a coordinated, structured, strategy-led approach to addressing transport impacts. Watermead is mentioned but other important wildlife areas exist.		Yes	LUA1
PSLP/580	Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The place-based policies for Leicester are appropriate.		Not stated	LUA1
PSLP/319	Dr Anthony Kay		Paragraphs 3.24-3.25 promote sustainable travel in the Leicester Urban Area. Yet there is no mention of the scope for a new railway station for Thurmaston, which would also serve the "Thorpebury" SUE Policies LUA1 and LUA2 are not sound without mention of the possibility of providing a new station. Provision of a new station for Thurmaston would require cooperation with organisations in the railway industry. To comply with the duty to cooperate, the policies should make explicit mention of such cooperation.	Absence in policy of a new railway station in Thurmaston.	No	LUA1
PSLP/713	Mrs L. Aspinall	Harborough District Council	Pagrapgh 3.3: Reference to growth in Harborough (Scraptoft North SDA) and to ensuring a joined-up approach to delivering growth in the Leicester Urban Area is welcomed.	Reference in plan welcomed.	No	LUA1
PSLP/713	Mrs L. Aspinall	Harborough District Council	Recognition of the cross-boundary functions of green wedges and need for coordination in policy approach applying to them is welcomed. The timely and coordinated delivery of infrastructure, including infrastructure requirements which cross local authority boundaries, is also supported as set out.		No	LUA1
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Paragraph 3.38 - Severn Trent are supportive of the approach that Thurmaston SUE is developed sensitively in respect to the Melton and Barkby Brooks, ensuring that space is left for water and that surface water is managed sustainably such that it the drainage hierarchy is utilised to determine the outfall as part of a site wide drainage strategy. This approach could also support the development of blue-green corridors that will support and enhance the biodiversity of the watercourses and the surrounding habitats.		Not stated	LUA2
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Paragraph 3.39 - Severn Trent are also supportive of the approach to consider climate resilient design within the SUE such that water efficiency and energy efficiency / technology is applied within the new developments reducing the impacts on our natural resources.		Not stated	LUA2
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent are supportive of the inclusion of a statement within policy LUA2 requiring the Use of Appropriate SUDS systems, we would however recommend that the policy also highlights the drainage Hierarchy to ensure that sustainable outfalls for surface water are utilised over the use of Sewers. We also support the principles that development will protect and enhance water quality. It is also recommended that the requirement for the optional Water Efficiency is detailed within the policy to ensure that development considers the sustainable use of resources.	Policy should also reference the drainage hierarchy. Requirement for optional water efficiency should be detailed.	Not stated	LUA2
PSLP/063	Mrs Roaie Begrie		I had a contract that the field in front of my house would not be built on for 10years.		No	LUA2
PSLP/404	Hannah Shaw	Newtown Linford Parish Council	We do feel that the large increase in the number of households within 10 miles of Charnwood Forest and Bradgate Park (in the Loughborough and Leicester urban extensions as well as Anstey) will require careful planning to enable safe access and accommodation for the increased number of cars, as there is very little public transport to these regions.		No	LUA2
PSLP/079	G Wildbore		Development in Barkby Thorpe Area is not justified as new demand housing/ services will generate a lot of traffic on nearby country lanes.	Improve local country lanes	No	LUA2
PSLP/105	A Turner		Plan is not justifies at building in Thurmaston (i.e. LUA2) will destroy wildlife local fauna and flora and the view between Thurmaston and Barkby Church spire.	Remove allocation	No	LUA2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Additional growth is proposed in the surrounding area and the Plan should be clearer regarding contributions provided by this site to deal with cumulative transport impacts. Provide refuge for species impacted by loss of flood plain habitat. Reference to utilising alternative transport is positive. Broadband terminology should be updated.	Revise policy to reference contributions to cumulative transport impacts. Amend 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet in Community Facilities to “supporting the provision of <b><u>gigabite capable broadband infrastructure</u></b> for all homes and businesses in accordance with Policy E1 and E3”	Yes	LUA2
PSLP/611	Dermot Breen	Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce	The policy is supported.		Not stated	LUA2
PSLP/349	Dr Anthony Kay		Paragraphs 3.24-3.25 promote sustainable travel in the Leicester Urban Area. Yet there is no mention of the scope for a new railway station for Thurmaston, which would also serve the "Thorpebury" SUE Policies LUA1 and LUA2 are not sound without mention of the possibility of providing a new station. Provision of a new station for Thurmaston would require cooperation with organisations in the railway industry. To comply with the duty to cooperate, the policies should make explicit mention of such cooperation.	Objection to lack of recognition in policy of a railway station.	No	LUA2
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The specific strategic policy relating to NEoL SUE is largely based on the Core Strategy policy with more detail provided from the evidence base. It is important to ensure wording is appropriately phrased to allow sufficient flexibility to support delivery. The plan should recognise the approved masterplan and parameter plans. The precise boundaries shown on the Policies map and inset maps are unnecessary and prevent design development. The approach does not provide appropriate flexibility to respond to changing circumstances over the years it takes to deliver an SUE.	Provide suggested changes to the policy. Amend Policies and inset maps to identify the extent of the SUE only and identify requirements through specific policy wording.	Yes	LUA2
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent are supportive of the inclusion of a statement within policy LUA3 requiring the use of appropriate SUDS systems, we would however recommend that the policy also highlights the drainage Hierarchy to ensure that sustainable outfalls for surface water are utilised over the use of Sewers. We also support the approach to ensure that the development incorporates multifunctional green space and corridors. It is also recommended that the requirement for the optional Water Efficiency is detailed within the policy to ensure that development considers the sustainable use of resources.	Policy should also highlight the drainage hierarchy and ensure that the development incorporates multi functional green spae and corridors. Policy should also reference requirement for optional water efficiency.	Not stated	LUA3
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Additional growth is proposed in the surrounding area and the Plan should be clearer regarding contributions provided by this site to deal with cumulative transport impacts. Provide refuge for species impacted by loss of flood plain habitat. Reference to utilising alternative transport is positive. Broadband terminology should be updated.	Revise policy to reference contributions to cumulative transport impacts. Amend 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet in Community Facilities to “supporting the provision of <b><u>gigabite capable broadband infrastructure</u></b> for all homes and businesses in accordance with Policy E1 and E3”	Yes	LUA3
PSLP/611	Dermot Breen	Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce	The policy is supported.		Not stated	LUA3
PSLP/740	Bert Pollheimer		The fact that Broadnook, 1950 homes LUA3 was not considered at the same time as the two allocations in Rothley (HA51 and HA52) is a major flaw in the planning process. The two processes rely and depend on a similar resource pool and have to be considered together in order to provide an accurate projection, and provide meaningful services.	Objects to site selection process	No	LUA3
PSLP/615	Laura McCombe	Carter Jonas obo Mr C. Green	We strongly support the allocation of North of Birstall which will deliver approximately 1950 homes, up to 15 hectares of employment, a primary school, a local centre, along with associated transport infrastructure. We support the improved connectivity and accessibility link shown between the Sustainable Urban Extension and Thurstaston.	The wording should be amended to ensure the improved connectivity between the site and Thurstaston is a policy requirement as this will provide significant economic, social and environmental benefits.	Yes	LUA3
PSLP/329	M Lane	Thurcaston and Cropston PC	The supporting text to policy LUA3 should make stronger reference to Thurcaston; should conserve the local wildlife site and create a green corridor and a wider separation zone between the GCR and Broadnookn (to provide consistency with paragraph 8.41, 5.42 and 5.45).	Amend paragraph 3.56 to mention Thurcaston. Amend paragraphs 3.11, 3.16, 3.17, 3.56 to address landscaping and screening between Thurcaston, the GCR and Broadnook. Create a broadened green corridor along the GCR to enhance wildlife, recreation and tourism.	No	LUA3
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent are supportive of the principles to mitigate the impacts of flood risk, We would however recommend that the policy also promotes the use of SuDS, and the Drainage Hierarchy to mitigate the impacts of surface water within the urban environment, and promote the sustainable discharge of surface water back to the environment instead of discharging to the sewerage system. It is also recommended that the requirement for the optional Water Efficiency is detailed within the policy to ensure that development considers the sustainable use of resources.	Policy should promote SuDS and the drainage hierarchy. Requirement for optional water efficiency should be detailed.	Not stated	LUC1
PSLP/180	Mrs Ruth Youngs		Policies LUC1 should help to reduce reliance on out-of-town locations but also need to improve some basic facilities.		No	LUC1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/521	Jon Bradburn	Montagu Evans obo Beacon Bingo	The policy is unwieldy and difficult to put into practice and as such is not justified as an appropriate strategy. It requires further explanation and refinement to be considered robust and effective.	Amend policy structure and wording to assist development management. Suggested amendments supplied.	Yes	LUC1
PSLP/106	Rosamund Worrall	Historic England	The plan is not consistent with national policy because paragraph 3.84 does not reflect the requirements of the NPPF, including footnote 68 in relation to buried archaeology.	The final sentence of paragraph 3.84 should be amended as follows: It is important that growth in Loughborough is managed carefully to strike a positive balance between safeguarding the natural, <del>and built</del> <b>and historic</b> environment and ensuring the future prosperity of the town.	No	LUC1
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Reference to ensuring timely and coordinated delivery of infrastructure, and improving connectivity and accessibility are welcomed; however, the two aspects are split in the policy (and elsewhere in the plan) which does not support a coordinated, structured, strategy-led approach to addressing transport impacts. Consultation with Local Flood Authority should be key alongside the Environment Agency. The role of Loughborough town centre to support retail and leisure is welcomed but the need for additional retail space is questioned given recent changes. Leicestershire Tourism Growth Plan 2020-2025 could be referenced. The Bell foundry could mention wayfinding, car parking and coach provision. An Industrial Heritage Quarter is welcomed.	Include reference to Local Flood Authority. Consider additional retail requirement at Baxter Gate. Amend supporting text on town centre and regeneration, suggestions provided.	Yes	LUC1
PSLP/580	Strategic Property	Leicestershire County Council	The place-based policies for Loughborough are appropriate.		Not stated	LUC1
PSLP/611	Dermot Breen	Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce	Loughborough remains a strong urban centre and will be strengthened in progressing its role as a sub-regional centre.		Not stated	LUC1
PSLP/735	Maggie Taylor		More is needed to move the town centre from a retail focus to a more imaginative use of the spaces for recreation and other activities. There is potential for the town to become a positive resource for the community. An imaginative approach is needed to make it a space for community, congregation, utility, business and residential purposes. To be accessible, new housing developments need to be close to the core and have easily accessible non-car routes. Spread out housing does not easily allow for this, isolating people and increasing use of car.	Comment	Yes	LUC1
PSLP/630	Carl Stott	Nineteen47 obo Bowbridge Homes	Support for elements of the policy which promote the role of Loughborough Urban Centre, require the effective use of land, and the integration of development within the wider landscape, setting, landscape character, and wildlife networks		Not stated	LUC1
PSLP/459	F Travadi		The plan is not positively prepared as paragraph 3.80 suggests Holywell and Burleigh Woods will be developed.	Paragraph 3.80 should refer specifically to HA18 and LSEP	No	LUC1
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The wording of paragraph 3.80 is unclear and appears to advocate development in Bureleigh Wood and Holywell Wood. The final reference to sites in 3.80 should instead refer specifically to HA18 and the LSEP.	Amend wording to provide greater clarity and refer specifically to HA18 and LSEP.	Yes	LUC1
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The aspirations of the vision in relation to health and wellbeing will not be met unless existing shortfalls in provision are addressed.	Commit to addressing shortfalls in open space generally and protecting the remaining 1.4ha of open space at the top of Leconfield Road in Nanpantan	Yes	LUC1
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent are supportive of the inclusion of a statement within policy LUC2 requiring the use of appropriate SUDS systems, we would however recommend that the policy also highlights the Drainage Hierarchy to ensure that sustainable outfalls for surface water are utilised over the use of Sewers. We also support the approach to ensure that the development incorporates multifunctional green space and corridors. It is also recommended that the requirement for the optional Water Efficiency is detailed within the policy to ensure that development considers the sustainable use of resources.	Policy should highlight the drainage hierarchy. Requirement for optional water efficiency is detailed within the policy.	Not stated	LUC2
PSLP/404	Hannah Shaw	Newtown Linford Parish Council	We do feel that the large increase in the number of households within 10 miles of Charnwood Forest and Bradgate Park (in the Loughborough and Leicester urban extensions as well as Anstey) will require careful planning to enable safe access and accommodation for the increased number of cars, as there is very little public transport to these regions.		No	LUC2
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Additional growth is proposed in the surrounding area and the Plan should be clearer regarding contributions provided by this site to deal with cumulative transport impacts. Substantial infrastructure including new link roads and enhanced public transport will be required, no mention is made of funding sources or S106.	Revise policy to reference contributions to cumulative transport impacts. Provide more clarity on infrastructure funding and the mechanisms to be used.	Yes	LUC2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/611	Dermot Breen	Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce	The policy is supported.		Not stated	LUC2
PSLP/616	Eri Wong	National Highways	Welcome requirement for appropriate measures to mitigate noise and air quality impact.		Yes	LUC2
PSLP/006	J Crowe		The Local Plan is not justified because the Loughborough Science and Enterprise Park and H18 are prone to flooding and provide a valuable wildlife barrier	H18 planted with trees and LSEP split between employment, housing and green land.	No	LUC3
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent are supportive of the principles to protect and enhance ecological sites and wildlife corridors including the Black Brook and the Burleigh Brook, the approach to create green corridors that allow biodiversity to navigate through the urban environment and make space for water could provide benefits and increase the viability for surface water management and SuDS to be delivered. Whilst Severn Trent are supportive of the principles and changes that would impact on the ability for existing Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) to operate would be opposed unless they have been incorporated into our existing improvements programme that ensure Seven Trent deliver our fair share of watercourse improvements but are not required to meet targets that could not be delivered.		Not stated	LUC3
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent are supportive of the inclusion of a statement within policy LUC3 requiring the use of appropriate SUDS systems, we would however recommend that the policy also highlights the Drainage Hierarchy to ensure that sustainable outfalls for surface water are utilised over the use of Sewers. It is also recommended that the requirement for the optional Water Efficiency is detailed within the policy to ensure that development considers the sustainable use of resources.	Policy should highlight the drainage hierarchy. Also optional water efficiency should be detailed in the policy.	Not stated	LUC3
PSLP/627	Loughborough University	Avison Young	Support allocation and expansion of LUSEP. Concern that paragraph 3.142 restricts general industrial development as there is demand for this as ancillary uses in the knowledge based sector. Request paragraph is amended to support small scale ancillary general industrial uses, in line with NPPF 81 and 82. Concerned about requirement to retain 40% of the land as green infrastructure in addition to biodiversity offsetting requirements.	Amend paragraph 3.142 to supports general industrial uses that are ancillary to the knowledge based sector. Request that either (a) biodiversity can be provided for across the university's land holdings, (b) biodiversity and landscaping provision can be combined where feasible, and/ or (c) the 40% requirement is reviewed to provide a specific plot/phase where biodiversity offsetting would be better provided.	No	LUC3
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	Additional policy wording proposed: "Support measures to mitigate flood risk including contributions towards flood alleviation works in the wider catchment of the Burleigh Brook or other water courses flowing through or adjacent to Loughborough".	Additional policy wording proposed	Not stated	LUC3
PSLP/144	S Kumar		Policy LUC3 is not positively prepared or justified as the LSEP site will remove 73ha of green space from Nanpantan, an area with a large per capita shortfall (20%) as set out in the Open Space Strategy.	(1) Protect 1.4ha of open space at Leconfield Road to compensate for LSEP and secure this through S106 contributions from the LSEP site. State this intension in policy LUC3	No	LUC3
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Additional growth is proposed in the surrounding area and the Plan should be clearer regarding contributions provided by this site to deal with cumulative transport impacts.	Revise policy to reference contributions to cumulative transport impacts.	Yes	LUC3
PSLP/580	Strategic Property	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is strongly supported.		Not stated	LUC3
PSLP/611	Dermot Breen	Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce	The Chamber agree with the policy and the assessment that the LUSEP can cater for future needs and growth driven by new development in adjoining areas such as the International Gateway. The links to LUSEP gateway policies are strong and inclusive. The policy should make clear statements about how business start-up and incubator spaces will be accessible to the existing community. Information is needed on how the policy connects with the Loughborough Town Deal area.	Provide details on how space can be accessed by the existing community. Consider the relationship with the Loughborough Town Deal area.	Not stated	LUC3
PSLP/319	Mr Ramsey Pollock		Loughborough Science and Enterprise Park (LSEP) does not create sufficient space between ancient woodland and will impair the tranquillity of the area. LUC3 policy is not sound based on environmental sustainability.	Objects to policy.	No	LUC3
PSLP/317	Miss Abigail Coles		Loughborough Science and Enterprise Park (LSEP) does not create sufficient space between ancient woodland and will impair the tranquillity of the area. LUC3 policy is not sound based on environmental sustainability.	The LSEP (Policy LUC3) should be amended.	No	LUC3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/316	Mrs Denise Coles		Loughborough Science and Enterprise Park (LSEP) does not create sufficient space between ancient woodland and will impair the tranquillity of the area. LUC3 policy is not sound based on environmental sustainability.	The LSEP (Policy LUC3) should be amended.	No	LUC3
PSLP/317	Miss Abigail Coles		Loughborough Science and Enterprise Park (LSEP) does not create sufficient space between ancient woodland and will impair the tranquillity of the area. LUC3 policy is not sound based on environmental sustainability.	The LSEP (Policy LUC3) should be amended.	No	LUC3
PSLP/364	Emma Crowe	Woodhouse Parish Council	Wishes the review of employment development on the site in favour of the provision of student housing.	Review policy	No	LUC3
PSLP/479	R Malpas		Policy LUC3 is not positively prepared as the LSEP will remove 73ha of open space from Nanpantan, which has a large shortfall of open space provision in accordance with the Open Space Strategy.	Protect the last remaining unallocated green space (1.4ha) – assume this is Leconfield Road – using S106 money from LSEP	No	LUC3
PSLP/641	M Martin		The LSEP (Policy LUC3 and pages 68, 114, 153, 208) is not justified as development should not extend towards Burleigh Wood as shown on p114 and the University has not made good use of the existing science park, the relevant masterplan is 5 years out of date considering what is proposed in the local plan;	The plan needs a suitable buffer between Leconfield Road and the wood to ensure development does not encroach on ancient woodland.	Yes	LUC3
PSLP/625	A Swann		Policy LUC3 (ref pages 68, 114, 153, 208) is not justified as the LSEP allocation will destroy countryside near Garendon Park and replace it with a low density retail park; the university doesn't make use of its existing science and enterprise park; development close to Burleigh Wood will spoil this area;	Development should have restrictions on building quality. Preserve the area around Burleigh Wood as green wedge	No	LUC3
PSLP/473	S Cuff	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Paragraph 3.170 is not justified as the phrasing 'industrial sources' is imprecise	Refer to the 'Biffa/ Covanta waste incinerator at M1 J23.	Yes	LUC3
PSLP/116	P Isherwood		Paragraphs 3.221 - 3.222 are not justified or effective as 60 infill dwellings in Wymeswold is unachievable. 139 new dwellings have been built in the settlement since 2004 with a further 110 granted consent. Previous local plan is not prevent development beyond the village limits. No plans provide employment, local services or a bus service to support development	Omit all development in other settlements	No	OS1
PSLP/107	Alison Armstrong		The plan is not justified as new development will destroy the identity of Cossington and will overwhelm the village. The village does not have the services and facilities for new housing, the school is full and there is no health centre. Public transport is not good and development will only make the traffic problem worse. Cossington is at risk of flooding.	There should be less housing in Cossington, it should be more fairly distributed between other settlements.	No	OS1
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	Support the policy which will meet Other Settlements social and economic needs, and support the identification of East Goscote as such a settlement.		Yes	OS1
PSLP/554	Andrew Taylor	Thomas Taylor Planning obo Mr Scottorn	The policy is not justified or reflect national policy as it does not give sufficient support to re-use of brownfield or underused land and buildings outside the limits to development.	Amend second bullet - is small-scale and within defined Limits to Development <b>or else is in accordance with Policy DS1 and protects the intrinsic character of the Countryside where the proposal involves employment development outside Limits to Development</b>	Yes	OS1
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The criteria for lower order settlements in a hierarchy are as expected.		Yes	OS1
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is supported.		Not stated	OS1
PSLP/583	Liberty Stones	Fisher German obo Lone Star	The policy is not consistent with NPPF 199 and 120 and should include an additional criterion encouraging the reuse of suitable brownfield land.	Include additional criterion encouraging the reuse of suitable brownfield land	Not stated	OS1
PSLP/296	Mr Brian Flynn	Cartar Jonas obo LCC Strategic Property Services	No comments on other matters, but the policy is not justified as employment land needs and reducing out commuting in service centres will not be achieved. There is strong market demand for small/medium units; there is limited supply of industrial space; most industrial space are larger units; employment allocations are directed to larger centres, with a limited supply in service centres; some employment allocations are constrained or not suitable for small/medium units; and there are no allocations at Quorn. Policy E1 and supporting text of the Quorn Neighbourhood Plan supports businesses to locate in the village, but highlights the lack of available units with businesses in relocating elsewhere. Residents commute to access employment, including employees previously located within Quorn. NP shows some local support for a small business park and policy support for employment development but does not allocate land. The objectives of Policy SC1 to support the role of service centres in providing employment opportunities and reducing out commuting would not be met through the Quorn NP or Local Plan.	Additional employment allocations at land at Poole Farm and at land off Barrow Road in Quorn are required to specifically meet the need for small/medium business units.	No	SC1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/162	Mr Geoffrey Prince	Geoffrey Prince Associates Ltd obo Cawrey Ltd	The Plan is not positively prepared as it fails to take account of Leicester's unmet need. Allocation of SHELAA site PSH2 would sit well with this policy.	Allocate SHELAA site PSH2	Yes	SC1
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	The Plan is not justified as the allocations at Anstey do not satisfy requirements of SC1, not being within 800m of public transport. Masterplan for Anstey is necessary. HA12 & HA13 are in Anstey not Leicester Urban Area. The Plan is not sound without a comprehensive transport assessment of the impact of development on Anstey village centre. Communal services, including open space, should be managed by the local authority.	Remove allocations at Anstey; attribute HA12 & HA13 to Anstey; undertake comprehensive transport assessment.	No	SC1
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	SC1
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sibley Parish Council	Local Plan is not justified and should be amended to ensure that where appropriate, policies should ensure that if the proposed housing allocations within Sibley remain, their development should be conditional upon each allocation being required to contribute to the provision of an appropriate level of playing and sports pitch provision with resources "pooled" if necessary. SC1 Page 124 The plan is not justified because education provision should be made within Sibley where the need will arise rather than Cossington. The need for a school in Cossington is not justified. The policy and para 3.203 should be amended to require education provision in Sibley and not Cossington.	Consider amendments with regards to sports pitch provision and education.	Yes	SC1
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	Support the policy which ensures development is in accordance with the development strategy and will deliver the infrastructure necessary to support sustainable communities.		Yes	SC1
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The importance of locating homes within walking distance of a primary school is noted. Reference to ensuring timely and coordinated delivery of infrastructure, and improving connectivity and accessibility are welcomed; however, the two aspects are split in the policy (and elsewhere in the plan) which does not support a coordinated, structured, strategy-led approach to addressing transport impacts. The policy refers to a target walking distance of 800m, this is contradictory to policy CC%: Sustainable Transport which states 400m. Policies should align with Leicestershire Highway Design Guide standards unless there is clear evidence for a more ambitious target. Support for Local and District Centres is welcomed and there is potential for tourism in these locations		Yes	SC1
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	Subject to comments on policy DS1, DS2, DS3 and DS4 the policy is supported. Allocation HA50 would be contrary to policy EV3.		Not stated	SC1
PSLP/611	Dermot Breen	Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce	The policy is noted and gives inclusivity to rural Service Centres respective areas.		Not stated	SC1
PSLP/321	Mrs Judith Rodgers		To plan new developments in service centres such as Barrow that are known not to be able to achieve the provision of new off street car parking means that the plan is not legally compliant and the Local Plan is not sound, and the Council has not complied with the Duty to Co-operate. Adding more residents will make the situation worse and will reduce the sustainability of the community. Shops will close as residents choose to shop in big supermarkets where parking is not a problem.	Lack of means to implement off street car parking in policy in Policy SC1.	No	SC1
PSLP/321	Mrs Judith Rodgers		Paragraph 3.188 includes features assumed to exist in Service Centres including Community buildings. Barrow upon Soar does not have a village-managed community building. All the other facilities are small and owned by individual community groups, churches, pubs etc. Their use is limited. The population of Barrow warrants the provision of land for a proper large community facility and a building. This need is not identified in plans to build 703 houses in Barrow.	Identify land to be used to build a community building as near to the village centre as possible (probably off Cotes Road). Identify financial contributions from each of the proposed housing plots to enable a centre to be built. Allocate the duty to build a community facility as part of the proposals for one of the potential sites.	No	SC1
PSLP/035	Mrs Zoe Boyer		Development in villages such as Sibley is not justified because of a lack of infrastructure and services (doctors/ schools). There is no mitigation against road flooding which causes congestion issues.	Implement more village services and relieve flooding issues.	No	SC1
PSLP/491	Mr and Mrs Chandler		The plan doesn't take account of the Barrow upon Soar Neighbourhood Plan. No further housing is needed in the village. The allocation of homes is derived purely on the capacity of primary schools. There will be an adverse impact on settlement identity. The local bus service is not sufficient to meet the demand from new homes meaning people will travel by private car, increasing congestion and air pollution. Barrow suffers from serious flood risk. All sites that have been assessed are in contradiction with the Neighbourhood Plan. The plan destroys green spaces in the village and gives no consideration to community facilities. The proposed sites are not accessible to the main high street.		Not stated	SC1
PSLP/494	Ruth Middleton		The plan is not justified because the number of new homes is based on the supply of a new primary school. Barrow upon Soar suffers from serious traffic congestion, flooding and a lack of GP facilities. There will be a loss of precious green space. Proposals are not in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan. There is a lack of services and facilities in Barrow and the village is already rapidly losing its character.		Not stated	SC1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/589	Carl Stott	Nineteen47 obo FN and GT Barber	Supports policy for Service Centre.		Yes	SC1
PSLP/626	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow Homes	The Key Diagram which accompanies the proposed policy includes green dots which from the key appears to be described as 'strategically important links in the wildlife network'. This is not shown on the Policies Map 1. It is unclear where the evidence is to support this highly diagrammatical notation and what it means for the development strategy in the local plan, if anything. We object to the proposal to provide additional primary school provision at Cossington to serve Sileby. This builds upon our comments in respect of Policy DS1, DS3 and Site HA59. There is insufficient evidence on the suitability of a strategy to deliver part of a school expansion at Cossington, not being a Service Centre for children that will in part live at Sileby. The strategy should follow the evidence by deleting HA59 and instead identifying land south of Sileby for a residential-led development including land for a primary school	Policy SC1: Service Centres should not include development at Cossington being an Other Settlement and not a Service Centre. Instead land south of Sileby should be identified for residential-led development including land for a primary school.	Yes	SC1
PSLP/004	Mr John Eckersley		The policy is not effective because it contains only one cursory reference to health services when Shepshed doctors' surgeries are full.		No	SUA1
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within SUA 1 in a particular ensures the timely and coordinated delivery of infrastructure to support sustainable communities. As identified in one of our previous responses there are a number of sites within Shepshed where we would anticipated Infrastructure improvements will be required therefore it is vital that sufficient certainty and lead in timescales are provided to enable delivery of the upgrades at the appropriate time. We are supportive of the approach to address how water flow will be managed to enhance biodiversity and reduce flood risk, the sustainable management of surface water will be key for resilience to climate change and mitigating flood risk, Utilisation of the Drainage Hierarchy and SuDS are therefore key to delivering this aim.	Reference to the drainage hierarchy.	Not stated	SUA1
PSLP/180	Mrs Ruth Youngs		Policy SUA1 should help to promote the regeneration of Shepshed which should help to reduce reliance on out-of-town locations but also need to improve some basic facilities such as banks as there aren't any in Shepshed.		No	SUA1
PSLP/518	Sarah Clark	P&DG obo Godwin Developments (GC No.37 Ltd)	Support the regeneration of Shepshed by facilitating sustainable growth. Welcome the flexibility for windfall sites to come forward. The policy should clarify developer contributions will be subject to viability.	Amend policy to refer to viability for developer contributions and cross-reference to Policy INF1.	Yes	SUA1
PSLP/533	Vicky Utting	Shepshed Town Councillor	The policy is not justified as the existing highway layout does not encourage links to the centre and causes gridlock with Shepshed becoming a commuter town. Covid has changed the use of town centres. The community will not be interconnected; development sites are 'siloes' and distant from town centre encouraging trips away from Shepshed. Landscape is being destroyed and flood risk increased. Biodiversity needs to be protected. Pollution needs to be reduced and air quality improved. No mention of trees or green energy (wind/solar) for Shepshed.	Protect existing biodiversity. Acknowledge impact on air quality, especially from link to international gateway. Show how community cohesion will be supported given distance of development from town centre. Include more green energy sources. Use more current data.	No	SUA1
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Reference to ensuring timely and coordinated delivery of infrastructure, and improving connectivity and accessibility are welcomed; however, the two aspects are split in the policy (and elsewhere in the plan) which does not support a coordinated, structured, strategy-	Consider additional food retail in Shepshed town centre. Strengthen policy on biodiversity and nature	Yes	SUA1
PSLP/413	H Johnson		The plan is not justified because the evidence doesn't consider properly flood risk and the impact on Shepshed Watermill. There is an overflow tank on Tickow Lane which could be the reason for high nitrate readings at the Mill. This harms the environment and biodiversity. The plan gives no consideration for protecting the Watermill. There are road safety concerns. The traveller and showmans site will affect the setting of the Mill. There is a lack of services and facilities in the area and more consideration should be given to this.	Consider the impact of development on Shepshed Watermill.	Not stated	SUA1
PSLP/021	Mr Andrew C. Roberts		Housing development in Shepshed is not justified in addition to the Loughborough SUE because of the loss of separation between the two towns; lack of commitment to improve facilities; and scale of previous development only supported by an apposed incinerator and town centre improvements.	Reduce scale of development at Shepshed and rethink strategy.	No	SUA1
PSLP/330	Brenda Snape	Shepshed Town Council	Support policy		No	SUA1
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	Overall the policy is supported. The objective of the third bullet point of the policy to improve connectivity between development and the district centre is supported this should be supported by a strategy in order to be effective and avoid a piecemeal approach.	The policy or explanation should include a commitment by the Council to prepare a connectivity strategy to inform the implementation of the third bullet point of the policy at the planning application stage.	Yes	SUA1
<b>CHAPTER 4 - HOUSING</b>						
PSLP/180	Mrs Ruth Youngs		Housing density should be increased, ie. more low rise flats, not large detached houses. There are many small, transient households. Less land would be required. Use unlet buildings, such as Poundland in Market Street, L'boro for conversion to residential flats as less shops and offices required as more home working/shopping online since Pandemic.	General comment	No	H1
PSLP/340	Tony Stott	CPRE	The plan is not in accordance with national policy - Policy H1 does not give an accurate reflection of the Housing Mix identified in paragraph 4.5 Table 6. NPPF para 62 notes the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies	Add table 6 to Policy H1	Yes	H1
PSLP/537	Neil Cox	Evolve obo Bloor Homes	Policy provides a flexible approach and is supported as sound.		No	H1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	Support the policy to set appropriate housing mix.		No	H1
PSLP/350	Sarah Legge	Melton Borough Council	Inconsistent reasoning to inform policy: 4.5 (Table 6) shows a high percentage need for 1 and 2 bed affordable rent, yet the reasoned justification states that there is a greater need for larger homes for families with children. Policy H2 – “support the provision of bungalows or other single level properties” – unless a specific percentage is stated, it is likely to be difficult to secure bungalows and applicants are likely to offer flats or dormer bungalows instead.	Possible text and policy changes.	No	H1
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	Policy does not seem to relate to Policy DS1 which also seeks to meet the overall needs of the Borough. Plan requires Sileby to accommodate a disproportionate amount of the Borough’s housing needs having regard to existing housing commitments and recent housing growth in Sileby, this undermines community cohesion and Sileby Neighbourhood Plan. Policy should be amended to set out how it has informed Policy DS1 with regards to the number of new homes required for the Borough’s growing and changing communities whilst taking into account the extent to which housing needs have already been met by other development and having regard to “local housing needs”.	Consider suggested policy amendments to H1.	Yes	H1
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	H1
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	The general approach of the policy is supported. It is not over prescriptive and contains enough flexibility to allow change should this be justified.		Yes	H1
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	More support could be given to dwellings for single people. Viability could potentially impact on County infrastructure.	Add further wording <b><u>‘To support the dwellings suitable for single people including those with frailties and disabilities including bungalows, one-bedroom flats and wheelchair accessible single person units.’</u></b>	Yes	H1
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	Housing mix is based on latest evidence and is supported.		Not stated	H1
PSLP/356	Mrs Anne Tomalin		The housing shortage is for starter homes, or downsizing homes, of which there is a dearth. Housebuilding should be to provide homes for people who need homes, not investment opportunities for people who already own homes. The council should provide more starter homes and these should not be “buy to let”.	Change of emphasis called for.	No	H1
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The policy is sufficiently flexible and is supported.		Yes	H1
PSLP/635	I Deverell	Rainer	Policy H1 requires flexibility in accordance with NPPF paragraph 34 to allow house size, type and tenure to be based on up to date evidence rather than a prescriptive policy.	Amend policy to a less prescriptive approach towards house size, type and tenure	Yes	H1
PSLP/023	Dee Narga		The plan is not justified as increases in diverse communities, older people and multigenerational living means changes in demographics and the way people live is not addressed. The plan lacks up to date research into housing needs and social care options. Multigenerational housing and homeshare reduces need for social care.	Amend policy to support multigenerational living and opportunities for housebuilders. Ensure policy reflects demographics and how people want to live.	No	H2
PSLP/340	Tony Stott	CPRE	The plan is not justified as the policy should be strengthened so not to rely on Developers controlling the provision of bungalows.	Use word ‘promote’ rather than ‘support’ in policy.	Yes	H2
PSLP/537	Neil Cox	Evolve obo Bloor Homes	The policy is not justified as the evidence shows that the proportion of older people in the Borough is similar to the national average and the proportion of people with disabilities is slightly lower than the national average.	Remove requirements to seek at least 10% of new market homes on major developments that meet the Building Regulations Part M4(2) standards and an appropriate proportion of affordable homes that meet the Building Regulations Part M4(2) standards and/or the Part M4(3) standards.	Yes	H2
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	Support the policy requirement for 10% of new market homes to meet accessibility standards.		No	H2
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	This policy is supported but should be amended to include greater justification for the level of provision to be sought to underpin delivery and viability assessment.	Include justification for the level of provision sought.	Yes	H2
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	H2
PSLP/542	Joe Bennett	RCA obo Spitfire Homes	The policy is not justified as it requires greater clarity regarding the affordable housing element rather than ‘an appropriate proportion’.	Provide further clarity rather than the ‘appropriate proportion’.	Yes	H2
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	The supporting evidence provides justification for the requirement; however, the policy is overly prescriptive and requires further flexibility.	Amend policy to introduce more flexibility.	Yes	H2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Suggested addition to policy to provide more detail on LCC involvement.	Addition to policy <b><u>'To consult with and work in partnership with Leicestershire County Council Adults and Communities Department in planning for future demand and associated types of housing for Older People and for People with Disabilities including physical, sensory, learning and mental health disabilities, including Extra Care Housing and specialist supported living.'</u></b>	Yes	H2
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is supported.		Not stated	H2
PSLP/626	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow Homes	We would ask for evidence that the policy wording here has been tested in terms of need and impact on development viability. The proposal to seek an appropriate proportion of affordable homes that meet the Building Regulations Part M4(2) standards and/or the Part M4(3) standards for being suitable for wheelchair users in consultation with relevant Registered Providers of affordable housing can have implications for build costs.	We would ask for evidence that the policy wording here has been tested in terms of need and impact on development viability	Yes	H2
PSLP/624	Ellen Pearce	Inspired Villages	<p>Recognition of the requirement for specialist housing options for older people is welcomed. The plan is not positively prepared or effective. The plan and its evidence base should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Be based on a clear understanding of specialist housing for older people</li> <li>•Be based on a robust evidence base that identifies the housing requirements of specialist housing for older people</li> <li>•Set out clear and specific policy / policies to address housing needs for older people</li> <li>•Set indicative figures or a range for the number of specialist housing for older people needed</li> <li>•Monitor the delivery of housing for older people and deliver action plans to address under provision.</li> <li>•Consider the inclusion of specialist housing for older people within appropriate strategic or other site allocations</li> <li>•Must recognise the significant benefits associated with specialist housing for older people</li> <li>•Set out different policy requirements, for example, affordable housing, for a retirement community (C2 use) compared to residential development (C3 use).</li> </ul> <p>The policy does not discuss the distinction between different tenures and types of housing for older people. A retirement community falls within the C2 Use Class as 'Extra Care' which is clearly different from C3 dwelling houses.</p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) identifies that the need to provide housing for older people is 'critical', the only group identified as such in national policy guidance (Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 63-001-20190626).</p> <p>The PPG advises that plan-making authorities can "also provide indicative figure figures or a range for the number of units of specialist housing for older people needed across the plan area throughout the plan period" (Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 63-006-20190626).</p> <p>PPG Paragraph 4 (Reference ID: 63-004-20190626) states that the future need for specialist accommodation for older people should be broken down by tenure and type.</p>	Policy H2 should provide targets for older persons housing based upon evidenced need, as well as the site specific criteria upon which proposals to meet older persons needs will be supported by the Council. Amendments also suggested to Policy DS1 and Appendix 1 (Monitoring).	No	H2
PSLP/598	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons Developments, Redrow Homes and Helen Jean Cope charity	The Council's Viability Study has not properly considered the viability implications of the proposed policy requirement reflecting up-to-date costs. Further viability work is therefore required before the Council proceeds to submit the plan for Examination.	Objection relates to viability.	Yes	H2
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	<p>The policy is not justified and does not comply with national policy as it is not supported by suitable evidence. The Council's Housing Needs Assessment shows that the age and health of its population is broadly similar to the national average.</p> <p>The policy is not effective and does not comply with national policy as there is ambiguity on the proportion of M4(2) and / or M4(3) standards sought for affordable housing.</p> <p>The Council's proposed policy approach will be superseded if the Government implements proposed changes to Part M of the Building Regulations as set out in the "Raising Accessibility Standards for New Homes" consultation, which closed on 1 December 2020.</p> <p>Further viability work should be undertaken to sensitivity test the Council's assumptions for this policy in its viability study as they are out of date</p>	<p>If the policy is retained the following clarification should be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•the approach to the proportion of M4(2) and / or M4(3) standards sought for affordable housing;</li> <li>•distinguishing between M4(3a) wheelchair adaptable and M4(3b) wheelchair accessible dwelling;</li> <li>•that the requirement for M4(3) should only be required for dwellings over which the Council has housing nomination rights.</li> </ul>	Yes	H2
PSLP/707	A Child	McCarthy Stone	Concern that Policy H2 is undermined by the council's speculative approach to seeking affordable housing contributions from specialist older persons housing, given that the CBC affordable housing viability assessment concludes this would make them unviable. Otherwise support policy		Yes	H2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/537	Neil Cox	Evolve obo Bloor Homes	The policy is not justified and is not consistent with the NPPF and the Ministerial Statement made in March 2015. The Council's evidence does not conclude that the standards are necessary and identifies risks associated with introducing the policy in relation to reduced delivery and increased house prices.	Remove Policy H3	Yes	H3
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	H3
PSLP/542	Joe Bennett	RCA obo Spitfire Homes	The policy is not justified, it provides more flexibility for affordable housing and does not show why space standards are required in Charnwood.	Amend wording or remove policy.	Yes	H3
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is supported.		Not stated	H3
PSLP/618	Jon Kirby	Lichfields obo Rebecca Birch, St Philips	St Philips objects to the Council's approach in Policy H3 on the ground of limited robust evidence justifying the requirement for NDSS and limited viability testing, failing the tests of soundness as per NPPF paragraph 35(b).	In the absence of robust evidence justifying the requirement for NDSS and limited viability testing, before the Local Plan is submitted for examination, the Council should delete Policy H3. If the proposed requirement for NDSS is carried forward, then the Council should put forward proposals for transitional arrangements as land interests may have may have been secured prior to any proposed introduction of the NDSS and will therefore not have accounted for this requirement. These sites should be allowed to move through the planning system before any proposed policy requirements are enforced. The NDSS should not be applied to any reserved matters applications or any outline or detailed approval prior to a specified date.	No	H3
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The policy is not justified as the Housing Needs Assessment 2020 states that the evidence may not be strong enough to sustain a policy to require the nationally described space standards and doing so will impact on viability, delivery and affordability.	Remove policy or amend it to read: Development will be supported where it complies with the nationally described space standards.	Yes	H3
PSLP/626	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow Homes	We would ask for explanation as to why the potential for exemption from the nationally described space standards or replacement thereof, might only apply to affordable housing and why not to any housing? This does not appear to be justified.	We would ask for explanation as to why the potential for exemption from the nationally described space standards or replacement thereof, might only apply to affordable housing and why not to any housing? This does not appear to be justified.	Yes	H3
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	The policy is not justified and does not comply with national policy as it is not supported by the evidence in the Council's Housing Needs Assessment (HNA). Well-designed dwellings below the nationally described space standards can provide a good, functional home. Smaller dwellings play a valuable role in meeting specific needs for both open market and affordable home ownership housing. The HNA acknowledges that introducing the space standards may reduce housing delivery, place upward pressure on house prices, and potentially reduce the ability of households to access affordable homes. The assumptions used in the Council's viability study under-estimate the impact on viability and affordability. It is noted that the Council is applying a more flexible collaborative policy approach for affordable housing than open market housing. This differentiation has not been justified by the Council.	Policy H3 should be deleted. If policy is retained it should include a transitional period so that it is not applied to any reserved matters applications or any outline or detailed approval prior to a specified date.	Yes	H3
PSLP/344	Natalie Atkinson	Tetlow King obo William Davis Homes	The Plan is not justified as it does not take sufficient account of First Homes. The focus on shared ownership rather than discounted market sales as the preferred affordable home ownership route is not evidenced.	Reword policy H4 to take account of First Homes. Consider discounted market sales in the Plan and evidence base.	Yes	H4
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	Support the 30% affordable housing requirement. The policy should allow alternative mix to be allowed where demonstrated in a neighbourhood plan. Support local eligibility criteria and design standards.	Amend policy to allow neighbourhood plans to vary affordable housing mix where justified.	No	H4
PSLP/350	Sarah Legge	Melton Borough Council	4.30 States that 67% affordable housing for rent and 33% affordable home ownership will be sought on greenfield sites, whereas 50% affordable housing for rent and 50% affordable home ownership will be sought on brownfield sites due to a much greater need for affordable rented housing. This reasoning does not appear to match the percentage split differences between green and brownfield sites.	Inconsistency between evidence and policy.	No	H4

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	This policy is supported but should be amended to explicitly state that where independent viability assessments are submitted by applicants, they represent material planning considerations and will always be made available in the public realm for scrutiny by any interested parties and consultees (including Parish Councils).	Amend policy with regards to viability assessments.	Yes	H4
PSLP/557	Andy Brettle	Rothley Parish Council	The plan is not justified because it does not show any plans to build local authority social housing. It appears to only mention affordable homes. A proportion of the new homes should be affordable to all and available to Rothley residents first.	Amend plan to include local authority social housing and that these will be available to Rothley residents first.	Not stated	H4
PSLP/521	John Bradburn	Montagu Evans obo Beacon Bingo	The policy is sound and provides an effective solution to delivering affordable housing. It will promote brownfield development and accords with the NPPF.		No	H4
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported but supporting text on minimum group sizes for affordable housing would assist clarity.	Add supporting text on minimum group sizes for affordable housing.	Yes	H4
PSLP/542	Joe Bennett	RCA obo Spitfire Homes	The policy is broadly supported but more housing is required to address affordability issues. 100% affordable housing developments should be given more support.	Amend policy to give more support to affordable housing developments.	Yes	H4
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	The policy requirement is acknowledged and accommodated in proposals for HA45, HA46 and HA60.		Yes	H4
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The policy requirement is supported. Viability requirements will impact upon County infrastructure at the expense of delivering affordable housing with residents needing infrastructure which won't be delivered as part of the scheme. Para. 4.30 - should the 10% figure be 30%?		Yes	H4
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy should be caveated identifying the percentages as a maximum. The flexibility for viability issues is supported.	Add the words 'up to' to the policy.	Not stated	H4
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The policy is supported and aligns to national policy.		Yes	H4
PSLP/579	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelsons	Jelson does have a concern about the details of the affordable housing policy set out in paragraph 4.34. In particular the suggestion that where a Registered Provider (RP) cannot be identified then the affordable housing units should simply be gifted to the Council. It is not considered that this is an acceptable approach as it creates significant financial uncertainty	Comments on policy.	Not stated	H4
PSLP/626	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow Homes	We would ask for a change to the policy wording to say 'up to x%' of housing as affordable, rather than a fixed %. The absence of the 'up to' is not justified or effective.	We would ask for a change to the policy wording to say 'up to x%' of housing as affordable, rather than a fixed %	Yes	H4
PSLP/598	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons Developments, Redrow Homes and Helen Jean Cope Charity	It is noted that this policy was subject to a late change before publication to include First Homes in the affordable housing tenure mix. Whilst it would appear that First Homes were included in the housing tenure mix tested in the supporting Viability Study, there is a concern that the impacts of this new form of affordable housing on viability has not been fully considered.	Further viability assessment work should be undertaken on this late revision to the policy ahead of the Examination in Public.	Yes	H4
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	The policy is not justified as the uncertainties and risks in relation to First Homes have not been adequately considered as part of the Council's viability study.	Further viability testing is required before the plan is submitted.	Yes	H4
PSLP/389	J Palmer		Policy H4 is not justified as more council homes are required than 30% given national housing affordability issues / waiting lists.	Require 50% affordable housing	No	H4
PSLP/716	R Offiler-Russell		The plan is not positively prepared as no specific plan to accommodate an ageing population is proposed, i.e. affordable bungalows; concerns about private landlords not meeting family housing requirements;	Only permit housing for an older population on Knightthorpe Road and around Loughborough. Ensure bungalows are adaptable with smaller gardens.	Yes	H4
PSLP/707	A Child	McCarthy Stone	Policy H4 is not justified, positively prepared or effective as It requires affordable housing contributions from specialist older person housing developments. This requirement is not evidence-based and is inconsistent with paragraph 9.97 of the CBC affordable housing viability assessment. welcome paragraph 4.33 of the local plan which sets out specialist housing affordable housing contributions will be considered on a case by case basis, although the 10% requirement may still not be viable and is not evidence-based and appears to reflect historic delivery.	Set an affordable housing requirement of nil for sheltered housing in line with the councils viability assessment. Amend the policy to require "A clear justification supported by an independent viability assessment will be required if the applicant considers that particular circumstances justify the need for a lower level of provision" and "contributions will not be sought from... specialist older persons housing including sheltered and extra care accommodation"	Yes	H4
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is supported.		Not stated	H5
PSLP/537	Neil Cox	Evolve obo Bloor Homes	The policy is considered to be sound as it does not require the delivery of self- or custom-build homes and enables serviced plots that are provided to be used for general market housing after they have been marketed for 12 months.		Yes	H6

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	This policy is supported but should be amended so that the threshold for provision is lowered to sites of 100 dwellings or more and to provide some flexibility through the submission of site viability assessments where less than 5 serviced plots is justified.	Amend threshold	Yes	H6
PSLP/115	J Kersey		Support Policy		No	H6
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	This policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	H6
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	The policy is broadly supported, providing flexibility and avoiding onerous requirements. However, the requirement of five serviced plots on sites of more than 250 dwellings is objected to and will create difficulties for delivery of infrastructure, phasing and site safety.	Modify policy by removing the requirement and providing a positive policy framework to deliver the products through windfall sites adjacent to settlement boundaries.	Yes	H6
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The policy identifies that affordable housing contributions won't be sought from self-build but is silent on other contributions which could impact on the county's infrastructure.	Add text setting out the position on developer contributions beyond affordable housing.	Yes	H6
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is supported, particularly the provision for plots where no market demand can be found.		Not stated	H6
PSLP/579	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelsons	Comments on lack of availability of self build register. Insofar as the provision of serviced plots on large sites is concerned, these types of sites do not, in our Client's view, lend themselves to the provision of self or custom build properties due to practical site management / construction issues	Comments on policy.	Not stated	H6
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The policy is not justified or effective as it just changes housing delivery from one form to another and is not backed by evidence of the preference of people wishing to self- and custom-build. Requiring serviced plots to be provided on large sites will remove those plots from the housing supply and have impacts in relation to site safety, maintenance, security, length of build and viability.	Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the policy should be deleted or paragraph 4 amended to read: Where plots have been made available and marketed appropriately for at least 12 3 months and have not sold, the plots can be used to deliver general market housing.	Yes	H6
PSLP/626	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow Homes	We would ask for justification of the proposed policy wording here when it comes to delivery of self-build and custom housebuilding as part of an appropriate mix of dwellings on all major developments in locations where there is clear evidence of local demand. It is the Council's responsibility to identify the evidence of local demand and this should be available now to inform this proposed policy. The proposal to seek the provision of at least five serviced plots for self-build and custom housebuilding on sites of more than 250 dwellings does not appear to have been assessed in terms of viability but also what this might yield in terms of numbers of plots relative to demand. A proposed period of at least 12 months after such plots have been made available and marketed appropriately before any change in their status arising from the plots not having been sold is too long and uncertain as 'at least' could be stretched-out almost indefinitely before the plots can be used to deliver general market housing.	We would ask for a comprehensive review of this policy in terms of thresholds, amounts and wording.	Yes	H6
PSLP/598	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons Developments, Redrow Homes and Helen Jean Cope Charity	Reference is made to the Blaby Local Plan Examination where the Inspector noted that whilst the Self-Build and Custom Build Register may indicate an interest in this type of housing, it was not clear how this evidence translated into actual demand, with potential issues of double counting where individuals register with more than one Council. In proposing a Modification to the plan to remove the requirement for self-build housing on larger sites, the Inspector concluded that the requirement was not justified by the available evidence, there were potential viability issues and there may be negative consequences for the provision of affordable housing	Amend policy to remove requirement to provide at least 5 self build plots on sites of more than 250 dwellings.	Yes	H6
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	The policy is not justified or effective as the Council's evidence shows the demand is low and it is unlikely that plots on larger sites would meet that demand. The provision of plots on sites of more than 250 dwellings adds to the complexity and logistics of developing these sites. The assumption that doing so has no viability implications is disputed.	Policy H6 should be deleted.	Yes	H6

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/171	Cllr M. Hunt		<p>H7 Houses in Multiple Occupation is unsound (not justified)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan for threshold levels is not based on any firm evidence.</li> <li>Policy H7 is not supported by an analysis of Loughborough's housing need.</li> <li>The policy will further erode the stock of affordable homes.</li> <li>The fragility of the threshold applied in Loughborough makes it impossible to deliver with consistency or transparency.</li> </ol> <p>There is no evidence to support a specific threshold percentage, such as 10%, merely a downward trend.  There is no evidence of further housing need in this sector in Charnwood's Needs Assessment 2020.  The current threshold system, with its protected HIMOG database, is not transparent and relies on annual updates which are not made or published.  The addition of so many qualitative factors already permits the threshold to be breached</p>	<p>The threshold should be removed from H7 and in order to prevent further loss of family homes through conversion to HMO, there should be a presumption in favour of retention of the status quo and planning permission for change of use to HMO should be refused except in demonstrated need. The Article 4 Direction applies to Loughborough only and these policies therefore do only apply beyond the town.</p> <p>Should this not be accepted the Authority should either,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not set the threshold limit itself in policy and review between Local Plans or,</li> <li>• Set a threshold of 5% with mitigating quality factors continuing to apply.</li> </ul>	Not stated	H7
PSLP/627	Loughborough University	Avison Young	Support Policy		No	H7
PSLP/497	Cllr Smidowicz		<p>The plan is not justified because the threshold levels is not based on firm evidence, the method of calculating one HMO in the analysis does not account for the cumulative effect of occupants and the differing needs of residents or the community 'places', Policy H7 is not supported by an analysis of Loughborough's Housing need. The policy doesn't take account that it is unlikely HMOs will be reverted to family occupation and that affordable family homes have diminished. The Article 4 Direction applies only to Loughborough but needs to address the fact that affordable family homes are diminishing.</p>	<p>The threshold should be removed from H7 to prevent further negative impact on family homes. There is no evidence of further housing need in this sector in the Charnwood's Needs Assessment. The method of calculation for any new extension to an HMO or approval for new HMO should consider the number of occupants in the existing rental properties vis a vis family grouping. A new Article 4: Planning permission for change of use to an HMO or studio flats in specific areas unless on brownfield sites or 'demonstrable need is identified.' Introduce a residents' parking scheme where there are known parking problems because of inadequate lines and displacement.</p>	Yes	H7
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The policy to manage the proportion of HMOs is supported.		Yes	H7
PSLP/611	Dermot Breen	Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce	The policy is noted, and the Chamber consider that Loughborough Town Deal will benefit local communities whose identity has been eroded by the loss of family homes converted to concentrations of HMOs.		Not stated	H7
PSLP/596	Joshua Vande Hey		There is a lack of evidence on HMOs, particularly available rooms and occupancy rate of purpose-built student accommodation. Large family homes could be reclaimed with further regulation reducing need to develop on green spaces.	Further evidence HMOs occupancy and regulate more carefully to free large family homes	Yes	H7
PSLP/473	S Cuff	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Policy H7 is not justified as It will not prevent new HMOs in areas that have none or low concentration	Paragraph 4.48-4.73 should be amended to not allow new HMO's weather isn't one within 100 metres and a general presumption against HMOs.	Yes	H7
PSLP/661	R Johal		The HMO Policy (and pages 142-147) is not justified or positively prepared or effective as The methodology for calculating HMO saturation is theoretical but flawed as it overinflates the number of HMOs; the policy does not state how HMO data can be scrutinised by applicants; HMO applicants should be given guidance about property management similar to purpose built accommodation. an example of a complaint about the current procedure is provided to demonstrate concerns	The policy needs to state a clear process for identifying HMO saturation and how this can be verified by applicants	Yes	H7
PSLP/627	Loughborough University	Avison Young	Support policy. However the policy or its supporting text should highlight elements of the University's Travel Plan that the Council will take into account when assessing proposals for student accommodation on campus.	Highlight elements of the University's Travel Plan within the policy.	No	H8
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	No comment.		No	H8

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/611	Dermot Breen	Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce	The policy is supported and consider that regulating the location of student accommodation, along with Loughborough Town Deal, will benefit local communities whose identity has been eroded by the loss of family homes converted to concentrations of HMOs.		Not stated	H8
PSLP/592	Cllr Ted Parton		No evidence has been provided s to justify the claim that only market forces will dictate whether purpose built student blocks will be built in Loughborough Town Centre. Recent purpose built student flats have experienced difficulties in lettings. Permission should be refused for these types of buildings, as they have had no impact on regenerating our high street. Vacancy rates have not risen as a result of these blocks. The argument that granting permission for purpose built student accommodation reduces HMO usage in the town is flawed and is not supported by evidence. purpose built student blocks will be built in Loughborough Town Centre. Recent purpose built student flats have experienced difficulties in lettings. Permission should be refused for these types of buildings, as they have had no impact on regenerating our high street. Vacancy rates have not risen as a result of these blocks. The argument that granting permission for purpose built student accommodation reduces HMO usage in the town is flawed and is not supported by evidence.	Objects to policy and reasoned justification. Objects to policy	Yes	H8
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Reference to working with the other authorities in Leicester and Leicestershire is welcomed. There is reference to infrastructure but not how the policy will impact on that maintained by the County Council, such as schools.	Provide text on how local infrastructure needs will be addressed.	Yes	H9
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The policy approach is not robust, relying on provision at the SUEs, and should be reviewed. Travelling Showpeople provision would be better met nearer to Loughborough. The policy identifies no additional provision beyond that at the SUEs, identifying additional allocations would provide flexibility.	Reconsider quantum, location and nature of site provision. Identify additional sites for flexibility.	Yes	H9
<b>CHAPTER 5 - EMPLOYMENT</b>						
PSLP/296	Mr Brian Flynn	Cartar Jonas obo LCC Strategic Property Services	The Plan is not considered justified as the needs for small/medium sized business units would not be met. The Plan indicates neighbourhood plans could make decisions about employment land including scale and location. However, the Quorn NP, made in Feb 19, highlights the lack of available business units, businesses relocating elsewhere, some local support for a small business park, and policy support for employment related development, the document does not allocate land to meet business needs.	Additional employment allocations needed at Poole Farm and land off Barrow Road, Quorn to meet specific need for small/medium units.	No	E1
PSLP/539	Ian Nelson	North West Leicestershire District Council	The plan does not indicate how the council will bring forward land if any strategic B8 need is apportioned to the borough as a result of the Leicester & Leicestershire joint working. It is considered that the plan should set out the council's approach to allocating land, if required, through a review of the plan. This statement could be in the form of a policy in a similar style to Policy DS2 or, as a minimum, as part of the supporting text. This would help demonstrate that the plan has been positively prepared in respect of this issue (helping to meet objectively assessed needs) and effective (based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred)	Add additional wording to Policy DS2 - apportionment of unmet housing and employment need and/or strategic distribution need,	Yes	E1
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The policy intent is as anticipated and there is support for retention of Use Class E(g) by condition. There is no specific policy regarding strategic warehousing and logistics but reference to use of joint evidence and Duty to Cooperate, comfortable with this approach. There could be additional support given to a low carbon, circular economy. The reference to supporting transport, power and broadband infrastructure is welcomed but inconsistent with Place Based policies which reference policies INF1, INF2 and CC5. The policy does little to support coordinated, structured, strategy-led approach to addressing cumulative transport impacts across the Borough, including interactions between Service Centres, Loughborough and Leicester.	Add policy support for a low carbon, circular economy. Provide support to the need for a coordinated, structured, strategy led approach to addressing cumulative transport impacts.	Yes	E1
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	Provide more support to employment development at Service Centres.	Amend 7th bullet to ' Priority Neighbourhoods, existing urban areas and Service Centres'	Not stated	E1
PSLP/611	Dermot Breen	Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce	Increase in home-based working following the pandemic should be assessed for emerging employment patterns and benefits for transport and sustainability. Existing and new residential areas should be shaped to serve residents working from home.	Obtain further evidence on home-working and assess policies on housing need, business space and sustainable travel.	Not stated	E1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/629	Michael Davies	Savills obo Wilson Bowden (J23)	Agree with the aims of the policy but it is not positively prepared or justified. An incorrect employment need has been identified which conflicts with the evidence base. The scale, quality and location of employment sites are not suitable. Majority of employment sites are parts of SUEs and not suitable for strategic distribution. Employment site is required for strategic distribution, close to the M1 with access to a suitable workforce, land east of M1 J23 an obvious choice. A sequential approach is suggested in identifying strategic distribution sites but there is no suitable brownfield land of sufficient scale available. A high demand for strategic warehousing in Charnwood and the East Midlands is incapable of being met by current supply.	Inconsistencies between supporting evidence and employment need and supply in the plan should be rectified. Increase the industrial employment land to reflect the evidence base. Allocate an additional employment site to meet the need for strategic distribution.	Yes	E1
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	Support the intention of the policy but there is a need for flexibility to respond to changing demand for different types of employment space and locations over the plan period. The employment land at NEoL SUE should not be specifically identified on the Policies and inset maps. The policy suggests conditions will be used to restrict uses within Class E, this should only occur in specific circumstances.	Amend Policies and inset maps. Recognise that restricting use via conditions should only occur in exceptional circumstances.	Yes	E1
PSLP/713	Mrs L. Aspinall	Harborough District Council	Owing to the importance and strategic nature of the issue of warehousing and logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire, there is a need for Charnwood's Local Plan to set out the approach to this issue as a policy. The lack of a policy fails to demonstrate that this strategic matter has been dealt with and the Plan is therefore not effective or positively prepared and is considered unsound. Paragraphs 5.32 and 5.33 should acknowledge the Areas of Opportunity that the joint evidence study already identifies as most likely for new large warehousing and logistics provision to 2041. Two of these areas impact on Charnwood borough and as such should be explicitly referenced within the Plan. The study's recommendations around the identification and selection of sites to meet the forecast shortfall in provision to 2041 should be reflected in full.	Objects to lack of policy on what is seen as an important strategic issue.	No	E1
PSLP/713	Mrs L. Aspinall	Harborough District Council	As currently worded, paragraphs 5.32-5.34 could be interpreted as setting policy criteria within the supporting text of the Plan. There is a need, therefore, for a specific policy to be included. If the current wording in the supporting text is made into policy, it would need rewording to ensure it is positive and supportive of the potential role Charnwood has to play, and the collaborative work currently taking place on this strategic issue under the duty to cooperate. The current text suggests an unduly restrictive approach. Alternatively, the final sentence of para 5.32 and the whole of para 5.33 could be deleted to make the approach more positive. It is important that the Plan does not pre-empt the ongoing work on this issue, being undertaken under the DtC. The Soundness of the Plan, in terms of effectiveness and positive planning, would be improved by including specific reference to the quantitative need for large warehouses and Areas of Opportunity, as per the joint evidence. Policy DS2 should also include a criterion to reflect the strategic matter of warehousing and distribution which commits to an early review of the Plan should collaborative work (under the DtC) result in the distribution of L&L shortfall to an Area of Opportunity impacting the borough.	Objects to lack of policy on what is seen as an important strategic issue.	No	E1
PSLP/623	J Hicks	Carbide Properties	Policy E1 is not effective or consistent with national policy as it is overly restrictive to seek only to provide opportunities for 'manufacturing businesses' and 'small scale...businesses' and therefore does not meet the areas employment needs for warehousing and logistics. as drafted the policy does not accord with NPPF paragraph 83 as it does not meet the requirements of different sectors, i.e. meeting the warehousing and logistics needs set out in the Councils GL Hearn/ MDS Transmodal Study.	Amend policy E1 to address the needs of all scales of development/ employment sectors including warehousing and logistics	Yes	E1
PSLP/378	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Jelsons PNH Properties	The policy is not justified in relation to Land at Melton Road (Hawker Business Park) as this is evidenced not to be a good quality employment site.	Remove allocation as a good quality employment site.	No	E2
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Policy may be at odds with future development that allows land to become 'rewilded' and other recreational uses, not a farmed landscape.	Amend to allow for land-use change to rewilding and other recreational uses.	Yes	E2
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is sound, but criteria could be widened to include those where poor energy efficiencies will limit future economic life.	Include criteria relating to poor energy efficiency.	Not stated	E2
PSLP/413	H Johnson		There is little or no protection for existing equine businesses. The introduction and reclassification or more multiuser routes would be of considerable benefit to local areas experiencing high levels of development.		Not stated	E2
PSLP/296	Mr Brian Flynn	Carter Jonas obo LCC Strategic Property Services	Policy E3 is not consistent with national policy para 84 & 85 of the NPPF ( <i>should be 83&amp;84?</i> ) and does not reflect supporting text at para 5.37. No employment allocations for small/medium sized units at Quorn, and the Quorn NP does not allocate despite highlighting the lack of available units. Para 84 ( <i>83?</i> ) expects policies to enable "the sustainable growth and expansion of <b>all types of business</b> in rural areas" not just existing businesses. Para 85( <i>84?</i> ) expects policies to "recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements" and goes on to state that "the use of previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist". These locational factors are not reflected in Policy E3.	Modify Policy E3 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides small scale, sustainable growth and expansion of existing and new businesses in rural areas both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings;</li> <li>• is located within, adjacent to, or well-related to existing settlements; . . .</li> <li>• provides tourism and leisure facilities, . . .;</li> <li>and or</li> <li>• is not detrimental to the character and appearance of the Countryside in terms of its scale, character or operational requirements.</li> </ul>	No	E3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/554	Andrew Taylor	Thomas Taylor Planning obo Mr Scottorn	The policy is not justified or reflect national policy as it does not give sufficient support for rural businesses or new businesses outside the limits to development and in the countryside.	Amended wording to policy provided	Yes	E3
PSLP/214	Gary Freer		The plan is not positively prepared in that it barely mentions freight development.	Policy to be amended to require logistics development to be linked to freight train lines.	Not stated	E3
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The tourism and leisure section are welcomed. More could be made of the local food and drink offer. Mention could be made on increasing and diversifying tourist accommodation. Art Deco architecture in Loughborough town centre should be mentioned. Low carbon economy could be added.	Reference tourist accommodation. Include Art Deco architecture in Loughborough town centre. Add reference to <b><u>'development that supports the move to a low carbon circular economy will be supported'</u></b> . Replace 'superfast broadband' with <b><u>'full fibre gigabit capable broadband'</u></b>	Yes	E3
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy should allow the re-use or replacement of existing farm buildings where a viable farm business cannot be sustained to make a positive contribution to the rural economy.	Add reference to allow re-use/replacement of farm buildings where farming is no longer viable.	Not stated	E3
PSLP/597	Robert Shields	Burton on the Wolds PC	Support policy E3		No	E3
<b>CHAPTER 6 - TOWN CENTRES, SERVICES &amp; FACILITIES</b>						
PSLP/180	Mrs Ruth Youngs		Policy T1 should promote the regeneration in Loughborough and Shepshed which should help to reduce reliance on out-of-town locations but also need to improve some basic facilities such as banks as there aren't any in Shepshed, Syston and Barrow and others too.		No	T1
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	The policy is not justified as it is confusing referring to town centre uses in District Centres.	Clarify confusion by rewording policy.	No	T1
PSLP/521	Jon Bradburn	Montagu Evans obo Beacon Bingo	The Loughborough town centre boundary identified is not justified as it does not consider reasonable alternatives or the evidence.	Extend eastern boundary across A6 to include key buildings (eg Magistrates Court, Beacon Bingo) and gateways.	Yes	T1
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The role of tourism in Loughborough town centre needs incorporating. The importance of town centres as hubs of community activity should be emphasised. There could be a focus on a retail core with vacant units on the periphery converted to residential use. Reference could be made to interaction between. hot food takeaways, health and the proximity to schools.	Reference the role of tourism and also centres role in community activity. Consider conversion of retail units to residential.	Yes	T1
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy needs to take account of the impact of online shopping and the need to reduce car travel. To widen choice units up to 2,000sqm should be permitted within or immediately adjoining limits to development.	Add support for units up to 2000sqm within or adjoining settlement limits.	Not stated	T1
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	Notwithstanding that precise locations within SUEs should not be identified on maps, the policy should identify the district and local centres to be provided at the SUEs.	Identify the SUEs district and local centres in the policy.	Yes	T1
PSLP/735	Maggie Taylor		More is needed to move the town centre from a retail focus to a more imaginative use of the spaces for recreation and other activities. There is potential for the town to become a positive resource for the community. An imaginative approach is needed to make it a space for community, congregation, utility, business and residential purposes. To be accessible, new housing developments need to be close to the core and have easily accessible non-car routes. Spread out housing does not easily allow for this, isolating people and increasing use of car.		Yes	T1
PSLP/094	Mr Tom Clarke	Theatres Trust	Support T2		No	T2
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	Neighbourhood plans can add local detail to the policy. Support the development of discount convenience retail.		No	T2
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	'Reasonable effort' should include liaison with Neighbourhood Plan groups. Community buildings should be supported in new development such as SUEs.	Mention neighbourhood planning in the context of 'reasonable effort' to preserve facilities. Mention support for community buildings in new development.	Yes	T2
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy should be widened to positively support the provision of new, improved or replacement facilities in accessible locations.	Give support to new, improved or replacement facilities in accessible locations.	Not stated	T2
PSLP/695	D Matthewman		Policy T2 is not justified as There is no evidence about the impact on the plan on GPs, dentists, schools.		No	T2
PSLP/674	N Matthewman		Policy T2 is not justified as There is no evidence about the impact on the plan on GPs, dentists, schools.		No	T2
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	Policy T3 takes a predict and provide approach, without any car management. This policy undermines policy for air quality. Active demand management would be far more sustainable from a carbon emissions perspective, and also give people far more resilience.	Review of policy called for.	Not stated	T3
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	The Plan is not justified as no further parking provision has been identified in Anstey despite an additional 2,000 vehicles being proposed.	Reassess Anstey allocations and parking provision.	No	T3
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sibley Parish Council	The policy should be amended by explicitly stating that planning applications for new development which do not provide appropriate car parking provision will be resisted.		Yes	T3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/542	Joe Bennett	RCA obo Spitfire Homes	Parking standards may not be justified in the most sustainable locations and the policy should reflect this. Reliance on guidance is not appropriate as this will not be tested through examination.	Amend policy wording.	Yes	T3
PSLP/214	Gary Freer		Policy T3 is not positively prepared as it will result in increased car usage, undermining sustainable transport options,	Policy should be amended requiring new development to include measures which discourage use of private car.	Not stated	T3
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Reference to the latest published LCC parking standards is welcomed; however, there should be reference to Leicestershire Highway Design Guide.	Add reference to Leicestershire Highway Design Guide.	Yes	T3
PSLP/266	G Cumming		Policy T3 does not address issues where street parking exists (HMO's / infill / sub-division) and is not positively prepared or justified as it does not meet objective parking needs through introducing a methodology or defined standards to calculate parking need. It is not justified as there is no assessment of the impact of the plan upon parking. It is not consistent with NPPF para 104 as on street parking has not been considered at the earliest stage of plan making.	Policy T3 should state that it doesn't permit development where this would cause excessive detriment to street parking capacity which should be measured at 85% capacity in accordance with the Guidelines on the Preparation of Parking Strategies and Management' (Institute of Highways and Transportation, 2006). A parking survey methodology should be adopted, using the Lambeth Council Method. Minimum car parking standards should be adopted. All development should include a parking/ traffic assessment, particularly in Loughborough Town Centre.	No	T3
PSLP/592	Cllr Ted Parton		The local plan seeks to build over 11,000 dwellings in the borough, yet there is no mention whatsoever of new car parking capacity, especially in Loughborough. A new chapter, is required where new car parking provision will be planned for and when.	Objects to car parking policy.	Yes	T3
PSLP/618	Jon Kirby	Lichfields obo Rebecca Birch, St Philips	St Philips objects to Policy T3 on the grounds that it defers policy requirement to separate guidance which has not been subject to examination, failing the tests of soundness as per NPPF paragraph 35(b). Policy T3 requires all new developments to provide car parking spaces in accordance with the latest published guidance of Leicestershire County Council and Charnwood Borough Council. The policy wording reference to "the latest published guidance of Leicestershire County Council and Charnwood Borough Council" effectively defers a policy requirement to separate guidance, which has not been subject to examination and does not form part of the Local Plan.	Policy change called for. This referencing should be removed from Policy T3. If considered necessary by the Council, the following wording could be inserted into supporting text "the latest published guidance of Leicestershire County Council and Charnwood Borough Council on parking standards will be used as a guide in the determination of planning applications".	No	T3
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	The policy is not justified as the reference to "the latest published guidance of Leicestershire County Council and Charnwood Borough Council" should not be interpreted by the Council's Development Management Officers as conveying the weight of a Development Plan Document onto this guidance, which has not been subject to examination and does not form part of the Local Plan.	The second bullet point of Policy T3 should be deleted and the following wording added to the supporting text: The latest published guidance of Leicestershire County Council and Charnwood Borough Council on parking standards will be used as a guide in the determination of planning applications.	Yes	T3
PSLP/719	I Dutton	Church of England	Policy T3/ Para 6.14 is sound and compliant with NPPF paras 92, 93, 189f and welcome mention of Anstey in para 6.14. However St Mary Church, Anstey, is Grade II Listed but has no curtilage parking.	Would welcome public car parking in the vicinity of the church	Yes	T3
PSLP/688	J Catt		Suggest Provision for cycle storage is made as part of the car parking policy. Suggest cycle parking at bus stops is included in rural locations to make public transport more attractive to rural users		No	T3
<b>CHAPTER 7 - CLIMATE CHANGE</b>						
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to highlight flood risk within the Local Plan and promote the appropriate management of surface water through the use of SuDS and directing surface water to sustainable outfalls. Whilst we note that the drainage hierarchy is mentioned in Paragraph 7.23 supporting policy CC1 we would recommend that it is also specifically reference within Policy CC1 to ensure that the principle of the Hierarchy are followed on all development sites. We are supportive of the approach to protect natural watercourses in such that they are retained as open feature capable of supporting wildlife and providing sustainable outfalls for surface water.	Reference to the drainage hierarchy.	Not stated	CC1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	This flood risk policy is a good example of a strong policy with the words “ensuring” and “requiring” used to make sure that the policy is acted on.		Not stated	CC1
PSLP/089	Cllr Myriam Roberts	Shepshed Town Council	Flood risk and impact of new housing on flood plain at Shepshed not been considered.		No	CC1
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	Stronger wording required on reinstating the functional floodplain (flood zone 3b) in urban areas and brownfield sites and developments upstream of urban areas to seek to reduce flood risk overall.	Wording changes to policy requested.	Not stated	CC1
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	We would like to see a statement or guidance to provide clear guidance to developers on climate change.	Additional wording proposed	Not stated	CC1
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	This policy is supported.		Yes	CC1
PSLP/533	Vicky Utting	Shepshed Town Councillor	The plan is not justified as insufficient consideration is given to increased rainfall and flooding. Developments need to be considered as a whole and natural flood defences preserved.	Flood zones need to be increased and a wider strategy for Shepshed and Loughborough developed.	No	CC1
PSLP/140	L Knapp		Thrussington Village is at risk of flooding. Adding more housing to green field space will only increase flooding in the village, and neighbouring villages of Ratcliffe and Rearsby. New houses proposed will be built on higher ground and therefore will not be affected but existing properties will. Flooding not only has an impact on residents but also on our wildlife, livestock and arable farming.	The waterways locally are not maintained, if they were this could help but would not decrease water levels enough to accommodate the additional 90 houses planned for Thrussington.	No	CC1
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Change policy wording to better reflect national policy and guidance.	Replace 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet with ‘ <b><u>requiring development on brownfield sites to discharge surface water run off at equivalent greenfield runoff rates. Where this is adequately demonstrated to not be reasonably practicable, the proposed discharge from the development should never exceed the existing rate for any given event.</u></b> ’	Yes	CC1
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	In applying the sequential test, where the development is to support the sustainability of a settlement the test should be based on a site of lower flood risk in the same settlement.	Introduce location as a factor when considering the sequential test for development which is supporting a specific settlement.	Not stated	CC1
PSLP/535	Juan Murray	TEP obo Leics County Council	A substantial amount of flood modelling work has been undertaken at Farley Way East and this modelling work shows that the whole site is located outside the 1 in 100 year flood extent and therefore wholly within Flood Zone 2, rather than the Flood Zone 3 as identified on the Environment Agency maps. This has been acknowledged by the Environment Agency in their correspondence.	Specific disagreement about flood risk for Farley Way, Quorn.	Not stated	CC1
PSLP/424	Janet Gillett		Avoid development on flood plains and retain meadow land. Ensure houses already built on flood plains have suitable avoidance strategies.		Not stated	CC1
PSLP/674	N Matthewman		Policy CC1 is not justified as gardens on Priory Road flood which will be exacerbated by the development of allocations HA16 and HA17. Removing existing fields cannot have a net zero impact on surface water run off		No	CC1
PSLP/695	D Matthewman		Policy CC1 is not justified as gardens on Priory Road flood which will be exacerbated by the development of allocations HA16 and HA17. It is unclear how mitigation could be achieved in a viable way		No	CC1
PSLP/664	D Heney		The plan is not justified as the Soar Valley is a flood plain as shown on the SFRA Index Grid B3. Development in the plan will have a cumulative impact on flooding which is a current issue in Charnwood	Feedback to central government that their targets need to be adjusted to account for local flooding	No	CC1
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent are supportive of the use of SuDS and the approach to ensure that SUDS provide wider benefits than just water attenuation, the delivery of SuDS that meet the four pillar of SuDS will provide wider benefits to the environment and community though improved water quality, biodiversity and amenity. Severn Trent are now able to adopt some SuDS systems, but cannot undertake maintenance relating to some of the wider goals of SuDS, it is therefore vital the Maintenance schedule for SuDS is clear about which parties will be carrying out which tasks.		Not stated	CC2
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	Points 2 and 5 of this policy need strengthening. SuDs should be a requirement rather than an option.	Strengthened word on SuDS policy called for.	Not stated	CC2
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	This policy is supported but should be amended to explicitly state that applicants will be required to secure arrangements for the long-term maintenance of and responsibility for SuDS before permission is granted.	Policy should be amended with regards to long term maintenance.	Yes	CC2
PSLP/533	Vicky Utting	Shepshed Town Councillor	The plan is not justified as SuDs do not acknowledge existing problems which will be increased by new development.	Acknowledge existing flooding problems and consider developments as a whole.	No	CC2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Policy CC1 states SuDS in minor development will be encouraged as per CC2; however, minor development is not specifically mentioned in CC2. The Plan refers throughout to SuDS being implemented where appropriate, this should be strengthened to accord with the NPPF. Pervious paving SuDS should be a requirement for all private driveways and shared parking areas to reduce total volume run-off. They should only be used for attenuation on shared areas accessible by a maintenance company.	The section should be reworded to provide more advice for SuDS in minor developments. Amend wording to ' <b><u>SuDS must be incorporated, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate</u></b> ' Add a requirement for pervious paving SuDS to private driveways and shared parking areas.	Yes	CC2
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is sound.		Not stated	CC2
PSLP/008	Mr Nick Hetzel		The policy may not be justified as there are the following errors in Table 7 on page 169: Two medium scale wind turbines have been omitted, Glebe Farm Barn, off Narrow Lane, Wymeswold (0.8MW) and Lodge Farm, off Narrow Lane, Wymeswold (0.5MW). There are many small wind turbines, which are similar in scale to the two at West Beacon Farm. For consistency they should either all be included, or the ones at West Beacon Farm should be excluded	Include the following wind turbines to Table 7 on p169: Glebe Farm Barn, off Narrow Lane, Wymeswold (0.8MW) Lodge Farm, off Narrow Lane, Wymeswold (0.5MW) Remove the following wind turbines from Table 7 on P169: West Beacon Farm (0.05MW)	No	CC3
PSLP/174	Olivia Venning		The proposed plans do not adequately address climate change and do not tackle it with the urgency that is required. The following is needed and should be made policy in this plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Any new development needs to be carbon zero</li> <li>•Local renewable energy generation needs to be prioritised</li> </ul>		Not stated	CC3
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	Large and very large-scale turbines would be far more efficient and productive. You should be supporting this wherever possible – along with the electrical infrastructure to cope with it. Wind turbines and the batteries, and other technology related to them have the potential to become an employment opportunity for this area. We also question the small size of solar installations being allowed for as tree planting and hedges can help with landscape. We are concerned that this policy does not cover issues around biomass. Additionally, the policy's capacity to support renewable energy generation is weakened by the penultimate paragraph which seems to suggest that applications are likely to be refused. Finally, we would like to see clearer policy wording to support wind and solar installations near villages where the community agrees projects to the benefit of the community.	A number of policy changes are called for, largely related to the size of renewable installations.	Not stated	CC3
PSLP/103	Paul Goodman		The plan falls short of becoming a carbon neutral borough as it only 'encourages'. All homes should be carbon neutral from the outset and not retrofitted. The Council fails to understand the nature of high standards. The Energy recovery facility at Newhurst Quarry is not low carbon or renewable.	None - Para 7.2 notes that low carbon technologies are not completely renewable as they may still have carbon emissions associated with them albeit much smaller than conventional fossil fuel burning technologies, an example of such technologies is energy recovery from waste.	Not stated	CC3
PSLP/541	Cllr Laurie Needham		The plan is not legally compliant as it falls short of being sufficient to achieve net zero emissions by 2050 (in accordance with the Climate Change Act). This fact was highlighted to the Council in the review I had commissioned from the CSE in January 2020. I have attached the review again for reference and request that it be submitted as part of my response. The plan is not legally compliant as it does not appear to have demonstrated how it's policies comply with its legal obligations to evaluate future emissions. The language in the climate change policies has been watered down so as to make the policies unenforceable. The current wording is such that they will carry no power and therefore it is unlikely that the Local Plan will meet its moral and legal requirements in terms of climate change. Every use of the word 'encourage' in policies CC1, CC4, EV7 and EV11 should be changed to 'require' in order to make this plan more environmentally sound. It is particularly disappointing to me that the expert advice and guidance from the CSE report has largely been disregarded. It provided an opportunity to make Charnwood's Local Plan 2021-2037 as robust as possible in terms of climate change mitigation. In its current form I feel that it is not legally sound nor is it safeguarding Charnwood residents from the impacts of climate breakdown.		Not stated	CC3
PSLP/238	Robert Parks	Chair, Quorn Parish Council Planning Committee	The policy is not consistent with the NPPF because it does not sufficiently tackle climate change and appears to display aspiration rather than enforce action.		Yes	CC3
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	Note neighbourhood plans can include a policy on wind energy.		No	CC3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/263	Richard Mapletoft	Rushcliffe Borough Council	Rushcliffe Borough Council is concerned that the policy doesn't fully reflect the NPPF's requirement for adequate assessment of the cumulative impact of the technologies on the landscape and visual impacts. As currently presented it suggests that the areas shown are suitable, regardless of any other consideration (heritage, noise etc. which are referred to in the first part of the policy). To reflect the policy it may be considered more appropriate to rename the two areas as "potentially suitable wind energy locations" and "potentially suitable solar energy locations". With reference to landscape impacts, it may be considered beneficial to cross refer more directly in the policy to the evidence included in the justification text (particularly table 8 and table 9). The content and presentation of Tables 8 and 9 needs review. In addition, although the policy does refer to the landscape impact and landscape sensitivity study in regards of wind turbines, it does not refer to this in regards to solar. As solar technologies do have a landscape impact, this is considered an omission. See also comments on Policies Map.	With reference to landscape impacts, it may be considered beneficial to cross refer more directly in policy CC3 to the evidence included in the justification text (particularly table 8 and table 9). Amendments to table 8 and 9 to resolve apparent confusion in the way in which landscape sensitivity areas are currently presented. Inclusion of a separate map showing the landscape sensitivity areas referred to in these tables may aid interpretation of the policy (this could perhaps be included in an appendix)	No	CC3
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	It should be clarified/ corrected as to whether one of the solar farms mentioned is located in Sileby not Barrow on Soar Parish.	Clarify location of solar farm.	Yes	CC3
PSLP/526	Liz Pizer	East Goscote Parish Council	A lack of ambition in relation to carbon reduction in the future Borough housing stock which could be promoted by inviting and encouraging committed developers to propose carbon neutral dwellings. In accordance with the need to generate carbon free sources of electricity, 2.7 Ha of contaminated land and more on HA60 could be reallocated as solar farm use.	Re-allocate H60 as a solar farm.	Not stated	CC3
PSLP/115	J Kersey		Policy is well evidenced but could go further.	Remove requirement for community agreement for wind development	No	CC3
PSLP/122	C March		Plan (CC3 most relevant) is not effective as 'support' for carbon neutrality/ identifying wind and solar energy infrastructure is not strict enough to address climate change crisis.	Take the environment more seriously and act with urgency in this plan	No	CC3
PSLP/138	E Hodgkinson		Policy CC3 is not effective as it only "encourages" carbon neutral development and restricts the erection of wind turbines. The NPPF requires local plans to address climate crisis and this plan doesn't.	Re-phrase policy CC3 to 'require' carbon neutral development and allocate areas for large and very large wind turbines.	No	CC3
PSLP/152	T M Jones		Plan (CC3 most relevant) is not positively prepared as it does not comply with the NPPF requirement to have action on the climate through policy. Strong action is required in accordance with the IPCC report	Re write the plan. New housing should be required to be zero carbon. Large efficient wind farms should be supported.	No	CC3
PSLP/542	Joe Bennett	RCA obo Spitfire Homes	The policy should be widened to include battery storage development.	Amend policy to include battery storage.	Yes	CC3
PSLP/550	Bib Newnham	Hathern Way Residents Association	Developers should be made to include energy saving products as part of the build process e.g. solar panels.		No	CC3
PSLP/214	Gary Freer		CC3 is not positively prepared in that it fails to allocate for large wind turbines.	Amend policy to include large turbines.	Not stated	CC3
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The generation of renewable energy is strongly supported. The policy could be made more positive by assuming a presumption in favour of development subject to there being no severe impacts that outweigh the benefits. Poole Farm, Quorn is considered an appropriate location for a solar farm.	Amend policy to give presumption in favour of development, subject to there being no severe impacts that outweigh the benefits.	Not stated	CC3
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The principles are supported and there is sufficient flexibility provided. Policies Map 2 illustrates locations for wind and solar installations, but it is not clear what evidence base has been used. The distinction between the map and opportunity areas identified in tables 8 & 9 should be made. Recognise that strategic allocations such as SUEs should be considered for wind/solar installations.	Provide further detail on Policies Map 2 and opportunity areas. Add text identifying need to consider strategic allocations.	Yes	CC3
PSLP/597	Robert Shields	Burton On The Wolds PC	support policy CC3		No	CC3
PSLP/329	M Lane	Thurcaston and Cropston PC	The plan should maximise opportunities for the incorporation of renewable energy innovations including solar panel and tile technology particularly in Broadnook SUE	See comment	No	CC3
PSLP/473	S Cuff	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Table 7 (p169) is not justified as energy from waste is not renewable or low carbon (UKWIN position).	Correct table	Yes	CC3
PSLP/599	C Mulvaney		The Charnwood Climate change Strategy 2018-2030 is not positively prepared as The energy performance of houses being built today will require modification to meet 2050 standards	The council should set higher energy performance standards at 'level 4 Code for sustainable Homes' (20% above current building regulations standards) instead of relying on the NPPF which is inadequate	No	CC3
PSLP/238	R Parks	Quorn PC	The plan is not justified or consistent with national policy as climate change policies "encourage" or "support" Carbon zero and renewable energy sources, and do not have a numbered requirement for electronic vehicle charging.	Re emphasise policies to state "we will require" or "planning permission will only be granted if". Set numbered targets for electronic vehicle charging	Yes	CC3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/174	Olivia Venning		Any new development needs to be carbon zero. The proposed policy references sustainable construction plans, but again suggests low carbon generation should happen 'where viable' and should make this a mandatory requirement from the offset. Were low carbon or neutral energy generation for new developments applied from the start, this would save money, whereas retrofitting later down the line would be more expensive and carbon intensive.		Not stated	CC4
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to promote SuDS, and the use of Rainwater Harvesting where viable as this will result in appropriate management of water as a resource. We are also supportive of the approach to require the Optional Water efficiency target and promotion of BREEAM as they also support the good water efficiency measures,		Not stated	CC4
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	Policy wording needs to be strengthened. The policy should require (rather than encourage) high levels of energy efficiency. Low carbon energy generation should be required to be installed from the start. Ideally heat-pump based district heating should also be put in from the start, but if this is economically viable, then the design should, as a minimum, support it being installed later. It does not make sense to be developing buildings which will have to be retrofitted within a few years. The policy requiring the layout, orientation and design of buildings to improve efficiency of heating, cooling and lighting and to maximise the potential for daylight and passive solar gain is good but undermined by encouraging the design and layout of new buildings which enable low carbon energy generation to be installed from the start where viable, or at a later stage, including district heating". .	Strengthened wording proposed on energy efficiency.	Not stated	CC4
PSLP/180	Mrs Ruth Youngs		Whilst this is a positive stance it cannot be guaranteed that developments will deliver the energy efficiency and carbon savings that are sought. For this reason, the effects are not considered to be significantly positive in this respect. Why can't it be guaranteed that developments will deliver the energy efficiency and carbon savings that are sought? A strong application of this policy is necessary to ensure that the net effect of development	Stronger policy wording suggested.	No	CC4
PSLP/628	David Kelly	National Forest	The policy demonstrates a lack of ambition in only encouraging renewable energy and high standards of energy efficiency. There should be more stringent requirements on new development, such as making the requirement for on-site renewable energy generation mandatory. Non residential development is only encouraged to reach BREEAM 3 credits in relation to water consumption with no reason why other BREEAM sustainability measures could not be required. Suggested amendments- requiring high standards of energy efficiency in sustainable construction processes including the use of materials with low embodied carbon and passive cooling and heating, optimal levels of thermal insulation, passive solar design and locally sourced and recycled materials, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>requiring the use of renewable and low carbon supply systems and connection to low carbon heat networks;</li> <li>minimising construction waste, including designing out waste during the design stage, selecting sustainable and efficient building materials and reusing materials where possible;</li> <li>requiring developments to reduce waste, provide for accessible and unobtrusive sustainable waste management facilities such as refuse/ recycling/ composting bin storage and allow convenient waste collections;</li> <li>requiring that sustainable water management solutions such as sustainable drainage systems, green roofs and/or rainwater harvesting systems are incorporated into proposals, where viable;</li> <li>requiring residential development to meet the Building Regulations optional water efficiency requirement of 110 litres/per person per day;</li> <li>requiring non-residential development in excess of 1,000sqm gross floorspace to achieve the equivalent of BREEAM 3 credits for water consumption as a minimum</li> <li>Ensure all non-residential developments meets BREEAM 'very good' standard or other successor guidance</li> </ul>	Consider strengthening policy wording.	No	CC4
PSLP/410	Roslyn Deeming	Natural England	Policy CC4 (Sustainable Construction) – specific policy wording amendments required to reference better connected natural habitats and green infrastructure and agricultural land.	Consider policy wording.	No	CC4
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes	Anstey Parish Council	The policy is supported.		No	CC4
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	We welcome the inclusion of Para 7.40. However we consider the wording could be made stronger by replacing "encourage" with "require all proposals to demonstrate how they will reduce the energy, water and materials useD	Wording change proposed to supporting text.	Not stated	CC4
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	Support policy reference to water efficiency measures.		Not stated	CC4
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sibley Parish Council	The policy is supported but we question the accuracy of the statement that the largest increases in population within the Service Centres has been in Rothley, Quorn and Barrow on Soar. No evidence is presented in the Plan to support this statement. Paragraph 3.190 should be revised to include evidence to justify the statement.	Consider revising para 3.190.	Yes	CC4
PSLP/557	Andy Brettle	Rothley Parish Council	The plan needs to include a firmer stance on the building standards it should impose for new developments. Any housing built between now and 2037 should be built to encourage net zero carbon emissions.	Amend plan to include requirement for new homes to be zero carbon.	Not stated	CC4
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged but the increased sustainability targets set out in para 7.42 is not supported. The additional 10% reduction in CO2 will impact viability and deliverability.	Remove reference to 10% reduction in para 7.42, revised text provided.	Yes	CC4

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/164	C Dobbins		Policy CC4, p173, is not effective as it should indicate the amount of solar required. Policy CC3 supports low carbon installations.	Amend “by encouraging high standards of energy efficiency... in passive solar design” to a “requirement to provide every new house with solar panels for electricity generation”	No	CC4
PSLP/214	Gary Freer		Policy CC4 is not positively prepared in that it lacks requirement for energy efficiency and high levels of insulation in new buildings.	Amend policy to place greater onus on delivering improved energy efficiency/levels of insulation.	No	CC4
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Consideration should be given to ensuring that space for nature is created, eg bird nesting, bat roosts. Give consideration to biosecurity with warmer temperatures increasing threats of pests and disease.	Add reference to ‘space for nature’ and biosecurity.	Yes	CC4
PSLP/208	Philip D. Sheppard		The Plan fails the test of soundness on the grounds, set out in the NPPF paragraph 35, that, with respect to the quality of agricultural land, it is not “positively prepared” nor “justified”. Two possible solutions are proposed: ·Add a new policy specifically to prevent development on Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land unless there are exceptional reasons, and let the Inspector decide on the importance of food security. ·Add a new policy to require developers to support equivalence or net gain in food production capacity in the Borough.	Changes to policy called for.	No	CC4
PSLP/463	David Hayes		The policy is weak and not justified, it will allow dwellings to be built that do not address the climate emergency and minimise carbon footprint. Expensive retrofitting will be required. Renewable, solar power, use of grey water etc should be incorporated at the planning stage.	Strengthen policy and requirements to contribute to the green agenda.	Yes	CC4
PSLP/474	Janet Cannon		The policy is not justified as it does not sufficiently address climate change or support zero carbon targets.	Amend policy to require all housing to be sustainably developed (eg solar panels, hydrogen ready boilers and design to encourage solar gain)	Not stated	CC4
PSLP/731	Diana Webster		Charnwood should be a green borough. There is nothing in this plan to insist that new homes will be built in a sustainable way, to the most modern standards, with non-gas heating and with use of brown water for example.	Comment.	No	CC4
PSLP/621	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Hallam Land Management	While the objectives of the policy are generally supported, it is not consistent with national policy in relation to being clear and unambiguous as it sets out a number of overlapping criteria with the relationship between them uncertain.	Policy CC4 should be re-written to deliver a clear policy, unambiguous in its intentions so that it is evident how a decision taker will react.	Yes	CC4
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The element of the policy in relation to layout and design is not justified as it provides insufficient flexibility to avoid sites failing to come forward or unnecessary costs being passed on to the end purchaser.	Amend ninth bullet point of Policy CC4 to read: <b>requiring encouraging</b> the layout, orientation and design of buildings to improve efficiency of heating, cooling and lighting and to maximise the potential for daylight and passive solar gain;	Yes	CC4
PSLP/618	Jon Kirby	Lichfields obo Rebecca Birch, St Philips	St Philips objects to the Council’s approach in Policy CC4 on the grounds that it is unjustified and would therefore fail the tests of soundness, failing the tests of soundness as per NPPF paragraph 35(b). Policy CC4 requires residential development to meet the Building Regulations optional water efficiency requirement of 110 litres/per person per day. Under Building Regulations, all new dwellings must achieve a mandatory level of water efficiency of 125 litres per day per person, which is a higher standard than that achieved by much of the existing housing stock. 5.4 If the Council wishes to adopt the optional standard for water efficiency of 110 litres per person per day, then the Council should justify doing so by applying the criteria set out in the PPG. The PPG12 states that where there is a “clear local need, LPA can set out Local Plan Policies requiring new dwellings to meet tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres per person per day”. In the Council’s supporting evidence, there is an absence of any justification for the requirement for new development to meet the optional water efficiency standard. A clear local need has not been demonstrated. Furthermore, there is no consideration of the impact on viability. The Charnwood Local Plan Policies Matrix in the Council’s Viability Study states that “costs are considered to be within BCIS cost allowance, increases in costs associated are anticipated to be off-set by value increases (due to better quality design / specification) given that we have adopted conservative sales prices”. St Philips disagree and consider that the cost of the optional water efficiency standard should be included in viability testing so the cumulative impact of compliance with all policy requirements set out in the Local Plan is tested.	In the absence of robust evidence of need and no viability testing, before the Local Plan is submitted for examination, the requirement for the optional water efficiency standard should be deleted from Policy CC4.	No	CC4
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	The policy in respect of requiring residential development to meet the Building Regulations optional water efficiency requirement of 110 litres/per person per day is not justified and does not comply with national policy as a clear local need has not been demonstrated and there is no consideration of the impact on viability. The approach of the viability study that ‘increases in costs associated are anticipated to be off-set by value increases’ is not accepted and the cost of the optional water efficiency standard should be included in viability testing so the cumulative impact of compliance with all policy requirements set out in the Local Plan is tested.	The seventh bullet point of Policy CC4 should be removed.	Yes	CC4

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/626	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow Homes	We would ask for justification of the proposed policy wording here when it comes to matters such as requiring that sustainable water management solutions such as sustainable drainage systems, green roofs and/or rainwater harvesting systems are incorporated into proposals, where viable. The emphasis on 'requiring' this even with the caveat of viability (how can this be tested?) is potentially onerous and not justified or effective.	We would ask for justification of the proposed policy wording here when it comes to matters such as requiring that sustainable water management solutions such as sustainable drainage systems, green roofs and/or rainwater harvesting systems are incorporated into proposals, where viable. With potential here for this to be deleted from the policy.	Yes	CC4
PSLP/598	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons Developments, Redrow Homes and Helen Jean Cope Charity	There is no robust evidence of a clear local need to justify the requirement set out in the policy, nor any proper consideration of the impact on viability. Accordingly, the requirement for the optional water efficiency standard should be deleted from the Policy.	Amend policy to delete requirement for optional water efficiency standards.	Yes	CC4
PSLP/597	Robert Shields	Burton On The Wolds PC	support policy CC4		No	CC4
PSLP/174	Olivia Venning		The proposed policy references sustainable transport however it makes no requirement development to result in a substantial shift away from cars towards public transport and bicycles. Additionally, the council proposed the construction of more car parking, which again encourages the use of cars in highly populated town centres where there should be innovations in public transport and bicycle lanes. The cycle paths and lanes in and around Loughborough are inadequate, absent and sometimes unsafe.		Not stated	CC5
PSLP/022	Rowan Roenisch		Encourage lower or zero carbon travel by encouraging more bus travel and walking from Leicester to sites in Charnwood (Bradgate Park, Stoneywell Cottage etc.). Improve bus services and walking routes (Gimson footpath).		No	CC5
PSLP/254	Steve Beard	Sport England	Policies to support alternative means of transport to the private car are supported.		Not stated	CC5
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	The policy should "require" not just "support" a shift from car to active and public transport options, and do this by requiring specific active demand management designs and requirements. It should also require specific local services within 400m and should apply to all development, not just major developments.	Alternative wording policy put forward.	Not stated	CC5
PSLP/180	Mrs Ruth Youngs		Policy CC5 is a beneficial policy but it is similar to the existing policy framework and unlikely to lead to a radical change in travel behaviour.		No	CC5
PSLP/340	Tony Stott	CPRE	CC5 needs to put more onus on developers to demonstrate that their proposals will lead to a reduction in car dependency and assist in a reduction in carbon emissions. Without that underpinning it the policy is unsound in relation to National Policy and is an inappropriate strategy given the Climate Emergency.	Reword policy as suggested by rep.	Yes	CC5
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	CC5
PSLP/573		Leicestershire and Rutland Bridleways Association	Action needs to be taken to separate the vulnerable from vehicles on the roads outside the 30mph limits. Quieter electric vehicles are likely to make matters worse in future.	Further action required in support of policy	Not stated	CC5

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/582	Grant Butterworth	Leicester City Council	We support measures to improve Park and Ride services and to work in partnership to identify the most effective, optimal solutions for residents, business and bus operators; improvements to the public transport connections into the city; improvements to cycle links from developments and Also appropriate orbital interventions to address any of re-routing of traffic from major routes onto local roads in the north area of Leicester. Policy needs to specifically refer to Leicester within the Policy and explain how it will deliver improvements to sustainable travel. The Policy needs to include that cycle ways are of high-quality standard which are segregated and physically protected, where possible. Finally, it is requested to confirm the intention to work with Leicester City Council as a partner to deliver the interventions	Comments are largely supportive of the plan's approach. The policy needs to be amended to include references to providing excellent accessibility to key facilities' and seek to 'support a shift from travel by private car to walking, cycling'. The Policy needs to specifically refer to Leicester within the Policy and explain how it will deliver improvements to sustainable travel. The Policy needs to include that cycle ways are of high-quality standard which are segregated and physically protected, where possible. Finally, it is requested to confirm the intention to work with, will need to refer to Leicester City Council as a partner to deliver the interventions. There is also currently no reference to Park and Ride opportunities which developments could support within the Policy itself which needs to be included. This could be through supporting or extending existing / proposed Park and Ride services which serve the city or any new sites which come forward during the Plan period. The draft Local Plan also has not referred to emerging smart transport technology that can help reduce pressures on transport systems and improve sustainability. As part of our Reg 18 representations, we referred to the use of smart technology concepts to encourage the use of sustainable transport and this comment is still relevant so the policy should be amended to reflect this.	Yes	CC5
PSLP/536	Camilla Burges	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported. Para 7.53 refers to Policy DS6, this should be DS5.	Amend para 7.53	Yes	CC5
PSLP/127	Mark Newall		The plan is not justified because section 4 of the SA notes option A1 would minimise the need for travel but this has not been chosen. The development strategy will increase the need for travel between the allocations & there are no plans to mitigate these impacts through sustainable transports options e.g. specifically segregated cycle lanes and foot paths. Working with partners is unlikely to yield significant improvements to the sustainable travel infrastructure. Instead the onus should be placed on the housing developers, i.e.	The plan should be amended to place the onus on developers	No	CC5
PSLP/214	Gary Freer		Policy CC5 is not positively prepared in that it fails to place a strong enough emphasis on a shift away from the private car.		Not stated	CC5
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Reference should be included to the Government's Transport Decarbonisation Plan. The policy is as anticipated. There is no reference to developer contributions to support bus services and sustainable travel options. The policy is generally welcomed but just refers to 'major' developments. The policy is written from the perspective of a single development in isolation and should also address cumulative transport impacts. Significant investment in sustainable travel will be needed to make a change to travel behaviours; revenue as well as capital funds will be required. It is not clear how the policy integrates with other policies to create a cohesive approach for delivering a package of transportation measures to support growth. Refer to the Government's National Bus Strategy 'Bus Back Better' to reform post pandemic bus services.	Refer to Government's Transport Decarbonisation Plan. Add reference to developer contributions supporting sustainable travel options. Reword to allow cumulative impacts to be addressed. Provide robust policy to allow developer contributions for revenue funded measures to be sought. Take a more cohesive approach to transport throughout the Plan. Refer to Government's National Bus Strategy Suggested additional wording to para 7.47 '... safe well-lit routes, <b>resting equipment and</b> increased connectivity between urban and rural areas <b>and key services.'</b>	Yes	CC5

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is supported		Not stated	CC5
PSLP/356	Mrs Anne Tomalin		Policy seeks to minimise the need to travel, particularly by private car, and prioritises public transport, walking and cycling” However, the new developments in H15, H16 and H17 will all depend on the car and there is no real consideration given to sustainable public transport and reducing our carbon emissions for the following reasons: There is no legal responsibility to provide bus services in the new developments as it is up to bus companies to decide on the viability of a bus service. People will not choose to cycle as a means of getting from A to B unless there are safe routes on which to cycle. Charnwood and Loughborough has a very piecemeal cycling infrastructure and many roads are just too dangerous for people to even consider cycling as an option. Cycling should be prioritised as in countries such as The Netherlands and Denmark. Shared cycle paths do not go where most people need to travel in many instances and are not ideal for for either pedestrians or cyclists. Traffic needs to be calmed, speed limits need to be reduced and driver education needs to be introduced to go anyway near getting more people to cycle across the borough. There is no mention of introducing this in the plan. There needs to be more public transport generally, including buses and trains. Buses will not operate services unless they see routes as cost effective. Expensive rail fares do not encourage people to use the trains, the access to Loughborough Railway Station is poor and the cost of parking at the station is expensive.	A wide range of comments on sustainable transport.	No	CC5
PSLP/413	H Johnson		There should be targets to ensure that existing public rights of way are enhanced.	Consider whether targets should be included to enhance PROW.	Not stated	CC5
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The policy should recognise the importance of working with the County Council and neighbouring authorities to support sustainable development and network improvements.	Make explicit reference to LCC and neighbouring authorities.	Yes	CC5
PSLP/739	Wendy Bannerman	British Horse Society	Any developments for walking and cycling should include all vulnerable road users including equestrians to avoid horses being sandwiched between fast moving motorised vehicles and fast moving cyclists.	Comments on policy	No	CC5
PSLP/651	T Birkinshaw		The plan should at paragraph 8.85, Policies CC5, DS3 – HA01 &HA07, LUA2 – diagram 2.71 and EV11 make reference to the Midland mainline railway as a viable form of sustainable transport between the borough and Leicester, rather than heavily emphasising bus services	Make reference to the benefit of local railway services; provide a new railway station at Thurmaston	No	CC5
PSLP/597	Robert Shields	Burton On The Wolds PC	Policy CC5 Should place more emphasis on providing public transport between rural settlements and nearby ‘Service Centres’	See comment	No	CC5
PSLP/117	J Maclean		Plan is not justified as it does not make reference to providing safe access to cycle routes, particularly in Barrow/ Soar Valley.	Refer to safe and attractive cycle routes for Soar Valley Villages.	No	CC5
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	This policy should include provision for electric bike charging and priority spaces within communities for carpool charging. It should also require 20% active charging and 80% passive charging facilities in both housing and business developments of over 10 homes/parking spaces and charging in taxi bays.	Specific policy changes called for.	Not stated	CC6
PSLP/627	Loughborough University	Avison Young	Concern that policy is not practical if developers are expected to contribute towards electricity infrastructure upgrades. Council should liaise with electricity providers and ensure a technical assessment of future loading has been undertaken.	Dependent on outcome of action.	No	CC6
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes	Anstey Parish Council	The policy is not justified and should ‘require’ not ‘support provision.	Revise policy.	No	CC6
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported but requires greater flexibility to be deliverable and effective.	Add flexibility where provision is not practicable or viable.	Yes	CC6
PSLP/140	L Knapp		Thrussington has very little traffic calming in place and roads are very busy at certain times of day. The encouragement to use electric vehicles is a huge worry because electric cars cannot be heard due to them making about as much noise as a refrigerator.	Speed restrictions put in place and a full traffic survey to be conducted.	No	CC6
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	The policy is not justified and needs to consider the capacity of infrastructure providers to cope with demand. The provision should be left to the Building Regulations process.	Remove policy	Yes	CC6
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Support EV charging infrastructure in new development but could refer to provision in existing off-street car parks. Make more ambitious by having a minimum of passive provision for every new parking space apply to all development, unless site specific circumstances dictate otherwise.	Add reference to existing off-street car parks. Make the policy more ambitious by applying to every new parking space for all development, unless circumstances do not allow.	Yes	CC6
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is supported.		Not stated	CC6
PSLP/621	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Hallam Land Management	The policy is not consistent with national policy in relation to being clear and unambiguous as no mechanism is included within the policy to account for the viability impact of the charging points on a development proposal.	Policy CC6 should be amended to include a mechanism within the policy to account for the viability impact of the charging points on a development proposal.	Yes	CC6

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/579	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelsons	Jelson supports the provision of electric vehicle charging points in principle, but has significant concerns about the practicalities of delivery, in the light of wider infrastructure constraints. It cannot be left to individual developers to pick up the cost of what could be multi-million pound upgrades the Boroughs electricity infrastructure	Comments on poliy.	Not stated	CC6
PSLP/618	Jon Kirby	Lichfields obo Rebecca Birch, St Philips	St Philips objects to the Council's approach in Policy CC6 on the grounds that it is unjustified and would therefore fail the tests of soundness as per NPPF paragraph 35(b). Until the introduction of proposed changes to Part S of the Building Regulations, St Philips consider that the physical installation of active EVCPs is inappropriate. The evolution of automotive technology is moving quickly therefore a passive cable and duct approach is a more sensible and future proofed solution, which negates the potential for obsolete technology being experienced by householders. Installation of a passive cable and duct approach means that the householder can later arrange and install a physical EVCP suitable for their vehicle and in line with the latest technologies.	It is suggested that Policy CC6 is modified as follows: "We will significantly increase the number of electric vehicle charging points in the Borough. We will support development that: • provides cabling routing for each new residential dwelling (including flats) with a dedicated car parking space; and • provides at least 1 charging point or cable routing per 5 car parking spaces for new non-residential developments with more than 10 parking spaces. We will work with our partners and developers to deliver infrastructure for electric vehicles and ensure charging points are provided at appropriate locations." Before the Local Plan is submitted for examination, Policy CC6 should be modified as outlined above.	No	CC6
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The policy is not justified or effective there is significant uncertainty regarding this new technology. No standardised format for charging points is currently available and existing technology is not suitable for all dwellings. In addition, Government funding is available to enable occupiers to install charging points. In certain areas updates to the electricity grid required by installing charging points may cause viability burdens and impact housing supply.	Amend first bullet point of Policy CC6 to read: provides an electric vehicle charge point or cabling routing for each new residential dwelling (including flats) with a dedicated car parking space <u>where suitable</u> ; and	Yes	CC6
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	The policy is not justified or effective as future planned changes to the Building Regulations will be a more appropriate method of securing electric vehicle charging points. Installing charging points in advance of those changes risks using technology that will become	Amend the first bullet point of Policy CC6 as follows: provides an electric vehicle charge point or cabling	Yes	CC6
PSLP/598	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons Developments, Redrow Homes and Helen Jean Cope Charity	The Government's preferred approach is the introduction of a new requirement for electric vehicle charging points under Part S of the Building Regulations to introduce a standardised approach. Once introduced, this would supercede the proposed policy approach in the Submission Draft Plan. There is a risk that requirements for the installation of electric vehicle charging points could result in the installation of obsolete technology as the evolution of the technology is moving at pace. The policy reference to the installation of a charging point or cable routing provides necessary flexibility in the nature of the provision.	Policy change called for.	Yes	CC6
PSLP/597	Robert Shields	Burton On The Wolds PC	support policy CC6		No	CC6
PSLP/329	M Lane	Thurcaston and Cropston PC	The plan should make electronic vehicle charging points a priority in existing as well as new settlements particularly in rural areas where car dependency is higher	See comment	No	CC6
PSLP/689	C Thornborrow		The provision of Electronic vehicle charging in Policy CC6 is supported.	Strengthen paragraph 7.58 to read "throughout Charnwood, including existing residential areas. we will implement charging points for e-scooters and e-bikes." The end of policy CC6 should read "Provides at least 1 charging point or cable routing per 5 car parking spaces for new non-residential developments with more than 5 (not 10 as in the current document) car parking spaces" To encourage the use of electric vehicles	No	CC6
<b>CHAPTER 8 - ENVIRONMENT</b>						
PSLP/103	Paul Goodman	Loughborough Green Party	The Council refuses to designate any LGS spaces. HA15, HA16, and HA17 cannot be justified as they are on green spaces.		Not stated	EV1
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	EV1
PSLP/533	Vicky Utting	Shepshed Town Councillor	The plan is not justified as it does not adequately protect the environment.	The plan needs to better consider the impact on landscape of development sites.	No	EV1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	EV1
PSLP/148	D Coles		The plan is not justified as the policy lacks detail on how the landscape will be protected. This policy is extremely limited and does not afford the significance given to it in the introduction of Chapter 8.	The plan should set out how it will protect the landscape.	No	EV1
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The policy focuses on the look of the landscape not intrinsic natural capital biodiversity value.	Need to consider biodiversity and how the policy will achieve Biodiversity Net Gain working with EV6. Policy addition ' <u>Providing appropriate and practical landscape design solutions that reflect the identity and quality of place whilst meeting the current and future needs of the stakeholders in a sustainable and creative way.</u> '	Yes	EV1
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is sound, the strategic policies should have sufficient weight to prevent green wedges and areas of separation being compromised where other deliverable sites exist.		Not stated	EV1
PSLP/621	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Hallam Land Management	The policy is not consistent with national policy as it seeks to protect distinctive rather than valued landscapes.	The ambiguity that results from this drafting can be resolved through a modification, such as; Policy EV1: Landscape. We will carefully manage development to protect the Borough's distinctive landscape. We will do this by: <input type="checkbox"/> requiring new development to <del>recognise protect</del> landscape character and to <u>enhance valued landscapes</u> <del>reinforce sense of place and local distinctiveness</del> ; and requiring new development to maintain the separate identities of our towns and villages.	Yes	EV1
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate action Leicester and Leicestershire	Development should not be supported in green wedges unless it improves the carbon emissions and biodiversity of the space in question.		Not stated	EV2
PSLP/544	Rob Foers	Hinckley and Bosworth BC	The Borough supports policy EV2 and the designation of green wedges in Charnwood Borough, in particular GW1		Not stated	EV2
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	Green Wedges add to the work on combating climate change and support the preservation of Green Wedges, notably GW1. The policy is not considered justified given the development taking place in designated areas (EG Anstey) and should be strengthened.	Remove development from Green Wedges and strengthen policy.	No	EV2
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	EV2
PSLP/557	Andy Brettle	Rothley Parish Council	The following areas should be protected as Green Wedges and areas of separation to ensure village keeps its individuality, vistas and identity: Land off Westfield Lane / The Ridings / West Cross Lane, Land off Westfield Lane / Wellsic Lane / Rothley Court / Rothley Brook Known as Rothley Park and associated paddocks / Cricket pitch Existing open space to each side of Bier Way, Land off Town Green Street to Rothley Brook, Land off Town Green Street / Hallfields Lane and Rothley Brook, Land off Homefield Lane / Loughborough Road / Brooklea nursery, Land at the corner of Swithland Lane and the Ridgeway	Green Wedge/ ALS should be amended to include proposed areas.	Not stated	EV2
PSLP/533	Vicky Utting	Shepshed Town Councillor	The plan is not justified as it does not adequately protect the environment.	The plan needs to better the impact of planned developments.	No	EV2
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	EV2
PSLP/148	D Coles		Green wedges are not afforded significant protection and instead the policies give broad conditions as to when green wedges can be eroded.	There needs to be far stronger protection of Green Wedges.	No	EV2
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Green wedges are a local policy tool used in Leicester and Leicestershire and their longevity into the future is supported, though it is recognised changes may be required. The use of shared methodology for reviewing green wedges is supported. Green wedges should promote wider landscape connectivity and avoid further fragmentation by providing spatial and linear habitat.		Yes	EV2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is sound and proportionate. The strategic policies should have sufficient weight to prevent green wedges being compromised where other deliverable sites exist.		Not stated	EV2
PSLP/313	Pamela Evans		The Green Wedge between Birstall and the City of Leicester will be reduced to the point of being non-existent. Development would inevitably join Birstall to the whole of the Ashton Green, Beaumont Lodge and Beaumont Leys areas of the city. How can this be justified by Charnwood Council as protecting local separation and the intrinsic character of the countryside? There would not be any countryside left between this area of Birstall and Leicester city.	Representation relates more to development proposals and their incompatibility with a green wedge.	No	EV2
PSLP/381	Martin and Penny Broomhead		We strongly support the development and preservation of Green Wedges, specifically GW1 - Leicester (Beaumont Leys) / Birstall / Thurmaston / Cropston/ Anstey/ Glenfield/ Groby. The loss of this green wedge due to the inclusion of site HA43 is not acceptable.	General support but concern about impacts of development upon green wedge.	Not stated	EV2
PSLP/651	T Birkinshaw		Policies EV2/3 are not justified as the map on page 179 Does not show housing allocations therefore it underestimates the reduction in open space between Loughborough and Quorn. Map on page 43 gives a clearer view		No	EV2
PSLP/028	Mr Percy C. Hartshorn		Area of separation shown on Policies Map at Rothley should be the same as the Neighbourhood Plan.	Amend Policies Map	No	EV3
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	Any development in these areas should be required to be carbon zero and at least 50% affordable housing with at least half of that social housing rather than privately owned	Policy requirements suggested.	Not stated	EV3
PSLP/097	Mr Richard Guise		The Area of Local Separation (#16) between Loughborough and Quorn is disingenuous as allocation HA15 is a large part of the current undeveloped land between these areas.	Suggest Areas of Local Separation are numbered on the policy map for consistency with paragraph 8.19. Designate all land between settlements, including HA15 as area of local separation.	No	EV3
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	Areas of Separation add to the work on combating climate change and are strongly supported. Support ALS/13 but extremely concerned there is no ALS between Anstey and Groby. The Anstey Landscape Character Assessment (2014) should be considered.	Introduce ALS between Anstey and Groby.	No	EV3
PSLP/375	James Beverley	Fisher German LLP obo David Wilson Homes	The policy is not objected to in principle but it is not effective as it is not clear it is not a blanket designation to prevent development within an ALS.	Re-word reasoned justification.	Yes	EV3
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	EV3
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	Policy is supported however HA54 should not be included as it is a sensitive, greenspace providing an important connection to the countryside forming the setting and identity of Sileby. This area is highly visible from Sileby Cemetery and Barrow Road Conservation Area. ALS5 should be re-drawn to reflect the boundary originally shown in the draft Charnwood Local Plan (2019).	Remove HA54 and amend ALS5.	Yes	EV3
PSLP/526	Liz Pizer	East Goscote Parish Council	The plan is not justified. The plan itself and the policy EV3 in respect of Areas of Local Separation is undermined by then allocating massive development within any meaningful ALS. The policy is contradictory and in the case of Woodthorpe, is entirely undermined by subsuming the village into Loughborough as a suburb.		Not stated	EV3
PSLP/557	Andy Brettle	Rothley Parish Council	Rothley Parish Council would like to remain a village and not be a part of a string of settlements joined together along the A6 corridor. There is a complete lack of areas of separation in the pre-submission draft which will lead to the loss of individual villages and identity. One of the local areas of separation in the pre-submission draft is also in conflict with the newly created Rothley Neighbourhood Plan. (Land of Westfield Lane). This area between the southern end of The Ridings and Templar Way is not marked as part of the AoLS in the pre-submission draft (p283) but is included in the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan (p27)	Amend ALS to align with Rothley Neighbourhood Plan.	Not stated	EV3
PSLP/139	B Simons		Plan is not effective as an area of separation / green wedge is required around Rothley, Westfield Lane area to avoid speculative planning applications and prevent cumulative encroachment from Broadnook	Add an area of separation / green wedge around Rothley, Westfield Lane	No	EV3
PSLP/533	Vicky Utting	Shepshed Town Councillor	The plan is not justified as it does not adequately protect the environment.	The plan needs to better consider the impact of planned development. Settlement identity should be maintained.	No	EV3
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	EV3
PSLP/148	D Coles		There needs to far greater protection of Areas of Local Separation.		No	EV3
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	The principle of the policy and the boundaries of ALS-D (Sileby- Cossington) are supported. The policy refers to perceptual separation which is subjective and may not lead to the certainty in decision making outcomes required by paragraph 16d of the NPPF		Not stated	EV3
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	No specific comments but welcome the revised boundary at Rearsby/East Goscote AoLS and the opportunity to take part in any further discussions.		Yes	EV3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is sound and proportionate. The strategic policies should have sufficient weight to prevent areas of separation being compromised where other deliverable sites exist.		Not stated	EV3
PSLP/558	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates and Bowler Family	The policy refers to perceptual separation which is subjective and may not lead to the certainty in decision making outcomes required by paragraph 16d of the NPPF		Not stated	EV3
PSLP/561	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Owl Partnerships Ltd, Nottingham Community Housing Association and Inside	The policy refers to perceptual separation which is subjective and may not lead to the certainty in decision making outcomes required by paragraph 16d of the NPPF		Not stated	EV3
PSLP/413	H Johnson		There is no ALS between Loughborough and Shepshed and should be. The Council is not concerned about Shepshed losing their identity and being absorbed by Loughborough.		Not stated	EV3
PSLP/381	Martin and Penny Broomhead		Support for areas of open countryside with the purpose of preserving settlement identity. One such area of separation is ALS13 between Anstey and Newtown Linford and Charnwood should continue to protect this area		Not stated	EV3
PSLP/579	Tim Evans	Avison Young	Jelson's site at Melton Road is bound on three sides by development. It is a matter of fact that the site's development would not result in Rearsby and East Goscote coalescing. It would therefore be perverse of the Council to resist allocating Jelson's land for development on the grounds of impacts on the Area of Separation / adverse impacts on settlement Identity. In more general terms the approach has yet again been to assume as a starting point that all of the historic Areas of Separation should be retained unless there is a good reason not to. This is not considered to be a sound approach given the need to identify sustainable land for housing. The correct approach should be to start again with no designation and determine precisely where it is necessary to apply the designation to achieve the policy objective. This should in all cases be the minimum required to secure that objective. Continuing to blanketing the countryside in unnecessary restrictive designations is not compliant with the NPPF.	Comments on ALS boundary as it affects Jelsons site and more general criticisms of approach.	Not stated	EV3
PSLP/601	C Myles	Wanlip Parish	Concern that the Area of local separation between Wanlip and Birstall May be realigned to take account of the park and ride Meaning the current playing fields towards the A6 will not be included		No	EV3
PSLP/664	D Heney		The plan is not justified as progressive loss of green space his negatively impacting wildlife and the character of the borough; the area 'ALS-A' has been reduced to a small area of land which will devastate the unique heritage character of Woodthorpe	Remove housing allocation HA15	Yes	EV3
PSLP/238	R Parks	Quorn PC	The Area of local separation how to do that between Loughborough and Quorn would be disingenuous if a sand and gravel quarry is placed here in the future		Yes	EV3
PSLP/022	Rowan Roenisch		Improve bus travel and walking routes to attractions such as Bradgate Park, Woodhouse Eaves and Stoneywell Cottage.		Not stated	EV4
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	Policy should include ambitious tree planting targets with an emphasis on food trees, especially sweet chestnuts for starch and nut trees for protein.	Tree planting targets called for	Not stated	EV4
PSLP/628	David Kelly	National Forest	EV4 is not consistent with national policy - paragraph 146 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that the 'The National Forest Strategy and an approved Community Forest Plan may be a material consideration in preparing development plans and in deciding planning applications. The wording in EV4 is inappropriate since the National Forest has a wider purpose and vision which encompasses the delivery of woodland planting and landscaping, habitat creation and public access. The policy should be amended to - We will support development that: provides woodland planting and landscaping within the National Forest and Charnwood Forest Regional Park, in accordance with the National Forest Planting Guidelines outlined within the National Forest Guide for Developers and Planners' The use of the term Woodland Planting and Landscaping would align this policy with other equivalent policies in place within the Local Plans covering the National Forest.	Amend policy	No	EV4
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	EV4

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/129	B Lapena		Policy EV4 is not positively prepared / consistent with national policy as the policy is reactive rather than proactive in identifying land it protects. This is contrary to NPPF para 17 which states local plans should relate to land use in general	EV4 should (1) specify locations within Charnwood Forest it protects and (2) be re-phrased to 'not support' development worded as follows: " We will not support development unless it can be demonstrated that it will: • protect, and enhance the distinctive landscape character of the Charnwood Forest; • protect and enhance the biodiversity of the Charnwood Forest Regional Park, consistent with the aims of the National Character Area profile of Charnwood;"	No	EV4
PSLP/148	D Coles		This policy does not offer sufficient protection against erosion and overdevelopment. It does not give conditions/ red lines for preventing developments.	The policy should afford more protection to Charnwood Forest and the National Forest.	No	EV4
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	This is well-aligned to local strategies for sustainable tourism development in these areas. Reference could be made to eco-tourism for visitor experiences and managing conflicts of tourism and recreation against biodiversity. Access for all, including access audits, accessibility training at tourist sites and improved visitor facilities enhances visits. There is potential for Green Flag status at key sites.	Refer to eco-tourism and managing conflict between tourism/recreation and biodiversity. Provide further detail on access for all.	Yes	EV4
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy is sound and proportionate.		Not stated	EV4
PSLP/316	Mrs Densie Coles		Policy EV4 Charnwood Forest and the National Forest is Not sound, not positively prepared Policy EV4 is phrased to be only reactive to development proposals where instead it should be pro-active in specifying the specific sites and areas of land that should be protected due to their environmental importance and what form that protection should take.	1) The Council must specify the physical locations of the sites in Charnwood Forest that are to be protected. (2) EV4 begins with the phrase that. We will support development that: • supports the woodland economy and rural diversification, including sustainable small-scale tourism and recreation opportunities which protect, and enhance the distinctive landscape character of the Charnwood Forest; • protects and enhances the biodiversity of the Charnwood Forest Regional Park, consistent with the aims of the National Character Area profile of Charnwood; For its Charnwood Forest policies, the Council should not be using the phrase support development. Instead, the assumption should be in favour of not supporting development. EV4 should become We will not support development unless it can be demonstrated that it will: • protect, and enhance the distinctive landscape character of the Charnwood Forest; • protect and enhance the biodiversity of the Charnwood Forest Regional Park, consistent with the aims of the National Character Area profile of Charnwood;	No	EV4
PSLP/437	James Fish		Paragraph 8.22 includes the sentence 'Its significance for ecology and biodiversity is also recognised by the Charnwood Forest Living Landscape Scheme and the Charnwood National Character Area Profile. However, the corresponding policy EV4 Charnwood Forest and National Forest, omits 'Charnwood Forest Living Landscape Scheme'. We will support development thatprotects and enhances the biodiversity of the Charnwood Forest Regional Park, consistent with the aims of the National Character Area profile of Charnwood.	Policy amendment called for Change EV4 to include the Charnwood Forest Living Landscape Scheme. It should become. We will support development that: protects and enhances the biodiversity of the Charnwood Forest Regional Park, consistent with the aims of the National Character Area profile of Charnwood and the Charnwood National Character Area Profile	No	EV4
PSLP/396	B Singer		Policy EV4 is not justified as The policy text does not refer to 'Charnwood forest living landscape scheme' to reflect paragraph 8.22	Amend policy to refer to 'Charnwood forest living landscape scheme'	No	EV4

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/572	Daniel Hibbard	We Are Define obo Bloor Homes (Laburnum Way)	Recognise importance of protecting and enhancing Charnwood Forest. Proposed allocation at Laburnum Way presents significant opportunity to enhance access to public rights of way from Charnwood Forest to Loughborough. Masterplan provides tree planting along western boundary to strengthen landscape structure and help integrate the development into surrounding settlement edge, and proposes a series of open spaces. It is considered that the approach will contribute to enhancing the biodiversity of the site and is consistent with the aspirations of Policy EV4.	None	Yes	EV4
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	EV4 is phrased to be only reactive to development proposals where instead it should be pro-active in specifying the specific sites and areas of land that should be protected due to their environmental importance and what form that protection should take.	1. Locations in the Charnwood Forest that are to be protected should be specified. 2. EV4 should become We will not support development unless it can be demonstrated that it will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>protect, and enhance the distinctive landscape character of the Charnwood Forest;</li> <li>protect and enhance the biodiversity of the Charnwood Forest Regional Park, consistent with the aims of the National Character Area profile of Charnwood;</li> </ul>	Yes	EV4
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Reference to the Charnwood Forest Living Landscape Scheme is missing from Policy EV4.	Change EV4 to: We will support development that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>protects and enhances the biodiversity of the Charnwood Forest Regional Park, consistent with the aims of the National Character Area profile of Charnwood and the Charnwood National Character Area Profile</li> </ul>	Yes	EV4
PSLP/254	Steve Beard	Sport England	Policy EN5 is supported. Both as recreation route for cycling and walking but also supporting active travel		Not stated	EV5
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	EV5
PSLP/148	D Coles		The policy does not offer sufficient protections against overdevelopment and does not detail criteria for what would stop development from occurring. It does not specify the drivers for protection and restoration.		No	EV5
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Positive opportunities for sustainable growth in the visitor economy have been identified. New development sites could be designed to integrate with the River Soar and Grand Union Canal and improving access and removing barriers. Cultural links to the BEM communities along the corridor could be improved, including cultural considerations in managing the waterway. Biodiversity plans should safeguard the ecology of the waterway and consider invasive/non-native species. Potential exists for Green Flag status along improved routes and key sites. Also, around water taxis, improved visitor moorings and recreational activities.	Improve access from new development. Encourage improved access on to towpaths and better signage. Highlight potential for guides linking key hubs and facilities. Consider biodiversity plans and invasive species. Highlight Green Flag potential and travel by water opportunities.	Yes	EV5
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy appears sound and proportionate.		Not stated	EV5
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent are supportive of the principle to improve the water quality of any water body as required by the WFD, Severn Trent work with the Environment agency to set out a plan of where we can deliver WFD improvements in a sustainable way such that water quality is improved to meet WFD whilst also acknowledging the need for sewerage and treatment to be available to meet growth demands. We would however recommend that this policy also highlights the need to protect watercourses as open features such that they can provide access to water for wildlife, natural Habitat and sustainable method of discharging and conveying surface water.	Include reference to the protection of watercourses as open features.	Not stated	EV6
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	We would like to see this biodiversity policy made stronger. This could be done by replacing “seeking” with “requiring”, and “should be” with “will be”. The last section on development which harms should require 30% net gain, not 10% which treats it like the other categories.	Policy changes called for.	Not stated	EV6
PSLP/410	Roslyn Deeming	Natural England	Policy EV6 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity) – requires reference to 25 year Environment Plan, Nature Recovery Network and a commitment to prepare a SPD on Biodiversity Net Gain. Amended policy wording suggested.	Policy changes called for.	No	EV6
PSLP/410	Roslyn Deeming	Natural England	Paras 8.9 and 8.10 (Green Infrastructure) – overarching policy on GI called for – specific policy wording suggested.	Overarching GI Policy called for.	No	EV6

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/340	Tony Stott	CPRE	The picture presented is a series of individual locational responses rather than a coherent comprehensive Spatial Strategy for nature and biodiversity recovery across the borough. As constructed Policy EV6 is a reactive rather than a proactive one as it is not linked underlying to a Spatial Strategy for nature and biodiversity. The plan is not in accordance with national policy - there is no map in the Plan that identifies and maps the wildlife habitats, ecological networks, designated sites and wildlife corridors in and across Charnwood as a whole. Without this data, it is difficult to judge whether the Plan will fulfil the requirements of sub-paragraph b) of 179 and in particular to judge whether 10% biodiversity gain overall is being achieved.	Include in the Plan document a comprehensive borough wide map of wildlife habitats, ecological networks, designated sites and wildlife corridors. Explain in supporting text what "protects and enhances biodiversity networks, including strategically important links in the wildlife network between our most valuable habitats..." involves. Make a link to how Policy EV6 will promote Environmental Objective 3 (page 16): "To protect and enhance the range of habitats and species found in Charnwood, seek to deliver biodiversity gain, reverse habitat fragmentation and encourage the recovery of ecological networks.	Yes	EV6
PSLP/627	Loughborough University	Avison Young	Paragraph 8.48 is imprecise as it requires a suitable metric for Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA). The Environment Bill refers to DEFRA's Biodiversity Metric (currently beta version) and the policy should specifically refer to this metric and not any locally set metrics. The policy should allow for biodiversity off setting to be provided across the university's land holdings in order to create areas of scale. Support should be given for off site biodiversity credits.	Specifically refer to the DEFRA Biodiversity Metric in paragraph 8.48. Make reference to biodiversity credits to allow for off site biodiversity net gains.	No	EV6
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	EV6
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	We consider that the wording of Policy EV6 could be strengthened by replacing the word 'seeking' with 'requiring'.	Policy change proposed	Not stated	EV6
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	The Plan document does not acknowledge that a requirement of the WFD is to ensure 'no deteriorate of water bodies' and this is an important distinction. ,	Additional wording proposed in policy or supporting text.	Not stated	EV6
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	Support inclusion of maintenance of biodiversity and geodiversity during construction, however, policy should be amended to state that applications involving new development which likely to harm biodiversity and geodiversity during construction will be refused unless applicants submit construction management plans which ensures biodiversity and geodiversity are maintained during construction.	Amend policy using suggested wording.	Yes	EV6
PSLP/112	G Maxwell		EV6 is not positively prepared as it is reactive to development rather than proactively designating biodiversity sites in accordance with NPPF para 17 principle of setting out local land use priorities. EV6 should be drafted to start from the assumption of 'not supporting' development which sets a higher standard.	Identify areas of biodiversity and geodiversity within the plan. Re draft the policy to ensure the presumption is against development, policy to read "We will not support development unless it can be demonstrated that it: • protects and enhances national and local priority habitats and species; • protects and enhances irreplaceable habitats including trees, veteran trees and ancient woodland;Etc"	No	EV6
PSLP/533	Vicky Utting	Shepshed Town Councillor	The plan is not justified or consistent with national policy as it does not reflect the goals of the Environment Bill. Evidence for Shepshed is out of date. All species need better protection. Trees, woods, hedgerows, wildlife corridors and waterways need more recognition. 10% minimum biodiversity next gain is not enough. Developments are considered in isolation rather than as a whole. The plan should address all areas of biodiversity.	Protection of diversity, including watercourses, should be improved. Protected species should be protected. Local wildlife sites need linking by wildlife corridors. More trees are needed in Shepshed.	No	EV6
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	EV6
PSLP/148	D Coles		Net gain target is too low. How will it be monitored? The criteria for allowing development should set a far higher bar and far more protective of these important and unique aspects of Charnwood.	Policy should afford more protection to biodiversity and geodiversity.	No	EV6
PSLP/542	Joe Bennett	RCA obo Spitfire Homes	Support the policy but it is not clear if the 10% biodiversity net gain has been included in viability assessment and is justified.	Assess impact of policy on viability.	Yes	EV6

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/170	F Barnard		Policy EV6 is not positively prepared as it is reactive to development, rather than proactively specifying protected areas of biodiversity and geodiversity, which is not in accordance with NPPF Para 17 which specifies that plan making is about the use of land in general	Identify areas of biodiversity and geodiversity within the plan. Re draft the policy to ensure the presumption is against development, policy to read "We will not support development unless it can be demonstrated that it: • protects and enhances national and local priority habitats and species; • protects and enhances irreplaceable habitats including trees, veteran trees and ancient woodland; Etc"	No	EV6
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	Support a policy which aligns with the Government's Environment Bill requirement of 10% net gain in biodiversity and should not exceed that.	None but CBC should be aware that requirements may change as the Environment Bill progresses.	Yes	EV6
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Appropriate green infrastructure along highways, Country Parks and other land such as County farms should be included in discussions on priorities for improvement. The Lawton review 'Making Space for Nature' should be considered. Reference to the local and national UKBAP with LWS considered as high value spaces for nature. Wildflower creation schemes should refer to native species. Hedgerow restoration would also restore fragmented habitats. Carbon credits could be used for biodiversity net gain and off-setting.	Refer to LCC land as areas for investment in protected species and priority habitats. Refer to the principles of 'Making Space for Nature'. Consider LWS as high value spaces for nature and refer to local and national BAP. Refer to native species of local providence for wildflower creation schemes. Identify hedgerow restoration as helping connectivity and restoring fragmented habitats. Consider use of carbon credits.	Yes	EV6
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	Policy appears sound and proportionate.		Not stated	EV6
PSLP/700	G Killey		Policy EV6 should integrate biodiversity conservation, not by simply requiring net gain, but by retaining features such as trees where possible. Replacing a veteran tree with 2 saplings for example is net gain but not as beneficial.	Review Wildlife Trust Advice <a href="https://www.wildlifetrusts.org/sites/default/files/2018-11/Local%20Authority%20Services%20and%20Biodiv%20report.pdf">https://www.wildlifetrusts.org/sites/default/files/2018-11/Local%20Authority%20Services%20and%20Biodiv%20report.pdf</a>	No	EV6
PSLP/413	H Johnson		More consideration needs to be given to water run-off, flooding, wildlife corridors and enhancing habitats which are being affected by the continued development in the area, with specific targets attached. To date there would appear to be a lack of sufficient data with respect to the developments around Shepshed and the proposed SUE at Loughborough.		Not stated	EV6
PSLP/422	Sara Haynes		The plan is not justified - allowing uncertainty in which metric is to be applied does not instil confidence that biodiversity net gain is being fairly applied across developments.	The 'suitable BIA metric' should be specified rather than leaving this to developers. This will ensure consistency and instil confidence that biodiversity net gain is being fairly implemented.	No	EV6
PSLP/424	Janet Gillett		The plan is not justified as the number of wildlife corridors, such as on grass verges, should be increased.	Retain all support for nature.	Not stated	EV6
PSLP/438	Evaline Shawson		Paragraph 8.48 states Biodiversity net gain means leaving the natural environment in a measurably better state than beforehand. Biodiversity Impact Assessments (BIA) are used to measure the impact of development taking account of the proposed mitigation. To achieve net gain, a development must have a higher biodiversity unit score after development than before development. A suitable BIA metric should be used to allow the assessment of biodiversity impact of a given development, and where appropriate the size of contribution required to offset the ecological impact of that development. Allowing uncertainty in which metric is to be applied does not instil confidence that biodiversity net gain is being fairly applied across developments.	The 'suitable BIA metric' should be specified by the Council rather than leaving this to developers. This will ensure consistency and instil confidence that biodiversity net gain is being fairly implemented.	Not stated	EV6
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The phased approach for delivering large strategic allocations should be recognised when assessing biodiversity net gain.	Provide flexibility when assessing development parcels in the context of a large strategic allocation.	Yes	EV6

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/735	Maggie Taylor		The impact of the plan on the local natural environment is its weakest aspect and requires a complete rewrite. The plan involves the loss of many hectares of land, hedgerows and wildlife areas to be replaced by housing and the loss of habitat is widely understood to be the most important factor in the decline of our native species of animals and plants. The plan notes that development will be expected to bring net benefits to the environment and implies that planting trees to mitigate housing development is the panacea to houses built on green space. This is completely inadequate, planting trees is not enough. It may provide some long-term benefit to air quality and a green screen but the loss of undeveloped land will remove terrain for many creatures and plants. How are the needs of wildlife being measured and what actions are to be put in place to protect those needs? How will the claimed positive net benefit be measured? Without a clear, quantitative set of objectives and plans, as stated in the Charnwood Environmental plan, this aspiration for a net benefit will be purely aspirational and unlikely to be achieved.	Review of policy called for.	Yes	EV6
PSLP/579	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelsons	Jelson supports the principal of net gain and the 10% target which will shortly be mandated nationally. There are however a number of modifications / clarifications to this policy so that it is fully justified and effective and meets the tests of soundness. There is a national metric available provided by DEFRA. The policy should be updated to make specific reference to this metric and to exclude use of any other locally set or derived matrices. The policy should be amended to include support for voluntary offsetting schemes and to allow credits for these to be used across LPA boundaries where appropriate	Amendment to policy proposed.	Not stated	EV6
PSLP/618	Jon Kirby	Lichfields obo Rebecca Birch, St Philips	St Philips objects to the Council's approach in Policy EV6 on the grounds that it is inconsistent with national policy and would therefore fail the tests of soundness, particularly NPPF para 35(d). St Philips supports the principle of biodiversity offsetting through Biodiversity Net Gain ('BNG'). However, the CLP should not pre-empt the Government's requirements on BNG, set out in the 2019 Environment Bill.	Before the Local Plan is submitted for examination, Policy EV6 should be modified to incorporate transitional arrangements in order to reflect the Environment Bill.	No	EV6
PSLP/598	Guy Longley	Pegasus obo Davidsons Developments, Redrow Homes and Helen Jean Cope Charity	There is no reference in the policy to transitional arrangements. The Environment Bill sets out the Government's intention to provide for a two-year transitional period. The policy should therefore make reference to transitional arrangements. There is again concern that the Council's Viability Assessment does not provide a sufficiently robust assessment of the impacts of biodiversity net gain on housebuilding. Further work on the impacts of this requirement on viability are therefore required.	Amend policy to make reference to transitional arrangements	Yes	EV6
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	The policy is not justified as it should accord with the Government's proposals as set out in the Environment Bill, which include provision for a transition period of two years. The policy would not be effective if it prevented, delayed or reduced housing delivery. Further viability work should be undertaken to sensitivity test the Council's assumptions.	Policy EV6 should be modified to incorporate transitional arrangements.	Yes	EV6
PSLP/695	D Matthewman		Policy EV6 is not justified as the supporting appendix D does not include allocation HA17 as an area for wildlife when wildlife is active on this site		No	EV6
PSLP/674	N Matthewman		Policy EV6 is not justified as the supporting appendix D does not include allocation HA17 as an area for wildlife when wildlife is active on this site		No	EV6
PSLP/396	B Singer		Policy EV6 is not positively prepared as it is reactive and does not proactively specify exact locations of geodiversity and biodiversity. Policy EV6 should be re-phrased from the presumption of not supporting development in order to better protect ecology.	Specify locations of geodiversity and biodiversity. re-phrase policy from the presumption of not supporting development	No	EV6
PSLP/635	I Deverell	Rainer	Support flexibility of Policy EV6		No	EV6
PSLP/444	N Hand		The plan is not justified as the paragraph 8.43 reference to supporting 'Living Landscapes' is not reflected in the plan as fragmented habitats are not identified and will be impacted by HA15, HA16, HA17 and not designating Leconfield Road as Local Green Space.	Amend paragraph 3.80 to refer to DEFRA maps to clarify the locations of ecological networks.	No	EV6
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The Council recognises that ecologically important sites exist but does not identify them on the Policies Map or state what protection they should have. Nor does the policy identify what management, enhancement, restoration and creation of habitats needs to take place or where it should take place an over what time period.	Identify the specific sites for nature recovery, what protection they should have and the actions that need to be followed at each site	Yes	EV6

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The Local Plan should always be 'Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity', not just when considering development	Two modifications are needed (1) The Council must specify the physical locations of the areas of biodiversity and geodiversity that are to be protected. (2) The Council should not be using phrase support development. Instead, the assumption should be in favour of no development. EV6 should become We will not support development unless it can be demonstrated that it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>protects and enhances national and local priority habitats and species;</li> <li>protects and enhances irreplaceable habitats including trees, veteran trees and ancient woodland; etc</li> </ul>	Yes	EV6
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The policy allows uncertainty in which biodiversity metric is to be applied.	The 'suitable BIA metric' should be specified in paragraph 8.48 rather than leaving this to developers	Yes	EV6
PSLP/221	Chris Bramley	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to plant trees, we would however encourage that where tree planting is carried out within the urban landscape, consideration of SuDS systems such as Tree-Pits are considered due to their ability to support the growth and development of the tree, whilst also providing flood mitigation benefits		Not stated	EV7
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	Policy should include an emphasis on food trees. Also a requirement for shade trees (at least half food trees) on streets, half of green spaces to have tree cover (again with an emphasis on food trees) require the keeping of trees (not just "where appropriate"), and if planting trees elsewhere in compensation to require payment for them to be looked after once planted and replaced if they do not survive.	Policy changes called for.	Not stated	EV7
PSLP/103	Paul Goodman	Loughborough Green Party	Many hundreds of saplings are required to replace a single mature tree. It would be useful for Charnwood to assess through detailed survey of the tree stock in the Borough, the extent to which CO2 capture by trees is actually being lost.		Not stated	EV7
PSLP/628	David Kelly	National Forest	EV7 is not consistent with national policy – the precise policy wording amounts to weak protection for existing trees which play a vital part in Climate Change adaptation and mitigation. Paragraph 174 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that the intrinsic value of the countryside is retained including trees and woodland. The retention of existing trees is considered important in terms of the character of Charnwood and an important mitigation and adaptation measure in respect of Climate Change. The retention of existing trees is supported by paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Wording should be amended to - • retains existing trees unless sufficient evidence is provided (in the form of a Tree Survey or Arboricultural Assessment) to justify their removal	Amend EV7 to retain existing trees unless sufficient evidence is provided (in the form of a Tree Survey or Arboricultural Assessment) to justify their removal	No	EV7
PSLP/340	Tony Stott	CPRE	EV7 should also be about the enhancement of hedgerows.	Add hedgerows to EV7 and suggested wording.	No	EV7
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	Tree planting adds to the work on combating climate change. Areas for tree planting will be considered in the neighbourhood plan.		No	EV7
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	EV7
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sibley Parish Council	Clarification is sort over the meaning of 'proper consideration of long-term management' in enforcement or delivery terms.		Yes	EV7
PSLP/533	Vicky Utting	Shepshed Town Councillor	The plan is not justified as existing trees, hedgerows and woods are not sufficiently considered.	Needs to include plans for planting more trees.	No	EV7
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	EV7
PSLP/148	D Coles		The policy should protect mature trees more robustly. There should be a clearer target for increasing tree planting.	Review tree planting target.	No	EV7
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	The policy should be updated to reflect the revised 2021 NPPF's approach to trees. The requirement for 3:1 replacement planting of non-woodland trees is overly restrictive.	Revise policy in late of 2021 NPPF and remove 3:1 re-planting requirement.	Yes	EV7
PSLP/550	Bob Newnham	Hathern Way Residents Association	The plan should clearly state that the residential developer should make significant contributions to tree planting.		No	EV7

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The content is supported. Biosecurity should be considered to control the spread of disease. Further detail on biodiversity surveys would help ensure high value habitat is not displaced by new planning. Bird and bat boxes could be installed on new trees where appropriate. Local providence trees should be utilised. Tree planting interacting with the public highway should be covered by effective management and funding.	Refer to biosecurity needs as part of site management and use of trees of local providence. Expand on the need to ensure high value habitat is not displaced by new planting. Identify potential for bird and bat box installation. Ensure developer contributions will manage trees during lifetime of the development.	Yes	EV7
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy appears sound and proportionate.		Not stated	EV7
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The phased approach for delivering large strategic allocations should be recognised when assessing tree planting.	Provide flexibility when assessing development parcels in the context of a large strategic allocation.	Yes	EV7
PSLP/599	C Mulvaney		Policy EV7 is not positively prepared or consistent with national policy as whilst NPPF Paragraph 131 Requires new development to have tree lined streets, it does not specify the board is required around those trees to enable the canopy to develop.	Agree suitable boundaries around new trees with the local Wildlife Trust and define this in the local plan	No	EV7
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	We are strongly in favour of the support this policy gives for retrofitting renewables and energy efficiency measures to old buildings.		Not stated	EV8
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	EV8
PSLP/350	Sarah Legge	Melton Borough Council	Policy EV8 (page 192) references Policy DS6: Design, however this policy does not seem to exist within the Local Plan Document. There are a few other references to Policy DS6 on pages 112 & 175. I believe the references should be to Policy DS5: High Quality Design.	Changes to policy references	Not stated	EV8
PSLP/521	Jon Bradburn	Montagu Evans obo Beacon Bingo	The policy is not consistent with national legislation; it lacks support for future uses of heritage assets through enabling development; is ineffective and requires sub-clauses against which a proposal can be assessed; and, the use of 'and' at the end reads as a list of requirements, even if some aren't relevant.	Reformat and amend policy (text provided)	Yes	EV8
PSLP/533	Vicky Utting	Shepshed Town Councillor	The plan is not justified as Shepshed's heritage is not given sufficient weight in development proposals.	Shepshed's heritage and important role in history needs recognition.	No	EV8
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported. Bullet 6 refers to DS6: Design, this should be DS5.	Amend bullet 6, DS6: Design, to DS5.	Yes	EV8
PSLP/106	Rosamund Worrall	Historic England	The policy is welcomed		No	EV8
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	LCC maintain the Historic Environment Record (HER) for the Borough to inform the management of heritage, particularly non-designated assets. Fails to take account of 'contested heritage' such as statues, memorials etc in recent changes to NPPF.	Reinforce reference to HER and its use. Update to take account of NPPF changes on 'contested heritage'.	Yes	EV8
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy appears sound and proportionate.		Not stated	EV8
PSLP/330	Brenda Snape	Shepshed Town Council	Paragraph 8.62 is not justified as It is unclear how local heritage assets can be identified outside of neighbourhood plans. Paragraph 8.63 is incorrect as the council has permitted a large Road junction across from the Grade II listed Mill		No	EV8
PSLP/086	Miss Mercedes Guitierrez		The plan does not meet the duty to cooperate, is not legally compliant and is not sound for the following reasons. Last paragraph of the policy is too stringent in terms of groups allowed to proposed new open spaces (EV9 refers to neighbourhood plan groups). This is not in accordance with the NPPF (2019) paragraphs 8b, 83 or 92a.	Modify final paragraph of EV9 to read: "We will support neighbourhood plan groups, residents' groups and community groups in proposing, protecting and enhancing locally important open space, sport and recreation facilities through neighbourhood plans or other community-led initiatives."	No	EV9
PSLP/254	Steve Beard	Sport England	Table 10 is supported with regard to Outdoor Sports facilities, however it is important to review the Playing Pitch Strategy (2018) regularly and make sure that it remains robust and up to date Par 99 of NPPF 2021		Not stated	EV9
PSLP/254	Steve Beard	Sport England	Evidence needs to be robust and up to date. Sport England advises that without regular review and updates the value of the Playing Pitch and Built Sports Facilities strategies diminishes after 3 years and may not necessarily meet the needs of para 98/99 of NPPF 2021 and policy EV9.		Not stated	EV9
PSLP/028	Mr Percy C. Hartshorn		Open space shown on the Policies Map at Rothley should be the same as those in the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan.	Amend Policies Map	No	EV9

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/254	Steve Beard	Sport England	The references in the plan to Building for a Healthy Life are supported however, this guidance does not include all of the 10 principles of Active Design one such example is, co-location of community facilities. Sport England would support a link and references to Active Design as part of a suite of guidance which seeks to ensure that healthy communities and places are created.	References to Active Design called for.	Not stated	EV9
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	Policy should include requirements for segregated cycle paths linking them to local communities.	Policy change called for	Not stated	EV9
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	EV9
PSLP/113	J.Belton	Loughborough FC	The plan contradicts itself, in one section it commits to protecting open spaces particularly football pitches while in another section it commits to a section of the Derby Road Playing Fields being taken for industrial development. CBC has accepted a planning application from the Brackley Property Development Company to industrialise a section of the Derby Road Playing Fields taking out three football pitches. The new local plan has removed the "retain or relocate" clause on the clubs no league stadium which was inserted in the local plan originally. It is necessary and logical to review the employment land area at Dishley that extends onto the Derby Road Playing Fields and takes out the pitches etc. Release the section of the Derby Road Playing Fields to remain what it is supposed to be a sports ground. Failing this the "retain or relocated" clause on the football ground as it is now should be replaced in the new local plan. As the new local plan stands the developers can take out the section of the sports ground with replacing it. Objection also recorded for ES5.	Objection relates to Policy ES5 and its relationship to EV9	Yes	EV9
PSLP/497	Cllr Smidowicz		The Local Plan is not positively prepared – there are identified shortfalls in green space for existing communities (5.6ha). There is no evidence to determine if there is sufficient physical land suitably close to residents that is actually available to meet the shortfalls. The plan is not justified - Leconfield open space should be designated as LGS.	Designate Leconfield open space as a Local Green Space.	Yes	EV9
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sibley Parish Council	Open spaces, Sport and Recreation. The policy is supported. Allocations HA53, H54, H55, H56, H57 and HA58 should be amended to cross-reference to the need to satisfy Policy EV9 and set out a requirement to “pool” provision to cater for cumulative need generated by these planned-for allocations as well as any windfall developments which individually, might not be of sufficient scale to deliver meaningful Open space, Sport and Recreation infrastructure. Alternatively, Policy EV9 should be re-worded to secure the same objective.	Cross reference EV9 in allocation policies (HA53-HA58).	Yes	EV9
PSLP/111	T Magee		Policy EV9 is not positively prepared as it does not seek to meet the shortfalls identified in the Open Space Strategy. EV9 only seeks to meet the needs of the ‘proposed community’. Not accommodating the need of the whole community is at conflict with NPPF (2018) Para 96	EV9 should allocate open spaces to meet shortfalls set out in the Open Space Strategy by (1) identifying more Protected Open Spaces, (2) require additional open spaces from development to account for the whole community shortfall and (2) set out a plan to meet shortfalls by 2028 to align with Core Strategy Policy CS15.	No	EV9
PSLP/120	D Tipping		Policy EV9 is not positively prepared as it does not seek to meet the shortfalls identified in the Open Space Strategy. Not accommodating the need of the existing community is at conflict with NPPF (2018) Para 96.	A map-based assessment is required to determine if land is available to meet shortfalls. Any land identified should be protected.	No	EV9
PSLP/130	J Gestion		Policy EV9 is not positively prepared as it does not seek to meet the shortfalls identified in the Open Space Strategy. Not accommodating the need of the whole community is at conflict with NPPF (2018) Para 96	EV9 should set open space targets based on the Open Space Strategy or Fields in Trust Standards. Policy should be modified to make meeting targets demonstrable - i.e. modifying EV9 Appendix 1 monitoring framework	No	EV9
PSLP/141	D McGarth		Policy EV9 is not positively prepared as it does not provide additional open space to meet shortfalls which supported wellbeing during lockdown. New Scientist article about nature boosting mental health attached.	EV9 should include an action plan setting out how the plan will provide open space	No	EV9
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	EV9
PSLP/134	Seth Barton		The plan is not justified as there is no evidence to support that open space shortage is most acute in Garendon and Hastings wards. The lowest per capita is actually Nanpantan. The plan proposes no action to address the shortfall of open space in Loughborough and this should be done immediately.	Assess open space shortfall by ward using the Fields in Trust metric of per capita provision. Prioritise wards for open space provision using the above and the Charnwood Open Spaces Strategy. Include in the plan actions as to how the shortfall will be addressed.	No	EV9

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/148	D Coles		Table 10 Provision standards. The standards are insufficient to make up for loss over decades. Some areas have no targets at all and this needs to be rectified.	Review open space provision standards.	No	EV9
PSLP/167	J Morrison		Policy EV9 is not positively prepared as the shortfall of open space of 5.6ha in Nanpantan, identified in the Open Space Strategy, has not been met. NPPF Paragraph 8 requires open spaces to reflect current and future needs. The Nanpantan Ward Resident Group has prepared an Open Space Strategy that supports the designation of Leconfield Road as an open space.	Protect the open space at Leconfield Road and Snell's Nook Lane (HA18).	No	EV9
PSLP/186	M Whiteman		Policy EV9 is not positively prepared as the shortfall of open space of 5.6ha in Nanpantan, identified in the Open Space Strategy, has not been met. The Council has failed to mee current and future needs for open space	Protect the open space at Leconfield Road and Snell's Nook Lane (HA18).	No	EV9
PSLP/157	J Restarick		A more radical approach is needed to meet the shortfall in open spaces. Shortfalls are identified in the Open Spaces Strategy but not sufficiently addressed through EV9 in the plan. This is abandonment of the Council's duty to care for the health and wellbeing of residents.		Not stated	EV9
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Additional allotment gardens should be encouraged in larger developments. Health Impact Assessments could target need to those experiencing inequality in accessing green space to grow produce.	Amend to support allotments in large developments. Target on areas of inequality identified through health impact assessments.	Yes	EV9
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy appears sound and proportionate.		Not stated	EV9
PSLP/246	C Ortega		The plan is not consistent with national policy because Leconfield open space has public value and should be designated as a local green space. EV9 should be amended to protect 'informal open spaces'.	Amend EV9 and designate Leconfield open space as Local Green Space.	No	EV9
PSLP/351	J Sheraton		Policy EV9 is not consistent with National Policy or positively prepared as NPPF paragraphs 99 and 100 require the Council to make it clear hoe Local Green spaces can be identified, which has not been the case.	Include the following statement in the policy taken form the Core Strategy: "responding positively to Local Green Space applications, identified through a Neighbourhood Plan or similar robust, community led strategy."	No	EV9
PSLP/360	N Hodgson		A range of comments relating to the local plan but the main focus was to emphasise the importance of retaining and providing good quality open space so as to encourage healthy lifestyles for children.	No specific changes called for.	No	EV9
PSLP/347	Michael J. Cahill		Nanpantan has the least Green Space in Charnwood. For many years the land at the top of Leconfield Road was designated as an Open Space of Special Character by CBC. This protected the site from development. However in 2015 the incoming Local Plan effectively removed this valued protection. With the change from protected open space to a site for development it is not surprising that there has been a strong reaction in the local community.	The site was not allocated in the Pre Submission Draft Plan. The representation calls for a refusal of planning permission for development.	No	EV9
PSLP/319	Mr R. Pollock		Open space is protected by the National Planning Policy Framework. Informal open space is clearly open space under the NPPF definition. Leconfield is clearly an open space as it has been demonstrated to be of value of the public.	We will protect our open space, sport and recreation provision identified on the Policies Map, and any future provision made as part of new development, unless it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that is too stringent and must be removed and replaced by We will protect our open space, sport and recreation provision identified on the Policies Map or used informally as open space, and any future provision made as part of new development, unless it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that. Further, the local plan should seek to protect informal open space using a suitable designation. This can be done perhaps by modifying the final paragraph of EV9. We will support neighbourhood plan groups, residents' groups and community groups in proposing, protecting and enhance locally important open space, sport and recreation facilities through neighbourhood plans or other community-led initiatives.	No	EV9

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/310	Dr Karen Henderson		Open space shortfalls for Nanpantan are calculated in the Open Spaces Strategy document, but, due to the 73ha of greenfield land that has been allocated to the Loughborough Science and Enterprise Park, insufficient physical land is available in Nanpantan to address the shortfalls. In fact, only Leconfield Road remains as land unallocated in the residential area. Further, the land at Snell's Nook Lane (HA18) that has been designated in the Local Plan as a housing site must instead be used to address the shortfalls. The Local Plan has not demonstrated that the Council is able to meet the objective open space needs of residents in Nanpantan as identified in the Open Spaces Strategy. The Local Plan is thus not being positively prepared.	Positive action must be taken to protect the land at Leconfield Road as a Local Green Space or other suitable protected status. The land at Snell's Nook Lane (HA18) must also be protected for the open space needs of the community.	No	EV9
PSLP/316	Mrs Denise Coles		Policy EV9 Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation is not sound, not consistent with National Policy, not positively prepared. NPPF sets out the criteria of Local Green Space designation. The Council has not made clear under what circumstances LGS applications will be considered. This has the effect of not making it clear that LGS applications are welcomed and is against the spirit of planning positively as required by NPPF. Access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate. The Council needs to confirm that it is meeting the objective open space needs of residents as identified in the Open Spaces Strategy. The policy in the previous Local Plan of meeting the open space needs of the community has been dropped and must be reinstated. The Council's Core Strategy CS15 of the previous local plan states "We will work with our partners to meet the strategic open space needs of our community by 2028. Without any justification whatsoever, the Council appears to have dropped this policy,	In EV9, include the following statement from the previous local plan responding positively to Local Green Space applications, identified through a Neighbourhood Plan or similar robust, community led strategy. The targets should be those specified in the Open Spaces Strategy (or as advised by the Fields in Trust standards). Most importantly, EV9 must be modified in such a way that it is realistic and demonstrable that the targets will be met. EV9 should be modified to include the statement. We will work with our partners to meet the strategic open space needs of our community by 2028. It must be made clear that the open space needs are those specified in the Charnwood Open Spaces Strategy 2018-2036. It identifies shortfalls in provision for a range of typologies of open space in terms of quantity, accessibility and quality. With 2028 coming soon, the Council must, as part of its Local Plan documentation, submit a realistic and target-based plan to ensure that the open space needs will be met during the five-year lifetime of Local Plan	No	EV9
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The last paragraph in EV9 is too stringent in terms of the groups that will be allowed to propose new open space.	To include initiatives from more of the community, the local plan will be more in line with the intentions of the NPPF by widening from where proposals of new open space can originate. This can be done by modifying the final paragraph of EV9 from We will support neighbourhood plan groups in protecting and enhance locally important open space, sport and recreation facilities through neighbourhood plans. To We will support neighbourhood plan groups, residents' groups and community groups in proposing, protecting and enhance locally important open space, sport and recreation facilities through neighbourhood plans or other community-led initiatives.	Yes	EV9

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The actual physical sites for open space must be identified in the Local Plan. Open space shortfalls are calculated in the Open Spaces Strategy document, but no attempt has been made to determine if there is sufficient existing physical land available to address the shortfalls. Until this is done, it is not known whether it is realistic to meet the shortfalls.	A map-based study must be carried out to determine the physical availability of sufficient land to meet the open space shortfalls. Where the land identified in this process is required to meet shortfalls in open space, the Council must immediately protect this land from development and then seek to designate the land appropriately for open space, sport and recreational provision. The Council should work with owners, residents and local interest groups to acquire, lease or designate the land, and work out a suitable management approach so that it can be protected as open space for the long term.	Yes	EV9
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The policy in the previous Local Plan of meeting the open space needs of the community has been dropped and must be reinstated. This is clearly at odds with NPPF 35(a). The aspirations of the vision in relation to health and wellbeing will not be met unless existing shortfalls in provision are addressed.	(1) EV9 to be modified to include the statement. We will work with our partners to meet the strategic open space needs of our community by 2028. (2) It must be made clear that the open space needs are those specified in the Charnwood Open Spaces Strategy 2018-2036. It identifies shortfalls in provision for a range of typologies of open space in terms of quantity, accessibility and quality. (3) With 2028 coming soon, the Council must, as part of its Local Plan documentation, submit a realistic and target-based plan to ensure that the open space needs will be met during the five-year lifetime of Local Plan. Amend EV9 to ensure open space contributions of new developments take into account the open space needs for existing residents by reducing any shortfall in a Ward or Parish by 2028.	Yes	EV9
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Where the open space shortfall can never be met the Council must protect what is left. As there is insufficient physical land remaining, the required provision for Nanpantan identified in the Council's 2018 Open Space Strategy can now never be met. Partly as a result of the development of the LSEP, only 1.4ha is available at Leconfield and the shortfall is 5.6ha [1]. If any development takes place at Leconfield the Council will be exposed as abandoning any attempt even to reduce the open space shortfall in the Ward.	The Council must demonstrate it is acting in an honest manner in meeting the calculated open space shortfalls. The Council must therefore commit to protecting the remaining 1.4ha of open space at the top of Leconfield Road in Nanpantan. Amend EV9 to ensure open space contributions of new developments take into account the open space needs for existing residents by eliminating any shortfall in a Ward or Parish by 2028. These should include S106 contributions from the LSEP to fund the acquisition of the open space.	Yes	EV9
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The Local Plan will need to consider how design codes will be applied, but this is not included in Pre-Submission of the Local Plan. There must be the opportunity for a full public consultation on the Council's intentions. It will need to be clear how the Council intends to reduce the shortfalls in open space, especially in those Wards with substantial shortage of provision.	Include clarity regarding the use of design codes.	Yes	EV9
PSLP/421	T Coleman		The plan is not justified because HA16 and HA17 will be built on land which is used by residents for exercise and leisure. There is no policy to address the shortfall in open space. EV9 has no approach for meeting the needs of the whole community in areas where there is a shortfall in the first place. This is in conflict with paragraphs 35 and 96 of the NPPF.		No	EV9
PSLP/427	Sergio Cavalaro		The policy is not justified as it does not address existing shortfalls in open space identified through the Open Spaces Strategy. This conflicts with the NPPF, and the health and well-being of communities is being ignored.	Allocate open space for existing residents from new development. Identify sites in the Local Plan to address the shortfall.	No	EV9

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/463	David Hayes		The policy is not consistent with national policy as it does not meet the requirements of the NPPF in relation to open space and recreation provision.	Amend policy to meet requirements of the NPPF	Not stated	EV9
PSLP/476	Dr Peter Reid		The plan is not positively prepared as open space shortfalls have been calculated at Nanpantan but insufficient physical land is available to meet the shortfall. HA18 has been designated for housing and only the Leconfield Rd site remains to meet this need. This must be protected for the health and well-being of residents. No map-based assessment has been done to determine if actual physical land is available to meet the shortfall and the Local Plan cannot demonstrate that it can meet the objective open space needs of residents.	Protect land at Leconfield Road as a Local Green Space or other suitable protected status and protect Snell's Nook Lane site (HA18) for open space needs of the community.	No	EV9
PSLP/478	Dr Helen Reid		The plan is not positively prepared as there is a shortage of amenity green space for Nanpantan. The land at Leconfield Rd is the last unallocated open space. The Council has failed to meet current and future needs and there is insufficient land to meet the shortfall. Nanpantan Ward Residents Group has prepared a strategy and document to protect, acquire and manage Leconfield open space.	Protect Leconfield Rd site and Snell's Nook Lane site (HA18) from development to meet open space shortfalls.	No	EV9
PSLP/492	Mrs L Malpas		The plan is not justified because Nanpantan has a shortfall of 5.6ha of open space. The Council has failed to meet current and future needs.	Protect Leconfield Road and HA18 as open space.	No	EV9
PSLP/496	Megan Lepper		The plan is not justified because the sustainable development criteria is too stringent and not in accordance with the NPPF i.e. whilst the site is subject to a planning application it can still be designated as LGS. Leconfield Road is capable of 'enduring'.	Designate Leconfield Road as Local Green Space	No	EV9
PSLP/538	Tim Jarram		The open space figures for Nanpantan are incorrect and need to be amended.	Review open space evidence.	No	EV9
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The phased approach for delivering large strategic allocations should be recognised when assessing recreation requirements.	Provide flexibility when assessing development parcels in the context of a large strategic allocation.	Yes	EV9
PSLP/585	Dr Jane Percival		The plan is not positively prepared as Nanpantan has a shortage of amenity greenspace with insufficient land to meet the shortfall. Nanpantan Ward Residents Group has prepared a strategy and document to protect, acquire and manage Leconfield open space.	Protect Leconfield Rd site and Snell's Nook Lane site (HA18) from development to meet open space shortfalls.	No	EV9
PSLP/739	Wendy Bannerman	British Horse Society	Horse-riding brings physical and mental health benefits and is a means of leisure and exercise. Rights of way are important for horse riding and should be protected and enhanced Any developments for walking and cycling should include all vulnerable road users including equestrians to avoid horses being sandwiched between fast moving motorised vehicles and fast moving cyclists.	Comments on policy	No	EV9
PSLP/632	P Lanyon		The plan is not in accordance with para 97 of the NPPF. Leconfield is valued open space and should be preserved.	Amend policy EV9 to include reference to informal open space and resident and community groups.	No	EV9
PSLP/396	B Singer		The plan is not consistent with National policy as Leconfield Road has been an open space a public value for 50 years and meets NPPF Paragraph 97a-c criteria. Informal open space is clearly open space under the NPPF definition.	Amend EV9 to refer to protecting areas used informally as open space in addition to formal open space. Widen final sentence of EV9 to support resident and community groups to identify open spaces through community led initiatives.	No	EV9
PSLP/406	D Keen		Policy EV9 is not positively prepared as it remove the current local plan policy CS15 commitment to "Work with our partners to meet the strategic open space needs of our community by 2028". The plan is therefore not positively prepared because it doesn't meet the areas open space needs in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35a.	Modify EV9 to insert statement "We will work with our partners to meet the strategic open space needs of our community by 2028". Modify EV9 to state open space needs although specified in the Charnwood open space strategy 2018- 2036. Include realistic targets to provide open space by 2028	No	EV9
PSLP/695	D Matthewman		Policy EV9 is not justified as the development of allocations HA16 and HA17 Will result in the loss of existing recreation area and this policy will replace it with standard playground		No	EV9
PSLP/674	N Matthewman		Policy EV9 is not justified as the development of allocations HA16 and HA17 Will result in the loss of existing recreation area and this policy will replace it with standard playground		No	EV9
PSLP/683	R Phillips		Policy EV9 is not justified or consistent with national policy as it does not meet the social objective to provide accessible open space (NPPF Paragraph 8); There is a green space provision shortage of 5.6 hectares in Nanpantan as only 2 hectares is allocated. Nanpantan Ward Residents Group Has prepared an open space strategy and the document 'the future of Leconfield open space' to evidence the need to protect and manage open spaces in Nanpantan; Insufficient open space exists in the area due to LSEP being allocated; No map based assessment of open space land availability to meet shortfalls have been produced	Protect Leconfield Road as a Local Green Space. Remove Allocation HA18 to instead meet open space shortfalls	No	EV9

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The NPPF definition of open space is broader than just formal open space and includes informal spaces. EV9 should protect this broader range of sites and the current wording is therefore too stringent. The local plan should seek to protect informal open space using a suitable designation. This can be done perhaps by modifying the final paragraph of EV9	Amend EV9 to read: We will protect our open space, sport and recreation provision identified on the Policies Map or used informally as open space, and any future provision made as part of new development, unless it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that... Also modify final paragraph of EV9 to: We will support neighbourhood plan groups, residents' groups and community groups in proposing, protecting and enhance locally important open space, sport and recreation facilities through neighbourhood plans or other community-led initiatives.	Yes	EV9
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	No target is set for new open space. The targets set out in the Open Spaces Strategy should be used.	Include target for new open space in policy and Monitoring Framework.	Yes	EV9/ Appendix 1
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The plan is not justified as there is no evidence to support that open space shortage is most acute in Garendon and Hastings wards. The lowest per capita is actually Nanpantan. The plan proposes no action to address the shortfall of open space in Loughborough and this should be done immediately.	Assess open space shortfall by ward using the Fields in Trust metric of per capita provision. Prioritise wards for open space provision using the above and the Charnwood Open Spaces Strategy. Include in the plan actions as to how the shortfall will be addressed.	Yes	EV9
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Open space needed for the health and wellbeing of residents	Policy EV9 must include a plan of action that will meet the open space provisions of the Open Spaces Strategy	Yes	EV9
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The Council has not made clear under what circumstances LGS applications will be considered. This has the effect of not making it clear that LGS applications are welcomed and is against the spirit of planning positively as required by NPPF 35(a).	In EV9, include the following statement from the previous local plan responding positively to Local Green Space applications, identified through a Neighbourhood Plan or similar robust, community led strategy.	Yes	EV9
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	These continue to ignore the needs of existing residents as towns expand. To tackle properly the issue of shortfalls, approaches far more radical are needed in meeting the open space needs of the community. The financial burden of open spaces is well known, but the Council should embrace new initiatives that engage residents in contributing to the expansion in provision as well as the enhancement of open spaces.	The following policies must be introduced 1. Set up a Citizen's Assembly with the aim of generating a range of creative ideas to satisfy the provision targets and quality of open spaces. 2. The Council must be proactive in facilitating and supporting the operations of the Citizen's Assembly.	Yes	EV9
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The Leconfield Road site is fundamental to the green infrastructure in Nanpantan. residents are working on new rights of way that would provide a wildlife corridor to connect fragmented parts of Charnwood Forest and provide links to other paths	Protect Leconfield Road site.	Yes	EV9
PSLP/254	Steve Beard	Sport England	Policy EV10 is supported. Need to ensure that evidence is robust and up to date applies equally to the Built Sports Facilities Strategy (2018). Sport England advises that without regular review and updates the value of the PP and BSF strategies diminishes after 3 years and may not necessarily meet the needs of para 98/99 of NPPF 2021 and policy EV9.		Not stated	EV10
PSLP/254	Steve Beard	Sport England	The references in the plan to Building for a Healthy Life are supported however, this guidance does not include all of the 10 principles of active Design one such example is, co-location of community facilities. Sport England would support a link and references to Active design as part of a suite of guidance which seeks to ensure that healthy communities and places are created.	References to Active Design called for	Not stated	EV10
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate action Leicester and Leicestershire	Policy should include requirements for segregated cycle paths linking them to local communities.	Policy change called for.	Not stated	EV10
PSLP/627	Loughborough University	Avison Young	Support policy		No	EV10
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	EV10

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	EV10
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy appears sound and proportionate.		Not stated	EV10
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The phased approach for delivering large strategic allocations should be recognised when assessing recreation requirements.	Provide flexibility when assessing development parcels in the context of a large strategic allocation.	Yes	EV10
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	Support the policy but consider the Plan is not justified given the impact of increased car journeys in the context of proposed allocations at Anstey.	Remove/revise Anstey allocations	No	EV11
PSLP/393	Ross Willmott	Mountsorrel Parish Council	Support the policy.		No	EV11
PSLP/533	Vicky Utting	Shepshed Town Councillor	The plan is not justified as sufficient thought on air quality has not been given to planned developments.	Consider air quality issues in Shepshed.	No	EV11
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged; however, the thresholds set in para 8.89 are not justified; not proportionate to the nature and scale of development or the potential impact, as required by the PPG.	Reconsider threshold for considering an air quality assessment.	No	EV11
PSLP/148	D Coles		The policy only looks to maintain current air quality and does not seek to improve current levels.	Policy should seek to improve current levels.	No	EV11
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The policy implies acceptance of a certain level of pollution from development but 'significant impact' needs defining.	Define 'significant impact' in terms of air quality.	Yes	EV11
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy appears sound and proportionate.		Not stated	EV11
PSLP/463	David Hayes		The policy is weak and not justified, air quality monitoring should be increased. Quorn has the largest quarry in Europe, AQM has not been updated to cover the whole parish and further monitoring requests have not been actioned. PM 2.5 is currently not monitored.	Strengthen policy in relation to Quorn, increase AQM and level of monitoring. Increase monitoring to avoid	Not stated	EV11
PSLP/473	S Cuff	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Policy EV11 is not justified as it does not specify a AQMA for PM2.5/Biffa. The environmental permit for Biffa noted that almost all of the 75 receptor sites around Loughborough, the Univeristy and Shepshed exceeded the WHO level of 10ug/m3 PM2.5 pollutants.	CBC has a legal duty to monitor and improve air quality which will be enhanced to maintaining a 10 ug/m3 limit under the Environment Bill. Plan should not state that impact of individual developments is not significant.	Yes	EV11
PSLP/582	Grant Butterworth	Leicester City Council	We would suggest an amendment to policy LP28 'Burial Space' to add additional criteria allowing neighbouring planning authorities and also the private sector where a clear need can be demonstrated.	Amend policy wording. We suggest a new criterion be added policy requiring new proposals for burial space to be viewed positively where it meets a defined cross boundary need especially where the site is close to boundaries of neighbouring authorities. The policy also should be amended to state that both other public bodies and the private sector can promote burial land with the borough.	Yes	EV12
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Burial spaces off opportunity to increase habitat and promote landscape connectivity.	Give early consideration to achieving biodiversity net gain in the design process.	Yes	EV12
PSLP/580	Strategic Property Services	Leicestershire County Council	The policy appears sound and proportionate.		Not stated	EV12
PSLP/731	Diana Webster		The burial space on the plan does not show the buffer zone which was originally part of the council's plans and on which local people commented in choosing the site.		No	EV12
<b>CHAPTER 9 - INFRASTRUCURE &amp; DELIVERY</b>						
PSLP/038	Mrs Anna Coles		New village-style communities need more facilities than just schools to limit car use e.g. GP surgeries, community centre, library, shops, allotments, office/workshop space to rent. Would help cohesive response to climate crisis and adapt ways of living.	Provide more services and facilities with development.	Yes	INF1
PSLP/340	Tony Stott	CPRE	INF1 (along with the accompanying table of transport investment priorities) would fail to deliver the kind of change required if Charnwood is to meet its own and the Government's goals to radically reduce carbon emissions (NPPF Para 152) and so is unsound in relation to National Policy and is an inappropriate strategy given the Climate Emergency.	Add 'while meeting our climate change goals as set out in Policy DS1' to first bullet in policy INF1.	Yes	INF1
PSLP/089	Cllr Myriam Roberts	Shepshed Town Council	Lack of infrastructure not considered in Shepshed. Lack of car parking, sports and recreation, burial space.		No	INF1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/373	Liz Hawkes (Clerk)	Anstey Parish Council	The Plan is not justified due to increased traffic levels in Anstey. Traffic impact should be minimised and off-street parking improved. Support the policy requirement but detailed, comprehensive understanding of impacts and appropriate mitigation is required.	Provide further evidence on traffic impact and mitigation.	No	INF1
PSLP/546	Tamsin Cottle	P&DG obo William Davis and Chapman Estates (HA12)	Policy INF1 is not justified or effective and needs amendment to be more precise an accord with legislation.	First para substitute "our development strategy" with development proposals. 3rd bullet point substitute "the development strategy with " development proposals".	Not stated	INF1
PSLP/582	Grant Butterworth	Leicester City Council	No reference is currently made to the list of infrastructure requirements within Policy INF1. There is also little detail on how this infrastructure will be paid for and the partners required to ensure delivery which needs addressing. More generally, we would expect the plan to identify and acknowledge Leicester City Council as a key delivery partner for infrastructure delivery. This is not properly set out in the plan at the moment, particularly with regard to transport and other cross boundary matters such as schools and open space.	Closer alignment of policy with infrastructure requirements called for. Appendix 3 needs amended to properly reflect properly Leicester City Council as a key delivery partner for the Charnwood local plan. Associated to this policy INF1 needs to amended, to specifically mention the infrastructure list contained within appendix 3.	Yes	INF1
PSLP/687	Colin Wilkinson	Barrow PC	Note: Although the essence of these comments would seem to relate more to IF1 they were specifically made in relation to IF2. Contrary to the NPPF the policies of the Charnwood Local Plan are not underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence, particularly in relation to transport and foul drainage infrastructure. Nor does the Local Plan align the proposals for 703 dwellings with the necessary improvements in community and transport infrastructure. The Parish Council recognises that the infrastructure improvements required to support the proposed development are substantial and costly. But, without improvements in education provision, a community hall, open space, indoor and outdoor sports facilities, highway and public transport improvements, and the public sewerage system, the Local Plan's proposals for 703 dwellings in Barrow upon Soar do not constitute sustainable development. The Parish Council understands that the cost of these necessary infrastructure and community facilities may make the proposed development unviable. If this is the case, then the development strategy of the Local Plan is flawed and unsound.	Policy content is lacking.	Yes	INF1
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	The plan is not justified. The adequacy of provision of primary education within Sileby is questioned. Provision should be made within Sileby and not Cossington. We are not convinced that CBC and Severn Trent Water have worked closely to ensure major capital investment and developments are aligned, particularly in Sileby.	Review location of education provision and amend policy accordingly.	Yes	INF1
PSLP/147	A Hunter		Chapter 9 is not justified / effective as it does not state how issues will be addressed. Wymeswold has limited local services at capacity, broadband issues, flooding issues, sewerage issues. There is no assessment on how proposed housing will impact and address these.		No	INF1
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	INF1
PSLP/547	Tamsin Cottle	P&DG obo William Davis (HA43)	Policy INF1 is not justified or effective and needs amendment to be more precise an accord with legislation.	First para substitute "our development strategy" with development proposals. 3rd bullet point substitute "the development strategy with "development proposals".	Not stated	INF1
PSLP/535	Juan Murray	TEP obo Leics County Council	Consideration should be given to the provision of a school in Quorn including a SEND School.	New allocation called for.	Not stated	INF1
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The county highway authority considers the policy as currently drafted is too generic and does not embed a coordinated, strategy led approach required to support/enable further growth. Library and waste provision to mitigate development is not included. The requirement for significant education provision is identified but the ability to introduce viability issues to reduce contributions the required provision may not be delivered, and its delivery will fall to LCC. Contributions to promote healthy lifestyles are not mentioned. Broadband provision is extremely important, both socially and economically, and this section of the Plan should be revised and expanded to provide further support.	Revise the policy and supporting text to give a more coordinated, strategy-led approach to enable growth. It should deliver infrastructure and address highways and transport challenges, including cumulative impacts. Expand policy to include library and waste provision. Protect LCC by ensuring the whole plan is properly viability tested at a strategic level to ensure all required infrastructure for development is delivered. Link activity to health, policies EV/9 and EV/10, and use HIA to make facilities available for those suffering most inequality. Revised broadband text supplied (para 9.12).	Yes	INF1

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/580	Education	Leicestershire County Council	Good progress has been made in identifying sites for new primary schools and school expansion. LCC is encouraged that the Plan recognises the importance of education and its relationship with communities, social development and the economy. However, conversations are required regarding additional land at Woodbrook Vale Academy and for SEND provision across the Borough. Early Years provision will be required.	Undertake further discussions on education provision.	Yes	INF1
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The policy should ensure that infrastructure requirements have regard to committed developments. Schemes close to approved SUEs should not take up short term capacity increasing burden on SUEs.	Ensure committed development is considered.	Yes	INF1
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	The policy is not effective as it implies that it suggests that highway improvements can only be secured through Section 278 Agreements. They can be secured through conditions or Section 106 Agreements.	That the second bullet point of Policy INF1 be amended as follows: contributes to the reasonable costs of on site, and where appropriate off site, infrastructure needed to mitigate the impacts of the development through the use of <u>planning conditions</u> , Section 106 Legal Agreements, or <del>in the case of highways</del> , Section 278 Legal Agreements; and	Yes	INF1
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	The policy wording for the site in relation to the extension to Cossington primary school should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57 and HA58 as well as HA59). On that basis the Infrastructure Delivery Plan should also include a land value alongside the sum identified for build costs.	Include land value as well as build costs in Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Not stated	INF1
PSLP/558	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates and Bowler Family	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school to serve south Loughborough should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24 and HA29 as well as HA15). On that basis the Infrastructure Delivery Plan should include a breakdown of the costs for primary and secondary education requirements that includes a land value as well as build costs for the new primary school.	Include land value and build costs for the new primary school as separate items in Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Not stated	INF1
PSLP/631	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school in Barrow should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA45, HA46, HA47 and HA48 as well as HA49). On that basis the Infrastructure Delivery Plan should also include a land value alongside the sum identified for build costs.	Include land value as well as build costs in Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Not stated	INF1
PSLP/633	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land, St Philips, William Davis and Swithland Homes	The policy wording for the site in relation to the provision of a new primary school in Barrow should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites (HA45, HA46, HA47 and HA48 as well as HA49). On that basis the Infrastructure Delivery Plan should also include a land value alongside the sum identified for build costs.	Include land value as well as build costs in Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Not stated	INF1
PSLP/463	David Hayes		The consultation process is flawed, the local plan has not been made easily available to view and it is difficult to book an appointment, resulting in a lack of transparency. The commitment to receive £200 million from planned development through the S106 process will not be achieved given past achievements and a breakdown of how this will be achieved is required.		Not stated	INF1
PSLP/572	Daniel Hibbard	We Are Define obo Bloor Homes (Laburnum Way)	Recognises intention of policy and importance that developer contributions will have in securing necessary infrastructure. Recognises infrastructure schedule for Loughborough. Would welcome more clarity in relation to contributions required as part of the delivery of HA16 for the provision of a new 2FE primary school in allocation site HA15.	None	Yes	INF1
PSLP/103	Paul Goodman	Loughborough Green Party	The plan is not justified because more housing will cause more congestion and worsen air quality.		Not stated	INF2
PSLP/340	Tony Stott	CPRE	INFF2 (along with the accompanying table of transport investment priorities) fails to deliver the kind of change in modal behaviour which is required if Charnwood is to meet its own and the Government's goals to radically reduce carbon emissions (NPPF Para 152) and so is unsound in relation to National Policy and is an inappropriate strategy given the Climate Emergency	Add new bullet to INF2 - can show that any improvements to the local and strategic road network are consistent with the aims of DS1 to minimise travel and reduce carbon emissions	Yes	INF2
PSLP/089	Cllr Myriam Roberts	Shepshed Town Council	Lack of infrastructure in Shepshed not considered. Roads need improving for increased traffic.		No	INF2
PSLP/582	Grant Butterworth	Leicester City Council	Policy is currently too generic and does not give a sense of the underlying extent of work still required in transportation terms to ensure the Plan is deliverable. Policy needs to set out a strategic approach to transportation assessment and mitigation which is agreed with the key partners. This must commit to an evidence-based approach to problem assessment, identification of appropriate mitigation measures and a robust methodology to determine relevant and proportionate developer contributions.	Policy approach commented upon. The Policy needs to set out a strategic approach to transportation assessment and mitigation which is agreed with the key partners. This must commit to an evidence-based approach to problem assessment, identification of appropriate mitigation measures and a robust methodology to determine relevant and proportionate developer contributions.	Yes	INF2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/687	Colin Wilkinson	Barrow PC	Without improvements in education provision, a community hall, open space, indoor and outdoor sports facilities, highway and public transport improvements, and the public sewerage system, the Local Plan's proposals for 703 dwellings in Barrow upon Soar do not constitute sustainable development.	Policy INF2 should clarify its intended objective about the efficiency of the local and strategic highway network includes the AM and PM peak hours.	Yes	INF2
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sileby Parish Council	The plan is not justified as the development strategy will place more pressure on the network and especially in Sileby where numerous junctions are already above capacity (King Street/ Barrow Road/ Mountsorrel Lane/ High Street and Brook Street/ High Street and Swan Street/ Radcliffe Road/ High Gate Road). It is not clear how increased pressure arising from individual development proposals will be mitigated on these junctions. If HA53 – HA58 remain in the plan then each allocation should explicitly cross-reference the need to satisfy Policies INF1 & INF2.	Cross reference INF1/ INF2 with housing allocation policies.	Yes	INF2
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Carter Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	The policy is supported.		Yes	INF2
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The transport evidence to date is welcomed and highlights challenges on the local transport system and Strategic Road Network in accommodating growth, not least cumulative impacts. A coordinated, strategy-led approach is required to address the challenges and secure funding for transport measures to support/enable growth. Whilst new development cannot fund existing infrastructure shortfalls, the evidence shows existing problems on the local and strategic road network will be a barrier to delivering growth unless a route to alternate funding can be agreed. On that basis, it is important the Plan embeds a coordinated, strategy-led approach, through a core narrative and robust policies linking growth to strategy development and delivery. The Infrastructure Schedule is derived from evidence and gives a platform moving forward but the transport measures are not coordinated in a strategic way. It is noted that the transport schemes total several hundreds of million and include Strategic Transport Projects. Discussions are on-going to agree a continuing work programme to develop a strategy led, coordinated approach to deliver a package of highway and transport measures. The outcomes should be available by EIP and may require discussions about changes to the Plan's text and policies to reflect an evolving situation and give a strong platform to seek investment. The policy as currently drafted is too generic and does not embed a coordinated, strategy led approach required to support/enable further growth. Support for sustainable travel, including public transport, broadly meets requirements.	Revise the policy and supporting text to give a more coordinated, strategy-led approach to enable growth. It should deliver infrastructure and address highways and transport challenges, including cumulative impacts. The term 'public transport' should be replaced with 'passenger transport' throughout the plan.	Yes	INF2
PSLP/587	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates	The plan is not clear regarding how cumulative highway impacts should be considered and is potentially broader in scope than the approach set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 42-014-20140306).	Text could be introduced in paragraph 9.18 to reinforce the need for positive engagement by the local highway authority and pragmatism in decision making which enables assessments which have reasonably assessed cumulative impacts in accordance with the PPG at the time of submission to progress without the need for transport assessments to be re-cast multiple times as an application progresses.	Not stated	INF2
PSLP/616	Eri Wong	National Highways	Welcome the policy, additional transport evidence will be required to justify developer contributions, particularly where cumulative impacts are anticipated. Acknowledge the package of costed schemes. Require further evidence to be satisfied of the most suitable package including ensuring that highway mitigation options are at the correct locations; are treating the causes of congestion, rather than secondary impacts; have been tested at the correct scale; and are feasible and provide value for money. Committed to supporting CBC, in collaboration with LCC, to deliver the necessary highway mitigation.		Yes	INF2
PSLP/412	Paul Mizen		The plan is not justified because Snells Nook Lane and Epinall Way will not be able to cope with the extra traffic from Garendon Park.		Not stated	INF2
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The policy should ensure that infrastructure requirements have regard to committed developments. Schemes close to approved SUEs should not take up short term capacity increasing burden on SUEs.	Ensure committed development is considered.	Yes	INF2
PSLP/331	Councillor David Snartt	Borough Councillor for Forest and Bradgate Ward	The transport evidence is not sufficient to justify mitigation measures proposed, particularly with regard to sites around Anstey and HA15 in Loughborough.		Not stated	INF2
PSLP/651	T Birkinshaw		Policy INF2 should encourage developer enhancements to passenger railway services, for example new and improved stations which would alleviate pressure on the road network	See comment	No	INF2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/473	S Cuff	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The plan is not justified as the Transport Assessment evidence and previous planning decision P/19/0524/2 note that Nanpantan Crossroads operate at over capacity which cannot be mitigated, yet paragraph 9.18 of the plan states this will be resolved through a planning application.	The local plan should state that development impacting Nanpantan Crossroads should not be allowed. Paragraph 9.18 should recognise that where mitigation is not possible, developments that would add to overcapacity should be refused	Yes	INF2
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The County Highway Authority have worked closely with CBC to support and enable growth in the Borough and recognise the need to continue to deliver growth in a planned manner. There is significant existing pressure on the transport system with challenges in accommodating further growth and issues from cumulative impacts in Charnwood and adjoining areas which require a structured, coordinated and strategy led approach. LCC continue to build upon supporting evidence with a work programme to secure investment in highway and transport measures to deliver further growth	Discussions during the Examination may be necessary following the outcomes of the continuing work for possible changes to the Plan's narrative and policies to secure the required investment. This would provide the basis to address cumulative impacts of growth and provide a basis to address those challenges.	Yes	INF2
PSLP/616	Eri Wong	Highways England	The response has regard to DfT's Circular 02/2013, the NPPF and other relevant policies. NH have engaged proactively with CBC and LCC on the Local Plan. The impacts of allocations on the M1 and A46 which are already congested are noted. Impacts will be subject to cumulative effects from wider growth in neighbouring authorities. The extensive engagement in the plan-making process is welcomed and meetings attended, and documents reviewed are identified. Transport modelling has utilised the Pan Regional Transport Model which is an appropriate model for the transport evidence base. The baseline scenario shows many junctions on the SRN at or approaching capacity by 2037 resulting in reassignment of traffic to secondary routes. Assessment has shown that route preference is for the SRN if capacity is available with implications for the mitigation strategy. Transport evidence shows Local Plan developments will result in an increase in traffic on the M1 and on the A46 interpeak. There is little change on the A46 at peak periods as it will already be heavily congested, rather than a lack of demand. Development at Shepshed, on the opposite side of the M1 to Loughborough will add pressure to M1J23, though employment development at Shepshed could reduce out-commuting. Development at Anstey result in delays on the A46 in the PM peak. Development at Syston mainly affect the Local Road Network but may affect how trips access the A46. Development in Birstall and North Leicester impact on the A46/A6 junction. Mitigation work identifies junctions with a significant deterioration in performance. Whilst a common approach it does not account for impacts arising from Baseline congestion. Developments then result in secondary impacts on routes with capacity rather than where demand really lies. Any assessment of mitigation should include all congested links and junctions as the most effective mitigation may be at locations not showing an increase in congestion from Local Plan development as they are at capacity already. Five SRN schemes are included in the mitigation scenario, two are in the Road Investment Strategy (RIS3) pipeline but as yet do not have committed funding for delivery. The remaining 3 schemes require further exploration of feasibility and value for money. Identify issues in the transport assessment to be addressed including ensuring that highway mitigation options are at the correct locations; are treating the causes of congestion, rather than secondary impacts; have been tested at the correct scale; and are feasible and provide value for money. Note that even with SRN schemes only about half of the impact of Local Plan developments is mitigated, removing these the benefits of the package are even lower. Further work is commissioned to address the above issues which is welcomed, and further engagement and collaboration is invited.		Yes	INF2
<b>APPENDICES</b>						
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	No comment		Yes	App1
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	The third Policy LUA2 indicator sets a target of 3 primary schools, a target of 2 schools would be appropriate given expected delivery rates.	Reduce primary school target.	Yes	App1
PSLP/624	Ellen Pearce	Inspired Villages	The provision of housing for older people should be included in the monitoring process when preparing the Annual Monitoring Report (NPPG Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 63-007-20190626).	Include target for the provision of housing for older people.	No	App1
PSLP/366	Stephen Harris	Emery Planning obo Hollins Strategic Land LLP	Housing allocation DS3(HA65) is suitable, available and deliverable and can come forward earlier to be delivered in the first five years to assist 5-year supply.	Amend trajectory	Yes	App2
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The trajectory may be considered overly favourable in the early years for the three SUE's.		Yes	App2

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/566	Owen Jones	LRM Planning Limited on behalf of William Davis Homes and Parker Strategic Land	It is entirely possible that the peak output of 90dpa is achieved in 2027/28 through to 2029/2030 rather than falling to the extent suggested in the trajectory. This would see the Site being completed sooner in the plan period.		Yes	App2
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	The plan is not consistent with national policy as the trajectory is not supported by sufficient information to enable the Council's assumptions to be tested and to demonstrate that sites are deliverable. The plan is not effective as in the five year housing land supply statement provided a supply of 5.37 years is shown in 2021 reducing to 4.88 in 2029 (see page 223).		Yes	App2
PSLP/565	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis (Shepshed)	The allocation is expected to start delivering homes in 2024/25 as set out in the trajectory. The trajectory is reasonable but recent local experience suggests that a higher delivery rate could be achieved.		Yes	App2
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	Traffic modelling shows that the proposed development in this Plan will overload the road network. The breakdown of the Transport element of the infrastructure sought shows this is directed at a long list of projects very heavily weighted towards increasing the capacity of the road network to facilitate car use. Many of the highway schemes seem of dubious benefit and uncertain delivery and the traffic modelling still shows unresolved problems. We feel this approach is completely at odds with the Local Plan's aim to achieve a modal shift from cars, NPPF Chapter 9 (in particular para 105), and the Department of Transport's Decarbonisation Plan which has an aim of achieving 50% of journeys in towns and cities by 2030. We think this makes the Plan unsound, since what is needed is active car demand management.	Changes to policy on transport schemes proposed.	Not stated	App3
PSLP/687	Colin Wilkinson	Barrow PC	Contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, the policies of the Charnwood Local Plan 2021-37 are not underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence, particularly in relation to community, transport and foul drainage infrastructure. Nor does the Local Plan align the proposals for 703 dwellings with the necessary improvements in community and transport infrastructure.	Without improvements in education provision, a community hall, open space, indoor and outdoor sports facilities, highway and public transport improvements, and the public sewerage system, the Local Plan's proposals for 703 dwellings in Barrow upon Soar do not constitute sustainable development.	Yes	App3
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton	The Infrastructure Schedule is acknowledged and supported.		Yes	App3
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Delivery of infrastructure by S106 risks that the necessary funding might not come forward. Some highways work will be delivered by S106, others direct by the developer, it is important these schemes happen to facilitate growth. A work programme on transport is continuing and the results are likely to see the transport components simplified/broadly worded to relate to cumulative, area-based transport strategies and mitigation packages rather than listing specific measures tested through Local Plan modelling. Some locations do not include a transport line which creates a misleading impression cumulative transport mitigation is not required to accommodate growth.	Assess strategic viability of the plan to ensure cost associated with delivery of development and infrastructure is future proofed and delivered as envisaged. Review highways/transport elements of the Schedule. Include reference to cumulative transport mitigation in all locations. Suggested rewording for civic amenity elements ' <u>Site reconfiguration and development of waste infrastructure to increase the capacity at . . .</u> ' Details provided.	Yes	App3
PSLP/616	Eri Wong	National Highways	Reviewed the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Several Strategic Transport Projects are identified with funding to be confirmed and are unable to presently provide any assurance for these. Collaborative working to secure developer contributions is invited. Welcome preparation of further transport evidence and understanding of infrastructure and sustainable transport measures. A National Highways study of the A46 Hobby Horse Roundabout to Birstall A6 interchange is underway.		Yes	App3
PSLP/475	Sam Armstead		Transport - The plan is not justified as the transport package for Barrow upon Soar, item BA5, is totally insufficient with additional cars and multiple journeys from resulting development. There are no improvements to Grove Lane/South St and Cotes Rd/High St which are already a major problem, despite the additional builds. The package offers significant cycle route improvements, how can £1.3 million be spent on cycle routes and only £50k to mitigate car journeys.	The spend for roads is significantly below what is required and needs a substantial increase with better planning for traffic through the village. Spend on cycle lanes must be an error and needs checking. Ensure road and cycle improvements are linked. Moving car journeys to cycles will not work for the majority.	Yes	App3
PSLP/475	Sam Armstead		Water and sewerage - Severn Trent have advised the system is almost at peak capacity. There are numerous leaks and a regular smell of sewage. Waiting is not justified or effective and will lead to issues for the local population and environment.	Upgrade sewerage system prior to new builds being added.	No	App3
PSLP/574	Nick Thompson	Lichfields obo CEG	Some estimates of infrastructure costs for NEoL SUE have been taken directly from the S106 which makes no allowance for indexation. The source of other costs is unclear. No costs are provided for open space and recreation facilities.	Provide additional evidence and information to support the infrastructure schedule.	Yes	App3

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	The approach is supported, particularly in light of increased emphasis on good design. Walking and Cycling Routes section could give further guidance and clarity on developer-led infrastructure. Wording regarding waste and bin storage does not require sufficient space for current proposals for consistency in waste collection.	Add bullet to Walking and Cycling Routes ' <b>new facilities should be developed in accordance with the Government's current cycle design guidance LTN 1/20'</b> Wording on Waste and Bin Storage should be revised to take account of current proposals and accessibility requirements.	Yes	App4
<b>POLICIES MAP</b>						
PSLP/546	Tamsin Cottle	P&DG obo William Davis / Chapman Estates	The site boundaries of HA43 are not positively prepared, effective having regard to ecological and landscape constraints described in housing topic paper and appendix H of the sustainability appraisal report., and also to the potential to enable expansion of primary school on the site. The single allocation of HA43 under dual ownership is not effective as it has potential to inhibit delivery.	Site allocation HA43 should be split to cover different sites ownerships	No	Policies Map
PSLP/263	Richard Mapletoft	Rushcliffe Borough Council	Rushcliffe Borough Council is concerned that the policy doesn't fully reflect the National Planning Policy Framework's requirement for adequate assessment of the cumulative impact of the technologies on the landscape and visual impacts. This is of concern given the large areas of land identified on Policies Map 2 and the vicinity of the southern part of our administrative area. The labelling of the features on Policies Map 2 may also benefit from amendments as currently presented it suggests that the areas shown are suitable, regardless of any other consideration (heritage, noise etc. which are referred to in the first part of the policy). To reflect the policy it may be considered more appropriate to rename the two areas as "potentially suitable wind energy locations" and "potentially suitable solar energy locations".	Changes to Policy CC3 and concomitant changes to the policy map proposed. Rushcliffe proposes: Changes to Policies Map 2 - to reflect policy CC3 it may be considered more appropriate to rename the two areas as "potentially suitable wind energy locations" and "potentially suitable solar energy locations". Inclusion of a separate map showing the landscape sensitivity areas referred to in these tables may aid interpretation of the policy (this could perhaps be included in an appendix)	No	Policies Map
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	The eastern site boundary of site HA59 is not justified in landscape terms and there is no reason to exclude the land between this boundary and the railway line in the allocation. This would provide the opportunity for a more cohesive development of the land holding and a more defensible boundary.	Amend the Policies Map to include the land between the proposed eastern boundary of the site and the railway line.	Not stated	Policies Map
PSLP/554	Andrew Taylor	Thomas Taylor Planning obo Mr Scottorn	The settlement limits to development at Sowters Lane, Burton on the Wolds are not justified and do not meet the methodology in the evidence base.	Amend to include industrial buildings on Sowters Lane, Burton on the Wolds which form part of the settlement form. Details provided.	Yes	Policies Map
PSLP/560	Nigel Reeves	Nigel Reeves Planning obo Andrew Askey	The Limits to Development for Thrussington are not justified as they do not carry forward amendments proposed in the Settlements Limits to Development Assessment 2018.	Amend to Settlements Limits to Development Assessment and include land between Brook Barn and 18 Seagrave Road	No	Policies Map
PSLP/562	Beth Evans	DLP obo Gloeбал (Oakley Road)	To be consistent with other allocations in the vicinity the boundary of allocation HA33 on the Policies Map should be taken to the Black Brook.	Amend boundary of allocation HA33 to the Black Brook.	Yes	Policies Map
PSLP/563	Beth Evans	DLP obo Gloeбал (Hallamford Road)	To be consistent with other allocations in the vicinity the boundary of allocation HA35 on the Policies Map should be taken to the Black Brook.	Amend boundary of allocation HA35 to the Black Brook.	Yes	Policies Map
PSLP/568	Lynsey Reid	Burges Salmon obo Mr and Mrs Proctor	The Limits to Development for Queniborough are not justified as they are overly restrictive and inhibit opportunities for sustainable development.	Redraw the limits to development for Queniborough to include the Old Hall. Details supplied.	Yes	Policies Map
PSLP/535	Juan Murray	TEP obo Leics County Council	The boundary should be linear in its form and include strong defensible barriers. We would request that the Charnwood Local Plan aligns with a similar settlement to the one shown in the Quorn Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Draft utilising the A6 to the north of the village as the settlement boundary. Land off Farley Way lies naturally within the settlement of Quorn, with adjacent built development and the A6 to the north forming a defensible boundary.	Check boundaries	Not stated	Policies Map
PSLP/053	Mr Gary C. Jackson		Policy map 1 is not justified as it fails to protect land between Cropston and Anstey, leading to Bradgate Park and Cropston Reservoir from development and protect the countryside.	Land between Anstey and Cropston extending to Bradgate Park and Cropston Reservoir should be classified as a green wedge.	No	Policies Map
PSLP/463	David Hayes		Policies Map 1 does not show all the potential development opportunities identified in Appendix H of the Sustainability Appraisal which is a deliberate attempt of creating confusion for local people. Areas of Local Separation (Policy EV/3) are also shown as development	Amend plan accordingly.	Not stated	Policies Map
PSLP/475	Sam Armstead		The map is not justified as it shows no Green Wedges or Areas of Separation around Barrow upon Soar to protect green space from future development. Quorn has areas of separation which removes land just as suitable for development from the plan.	Add Green Wedges to locations around the village to show development has limits. Incorporate land at Quorn into the plan to share development across the Soar valley.	No	Policies Map

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/594	Andrew Thomas	Thomas Taylor Planning obo Mr W Murdoch	Site HA47 - Changes should be made to the Policies Map in the Pre-Submission Local Plan 1 as follows: 1. In the first instance, as a minimum, Policies Map 1 should be corrected to identify the SLtD boundary based upon that described and illustrated in the Evidence Base documents "Settlement Limits to Development Assessment Maps - 2018" and "Settlement Limits to Development Assessment - 2018". The SLtD boundary should be amended/enlarged to include the garden, curtilage and outbuildings clearly associated with 84 Melton Road as well as the proposed Housing Allocation Site DS3(HA47) which would be consistent with the overall thrust of the Methodology and Principles used to define the SLtD. The SLtD boundary should also be enlarged to include the land and buildings at "Seagrave Nursery" to the east of DS3(HA47) used for a mix of horticultural and retail sales in accordance with planning permission P/07/1369/2	Changes to site boundary proposed.	Yes	Policies Map
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	The Policies Map should be up to date at the time of adoption.	Include the development permitted in Burton on the Wolds by P/20/2322/2 within the settlement's limits	No	Policies Map
PSLP/443	S Millar		The plan/ policy map is not positively prepared as at paragraph 3.80 ecological networks are recognised to the south-west of Loughborough but DEFRA/ Natural England ecological network maps are not shown on the policy map	Show habitat network maps in the Policy Map to identify Nature Recovery Networks	No	Policies Map
PSLP/620	Tarmac		The policy map is not consistent with national policy as it should show areas of mineral safeguarding in accordance with PPG Minerals reference 005 (ID 27-005-20140306). The operation of Mountsorrel quarry is of national importance	Include mineral safeguarding within policy map	No	Policies Map
PSLP/620	Tarmac		Policy Map 2 is not justified as the Mountsorrel mineral conveyor route and adjacent land (see plan in representation) is not suitable for wind energy and conflicts with Policy M12 of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Plan.	Remove Mountsorrel mineral conveyor route and adjacent land from Policy Map 2	No	Policies Map
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The plan/ policy map is not positively prepared as at paragraph 3.80 ecological networks are recognised to the south-west of Loughborough but DEFRA/ Natural England ecological network maps are not shown on the policy map	Show these areas as protected on the Policies Map	Yes	Policies Map
<b>GLOSSARY</b>						
PSLP/344	Natalie Atkinson	Tetlow King obo William Davis Homes	The Plan is not consistent with national policy as the affordable housing definition in the glossary does not match the 2021 NPPF definition.	Update the definition	Yes	Glossary
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	2015 is given as the date by which water bodies should achieve good qualitative and quantitative status. The date for achieving this is 2027.	Change date from 2015 to 2027.	Not stated	Glossary
<b>MISCELLANEOUS</b>						
PSLP/023	Dee Narga		National policy of reducing emissions is not cascaded down locally. Charnwood is not a smokeless zone and does not appear to be considering becoming one despite heavy approach to conservation.	Make the Borough smokeless. Encourage use of electricity not dark smoke fuels.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	We suggest that the sequential approach to logistics should prioritise sites near to train freight lines and likely future train freight lines. It should also require logistics companies to support, contribute to and use such train freighting equipment.	Comment relates to section on warehousing and logistics.	Not stated	Misc
PSLP/176	Zina Zelter	Climate Action Leicester and Leicestershire	The absence of proper carbon auditing makes this Local Plan inadequate as it stands. We do not believe this plan should go to public examination until it has been adjusted to contain more strongly worded policy around sustainable transport and climate change, and more support for wind and solar, as well as proper carbon auditing. As it stands, we do not believe it meets the requirements of either The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (section 19) or the NPPF (Paragraph 148) which require Local Plans to carbon audited, and to achieve radical carbon emission reductions in line with the Climate Change Act, and reaching zero by 2050.	Policy changes called for.	Not stated	Misc
PSLP/162	Mr Geoffrey Prince	Geoffrey Prince Associates Ltd obo Cawrey Ltd	Review housing site allocations to consider 2020 SHELAA site PSH2 Land at Gorse Hill, Anstey. The site is on the edge of Leicester Urban Area and is suitable, available and achievable. It has been removed from the green wedge and compares favourably with DS3: Housing Allocations.	The Plan does not address Leicester's unmet need, PSH2 Land at Gorse Hill should be allocated.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/003	Emma Brook	Nottinghamshire County Council	No comments		No	Misc
PSLP/009	Deb Roberts	The Coal Authority	No comments		No	Misc
PSLP/085	Mr Namrit Ashok		The plan does not meet the duty to cooperate, is not legally compliant and is not sound for the following reasons. Local Green Space Assessment, Site A (Leconfield Road) conclusion is not sound or justified. It is illogical to assess Local Green Space designation with consideration of planning applications, as applications are determined in accordance with the Local Plan, not the other way round. Several questions raised related to the relationship between the development management and plan making processes.	Remove Local Green Space Assessment criterion that designation will consider planning applications. Designate Site A (Leconfield Road) as a Local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/299	Ian Dickenson	Canal & River Trust	We have no comments to make on the plan.		No	Misc
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	We particularly welcome the Policy wording for those Allocation sites which require a Sustainability Assessment to be submitted that identifies the developments response to carbon emissions reduction and climate change resilience (LUA2, LUA3, LUC2 and LUC3). We would strongly encourage your Authority to go further and make this a requirement of all developments within the borough.	Policy wording proposed for all site housing site allocations	Not stated	Misc
PSLP/591	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	We strongly advise that the wording of Para 8.9 and Para 8.10 is amended to include "Blue Infrastructure".	Wording of supporting text proposed.	Not stated	Misc
PSLP/515	Andrew Thomas	Sibley Parish Council	Infrastructure Schedule should be re-worded to secure the same objectives so far as any proposed housing allocations in Sibley are concerned.	Amend IS to cross reference Sibley.	Yes	Misc

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/083	T Johnson		Plan is not consistent with NPPF as Para 99 has been applied too stringently when assessing proposed Local Green Spaces. Case law [Lochailort Investments Ltd, R (On the Application Of) v Mendip District Council] finds that the 'enduring' test is not an assessment of permanence. As Leconfield Road is not being allocated for housing, it is therefore enduring during the plan period as the plan will have a FYLS upon adoption.	Designate the Leconfield Road site as Local Green Space	No	Misc
PSLP/091	J Shaw		Plan is not consistent with NPPF as Para 99 has been applied too stringently when assessing proposed Local Green Spaces. Taking into account the current planning application on Leaconfield Road is not a valid as the outcome of the application is not known.	Designate the Leconfield Road site as Local Green Space	No	Misc
PSLP/108	G Tweedie		Plan is not positively prepared or effective as there is no joint coordination between the level of development proposed to the borders of Leicester City, Charnwood or Harborough. Over development in villages such as Scruptoft result in unsafe countryside roads and loss of village life.	Develop on brownfield sites instead	No	Misc
PSLP/131	B Boocock		Land at the top of Leconfield Road should be left alone to rewild, enabling wildlife, recreational and climate change benefits. Scientific evidence that land adjacent to ancient woodland rewilds in 60 years.	Leave the land at the top of Leconfield Road to rewild	No	Misc
PSLP/374	R West		The Council has failed to consult properly on the plan because the timing of the zoom consultation was inconvenient. The CBC website is unsatisfactory it is difficult to navigate and understand and is not user-friendly. It is totally unsatisfactory there is only one hard copy to view.		Not stated	Misc
PSLP/151	J Clarke		The Local Green Space (LGS) Assessment unfairly represents the local community's position on Leconfield Road (p5-6). Incorrect to state LGS designation is sought as a result of development pressure, rather the Council did not protect the site through the Core Strategy; the area has been used as open space for 50 years; there is a shortage of open space in Nanpantan, the site is important for wildlife, beauty and tranquillity.	Amend the Local Green Space Assessment to include a fuller bullet pointed list of the community's reasons for designation.	No	Misc
PSLP/536	Camilla Burgess	Cartar Jonas obo Taylor Wimpey and Merton College, Oxford	Sustainability Appraisal - A critique of the SA is made in relation to site D3(HA1) and an assessment is made. The allocation is smaller than the site considered by the SA and performs considerably better.	Note revised SA.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/163	P Cottesmore		The Local Green Space (LGS) Assessment is not justified as its assessment of Leconfield Road does not address whether the site is capable of being 'enduring' if the planning application is refused.	Designate Leconfield Road as Local Green Space. Remove the 'sustainability assessment' on page 2 of the LGS Assessment.	No	Misc
PSLP/168	M Rudczenko		The plan is not positively prepared as consultation methods have not been diverse enough and the site diagrams, including the two for Anstey, are vague.	Provide more diverse consultation methods to make local people aware of the plan	Yes	Misc
PSLP/181	A McDonald		The Local Green Space (LGS) Assessment is not justified as its assessment of Leconfield Road does not address whether the site is capable of being 'enduring' if the planning application is refused.	Designate Leconfield Road as Local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/545	Andrew Collis	Gladman	Sustainability Appraisal - Ensure that results of the SA process justify policy choices and it is clear why options have been progressed and others rejected.	Ensure the SA provides a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/523	K Smith		The plan is not justified. The LGS assessment does not address whether the site is 'capable of enduring'. Para 99 of the NPPF (2018) requires the assessment of a site's 'capability of enduring'. Capability has not been assessed, just a particular circumstance under which it is not capable (i.e. if the site gets planning permission). This is an invalid argument.	Allocate Leconfield Road as a Local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/525	Mr & Mrs Walsh		The plan is not justified. The LGS assessment does not address whether the site is 'capable of enduring'. Para 99 of the NPPF (2018) requires the assessment of a site's 'capability of enduring'. Capability has not been assessed, just a particular circumstance under which it is not capable (i.e. if the site gets planning permission). This is an invalid argument.	Allocate Leconfield Road as a Local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/191	I Kent		Decision not to designate Leconfield Road in the Local Green Space Assessment is not justified as the 'Fields in Trust Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play' have not been used. Also the area has a shortfall of open space provision of 5.6ha.	Amend the Local Green Space Assessment and the Local Plan to designate Leconfield Road as Local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/555	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Clarendon Land	The evaluation of site HA59 (Land to rear of Derry's Garden Centre, PSH260) as part of the Sustainability Assessment report is incorrect in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The climate change mitigation assessment should be a minor negative rather than a major negative as only a small part of the site is suitable for wind energy generation.</li> <li>•The minerals safeguarding assessment records a loss of 10ha of safeguarded land but the site is smaller than 10ha.</li> <li>•The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment that has been prepared suggests that the impact will be less than that described in the assessment.</li> </ul>		Not stated	Misc
PSLP/123	Carole West		The consultation has not been undertaken effectively and excludes the residents who it will effect. We only found out about meetings on the days they were being held and the consultation was undertaken during the busy summer holiday periods. There was no hard copy available at the parish council offices.		Not stated	Misc

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/558	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates and Bowler Family	The evaluation of site HA15 (Land south of Loughborough, PSH255) as part of the Sustainability Assessment report is incorrect in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The climate change mitigation assessment should not be a major negative as none of the site is identified as suitable for wind energy generation.</li> <li>•The minerals safeguarding assessment should not be a major negative to take account of the proximity of the site to the built up area.</li> <li>•There is a contradiction between the heritage assessment in appendix H (potential negative effect) and in paragraph 7.9.12 of the main report (neutral effect).</li> </ul>		Not stated	Misc
PSLP/236	A Groom		The plan is not justified as it does not plan for public toilet; park rangers or a visitor centre for Watermead Country Park North.	Plan for toilets, one more full time park ranger and a visitor centre	No	Misc
PSLP/577	Cara Chambers	Penland Estates Ltd, RV Millington Ltd, Sarah Higgins and Gavin Higgins	The evaluation of site PSH40 (Land at Ashby Road, Markfield) as part of the Sustainability Assessment report is incorrect in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The climate change mitigation assessment should not be a significant negative effect as none of the site is identified as suitable for wind energy generation.</li> <li>•The access to leisure facilities assessment should not be a significant negative effect as additional facilities have been identified.</li> <li>•There is an inconsistency in the description of the distance of the site to a primary school between the SA report and the site selection topic paper.</li> <li>•There is an inconsistency between the description of the impact on biodiversity between the SA report and the site selection topic paper. The ecological appraisal accompanying a planning application for the site shows how biodiversity gain can be achieved.</li> </ul>	The site at Ashby Road Markfield (PSH40) should be allocated under Policy DS3.	Not stated	Misc
PSLP/237	C Chambers		The plan is not justified, the evidence states there is a 5ha shortfall of green space in Nanpantan ward. A further 0.43ha has been lost at Kirkstone Park.		No	Misc
PSLP/239	C R Holdsworth		The plan is not justified. Nanpantan has a shortfall of 5.6ha of green space and this has not been identified through the local plan. The existence of a planning application cannot stop the designation of a LGS, this is an invalid argument.	Designate Leconfield Road as Local Green Space	No	Misc
PSLP/242	J Ferguson		The plan is not consistent with national policy because the council's assessment of Leconfield Road is not in accordance with para 100 of the NPPF. There is in fact evidence of local significance with respect to tranquillity.	Designate Leconfield Road as Local Green Space	No	Misc
PSLP/587	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Richborough Estates	The evaluation of site HA40 (Land to the west of the B591/Ingleberry Rd & north of Iveshead Lane, PSH405) as part of the Sustainability Assessment report is incorrect in the following way: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The climate change mitigation assessment should not be a significant negative effect as none of the site is identified as suitable for wind energy generation.</li> </ul>		Not stated	Misc
PSLP/226	Barry Sandilands		Various comments questioning the accuracy of the statements in Appendix H Sustainability Report with respect to H67 and H68.	Respondent disagrees with SA	Not stated	Misc
PSLP/262	Richard Heath		The plan is not justified because a potential planning permission cannot be used as a reason for why somewhere cannot be designated as local green space.	Designate Leconfield Road as Local Green Space	No	Misc
PSLP/271	B Ghorat		It is not clear under which circumstance Leconfield Road would be capable of 'enduring'. Does this mean it would be capable if the planning application were refused?	Designate Leconfield Road as Local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/580	Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council	Useful to have a list of external evidence supporting the document. For ease of reading, it would be better if diagrams and maps had figure numbers and referenced in text. Reference tables by number in text.	Add list of references to end of document. Add reference numbers to maps and diagrams. Reference in text along with tables by number.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/280	I Kent		The plan is not justified because Leconfield Road does not have planning permission which means it is 'capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period' and should be designated as local green space. NWRA conducted a survey which proved that the local significance of tranquillity has been demonstrated.	Designate Leconfield Road as Local Green Space	No	Misc
PSLP/304	N Bower		The plan is not justified as consultation responses will be ignored. Details of objection to a waste generator granted government permission in Shepshed. Details of grievance with the Government		No	Misc
PSLP/305	A Lundie		The plan is not justified as there is a 5ha shortfall of green space in Nanpantan. The Council has failed to meet current and future needs. NWRA is keen to work with the Council to manage, protect and acquire the open space. The plan is not sustainable and Leconfield Road and HA18 should not be developed.	Designate Leconfield Road as Local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/300	D Thompson		The plan is not justified because Leconfield Road does not have planning permission and therefore should be designated as Local Green Space. It is currently 'capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period'.	Designate Leconfield Road as Local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/611	Dermot Breen	Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce	The plan as a whole is a strong document that confronts future change, its opportunities and its threats.		Not stated	Misc

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/320	A Abrams		Concern about climate change	All houses proposed in the plan should be carbon neutral to avoid the need for future retrofitting.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/590	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Bellway	DS3 (HA7) Land off Barkby Thorpe Lane, Thurmaston is partly assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal Appendix H as PSH189. The assessment results in three significant positive, six minor positive, nine neutral, one minor negative and one significant negative effect. the mineral in this location is unlikely to be workable and therefore this element should be recorded as a neutral impact (rather than significantly negative). DS3 (HA7). The minor negative effect relates to the site being within 250m of area suitable for wind energy generation. Policy Map 2 identifies that this area is located within HA1 to the northeast of the site and should not negatively impact PSH189. Accordingly, a neutral effect should be noted	Changes to scoring of Sustainability Appraisal Appendix H PSH189 regarding minerals and renewable energy	Not stated	Misc
PSLP/355	Mr D.Waymont		HA17 and HA16 are not sound because they do not take enough account of the Sustainability Appraisal Report.	Criticisms are made of the interpretation of the SA.	No	Misc
PSLP/029	Mr David J. Nolan		The Local Green Space Assessment for Leconfield Road concludes that the planning application means the site is not capable of enduring but does not mention what will happen if the application is refused. Planning applications should not influence Local Plan recommendations.	Allocate Leconfield Road as Local Green Space	Yes	Misc
PSLP/415	J Buckland		The plan is not justified because there is insufficient land in Nanpantan to meet the open space shortfall of 5.6 ha. The land designated in for the LSEP should be used to address the open space shortfall. Leconfield Road must be protected. There has been no map-based assessment to determine if actual physical land is available that is sufficiently close to residents and able to meet the shortfalls.	Allocate Leconfield Road as local Green Space	No	Misc
PSLP/030	Mrs Christine E. Hodgson		The Local Green Space Assessment for Leconfield Road does not adequately assess tranquillity. The inclusion of planning applications in the assessment is illogical and should be separate from the plan preparation process.	Allocate Leconfield Road as local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/044	Mr Matthew Martin		The Local Green Space Assessment for Leconfield Road does not adequately assess tranquillity.	Allocate Leconfield Road as local Green Space.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/045	Lady Jayna Patel		The Local Green Space Assessment for Leconfield Road does not adequately assess tranquillity which has been evidenced as being of local significance.	Allocate Leconfield Road as local Green Space.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/064	Mr Jonathon M. Feeley		The Sustainability Appraisal raises coalescence and identity but then ignores it with allocations such as HA1. There will be no delineation between Wigston and East Goscote. The assumption is made that social infrastructure will follow development, when will this be and where?	Give greater weight to coalescence, the environment and loss of prime agricultural land.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/371	Julian Jones		Ecology Assessment Report 2019 & 2021 & Addendum - Believes that a comprehensive review of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and potential or candidate Local Wildlife Sites (cLWS) is required within Charnwood Borough. The last comprehensive surveys were conducted in 2008 and 2010 and these referred to numerous cLWS. Whilst the Senior Ecologist for CBC has conducted his own thorough surveys and investigation in 2018, there appears to be no mechanism in place to protect the cLWS that were identified as far back as 2008. Believes there also needs to be a review of graded sites – particularly those with Grade D, in the light of the removal of an additional site from the SHLAA over the summer of 2021. It is important that all similar sites within the Borough receive objective and fair treatment.	Calls for a review of sites.	No	Misc
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Local Plan Green Space Assessment - Objects to the consideration of tranquility.	Recommends reconsideration of this issue.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Local Plan Green Space Assessment - In the assessment of 'Sustainable development' for this site (page 5-6), it is stated that The site was proposed for allocation in the draft Local Plan (2019) but is no longer proposed for allocation in the pre-submission version. Materials submitted by the local community indicate that Local Green Space designation is sought, at least in part, as a response to the threat of development. This is an unfair representation of the views of the NWRG as designation was sought for a number of other reasons	Include a list of all the reasons why the community sought LGS designation for Leconfield.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Although we understand that the land at the top of Leconfield Road is no longer identified in the Local Plan as one for development, we wish to provide support for the designation of this land as Local Green Space To develop on land such as this would be tantamount to giving up all hope of protecting the environment. It would also be a huge snub to residents who are working hard to put initiatives into effect that would make life a little better for us all. Residents in the west of Nanpantan Ward will not have access to amenity green space within the specified accessible range of 400m unless the land at the top of Leconfield Road is protected.	Local Green Space designation	Yes	Misc
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The inclusion of consideration of the planing application for the site as part of the assessment of its ability to endure as a Local Green Space is not justified or in accordance with national policy. Only the 'capability of not enduring' based on an assumed circumstance has been assessed. In the assessment of LGS at Leconfield, its 'capability of enduring' has not been assessed as required by NPPF.	Amend assessmnet and designate site as Local Green Space	Yes	Misc
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Nortoft open spacces study includes incorrect information for Nanpantan Ward	Study should be corrected	Yes	Misc
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Under Fields in Trust Guidance, Leconfield Road should have Local Green Space status	Designate site as LGS	Yes	Misc

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	For many years, the land at the top of Leconfield Road was designated and protected as an open space by Charnwood Borough Council. This protection was removed in 2015 and should be reinstated.	Designate site as LGS or offer similar protection to that previously provided in 2004 Local Plan.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The NPPF definition of open space is broader than just public open space and includes informal spaces. The site selection method should have used this broader definition when excluding sites.	To be in agreement with National Policy, sites that are used by the public as 'informal open space' should also be excluded by the assessment in the Development Strategy and Site Selection Topic Paper	Yes	Misc
PSLP/376	David Mulvaney	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	Nanpantan lost 0.43 ha of amenity green space at Kirkstone Park (confirmed by the Council) and we have only just over 20% of the amenity green space specified in the provision standard.	As the Council has already failed to meet our 'current and future needs' as required in sustainable development. In particular, there is insufficient physical land available to meet more than 1.4ha of the 5.6ha shortfall. There should be no further development in Nanpantan.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/071	Miss Baljinder Shina		The Local Green Space Assessment considers planning applications in the sustainable development criteria. This is illogical and planning applications, rather than permissions, should not influence the process.	Allocate Leconfield Road site as Local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/073	Mr Stavos Ahmed		The Local Green Space Assessment criteria of 'being capable of enduring' is not valid or sound. There is no indication of how planning history and planning applications will be taken into account.	Allocate Leconfield Road site as Local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/432	Ian Pepper		Objection refers to the Council's unwillingness to pursue Local Green Space designation. A document entitled Local Green Space Designation is referred to.	Remove the final paragraph of the 'sustainability assessment' on page 2. As this removes the last objection to Leconfield being assigned Local Green Space designation, it must now be given Local Green Space status	No	Misc
PSLP/433	Melanie Pepper		Objection refers to the Council's unwillingness to pursue Local Green Space designation. A document entitled Local Green Space Designation is referred to.	Remove the final paragraph of the 'sustainability assessment' on page 2. As this removes the last objection to Leconfield being assigned Local Green Space designation, it must now be given Local Green Space status	No	Misc
PSLP/466	Lisa Ambler		The Local Green Space Assessment considers planning applications in the sustainable development criteria. This is illogical and planning applications, rather than permissions, should not influence the process.	Allocate the Leconfield Road site as Local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/485	Janette Miller		The plan is not positively prepared as there is a shortfall of greenspace in Nanpantan which is not remedied in the Local Plan and no physical site is identified to restore open space provision.	Identify and protect the Leconfield Rd site to provide open space.	No	Misc
PSLP/540	H Richardson		The plan is not justified and not consistent with national policy as Leconfield Road should be designated as Local Green Space.	Designate Leconfield Road for Local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/608	David Miller		The plan is not positively prepared as according to Fields in Trust guidance Leconfield Rd site should be protected as Local Green Space.	Designate Leconfield Rd as Local Green Space.	No	Misc
PSLP/722	Adam Percival		The LGS conclusion for Leconfield does not address the criterion relating to whether the site is 'capable of enduring'.	The inclusion of references to planning applications is not appropriate. NPPF guidance only excludes sites if they have planning permission not planning applications. Local plans should be used to decide planning applications, not vice versa. Remove the final paragraph of the 'sustainability assessment' on page 2. This removes the only objection to Leconfield being assigned Local Green Space designation. It must now be given Local Green Space status.	No	Misc

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/731	Diana Webster		The nature of this consultation, set as it is during the ongoing Covid-19 outbreak has meant that documents are expected to be accessed largely online. Not all inhabitants of the borough are either computer literate or indeed have access to the internet or the technology to print-out or view the documents. This consultation is about process. It feels like local voices have not been listened to and indeed when the draft plan says that no changes will be made to the draft regardless of the comments made, it feels like a pointless exercise which is designed to discourage engagement.	The consultation should have included public meetings with power point and other presentations to explain to people the implications of the plan and to allow proper addressing of issues and questions. The consultation should be over a longer period given the volume and detailed documents involved. The consultation should be revisited in light of the effects of the pandemic which have changed how local people use the land and the demand for town centre services and local transport.	No	Misc
PSLP/734	Oliver Munden	Avison Young obo Dobbies Garden Centre	It is noted that the Dobbies site has been assessed during the preparation of the Local Plan as a potential housing allocation. This assessment is contained within Appendix H (May 2021) of the Sustainability Appraisal Report. Whilst the site has not been recommended for an allocation of housing principally due to flood risk, the findings of this assessment are still helpful. We note that there are a number of criteria which the Council have considered in terms of the site's suitability for development. Principally, across a variety of criteria such as landscape impact, the site scored highly with it only being marked down due to lack of public transport provision and distance to schools/food shopping. Clearly the latter of these are not relevant to a continued garden centre operator, and in terms of public transport we note that the majority of uses of a garden centre would arrive by public car due to the generally bulky type goods which a garden centre sells..	In conclusion, based on the above we request that the Dobbies site as outlined in Appendix 1 is re-designated as white land (or similar designation). Given the evidence provided above, it is clear that the site and surrounding area is suitable or appropriate development and that a countryside designation on the Dobbies site is no longer suitable and may inhibit future investment at this garden centre	No	Misc
PSLP/652	S Rasaiah		HS36 Nanpantan Grange has been removed from the draft plan with no justification as to why it has been removed.		Yes	Misc
PSLP/631	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land	The evaluation of site HA49 (Land off Cotes Road, Barrow upon Soar, PSH484, PSH321, PSH462, PSH283, PSH280 and PSH177) as part of the Sustainability Assessment report is incorrect or inconsistent in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The biodiversity assessment for PSH484 should be neutral rather than a minor negative to be consistent with sites PSH462 and PSH321 which have similar characteristics.</li> <li>•The historic environment assessment for PSH484 should be neutral rather than a minor negative to be consistent with site PSH283 which has similar characteristics.</li> <li>•The climate change mitigation assessment should not be a significant negative effect as none of the site is identified as suitable for wind energy generation.</li> <li>•The minerals safeguarding assessment records a negative impact but extraction is not likely to be possible or viable due to the proximity of the built form of Barrow.</li> </ul>		Not stated	Misc
PSLP/668	Paul Conway		HA16and HA17 are not sound because a holistic view of sustainability has not been provided in terms of CO2 impact of the development, increased road traffic, the site is not within walking distance of bus route or employment centre, reduced headcount of Loughborough University as result of Covid19.	Sustainability Appraisal should be more holistic	No	Misc
PSLP/592	Cllr Ted Parton		I would also like to place on record my huge disappointment with the manner in which this consultation has been issues to the public, having been made as difficult as possible for the taxpayer to contribute to.	Objection to consultation process.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/633	Cara Chambers	Marrons obo Rosconn Strategic Land, St Philips, William Davis and Swithland Homes	The evaluation of site HA49 (Land off Cotes Road, Barrow upon Soar, PSH484, PSH321, PSH462, PSH283, PSH280 and PSH177) as part of the Sustainability Assessment report is incorrect or inconsistent in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The biodiversity assessment for PSH484 should be neutral rather than a minor negative to be consistent with sites PSH462 and PSH321 which have similar characteristics.</li> <li>•The historic environment assessment for PSH484 should be neutral rather than a minor negative to be consistent with site PSH283 which has similar characteristics.</li> <li>•The climate change mitigation assessment should not be a significant negative effect as none of the site is identified as suitable for wind energy generation.</li> <li>•The minerals safeguarding assessment records a negative impact but extraction is not likely to be possible or viable due to the proximity of the built form of Barrow.</li> </ul>		Not stated	Misc
PSLP/564	James Chatterton	William Davis	Plans should be clearly written and unambiguous.	The plan should be structured to include sub-numbering within policies. Some policy wording could be moved to the supporting text.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	The plan is not consistent with national policy as it does not clearly distinguish between strategic and non-strategic policies. Strategic polices should address the Council's identified strategic priorities for the development and use of land in the plan area and set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development.	The plan should be modified to make a clearer distinction between its strategic and non-strategic policies.	Yes	Misc

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/583	Liberty Stones	Fisher German obo Lone Star	It is unclear why Sturdee Poultry Farm, Burton on the Wolds has not been included as an allocation. [Point repeated across from DS3]		Not stated	Misc
PSLP/630	Carl Stott	Nineteen47 obo Bowbridge Homes	The Council's approach to site selection, in particular site at Leconfield Road, Loughborough is flawed, as it fails to properly take into account available evidence, and does not undertake a comparative assessment of sites. The sustainability appraisal indicates that the majority of impacts are neutral or positive. With regard to landscape the site has been consistently identified through evidence as having a moderate to low value, is not recognised as a valued landscape, and there are now landscape reasons which would indicate the site should be excluded as an allocation. With regard to biodiversity, promoter evidence on biodiversity illustrate that the D rating given to the site at Leconfield Road is exaggerated and it is noted that a nearby site PSH133 is given a lower C rating. The site at Leconfield Road has neutral impacts on soil and resources and this would be less than the effects at the larger site of PSH133. The site at Leconfield Road has minor negative effects on heritage as shown in the sustainability appraisal and the Council's conservation officer concluded that it would have less than substantial harm. Ther assessment of the Leconfield Road through sustainability appraisal is inconsistent with PSH133 in terms of access to access to healthcare and public transport. In support of their representation there is a site location plan, parameter plan, layout and masterplans, a landscape note, a number of assessments relating to ecology and a built heritage assessment.	Include Leconfield Road, Nanpantan as a housing allocation	Not stated	Misc
PSLP/556	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	The Council's latest viability assessment is set out in Charnwood Local Plan Viability Study dated February 2021 by Aspinall Verdi. This Study assesses the viability of numerous typologies. It is noted that SUEs will be separately tested (see para 2.19), however, the results of these individual viability assessments have not been disclosed or published by the Council. The assumptions used in the Council's viability study do not include additional costs for the 2021 Part L Building Regulations or 2025 Future Homes Standard. The impact of such cost increases on viability should be assessed, the Council should undertake further sensitivity testing.	Further viability work should be undertaken prior to submission.	Yes	Misc
PSLP/395	L Stevens		The plan is not consistent with national policy (para 99 and 100 NPPF 2018) or positively prepared as it does not make clear that applications for Local Green Spaces are welcomed.	Amend EV9 to state "Responding positively to local green space applications, identified through a neighbourhood plan or similar robust, community led strategy" Prevent unnecessary builds	No	Misc
PSLP/454	M Cross		Box ticked 'yes' for DtC, Soundness and Legally Compliant. Representation only states 'the full details' for policies map.		No	Misc
PSLP/457	C Arnold		The plan is not positively prepared or consistent with national policy as statements to protect wildlife habitats in para 8.41 and 8.42 are insufficient by simply stating areas need protecting. NPPF Paragraph 35 states specific needs should be identified and addressed.	Identify exact locations of sites, work required, timescales and specific protections.	No	Misc
PSLP/657	R Sinclair		The plan is not justified as the local green space assessment uses the outcome of future planning applications to determine whether a site is enduring, which is incorrect because local plans should be used to determine planning applications in accordance with NPPF Para 11.	Remove final paragraph from sustainability assessment on page 2 of the local green space assessment. Designate Leconfield Road as a local green space	No	Misc
PSLP/481	A Hutchinson		The Local Green Space Assessment is not in accordance with national policy as NPPF paragraph 100 requires an assessment of "local significance". The assessment states that local significance of tranquilly is not demonstrated, however a local resident survey (July 2020) included 22 out of 79 respondents mentioning tranquilly.	Amend the outcome to "The tranquilly of the site is of local significance as demonstrated by local residents"	No	Misc
PSLP/489	J Bateman		The plan is not positively prepared or justified as It is illogical to assess proposed local green spaces based on live planning applications as this is not an appropriate way to assess "enduring"	Amend the local green space assessment criteria to remove the final paragraph of the "sustainability assessment" section. Designate Leconfield Road as a local green space.	No	Misc
PSLP/679	S Clarke		The consultation was limited because the plan/ proposals should have been posted to every resident	Post the plan to all residents and provide a suitable time frame for people to comment	Yes	Misc
PSLP/640	H Hassen		The plan is not positively prepared as the Fields in Trust Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play has not been used to Help determine the designation of local green spaces; only 2ha of green space is designated When the councils Open space Strategy requires provision for 7.6ha; the local community have made a strong case for Leconfield Road to be designated as local green space	Designate Leconfield Road as local green space; use Fields in Trust Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play As part of the local green space assessment	No	Misc
PSLP/645	P Woolley		The plan is not positively prepared as Six weeks is not long enough for the general public to respond in a meaningful way particularly as legal compliance and duty to cooperate is technical		Yes	Misc
PSLP/715	S Mellors		The plan is not justified as the Local Green Space Assessment assumes that any site near a road is not tranquil which would discount most town sites; Some parts of the Leconfield Road site are 150 metres from a road; the Campaign for Rural England define tranquilly as 'the quality of com experience in places with mainly natural features and activities, free from disturbance from manmade ones'	Leconfield Road Assessment should be changed to recognise that the tranquilly of the site is of local significance	No	Misc

COMMENT ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION (if required)	EXAMINATION (Y/N)	POLICY
PSLP/703	G Morgan		The plan is not justified or effective as Development will have a general damaging impact upon biodiversity and climate change; it is problematic to only only 'encourage' developers to include biodiversity; There is a precedent in Barrow whereby a developer (Jelson) Removed trays outside of planning agreement and did not implement agreed planting meaning there is no accountability for future developments; Removing mature trees and replanting is not sufficient biodiversity replacement		Yes	Misc
PSLP/703	G Morgan		The plan should plan for small accommodation to meet housing demands as smaller living spaces will help society adjust to ecosystem collapse and climate change	See comment	Yes	Misc
PSLP/597	Robert Shields	Burton On The Wolds PC	Support all EV policies where they accord with The Wolds neighbourhood plan		No	Misc
PSLP/664	D Heney		The six week consultation. Is not acceptable as it was during the summer holidays; there is too much complex information to consider; the plan will profoundly affect the future of the borough; community groups have not been able to form and gather legal and expertise advice	Consult on the plan for three to six months to prevent future legal challenges and encourage community groups	No	Misc
PSLP/238	R Parks	Quorn PC	The plan should take account of the Quorn Neighbourhood Plan and address its vision rather than simply designating the area as a 'Service Centre', especially to ensure that medical and education facilities are not overwhelmed. Welcome that no further development is promoted in Quorn and support neighbourhood plan policies being applied for windfall development proposals		Yes	Misc
PSLP/238	R Parks	Quorn PC	Areas of biodiversity, geodiversity and heritage value (such as Soar Valley) are managed cross boundary by various bodies and the plan should promote cooperation between stakeholders	See comment	Yes	Misc
PSLP/473	S Cuff	Nanpantan Ward Residents Group	The adoption of the Core Strategy (2015) resulted in removing policy EV/18 from the 2004 Local Plan which designated Leconfield Road as an 'open space of special character'. the community were not specifically consulted on this in accordance with statement 1(f) of the 2013 open space strategy	Designate Leconfield Road as a local green space	Yes	Misc
PSLP/396	B Singer		Support natural rewilding initiatives on Burleigh Wood and Leconfield Road – article on benefits of rewilding provided.		No	Misc
PSLP/664	D Heney		The plan is not justified as it does not protect heritage and will only protect key heritage features such as the Roman Villa at Barkby Thorpe in line with legal requirements. Individual villages and communities will be lost which are the reason Charnwood is an attractive place and will turn the area into a commuter corridor	Reduce development in village; protect local separation between villages including between Loughborough and Quorn	No	Misc