

# Charnwood Local Plan 2021-2037

## Regulation 22 Statement of Consultation

---

December 2021

# Contents

---

	Page
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
▪ Purpose of Statement of Consultation	3
▪ Background	3
▪ Structure of Consultation Statement	4
<b>2. Plan Production Timeline</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Summary of Process</b>	<b>5</b>
▪ Scoping and Issues July/August 2016	5
▪ Towards a Local Plan for Charnwood April/June 2018	7
▪ Draft Plan November/December 2019	10
▪ Pre-Submission Consultation July/August 2021	15
<b>4. Conclusion</b>	<b>17</b>
Appendix 1 – Regulation 18 Consultation	18
Appendix 2 – Regulation 19 Consultation	38

# 1. Introduction

## **Purpose of the Statement of Consultation**

- 1.1. This Statement of Consultation has been prepared in pursuance of Regulation 22 (1)(c) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and sets out how the Council has undertaken community participation and stakeholder involvement in the production of the local plan in accordance with Regulations 18, 19 and 20 and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) adopted in January 2021. The statement sets out how this engagement has shaped the plan and the main issues raised by consultation / representations.
- 1.2. This statement sets out:
  - (i). Which organisations and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations under regulation 18;
  - (ii). How they were invited to make their representations;
  - (iii). A summary of the main issues raised;
  - (iv). How those issues have been taken into account;
  - (v). If representations were made pursuant to regulation 20, the number made and a summary of the main issues raised;
  - (vi). If no representations were made pursuant to regulation 20 a statement of that fact.
- 1.3. This statement meets the requirements of Regulation 22 (1)(c) and demonstrates that consultation on the preparation of the local plan has been undertaken in accordance with the relevant Regulations and the adopted SCI.
- 1.4. The SCI document sets out how the Council will consult and involve the public and statutory consultees in planning matters. Full details of the current adopted SCI can be viewed [here](#).

## **Background**

- 1.5. The Council began preparing a new local plan in 2016. The local plan provides a strategy to accommodate the development required to support growth in the borough up to 2037. The plan is a strategic framework to deliver some of the Council's key objectives by creating a thriving economy with healthy communities and environmental safeguards. It sets out how the borough will provide employment land and meet demand for infrastructure including roads and schools - as well as meeting increased Government targets for new homes. The plan establishes policies and guidance to ensure local development is built in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 1.6. The Charnwood Local Plan 2021 - 2037 once adopted, will replace the Charnwood Local Plan Core Strategy (2015) and the saved policies from the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan (2004).

- 1.7. The Council's proposed submission local plan – the Charnwood Local Plan 2021 – 2037 Pre-Submission Draft and supporting documents, including the sustainability appraisal, were published in accordance with Regulation 19 for a six week consultation period lasting from Monday 12<sup>th</sup> July until Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2021. The Council consulted specific consultation and statutory bodies, local amenity and residents' groups, businesses and individual residents. A variety of consultation techniques were used in accordance with the SCI.

### **Structure of Consultation Statement**

- 1.8. Section 1 introduction.
- 1.9. Section 2 sets out the timeline which has been followed in preparing the local plan which is in accordance with the up to date Charnwood Local Plan Local Development Scheme 2021.
- 1.10. Section 3 summarises the main issues raised during the course of the consultation carried out under Regulations 18 and 19 and how the comments received have been considered by the Council. Section 3 is supported by the two Appendices:
- 1.11. Appendix 1 sets out the set out the requirements of Regulation 22(1)(c)(i) to (iv). Namely:
- which bodies and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations under regulation 18;
  - how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18;
  - a summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to regulation 18; and
  - how any representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account.
- 1.12. Appendix 2 sets out:
- how the Regulation 19 local plan consultation was undertaken and the number of representations made; and
  - a summary of the main issues (Regulation 22 (1)(c)(v) with a high level Council response to the main issues raised.

## **2. Plan Production Timeline**

- 2.1. In order to ensure thorough engagement with all stakeholders including the local community, businesses and organisations, the local plan has been the subject of four stages of consultation. The aim of these consultations has been to inform the preparation of a comprehensive plan, tailored to the needs of the borough.
- 2.2. The following consultations have been held:
- Scoping and Issues (Regulation 18 Consultation) – July/August 2016
  - Towards a Local Plan for Charnwood (Optional Consultation) – April/June 2018

- Draft Plan (Optional Consultation) - November/December 2019:
- Pre-Submission (Regulation 19/20 Consultation) July/ August 2021 - the final round of consultation prior to the local plan being submitted to the Secretary of State for examination.

2.3. All consultations have been undertaken in accordance with the legislative requirements and the SCI, which exceeds minimum consultation requirements. This timeline is in accordance with the up to date Charnwood Local Plan Local Development Scheme 2021 which can be viewed [here](#).

2.4. Further key local plan stages include:

- Submission to the Secretary of State November 2021
- Examination Spring 2022
- Adoption Autumn 2022

### **3. Summary of Process**

3.1. This section sets out a summary of the plan preparation process, the different stages of consultation and how the responses have shaped the final submission local plan. Further detail on the process undertaken is provided in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.

#### **Scoping and Issues (Regulation 18 Consultation) – July/August 2016**

##### *Introduction*

3.2. This consultation was the initial step of plan preparation and sought views to establish local priorities to scope plan content.

##### *How was the consultation undertaken?*

3.3. Details of the consultation were added to the Council's website and a dedicated webpage was created. The consultation document and associated questions were placed on Charnwood's consultation portal which enabled representations to be made online. Interested parties were directed to submit their comments via the online consultation portal, email or letter.

3.4. A list of bodies/persons that were invited to make representations as part of the Regulation 18 consultation is at Appendix 1 (table 1). These include specific and general consultation bodies that are prescribed by legislation. Charnwood Borough Councillors and bodies/persons who registered to receive local plan alerts were also invited to make representations. All bodies/persons were notified by e-mail or letter.

3.5. In total 16 consultees responded. The Statement of Consultation (September 2016) summarises the responses received and sets out the Council's response to individual comments. Further detail on this is provided in Appendix 1 of this Statement.

### *Main issues raised through the consultation*

- 3.6. Responses highlighted that similar issues to those addressed by the Core Strategy 2011-2028 were likely to remain. The consultation asked 14 questions and a summary of the main issues raised pursuant to Regulation 18 were:
- The issues facing Charnwood were generally similar to those addressed by the previous Local Plan although some changes are brought about by demographic changes.
  - Changing circumstances that require understanding were issues such as climate change, increased traffic, reduced services and the need for housing. The importance of new documents such as the Strategic Growth Plan was also identified.
  - There was a general preference that the strategy and plan period should continue to 2036, although there may be a need for this to be updated as needs change. There is a need for consistency with the plans of surrounding authorities.
  - In terms of further evidence required to understand the amount of development needed, evidence was thought necessary on services and facilities and the constraints on development, especially environmental issues. Traffic assessments were also highlighted as important.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for the spatial strategy, evidence was thought needed on flood risk, infrastructure, transport and sustainability with a careful assessment of settlements required to determine the spatial strategy.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for the transport strategy, the importance of comprehensive traffic assessments and modelling to inform the plan was emphasised.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for the environment, a number of statutory requirements were highlighted. The importance of assessing various aspects of the environment and the need to assess the environmental capacity for development was highlighted.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for the type, mix and tenure of homes needed, of housing need was highlighted as important and also the importance of providing of certain types of housing.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for the economy, various areas were identified for investigation including small and rural business, Watermead Regeneration corridor, retail and strategic warehousing.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for community facilities and services, the need for accurate evidence of existing provision was highlighted.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for infrastructure delivery, the need for understanding of the impact of development upon infrastructure, services and facilities was highlighted.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to monitor and respond to a lack of delivery, the importance of ongoing monitoring was highlighted.
  - There was a mixed response to whether the Core Strategy Vision to 2028 should be continued to 2036, with some considering the vision could be

continues whilst others believed that it should be re-assessed in the light of new evidence.

*How has the consultation helped to shape the local plan?*

- 3.7. In terms of how representations made pursuant to Regulation 18 have been taken into account, it was recognised that a detailed and robust evidence base was required to inform the preparation of the Local Plan including assessments of the settlement hierarchy, housing growth, climate change, infrastructure, environmental issues, flood risk, economic development needs and more. The evidence base documents supporting the Local Plan are online:

<https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/evidencebase>.

- 3.8. The plan period was continued to 2036, although subsequently revised to 2037, reflecting the time taken to prepare the plan. Matters of cross-boundary importance have been considered as part of plan preparation which is demonstrated in Statements of Common Ground. The plan is supported by a monitoring framework to assess delivery and effectiveness on an annual basis and the vision has been amended as appropriate. In addition, the Council undertook two additional optional rounds of consultation (between the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19/20 consultations) which provided further elaboration on the representations made pursuant to Regulation 18. The Regulation 18 consultation informed the preparation of the Towards a Local Plan consultation.

**Towards a Local Plan for Charnwood (Optional Consultation) – April/June 2018**

*Introduction*

- 3.9. This consultation sought views on key issues relating to the overall development strategy and scale of development required; considered the options for delivering the growth needed; and gave an opportunity to comment on part of the evidence base. In total 104 consultees responded. The Statement of Consultation (June 2018) summarises the responses received and sets out the Council's response to individual comments. The details of this consultation can be viewed in Appendix 1.

*How was the consultation undertaken?*

- 3.10. A notification letter was sent to 1,338 bodies/ persons contained on the Council's Local Plan consultation database and an e-mail alert was sent to bodies/ persons who registered to receive local plan alerts. A list of consultees invited to comment on the plan is detailed in Appendix 1. The consultation was also publicised via the Council website, social media and press release.

*Main issues raised through the consultation*

- 3.11. Several infrastructure providers and statutory organisations responded to the consultation including Clinical Commissioning Groups, Highways England,

Leicestershire County Council, Environment Agency, Sport England and Natural England. These bodies commented on how to improve the vision and on the key issues the plan needs to address including infrastructure capacity issues. Responses also highlighted the evidence which will be needed to inform the Local Plan including Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Transport Assessments and Infrastructure Delivery Plans.

- 3.12. Responses were also received from Syston County Doctors Practice and Woodbrook Vale School highlighting capacity concerns and the impact of the settlement limits on future development of the School to meet increasing demand.
- 3.13. Many respondents raised concerns about the need and capacity for more housing developments in the borough. In particular, respondents highlighted concerns about traffic and the availability and capacity of community infrastructure as well as the impact on agricultural land, ecology, heritage, air quality, flooding and the character and separation of villages. Concerns were also raised about recent developments and about increasing the housing target to ensure delivery.
- 3.14. Other respondents suggested that the Council should be taking account of the proposed standard housing methodology due to be introduced as part of the new National Planning Policy Framework and that a higher housing figure and variety of sites will be needed to ensure a sufficient supply of housing land. Respondents also highlighted that the unmet need of other authorities in Leicester and Leicestershire will need to be considered.
- 3.15. There were questions raised about the relationship between the Local Plan and the Strategic Growth Plan with respondents highlighting concerns about aligning the Local Plan to a non-statutory plan which is not complete and others raising concerns that the discussion paper is silent on the proposal for the proposed A46 extension, a proposal some respondents raised concerns about.
- 3.16. Leicester City Council, Leicestershire County Council, Melton Borough Council, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and Harborough District Council all responded welcoming on-going engagement under the duty to cooperate. Leicester City Council highlighted the need to work together to consider their unmet need for housing and employment and cross boundary infrastructure. Leicestershire County Council provided detailed comments on transport, education and strategic planning.
- 3.17. Overall, there was support for the proposed Areas of Local Separation and Green Wedges and the proposed Settlement Hierarchy, although there were some responses challenging the conclusions. A number of additional Areas of Local Separation were suggested and suggestions made about what should be permitted within these areas. The lack of a national planning policy on landscape designations was also highlighted in response to Green Wedges and Areas of Local Separation.
- 3.18. There were also detailed comments provided on the Settlement Limits to Development as well as a request to consider the proposed limits in the Quorn Neighbourhood Plan and concerns about proposing limits before identifying future

development locations. Responses were also received highlighting the need for the Local Plan to include housing targets for Neighbourhood Planning.

- 3.19. Several site appraisal and promotional documents were provided for potential development sites. The majority of these were already known to the Council through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment although a small number of additional sites were put forward. Agents and developers took the opportunity to provide additional information about sites and work being undertaken to understand any constraints and opportunities or explore options for future development. There were also a number of site specific objections made.
- 3.20. The issue of student accommodation was raised by a number of respondents including concerns about the quantity of Houses in Multiple Occupation and purpose built accommodation and the impact they have on communities. However, there was also support for meeting student needs in a wider area and through purpose built accommodation. Suggestions were also made for further accommodation to be provided on campus. There was also a case made for removing all restrictions on Houses in Multiple Occupation to allow them to meet the needs of non-students.
- 3.21. Comments were received from the Forestry Commission about the need to consider the impact of development on ancient woodland and the Canal and River Trust about considering the opportunities and impacts on the river and canal network. The National Farmers' Union highlighted the need to consider the rural economy and CPRE suggested higher density housing in urban areas and raised concern about the amount of student accommodation, which could be meeting housing needs.
- 3.22. The Leicestershire Local Access Forum set out support for major schemes with planned infrastructure and highlighted opportunities to improve flood affected routes and avoid air quality issues and East Midlands Airport highlight the need to consider the airport safeguarded area. A response was also received from the Education & Skills Funding Agency on planning for school places.
- 3.23. A preference for one or more of the housing strategies identified in the consultation document was included by some. This included support for urban concentration principles as it maximises existing infrastructure and minimises the need to travel but also concern about focusing development in too few areas or too few sites putting too much pressure on existing infrastructure. There was support for a new settlement approach from a small number of respondents who considered it to take the pressure off existing infrastructure but others raised concern about timescales and uncertainty of new settlements. There was support for more dispersed development to create choice and flexibility from some respondents but also concern about the ability to provide appropriate infrastructure for this pattern of development from others.
- 3.24. In addition to these key themes, there were a range of other issues raised by one or two respondents including comments or concerns about:
  - how the vision will be implemented;

- how developments will be accessed;
- how the needs of the elderly will be met;
- the need to review the approach to rural communities,
- the need to require a mix of homes including affordable homes;
- the impact of internet shopping and need for car charging points;
- challenges to assumptions about infrastructure delivery from small sites;
- concerns about creating a sense of place in new developments;
- the need for a vision for the future of the Great Central Railway;
- the quality and design of development;
- the need for adequate protection for the borough's theatres and other arts, community and cultural facilities;
- greater detail needed on the environment and landscape protection;
- reducing the impact of lighting on the countryside;
- supporting sustainable forms of transport including provision of more buses and safe walking and cycle routes; and
- detailed comments on the Interim Sustainability Appraisal.

*How has the consultation helped to shape the local plan?*

- 3.25. Issues raised through the Towards a Local Plan consultation provided confirmation of the importance of issues related to the local plan and were used to inform further evidence studies, options for development and policy drafting for the preparation of the draft Local Plan.

### **Draft Plan (Optional Consultation) - November/December 2019**

#### *Introduction*

- 3.26. This consultation sought views on the Council's preferred options for a development strategy and planning policies, taking account of Government requirements set out in the NPPF; the Council's corporate priorities; the local plan evidence base; and comments raised during previous consultations.

*How was the consultation undertaken?*

- 3.27. A notification letter was sent to approximately 1,330 bodies/persons contained on the Council's Local Plan consultation database and an e-mail alert was sent to bodies/ persons who registered to receive Local Plan alerts. A list of consultees invited to comment is published in table 3 in Appendix 1. The consultation was also publicised via the Council website; social media; press release; posters in libraries and community buildings; fliers containing key questions; information boards and consultation events at three locations in the Borough – the Council Offices (Loughborough), Glenmore Castle (Shepshed); and Syston Community Centre; and officer attendance at parish council events upon request. Approximately 100 people attended the three roadshow events.
- 3.28. In total 434 consultees responded. The Statement of Consultation (March 2020) summarises the responses received and sets out the Council's response to individual comments. Further detail on this consultation is given in Appendix 1.

### *Main issues raised through the consultation*

- 3.29. In response to the vision and objectives, respondents suggested that there needs to be better integration of the policy areas covered by the local plan to achieve genuine sustainable development. It was also suggested that the authority needed to be more ambitious in relation to climate change, sustainable transport, design, health and provision of green spaces. Others suggested that there needed to be greater realism about what can be achieved through the Local Plan, for example in relation to car use. This highlighted the importance of an appropriate monitoring framework for the plan. Respondents highlighted a lack of vision for Service Centres and Other Settlements and a lack of explanation of the International Gateway and how this fits with the aim to protect the National and Charnwood Forest. The need to protect community identity is supported.
- 3.30. In response to the scale of development, North West Leicestershire, Harborough, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Councils, Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Council all highlighted the lack of flexibility built into the plan to respond to the outcomes of the Statement of Common Ground with regard to the redistribution of Leicester's unmet housing need. Leicester City Council suggested that the Council should be planning for a higher housing target and that a low growth scenario is not consistent with the NPPF. Leicestershire County Council expressed caution and concern about the scale of housing highlighting that it does not appear to chime well with the Government's national ambition for housing delivery and they suggest a 20% buffer is applied to the housing numbers.
- 3.31. The responses from developers and agents generally shared this view that the scale of housing planned is insufficient. Concerns were raised that the unmet need from Leicester is not taken into account and it was highlighted that the Strategic Growth Plan is non-statutory and cannot be relied upon. It was argued that there is insufficient flexibility to secure the required five year supply of deliverable sites in the context of slow delivery of the SUEs and implementation rates. Respondents also suggested that the proposed scale of development will fail to meet affordable housing needs and not support economic growth.
- 3.32. It was suggested that the housing provision proposed was not consistent with NPPF requirements, was not been appropriately tested in the sustainability appraisal and was not justified by a published Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
- 3.33. The low growth scenario was supported by CPRE, a number of Parish Councils, Edward Argar MP and local residents. It was suggested by respondents that the additional homes proposed by the draft local plan for flexibility was not justified, would have unacceptable impacts on the environment and cannot be supported by infrastructure.
- 3.34. In response to the development strategy, the position of some settlements in the settlement hierarchy was questioned by some respondents. There was a grouping of respondents that suggest Cossington, Rothley and Queniborough should be in a lower tier of the hierarchy. It was also suggested by some that Anstey should be part of Leicester Urban Area, but there was general consensus for Syston being part of Leicester Urban Area. There was also a view that Cossington, East

Goscote, Queniborough, Rearsby and Wymeswold are more sustainable villages than the remaining 'Other Settlements' in the proposed hierarchy.

- 3.35. In response to the distribution of development there were suggestions of unfairness and that the scale of development in some areas was out of proportion with the size of the settlement or the infrastructure available to support development. There appeared to be greater concern about infrastructure, flooding and settlement separation in Service Centres and Other Settlements, particularly in the south-east of the Borough, and more concern about transport and congestion in Loughborough. A new settlement was suggested as an alternative, with East of Loughborough and the Wolds given as potential locations.
- 3.36. It was suggested by some respondents that more development should be directed towards Loughborough (including suggestions for development at Cotes) and Shepshed. Others suggested more development should be directed to small villages and hamlets, Other Settlements and Service Centres. It was highlighted that very little development was proposed in the northeast of the borough. Others suggested there was too much development concentrated in parts of Loughborough, Shepshed, Syston, Service Centres and the Other Settlements.
- 3.37. Respondents questioned how the plan proposes to restructure Shepshed Town Centre and how regeneration will be achieved without allocating any new employment land there. Respondents highlighted inconsistencies in employment land provision figures. Respondents questioned the sustainability of the Strategic Growth Plan and the focus on the A46 expressway and others called for greater recognition of the International Gateway in the strategy.
- 3.38. Respondents highlighted a lack of clarity for Neighbourhood Plans and call for existing plans to be taken into account. There was a wish from some for the task of identifying sites to be undertaken by neighbourhood plan groups.
- 3.39. In response to housing sites, the draft local plan proposed 70 new sites for housing development alongside the existing Sustainable Urban Extensions. The inclusion of the majority of proposed sites had been supported by the landowner, promoter or developer and a significant amount of supporting evidence had been submitted. Additional evidence had also been submitted for a large number of alternative sites assessed as part of the process but not proposed for allocation, to show how issues with sites could be overcome. Some respondents challenged the site selection process, the need for more small sites and the transparency of the assessment.
- 3.40. The promoters of all the larger proposed housing allocations submitted large amounts of supporting evidence for their sites which together with the evidence for smaller sites needed to be considered in detail and discussed with specialists within the Council as well as infrastructure providers, Leicestershire County Council and neighbouring authorities. The promoters of the land south west of Loughborough proposed a significantly different allocation boundary and the promoters of the site south of Loughborough promoted significantly more homes than identified in the draft local plan.

- 3.41. In total six landowners indicated that they were not willing to develop their site. These sites combined were proposed to provide land for 189 homes. No contact was received from owners of eleven sites, which are in total proposed to provide land for 409 homes. Further work was therefore required to confirm there is a willing landowner for these sites. In total at least 25 new sites were proposed for consideration.
- 3.42. A site in the Thurcaston/Cropston area has been proposed by Leicester City Council for burial space to meet the needs arising from within the City.
- 3.43. The Environment Agency highlighted concerns with HS38 (Fairway Rd, Shepshed) as there are 3 Environment Agency permit sites within 200 metres of the site (incinerator, car scrapyards and animal feed factory). They also identified concerns about toxic material associated with a proposed site, HS18 (Beacon Road, Loughborough) which may be a substantial barrier to the development of this site.
- 3.44. Concerns were raised in relation to individual proposed sites and the concentration of sites in Shepshed, Cossington, Wreake Valley villages and parts of Loughborough. This included a range of concerns about whether there would be sufficient infrastructure to support development, whether flood risk will be increased, how traffic will be managed and concerns about the landscape and biodiversity impacts. There was a lack of confidence that certain aspects of the planning system will work including confidence regarding flooding evidence and delivery of infrastructure.
- 3.45. In response to infrastructure provision, respondents highlighted the pressure proposed development will put on local infrastructure especially schools and health services. It was argued that many doctors' surgeries and schools are already oversubscribed. Concerns were also highlighted about the focus on bus access when the Council exerts no control over this service.
- 3.46. The West Leicestershire Clinical Commissioning Group commented that it believes further development in Shepshed, on the scale proposed within the draft local plan, would have posed a significant risk for Health Care provision in the area. The two current surgeries will require significant investment and there are potential site and workforce constraints to significant further expansion.
- 3.47. Leicestershire County Council Education highlighted significant challenges to meeting primary education needs in Barrow Upon Soar, Cossington and Hathern. They highlighted the need for new schools to support the development proposed at Loughborough, Shepshed and Syston. It was also highlighted that additional land would be required to expand schools in Queniborough, Quorn, Rearsby, Rothley and Sileby.
- 3.48. Leicester City Council highlighted that the preferred spatial development strategy for both the City and Charnwood directs growth to the north/north-west of the urban area of Leicester and therefore it will be important to ensure close working on cross boundary infrastructure matters. This issue was also raised by North West Leicestershire in relation to the International Gateway and by Leicestershire

County Council Highway Authority in terms of transport in relation to both the City and North West Leicestershire.

- 3.49. Highways England highlighted the likely impact on the operation of the M1, specifically between M1 J21A and J24, and on the A46 of the development on the edge of Leicester, Loughborough and Shepshed.
- 3.50. Severn Trent Water did not raise any water supply issues but waste water treatment capacity at some sites will require reinforcement. Increasing capacity at Wanlip is already planned for but the additional allocation to Loughborough and Shepshed will mean increased treatment capacity will be required, as it will be at some of the Service Centres.
- 3.51. In response to other policy areas, there were a range of policy refinements proposed including from several specialist organisations. Some respondents also raised concerns about whether there are sufficient evidence to support the policies, whether policies were ambitious enough and also whether they were practical and viable.

*How has the consultation helped to shape the local plan?*

- 3.52. The responses to the 2019 consultation, additional evidence work and discussions with partners have helped significantly to shape the final submission version of the plan. The Local Plan now identifies a Local Housing Need for Charnwood of 17,776 new homes over the plan period to 2037. Of these homes, 8,355 will be delivered through sustainable urban extensions to the west of Loughborough, north east of Leicester and north of Birstall. Taking in to account the SUEs and all existing planning permissions (10,603 homes) and the need to provide flexibility, the local plan proposes to allocate land for 8,858 new homes. This number has increased from 7,252 homes identified in the draft local plan and reflects the latest nationally set local housing need figure and the increase in the level of flexibility provided for in the plan to help protect the five year supply.
- 3.53. Below is a summary of some of the key changes that have been made to the plan compared to the draft local plan consulted on in 2019:
- The structure of the plan has been amended to create place-based policies for Leicester Urban Area, Loughborough Urban Area, Shepshed, the Service Centres, Other Settlements and the Countryside.
  - There are now three distinct sections to the local plan:
    - overall development strategy;
    - place-based policies; and
    - topic-based policies including new chapters on climate change and infrastructure.
  - There have been several changes to the proposed housing allocations with:
    - 17 sites removed based on new information, no willing landowner or site already having permission.
    - 18 new sites added to reflect new promotions or new information and the need to create a critical mass for new schools.

- 6 sites have changed significantly due to a better understanding of the site (4 have increased in capacity and 2 reduced).
- Site specific policies have been prepared for those allocations that require them.
- The committed SUE and LSEP site allocation policies have been carried forward and updated from the Core Strategy.
- The affordable housing requirement for brownfield development has been reduced to 10%, but the greenfield requirement remains 30%.
- The requirement to provide self build plots has been limited to larger sites >250 homes, and the requirement has been set at 5 plots rather than a proportion of the number of homes on the site.
- A 10% biodiversity net gain policy has been added.
- The tree planting policy has been amended to include a ratio of replacing any removed non-woodland tree with at least three new trees.
- Appendices have been added for Monitoring, Housing and Employment Trajectory, Infrastructure Schedule and Design Guidance.

### **Pre-Submission (Regulation 19/20 Consultation) July/ August 2021**

#### *Introduction*

- 3.54. The Council published the Charnwood Local Plan 2021- 2037 Pre-Submission Version and supporting documents including the Policy Maps, Sustainability Appraisal, Habitats Regulations Assessment and Equalities Impact Assessment for a 6 week consultation during July and August 2021. The consultation sought views on whether the plan is sound and complies with the relevant legal requirements, including the duty to co-operate. This was in order for representations to be made on the plan and supporting documents before they are submitted for examination by a Planning Inspector.

#### *How was the consultation undertaken?*

- 3.55. The consultation was undertaken during the Coronavirus pandemic and as such the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 No 7312 took effect. The Council ensured the consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement (adopted January 2021) which notes that COVID-19 measures may temporarily restrict the Council's ability to undertake physical consultation methods. Should this be the case the Council will facilitate online alternatives. The following measures undertaken to publicise the consultation and ensure that consultation material was available and accessible:

- Consultation documents made available on the Council's website
- Hard copy available to view at the Council's offices by appointment in accordance with covid regulations
- Email and letter notification to those on the local plan consultation database
- Site notices - an A4 site notice poster placed adjoining each proposed housing and employment allocation.
- Social media and email alerts to be posted throughout the consultation
- Press release to local media organisations

- Two virtual presentations during the consultation process with a text Q&A opportunity.
- Focused meetings on request
- Virtual presentation for Parish and Town Councils ahead of the consultation launch to outline the content of the plan and how to make comments
- E-mail to all local politicians (MP, District and Borough Councillors) setting out how documents can be viewed, how to respond and the deadline for responses.
- e-mail to developers, stakeholder and community forums setting out how documents can be viewed, how to respond and the deadline for responses.
- Responding positively to equal access requests.

3.56. Arrangements were made for representations on the Local Plan and its evidence base to be submitted on-line, by email and by letter with the option of using a consultation form that could be completed via the Council’s website or by using a word version available to download online. A list of consultees invited to comment is published in table 1 in Appendix 2.

3.57. The Council received a total of 740 representations in total. This is 70% more than the previous consultation on the draft plan at Regulation 18 in November 2019.

*Main issues raised through the consultation*

3.58. Detail on the main issues raised through this consultation together with a high level Council response is provided in table 2 of Appendix 2. This has been prepared to assist the Inspector as part of the examination process.

3.59. Below are some of the key themes that have been identified through the consultation:

<b>Section</b>	<b>Key Themes</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	Vision generally welcomed; additional references called for within Objectives and question raised about whether the Vision should better recognise the role of Service Centres and Other Settlements.
<b>Development Strategy</b>	Appropriateness of focusing growth in particular locations and others suggesting should be more, impact on existing infrastructure and ability to deliver the new infrastructure, whether there is sufficient flexibility in housing numbers given SUE delivery, not clear why oversupplying on employment, plan period not long enough, retail needs out of date following pandemic and reference should be included to strategic warehousing. Comments on the Limits to Development, appropriateness of the settlement hierarchy.
<b>Leicester and Leicestershire Unmet Needs</b>	Support from HMA partners with amendments suggested by City, NWL and Harborough. Plan not positively prepared as not contributing to Leicester’s unmet need and deferring issues.
<b>Housing Allocations</b>	A wide range of issues raised, including site specific matters typically dealt with through the development management process; supporting evidence; conformity with neighbourhood plans; and site promoters / objectors suggesting alternative site capacities.
<b>Employment Allocations</b>	Policy does not meet the needs of small/ medium size businesses, amount of employment land not justified, concerns about impacts of allocations and whether LSEP is necessary. Covid impacts and flexibility for other uses on

Section	Key Themes
	SUE employment allocations should be considered. Clarity needed on how any over-supply of employment land will meet Leicester's unmet employment need.
<b>Design</b>	Greater emphasis called for on biodiversity, natural environment, healthy places, higher density & brownfield development. More clarity on use of local design codes needed and closer links to neighbourhood plans. Concerns about cost / delay of review panels and need for consistency.
<b>Place Based Policies</b>	Appropriateness of allocating SUEs, approach to securing infrastructure, approach to flooding and drainage issues, clarity of approach to LSEP regarding ancillary uses and in terms of Green Infrastructure and securing biodiversity net gain, approach to regeneration in Shepshed, approach to development outside limits to development.
<b>Housing</b>	Whether the Council has sufficient evidence to justify the inclusion of the policies in relation to internal space standards, housing for older people and people with disabilities, and self-build and custom housebuilding.
<b>Employment</b>	Support for retention of Use Class E(g) by condition. Policy doesn't reflect evidence and increase in home working. Policy needs to be more flexible. Should include 'Areas of Opportunity up to 2041' or a plan review trigger for cross-boundary strategic B8 uses. Others comfortable with approach to warehousing and logistics. Calls for policies to support quine businesses, local food and drink offer, tourism, logistics and freight train development.
<b>Town Centre, Services and Facilities</b>	Mostly minor issues raised although most substantial include town centre policy should include SUE local centres to future proof their protection, proposed amendment to Loughborough town centre, and car parking policy is based on future guidance not subject to examination and policy should refer to cycle parking.
<b>Climate Change</b>	Flood risk policy amendments to better reflect national policy, clearer guidance on climate change and stronger approach to reinstating functional floodplain, clearer about SuDs maintenance. Plan will not achieve net zero by 2050, should be more ambitious on construction, travel, renewables and electric vehicle charging points. Not legally compliant as no evaluation of future emissions. Sustainable travel policy should explain how sustainable travel into City will be delivered.
<b>Environment</b>	Should be avoiding development in Green Wedges & Areas of Local Separation, Neighbourhood Plans should be used to identify areas and new Green Wedges should be identified. National Forest policy should include more ambitious tree planting targets and River & Canal should be improved and access encouraged. Biodiversity policy should be stronger and more ambitious, not clear if 10% was viability tested and the DEFRA Metric should be referenced. Policies should be stronger on protecting existing trees, deal with contested heritage, and the thresholds for air quality are not justified. Open space and sports evidence should be regularly reviewed.
<b>Infrastructure &amp; Delivery</b>	Concerns about the increase in traffic, need for a much wider range of supporting infrastructure. The need for the plan to assess all policy requirements emphasised while concern was expressed by the County Council that reference to viability could reduce developer contributions.
<b>Policies Map</b>	Amendments suggested to housing allocation and limits to development boundaries, suggest inclusion of minerals safeguarding and Nature Recovery Networks, concerns about cross-boundary implications of renewable energy locations from Rushcliffe BC
<b>Other</b>	Concerns about the Local Green Space evidence as it relates to Leconfield Road, Loughborough, consultation had not met our legal duties and duty to cooperate not met (not from prescribed body).

## **2. Conclusion**

- 4.1. This Statement of Consultation illustrates that the requirements of Regulation 22 (1)(c) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 have been met and demonstrates that consultation on the preparation of the local plan has been undertaken in accordance with the relevant Regulations and the adopted SCI.

## **APPENDIX 1 – Regulation 18 Consultation**

Appendix 1 sets out how the requirements of Regulation 22(1)(c)(i) to (iv) have been met through the following consultations:

- Scoping and Issues (Regulation 18 Consultation) – July/August 2016
- Towards a Local Plan for Charnwood (Optional Consultation) – April/June 2018
- Draft Plan (Optional Consultation) - November/December 2019

### **Scoping and Issues (Regulation 18 Consultation) – July/August 2016**

The initial step in the preparation of a new plan is to identify what the scope and content of the plan should be (in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012). This first consultation for the new Charnwood Local Plan was carried out to help understand and engage with interested parties on the future for Charnwood, the scope of the plan and what matters it should cover.

To aid the consultation Charnwood Borough Council produced the [Regulation 18 Consultation Document](#). This briefly outlined a number of key issues for the plan and the type of evidence thought necessary to examine and understand these issues. The consultation document posed a series of fourteen questions across a number of areas to prompt comments and aid discussion. Interested parties were invited to consider the document between the 12<sup>th</sup> July 2016 and the 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2016.

#### *Who was consulted under Regulation 18 and how was this undertaken?*

A list of all the specific and general consultation bodies identified in the Regulations along with all Charnwood Borough Councillors who were consulted is available in Table 1. An email alert was sent to the people registered to receive alerts via the Charnwood Local Plan Email Alert service. Charnwood Borough Council's website was updated with details of the consultation and a webpage was created on the dedicated Charnwood Local Plan website. The consultation document and associated questions were also placed on Charnwood's consultation portal which allows representations to be made online. Interested parties were directed to the portal to submit their comments, with the option also available to present representations by email or letter if these means were more convenient.

*Table 1 – Bodies and persons invited to make representations*

<b>Company/Organisation</b>	
Bardon Parish Meeting	Gaddesby Parish Council
Belton Parish Council	Groby Parish Council
Broughton & Dalby Parish Council	Hickling Parish Council
Charley Parish Council	Hoby with Rotherby Parish Council
Costock Parish Council	Hungarton Parish Council
	Kingston on Soar Parish Council

Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council
Lowesby & Cold Newton Parish Meeting
Markfield Parish Council
Twyford and Thorpe Parish Council
Upper Broughton Parish Council
Willoughby on the Wolds Parish Council
Wysall & Thorpe in the Glebe Parish Council
Scraptoft Parish Council
East Leake Parish Council
Normanton on Soar Parish Council
Rempstone Parish Council
Stanford on Soar Parish Council
Sutton Bonington Parish Council
Keyham Village Meeting
Glenfield Parish Council
Kegworth Parish Council
Rutland County Council
Leicestershire County Council
Leicestershire County Council
Leicestershire County Council
Leicestershire County Council
Harborough District Council
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council
Leicester City Council
Melton Borough Council
Nottinghamshire County Council
Oadby & Wigston Borough Council
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Local Enterprise Partnership
North West Leicestershire District Council
Melton Borough Council

Leicester City Council
Blaby District Council
Leicestershire County Council
Leicestershire Constabulary
Leicestershire Constabulary
Natural England
Network Rail
British Gas Connections Ltd
British Telecommunications Plc
Npower Ltd
NTL Group Ltd
O2 (UK) Ltd
Orange Personal Communications Ltd
Powergen
Severn Trent Water
T-Mobile Ltd
Transco Plc
NHS Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland PCT
Environment Agency
Vodafone Ltd
Department of Transport
The Coal Authority
Vodafone Group plc
National Grid
Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)
Homes and Communities Agency
English Heritage
Natural England
Vodafone and O2
EE

Three
Western Power
Historic England
Highways England
Anstey Parish Council
Barkby & Barkby Thorpe Parish Council
Barrow upon Soar Parish Council
Birstall Parish Council
Burton on the Wolds, Cotes and Prestwold Parish Council
Cossington Parish Council
East Goscote Parish Council
Hathern Parish Council
Hoton Parish Council
Mountsorrel Parish Council
Newtown Linford Parish Council
Queniborough Parish Council
Quorn Parish Council
Ratcliffe on the Wreake Parish Council
Rearsby Parish Council
Rothley Parish Council
Seagrave Parish Council
Shepshed Town Council
Sileby Parish Council
South Croxton Parish Council
Syston Town Council
Thrussington Parish Council
Thurcaston & Cropston Parish Council
Thurmaston Parish Council
Walton on the Wolds Parish Council
Woodhouse Parish Council

Wymeswold Parish Council
Beeby Parish Meeting
Swithland Parish Council
Ulverscroft Parish Meeting
Wanlip Parish Meeting

*Summary of the main issues raised by the representations and how the representations have been taken into account*

The Charnwood Local Plan Regulation 18 Statement of Consultation (September 2016) provides a summary of the main issues raised through the consultation and can be viewed here:

[https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/regulation\\_18\\_statement\\_of\\_consultation/Reg%2018%20Statement%20of%20Consultation.doc](https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/regulation_18_statement_of_consultation/Reg%2018%20Statement%20of%20Consultation.doc)

Appendix B to the Charnwood Local Plan Regulation 18 Statement of Consultation can be viewed here:

[https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/appendix\\_b\\_n\\_complete\\_responses\\_by\\_question/Appendix%20B%20Complete%20Responses%20by%20Question.docx](https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/appendix_b_n_complete_responses_by_question/Appendix%20B%20Complete%20Responses%20by%20Question.docx)

Towards a Local Plan for Charnwood (Optional Consultation) – April/June 2018

The Council published a Discussion Paper, '[Towards a Local Plan for Charnwood](#)' and [Interim Sustainability Appraisal](#) as part of the preparation of the new Local Plan for Charnwood to 2036. The Paper was prepared specifically to seek views on the issues and evidence that will influence how new homes and jobs are planned for. It also sought views on the scale of development needed in the Borough, the key issues and opportunities that need to be taken into account and the options for an overall strategy for delivering the growth needed as well as the relationship between development and the environment.

The opportunity was also taken to consult on the [Settlement Limits to Development Assessment](#), [Settlement Hierarchy Assessment](#) and the [Green Wedges and Areas of Local Separation Assessment](#).

*Who was consulted under Regulation 18 and how was this undertaken?*

Consultation started on 26th April 2018 for six weeks and ended on the 7th June 2018. A notification letter was published on the 26th April to signal the commencement of consultation and invite participation. The letter was sent to the 1,338 organisations and individuals that are on the Local Plan consultation database which includes statutory consultees, Parish Councils, planning agents, members of the public and local groups. Table 2 below sets out the bodies consulted. An email alert was also sent to those that have registered to receive updates and the communication team also publicised the consultation through the website, social media and press release.

*Table 2 – Bodies and persons invited to make representations*

Action Deafness
Action for a Better Charnwood
Action for Hearing Loss
Adlington
Advance Housing and Support Ltd

Affiniti Integrated Solutions Limited
Affinity Water Limited
Age UK, Leicester Shire & Rutland
Airband Community Internet Limited
Airwave Solutions Limited

All Saints Residents Association (Shepshed)
Andrew Granger & Co. LLP
Andrew Hiorns Town Planning
Andrew Martin Associates
Anglian Water Services Ltd
Anstey Library
Antony Aspbury Associates
AQ Ltd
Arcus Consulting Services Ltd
Arqiva Communications Ltd
Arriva Midlands
Arriva plc
Arts Council England (East Midlands Arts)
Ashby Road Estates Community Association
AT&T Global Network Services (UK) B.V.
Atlas Communications NI Ltd
Aylesbury Vale Broadband Ltd
Bangladesh Social Association
Bardon Parish Meeting
Barkby & Barkby Thorpe Action Group
Barkby & Beeby Womens Institute (WI)
Barratts
Barrow Library
Barrow Voice
Barton Willmore
BBC Radio Leicester
Bell Cornwell
Belton Parish Council
Bidwells
Birstall & Wanlip Neighbourhood Watch
Birstall Library
Birstall Post
Blaby District Council
Bloor Homes Midlands
BNP Paribas Real Estate UK
Bolt Pro Tem Ltd
Boundless Networks Ltd
Bovis Homes Ltd
Boyer Planning
Bristol Water Plc
British Democratic Party
British Geological Survey
British Telecommunications plc
Broadband for the Rural North Ltd
Broughton & Dalby Parish Council
Building Relationships
Burnett Planning
Bytel Networks Ltd
Cadent (Gas)
Calico Quays Ltd
Call Flow Solutions Ltd
Cambridge Fibre Networks Ltd
Canal & River Trust

Carter Jonas LLP
CEG
Central North Sea Fibre Telecommunications Ltd
Centric Telco Ltd
Cerda Planning Ltd
Charles Church (North Midlands) Limited
Charles Lowe and sons/Generations
Charley Parish Council
Charnwood Arts
Charnwood Bangladeshi Society
Charnwood Borough Council
Charnwood Carers
Charnwood Conservative Association
Charnwood Disability Forum
Charnwood Shelter Group
Charnwood Together
Charnwood Tree Trust
Chilton Strategic Land
Churches Together in Loughborough
City Screen Printers UK) Ltd
CityFibre Metro Networks Ltd
Citygrove Securities Plc
CityLink Telecommunications Ltd
Civil Aviation Authority
Cogent Communications UK Ltd
COLT Technology Services
Commercial Estates Group
Community Fibre Ltd
Concept Solutions People Ltd
Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Ltd
Costock Parish Council
County Broadband Ltd
CPRE - Charnwood District
CPRE Leicestershire
CTIL
Cyclist Touring Club
D J Deloitte
David Wilson Homes East Midlands
Davidsons Development Limited
De Montfort University
Define
Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)
Department for Work & Pensions
Department of Constitutional Affairs
Department of Transport
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
Derwent Living
Design Council - CABE
Dev Plan
Dialogue

DLP Planning Consultants
E A Lane & Sons
East Goscote Library
East Leake Parish Council
East Leicestershire & Rutland Clinical Commissioning Group
East Midlands Airport
Education & Skills Funding Agency
EE Ltd
Eircom UK Ltd
EMH Group
Emmanuel Church
Energis Communications Ltd
Environment Agency
Equality Action
Equality and Human Rights Commission
EU Networks Fiber UK Ltd
Euro Payphone Ltd
Eurobell Ltd
Fairhurst
Faulks, Perry, Culley & Rech
Fearon Community Association
FFR Ultrasonics Ltd
FibreSpeed Ltd
Fibrewave Networks
Firstplan
Fisher German LLP
Fisher Scientific UK Ltd
FLAG Atlantic UK Ltd
Forest Road North & Holywell Drive Area Residents Group (FRHARG)
Forestry Commission
Fox Bennett
Fox Strategic Land & Property
Foxpark Limited
Framptons
Friends of Charnwood Forest
Fujitsu Services Ltd
G R Planning Consultancy Ltd
G. Network Communications Ltd
Gaddesby Parish Council
Gamma Telecom Holdings Ltd
Garendon Park & Countryside Protection Group
Geeta Bhawan
GeneSYS Telecommunications Ltd
Geo Networks Ltd
Geoffrey Prince
Gerald Eve LLP
Gigaclear Plc
Gladmans Development
Glenfield Parish Council
Gorse Covert Community Association

Great Central Railway plc
Groby Parish Council
GVA
GVA Grimley
Haddon Way Residents Association
Hallam Land Management
Hamilton Community College
Hamilton Library
Hanover Housing Association
Hanson UK
Harborough District Council
Harris Lamb
Hastings Community Association
Hastings Residents Association
Hathern Library
Hawksmoor
Haydon Road Residents Association
Heaton Planning Ltd
Help the Aged
Henry Davidson Developments Ltd
Herrick Road Area Residents Group
Hibernia Express (UK) Ltd
Hickling Parish Council
Highlands and Islands Enterprise
Highways Agency
Highways England
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council
Historic England
Hoby with Rotherby Parish Council
Hollins Strategic Land LLP
Holmes Antill
Home Builders Federation Ltd
Homes England
Howkins & Harrison
Hungarton Parish Council
Hutchison 3G UK Ltd
HWRA (Haddon Way Residents' Association)
Hyperoptic Ltd
In Focus Public Networks Ltd
Independent Fibre Networks Ltd
Indigo Planning Ltd
Inland Waterways Association
Internet Central Ltd
Internet Connections Ltd
Interoute (i-21 Ltd)
IX Wireless Ltd
Jas. Martin & Co
Jelson Limited
John Martin & Associates
John Storer Charnwood
KCOM Group Plc
Kegworth Parish Council
Keyham Village Meeting

Kinchbus
King Sturge
Kingfisher Area Residents Group (KARG)
Kirkwells Town Planning Consultants
Knight Frank
KPN EuroRings B.V.
Lancaster University Network Services Ltd
Landesign
Landmark Planning Limited
LCPT
Leicester & Leicestershire Enterprise Council
Leicester Audi
Leicester City Council
Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance
Leicester-Shire & Rutland Sport
Leicestershire Bridleways Association
Leicestershire Campaign for Better Transport
Leicestershire Centre for Integrated Living
Leicestershire Constabulary
Leicestershire County Council
Leicestershire County Council
Leicestershire County Council - Environment & Transport
Leicestershire Fire & Rescue Service
Leicestershire Food Links Ltd
Leicestershire Footpaths Association
Leicestershire Local Access Forum
Leicestershire Waste Partnership
Leics & Rutland Assoc of Local Councils
Level 3 Communications UK Ltd
LHA-ASRA Group
Lib Dem Local Branch
Lichfields
Local Enterprise Partnership
Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council
Longhurst Group
Loughborough & District Cycle Users Campaign
Loughborough Churches Partnership
Loughborough Conservative Association
Loughborough Conservatives
Loughborough Council of Faiths
Loughborough Echo Newspaper
Loughborough Endowed Schools
Loughborough Gospel Halls Trust
Loughborough Jansari Centre
Loughborough Library
Loughborough Mosque & Islamic Cultural Association
Loughborough Naturalists' Club
Loughborough South West Action Group
Loughborough Students Union
Loughborough Town Centre Partnership

Loughborough United Reformed Church
Loughborough University
Loughborough Urban Forum
Love Loughborough BID Company Ltd
Lowesby & Cold Newton Parish Meeting
LRRCC
LSWAG
M & S Solicitors
Manor Farm Community Group
Marcus Bates Ltd
Marine Management Organisation
Mariners Quay Residents Association
Markfield Parish Council
Marrons
Martin Robeson Planning Practice
Mather Jamie Ltd
Maximus Networks Ltd.
Melton Borough Council
Merton College
Metropolitan Development Services
Metropolitan Housing Trust
Midland Heart
Midlands Rural
Miller Homes
Ministry of Defence Estates
MLL Telecom Ltd
Montague Evans
Morris Homes
Mountsorrel Library
MS3 Networks Ltd
Nanpantan Residents' Network (NRN)
Nathaniel Lichfields & Partners
National Farmers' Union, (East Midlands)
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
National Forest Company
National Grid
National Trust
Natural England
Neighbourhood Watch (Thurmaston)
Neos Networks Ltd
Network Rail
Network Rail (Property)
Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd
Network Rail Property
NextGenAccess Ltd
NHS Leicestershire & Rutland
Normanton on Soar Parish Council
North West Leicestershire District Council
Northumbrian Water Ltd
Nottingham Community Housing Association
Nottinghamshire County Council
Npower Ltd
NWP Street Ltd

NWRG
O2 (UK) Ltd
Oadby & Wigston Borough Council
Open Network Systems Ltd
OPUN
Orange Personal Communication Services Ltd
Oxalis Planning
Parkers of Leicester Ltd
Peacock and Smith Ltd
Peatfield Associates
Pegasus Group
Pegasus Planning Group
Persimmon Homes
Persimmon Homes & Charles Church
Persimmon Homes Notts
Planinfo
Planning and Design Group
Planning Potential Ltd
Planware
Planware Ltd
Polish Community Centre
Powergen
Pro Vision Planning & Design
Protection of Wildlife in Charnwood
Queniborough Gazette
Quickline Communications Ltd
Quorn Library
Ramblers Association
Rawlins Academy
Reach Europe Ltd
Redrow Homes East Midlands Ltd
Reminiscences Group
Rempstone Parish Council
rg+p Ltd
Richborough Estates Ltd,
Riverside Housing
RNIB Vocational College
Road Haulage Association
Roger Tym & Partners
Rothley Conservative Party
Rothley Library
Roundabout Magazine
Royal Mail Estates Ltd
Royal Mail Properties
Royal National Institute for Deaf People
RPS Planning & Development
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rutland County Council
Savills
Scott Brownrigg
Scottish Water
Scraftoft Parish Council

Sea Fibre Networks Ltd
Seagrave Parish Magazine
Sedgwick Associates
Serco UK&E Local Regional Government
Severn Trent Water Ltd
Shelthorpe Community Association
Shepshed Countryside Protection Group (SCPG)
Shepshed Library
Shree Ram Krishna Community Association
Sidings Park Residents Association
Signet Planning
Sikh Temple
Sileby Library
SIP (Industrial Products) Ltd
Sky Telecommunications Services Ltd
Smallworld Media Communications Ltd
Solway Communications Ltd
South East Water Plc
South Notts Bus Company Limited
South West Water Ltd
Sport England
Sprintlink UK Ltd
Spyder Facilities Ltd
Sri Niketan Cultural Association
SSA Planning Limited
SSE Telecommunications Ltd
St Michael's Church
St Peters Community Association
Stanford on Soar Parish Council
Stansgate Planning Consultancy
Stonewater Ltd
Straw & Pearce
Subtopia Ltd
Surf Telecoms Ltd
Sutton and East Surrey Water Plc
Sutton Bonington Parish Council
Syston & District Labour Party
Syston Library
TalkTalk Communications Ltd
Tata Communications (UK) Ltd
Taylor Wimpey
Telefonica UK Ltd
Telensa Ltd
Telewest Ltd
TeliaSonera International Carrier UK Ltd
TES (Shepshed) Ltd
Tetlow King Planning
Thames Water Utilities Ltd
The Abbeyfield Loughborough Society
The Bridge Housing Association
The Coal Authority
The Crown Estate

The Garden Centre Group
The Garden Trust
The Long Furrow Community Magazine
The Mobile Operators Associations (MOA)
The Planning Inspectorate
The Prince's Trust EM Regional Office
The Sirius Group
The Theatres Trust
The Wireless Infrastructure Company Ltd
The Woodland Trust
Three
Thrussington Life
Thurcaston Action Group (TAG)
Thurmaston Library
Thurmaston Park Trust
Thurmaston Times
Thus plc
TIBUS
Timico Partner Services Ltd
Tiscali UK Ltd
Transco Plc
Travis Baker Transport Planning Ltd
Trent Barton
Truespeed Communications Ltd.
Trustees - De Lisle Family Fund (Garendon Estate)
Turley Associates Ltd
Twyford and Thorpe Parish Council
UK Broadband Ltd
United Utilities Plc
Upper Broughton Parish Council
Urgo Ltd
Valuation Office Agency
Verizon UK Ltd
Viatel Infrastructure (UK) Ltd
Virgin Media Ltd
Vodafone and O2
Vodafone Ltd
Voneus Ltd
Vtesse Networks Ltd
WarwickNet Ltd
WDA Planning Ltd
Welbeck - The Defence Sixth Form College
Wessex Water Services Ltd
West Cross Lane Fields Residents Group
Western Power Distribution
Westleigh Developments Limited
Wifinity Ltd
Wightfibre Ltd
Wildcard UK Ltd
William Davis Ltd
Willoughby on the Wolds Parish Council
Woodthorpe Residents Association

Wyevale Garden Centres
Wysall & Thorpe in the Glebe Parish Council
Yorkshire Water Service Ltd
Zayo Group UK Ltd
All Borough Councillors
All Parish Councils
Members of the Public on Database

### *Summary of the main issues raised by the representations and how the representations have been taken into account*

In total 104 responses were received in response to the consultation. The Towards a Local Plan for Charnwood Discussion Paper Statement of Consultation (June 2018) summarises the main responses to the consultation and also details of individual representations and an officer response. The Statement of Consultation can be viewed here:

[https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/towards\\_a\\_local\\_plan\\_for\\_charnwood\\_statement\\_of\\_consultation\\_june\\_2018/Towards%20a%20Local%20Plan%20for%20Charnwood%20Statement%20of%20Consultation%20-%20June%202018%20%28FINAL%29.pdf](https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/towards_a_local_plan_for_charnwood_statement_of_consultation_june_2018/Towards%20a%20Local%20Plan%20for%20Charnwood%20Statement%20of%20Consultation%20-%20June%202018%20%28FINAL%29.pdf)

### Draft Plan (Optional Consultation) - November/December 2019

#### *Who was consulted and how was this undertaken?*

The Council published the Draft Charnwood Local Plan 2019-36 and an accompanying Interim Sustainability Appraisal as part of the process it is following to prepare a new local plan.

The consultation lasted for six weeks, starting on 4th November 2019 and ending on 16th December 2019. A letter/email was sent to the approximately 1,330 organisations and individuals that are on the local plan consultation database, which includes statutory consultees, parish and town councils, developers and planning agents, members of the public and local groups, to inform them of the consultation and invite their participation. A list of the organisations that were consulted in this way is set out in the appendix to this statement. An email alert was also sent to approximately 350 people who have registered to receive updates on the development of the local plan.

In order to seek as broad a range of responses to the consultation as possible, the Council also sought to publicise it in the following ways:

- The Council's communications team publicised the consultation, and information about how to respond to it, through the Council's website, social media (including paid for advertising), press releases which were picked up by several local newspapers and other publications, to the 2,700 subscribers to the Charnwood Now email alert and to members of the Virtual Citizens' Panel
- posters were sent to libraries, parish/town councils and community centres for them to display on their noticeboards
- copies of the draft plan were made available at libraries, the Borough Council's offices and the County Council's offices
- information about the local plan and the consultation was included in the Charnwood News magazine which is distributed to every household in the Borough
- information boards were displayed at three venues over a period of six weeks: the Borough Council offices in Loughborough, the Glenmore Centre in Shepshed and Syston Community Centre

- three consultation roadshow events were held, in Loughborough, Shepshed and Syston, at which officers were present to answer questions regarding the proposals in the draft plan and provide help with how to respond to the consultation
- officers attended a number of additional events at the request of parish councils to provide information about the draft plan and answer questions.

The Council is committed to involving a wide range of individuals and organisations in its planning consultations, including hard to reach groups, and to using a wide range of consultation techniques in seeking to engage with people who may not otherwise respond to planning consultations. The Council sought to overcome some of the barriers to people participating in the consultation by:

- expanding the consultation database to include a wider range of voluntary sector organisations
- contacting organisations representing hard-to-reach groups and offering assistance in enabling them and the people they represent to respond to the consultation
- producing a summary version of the draft local plan which was 12 pages long rather than the 132 pages of the complete draft plan
- enabling people to respond to the consultation in a number of different ways, including a flier with four key questions to answer which was sent to schools and voluntary sector organisations.

Around 100 people attended the three roadshow events. A record was kept of the comments that were made at each of the events and a summary of the key issues from each event was prepared. Table 2 below sets out the bodies consulted.

*Table 3 – Bodies and persons invited to make representations*

Action Deafness	Anstey Martin High School
Action for Hearing Loss	Anstey The Latimer Primary School
Adlington	Anstey Woolden Hill Community Primary School
Advance Housing and Support Ltd	AQ Ltd
Affiniti Integrated Solutions Limited	Arcus Consulting Services Ltd
Affinity Water Limited	Arqiva Communications Ltd
Age UK Leicester Shire and Rutland	Arriva Midlands
Airband Community Internet Limited	Arriva plc
Airwave Solutions Limited	Arts Council England (East Midlands Arts)
Andrew Granger & Co LLP	Ashby Road Estates Community Association
Andrew Hiorns Town Planning	
Anglian Water	

AT&T Global Network Services (UK) B.V.
Atlas Communications NI Ltd
Aylesbury Vale Broadband Ltd
Bangladesh Social Association
Bardon Parish Meeting
Barkby & Barkby Thorpe Action Group
Barkby The Pochin School
Barratts
Barrow Hall Orchard C.E. Primary School
Barrow Humphrey Perkins School
Barrow Upon Soar Community Association
Barrow upon Soar Neighbourhood Plan Group
Barrow Voice
Belton Parish Council
Bepschools
Bidwells
Birstall & Wanlip Neighbourhood Watch
Birstall Hallam Fields Primary School
Birstall Highcliffe Primary School & Community Centre
Birstall Post
Birstall Riverside Community Primary School
Birstall The Cedars Academy
Blaby District Council
Bloor Homes Midlands
BNP Paribas Real Estate UK
Bolt Pro Tem Ltd
Boundless Networks Ltd
Bradgate Magazine

Bristol Water Plc
British Democratic Party
British Geological Survey
British Telecommunications plc
Broadband for the Rural North Ltd
Broughton & Dalby Parish Council
Building Research Establishment
Burnett Planning
Burton On The Wolds Primary School
Bytel Networks Ltd
Cadent (Gas)
Cala Homes (South) Ltd
Call Flow Solutions Ltd
Cambridge Fibre Networks Ltd
Canal & River Trust
Carter Jonas LLP
CBRE Ltd
Central North Sea Fibre Telecommunications Ltd
Cerda Planning Ltd
Chapman Street Residents Association
Charles Lowe and sons/Generations
Charley Parish Council
Charnwood Arts
Charnwood Bangladeshi Society
Charnwood Disability Forum
Charnwood GP Network
Charnwood Together
Chilton Strategic Land
City Screen Printers UK) Ltd
CityFibre Metro Networks Ltd

CityLink Telecommunications Ltd
Civil Aviation Authority
Cogent Communications UK Ltd
COLT Technology Services
Community Fibre Ltd
Concept Solutions People Ltd
Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Ltd
Cossington C.E. Primary School
Costock Parish Council
Countryside Properties
County Broadband Ltd
CPRE - Charnwood District
CPRE charnwood
CPRE Leicestershire
CTIL
Cyclist Touring Club
David Wilson Homes East Midlands
Define
Department for Work & Pensions
Department of Constitutional Affairs
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
Derwent Living
Design Council - CABE
Dev Plan
DLP Planning Consultants
DLP Planning Ltd (East Midlands)
Dwr Cymru Cyfyngedig
E A Lane & Sons
East Goscote Broomfield Primary School
East Leake Parish Council

East Leicestershire & Rutland Clinical Commissioning Group
East Midlands Airport
East Midlands Council
Education & Skills Funding Agency
EE Ltd
Eircom UK Ltd
EMH Group
Energis Communications Ltd
Environment Agency
Equality Action
EU Networks Fiber UK Ltd
Euro Payphone Ltd
Eurobell Ltd
Fairhurst
Faulks, Perry, Culley & Rech
Fearon Community Association
FFR Ultrasonics Ltd
FibreSpeed Ltd
Fibrewave Networks
Fisher German LLP
Fisher Scientific UK Ltd
FLAG Atlantic UK Ltd
Forestry Commission
Fox Bennett
Fox Strategic Land & Property
Foxpark Limited
Framptons
Friends of Charnwood Forest
Fujitsu Services Ltd
G. Network Communications Ltd

Gaddesby Parish Council
Gamma Telecom Holdings Ltd
Garendon Park & Countryside Protection Group
Geeta Bhawan
GeneSYS Telecommunications Ltd
Geo Networks Ltd
Gigaclear Plc
Gladmans Development
Glenfield Parish Council
Gorse Covert Community Association
Great Central Railway plc
Groby Parish Council
Gurudwara Sahib Sikh Community Centre
GVA
Haddon Way Residents Association
Hallam Land Management
Hamilton Community College
Hanover Housing Association
Hanson UK
Harborough District Council
Harris Lamb
Hastings Community Association
Hastings Residents Association
Hathern C.E.Primary School
Hawksmoor
Haydon Road Residents Association
Health & Safety Executive
Heaton Planning Ltd
Hibernia Express (UK) Ltd
Hickling Parish Council

Highways England
Highways England
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council
Historic England
Hoby with Rotherby Parish Council
Home Builders Federation Ltd
Homes England
Homes for the Homeless, Leicestershire
Home-Start Charnwood
Howkins & Harrison
Hungarton Parish Council
Hutchison 3G UK Ltd
HWRA (Haddon Way Residents' Association)
Hyperoptic Ltd
In Focus Public Networks Ltd
Independent Fibre Networks Ltd
Indigo Planning Ltd
Internet Central Ltd
Internet Connections Ltd
Interoute (i-21 Ltd)
IX Wireless Ltd
Jas. Martin & Co
John Martin & Associates
John Storer Charnwood
KCOM Group Plc
Kegworth Parish Council
Keyham Village Meeting
Kinchbus
Kingfisher Area Residents Group (KARG)
Kingston on Soar Parish Council

Knight Frank
KPN EuroRings B.V.
Lancaster University Network Services Ltd
Landmark Planning Limited
LAQPG
Leicester & Leicestershire Enterprise Council
Leicester Audi
Leicester City Council
Leicester City Council -Transport
Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance
Leicestershire & Rutland Playing Fields Association
Leicestershire & Rutland Rural Community Council
Leicestershire and Rutland Association of Local Councils
Leicestershire Bridleways Association
Leicestershire Campaign for Better Transport
Leicestershire Centre for Integrated Living
Leicestershire Constabulary
Leicestershire County Council
Leicestershire County Council - Environment & Transport
Leicestershire Local Access Forum
Leicestershire Police HQ
Leicestershire Waste Partnership
Leics & Rutland Assoc of Local Councils
Level 3 Communications UK Ltd
LHA-ASRA Group
Lichfields
Local Enterprise Partnership

Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council
Longhurst Group
Loughborough Ashmount School
Loughborough Beacon Academy
Loughborough Booth Wood Primary School
Loughborough C of E Primary School
Loughborough Charnwood College
Loughborough Churches Partnership
Loughborough Cobden Primary School & Community Centre
Loughborough Conservative Association
Loughborough Conservatives
Loughborough Council of Faiths
Loughborough De Lisle College
Loughborough Echo
Loughborough Endowed Schools
Loughborough Holywell Primary School
Loughborough Limehurst Academy
Loughborough Mosque & Islamic Cultural Association
Loughborough Mountfields Lodge School
Loughborough Naturalists' Club
Loughborough Outwoods Edge Community Primary School
Loughborough Polish Community Centre
Loughborough Rendell Primary School
Loughborough Robert Bakewell Primary School & Community Centre
Loughborough Sacred Heart Catholic Voluntary Academy
Loughborough Saint Mary's Catholic Primary School

Loughborough Stonebow Primary School
Loughborough Students Union
Loughborough Thorpe Acre Junior School
Loughborough Town Centre Partnership
Loughborough University
Loughborough Woodbrook Vale High School
Love Loughborough BID Company Ltd
Lowesby & Cold Newton Parish Meeting
LSWAG
M & S Solicitors
Marcus Bates Ltd
Marine Management Organisation
Markfield Parish Council
Marrons Planning
Mather Jamie Ltd
Maximus Networks Ltd.
Melton Borough Council
Merton College
Metropolitan Development Services
Metropolitan Housing Trust
Midland Heart
Midlands Rural
Ministry of Defence
MLL Telecom Ltd
Mosaic - Shaping Disability Services
Mountsorrel Christ Church & St.Peter's C.E. Primary School
Mountsorrel Post
MS3 Networks Ltd
Nanpantan Residents Association

Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
National Farmers' Union, (East Midlands)
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
National Forest Company
National Grid Ltd
National Trust
Natural England
Neos Networks Ltd
Network Rail
Network Rail Property
Newtown Linford Primary School
NextGenAccess Ltd
NHS Leicestershire & Rutland
NHS Property Services Ltd
Normanton on Soar Parish Council
North West Leicestershire District Council
Northumbrian Water Ltd
Nottingham Community Housing Association
Nottinghamshire County Council
NWP Street Ltd
NWRG
O2 (UK) Ltd
Oadby & Wigston Borough Council
Office of Rail & Road
Open Network Systems Ltd
OPUN
Orange Personal Communication Services Ltd
Oxalis Planning
Parkers of Leicester Ltd

Peacock and Smith Ltd
Pegasus Group
Persimmon Homes
Persimmon Homes & Charles Church
Persimmon Homes North Midlands
Persimmon Homes Notts
Plainview Planning Ltd
Planinfo
Planning and Design Group
Planware Ltd
Queniborough C.E. Primary School
Queniborough Gazette
Queniborough Neighbourhood Plan Group
Queniborough Parish Office
Quickline Communications Ltd
Quorn Neighbourhood Plan Group
Quorn Rawlins Academy
Quorn St Bartholomew's C.E. Primary School
Rawlins Academy
Reach Europe Ltd
Rearsby Neighbourhood Plan Group
Rearsby St Michael And All Angels C.E. Primary School
Redrow Homes East Midlands Ltd
Rempstone Parish Council
rg+p Ltd
Richborough Estates Ltd
Riverside Housing
RNIB Vocational College
Road Haulage Association

Rosebery Community Centre Ltd
Rothley C.E. Primary School
Rothley Neighbourhood Plan Group
Roundabout Magazine
Roundhill Academy
Royal National Institute for Deaf People
Rural Community Council (Leicestershire & Rutland)
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rutland County Council
Savills
Scottish Water
Scraptoft Parish Council
Sea Fibre Networks Ltd
Seagrave Parish Magazine
Seagrave Village Primary School
Serco UK&E Local Regional Government
Severn Trent Water Ltd
Shelthorpe Residents Association
Shepshed Iveshead School
Shepshed Newcroft Primary School
Shepshed Oxley Primary School
Shepshed Saint Winefride's Catholic Voluntary Academy
Shepshed St Botolph's C.E. Primary School
Shepshed Town Council
Shree Ram Krishna Community Association
Sidings Park Residents Association
Sikh Temple
Sileby Highgate Community Primary

School
Sileby Neighbourhood Plan Group
Sileby Redlands Community Primary School
SIP (Industrial Products) Ltd
Sky Telecommunications Services Ltd
Smallworld Media Communications Ltd
Solway Communications Ltd
South East Water Plc
South Notts Bus Company Limited
South West Water Ltd
Sport England
Sprintlink UK Ltd
Spyder Facilities Ltd
SSA Planning Limited
SSE Telecommunications Ltd
Stanford on Soar Parish Council
Stansgate Planning Consultancy
Straw & Pearce
Subtopia Ltd
Surf Telecoms Ltd
Sutton and East Surrey Water Plc
Sutton Bonington Parish Council
Swithland St. Leonard's C.E. Primary School
Syston St Peter & St.Paul Academy
Syston Town Council
Syston Town News
Syston Wreake Valley Academy
TalkTalk Communications Ltd
Tata Communications (UK) Ltd

Taylor Wimpey
Telefonica UK Ltd
Telensa Ltd
Telewest Ltd
TeliaSonera International Carrier UK Ltd
TES (Shepshed) Ltd
Tetlow King Planning
Thames Water Utilities Ltd
The Abbeyfield Loughborough Society
The Bridge Housing Association
The Coal Authority
The County Practice
The Crown Estate
The Garden Trust
The Jubilee Medical Practice & Training Hub
The Mobile Operators Associations (MOA)
The Planning Inspectorate
The Prince's Trust EM Regional Office
The Quorndon
The Sirius Group
The Theatres Trust
The Wireless Infrastructure Company Ltd
The Woodland Trust
Thorpe Acre Residents Association
Thrussington C.E. Primary School
Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan Group
Thurcaston & Cropston Parish Council Memorial Hall
Thurcaston Richard Hill C.E. Primary School
Thurmaston Action Group

Thurmaston Church Hill C.E. Junior School
Thurmaston Church Hill Infant School
Thurmaston Eastfield Primary School
Thurmaston Times
Thus plc
TIBUS
Timico Partner Services Ltd
Tiscali UK Ltd
Trent Barton
Truespeed Communications Ltd.
Turley Associates Ltd
Twyford and Thorpe Parish Council
UK Broadband Ltd
United Utilities Plc
Upper Broughton Parish Council
Urgo Ltd
Valuation Office Agency
Verizon UK Ltd
Viatel Infrastructure (UK) Ltd
Virgin Media Ltd
Vista (The Royal Leicestershire, Rutland & Wycliffe Society for the Blind)
Vodafone Ltd
Voneus Ltd
Vtesse Networks Ltd
Warwick Way Residents Association
WarwickNet Ltd
WDA Planning
Welbeck - The Defence Sixth Form College
Wessex Water Services Ltd

West Cross Lane Fields Residents Group
West Leicestershire Clinical Commissioning Group
Western Power Distribution
Westleigh Developments Limited
Wifinity Ltd
Wightfibre Ltd
Wildcard UK Ltd
William Davis Ltd
Willoughby on the Wolds Parish Council
Wood Plc
Woodhouse Eaves Maplewell Hall School
Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan Group
Woodland Trust
Wyevale Garden Centres
Wysall & Thorpe in the Glebe Parish Council
Yorkshire Water Service Ltd
Zayo Group UK Ltd

*Summary of the main issues raised by the representations and how the representations have been taken into account*

In total 434 people and organisations responded formally to the consultation, making approximately 3,500 separate comments. The draft Charnwood Local Plan 2019-2036 Statement of Consultation (March 2020) summarises the main responses to the consultation and also details of individual representations and an officer response. The Statement of Consultation can be viewed [here](#).

**Conclusion**

Appendix 1 illustrates that the requirements of Regulation 22(1)(c)(i) to (iv) have been met and demonstrates that the consultation on the preparation of the Local Plan was in accordance with the adopted SCI.

## **APPENDIX 2 - Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan Regulation 19 Consultation**

### *Introduction*

This Appendix sets out how the requirements of Regulation 22(1)(c)(v) have been met and how the Charnwood Local Plan 2021- 2037 Pre-Submission Version Regulation 19 consultation has been undertaken.

The Council published the Charnwood Local Plan 2021- 2037 Pre-Submission Version and supporting documents including the Policy Maps, Sustainability Appraisal, Habitats Regulations Assessment and Equalities Impact Assessment for a 6 week consultation during July and August 2021. This was in order for representations to be made on the plan and supporting documents before they are submitted for examination by a Planning Inspector.

### *Who was consulted under Regulation 19 and how was this undertaken?*

The consultation sought views on whether the plan complies with the relevant legal requirements, including the duty to co-operate, and is sound. Table 1 below sets out the bodies consulted.

*Table 1 – Bodies and persons invited to make representations*

Action Deafness	Association
Action for Hearing Loss	Astill Consultants
Adlington	Atlas Communications NI Ltd
Advance Housing and Support Ltd	Avison Young
Affiniti Integrated Solutions Limited	Aylesbury Vale Broadband Ltd
Affinity Water Limited	Baca Charity
Age UK Leicester Shire and Rutland	Bangladesh Social Association
Airband Community Internet Limited	Banks Surgery
Airwave Solutions Limited	Bardon Parish Meeting
ALDI Stores Ltd	Barkby & Barkby Thorpe Action Group
Alpine House Surgery	Barratts
Altogether Place - Warwick Way Action Group in partnership with Charnwood Borough Council	Barrow Health Centre
Andrew Granger & Co LLP	Barrow Upon Soar Community Association
Andrew Hiorns Town Planning	Barrow upon Soar Neighbourhood Plan Group
Andrew Martin Associates	Barrow Voice
AQ Ltd	Barton Willmore
Arcus Consulting Services Ltd	Barwood Development Securities Ltd
Arqiva Communications Ltd	Beacon Academy
Arriva Midlands	Beacon Christian Fellowship
Arriva plc	Bell Cornwell
Arthritis Support Leicestershire	Belton Parish Council
Arts Council England (East Midlands Arts)	Berrys
Ashby Road Community Association	Bidwells
Ashby Road Estates Community	Biffa

Birstall & Wanlip Neighbourhood Watch
Birstall Medical Centre
Birstall Post
Bishop Ellis Catholic School
Blaby District Council
Bloor Homes Midlands
BNP Paribas Real Estate UK
Bolt Pro Tem Ltd
Booth Wood Primary School
Boundless Networks Ltd
Boyer Planning
Bradgate Magazine
Bristol Water Plc
British Democratic Party
British Geological Survey
British Telecommunications plc
Broadband for the Rural North Ltd
Broomfield Primary School
Broughton & Dalby Parish Council
Building Research Establishment
Burges Salmon LLP
Burnett Planning
Burton on the Wolds Primary School
Bytel Networks Ltd
Cadent (Gas)
Cala Homes (South) Ltd
Call Flow Solutions Ltd
Cambridge Fibre Networks Ltd
Canal & River Trust
Carter Jonas LLP
CBRE Ltd
Central North Sea Fibre Telecommunications Ltd
Cerda Planning Ltd
Chapman Street Residents Association
Charles Lowe and sons/Generations
Charley Parish Council
Charnwood Arts
Charnwood Bangladeshi Society
Charnwood College
Charnwood Constituency Labour Party
Charnwood Disability Forum
Charnwood GP Network
Charnwood Stroke Club
Charnwood Surgery
Charnwood Together
Chilton Strategic Land

Christ Church and St Peters CofE Primary School
Church Hill Infant School
City Screen Printers UK) Ltd
CityFibre Metro Networks Ltd
CityLink Telecommunications Ltd
Civil Aviation Authority
Clarendon Land & Development Ltd
Cobden Primary School
Cogent Communications UK Ltd
COLT Technology Services
Community Fibre Ltd
Concept Solutions People Ltd
Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Ltd
Cossington CE Primary School
Costock Parish Council
Countryside Properties
County Broadband Ltd
CPRE - Charnwood District
CPRE Leicestershire
Cyclist Touring Club
D J Deloitte
David Jarvis Associates Ltd
David Wilson Homes East Midlands
Davidsons Developments Ltd
De Lisle College
Define
Department for Work & Pensions
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
Derwent Living
Design Council - CABE
Design Midlands (formerly OPUN)
Design: Midlands
Dev Plan
Dishley Grange Medical Practice
DLP Planning Ltd (East Midlands)
DTZ
E A Lane & Sons
East Leake Parish Council
East Leicestershire and Rutland CCG
East Midlands Airport
East Midlands Council
Eastfield Primary School
Education & Skills Funding Agency
EE Ltd
Eircom UK Ltd

Emery Planning
EMH Group
Energis Communications Ltd
Environment Agency
Equality Action
EU Networks Fiber UK Ltd
Eurobell Ltd
Exaireo Trust
Fairhurst
Falcon Centre
Faulks, Perry, Culley & Rech
Fearon Community Association
FFR Ultrasonics Ltd
FibreSpeed Ltd
Fibrewave Networks
Field Street Surgery
Fisher German LLP
Fisher Scientific UK Ltd
Forest Edge Medical Centre (part of Charnwood Medical Group)
Forest House Surgery
Forestry Commission
Fox Bennett
Fox Strategic Land & Property
Foxley Tagg Planning Ltd
Foxpark Limited
Framptons
Friends of Charnwood Forest
Fujitsu Services Ltd
G R Planning Consultancy Ltd
Gaddesby Parish Council
Gamma Telecom Holdings Ltd
Garendon Park & Countryside Protection Group
GATE (Gypsy and Traveller Equality) Project
Geeta Bhawan
Geo Networks Ltd
Gerald Eve LLP
Gigaclear Plc
Gladmans Development
Glebe House
Glenfield Parish Council
Gorse Covert Community Association
Gough Planning Services
Great Central Railway plc
Greengate Medical Centre

Gregory Gray Associates
Groby Parish Council
Gurudwara Sahib Sikh Community Centre
GVA Grimley
Haddon Way Residents Association
Hall Orchard CE Primary School
Hallam Fields Primary School
Hallam Land Management Ltd
Hanover Housing Association
Hanson UK
Harborough District Council
Harris Lamb
Hastings Community Association
Hastings Residents Association
Hathern C of E Primary School
Hawker Business Park Limited
Hawksmoor
Haydon Road Residents Association
Health & Safety Executive
Health Education East Midlands
Heaton Planning Ltd
Hibernia Express (UK) Ltd
Hickling Parish Council
Highcliffe Primary School
Highgate Community Primary School
Highgate Medical Centre
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council
Historic England
Hoby with Rotherby Parish Council
Hollins Strategic Land LLP
Holywell Primary School
Home Builders Federation Ltd
Homes England
Howkins & Harrison
Humphrey Perkins School
Hungarton Parish Council
Hutchison 3G UK Ltd
HWRA (Haddon Way Residents' Association)
Hyperoptic Ltd
In Focus Public Networks Ltd
Independent Fibre Networks Ltd
Indigo Planning Ltd
Infraland
Internet Central Ltd
Internet Connections Ltd
Iveshead School

IX Wireless Ltd
Jas. Martin & Co
JMS Planning
John Martin & Associates
John Storer Charnwood
KCOM Group Plc
Kegworth Parish Council
Keyham Village Meeting
Kinchbus
Kingfisher Area Residents Group (KARG)
Knight Frank
KPN EuroRings B.V.
Lancaster University Network Services Ltd
Landmark Planning Limited
LAQPG
Latimer Primary School
Leicester & Leicestershire Enterprise Council
Leicester Audi
Leicester City Council
Leicester City Council -Transport
Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance
Leicester Lesbian Gay Bisexual & Transgender Centre
Leicestershire & Rutland Playing Fields Association
Leicestershire & Rutland Rural Community Council
Leicestershire & Rutland Wildlife Trust
Leicestershire and Rutland Association of Local Councils
Leicestershire Bridleways Association
Leicestershire Campaign for Better Transport
Leicestershire Centre for Integrated Living
Leicestershire Constabulary
Leicestershire County Council
Leicestershire County Council - Environment & Transport
Leicestershire Local Access Forum
Leicestershire Police HQ
Leicestershire Waste Partnership
Leics & Rutland Assoc of Local Councils
Level 3 Communications UK Ltd
LHA-ASRA Group
Lichfields
Limehurst Academy
Living Without Abuse

LLR Strategy and Planning Team
Local Enterprise Partnership
Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council
Longhurst Group
Loughborough Church of England Primary School
Loughborough Churches Partnership
Loughborough Conservative Association
Loughborough Council of Faiths
Loughborough Leggo Youth Group
Loughborough Mosque & Islamic Cultural Association
Loughborough Naturalists' Club
Loughborough Polish Community Centre
Loughborough Stonebow Primary School
Loughborough Students Union
Loughborough Town Centre Partnership
Loughborough University
Loughborough University Medical Centre
Love Loughborough BID Company Ltd
Lowesby & Cold Newton Parish Meeting
LRM Planning
LSWAG
M & S Solicitors
Marcus Bates Ltd
Marcus Laing
Marine Management Organisation
Marios Tinenti Centre (MTC)Â
Markfield Parish Council
Marrons Planning
Martin High School
Mather Jamie Ltd
Maximus Networks Ltd.
Melton Borough Council
Merton College
Metropolitan Development Services
Metropolitan Housing Trust
Michelmersh Brick Holdings Plc
Midland Heart
Midlands Rural
Midlands Rural Housing
Miller Homes
Ministry of Defence
MLL Telecom Ltd
Mono Consultants Ltd
Montague Evans
Mosaic - Shaping Disability Services

Mountfields Lodge School
Mountsorrel Post
MS3 Networks Ltd
Nanpantan Ward Residents Group (NWRG)
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
National Custom & Self Build Association
National Farmers' Union, (East Midlands)
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
National Forest Company
National Grid
National Highways
National Trust
Natural England
Neighbourhood Planning
Neos Networks Ltd
Network Rail Property
Newcroft Primary Academy
Newton Linford Primary School
Nextgen Access Ltd
NHS Leicestershire & Rutland
NHS Property Services Ltd
Nineteen 47
Normanton on Soar Parish Council
North West Leicestershire District Council
Northumbrian Water Ltd
Nottingham Community Housing Association
Nottinghamshire County Council
NWP Street Ltd
O2 (UK) Ltd
Oadby & Wigston Borough Council
Office for Nuclear Regulation
Office of Rail & Road
Open Network Systems Ltd
Orange Personal Communication Services Ltd
Outwoods Edge Primary School
Outwoods Medical Centre (part of Charnwood Medical Group)
Oxalis Planning
Oxley Primary School
Park View Surgery
Parkers of Leicester Ltd
Peacock and Smith Ltd
Pegasus Planning Group
Persimmon Homes

Persimmon Homes & Charles Church
Persimmon Homes North Midlands
Persimmon Homes Notts
Peter Le Marchant Trust
Pinfold Medical Practice
Plainview Planning Ltd
Planinfo
Planit-X Town and Country Planning Services Ltd
Planning and Design Group
Planning Potential Ltd
Planware Ltd
PRC Group
Pro Vision Planning & Design
ProActive Community Endeavours (PACE)
Queniborough C.E. Primary School
Queniborough Gazette
Queniborough Neighbourhood Plan Group
Queniborough Parish Office
Quickline Communications Ltd
Quorn Medical Centre
Quorn Neighbourhood Plan Group
Rawlins Academy
RCA Regeneration Ltd
Reach Europe Ltd
Rearsby Neighbourhood Plan Group
Rectory Wildlife Gardeners
Redrow Homes East Midlands Ltd
Rempstone Parish Council
Rendell Primary School
rg+p Ltd
Richard Hill Church of England Primary School
Richborough Estates Ltd
Riverside Housing
Riverside Primary School
RNIB Vocational College
Road Haulage Association
Robert Bakewell Primary School and Community Centre
Rosconn Strategic Land
Rosebery Community Centre Ltd
Rosebery Medical Centre (part of Charnwood Medical Group)
Rothley CE Academy
Rothley Neighbourhood Plan Group
Roundabout Magazine

Royal National Institute for Deaf People
RPS Planning & Development
Rural Community Council (Leicestershire & Rutland)
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rutland County Council
Sacred Heart Catholic Voluntary Academy
Savills
Scott Brownrigg
Scottish Water
Scraptoft Parish Council
Sea Fibre Networks Ltd
Seagrave Parish Magazine
Seagrave Village Primary School
Sedgwick Associates
Serco UK&E Local Regional Government
Severn Trent Water Ltd
Shearsby Parish Councillors
Shelthorpe Residents Association
Shepshed Volunteer Centre
Shree Ram Krishna Community Association
Sidings Park Residents Association
Signet Planning
Sikh Temple
Sileby Neighbourhood Plan Group
Sileby Redlands Community Primary School
Silver Fox Development Consultancy
Silverdale Medical Centre
SIP (Industrial Products) Ltd
Sky Telecommunications Services Ltd
Solway Communications Ltd
South & East Leicestershire Action Group
South Notts Bus Company Limited
South West Water Ltd
Spawforths
Sport England
Sprintlink UK Ltd
SSA Planning Limited
SSE Telecommunications Ltd
St Bartholomew's Primary School
St Botolphs CE Primary School
St Marys Catholic Church School
St Michael and All Angels Primary School
St Peter and St Paul CE Academy
St Peter's Centre

St Winefrides Catholic Voluntary Academy
St. Paul's CE Primary School
Stanford on Soar Parish Council
Stansgate Planning Consultancy
Stantec
Storer & Ashby Area Residents Group (SARG)
Straw & Pearce
Subtopia Ltd
Surf Telecoms Ltd
Sutton and East Surrey Water Plc
Sutton Bonington Parish Council
Swithland St Leonard's CofE Primary School
Syston & District Volunteer Centre
Syston Health Centre
Syston Town News
TalkTalk Communications Ltd
Tarmac Trading Ltd
Tata Communications (UK) Ltd
Taylor Wimpey
Telefonica UK Ltd
Telensa Ltd
Telewest Ltd
Telia Carrier UK Ltd
TES (Shepshed) Ltd
Tetlow King Planning
Thames Water Utilities Ltd
The Abbeyfield Loughborough Society
The Bridge Housing Association
The Carpenter's Arms
The Cedars Academy
The Coal Authority
The County Practice
The Environment Agency
The Garden Trust
The Health Centre
The Jubilee Medical Centre
The Merton Primary School
The Mobile Operators Associations (MOA)
The Planning Inspectorate
The Pochin School
The Prince's Trust EM Regional Office
The Roundhill Academy
The Sirius Group
The Theatres Trust
The Wireless Infrastructure Company Ltd

The Woodland Trust
Theatres Trust
Thomas Taylor Planning Ltd
Thorpe Acre Infant School
Thorpe Acre Junior School
Thorpe Acre Residents Association
Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan Group
Thrussington Primary School
Thurcaston & Cropston Parish Council Memorial Hall
Thurmaston Action Group
Thurmaston Church Hill Junior
Thurmaston Health Centre
Thurmaston Times
Thus plc
TIBUS
Timico Partner Services Ltd
Tiscali UK Ltd
Trent Barton
Turley Associates
Twyford and Thorpe Parish Council
UCR Construction and Development Ltd
UK Broadband Ltd
United Utilities Plc
Upper Broughton Parish Council
Urgo Ltd
Vale Planning Consultants
Verizon UK Ltd
Viatel Infrastructure (UK) Ltd
Virgin Media Ltd
Vista
Vodafone Ltd
Voneus Ltd
Warwick Way Residents Association
WDA Planning Ltd
Wessex Water Services Ltd
West Cross Lane Fields Residents Group
West Leicestershire CCG
Western Power Distribution
Westleigh Developments Limited
Wifinity Ltd
Wightfibre Ltd
Wildcard UK Ltd
William Davis Ltd
Willoughby on the Wolds Parish Council
Wood Plc
Woodbrook Medical Centre

Woodbrook Vale School
Woodhouse Eaves Cottage Surgery
Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan Group
Woodland Trust
Woolden Hill Primary School
Wreake Valley Academy
Wymeswold Primary School
Wysall & Thorpe in the Glebe Parish Council
Yorkshire Water Service Ltd
Zayo Group UK Ltd
All Parish Councils
All Borough and County Councillors
Members of the Public registered on our database

The consultation was undertaken during the Coronavirus pandemic and as such the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 No 7312 took effect. The Council ensured the consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement (adopted January 2021) which notes that COVID-19 measures may temporarily restrict the Council's ability to undertake physical consultation methods. Should this be the case the Council will facilitate online alternatives. The following measures undertaken to publicise the consultation and ensure that consultation material was available and accessible:

- Consultation documents made available on the Council's website
- Hard copy available to view at the Council's offices by appointment in accordance with covid regulations
- Email and letter notification to those on the local plan consultation database
- Site notices - an A4 site notice poster placed adjoining each proposed housing and employment allocation.
- Social media and email alerts to be posted throughout the consultation
- Press release to local media organisations
- Two virtual presentations during the consultation process with a text Q&A opportunity.
- Focused meetings on request
- Virtual presentation for Parish and Town Councils ahead of the consultation launch to outline the content of the plan and how to make comments
- E-mail to all local politicians (MP, District and Borough Councillors) setting out how documents can be viewed, how to respond and the deadline for responses.
- e-mail to developers, stakeholder and community forums setting out how documents can be viewed, how to respond and the deadline for responses.
- Responding positively to equal access requests.

Arrangements were made for representations on the Local Plan and its evidence base to be submitted on-line, by email and by letter with the option of using a consultation form that could be completed via the Council's website or by using a word version available to download online.

#### *Summary of the main issues raised by the representations and Council response*

The Council received a total of 740 representations. Table 2 below provides a summary by local plan chapter of the main issues raised through the Regulation 19 consultation together with a high-level Council response. This has been prepared to assist the Inspector.

Table 2 – Summary of main issues raised and high level Council response

**Introduction, Vision and Objectives**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 1, 81, 176, 208, 221, 254, 340, 356, 545, 559, 574, 575, 580, 595, 598, 619, 622, 635, 713, 731, 738

<b>Issues raised with reference to the Vision and Strategic Context</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Support for the Vision and Objectives	1 (Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland CCGs), 221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd), 254 (Sports England)
The Vision does not mention infrastructure to support development.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Earlier mention could be made in the Plan to the Strategic Growth Plan.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
It should be made clear that the Strategic Growth Plan is a non-statutory plan.	713 (Harborough District Council)
Blanket support for the Strategic Growth Plan is not sound because the plan is not new and requires review.	340
The Vision should be amended to recognise the role played by Service Centres in providing sustainable solutions to housing growth and delivering local benefits	575
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.	356
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.	81
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.	598
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.	598
Opportunities for sustainable growth on sites in Charnwood but well related to settlements in other districts should be referenced within the Vision.	619,222
Unmet need should be addressed in the Vision and Objective	635

<b>Issues raised with reference to the Objectives:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The Objectives underplay the transport package necessary to enable growth and a set of transport objectives may be appropriate.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
It is necessary to require development patterns of high density development which actively discourage car use and achieve a substantial modal shift.	176
The plan does not do enough to combat climate change and related policies throughout the Plan is far too weak.	176, 580 (Leicestershire County Council), 356
The Introduction has not been prepared based on proportionate evidence nor is it consistent with national policy on climate change, sustainable development and brownfield prioritisation.	340
Local infrastructure is already at capacity.	81
The role played by sustainable service centres and other settlements in accommodating development should be included in the objectives.	545, 559
Need to ensure allocated sites are delivered in a timely manner with infrastructure and policy requirements met as an objective.	545
<b>Other Issues raised in relation to the introduction</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Local infrastructure and health inequality should be mentioned.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
There should be a bit more ambition about green spaces around Loughborough.	208
This long term sustainability of 'sustainable urban extensions' is unproven.	738
The plan fails to demonstrate how the proposed scale of growth in Shepshed is sustainable; 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.	598
Greater focus on growth at Loughborough as the main economic, social and cultural heart of the Borough.	598
Various presentational and detailed comments provided for the profile covering issues which the plan should better address such as the differentiation of types of employment; the links between health and economic deprivation and updating of tourism information. A map of the location of Charnwood showing key settlements and strategic transport links should be included.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)

<b>Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to the Introduction comments</b>
The Introduction sets out the Vision and Objectives to provide the overall context while Chapter 2, the Development Strategy and subsequent topic and Place Based chapters providing detailed policy guidance to achieve the vision. The introduction includes an appropriate amount of detail.
With regard to climate change, the local plan is in conformity with the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance and meets all legal requirements.

With regards to tackling climate change, the Council has made responding to the challenge of climate change a corporate priority and climate change is a cross-cutting issue that influences all of the local plan's objectives and policies. It should be noted, that the policies included in a local plan must be deliverable; and must not be written in such a manner as to jeopardise the viability and deliverability of future development.

Matters related to strategy for homes and jobs, the environment, tackling climate change, infrastructure provision are covered in their respective chapters. The Plan has been informed by proportionate evidence base, has been tested through sustainability appraisal, and has been prepared in cooperation with key partners. The Council has prepared topic papers to explain its approach to housing, employment, transport evidence, Leicestershire International Gateway, and its approach to overall strategy and site selection.

The introduction is considered to be appropriate.

### **DS1: Development Strategy**

Comments made by (PSLP/02; 05; 07; 11; 13; 41; 65; 66; 67; 76; 80; 84; 87; 103; 106; 118; 132; 133; 140; 162; 165; 176; 180; 192; 200; 203; 207; 212; 213; 214; 228; 238; 239; 241; 243; 254; 257; 261; 270; 273; 274; 275; 278; 279; 281; 293; 296; 298; 302; 303; 307; 309; 311; 314; 315; 330; 331; 340; 356; 358; 364; 365; 366; 373; 375; 378; 380; 384; 385; 387; 388; 400; 405; 411; 446; 448; 449; 456; 460; 486; 490; 518; 526; 529; 531; 534; 535; 536; 542; 544; 545; 546; 547; 552; 553; 554; 555; 556; 557; 558; 559; 560; 561; 564; 566; 568; 570; 571; 572; 574; 575; 576; 577; 579; 580; 583; 587; 588; 589; 595; 597; 598; 610; 611; 615; 616; 617; 618; 619; 621; 622; 624; 625; 626; 630; 631; 634; 635; 642; 647; 652; 654; 655; 660; 664; 665; 666; 669; 672; 673; 676; 677; 679; 680; 681; 684; 686; 690; 691; 699; 701; 704; 710; 712; 713; 714; 717; 720; 721; 724; 725; 727; 729; 730; 731; 738

<b>Issues raised about the impact of Policy DS1 Development Strategy on environment, infrastructure, services and facilities with more specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Impacts on landscape, green wedges, and loss of countryside	02, 07, 373 (Anstey Parish Council), 526 (East Goscote Parish Council), 200, 212, 270, 279, 311, 307, 303, 293, 701, 710, 721, 724, 729, 298 (Queniborough Parish Council), 380, 669, 239, 460, 699, 446
loss of village character and loss of town character	07, 66, 373 (Anstey Parish Council), 140, 203, 311, 486, 665, 704, 664, 634

Comments on the capacity of current social infrastructure for example schools doctors surgeries or comments about whether provision of such facilities have been adequately planned for in Charnwood Local Plan	02, 05,11, 65, 67, 103, 526 (East Goscote Parish Council), 557 (Rothley Parish Council), 87, 309, 303, 293, 281, 710, 712, 714, 717, 729, 76, 490, 298 (Queniborough Parish Council), 387, 400, 647, 666, 684, 690, 665, 686, 681, 673, 330 (Shepshed Town Council), 118
Concerns transport and transport infrastructure, including traffic, road safety, the adequacy of roads and pavements, parking, pollution from transport.  Concern that raised around the adequacy of transport evidence and whether amount of development can be accommodated in particular locations	02, 05, 11, 65, 66, 67, 180, 80, 557 (Rothley Parish Council), 87, 200, 529, 534, 192, 203, 274, 309, 303, 293, 281, 701, 710, 712, 714, 717, 725, 490, 298 (Queniborough Parish Council), 380, 385, 387, 400, 405, 642, 647, 654, 666, 677, 684, 690, 665, 681, 625, 664, 238 (Quorn Parish Council), 239
Loss of biodiversity / ancient woodland / wildlife	200, 212, 314, 303, 701, 717, 486, 634, 730 388, 664
Loss of high quality agricultural land	212, 380, 400, 691, 660
Concerns around flooding, resilience to flooding in terms of infrastructure	02, 66, 200, 534, 293, 701, 725, 490, 610, 385, 456, 486, 666, 691, 660, 686, 704, 664, 446
Lack of green space/ loss of green space Visitor attraction such as Bradgate Park being overwhelmed.	02, 672, 660, 673, 669, 634, 460, 486, 41
Development in Hathern is not justified because of historic commitments of Garendon Estate	275
<b>Issues raised in relation to the amount of housing that is planned for in of Policy DS1 Development Strategy with more specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Amount of growth is supported	58, 574
Policy DS1 should take account of unmet need from Leicester and the housing requirement should be	162,375, 531, 583, 727

increased.	
Housing Requirement should take account of employment needs / economic growth	536, 559, 598
Housing requirement should be increased to take account of affordable housing	366, 375, 531, 536, 545, 559, 575, 618, 556, 598, 727
Housing requirement should be increased to include greater flexibility	366, 378, 411, 536, 542, 545, 559, 535 (Leicestershire County Council), 572, 575, 576, 621, 631, 579, 615, 618, 619, 566, 626, 556, 622, 570, 630, 727, 597 (Burton on the Wolds Cotes and Prestwold Parish Council), 635
Flexibility in the plan is not quite 10% and explanation should be clearer	555, 558, 561, 577, 587, 615, 564
The policy should be clear that the flexibility allowance should not be counted towards unmet need	713 (Harborough Borough Council)
Housing need not driven by local need	84
The amount of housing is not justified because of fall in life expectancy, Covid death rates, impact of Brexit on migration.	132, 302, 724, 356, 448, 676
Policy DS1 should be minimum housing requirement and this should be clear.	542, 559, 595, 619, 556. 622, 630
Policy DS1 is not justified as includes more homes than housing requirement	655
The plan needs to include an extra year on the plan period to be consistent with NPPF and include 15 year time period.	635
The plan should have a longer time period	384
It is not clear whether the Council is applying to have 5 year supply confirmed through local plan adoption	630
<b>Issues raised in relation to the soundness of the strategy for employment land and retail with more specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
There is a significant over supply in employment land and there is the explanation of this could be clearer. It is not clear whether the oversupply is contributing to Leicester's unmet need for employment land	713 (Harborough Borough Council)
The strategy employment land is not justified because of limited supply in service centres, and because it does not address the need for small medium sized units	296 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy DS1 should include specific reference to evidence on strategic distribution and joint working in this respect	713 (Harborough Borough Council)

The policy does not meet unmet employment needs in Functional Economic Area	617
Retail need will need to be reviewed following pandemic	580 (Leicestershire County Council), 731
<b>Issues raised in relation to the appropriateness of distribution / strategy for new homes with more specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Generally supported	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
The strategy is supported, it is appropriate. There is support principles of development strategy, criteria for sustainable development	546, 378, 518, 536, 555, 545, 547, 558, 561, 577, 587, 611, 571, 575, 621, 631, 588, 589, 595, 570, 296 (Leicestershire County Council)
Development strategy should be better explained in terms of the evidence and engagement that has informed it	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Should build on brownfield sites, should consider infill development Should give support for brownfield development outside the limits to development	13, 200, 554, 315, 724, 679, 660
There should be a greater number of smaller sites	535 (Leicestershire County Council), 571
There is too much development in Shepshed	375, 598
There should be more development to Service Centre	375, 384, 580 (Leicestershire County Council), 626
There should be less development to Service Centres	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
There should be less development in Other Settlements	384, 680
There should be more development to Other Settlement	531, 583
The amount of development in other settlements directed to East Goscote and Rearsby is disproportionate	720
There is too much development in Soar Valley	358
There is too much development in Loughborough	679
The number of homes in Barkby area is disproportionate compared to the rest of the borough	228
Development should be directed to Leicester City	103
The sustainability appraisal would support more development being directed to Loughborough	566
The amount of development directed to Barrow is contrary to sustainability appraisal	534
Barrow cannot support 700 homes	315
The development strategy fails to take account of the opportunities provided by Markfield / Field Head to	577, 619, 622

accommodate development. Markfield should be counted as a Service Centre in Table 4.	
Question raised as to why Cotes not been considered for development	330 (Shepshed Town Council)
Locating development in Thrussington does not reduce the need to travel	140
The strategy is contrary to Strategic Growth Plan in terms of the amount of development in villages.	331
Contrary to Barrow Neighbourhood Plan	534, 293
Contrary to Sileby Neighbourhood Plan	712
Contrary to Queniborough NP	729
Does not take account of Queniborough Neighbourhood Plan – allocation HA/4 should not be identified as Syston but Queniborough	257, 241
Strategy not justified as Wymeswold is the only area to be able to allocate land through Neighbourhood Plan.	373 (Anstey Parish Council)
There should be more emphasis on the role of Town Centres	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
HA64 and HA65 recently refused planning permission	257
Impacts on the SRN would need to be fully assessed and mitigation identified	616 (Highways England)
Development strategy is inconsistent as it proposes large amount of development adjoining Woodthorpe and in Woodhouse Parish.	331
Development strategy is not justified in terms of the loss of agricultural land	331
The plan is not sound because it does not include specific allocations for specialist housing for older people.	624
The Council has not selected the most sustainable sites for development	411
<b>Issues raised in relation to Settlement Hierarchy with specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Suggest amendments to 2.30 in the case development were to be proposed in Markfield in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	544 (Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council)
SUEs should be identified as urban settlements in the settlement hierarchy	574
Inclusion of Syston and Thurmaston and Birstall into Leicester raises question whether will be absorbed into Leicester.	738
Inclusion of Anstey as service centre supported	575
Cotes should be counted as Loughborough Urban Area rather than new settlement	411
The settlement hierarchy does not align with development strategy (top two tier should be combined)	536
<b>Comments in relation to justification of the proposed Settlement Limits</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Settlement limits are not justified in the following locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 Swan Street, Seagrave,</li> <li>• Moor Lane, Loughborough</li> <li>• Rothley to reflect P/20/2140/2</li> <li>• Wymeswold to reflect P/20/2044/2</li> </ul>	165, 365, 552, 553,560, 568, 571, 364 (Woodhouse Parish Council)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thrussington as does not follow Settlement Limits assessment</li> <li>• Queniborough Old Hall</li> <li>• Brick Kiln Lane, Shepshed</li> <li>• Limits to development incorrectly drawn between Loughborough and Wood house</li> </ul>	
<b>Policy wording issues raised with more specific comments below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The inclusion of criteria on circumstances where a 5YLS cannot be demonstrated is supported, particularly in relation to infrastructure delivery.	580 (Leicestershire County Council), 579, 626, 583
Should properly reflect NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development, and the last paragraph of policy DS1 should be deleted	
<b>Other Issues raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Comments on Draft Plan 2019 regarding the size of allocations appear to have been ignored	228
Top down government	11
Council only cooperate with those who have those who have financial influence	712, 714
Council has not met its equalities duties as information is inaccessible	712, 714
Policy should include call for modal shift rather than minimising the need to travel	176
Does not adequately tackle climate change	214
DS1 should have emissions reduction target	340
Should be carbon neutral	686
Blanket support for SGP at 2.5 is not sound	340
Reference to A46 priority corridor is not sound because of landscape impacts	340, 713 (Harborough Borough Council)
Harborough Borough Council ask for clarity of wording regarding growth dependent upon delivery of strategic infrastructure	
DS1 is not consistent with NPPF regarding buried archaeology footnote 68	106 (Historic England)
Impact on sewerage system in Bridge Street in Barrow on Soar	274, 278, 704
There should be support protection of rights of way	273
Will not improve Loughborough	701
Peashill Farm, Sileby should be included in the strategy	384
The policy should include reference to creation of active environments	254 (Sports England)
Decision not to allocate development in some villages is political	84

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy DS1 Development Strategy comments**

In relation to concerns raised in relation to impact of the development strategy on the environment, infrastructure and services and facilities, these factors have been taken into account in a proportionate way in the Council's evidence base and sustainability appraisal.

The Council has prepared a topic paper setting out its justification for the amount of new homes planned in the Charnwood Local Plan, and this paper sets out how the Council has considered, flexibility, whether an uplift in housing requirement is justified to address housing affordability or economic factors.

The Plan does not accommodate unmet need for housing. Work is underway with partners in the Housing Market Area on evidence and options testing through Sustainability Appraisal to agree a Statement of Common Ground to apportion unmet need in Leicester and Leicestershire. A topic paper has been prepared setting out the justification for not delaying the progress of the Charnwood Local Plan to respond to this Statement of Common Ground.

Should the plan be adopted in 2022, the Plan includes a 15 year plan period to 2037 and it is considered appropriate.

The Council has prepared a topic paper on employment setting out its justification for the amount of employment land identified in the Charnwood Local Plan.

The Council's evidence on the need for town centre uses was prepared before the Covid 19 pandemic and paragraph 2.23 of the Charnwood Local Plan explains the Council's policy response in light of the pandemic.

The Council has been through a thorough, logical process to identify its overall development strategy and this is clearly explained in the Sustainability Appraisal Report and its topic paper on strategy and site selection.

The Council has prepared a Settlement Hierarchy Assessment which sets out its justification which supports the hierarchy identified in Policy DS1 Development Strategy. The Settlement Hierarchy is appropriate and justified.

The Council has prepared Settlement Limits Assessment which details the methodology which has been applied by the Council and sets out its justification for the Limits to Development identified in the Charnwood Local Plan.

The Council has included wording in Policy DS1 to provide clarity as to application of the policy in the circumstances where a 5 year supply of deliverable homes cannot be demonstrated. The wording is considered necessary, justified and consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Council has consulted appropriately in line with its Statement of Community Involvement, and legal obligations.

The Council has agreed a Statement of Common Ground with Historic England. The Council considers its approach to buried archaeology is sound, but is open to minor wording changes. In other respects the wording and scope is considered appropriate for the strategic nature of Policy

DS1 Development Strategy.

**Policy DS2: Leicester and Leicestershire Unmet Needs**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 115; 162; 323; 340; 350; 366; 373; 375; 378; 384; 411; 521; 531; 535; 536; 539; 542; 544; 545; 546; 547; 555; 556; 566; 569; 580; 582; 583; 586; 593; 598; 615; 616; 617; 618; 626; 629; 630; 635; 711; 713; 727

<b>Comments in support of Policy DS2 Leicester and Leicestershire Unmet Needs</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Support	323 (Oadby & Wigston Borough Council), 544 (Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council), 546, 586 (Blaby District Council), 350 (Melton Borough Council), 545, 547, 616 (Highways England), 566
Support with caveats around wording	713 (Harborough District Council), 582 (Leicester City Council)
Concern that accommodating unmet need will lead to unsustainable development	340
<b>Issues raised as whether Charnwood Borough Council has complied with Duty to Cooperate with specific comments including:</b>	
The Plan does not meet the Duty to Cooperate because there has been no further Statement of Common Ground signed	569
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.	618, 630
<b>Issue raised that Policy DS2 Leicester and Leicestershire Unmet Needs is not positively prepared or effective with specific comments including:</b>	
The plan is not positively prepared because it doesn't address unmet need for employment and housing, and this should be addressed in the short term and not deferred. There is no consequence of not meeting timetable	162, 366, 617, 375, 384, 411, 521, 531, 536, 542, 535 (Leicestershire County Council), 629, 583, 615, 556, 711, 635
Timescales should be more ambitious.	713 (Harborough Borough

	Council), 626, 727
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	593
The policy risks being ineffective as there is no fall back position should the SOCG not be agreed by all or some of the partners, or is delayed	713 (Harborough District Council), 598
<b>Proposed amendments to Policy DS2</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
unmet needs Strategic Distribution should be included within the scope of the policy	539 (Northwest Leicestershire District Council), 713 (Harborough District Council)
Clarity required in the text to address implications of delay in the process. It would be useful to provide clarity in the supporting text under what circumstances a full or partial review would be expected.	582 (Leicester City Council)
Policy 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.	582 (Leicester City Council)
without defining when the 6 month 'trigger' is likely to occur, then the policy is too vaguely written and so in not soundly-based.	593

<b>Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy DS2 Leicester and Leicestershire Unmet Need comments</b>	
<p>The Council welcomes support for the Policy DS2. The principle of the policy has been agreed with partners in Leicester and Leicestershire through a Statement of Common Ground.</p> <p>The Council has been signatories to a number of Statements of Common Ground with partners in Leicester and Leicestershire, which have addressed strategic matters at an appropriate point in time, and these statements have been available on the Council's website. The Council has prepared a Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>The Council has also set out a paper setting out its reasons for progressing with its Local Plan ahead of agreement of apportionment of unmet need for housing and employment development in Leicester and Leicestershire. The Council considers Policy DS2 to be positively prepared and effective.</p> <p>The Council is open to amending the policy to improve its clarity.</p>	

### **Policy DS3: Housing Allocations**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 101; 114; 124; 126; 158; 162; 176; 182; 321; 326; 338; 340; 352; 365; 376; 393; 411; 463; 518; 535; 536; 545; 555; 556; 558; 559; 561; 564; 565; 571; 574; 576; 579; 580; 583;587; 598; 616; 619; 621; 622; 626; 627; 631; 633; 687

<b>Issues whether Policy DS3 is justified in terms of impact of allocations on environment, traffic, infrastructure and services and facilities</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Infrastructure improvements need to take place in in Barrow upon Soar and Shepshed	687,126
Concern that housing will exacerbate traffic issues, result in air pollution and the loss of green fields and impact on wildlife.	124, 326, 338
Plan is not sound as allocations are proposed on flood plains in Soar Valley and additional development will exacerbate flooding.	101, 114 ,124
Significant development in other settlements is not supported by services and will be car dependent, in particular in Rearsby and Thrussington.	182
Concern about the impact of development upon areas of separation.	182
Object to the development of greenfield sites which will coalesce settlements.	326
The transport model doesn't address detailed traffic problems at key locations and it is an inadequate basis for the modelling.	321
More infrastructure is needed to enable Barrow to cope with more including the creation of a bypass.	321
Allocations in close proximity to the SRN will be impacted by noise and pollution with potential for exceeding air quality standards and the plan should set out a requirement for mitigation measures.	616 (Highways England)
Sites should be reconsidered in the context of open spaces strategy.	463
<b>Issues whether Policy DS3 is positively prepared and effective:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The shortfall in housing is less than stated in the plan. Leicestershire CPRE considers there to be a shortfall of 3,037 compared to 8,858 in the plan.	340
The Plan fails to take account of Leicester's unmet need.	162
Additional named sites should be allocated in sustainable locations to provide greater flexibility.	162, 365,411,559, 535 (Leicestershire County Council), 580 (Leicestershire County Council), 571, 576, 579, 619, 626, 622, 598, 583, 626, 583
More clarification required within the plan to set out timescales for delivery, the disparity in housing numbers between some draft allocations and applications for planning permission and the reconsideration of sites which are neither deliverable nor developable.	579, 626
There is an over reliance on housing delivery at certain locations such as the SUEs or the Leicester Urban Area. New sites should be allocated in sustainable locations.	579, 626
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.	556

The scale of allocations at Syston and Thurmaston could undermine delivery of the North East of Leicester SUE (Thorpebury).	574
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.	579
<b>Issues whether Policy the overall strategy for housing allocation is appropriate</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
A more strategic approach to growth is required including south and south west Loughborough. Comprehensive master planning would allow a more coordinated approach for securing transport infrastructure/mitigation and reduce challenges from dispersed development.	598, 580, Leicestershire County Council
More sites should be allocated for development in Service Centres such as Sileby.	626
There is a significant disparity in the amount of development within individual 'Other Settlements'.	583
<b>Other Issues raised in relation to Policy DS3 on Housing Allocations:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Additional secondary schools in larger developments would help to reduce car use.	176
Each allocation should be described as being for 'approximately' or 'around' the given number of dwellings with the precise number to be determined at the planning application stage.	555, 558, 561,621, 631, 633, 565
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. This is prejudicial to the outcome of an undetermined planning application.	158
Reference should be made to Health Impact Assessments for large settlements.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Amend policy to seek comprehensive masterplan for key sites.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Concern about changes to plan since previous consultation and site selection process including changes to the capacity of certain sites.	352, 579

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy DS3 Development Strategy comments**

In relation to concerns raised in relation to impact of the development strategy on the environment, infrastructure and services and facilities, these factors have been taken into account in a proportionate way in the Council's evidence base and sustainability appraisal. The Council has prepared a topic paper on strategy and site selection, and explains how delivery has been considered as part of the strategy for new homes

The Council has prepared a topic paper setting out its justification for the amount of new homes planned in the Charnwood Local Plan, and this paper sets out how the Council has considered, flexibility, whether an uplift in housing requirement is justified to address housing affordability or economic factors.

Please note a response to cover all housing allocations HA1 – HA69 is set out after HA69.

**DS3 (HA1)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 15; 16; 33; 55; 58; 59; 61; 62; 64; 68; 69; 70; 75; 88; 209; 228; 268; 366; 423; 441; 469; 536; 591; 713

Main Issues Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of green wedge</li> <li>• Loss of area of local separation between Barkby, Syston, Thurmaston and Queniborough</li> <li>• Impact upon landscape character</li> <li>• Impact upon local character / identity</li> <li>• Increase in pollution – air and noise</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife and wildlife corridors</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Reduction in land carbon storage</li> <li>• The area is over populated</li> <li>• Development will result in urban sprawl from Leicester</li> <li>• Housing density is too high in the area</li> <li>• Increased demand on water supply</li> <li>• Increased demand on waste management</li> <li>• Increased demand for power</li> <li>• Lack of transparency</li> <li>• Site is disproportionate for the area</li> </ul>	<p>15, 16, 175, 33, 58, 59, 61, 62, 228, 366, 441 (Beeby Parish Meeting), 69, 88, 209, 268, 64, 70, 423, 469</p>
Barkby was promised no further development when the Sustainable Urban Extension was allocated	16
HA1 requires landscaping / visual compensation	68, 69
HA1 requires highway improvements including direct access to Melton Road over the railway line	68, 69
Policy should reference opportunities for enhanced upstream storage	591 (Environment Agency)
Policy reference to the flooding Exception Test should be removed as the site is not in Flood Zone 3.	536
Policy reference to production in site capacity requires clarification	713 (Harborough District Council)

**DS3 (HA2)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 15; 16; 175; 33; 55; 58; 59; 61; 62; 441; 536; 241; 32; 64; 70; 423; 579; 268; 469; 228

Main Issues Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of green wedge</li> <li>• Loss of area of local separation between Barkby, Syston, Thurmaston and Queniborough</li> <li>• Impact upon landscape character</li> <li>• Impact upon local character / identity</li> <li>• Increase in pollution – air and noise</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife and wildlife corridors</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Reduction in land carbon storage</li> <li>• The area is over populated</li> <li>• Development will result in urban sprawl from Leicester</li> <li>• Increased demand on water supply</li> <li>• Increased demand on waste management</li> <li>• Increased demand for power</li> <li>• Lack of transparency</li> <li>• Increase in anti social behaviour</li> <li>• Loss of privacy for existing properties</li> <li>• Site is disproportionate for the area</li> </ul>	<p>15, 16, 175, 33, 55, 58, 59, 61, 62, 441 (Beeby Parish Meeting), 241, 32, 64, 70, 423, 228, 469, 268</p>
<p>Barkby was promised no further development when the Sustainable Urban Extension was allocated</p>	<p>16</p>

**DS3 (HA3)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 15; 16; 33; 55; 58; 59; 61; 62; 64; 70; 175; 241; 268; 423; 441; 469; 536; 595; 598; 634

Main Issues Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of green wedge</li> <li>• Loss of area of local separation between Barkby, Syston, Thurmaston and Queniborough</li> <li>• Impact upon landscape character</li> <li>• Impact upon local character / identity</li> </ul>	<p>15, 16, 175, 33, 55, 58, 59, 61, 62, 441 (Beeby Parish Meeting), 241, 64, 70, 423, 228, 469, 268, 634</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in pollution – air and noise</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife and wildlife corridors</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Reduction in land carbon storage</li> <li>• The area is over populated</li> <li>• Development will result in urban sprawl from Leicester</li> <li>• Increased demand on water supply</li> <li>• Increased demand on waste management</li> <li>• Increased demand for power</li> <li>• Lack of transparency</li> <li>• Increase in anti social behaviour</li> <li>• Site is disproportionate for the area</li> </ul>	
Barkby was promised no further development when the Sustainable Urban Extension was allocated	16
Policy requirement for two points of access (one via site HA2) is not deliverable	595
Policy is not evidenced or viability tested therefore transitional arrangements for the site to proceed with planning before policy requirements are enforced should be included	598
<b>DS3 (HA4)</b>	
Comments made by (PSLP/) 33; 55; 62; 537; 128; 241; 54; 423; 75; 426; 579	
<b>Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of green wedge</li> <li>• Loss of area of local separation between Barkby, Syston, Thurmaston, East Goscote and Queniborough</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Increase in pollution – air and noise</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, employment, health and education)</li> <li>• Reduction in land carbon storage</li> <li>• The area is over populated</li> <li>• Impact upon local character / identity</li> </ul>	33, 55, 62, 128, 54, 75, 426

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queniborough He's already overdeveloped</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife</li> <li>• Increase in anti social behaviour</li> <li>• There is no employment therefore out-commuting will increase</li> </ul>	
Allocation has no regard to the Queniborough neighbourhood plan and should not be attributed to Syston	241, 54, 423
HA4 should be removed as there is little prospect of the site coming forward in the plan period	579

### **DS3 (HA5)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 55

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, health and education)</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• The area is over populated</li> </ul>	55

### **DS3 (HA6)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 55

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, health and education)</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• The area is over populated</li> </ul>	55

### **DS3 (HA7)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 33; 58; 59; 61; 62; 64; 70; 367; 522; 590

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of green wedge</li> <li>• Loss of area of local separation between Barkby, Syston, Thurmaston and Queniborough</li> <li>• Impact upon landscape character</li> <li>• Increase in pollution – air</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife and wildlife corridors</li> </ul>	33, 58, 59, 61, 62, 367 (Thurmaston Parish Council), 522, 64, 70

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Reduction in land carbon storage</li> <li>• The area is over populated</li> <li>• Development will result in urban sprawl from Leicester</li> <li>• Increased demand on water supply</li> <li>• Increased demand on waste management</li> <li>• Increased demand for power</li> <li>• Lack of transparency</li> <li>• Increase in anti social behaviour</li> <li>• Site is disproportionate for the area</li> </ul>	
The proposed quantum of development/ site boundary should be increased reflecting withdrawn application P/14/1670/2 (225 homes)	590
Policy requirement for tree planting and visual separation is not evidence based	590

### **DS3 (HA8)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 175, 33, 62, 88, 579

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of green wedge</li> <li>• Loss of area of local separation between Barkby, Syston, Thurmaston and Queniborough</li> <li>• Impact upon landscape character</li> <li>• Impact upon local character / identity</li> <li>• Increase in pollution – air</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, health and education)</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Reduction in land carbon storage</li> <li>• The area is over populated</li> <li>• Housing density is too high in the area</li> </ul>	175, 33, 62, 88
Site capacity should be increased to 46 dwellings	579

**DS3 (HA9)**

No comments made.

**DS3 (HA10)**

No comments made.

**DS3 (HA11)**

No comments made.

**DS3 (HA12)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 26, 373, 546, 586, 374, 123, 580, 318, 357, 588, 564

<b>Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anstey area has already had a large amount of development</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Concern the surrounding road network is not configured to support development yeah</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, public transport, cycling, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Concern about the cumulative impact of this development with allocations proposed in the Leicester City draft local plan</li> <li>• Concern that infrastructure has not been delivered historically and therefore will not be delivered for this site</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife, including SSSI's</li> <li>• Impact on ancient hedgerow</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Increase in flooding, including impact downstream</li> <li>• Impact upon local character / identity</li> <li>• Concern about the capacity of the sewer system</li> <li>• Concern about the loss of ancient ridge and furrow</li> </ul>	26, 373 (Anstey Parish Council), 123, 318, 357
The site is assigned to Glenfield, but the impact is upon Anstey parish	373 (Anstey Parish Council), 374
The proposed quantum of development should be approximate	546
The Sustainability Appraisal makes an incorrect/ inconsistent assessment of accessibility, proximity to large	546

urban centre, heritage	
The requirement for 1FE primary school is not justified as the Department for Education recommends 2FE primary schools	546
Policy should state that the master plan should include parts of the site that are cross boundary, including the function of the green wedge	586 (Blaby District Council), 580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Site boundary should be extended	588

### **DS3 (HA13)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 26, 373, 123, 564

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anstey area has already had a large amount of development</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, public transport, cycling, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Concern about the cumulative impact of this development with allocations proposed in the Leicester City draft local plan</li> <li>• Concern that infrastructure has not been delivered historically and therefore will not be delivered for this site</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife</li> <li>• Impact on ancient hedgerow</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Concern about the capacity of the sewer system</li> <li>• Impact upon local character / identity</li> </ul>	26, 373 (Anstey Parish Council), 123
The site is assigned to Glenfield, but the impact is upon Anstey parish	373 (Anstey Parish Council)

### **DS3 (HA14)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 40; 60; 98; 82; 102; 137; 159; 169; 187; 240; 282; 283; 268; 272; 301; 312; 50; 52; 480; 517; 726; 579; 389; 452; 453; 455; 644; 658; 685.

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site:	40, 60, 98, 82, 102, 137, 159,

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road configuration cannot support development including construction and emergency service vehicles access (narrow, pedestrian safety, weakening the Great Central Railway Bridge, parking issues)</li> <li>• Access road is not adopted and is maintained by residents / restricted by covenant</li> <li>• Increase in traffic and parking</li> <li>• Increase in pollution – noise, air</li> <li>• Impact on the landscape</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife</li> <li>• Loss of green and recreational space</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, public transport, cycling, health and education)</li> <li>• Loss of separation/ green wedge between Birstall and Leicester City</li> <li>• Loss of historic ridge and furrow</li> <li>• Loss of historic hedgerow</li> <li>• Impact on protected trees</li> <li>• The site is contrary to the Ashton Green Masterplan</li> <li>• The site would remove unrecorded rights of way which are under application to formalise</li> <li>• Water mains run through the site</li> <li>• The site becomes waterlogged in winter</li> <li>• Impact on character of the area</li> <li>• Loss of character on unique Victorian housing</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Concern about capacity of sewerage/ drainage system</li> <li>• Building 35 houses is not worth the loss of the site</li> <li>• Concern about cumulative impact of Sustainable Urban Extensions and development in Leicester city.</li> <li>• The undeveloped field helps to address climate change</li> <li>• Proposed mitigation is inadequate</li> </ul>	<p>169, 187, 240, 282, 283, 268, 272, 301, 312, 50, 52, 480, 517, 726 (Birstall Parish Council), 389, 452, 453, 455, 644, 658, 685</p>
<p>Site boundary should be extended</p>	<p>579</p>

**DS3 (HA15)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 14; 37; 42; 78; 92; 96; 109; 110; 125; 145; 148; 180; 189; 210; 223; 306; 311; 316; 317; 319; 333; 334; 348; 356; 362; 364; 377; 390; 409; 414; 420; 436; 439; 442; 445; 516; 550; 558; 564; 566; 592; 609; 649; 651; 652; 678; 694; 709; 711; 731

Main Issue Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
Following concerns were raised about the site:	14, 37, 42, 180, 96, 377, 78,

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is part of Charnwood Forest / Charnwood Regional Park</li> <li>• Increase in traffic and parking</li> <li>• Development will encourage car dependency</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, public transport, cycling, health and education)</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife and wildlife corridors</li> <li>• Loss of use of, buffer with Outwoods</li> <li>• Contradiction with the Strategic Growth Plan</li> <li>• Increase in pollution – air and noise</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• impact on heritage assets, including Woodthorpe as a heritage hamlet</li> <li>• loss of local character and identity</li> <li>• loss of recreational facilities / green space</li> <li>• access to the site is not suitable</li> <li>• Loss of separation between Loughborough and Quorn</li> <li>• Increasing anti social behaviour</li> <li>• Impact on health and wellbeing</li> <li>• Employment has not been provided for new residents</li> <li>• Infrastructure should be built in advance of development</li> <li>• Greater priority is given to Government housing targets than local considerations</li> <li>• Development will impact communities east of Loughborough, such as identity and social sustainability</li> <li>• Extending Grange Park development exacerbates poor design</li> <li>• Concern about loss of trees and hedges</li> <li>• Impact on the landscape results in conflict with Policy EV1</li> <li>• Allocation contradicts policy DS1 as it impacts the intrinsic nature of the countryside</li> <li>• Site will not deliver biodiversity net gain</li> <li>• Impact on ancient woodland</li> <li>• Impact on Public Rights of Way</li> <li>• The site is disproportionately large compared to development proposed in other areas</li> </ul>	<p>92, 109, 110, 125, 145, 550, 210, 223, 333, 334, 348, 609, 306, 189, 180, 356, 319, 317, 316, 414, 362, 364 (Woodhouse Parish Council), 420, 409, 390, 436, 439, 516, 731, 652, 678, 694, 592, 311, 709, 442, 649, 651, 711</p>
Capacity of HA15 should be reduced from 723 dwellings to 450 dwellings	317, 316,
Capacity of HA15 should be increased from 723 dwellings to circa 800 dwellings, and expressed as 'at least'	556
The site does not comply with Policy T3 of the Quorn Neighbourhood Plan	442
Too much development is cumulatively proposed (1350 dwellings rather than 300-700 stated in the sustainability	145, 148

appraisal	
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24, HA29 and HA15	558
Site PSH248 should be allocated	711

### **DS3 (HA16)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 14; 24; 37; 42; 46; 57; 90; 93; 109; 110; 125; 145; 148; 149; 150; 210; 221; 235; 248; 265; 306; 316; 317; 319; 342; 355; 356; 362; 364; 390; 397; 407; 409; 414; 420; 436; 439; 445; 447; 493; 543; 550; 558; 648; 652; 662; 668; 693; 695; 696; 697; 731; 735

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is part of Charnwood Forest / Charnwood Regional Park</li> <li>• Increase in traffic, including construction traffic, and parking</li> <li>• Development will encourage car dependency</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, public transport, cycling, health and education)</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife and wildlife corridors</li> <li>• Loss of use of, buffer with Outwoods</li> <li>• Contradiction with the Strategic Growth Plan</li> <li>• Increase in pollution – air and noise</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• impact on heritage assets, including Woodthorpe as a heritage hamlet</li> <li>• loss of recreational facilities / green space</li> <li>• Loss of separation between Loughborough and Quorn</li> <li>• Increasing anti social behaviour</li> <li>• Impact on health and wellbeing</li> <li>• Employment has not been provided for new residents</li> <li>• Greater priority is given to Government housing targets than local considerations</li> <li>• Development will impact communities</li> <li>• Concern about loss of trees and hedges</li> <li>• Impact on the landscape</li> <li>• Allocation contradicts policy DS1 and LUC1 as it impacts the intrinsic nature of the countryside</li> <li>• Site will not deliver biodiversity net gain</li> </ul>	<p>14, 24, 37, 42, 46, 57, 407, 543, 90, 93, 149, 150, 145, 148, 145, 550, 210, 235, 248, 265, 342, 355, 306, 356, 319, 317, 316, 362, 364 (Woodhouse Parish Council), 409, 420, 390, 436, 439, 493, 731, 735, 652, 668, 397, 447, 648, 662, 693, 696, 697, 695, 109, 110, 125, 445</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on ancient woodland</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Impact on the neighbouring Rainbows Hospice</li> <li>• Impact on nearby SSSI's</li> <li>• Concern about the impact on climate change</li> <li>• Site is not within walking distance of a bus stop or employment</li> <li>• Allocating is contrary to commitments given during elections</li> </ul>	
Policy should state development within the Wood Brook catchment should be discharged to a sustainable outfall	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24, HA29 and HA15	558
Too much development is cumulatively proposed (1350 dwellings rather than 300-700 stated in the sustainability appraisal	145, 148

### **DS3 (HA17)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 14; 31; 42; 46; 57; 109; 110; 125; 140; 145; 148; 172; 210; 221; 306; 316; 317; 319; 336; 355; 356; 390; 407; 409; 414; 420; 436; 439; 461; 472; 493; 520; 543; 550; 551; 558; 558; 596; 612; 613; 614; 645; 659; 668; 682; 718; 731; 735; 736

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is part of Charnwood Forest / Charnwood Regional Park</li> <li>• Increase in traffic, including construction traffic, and parking</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, public transport, cycling, health and education)</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife and wildlife corridors</li> <li>• Loss of use of, buffer with Outwoods</li> <li>• Increase in pollution – air</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• impact on heritage assets, including Woodthorpe as a heritage hamlet</li> <li>• loss of recreational facilities / green space</li> <li>• Loss of separation between Loughborough and Quorn</li> <li>• Impact on health and wellbeing</li> <li>• Employment has not been provided for new residents</li> <li>• Development will impact communities</li> <li>• Concern about loss of trees and hedges</li> <li>• Impact on the landscape</li> </ul>	<p>14, 172, 31, 42, 46, 57, 407, 543, 140, 148, 145, 550, 551, 210, 336, 736, 355, 306, 356, 319, 317, 316, 414, 420, 409, 390, 436, 439, 493, 520, 596, 731, 735, 668, 461, 472, 659, 682, 645, 612, 613, 614, 718, 109, 110, 125, 145</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocation contradicts policy DS1 and LUC1 as it impacts the intrinsic nature of the countryside</li> <li>• Site will not deliver biodiversity net gain</li> <li>• Impact on ancient woodland</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Impact on nearby SSSI's</li> <li>• Concern about the impact on climate change</li> <li>• Site is not within walking distance of a bus stop or employment</li> <li>• Results in a lack of access to the countryside</li> <li>• The protected green space annotated on HA17 is not protected as an access road runs through it</li> <li>• Development would disregard human life and property</li> <li>• Development next to a new burial ground would ruin the peace of that space</li> <li>• The creation of SUDS next to a footpath would detriment its visual credentials</li> </ul>	
Policy should state development within the Wood Brook catchment should be discharged to a sustainable outfall	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24, HA29 and HA15	558
Too much development is cumulatively proposed (1350 dwellings rather than 300-700 stated in the sustainability appraisal)	145, 148
HA17 (Moat Farm) has no justification 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. Delete references to biodiversity net gain on the site and statement that site is a strategically important wildlife network link with Charnwood Forest and the Soar Valley as not justified by the evidence.	627

### **DS3 (HA18)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 6, 19, 25, 51, 95, 135, 148, 177, 258, 285, 305, 310, 316, 317, 319, 376, 396, 401, 428, 484, 488, 489, 564, 580, 591, 683, 842, 843

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on flooding</li> <li>• Impact on ancient woodland</li> <li>• Housing should not be located next to an employment site</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife and ecological networks</li> <li>• There should be a tree planting plan</li> <li>• Evidence on ecological impact on Burleigh and Holywell Woods does not use correct data</li> </ul>	6, 25, 177, 135, 148, 580 (Leicestershire County Council), 285, 305, 310, 319, 317, 316, 19, 51, 376, 428, 401, 182, 483, 484, 488, 489, 396

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of recreational / open space</li> <li>• Impact on traffic</li> <li>• Site should have 'parkland setting' status as described on paragraph 3.147 for LSEP.</li> <li>• Impact on landscape</li> <li>• Impact on Charnwood Forest</li> <li>• Impact on trees</li> </ul>	
Site capacity should be reduces from 120 dwellings to 50 dwellings	95, 683
Policy should support measures to mitigate flood risk through contributions to the Burleigh Brook catchment	591 (Environment Agency)
Policy should clarify wording in relation to access to LSEP	564

### **DS3 (HA19)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 210, 588, 390

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on wildlife</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, public transport, cycling, health and education)</li> <li>• Greater priority is given to Government housing targets than local considerations</li> <li>• Impact on health and wellbeing</li> <li>• Loss of use of, buffer with Outwoods</li> <li>• Impact on ancient woodland</li> </ul>	210, 390
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24, HA29 and HA15	558

### **DS3 (HA20)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 10; 104; 166; 206; 210; 258, 269; 306; 372; 487; 530; 558; 564; 581; 584; 655; 656; 669; 670; 708; 735

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site name is misleading as access is unclear</li> <li>• Access should be via Parkland Drive, not Beacon Road</li> <li>• Access should be via Beacon Road, not Parkland Drive</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife</li> <li>• Concern about increase of anti-social behaviour</li> <li>• Surrounding roads are not configured to support development</li> </ul>	10, 372, 104, 166, 530, 206, 210, 269, 306, 581, 584, 735, 708, 487, 655, 656, 670, 669, 258

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern the site is a former landfill site which has been the subject of an Environment Agency objection and would impact the pollution of water courses; release harmful substances such as hydrogen sulphide if the soil is disturbed</li> <li>Increase in flooding, including as a result of site clay geology</li> <li>Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>Increase in pollution – air and noise</li> <li>Increase in traffic which has been the subject of a Highways Authority objection, including construction traffic</li> <li>Concern about the cumulative traffic impact from HA16, HA17 and HA19 Which is not referred to in the transport assessment PTRMv2</li> <li>Increase in on street parking</li> <li>Concerned government housing targets all being given precedence over health and well being</li> <li>Concern about capacity of the sewer system</li> <li>Concern about the loss of surrounding street grass verges and impact on street character</li> <li>The plan already plans for the amount of housing required without this site being allocated</li> <li>Concern the site is being used to fund a new school in Woodthorpe</li> </ul>	
Policy should state that the site should 'fairly and reasonably contribute' to the provision of infrastructure	564
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24, HA29 and HA15	558

**DS3 (HA21)**

No comments made.

**DS3 (HA22)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 221

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should state development within the Wood Brook catchment should be discharged to a sustainable outfall	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)

**DS3 (HA23)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 221

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should state development within the Wood Brook catchment should be discharged to a sustainable outfall	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)

**DS3 (HA24)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 558

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24, HA29 and HA15	558

**DS3 (HA25)**

No comments made.

**DS3 (HA26)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 221, 735, 759, 692

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should state development within the Wood Brook catchment should be discharged to a sustainable outfall	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
HA26 Should be deleted as there is little prospect of site delivery	759
Concern about parking provision on the site	692

**DS3 (HA27)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 735

No main issues raised.

**DS3 (HA28)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 221

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should state development within the Wood Brook catchment should be discharged to a sustainable outfall	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)

**DS3 (HA29)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 558

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA16, HA17, HA19, HA20, HA24, HA29 and HA15	558

**DS3 (HA30)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 636, 330, 565

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The site should be part residential and part employment land	330 (Shephed Town Council)

Policy should clarify that the site will contribute to both the land and build cost of the new primary school at HA32.	565
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

### **DS3 (HA31)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 330, 565

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Highways improvements are required to support development	330 (Shepshed Town Council)
Policy should clarify that the site will contribute to both the land and build cost of the new primary school at HA32.	565

### **DS3 (HA32)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 539, 578, 330, 565

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should include requirement to address impacts upon the road network	539 (North West Leicestershire District Council)
Highways improvements are required to support development	330 (Shepshed Town Council)
Black Brook should be retained as a wildlife site	330 (Shepshed Town Council)
Policy should clarify other allocations will contribute to both the land and build cost of the new primary school at HA32.	565

### **DS3 (HA33)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 539, 591, 562, 330, 565

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should include requirement to address impacts upon the road network	539 (North West Leicestershire District Council)
Policy should refer to enhanced upstream storage benefiting the Black Brook	591 (Environment Agency)
Policy should clarify whether 133 dwellings it is a maximum, and if so should allocate the site for 204 dwellings	562
Concern that development will exacerbate flooding which will harm Grade II Listed Shepshed Watermill	330 (Shepshed Town Council)
Policy should clarify that the site will contribute to both the land and build cost of the new primary school at HA32.	565

### **DS3 (HA34)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 539, 578, 564, 565

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should include requirement to address impacts upon the road network	539 (North West Leicestershire

	District Council)
Policy should clarify that the site will contribute to both the land and build cost of the new primary school at HA32.	565

### **DS3 (HA35)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 539; 591; 563; 36; 330; 565

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HA35 crosses the Black Brook</li> <li>• Impact on the road network including highway/pedestrian safety</li> <li>• Surrounding road configuration is not suitable (narrow)</li> <li>• Impact on flood risk</li> <li>• Loss of hedgerows / trees which support wildlife</li> </ul>	35, 330 (Shepshed Town Council)
Policy should clarify that the site will contribute to both the land and build cost of the new primary school at HA32.	565
Policy should require specific landscaping mitigation along north and west boundaries	539 (North West Leicestershire District Council)
Policy should include requirement to address impacts upon the road network	539 (North West Leicestershire District Council)
Policy should refer to enhanced upstream storage benefiting the Black Brook	591 (Environment Agency)
Policy should clarify whether 250 dwellings it is a maximum, and if so should allocate the site for 350 dwellings	563

### **DS3 (HA36)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 330, 565

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Sites have been granted planning permission	330 (Shepshed Town Council)
Policy should clarify that the site will contribute to both the land and build cost of the new primary school at HA32.	565

### **DS3 (HA37)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 4, 330, 565

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Sites have been granted planning permission	330 (Shepshed Town Council),

	4
Policy should clarify that the site will contribute to both the land and build cost of the new primary school at HA32.	565

**DS3 (HA38)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 330

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Sites have been granted planning permission	330 (Shepshed Town Council)

**DS3 (HA39)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 330, 565

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Highways improvements are required to support development	330 (Shepshed Town Council)
Policy should clarify that the site will contribute to both the land and build cost of the new primary school at HA32.	565

**DS3 (HA40)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 330, 587, 565

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Highways improvements are required to support development	330 (Shepshed Town Council)
Policy should clarify that the site will contribute to both the land and build cost of the new primary school at HA32.	565

**DS3 (HA41)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 330, 518, 565

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The site should be used for industrial use (not warehousing)	330 (Shepshed Town Council)
Policy should clarify that the site will contribute to both the land and build cost of the new primary school at HA32.	565

**DS3 (HA42)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 330, 565

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The site should be used for a small business complex	330 (Shepshed Town Council)

Policy should clarify that the site will contribute to both the land and build cost of the new primary school at HA32.	565
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

### **DS3 (HA43)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 26, 27, 77, 544, 343, 373, 404, 156, 84, 374, 146, 184, 547, 190,123, 194, 211, 335, 318, 308, 353, 74, 381, 450, 430, 434, 498, 471,643, 650, 653, 675, 702

<b>Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anstey has already taken a large amount of housing</li> <li>• The Nook is already congested and will get worse</li> <li>• There will be an increase in pressure on local services</li> <li>• Anstey is the gateway to the Charnwood Forest and needs to maintain its rural nature.</li> <li>• Flood risk</li> <li>• Access to the site is insufficient</li> <li>• There will be a loss of open countryside</li> <li>• There is an area of natural beauty nearby which will be destroyed.</li> <li>• Historical grazing land will be lost</li> <li>• Historic ridge and furrow grassland will be destroyed</li> <li>• The site is larger than that previously consulted on</li> <li>• The site is within Green Wedge</li> <li>• Transport mitigation is not identified</li> <li>• The site is crossed by a 400kv overhead transmission line</li> <li>• The site does not comply with the strategic growth plan</li> <li>• The site should be split into separate sites to help delivery</li> <li>• The proposal will impact on existing properties through loss of privacy and day light.</li> <li>• Concerns that electric vehicles will cause power cuts</li> </ul>	26, 27, 77, 544 (Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council), 343, 373 (Anstey Parish Council), 404 (Newtown Linford Parish Council), 156 (National Grid), 84, 374, 146, 184, 547, 190, 123, 194, 211, 335, 318, 308, 353, 74, 381, 450, 430, 434, 498, 471, 643, 650, 653, 675, 702
Public car parks in Anstey are inadequate	374
Brownfield sites should be developed first	211
Public transport and cycle lanes are insufficient	290
No consideration has been given to historic or archaeological sites	354
There has been a lack of consultation on the proposed housing changes for Anstey.	339
The scale of development could be split into smaller pockets of development to distribute the impact of the development around Anstey	339

**DS3 (HA44)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 26, 343, 220, 123, 705, 723, 354, 339, 74, 450, 402, 671, 458

Main Issues Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anstey has already taken a large amount of housing</li> <li>• The Nook is already congested and will get worse</li> <li>• There will be an increase in pressure on local services</li> <li>• Anstey is the gateway to the Charnwood Forest and needs to maintain its rural nature.</li> <li>• Fewer buses serve the area than previously</li> <li>• There is insufficient up to date evidence to require the buffers between the development and the woodland and stream adjacent to the site.</li> <li>• The most appropriate way of determining the site's overall capacity is through the development management process via submission of a planning application</li> <li>• It overly restricts developer contributions for primary education to the provision of a new school.</li> <li>• There are errors in the SA report in relation to the proximity of areas suitable for wind energy generation and distances to facilities</li> <li>• There will be an increase in pressure on local services</li> <li>• The proposals will impact on biodiversity, ancient hedgerows and wildlife and result in a loss of farmland.</li> <li>• Flood risk</li> <li>• planning appeal APP/X2410/W/16/3163501 should be upheld</li> <li>• access would dissect a public footpath which is well used</li> <li>• there will be a loss of green wedge</li> <li>• The allocation of housing could be in smaller packets to support villages and areas where there are school places and falling numbers.</li> <li>• There will be increased pollution and congestion.</li> <li>• HA44 is not using an up to date boundary on the policy map which is misleading</li> </ul>	26, 343, 220, 123, 705, 723, 354, 339, 74, 450, 402, 671, 458
Infrastructure will come forward in a piecemeal fashion.	123
Local roads are narrow, dangerous and parking is insufficient.	123
No consideration of character of the place	354
There has been a lack of consultation on the significant changes to the Plan for housing allocation for Anstey.	339
There is lack of secondary school provision	458

**DS3 (HA45)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 545, 20, 34, 49, 440, 737, 631, 633

Main Issue Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of the site cumulatively with other sites would result in disproportionate development in Barrow</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Concern about capacity of the sewer system</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Impact on parking</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Loss of village identity / community</li> </ul>	20, 34, 49, 440, 737
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA45, HA46, HA47, HA48 and HA49	631, 633

### **DS3 (HA46)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 545, 20, 34, 49, 440, 737, 631, 633, 703

Main Issue Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of the site cumulatively with other sites would result in disproportionate development in Barrow</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Concern about capacity of the sewer system</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Impact on parking</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Loss of village identity / community</li> <li>• Concern the site is proximal to green spaces</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife</li> </ul>	20, 34, 49, 440, 737, 703
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA45, HA46, HA47, HA48 and HA49	631, 633

### **DS3 (HA47)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 20, 34, 49, 440, 737, 631, 594, 633

Main Issue Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of the site cumulatively with other sites would result in disproportionate development in</li> </ul>	20, 34, 49, 440, 737

<p>Barrow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Concern about capacity of the sewer system</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Impact on parking</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Loss of village identity / community</li> </ul>	
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA45, HA46, HA47, HA48 and HA49	631, 633
Policy should state development 'up to' 18 dwellings	594

### **DS3 (HA48)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 20, 34, 49, 440, 631, 633, 570

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of the site cumulatively with other sites would result in disproportionate development in Barrow</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Concern about capacity of the sewer system</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Impact on parking</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Loss of village identity / community</li> </ul>	20, 34, 49, 440
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA45, HA46, HA47, HA48 and HA49	631, 633
The boundary of the site should be extended	570

### **DS3 (HA49)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 276; 733; 20; 34; 49; 440; 475; 631; 633; 618; 564; 405; 663; 703; 698

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site:	20, 34, 49, 440, 276, 733, 475,

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of the site cumulatively with other sites would result in disproportionate development in Barrow</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Concern about capacity of the sewer system</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Impact on parking</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Loss of village identity / community</li> <li>• Surrounding roads are not configured to support development</li> <li>• Surrounding footpaths are not wide enough</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife including two Local Wildlife Sites (impact from surface water run off)</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Loss of local views</li> <li>• Negative impact upon the cemetery which is a non designated heritage asset</li> <li>• The proposed primary school would be unsafe due to proximity to Humphry Perkins</li> <li>• Development will split investment amongst local schools a result in a 'two tier school system'</li> <li>• Proposed development in Barrow is disproportionate to the village</li> <li>• Concern the site is proximal to green spaces</li> </ul>	405, 663, 703, 698
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA45, HA46, HA47, HA48 and HA49	631, 633
Policy should refer to 'maintain or enhance' local wildlife sites instead of referring to surface water run off	631, 633
Policy should be amended to reflect that only part of the site is in flood zone two or three	631, 633

**DS3 (HA50)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 210, 442, 535

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on wildlife/ environment</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure</li> <li>• Too much weight being given to meeting government housing targets</li> <li>• Site is considered unsuitable for allocation due to flooding in the document 'Development Strategy and Site Selection'</li> </ul>	210, 442
HA50 should be classified as within the settlement boundary and removed from Countryside/ Policy C1	535 (Leicestershire County Council)

**DS3 (HA51)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 28, 557, 139, 740, 589

Main Issue Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on listed building at Woodcock Farm</li> <li>• Allocation does not take account of planning application P/20/2014/2</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads and education)</li> </ul>	28; 557 (Rothley Parish Council), 139, 740
Landowner no longer wants to promote HA51 land south of Cossington Lane for development	589

**DS3 (HA52)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 28, 557, 139, 740

Main Issue Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on listed building at Woodcock Farm</li> <li>• Proposed access is not wide enough</li> <li>• Allocation does not take account of planning application P/20/2014/2</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads and education)</li> </ul>	28, 557 (Rothley Parish Council), 139, 740

**DS3 (HA53)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 39, 384, 591, 515, 72, 555, 545, 398

Main Issue Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on flooding</li> <li>• Impact on traffic</li> <li>• High landscape sensitivity</li> <li>• Housing requirement for Sileby has already been met</li> <li>• Recent planning appeal decision determined Service Centres have had excessive development</li> <li>• Site is outside of the limits to development boundary</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife</li> </ul>	39, 384, 72, 398, 515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Policy should reference opportunities for enhanced upstream storage	591 (Environment Agency)
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58 and HA59	555

**DS3 (HA54)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 384, 515, 555, 561, 712, 714, 398

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of area of local separation between Sileby and Barrow on Soar</li> <li>• Recent planning decisions have refused development of the site</li> <li>• 100% affordable housing on the site does not reflect the local need for Sileby / is not socially sustainable</li> <li>• HA54 departs from policy H5</li> <li>• Site is outside of the limits to development boundary</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• Loss of hedgerow</li> <li>• Impact on traffic</li> <li>• Impact on infrastructure</li> </ul>	384, 515 (Sileby Parish Council), 712, 714, 398
Education provision should be made in Sileby, not Cossington	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Policy should refer to policy G2 in Sileby Neighbourhood Plan	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58 and HA59	555

**DS3 (HA55)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 384, 515, 555, 398

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on flooding</li> <li>• Impact on traffic</li> <li>• Impact on infrastructure</li> </ul>	398, 515 (Sileby Parish Council), 384
Education provision should be made in Sileby, not Cossington	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
It is not clear whether a sequential approach to flood risk has been taken	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
There is no evidence that the site is deliverable, especially given lapsed planning permission	384
Policy should refer to policy G2 in Sileby Neighbourhood Plan	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58 and HA59	555

**DS3 (HA56)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 384, 515, 555, 398

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on traffic</li> <li>• Impact on infrastructure</li> <li>• Half of the site is within the National Forest Inventory Map and has ecological and heritage value</li> <li>• The site does not front an adopted highway</li> </ul>	398, 515 (Sileby Parish Council), 384
Education provision should be made in Sileby, not Cossington	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
There is no evidence that the site is deliverable, with an owner intending to develop the site	384
Policy should refer to policy G2 in Sileby Neighbourhood Plan	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58 and HA59	555

### **DS3 (HA57)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 384, 515, 555, 398

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on traffic</li> <li>• Impact on infrastructure</li> <li>• Unworkable highways improvements are required to accommodate development</li> <li>• It is not clear that the building can be viably converted to residential use</li> </ul>	398, 515 (Sileby Parish Council), 384
Education provision should be made in Sileby, not Cossington	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
There is no evidence that the site is deliverable, as it is an active employment use; no evidence of an owner intending to develop the site especially given lapsed planning permission	384
Policy should refer to policy G2 in Sileby Neighbourhood Plan	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58 and HA59	555

### **DS3 (HA58)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 384, 515, 555, 398

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on traffic</li> </ul>	398, 515 (Sileby Parish Council), 384

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on infrastructure</li> <li>• Unworkable highways improvements are required to accommodate development</li> <li>• Contamination and remediation issues on site</li> <li>• It is not clear that the building can be viably converted to residential use</li> <li>• Proximity to railway will result in significant residential amenity issues</li> </ul>	
Education provision should be made in Sileby, not Cossington	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
There is no evidence that the site is deliverable, as it is an active employment use with a ten year lease, no evidence of multiple owners intending to develop the site	384
Policy should refer to policy G2 in Sileby Neighbourhood Plan	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58 and HA59	555

### **DS3 (HA59)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 12; 107; 179; 205; 249; 325; 363; 384; 391; 392; 451; 462; 515; 542; 555; 626; 667; 728; 737

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on character of the area</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Surrounding roads are not configured to satisfactorily support development.</li> <li>• The site is disproportionate to the village</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, public transport, town centre, cycling, health and education)</li> <li>• There is a lack of employment to accommodate new residents</li> <li>• Development will increase car dependency</li> <li>• Loss of separation from Sileby</li> <li>• Impact on heritage including the conservation area</li> <li>• previous planning application was refused</li> <li>• Impact on sewer and drainage capacity</li> <li>• Lack of and loss of footpaths (including Polly Pegs and Crab Tree Lane which are historic).</li> <li>• Site is outside of the limits to development</li> <li>• Impact on traffic and highway safety</li> <li>• Lots of farmland</li> <li>• The existing primary school is oversubscribed</li> </ul>	12, 363 (Cossington Parish Council), 384, 515 (Sileby Parish Council), 107, 205, 249, 325, 737, 391, 392, 728

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic and parking</li> <li>• Increase in pollution – noise, air</li> </ul>	
The site is contrary to the Cossington Neighbourhood Plan	12
Continue with original approach to allocate 70 dwellings in the 'Draft Charnwood Local Plan 2019-36' draft allocation HS65. Removing it from the plan when there is a live planning application means the plan does not account for this application with no reasoning given. The original site is preferable	179, 363 (Cossington Parish Council), 542
Policy should plan for both land and build costs between sites HA53, HA54, HA55, HA56, HA57, HA58 and HA59	555
Cossington does not require a larger school to accommodate housing in Syston and Sileby. There is insufficient evidence to support a school at this location, especially given the village's 'Other Settlement' status.	325, 737, 626
102 Main Street Cossington (P/21/1446/2) should be allocated instead	451, 462

### **DS3 (HA60)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 526, 128, 545, 289, 18, 47, 423, 474, 490, 514, 477, 638, 284

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of separation between Rearsby and East Goscote</li> <li>• The site is disproportionate to the village</li> <li>• Impact on flooding</li> <li>• Impact on highway safety</li> <li>• Impact on traffic including construction traffic</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• Loss of separation between villages, including East Goscote and Rearsby</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, town centre, cycling, health and education)</li> <li>• The land is a World War 2 contaminated due to soil moving</li> <li>• The site is disproportionate to the village (East Goscote, Queniborough and Rearsby account for 50% of Other Settlement development).</li> <li>• Development will encourage car dependency</li> <li>• Loss of village character</li> <li>• The development will be isolated from the existing community and will require pedestrian/ cycling connectivity</li> <li>• Impact on landscape</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Nitrogen pollution</li> </ul>	284, 638, 477, 514, 474, 423, 47, 18, 128, 526 (East Goscote Parish Council), 289

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will be 1200 metres from a school and public transport stop</li> </ul>	
The land is a World War 2 landfill site (ordnance depot) and is therefore contaminated with remediation not possible. Need to determine site can achieve full permission before outline permission is given therefore appropriate evidence is required.	477, 490, 18, 526 (East Goscote Parish Council)
The site can accommodate 270 dwellings, not 223 dwellings	545

**DS3 (HA61)**

No comments made.

**DS3 (HA62)**

No comments made.

**DS3 (HA63)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 136; 567; 564

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hedgerows should be retained and enhanced</li> <li>Suggestions for how site layout/ design should relate to existing development</li> </ul>	136, 567
Policy should look to 'improve' rather than 'maximise' linkages with existing development to ensure appropriate landscaping / biodiversity can be achieved	564

**DS3 (HA64)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 128; 241; 54; 423; 75; 426; 408; 474; 621; 298; 706

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Following concerns were raised about the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will result in Queniborough becoming a suburb of Leicester</li> <li>Site has previously been refused planning permission</li> <li>Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, health and education)</li> <li>Loss of area of local separation between Syston, Queniborough and East Goscote.</li> <li>Queniborough Is already overdeveloped</li> <li>Impact upon local character / identity</li> <li>No employment to support development</li> <li>Increase in pollution – air and noise</li> <li>Increase in traffic</li> <li>Increase in flooding</li> <li>Increase in anti social behaviour</li> </ul>	128, 423, 706, 241, 54, 75, 426, 408, 474, 298 (Queniborough Parish Council)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site in combination with other allocations is disproportionate to the village</li> <li>• East Goscote, Queniborough and Rearsby account for over 50% of homes allocated to Other Settlements</li> <li>• Development will encourage car dependency</li> <li>• The site is outside the limits to development</li> <li>• No housing need has been demonstrated</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> </ul>	
The site does not conform with the Queniborough Neighbourhood Plan	128, 423, 241
site boundary should be extended to allocate 200 dwellings instead of 100 dwellings	621

**DS3 (HA65)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 128, 423, 706, 366, 241, 54, 75, 426, 408, 474, 298

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development will result in Queniborough becoming a suburb of Leicester</li> <li>• Site has previously been refused planning permission</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, health and education)</li> <li>• Loss of area of local separation between Syston, Queniborough and East Goscote.</li> <li>• Queniborough Is already overdeveloped</li> <li>• Impact upon local character / identity</li> <li>• No employment to support development</li> <li>• Increase in pollution – air and noise</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Increase in flooding</li> <li>• Increase in anti social behaviour</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• The site in combination with other allocations is disproportionate to the village</li> <li>• Development will encourage car dependency</li> <li>• East Goscote, Queniborough and Rearsby account for over 50% of homes allocated to Other Settlements</li> </ul>	128, 423, 706, 241, 54, 75, 426, 408, 474, 298 (Queniborough Parish Council)
The site does not conform with the Queniborough Neighbourhood Plan	128, 423
Policy should introduce a 55 dwelling ‘minimum’ for the site	366

**DS3 (HA66)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 199, 531, 267, 284, 47, 474, 646

Main Issue Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, cycling, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Loss of separation between Rearsby and East Goscote</li> <li>• The site is disproportionate to the village (East Goscote, Queniborough and Rearsby account for 50% of Other Settlement development).</li> <li>• Rearsby has a lack of services, including</li> <li>• Drain capacity will be exceeded</li> <li>• Proposed access will be unsafe</li> <li>• Increase in traffic including construction traffic</li> <li>• Concern about the removal of a cycle/bridle path along Gaddesby Lane</li> <li>• Impact on heritage assets and their setting including the Conservation Area</li> <li>• Loss off farmland</li> <li>• Impact on flooding</li> <li>• Impact on landscape</li> <li>• Development will encourage car dependency</li> <li>• Loss of village character</li> <li>• The site is outside of limits to development</li> </ul>	119, 267, 284, 47, 474, 646 (Rearsby Parish Council)
Policy should clarify whether 47 dwellings it is a maximum, and if so should allocate the site for 65 dwellings	531

**DS3 (HA67)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 13; 17; 43; 48; 99; 100; 121; 140; 142; 143; 153; 155; 160; 161; 173; 185; 188; 193; 195; 196; 197; 198; 199; 201; 202; 204; 213; 215; 216; 217; 218; 219; 222; 224; 225; 226; 227; 229; 230; 231; 232; 234; 244; 247; 250; 251; 252; 253; 255; 256; 259; 260; 264; 277; 286; 287; 288; 291; 292; 294; 295; 297; 322; 327; 328; 332; 337; 341; 343; 345; 346; 359; 361; 368; 369; 370; 379; 382; 383; 386; 394; 399; 403; 416; 417; 418; 419; 425; 429; 435; 464; 465; 467; 468; 470; 494; 499; 500; 501; 502; 503; 504; 505; 506; 507; 508; 509; 510 ; 511; 512; 513; 519; 524; 527; 528; 532; 548; 549; 600; 602; 603; 604; 605; 606; 637; 639; 732

Main Issue Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on traffic including construction traffic and surrounding highway safety</li> <li>• Impact on parking</li> <li>• Surrounding roads are not configured to support development / access</li> <li>• Road upgrades are required to support development</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, public transport, cycling, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Impact on sewer and drain capacity (including existing sewer overflow issues)</li> <li>• Impact on wifi and telephone connectivity</li> <li>• Lack of recreational facilities</li> <li>• Loss of village character</li> <li>• The site is outside of limits to development</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife including wildlife corridors</li> <li>• Impact on pollution – air</li> <li>• The site, together with HA68, is disproportionate to the village comprising a 40% increase in housing</li> <li>• Impact on historic ridge and furrow</li> <li>• Impact on flooding and the watercourse</li> <li>• Impact on heritage assets and their setting including the Conservation Area</li> <li>• Site has previously been refused planning permission</li> <li>• Impact on hedgerows</li> <li>• Concern about speeding traffic</li> <li>• Development will encourage car dependency</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Development does not accord with COP26 principles in regards to climate change</li> <li>• There is no capacity for additional electric vehicle charging points</li> <li>• The site is not within 400m of a public transport stop in accordance with draft policy CC5</li> <li>• Concern about changing character of historic road network</li> <li>• Concern there will be no affordable housing</li> <li>• Impact on power supply</li> <li>• Impact on social life</li> <li>• Impact on police and council budgets</li> <li>• Site does not comply with policy CT1</li> </ul>	<p>17, 343, 99, 100, 121, 379, 142, 143, 155, 140, 160, 161, 201, 202, 185, 188, 524, 527, 528, 532, 204, 549, 195, 548, 196, 197, 198, 199, 222, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 224, 225, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, 244, 250, 251, 252, 253, 255, 259, 277, 291, 606, 256, 260, 264, 247, 286, 287, 288, 292, 234, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 602, 605, 637, 639, 603, 604, 368, 359, 193, 386, 403, 467, 327, 369, 370, 226, 332, 295, 297, 294, 322, 328, 337, 346, 732, 494, 345, 382, 383, 399, 464, 470, 341 (Thrussington Parish Council), 13, 173, 43, 213, 153, 361, 416, 417, 48, 419, 425, 418, 429, 435, 465, 468, 519, 600</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Delivery Study (2017) states that new development within 'Other Settlements' should be within the settlement boundary</li> <li>• Impact on water pressure</li> </ul>	
Appropriate consideration not given to the Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan	343, 121, 142, 201, 202, 188, 524, 527, 528, 532, 204, 549, 195, 196, 198, 199, 222, 218, 224, 225, 227, 231, 232, 252, 253, 255, 256, 260, 264, 247, 286, 287, 288, 292, 234, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 602, 605, 637, 639, 603, 604, 327, 369, 370, 226, 332, 295, 297, 294, 322, 328, 337, 346, 732, 494, 345, 382, 383, 399, 464, 470, 341 (Thrussington Parish Council), 465, 519, 600
Site was included at a late stage with no prior consultation and during covid restrictions	343, 603, 604,
The site is only acceptable due to the relaxation of sustainability appraisal criteria	160, 341 (Thrussington Parish Council)
Site should be reduced from 90 to 30 dwellings	195, 196

**DS3 (HA68)**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 17, 343, 99, 100, 121, 379, 142, 143, 155, 140, 160, 161, 201, 202, 185, 188, 524, 527, 528, 532, 204, 549, 195, 548, 196, 197, 198, 199, 222, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 224, 225, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, 244, 250, 251, 252, 253, 255, 259, 277, 291, 606, 256, 260, 264, 247, 286, 287, 288, 292, 234, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 602, 605, 637, 639,

603, 604, 368, 359, 193, 386, 403, 467, 327, 369, 370, 226, 332, 295, 297, 294, 322, 328, 337, 346, 732, 494, 345, 382, 383, 399, 464, 470, 341

Main Issue Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
<p>Following concerns were raised about the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on traffic including construction traffic and surrounding highway safety</li> <li>• Impact on parking</li> <li>• Surrounding roads are not configured to support development / access</li> <li>• Road upgrades are required to support development</li> <li>• Impact upon local services and infrastructure (including roads, public transport, cycling, town centre, health and education)</li> <li>• Impact on sewer and drain capacity (including existing sewer overflow issues)</li> <li>• Impact on wifi and telephone connectivity</li> <li>• Lack of recreational facilities</li> <li>• Loss of village character</li> <li>• The site is outside of limits to development</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife including wildlife corridors</li> <li>• Impact on pollution – air</li> <li>• The site, together with HA68, is disproportionate to the village comprising a 40% increase in housing</li> <li>• Impact on historic ridge and furrow</li> <li>• Impact on flooding and the watercourse</li> <li>• Impact on heritage assets and their setting including the Conservation Area</li> <li>• Site has previously been refused planning permission</li> <li>• Impact on hedgerows</li> <li>• Concern about speeding traffic</li> <li>• Development will encourage car dependency</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Development does not accord with COP26 principles in regards to climate change</li> <li>• There is no capacity for additional electric vehicle charging points</li> <li>• The site is not within 400m of a public transport stop in accordance with draft policy CC5</li> <li>• Concern about changing character of historic road network</li> <li>• Concern there will be no affordable housing</li> <li>• Impact on power supply</li> <li>• Impact on social life</li> </ul>	<p>17, 343, 99, 100, 121, 379, 142, 143, 155, 140, 160, 161, 201, 202, 185, 188, 524, 527, 528, 532, 204, 549, 195, 548, 196, 197, 198, 199, 222, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 224, 225, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, 244, 250, 251, 252, 253, 255, 259, 277, 291, 606, 256, 260, 264, 247, 286, 287, 288, 292, 234, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 602, 605, 637, 639, 603, 604, 368, 359, 193, 386, 403, 467, 327, 369, 370, 226, 332, 295, 297, 294, 322, 328, 337, 346, 732, 494, 345, 382, 383, 399, 464, 470, 341 (Thrussington Parish Council), 173, 43, 213, 153, 361, 607, 416, 417, 48, 419, 425, 418, 429, 435, 468, 495, 519, 13, 233, 465, 600</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on police and council budgets</li> <li>• Site does not comply with policy CT1</li> <li>• Housing Delivery Study (2017) states that new development within 'Other Settlements' should be within the settlement boundary</li> <li>• Impact on landscape setting of village</li> <li>• Impact on water pressure</li> </ul>	
Appropriate consideration not given to the Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan	343, 121, 142, 201, 202, 188, 524, 527, 528, 532, 204, 549, 195, 196, 198, 199, 222, 218, 224, 225, 227, 231, 232, 252, 253, 255, 256, 260, 264, 247, 286, 287, 288, 292, 234, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 602, 605, 637, 639, 603, 604, 327, 369, 370, 226, 332, 295, 297, 294, 322, 328, 337, 346, 732, 494, 345, 382, 383, 399, 464, 470, 341 (Thrussington Parish Council), 13, 233, 465, 600
Site was included at a late stage with no prior consultation and during covid restrictions	343, 603, 604,
The site is only acceptable due to the relaxation of sustainability appraisal criteria	160, 341 (Thrussington Parish Council)
Site should be reduced from 90 to 30 dwellings	195, 196
HA68 is situated on 'moderate ' landscape as defined in the landscape character assessment	341 (Thrussington Parish Council)

**DS3 (HA69)**

No comments made.

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy DS3 (HA1-HA69) Housing Allocations comments**

The Council has prepared a topic paper explaining its site and strategy selection for new homes, which should be read alongside the sustainability appraisal. The approach to site selection has been informed by a proportionate amount of evidence and is compliant with the National Planning

**Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.**

The Local Plan allocates land for development, but housing allocations will still be the subject of planning applications that will take detailed account of site specific matters, developer contributions and appropriate mitigations. Where concerns relate to the behaviour of people, ultimately this is not something that the planning process has any control over.

Where respondents have referred to conformity with neighbourhood plans, the role of Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans differ in that Local Plans set out 'strategic' policies (i.e. housing requirement in a borough-wide context) and Neighbourhood Plans focus on non-strategic policies (i.e. design, protective designations, etc). Emerging Local Plans do not have to conform to, but should take account of, adopted Neighbourhood Plans.

Where respondents have proposed alternative capacities for a housing allocation, it is considered that the most appropriate site capacities for all sites, taking account of appropriate densities and site constraints, have been included in the plan. There is potential for capacity of sites to be refined during the development management process.

**DS4: Employment Allocations**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 56; 113; 296; 340; 412; 535; 574; 580; 617; 620; 636; 664; 713; 741

<b>Issues raised in relation to support for businesses and economic development with more specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy does not meet the needs of small/ medium size businesses, consider opportunities within Service Centres or provide employment allocations in Quorn.	296 (Leicestershire County Council), 580 (Leicestershire County Council), 535 (Leicestershire County Council)
Allocation of Dishley Grange will impact upon settlement cohesion and existing sports facilities.	56, 113, 741
Amount of employment land allocated is not justified by evidence of need, job creation figures, timescales for delivery, the balance between housing provision and jobs, and the lack of a significant employer in the Borough.	340, 617, 713 (Harborough District Council), 664
Changes to requirements caused by Covid 19 should be considered.	340
LSEP allocation is unnecessary and will impact upon the environment, greater use should be made of existing space.	412, 664
Flexibility for other uses on employment allocations at SUEs is required.	574
Clarity is needed on how any over-supply of employment land will meet Leicester's unmet employment need.	713 (Harborough District Council)
Allocations ES1 and ES8 are supported.	636, 620

### Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy DS4 Employment Allocations comments

The Council has prepared an employment topic paper setting out its justification for the amount, type and location of employment land provided to meet identified need and is based upon our evidence base.

The specific allocations for which concerns have been raised regarding impact on the environment, areas of separation and sporting facilities have been previously assessed for such issues through the development plan or planning application process.

The Plan does not accommodate unmet need for employment land. Work is underway with partners across the Functional Economic Area to apportion this need and Policy DS2 provides the means for this to be accommodated.

The Plan has been positively prepared with sufficient flexibility to allow for changes in the economy and employment land requirements to be accommodated.

### **DS5: High Quality Design**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 176; 180; 208; 340; 393; 410; 413; 515; 536; 542; 580; 597; 664; 713

<b>Issues raised about Policy DS5, High Quality Design referencing design review with specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
More clarity required on the use of local design codes and the independent design review process.	340, 536, 542
Use of an independent design review panel introduces expense and delay	542
The policy lacks rigour. The policy should require a comprehensive design guide for every development.	597 (Burton on the Wolds Cotes and Prestwold Parish Council), 684
Greater consistency in the application of high design standards is required.	413
Design considerations should include the colour of brick which should enable integration of a development into the landscape	208
New development should comply with design criteria and requirements expressed in relevant Neighbourhood Plans	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
<b>Issues raised about Policy DS5, High Quality Design referencing climate change with specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy requires a greater emphasis upon zero carbon requirements for new development	176,
<b>Issues raised about Policy DS5, High Quality Design referencing other issues with more specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
A greater emphasis is required upon biodiversity and the natural environment.	180, 410 (Natural England), 340, 580 (Leicestershire County Council), 664

Greater emphasis upon density	340
Greater emphasis upon the creation of healthy places required and Health Impact Assessments should be included in place-making guidance.	713 (Harborough District Council), 580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Include reference to community spaces for interaction and ensuring they are accessible for all is important	580 (Leicestershire County Council)

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy DS5: High Quality Design comments**

High quality design is not just about how development looks, it is also about how it responds to the site and the environment around it. Policy DS5 reflects the breadth of policy considerations. More detail is provided in Appendix 4, Design Guidance.

Paragraphs 2.139 to 2.143 provide a significant amount of guidance on how the Council will implement its policy approach. To achieve high standards of design may take time but the outcomes are worth striving for. Policy DS5 will be applied consistently through the development management process to ensure high standards are achieved. It is important that local communities participate meaningfully in the neighbourhood planning process

The named sites in paragraph 2.140 which will need to be subject to independent design reviews are those of the largest scale and those in sensitive locations. Further reviews may be required on a case by case basis. Individual design considerations will vary and it would not be appropriate to impose limitations on creativity. Instead the Council sets out the range of considerations which should be considered.

Policy DS5 specifically references Policy CC4, Sustainable Construction so as to reduce the impacts, and be resilient to climate change.

### **LUA1: Leicester Urban Area**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 162, 404, 582, 536, 580, 319, 713.

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should refer to partnership working specifically with Leicester City Council to resolve transport matters	582 (Leicester City Council)
The policy splits the delivery of infrastructure and transport which does not support a strategic coordinated approach	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Promote SHELAA site PSH2 to be allocated by this policy.	162
The policy should refer to a new railway station at Thurmaston	319

### **Council's Response to main issues raised in relation to LUA1 Leicester Urban Area comments**

The Council has agreed a Statement of Common Ground with Leicester City Council, Leicestershire County Council and National Highways on transport matters. The Council is open to amendments to the Local Plan should this be required as a result of ongoing joint work between the parties.

The Council has produced topic paper setting out its approach to strategy and site section, which should be read in conjunction with the Sustainability Appraisal.

**LUA2: North East of Leicester Sustainable Urban Extension**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 319, 221, 63, 404, 79, 105, 580, 611, 349, 574

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should highlight the drainage hierarchy to ensure sustainable surface water outfalls to sewerage system	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
The optional water efficiency requirement should be detailed in policy	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
Concern about the cumulative impact upon transport in the area (including in Charnwood Forest, Bradgate Park, Barkby Thorpe).	404 (Newtown Linford Parish Council), 79, 580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Concern about the impact on local wildlife which should be mitigated	105, 580 (Leicestershire County Council)
The policy should refer to a new railway station at Thurmaston	319, 349
Broadband terminology should be updated to reflect 'gigabyte capable broadband infrastructure'.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy should be sufficiently flexible to support delivery, including recognising the approved master plan and parameter plans instead of showing precise boundaries on the policies map	574

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to LUA2 North East of Leicester Sustainable Urban Extension comments**

Northeast Leicester Sustainable Urban Extension is allocated in the Charnwood Local Plan Core Strategy 2015 and benefits from outline and reserved matters planning permissions. The Sustainable Urban Extension has been appropriately appraised in the Sustainability Appraisal in terms of cumulative impacts alongside other allocations proposed through the Charnwood Local Plan.

The Local Plan should be read as a whole, including topic based policies in chapters 4 to 9. Policies CC1 to CC4 deal with flooding, drainage and sustainable construction.

**LUA3: North of Birstall Sustainable Urban Extension**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 221, 580, 611, 740, 615, 239

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should highlight the drainage hierarchy to ensure sustainable surface water outfalls to sewerage system	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)

The optional water efficiency requirement should be detailed in policy	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
Concern about the cumulative impact upon transport in the area	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Broadband terminology should be updated to reflect 'gigabyte capable broadband infrastructure'.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Concern about the impact on local wildlife which should be mitigated	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Concern that the SUE was not planned for alongside the proposed allocation of site HA51 and HA52 in order to coordinate resources	740
Policy should refer to improving connectivity between the site and Thurcaston, including strengthening references to conserve wildlife and create a green broadened corridor and landscaping	615, 239

### **Council's response to main issues raised in relation to LUA3 North of Birstall Sustainable Urban Extension comments**

North of Birstall Sustainable Urban Extension is identified as a direction for growth in the Charnwood Local Plan Core Strategy 2015 and benefits from hybrid planning permission. The Sustainable Urban Extension has been appropriately appraised in the Sustainability Appraisal in terms of cumulative impacts alongside other allocations proposed through the Charnwood Local Plan.

The Local Plan should be read as a whole, including topic based policies in chapters 4 to 9. Policies CC1 to CC4 deal with flooding, drainage and sustainable construction.

Infrastructure provision has been considered in holistic manner with relevant infrastructure providers.

### **LUC1: Loughborough Urban Centre**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 221, 180, 521, 106, 580, 611, 735, 630, 459

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should highlight the drainage hierarchy to ensure sustainable surface water outfalls to sewerage system	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
The optional water efficiency requirement should be detailed in policy	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
Policy structure requires amendments to make it a robust and effective development management policy	521
Paragraph 3.84 does not reflect the NPPF and should refer to the 'built and historic environment'.	106 (Historic England)
The policy splits the delivery of infrastructure and transport which does not support a strategic coordinated approach	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy should refer to consulting the Local Lead Flood Authority as well as the Environment Agency	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
The requirement for a retail allocation may no longer be necessary given recent changes	580 (Leicestershire County Council)

	Council)
Policy could refer to the Leicestershire Tourism Growth Plan 2020-2025	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy should focus on residential development within the core of Loughborough alongside a mix of other uses.	735
Paragraph 3.80 suggests Ancient Woodlands will be developed which should be removed	459

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to LUC1 Loughborough Urban Centre comments**

The Local Plan should be read as a whole, including topic based policies in chapters 4 to 9. Policies CC1 to CC4 deal with flooding, drainage and sustainable construction. Regarding wording suggestions, the policy is considered to be sound, but the Council is open to improvements in clarity.

The Council has agreed a Statement of Common Ground with Historic England addressing wording suggestions.

### **LUC2: West of Loughborough Sustainable Urban Extension**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 221, 404, 580, 611, 616

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should highlight the drainage hierarchy to ensure sustainable surface water outfalls to sewerage system	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
The optional water efficiency requirement should be detailed in policy	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
Concern about the cumulative impact upon transport in the area (including in Charnwood Forest, Bradgate Park). Reference should be made to funding sources/ Section 106 for enhanced public transport and new road links.	404 (Newtown Linford Parish Council), 580 (Leicestershire County Council)

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to LUC2 West of Loughborough Sustainable Urban Extension comments**

The Local Plan should be read as a whole, including topic based policies in chapters 4 to 9. Policies CC1 to CC4 deal with flooding, drainage and sustainable construction.

West of Loughborough Sustainable Urban Extension is allocated in the Charnwood Local Plan Core Strategy 2015 and benefits from outline and reserved matters planning permissions. The Sustainable Urban Extension has been appropriately appraised in the Sustainability Appraisal in terms of cumulative impacts alongside other allocations proposed through the Charnwood Local Plan.

### **LUC3: Loughborough Science & Enterprise Park**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 6, 221, 627, 591, 144, 580, 611, 319, 317, 316, 364, 479, 625, 641, 473, 565

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The site is prone to flooding and should be a mix of employment, housing and green space.	6
Development that would require improvements to Severn Trent Water's operation should be incorporated into	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)

their improvements programme to ensure deliverability	
Policy should highlight the drainage hierarchy to ensure sustainable surface water outfalls to sewerage system	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
The optional water efficiency requirement should be detailed in policy	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
Paragraph 3.142 should be amended to support general industrial development that is ancillary to the knowledge-based sectors	627
Clarification sought on the relationship between the requirement to retain 40% of the site as green infrastructure and to provide biodiversity net gain	627
Policy should support measures to mitigate flood risk through contributions to the Burleigh Brook catchment	591 (Environment Agency)
Concern about loss of green open space for Nanpantan residents	144, 479
Concern about the cumulative impact upon transport in the area	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy should provide guidance on how business startup and incubator spaces will be accessible to the community	611
Concern about the impact upon the adjoining ancient woodland, where a suitable buffer is required.	319, 317, 316, 641, 625
Concern about loss of countryside surrounding Garendon Park	625

<b>Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to LUC3 Loughborough Science &amp; Enterprise Park comments</b>	
<p>The Local Plan should be read as a whole, including topic based policies in chapters 4 to 9. Policies CC1 to CC4 deal with flooding, drainage and sustainable construction.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.142 is appropriate and clear in its approach to ancillary uses in Loughborough Science and Enterprise Park.</p> <p>It is considered possible for requirements for biodiversity net gain to be met as part of the provision of 40% of green infrastructure, but this is dependent upon how the site specific proposals are planned and brought forward. Loughborough Science and Enterprise Park is allocated in the Charnwood Local Plan Core Strategy 2015. The Science Park has been appropriately appraised in the Sustainability Appraisal in terms of cumulative impacts alongside other allocations proposed through the Charnwood Local Plan. In other respects the Policy is considered to meet the test of soundness.</p>	

### **SUA1: Shepshed Urban Area**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 4, 221, 180, 518, 533, 580, 413, 21, 330

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Development that would require improvements to Severn Trent Water's operation should be incorporated into	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)

their improvements programme to ensure deliverability	
Policy should highlight the drainage hierarchy to ensure sustainable surface water outfalls to sewerage system	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
The optional water efficiency requirement should be detailed in policy	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
Policy should promote regeneration in Shepshed including the provision of basic facilities	180
Policy should clarify that developer contributions will be subject to viability	518
General concerns about the impact in Shepshed upon health services, cumulative transport, landscape, loss of separation between the settlement and Loughborough, flooding (including nitrate pollution on Shepshed Watermill), biodiversity, air quality and detached communities.	4, 533, 580 (Leicestershire County Council), 413
Consider the need for additional food retail in Shepshed.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Paragraph 3.170 should refer to the waste incinerator instead of industrial sources	473
Policy should commit to preparing a strategy for supporting connectivity between development and the district centre	565

<b>Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to SUA1 Shepshed Urban Area comments</b>	
The Local Plan should be read as a whole, including topic based policies in chapters 4 to 9. Policies CC1 to CC4 deal with flooding, drainage and sustainable construction.	
The policy identifies regeneration issues and provides an appropriate policy response, justified by evidence.	
The strategy for development strategy for Shepshed has been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal and social, environmental and economic effects of the strategy and Policy SUA1 have been appropriately assessed.	

### **SC1: Service Centres**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 296, 162, 373, 393, 515, 545, 580, 611, 321, 34, 491, 494, 589, 626.

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
There is strong market demand for small/medium business industrial units including within service centres which is not catered for. Employment allocations promoted at 'Poole Farm, Quorn' and at 'Land off Barrow Road, Quorn'.	296 (Leicestershire County Council)
Allocations in Anstey do not satisfy transport requirements of policy SC1.	373 (Anstey Parish Council)
Policy should ensure each allocation in Sileby makes contributions to sports pitch provision.	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Education provision should be made within Sileby instead of Cossington	515 (Sileby Parish Council), 626
The policy splits the delivery of infrastructure and transport which does not support a strategic coordinated	580 (Leicestershire County Council)

approach	Council)
Policy requirement for development to be a walking distance of 800 metres from public transport is contrary to policy CC5 which requires 400 metres	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Allocations in service centres (such as Barrow, Sileby) will be unable to accommodate needs for off street car parking, community facility, education, healthcare, transport, mitigating flood risk, providing green spaces. Allocations are proposed in Barrow solely on the basis of primary school capacity	321, 34, 491, 494
The Barrow Neighbourhood Plan has not been taken into account.	491, 494
The Key Diagram accompanying SC1 includes 'strategically important links in the wildlife network' which are not evidenced	626

<b>Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to SC1 Service Centres comments</b>	
<p>The Council has prepared a topic paper on employment which explains the approach in terms of need and supply for employment land. The Council has prepared a topic paper explaining strategy and site selection as part of the Charnwood Local Plan, which should be read in conjunction with the Sustainability Appraisal report.</p> <p>The development strategy and its relationship with education provision has been considered in collaboration with the Local Education Authority. Policy SC1 is seeking to direct development to locations within 800m of public transport, whereas CC5 is a policy which seeks to secure improvements to bus services where development is more than 400m from existing bus stops. The policies have different objectives and are considered compatible.</p> <p>The key diagram provides a visual guide to assist in the interpretation of the policy. The justification for strategically important wildlife networks is set out in paragraph 8.41.</p>	

### **OS1: Other Settlements**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 116, 107, 545, 554, 580, 583

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The requirement of 60 dwellings in Wymeswold is unachievable	116
Development in Other Settlements (including Wymeswold, Cossington) will not provide local employment, services, public transport, flood risk management, and will negatively impact settlement identity.	116, 107
Policy does not give sufficient support to the re use of previously developed land outside of Limits to Development	554, 583

<b>Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to OS1 Other Settlements comments</b>	
<p>The development strategy for Other Settlements is considered to be positively prepared and effective. The strategy has been considered through sustainability appraisal and is considered to be appropriate. The policy is considered to be sound in relation to use of previously developed land outside of limits to development.</p>	

### **C1: Countryside**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 554, 580, 583

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy does not give sufficient support to the re use of previously developed land outside of Limits to Development	554
It is unclear why 'Sturdee Poultry Farm, Burton on the Wolds' is outside the Limits to Development	583

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to C1 Countryside comments**

The policy is considered to be sound in relation to use of previously developed land outside of limits to development.

The Council has published a review of Settlement Limits which sets out its methodology for their assessment.

### **H1: Housing Mix**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 180, 340, 537, 373, 350, 515, 536, 545, 580, 356, 374, 635

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy does not plan for an appropriate/ the correct housing mix in accordance with NPPF paragraph 62.	340
Policy should set out how it relates to Policy DS1 with regards to the number of new homes required for different communities, And how that provision has already been met in different areas.	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Policy should give emphasis on dwellings for single people with disabilities	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy should emphasise the need for starter homes and not investment properties	356
Policy needs to be less prescriptive and rely on the latest evidence for development management purposes	635

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy H1 Housing Mix comments**

The policy is strategic in approach and should be read alongside other policies in the Local Plan and, where relevant, in Neighbourhood Plans.

The reasoned justification sets out a housing mix that meets the Borough's overall needs based on the evidence in the Housing Needs Assessment 2020. It also sets out other relevant considerations for decision makers.

### **H2: Housing for Older People and People with Disabilities**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 350, 23, 340, 537, 515, 536, 542, 545, 580, 626, 624, 598, 556, 707

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------

Unless a specific percentage requirement for the provision of single level properties is stated these will be difficult to secure.	350 (Melton Borough Council)
The policy is not informed by appropriate evidence that assesses housing needs for elderly and disabled people, including setting clear targets, allocations, housing types, and multigenerational living.	23, 624, 340
The evidence basis for policy requirements, and of the impact on viability, is not made including in relation to requiring a proportion of new market homes to meet optional Building Regulation Standards M4(2) and M4(3). Policy is therefore overly prescriptive	537, 626, 515 (Sileby Parish Council), 598, 545
Policy should clarify the approach taken to optional Building Regulation Standards M4(2) and M4(3) if these are amended following the Government consultation "Raising Accessibility Standards for New Homes" which closed in December 2020	556
Policy should define 'an appropriate proportion'	542, 556
Policy should make reference to partnership working with Leicestershire County Council for the provision housing for the elderly and disabled	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
The Housing Needs Assessment confirms the age and health of the borough's population is similar to the national average and therefore additional requirements are not justified	556
The Affordable Housing Viability Assessment states that requiring specialist older persons housing would be unviable, therefore concerns about policy deliverability	707

<b>Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy H2 Housing for Older People and People with Disabilities comments</b>	
<p>While the age profile of the Borough for older age groups is similar to the regional and national averages, PPG states that because of demographic trends "(t)he need to provide housing for older people is critical".</p> <p>The policy requirement for market housing was tested as part of the whole plan viability assessment.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the opportunity for further partnership working with Leicestershire County Council.</p>	

### **H3: Internal Space Standards**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 537, 536, 542, 580, 618, 564, 626, 556

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy is not consistent with the NPPF or ministerial statement (March 2015) and should be removed	537
Policy is not supported by sufficient evidence or viability testing, (including within the Housing Needs Assessment 2020)	537, 542, 618, 564, 556

Policy provides flexibility on standards for affordable housing which is not justified	542, 626, 556
Policy should include transitional arrangements for sites already granted planning permission	618, 556

<b>Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy H3 Internal Space Standards comments</b>	
The Council is responding to concerns regarding the internal space provisions of certain development proposals.	
The policy was tested as part of the whole plan viability assessment.	

#### **H4: Affordable Housing**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 344, 373, 350, 515, 557, 521, 536, 542, 545, 580, 579, 626, 598, 556, 389, 716, 707

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy does not take sufficient account of First Homes/ discounted market sales, including the viability implications of requiring First Homes.	344, 598, 556
Policy should allow neighbourhood plan affordable housing policies to take precedence	373 (Anstey Parish Council)
The proportion of affordable housing for rent and for market on greenfield and brownfield sites in the policy appears not to follow the reasoned justification	350 (Melton Borough Council)
Policy should state that independent viability assessments should be made publicly available for scrutiny	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Paragraph 4.34 provision that where a Registered Provider cannot be identified dwellings will be gifted to the Council results in uncertainty	579
Policy should provide guidance on minimum group sizes for affordable housing, including potentially supporting 100% affordable housing developments	536, 542
Policy should identify percentage requirements as an 'up to' maximum	580 (Leicestershire County Council), 626
Policy does not require a high enough percentage of affordable homes contributions or specific needs of older people	389, 716
Policy should make reference to local authority social house building	557 (Rothley Parish Council)
Policy should not require affordable housing contributions for specialist accommodation for older people, which is inconsistent with the viability assessment	707

<b>Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy H4 Affordable Housing comments</b>	
The policy sets an overall approach to affordable housing in the Borough that has been informed by a viability assessment.	
The policy does not prevent schemes providing more affordable housing than is sought being supported. The policy states that any proposed provision that is less than the policy seeks will need to be justified by an independent viability assessment.	

The Council does not wish to exclude the possibility that specialist accommodation could provide some affordable housing contributions.

### **H5: Rural Exception Sites**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 580

No main issues raised.

### **H6: Self Build and Custom Housebuilding**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 537, 515, 115, 536, 545, 580, 579, 564, 626, 598, 556

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The policy threshold should be lowered to 100 or more dwellings	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
The requirement for five serviced plots on sites over 250 dwellings will create infrastructure, phasing and practical issues and is not viability assessed	545, 626, 556
Policy should set out how developer contributions will be sought for self build and custom housebuilding developments	580 (Leicestershire County Council), 564
Policy is not justified by evidence of demand including the self build register	579, 564, 626, 598, 556
The requirement for appropriate marketing length should be reduced	564, 626

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy H6 Self Build and Custom Housebuilding comments**

The policy adopts a balanced approach to supporting the aspirations of people to build or commission their own homes, the Council's duties under the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended) and the efficient delivery of housing sites.

### **H7: Houses in Multiple Occupation**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 171, 627, 497, 580, 611, 596, 473, 611.

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The thresholds within the policy are not evidence based, Including no evidence of need for further Houses in Multiple Occupation in the Housing Needs Assessment	171, 497, 596
Policy cannot be delivered with consistency or account for differing circumstances and will therefore result in inappropriate Houses in Multiple Occupation being permitted	171, 497
Policy will not prevent new Houses in Multiple Occupation in areas of currently low concentration	473
The methodology for calculating Houses in Multiple Occupation saturation overinflates the situation and will not be able to be openly scrutinised by applicants	661

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy H7 Houses in Multiple Occupation comments**

The policy uses a threshold approach as one way of managing the potential negative impacts of an over-concentration of Houses in Multiple

Occupation and it includes other factors that will also be taken into account in decision making. It does not seek to unnecessarily restrict the supply of new HMOs.

The decision to reduce the threshold from 20% to 10% was informed by an evidence study that looked at a range of factors including practice at other local authorities which had adopted a threshold approach, levels of complaints relating to anti-social behaviour (noise and waste accumulation), and stakeholder engagement.

The Council is developing ways to increase public confidence in the data used to apply the policy.

### **H8: Campus and Purpose-Built Student Accommodation**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 627, 580, 611, 592.

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Concern the policy will result in student accommodation that will have no regeneration benefit and will not reduce the number of houses in multiple occupation	592

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy H8 Campus and Purpose-Built Student Accommodation comments**

The policy identifies the most appropriate locations for new accommodation, which include Loughborough town centre. Its main purpose is to contribute to meeting the needs of students in the context of generally increasing student numbers and generally static on-campus provision.

### **H9: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 580, 574

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should refer to how local infrastructure needs will be addressed	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy is reliant on the delivery of Sustainable Urban Extensions which is inflexible	574

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy H9 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople comments**

The policy continues the approach in the adopted Local Plan of using the suitable locations of the three Sustainable Urban Extensions and their associated infrastructure to meet the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.

### **E1: Meeting Employment Needs**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 296, 539, 580, 611, 629, 574, 713, 623

<b>Issues raised in relation to the amount, type and location of employment that is planned for in of Policy</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------

<b>E1: Meeting Employment Needs with more specific comments identified below:</b>	
Policy does not meet the needs of small/ medium size businesses, strategic distribution businesses, manufacturing businesses through appropriate site allocations.	296 (Leicestershire County Council), 629, 623
Policy should include a policy solutions such as identifying 'Areas of Opportunity up to 2041' (reflecting latest evidence) or a plan review trigger to plan appropriately for cross-boundary strategic B8 uses.	539 (North West Leicestershire District Council), 713 (Harborough District Council)
Support retention of Use Class E(g) by condition; comfortable with approach to use of joint evidence and Duty to Cooperate regarding strategic warehousing and logistics.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy should support a coordinated, strategy-led approach to addressing cumulative transport impacts across the Borough and Leicester.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy should support employment development in Service Centres.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Evidence should be reviewed to take account of the impact of home working.	611
Incorrect employment need is identified, and sites are located within Sustainable Urban Extensions which are not suitable for strategic distribution uses.	629
Policy needs to be more flexible by not specifying employment locations within Sustainable Urban Extensions and only restricting Class E uses by condition in specific circumstances.	574

<b>Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy E1 Meeting Employment Need comments</b>	
<p>The Council has prepared an employment topic paper setting out its justification for the amount of employment land provided to meet identified need and is based upon our evidence base.</p> <p>The geographical distribution and the phasing of supply has been assessed during plan preparation and has been informed by the employment trajectory included in the Plan.</p> <p>The Council's approach to strategic distribution is set out in the employment topic paper and will be informed by joint, cross-boundary working across Leicester and Leicestershire through the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>The Council is working with stakeholders on a coordinated approach to transport across the Borough, supported by a Statement of Common Ground.</p> <p>The Plan has been positively prepared with sufficient flexibility to allow for changes in the economy and employment land requirements to be accommodated but our evidence base shows the need to ensure good quality employment sites remain in this use in the future to meet our need.</p>	

### **E2: Protecting Existing Employment Sites**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 378, 580, 413

<b>Issues raised in relation to protection of employment sites with more specific comments below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Land at Melton Road (Hawker Business Park) is not evidenced as a good quality employment site.	378
Policy could include criteria to support land rewilding, recreational uses, and addressing poor energy efficiency.	580 (Leicestershire County

	Council)
Policy does not protect equine businesses.	413

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy E2 Protecting Existing Employment Sites comments**  
The policy is in place to protect good quality employment sites, other policies exist in the Plan to address a number of the issues raised.

**E3: Rural Economic Development**  
Comments made by (PSLP/) 296, 554; 214; 580; 597;

<b>Issues raised in relation to support for rural businesses and economic development with more specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy does not reflect national policy as it does not sufficiently support all types of rural businesses, including new businesses.	296 (Leicestershire County Council), 554
Policy should support the re-use or replacement of existing farm buildings where they are no longer viable for farm business use.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy should support local food and drink offer, and tourist accommodation.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy should support logistics/ freight train development.	214

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy E3 Rural Economic Development comments**  
The Council has included wording in Policy E3 to provide support for all types of sustainable economic development in rural areas in accordance with national policy.

**T1: Town Centres and Retail**  
Comments made by (PSLP/) 180, 373, 521, 574, 580, 735

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should promote regeneration in Loughborough and Shepshed, including promoting recreation, community space, tourism and a retail core in Loughborough to enable peripheral residential development, and promote basic facilities in smaller settlements	180, 580 (Leicestershire County Council), 735
Referring to 'Town Centre' uses within 'District Centres' is confusing	373 (Anstey Parish Council)
Loughborough Centre boundary is not justified as reasonable alternatives have not been considered (extend eastern boundary to A6)	521

Policy should support units up to 2000sqm should be permitted within and adjoining centre boundaries to widen choice.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy should identify future planned centres within the Sustainable Urban Extensions	574

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy T1 Town Centres and Retail comments**

The boundaries of town, district and local centres are based on those recommended in the Charnwood Retail and Town Centre Study 2018 which the Council considers to be appropriate and robust evidence. Referencing and policy provisions made are considered to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. Future local centres within Sustainable Urban Extensions are referred to within the relevant place based policy.

### **T2: Protection of Community Facilities**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 94, 373, 580, 674, 695.

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Neighbourhood plans can add local detail to this policy and should be liaised with.	373 (Anstey Parish Council), 580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy should support the provision of new, improved or replacement facilities in accessible locations	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Policy does not address the impact upon facilities from development	674, 695

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy T2 Protection of Community Facilities comments**

The Council has included wording in Policy T2 and supporting text to support neighbourhood planning. The provision of new community facilities has general policy support under the National Planning Policy Framework and provision is ultimately be led by service providers and the market. The impact of specific developments is assessed at the planning application stage.

### **T3: Car Parking Standards**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 176, 373, 515, 542, 214, 580, 266, 592, 618, 556, 719, 688.

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Policy should plan for active demand management to manage rather than simply provide for and encourage car use.	176, 214
Insufficient parking has been planned for Anstey; Loughborough; and areas in the borough with high densities of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs).	373 (Anstey Parish Council), 592, 266
Policy should state planning permission will be refused where car parking provision is not provided	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Requiring parking standards is not justified in the most sustainable locations	542

Policy T3 defers policy requirement to separate guidance which will not be the subject of examination	618; 556
Policy should also make provision for cycle parking including at rural public transport stops	688

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to T3 Car Parking Standards comments**

The Council considers that Policy T3 is appropriate to address the issue of car parking and it is sound to refer to latest guidance, particularly that prepared by the Highways Authority, to future proof the policy. Support for cycle provision within the policy is given in Policy CC5. The plan cannot account for the behaviour of individuals or retrospectively provide parking spaces within communities, however this policy will ensure that future developments appropriately address the issue of car parking.

### **CC1: Flood Risk**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 89; 140; 176; 221; 424; 515; 533; 535; 580; 591; 664; 674; 695

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Drainage Hierarchy should be referenced in policy CC1 so that the principle if followed on all sites.	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
Flood risk and the impact of new housing on flood plain at Shepshed have not been considered	89
Stronger wording is required on reinstating the functional floodplain (flood zone 3b) in urban areas, brownfield sites and developments upstream of urban areas to seek to reduce flood risk overall. There should be clear guidance to developers on climate change.	591 (Environment Agency)
Insufficient consideration has been 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	533
Thrussington Village is at risk of flooding. Building more houses will make this worse. Flooding affects residents wildlife, livestock and arable farming.	140
The policy wording should be amended to better reflect national policy and guidance.	535 (Leicestershire County Council)
County Council modelling shows that land at Farley Way East falls wholly within Flood Zone 2, rather than the Flood Zone 3 as identified on the Environment Agency maps.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to CC1 Flood Risk comments**

With regards to the drainage hierarchy, the supporting text details what the drainage hierarchy is and this is sufficient to support policy CC1. The drainage hierarchy is also referenced in policy CC2.

With regards to flood risk at Shepshed, the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has taken account of flood risk and the impact of new housing on floodplain at Shepshed and across the whole of the Borough.

The Council and Environment Agency have agreed a statement of common ground.

The NPPF paragraph 160 notes that strategic policies should take account of cumulative impact. The Charnwood Level 2 SFRA has taken

account of flood risk and cumulative impact.

The Charnwood Level 2 SFRA has taken account of the risk of flooding in Thrussington including the proposed new housing developments. The policy wording reflects national policy and guidance.

The Planning Practice Guidance - Flood Risk and Coastal Change uses the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning.

### **CC2: Sustainable Drainage Systems**

Comments made by (PSLP/)176, 221, 515, 533, 580,

<b>Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
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.	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd), 515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Policy CC1 states SuDS in minor development will be encouraged as per CC2; however, minor development is not specifically mentioned in CC2.  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.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to CC2 Sustainable Drainage Systems**

With regards to maintenance of SuDS, paragraph 7.24 of the local plan notes that we will seek advice from Leicestershire County Council to make sure there are clear arrangements for on-going maintenance over the lifetime of the development.

Paragraph 7.22 of the supporting text for CC2 notes that we will also recognise the cumulative impact of a smaller number of developments could have a significant impact on flood risk and in these circumstances the use of SuDS should be considered.

The policy is strategic and it is not its purpose to provide detailed guidance on different types of SUDs and their implementation.

### **CC3: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 08; 103; 115; 122; 138; 152; 174; 176; 214; 238; 239; 263; 373; 473; 515; 526; 541; 542; 550; 574; 580; 597; 599

<b>Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Large and very large-scale turbines would be far more efficient and productive and should be supported wherever possible.	541

The policy does not consider biomass.	
The plan will not achieve net zero emissions by 2050 (in accordance with the Climate Change Act). The plan is not legally compliant as it does not appear to have demonstrated how its policies comply with its legal obligations to evaluate future emissions.	716
The plan does not sufficiently tackle climate change and appears to display aspiration rather than enforce action.	238 (Quorn Parish Council)
The policy doesn't but should require assessment of the cumulative impact of the technologies on the landscape and visual impacts.	263 (Rushcliffe Borough Council)
Policy CC3 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.	122, 138, 296 (Leicestershire County Council)
Table 7 should be amended as energy from waste is not low carbon or renewable.	473, 103

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to CC3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy comments**

The policy is strategic and covers renewable and low carbon technologies which offer the most potential in Charnwood including wind and solar energy. The policy is worded so that other types of renewable and low carbon energy are also encouraged.

With regards to net zero emissions and legal compliance, the Council took legal advice and responded to a letter from ClientEarth in September 2019 which requested a response to whether the local authority intended to include carbon reduction targets in the Local Plan. The Council noted that there is no express statutory obligation to include carbon reduction targets rather that the obligation is a much broader one — "to include policies designed to secure that the development and use of land contribute to the mitigation of, and adaption to, climate change". The letter from ClientEarth was used during the plan making process as part of a review of the local plan policies. The local plan is in conformity with the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance and meets all legal requirements.

With regards to tackling climate change, the Council has made responding to the challenge of climate change a corporate priority and climate change is a cross-cutting issue that influences all of the local plan's objectives and policies. It should be noted, that the policies included in a local plan must be deliverable; and must not be written in such a manner as to jeopardise the viability and deliverability of future development.

With regards to cumulative impacts, paragraph 7.3 of the local plan supporting text notes that we have a positive strategy for renewable energy and low carbon technologies which supports the potential for suitable development whilst ensuring that any adverse impacts are satisfactorily addressed, including cumulative landscape and visual impacts.

With regards to wind energy, the policy is appropriately phrased and Policies Map 2 identifies areas where wind installations may be suitable.

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.

#### **CC4: Sustainable Construction**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 164; 174; 176; 180; 208; 214; 221; 373; 410; 463; 474; 515; 536; 556; 557; 564; 580; 591; 597; 598; 618; 621; 626; 628; 731

<b>Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
All new developments should be zero carbon from the outset.	174, 557 (Rothley Parish Council), 214
The policy wording should be strengthened to ensure energy savings and low carbon delivery. There should be more stringent requirements on new developments.	176, 180, 628, 591 (Environment Agency), 214, 463, 731
The increased sustainability targets are not supported, the additional 10% reduction in CO2 will impact viability and deliverability.	536
The plan is not in accordance with the paragraph 35 of the NPPF and a new policy should be added to prevent development on Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land (unless there are exceptional reasons) and a new policy to require developers to support equivalence or net gain in food production capacity.	208
The policy is not justified as it does not sufficiently address climate change or support zero carbon targets.	731
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.	621
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.	564
The requirement for the optional water efficiency standard should be deleted from Policy CC4 as there is no justification for its inclusion.  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.	618, 556, 598
What is the 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.	626
The energy performance of buildings will require modification to meet standards in 2050.	599

#### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to CC4 Sustainable Construction comments**

The policy framework in the local plan aims to improve the standard of new homes being built. Paragraph 7.38 notes that we will encourage all new developments to be designed to exceed national sustainable building standards to maximise the use of energy efficiency and energy conservation in their design, layout and orientation. This would be the national sustainable building standards that are in force at the time. The policies in the plan support zero carbon developments, however, policies in the plan must be deliverable; and must not be written in such a manner as to jeopardise the viability and deliverability of future development.

With regards to strengthening the wording, the use of wording such as 'require' instead of 'encourage' has been explored at a strategic level through Local Plan Viability Assessment, and this report finds that making policy 'requirements' rather than ones which 'encourage' pose a risk to the viability of the plan as a whole. The current wording is appropriate in the context of viability and national planning policy.

With regards to sustainability targets, the supporting text to the local plan notes that we recognise the impact such an ambitious target could have on viability; however, some of the best ways to improve environmental performance are through simple decisions on the layout and orientation of buildings and spaces. The plan notes that we will offer the flexibility for the scheme to be designed to achieve the best range of these measures. We will support schemes that compensate for CO2 emissions where reductions are not possible through the design and construction of a development.

With regards to agricultural land, Policy CC4 notes that we will support new development that protects environmental resources including local air quality and our most versatile agricultural land. Agricultural land is discussed in the protecting our rural economy chapter of the local plan and in Policy C1 Countryside. A separate policy to protect agricultural land from development is not required. The plan has sufficiently addressed and considered the issue of climate change against the NPPF requirements.

With regards to carbon reduction targets, there is no express statutory obligation to include carbon reduction targets. The obligation is a much broader one — to “include policies designed to secure that the development and use of land contribute to the mitigation of, and adaption to, climate change”.

With regards to the plan being ambiguous, the plan is in accordance with paragraph 16 (d) of the NPPF which notes that plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals. The policy is written in a clear and succinct way to enable effective decision making.

With regards to layout and design, the plan is in accordance with paragraph 154 of the NPPF which notes that new development should be planned for in ways that (b) can help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location, orientation and design. Any local requirements for the sustainability of buildings should reflect the Government's policy for national technical standards.

With regards to water efficiency standard, the Severn Trent Water area has been reclassified as an 'area of serious water stress' for water resources. The new classification can be found online here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/water-stressed-areas-2021->

classification. Both the River Severn River Basin Management Plan (Page 52) and the Humber River Basin Management Plan (page 46) recommend that Local Plans set out policies requiring homes to meet the tighter water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day as described in Part G of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. There is a clear local need for a policy which requires new dwellings to incorporate water efficiency measures which go beyond the mandatory national standard set out in the Building Regulations of 125litres/person/day (l/p/d). It is therefore appropriate to require that new development meet the optional target of 110 l/p/d. The optional requirement is also supported by the Environment Agency and Seven Trent.

**CC5: Sustainable Transport**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 22; 117; 127; 174; 176; 180; 214; 254; 340; 356; 393; 413; 536; 573; 574; 580; 582; 597; 651; 739

Main Issues Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
The policy wording should be strengthened to ‘require’ not just ‘support’. The policy will not lead to a radical change in travel behaviour	176, 180, 214
The onus should be placed on developers for them to show how developments will reduce car dependency.	340, 127
The policy should explain how it will deliver sustainable travel improvements into Leicester City. The policy should mention the intention to work with Leicester City as a partner to deliver the interventions	582 (Leicester City Council)
There is no reference to developer contributions to support bus services and sustainable travel options.  The policy is written from the perspective of a single development in isolation and should also address cumulative transport impacts.  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.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Safe cycle routes should be referred to.	117

**Council’s Response to Main Issues raised in relation to CC5 Sustainable Transport comments**

With regards to the strength of the wording, the current wording is appropriate in the context of viability and national planning policy. Policy CC5 forms part of a suite of policies which will encourage a change in travel behaviour and a move towards more sustainable modes of travel including the development strategy, the place based policies, air quality and the environment.

With regards to reducing car dependency, major developments are required to be informed by a transport assessment which will consider sustainable travel options from the outset and how car dependency can be reduced.

With regards to sustainable transport and Leicester City, the policy is a general strategic policy and more detail on sustainable travel in the south

of the Borough and into Leicester City is detailed in policy LUA1 and supporting text. Policy CC5 notes that we will work with our partners to secure funding for and delivery of sustainable transport improvements.

With regards to developer contributions, this is a strategic policy and further detail on developer contributions is provided in INF1 Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.

With regards to the cumulative impact of transport, this is a strategic policy and further detail on the cumulative impact of transport are considered and addressed through the place-based and housing allocation policies.

With regards to integration of this policy with other policies, sustainable travel is an important aspect of the local plan and is a theme which runs through other policies for example, the development strategy, place-based policies and air quality.

The Council is working with stakeholders on a coordinated approach to transport across the Borough, supported by a Statement of Common Ground.

**CC6: Electric Vehicle Charging Points**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 140; 176; 239; 373; 536; 545; 556; 564; 579; 580; 597; 598; 618; 621; 627; 689

Main Issues Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
The policy should be more specific and provide detail on electric bike charging point, and priority spaces within communities for carpool charging.	176
There are concerns that the policy is not practical if developers are expected to contribute towards electricity infrastructure upgrades.  There is no mechanism to account for the viability impact of the charging points on a development proposal	627, 545, 556, 621, 579
Future planned changes to the Building Regulations will supersede the policy. Installing charging points in advance of these changes risks using technology that will become obsolete. A passive cable and duct approach is more appropriate	618, 556, 598
No standardised format for charging points is currently available and existing technology is not suitable for all dwellings.	564, 598
The Council's viability Study includes a cost for charging points of £1,000 per dwelling (housing) and £10,000 for a multi-charging point (for every 4 apartments) but no costs for upgrading local electricity networks. Further viability work should be undertaken to sensitivity test the Council's assumptions	556

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to CC6 Electric Vehicle Charging Points comments**

Leicestershire County Council as the local highway authority has prepared the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide which provides advice on highway design, including parking standards. It provides guidance on the levels of car, cycle, motorcycle, electric car charging and disabled parking that should be provided in association with development. This document is the starting point for detailed discussions and agreement on development proposals and any new development will need to have regard to the guidance and advice set out in the document. Paragraph 7.58 of the supporting text in the local plan notes that we will also consider the potential for e-scooter and e-bike charging points.

With regards to developer contributions and viability, the local plan’s policy requirements together with local and national standards (including for electric vehicle charging) have been assessed to consider the impact they are likely to have on development viability. The assessment demonstrates that our policies are realistic, and that the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine deliverability of the plan. Western Power is a key stakeholder and has been involved in the preparation of the local plan.

With regards to Building Regulations, it is unlikely that the new building regulation legislation for electric vehicle charging points will come into force before the local plan is adopted therefore it is important to have an electric vehicle charging point policy in place which is supported by sustainable transport and viability evidence.

With regards to standardised formats for charging points, the policy notes that we will work with our partners and developers to deliver infrastructure for electric vehicles and ensure charging points are provided at appropriate locations. We will also work with infrastructure providers to trial new technologies such as street lamppost charging points and rapid charging hubs and the timely instalment of cable routing.

With regards to the Council’s Viability Study, further assessment will be undertaken through the development management process to understand the infrastructure upgrades required.

**EV1: Landscape**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 103; 148; 393; 533; 536; 580; 621

Main Issues Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
The plan does not adequately protect the environment and lacks detail on how the landscape will be protected.	533, 148
The policy focuses on the look of the landscape and not its intrinsic biodiversity value	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
The policy seeks to protect ‘distinctive’ rather than ‘valued’ landscapes.	621

**Council’s Response to Main Issues raised in relation to EV1 Landscape comments**

With regards to protecting the environment, protecting the environment is a corporate priority and is a cross-cutting issue that influences all of the local plan’s objectives and policies. The environment chapter policies set out how the landscape will be protected and should be read alongside other policies in the local plan.

With regards the focus of the policy, Policy EV1 sets out how we will protect the Borough's distinctive landscape and should be read alongside policy EV6 Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity.

With regards to distinctive landscapes, the supporting text to EV1 refers to the 6 landscape character areas which have their own distinctive character and are valued by our communities. The supporting text to the development strategy also refers to valued landscapes.

### **EV2: Green Wedges**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 148; 176; 313; 373; 381; 393; 533; 536; 544; 557; 580; 651

<b>Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Development should not happen in Green Wedges.	176, 373 (Anstey Parish Council), 320
Additional areas should be designated as Green Wedge.	557 (Rothley Parish Council)
The Green Wedge between Birstall and Leicester City will become non-existent with all the proposed development.	313, 381

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to EV2 Green Wedges comments**

With regards to development not happening in Green Wedges, the Council has published a topic paper on strategy and site selection which should be read in conjunction with the sustainability appraisal. Strategy and site selection was informed by evidence including evidence on Green Wedges.

Green Wedge policy designations in the local plan are supported by green wedge evidence.

### **EV3: Areas of Local Separation**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 28; 97; 139; 148; 176; 238; 373; 375; 381; 393; 413; 515; 526; 533; 536; 545; 555; 557; 558; 561; 579; 580; 601; 664

<b>Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The Area of Local Separation in the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan is different to that on the local plan policies map. Area of Local Separation boundaries should reflect those in adopted Neighbourhood Plans.	28, 557 (Rothley Parish Council)
There should be an Area of Local Separation between Anstey and Groby.	373 (Anstey Parish Council)
The principle of Areas of Local Separation is undermined because major development is proposed in	526 (East Goscote Parish Council)

them.	
-------	--

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to EV3 Areas of Local Separation comments**

The Area of Local Separation boundary reflects the evidence and recommendations in the Charnwood Green Wedges, Urban Fringe Green Infrastructure Enhancement Zones and Areas of Local Separation Study 2016.

The location of 'Areas of Local Separation' has been informed by evidence on areas of local separation.

The council has prepared a topic paper on site selection, which should be read in conjunction with the sustainability appraisal. The sustainability appraisal was informed by evidence, including evidence relating to Areas of Local Separation.

**EV4: Charnwood Forest and the National Forest**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 22; 129; 148; 176;316; 393; 396; 437; 580; 628

Main Issues Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
The policy should include ambitious tree planting targets.	176
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 wording should be amended to reflect this.	628
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	316, 129

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to EV4 Charnwood Forest and the National Forest comments**

With regards tree planting targets, Policy EV4 makes reference to the National Forest Planting Guidelines. The importance of tree planting is also recognised in EV12 and the Council's commitment to increasing the number of trees in Charnwood. The policy includes a tree planting target based on guidance from the Woodland Trust. It is important to include a tree planting target however, it should be noted, that the policies included in a local plan must be deliverable; and should not be written in such a manner as to jeopardise the viability and deliverability of future development.

With regards to the purpose of the National Forest, the policy is a strategic policy about the National Forest and Charnwood Forest and it is considered an appropriate level of detail.

With regards to the policy only being reactive and not pro-active, the policy sets out the types of development which will be supported in the National Forest and should be read in conjunction with other policies in the environment chapter and housing allocation and place-based policies

which provide more detail on development and areas which should be protected.

**EV5: River Soar and Grand Union Canal**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 148, 254, 393, 580

Main Issues Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
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.	148
The policy should consider access from new development, encourage improved access on to towpaths and better signage, consider biodiversity plans and invasive species and highlight Green Flag potential and travel by water opportunities.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to EV5 River Soar and Grand Union Canal comments**

The purpose of the policy is to protect and enhance the corridor and should be read in conjunction with other policies on biodiversity, open space, tree planting, sustainable travel, rural economic development and place-based policies.

**EV6: Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 112; 148; 170; 176; 221; 340; 393; 396; 410; 413; 422; 424; 438; 444; 515; 533; 536; 542; 545; 556; 574; 579; 580; 591; 598; 618; 627; 635; 674; 695; 700; 735

Main Issues Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
The policy should highlight the need to protect watercourses as open features so that they can provide access to water for wildlife, natural habitats and sustainable method of discharging and conveying surface water.	221 (Severn Trent Water Ltd)
Policy wording should be stronger this could be done by replacing “seeking” with “requiring”, and “should be” with “will be”.	176, 591 (Environment Agency)
Reference to 25 year Environment Plan, Nature Recovery Network and a commitment to prepare a SPD on Biodiversity Net Gain should be made.	410 (Natural England)
There should be a separate policy on Green Infrastructure	410 (Natural England)
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. This is needed to judge if 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.	340
The policy should allow for biodiversity off setting to be provided across the university's land holdings	627

in order to create areas of scale.	
The policy should be amended to state that new development will not result in worse water quality.	591 (Environment Agency)
Net gain is too low, it should be 30%, not 10%. It is not clear if the 10% figure has been viability assessed.	148, 542, 533, 176
Reference should be made to the principles of 'Making Space for Nature'. The policy should consider LWS as high value spaces for nature and refer to local and national BAP. The policy should identify hedgerow restoration as helping connectivity and restoring fragmented habitats	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
There is a national BIA metric provided by DEFRA. The policy should be updated to make reference to this metric rather than leaving this to developers to decide.	422, 438, 579, 627
The approach to LWS and candidate LWS needs to be reviewed as last updated 2008 and 2010	371
With reference to paragraph 8.41 and 8.42, the approach to biodiversity is not consistent with NPPF with regard to paragraph 35 which states that specific needs should be identified and addressed.	457

#### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to EV6 Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity comments**

The plan notes that watercourses are a valuable environmental and recreation asset and recognise the role watercourses play in helping to reduce flood risk, supporting a range of wildlife and that they require careful management to maintain their quality and value. EV6 should be read in conjunction with other policies on biodiversity and place-based policies.

With regards to policy wording, the use of wording such as 'require' instead of 'encourage' has been explored previously at a strategic level through Local Plan Viability Assessment, and this report finds that making policy 'requirements' rather than ones which 'encourage' pose a risk to the viability of the plan as a whole. The current wording is appropriate in the context of viability and national planning policy.

The policy makes reference to nature recovery. Further detail on biodiversity net gain and other biodiversity issues will be provided in a future Biodiversity Strategy.

With regards to a separate policy on green infrastructure, the supporting text at paragraph 8.10 discusses the strategically important areas of green infrastructure on which follow separate policies relating to these specific areas.

With regards to no map in the plan for wildlife and ecological corridors, the evidence base provides further detail via maps on the location of wildlife habitats, ecological networks, designated sites and wildlife corridors. The local plan is strategic in nature and it is not appropriate to record this level of detail in the local plan itself. The local plan policies map does however, highlight 'strategically important links in the wildlife network' which link these important areas together. The monitoring framework in Appendix 1 provides a mechanism for monitoring the level of biodiversity net gain is being achieved.

With regards to water quality, Policy EV6 notes that we will support development that improves the water quality of any water body as required by the Water Framework Directive.

The supporting text refers to Biodiversity Action Plans. Reference to Local Wildlife Sites is made throughout the local plan and the Glossary notes that they are identified and selected for their local nature conservation value. They protect threatened species and habitats acting as buffers, stepping stones and corridors between nationally designated wildlife sites

With regards to net gain, this is in accordance with the Environment Act 2021 which requires a minimum 10% net gain. The figure has also been viability assessed through the Charnwood Local Plan Viability Study 2021.

With regards to BIA metric, the Council is aware of the BIA metric provided by DEFRA and this will be discussed thoroughly through the development management process to ensure the most suitable metric is used.

With regards to Local Wildlife Sites, our approach is consistent with that of the Leicestershire County Council in that candidate LWS are considered in the same way as LWS in planning applications. With this approach, LWS selection criteria provides a benchmark for recognising sites that are locally valuable and distinctive. New sites may be recognised as they are identified and therefore a wholesale review is not necessary in order to add new sites to the existing list- for which the Council holds full designation records and maps important ecological sites as required by the NPPF.

With regards strategically important links in the wildlife network, this policy operates at broad development strategy level to guide development away from strategically important parts of Charnwood’s wildlife network, and crucially the areas which are important in connecting them. They are not designated wildlife sites.

**EV7: Tree Planting**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 103; 148; 176; 221; 340; 373; 393; 515; 533; 536; 545; 550; 574; 580; 599; 628

Main Issues Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
The policy wording is not strong enough to protect existing trees and should be amended to <i>‘retains existing trees unless sufficient evidence is provided’</i> .	628
Existing trees, hedgerows and woods are not sufficiently considered and should be given more protection.	533, 148
The 3:1 tree planting ration is overly restrictive and not in line with the NPPF.	545

**Council’s Response to Main Issues raised in relation to EV7 Tree Planting comments**

The aim and purpose of the policy and supporting text is to protect and enhance our natural environment by increasing the number of trees in the Borough. Development will be supported that retains existing trees where appropriate. Where this is appropriate or not will be established through

the development management process and will need to be assessed on a site by site basis.

Existing trees, hedgerows and woods are considered through are considered through the supporting text to Policy DS5 High Quality Design an in some of the site specific Housing Allocation policies.

The 3:1 tree planting ratio is taken from the Woodland Trust's Emergency Tree Plan for the UK 2020.

### **EV8: Heritage**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 106; 176; 330; 350; 393; 521; 533; 536; 580

<b>Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Page 192 there is reference to DS6 Design, this should be DS5 High Quality Design. Similar reference on pages 112 and 175.	350 (Melton Borough Council), 536
The policy fails to take account of 'contested heritage' such as statues, memorials etc in recent changes to paragraph 198 of the NPPF.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to EV8 Heritage comments**

The error in reference to the policy on High Quality Design is noted and will be amended through minor modifications.

Policy EV8 is a strategic policy and paragraph 198 of the NPPF is applicable when considering planning applications. Contested heritage issues will be dealt with through the development management process.

### **EV9: Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 28; 86; 111; 113; 120; 130; 134; 141; 148; 157; 167; 176; 186; 249; 254; 310; 316; 319; 347; 352; 360; 376; 393; 396;406; 420; 427; 463; 476; 478; 492; 496; 497; 515; 536; 538; 574; 580; 585; 632; 674; 683; 695; 739

<b>Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Evidence needs to be robust and up to date. If not reviewed regularly, the value of the Playing Pitch and Built Sports Facilities strategies diminishes after 3 years and may not meet the needs of para 98/99 of NPPF 2021.	254 (Sports England)
There should be reference to active design in policy EV9. The Building for a Healthy Life does not include all ten principles of Active Design.	254 (Sports England)
Leconfield Road should be designated as Local Green Space	497, 186, 249, 319, 310, 376, 476, 478, 492, 496, 585, 632, 396, 683

Policy does not seek to meet the shortfalls identified in the Open Space Strategy.	111, 130, 167, 376
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. Leconfield Road is clearly an open space.	
NPPF sets out the criteria of Local Green Space designation. The Council has not made clear under what circumstances LGS applications will be considered.	316

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to EV9 Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation comments**

The policy is supported by the most up to date and robust evidence.

With regards to Active Design, Active Design is referred to in the supporting text for DS5 High Quality Design. Reference to active design is also mentioned in Policy EV9.

The open space at Leconfield Road was considered in the Council's evidence on Local Green Space, the Council considers its evidence to be robust and fit for purpose and the method is reasonable in the light of NPPF and PPG.

With regards to meeting the shortfall identified in the open spaces strategy, the policy requires new and enhanced open space, sport and recreation facilities to contribute towards healthier and more active lifestyles. Policy EV9 is a strategic policy and it will be monitored through the Charnwood Local Plan Monitoring Framework in Appendix 1 of the local plan.

With regards to Local Green Space Designation, the criteria for designating LGS's are set out in paragraph 102 of the NPPF and as such are not repeated in the local plan.

**EV10: Indoor Sports Facilities**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 254, 176, 627, 393, 536, 580, 574

<b>Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
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	254 (Sports England)

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to EV10 Indoor Sports Facilities comments**

The policy is supported by the most up to date and robust evidence.

**EV11: Air Quality**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 148; 373; 393; 463; 473; 533; 536; 580

<b>Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
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	536
Air quality monitoring should be increased across the Borough.	463

#### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to EV11 Air Quality comments**

The thresholds given in paragraph 8.89 are for major developments and are therefore proportionate to the nature and scale of development. The threshold also supports the Council's commitment to reducing the impact of climate change by reducing CO2 emissions.

#### **EV12: Burial Space**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 582, 580, 731

<b>Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Add additional criteria allowing neighbouring planning authorities and also the private sector where a clear need can be demonstrated. Another criterion be added 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	582 (Leicester City Council)

#### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to EV12 Burial Space comments**

The council has prepared a statement of common ground with Leicester City Council, and the issue of burial space is one of the matters covered within it..

#### **INF1: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 38; 89; 147; 340; 373; 463; 515; 535; 536; 546; 547; 555; 558; 565; 574; 580; 582; 631; 633; 687

<b>Issues raised about Policy INF1 for the evidence base, joint working and strategic assessment of needs with more specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
A more coordinated, strategy-led approach is required to enable growth is required based on the delivery of infrastructure to address transport challenges, including cumulative impacts.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
The policy should specifically mention the infrastructure list contained within Appendix 3.	582 (Leicester City Council)
To achieve sustainable development will require the provision of new and improved infrastructure covering a wider range of services and facilities.	238 (Quorn Parish Council), 687, 580 (Leicestershire County Council), 89
Policy (along with the accompanying table of transport investment) would fail to deliver the kind of change required to radically reduce carbon emissions. Strengthened policy wording is required.	340, 238 (Quorn Parish Council)

Traffic impact should be minimised and off-street parking improved. A detailed, comprehensive understanding of impacts and appropriate mitigation is required. There is no plan as to how minimising the need to travel by car or achieving carbon neutrality will happen.	373 (Anstey Parish Council), 446
Policy INF1 needs amendment to be more precise with supporting evidence to and accord with the NPPF	546, 547, 687
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.	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Contributions to promote healthy lifestyles are required and policy should link to policies EV/9 and EV/10, and reference made to health impact to make facilities available for those suffering most inequality.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
The plan's environmental proposals will not be met by building on greenfield land and creating additional traffic.	446, 388
Plan should be revised and expanded to provide further support for broadband.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
<b>Issues raised about Policy INF1 for specific locations with comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The adequacy of provision of primary education within Sileby is questioned. Provision should be made within Sileby and not Cossington.	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Consideration should be given to the provision of a school in Quorn including a SEND School.	535 (Leicestershire County Council)
Conversations are required regarding additional land at Woodbrook Vale Academy and for SEND provision across the Borough. Early Years provision will also be required.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Wymeswold has limited local services at capacity and there is no assessment on how proposed housing will impact and address these	147
<b>Issues raised about Policy INF1 for delivery issues with specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
We would expect the plan to identify and acknowledge Leicester City Council as a key delivery partner for infrastructure delivery.	582 (Leicester City Council)
The policy should ensure that infrastructure requirements have regard to committed developments so that schemes close to approved SUEs should not take up short term capacity increasing burden on SUEs.	574
<b>Issues raised about Policy INF1 for funding issues and developer contributions with specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The policy should make clear that highway improvements can be secured through Section 278 Agreements, Section 106 Agreements or Planning Conditions.	565
There is little detail on how this infrastructure will be paid for and the partners required to ensure delivery which needs addressing.	582 (Leicester City Council)

Issues raised about Policy INF1 for viability with specific comments identified below:	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
Concern about the requirement to introduce viability issues which may reduce contributions towards the required provision. The whole plan should be properly viability tested at a strategic level to ensure all required infrastructure for development is delivered.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
The Council should undertake further sensitivity testing to assess additional costs arising from the 2021 Part L Building Regulations or 2025 Future Homes Standard.	556,

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy INF1 Infrastructure and Developer Contributions comments**

Local Plan Policy INF1 sets out an overarching policy for the delivery of infrastructure and the negotiation of developer contributions in the Charnwood Local Plan. It is underpinned by an extensive evidence base which has been assembled to address needs, impacts and mitigation. This is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and summarised in Appendix 3 of the Local Plan. This is referenced in Paragraph 9.3. Including a specific reference in the policy could limit flexibility should details of infrastructure schemes in any way change such as scope, costs or timescales. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a live document and will be regularly updated.

Policy INF1 does not set out the full list of infrastructure requirements that will be required for each development. This will be subject to consideration for each planning application, having regard to detailed site assessment and needs including the consideration of Leicestershire County Council's Developer Contributions Policy.

A Statement of Common Ground has been agreed with National Highways, Leicestershire County Council and Leicester City Council with regard to transport evidence requirements, and continued joint working to identify refinements to the mitigation package. A Statement of Common Ground has also been agreed with Local Education Authority with regard to education provision in the Local Plan.

A thorough Strategic Flood Risk Assessment was undertaken to inform the local plan with assistance from the Environment Agency. Severn Trent Water advised the Council on water supply and water treatment capacity to serve local plan growth in all parts of Charnwood.

There will be a variety of funding routes for the delivery of infrastructure depending on the type of infrastructure and the respective roles of the public and private sectors for each type. There will be a significant role for developer contributions to be negotiated through the development management process to address infrastructure needs. Section 106 contributions will be negotiated with developers to support the provision of other infrastructure which a development will create a need for such as libraries and open space.

Section 106 Agreements have been agreed with the promoters of all the Sustainable Urban Extensions. These legal agreements set out the delivery arrangements for infrastructure including costs, timescales and triggers. This information is included in Appendix 3 of the Local Plan. Delivery planning for the SUEs has been based on this information and the Borough Council is committed to implementing these arrangements. The Borough Council commissioned viability assessment from DTZ to inform decision making during the preparation of the Charnwood Core

Strategy, 2011 – 2028 and this report is publicly available.

The PPG states that the role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan making stage. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage.

The Local Plan has been viability tested as required by planning guidance. The Assessment was undertaken by Aspinall Verdi and published in February 2021. Additional work was commissioned by the Council following a further iteration of transport modelling and a Transport Addendum was published in May 2021. Specific viability assessments may be required as part of the development management process if additional evidence is material to viability considerations. The consultants were aware that changes to the Future Homes Standard were to take place but considered that this would be satisfactorily considered within cost assumptions.

### **INF2: Local and Strategic Road Network**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 89; 103; 331; 340; 412; 473; 515; 536; 574; 580; 582; 587; 616; 651; 687

<b>Issues raised about the evidence base and transport modelling of Policy INF2 with more specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
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.	580 (Leicestershire County Council), 582 (Leicester City Council)
Additional transport evidence will be required to justify developer contributions, particularly where cumulative impacts are anticipated.	616 (Highways England)
Policy fails to deliver the kind of change in modal behaviour which is required if Charnwood is to radically reduce carbon emissions.	340
The transport evidence is not sufficient to justify mitigation measures proposed, particularly with regard to sites around Anstey and HA15 in Loughborough	331
Policy INF2 should encourage developer enhancements to passenger railway services, for example new and improved stations which would alleviate pressure on the road network	651
<b>Issues raised about the impact of Policy INF2 on the impacts of development upon the strategic highway network and traffic growth with more specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
More housing will cause more congestion and worsen air quality.	103

The plan is not clear regarding how cumulative highway impacts should be considered.	587
Development strategy will place more pressure on the network, especially in Sileby where numerous junctions are already above capacity. It is not clear how increased pressure arising from individual development proposals will be mitigated on key junctions.	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
The plan is not justified because Snells Nook Lane and Epinal Way will not be able to cope with the extra traffic from Garendon Park.	412
Lack of infrastructure in Shepshed as roads need improving for increased traffic.	89
Transport Assessment evidence and previous planning decisions noted that Nanpantan Crossroads operates at overcapacity and cannot be mitigated so developments that would add to overcapacity should be refused.	473

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Policy INF2 Local and Strategic Road Network comments**

A Statement of Common Ground has been agreed with National Highways, Leicestershire County Council and Leicester City Council with regard to transport evidence requirements, and continued joint working to identify refinements to the mitigation package

Planning applications will need to be supported by a detailed transport assessment which will assess full transport impacts and set out detailed mitigation. Securing funding for transport schemes will be essential if the plan is to be delivered and sustainable growth facilitated. The Borough Council will work with partners to help achieve this.

The approach of the Local Plan enables an understanding of the scope of transport measures required to mitigate growth, but detailed transport assessment work will still be required at the development management stage because it is essential that detailed consideration be given to all aspects of the development.

Rail services play an important role in Charnwood through services which use the Midland Mainline and the Ivanhoe line, while the Great Central Line is an important heritage railway. Rail services and railway infrastructure is discussed in Paragraph 7.50 of the Plan. Policy CC5, Sustainable Transport would enable the Council to support rail schemes whenever appropriate.

### **Glossary**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 344, 591.

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The definition of affordable housing is not consistent with the NPPF 2021.	344
Water bodies should achieve good qualitative and quantitative status by 2027, not 2015.	519

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to the Glossary comments**

Comments noted and their incorporation is supported

## **Policies Maps**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 546, 263, 555, 554, 560, 562, 563, 568, 535, 53, 463, 475, 594, 564, 443, 620

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Allocation boundaries for the following sites should be amended on Policy Map 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HA33</li> <li>• HA35</li> <li>• HA43</li> <li>• HA47</li> <li>• HA59</li> </ul>	546, 555, 562, 563, 594
Limits to Development boundaries for the following settlements should be amended on Policy Map 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burton on the Wolds</li> <li>• Thrussington</li> <li>• Queniborough</li> <li>• Quorn</li> </ul>	554, 560, 568, 535 (Leicestershire County Council), 564
All sites within Appendix H of the Sustainability Appraisal should be identified on Policy Map 1	463
Areas of Local Separation Should not overlap housing sites	463
Protection areas should be included between the following areas on Policy Map 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cropston and Anstey</li> <li>• Around Barrow upon Soar</li> </ul>	53, 475
Policy Map 1 should show DEFRA Nature Recovery Networks	443
Policy Map 1 Should show areas of mineral safeguarding	620
Mountsorrel mineral conveyor route and adjacent land should be removed from Policy Map 2	620
Areas identified on Policies Map 2 as supporting renewable energy development may have cross boundary implications on a range of considerations and should be referred to as 'potentially suitable' locations	263 (Rushcliffe Borough Council)

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to the Policies Maps comments**

The site boundaries on Policy Map 1 are based on information and evidence sourced through the site selection process. The Council will review the evidence to make sure the site boundaries are correct.

The Limit to Development boundaries are based on up to date and robust evidence and the adopted Neighbourhood Plans. The Council will review the evidence and adopted Neighbourhood Plans to ensure the boundaries are consistent.

The depiction of Areas of Local Separation as they relate to housing sites is considered appropriate and clear.

Policy Map 1 shows the areas in Charnwood where different policies of the local plan apply. The map is strategic in nature and it is not appropriate to show all land use classifications and designations. Further information and detail on these can be found in the supporting evidence.

Cross boundary implications of renewable energy proposals will be considered and addressed through the development management process.

### **Appendix 1: Monitoring**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 580, 574, 624

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	
No comment	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
The third Policy LUA2 indicator sets a target of 3 primary schools, a target of 2 schools would be appropriate given expected delivery rates	574
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).	624

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Appendix 1 Monitoring Framework comments**

There are a number of permutations in how primary school provision is expected to be provided in the Northeast Leicester Sustainable Urban Extension. One of these permutations is that 2nd form of entry for 2nd primary school is required on 3200 occupation. The monitoring framework is appropriate should there be increased delivery in the plan period.

The monitoring framework is considered to meet the tests of soundness.

### **Appendix 2: Housing and Employment Trajectory**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 366, 580, 565, 566, 556

<b>Issues raised in relation to Appendix 1 Housing and Employment Trajectory</b>	
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	366
The trajectory may be considered overly favourable in the early years for the three SUE's.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
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. (comments relating to allocation HA15)	566
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.	556

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).	
The allocation is expected to start delivering homes in 2024/25 as set out in the trajectory. The trajectory reasonable but recent local experience suggests that a higher delivery rate could be achieved.(comments relate to HA32)	565

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Appendix 2 Housing and Employment Trajectory comments**

The Council notes that site promoters indicate that some sites will deliver at a faster rate and sooner in the plan period.

The housing trajectory is based upon intelligence gained from site promoters about their sites, and is considered to be robust. The Council will continue to maintain contact with site promoters to understand any changes in rates of delivery

Overall the strategy for new homes is considered to be positively prepared and effective to meet housing requirement over whole the plan period.

### **Appendix 3: Infrastructure Schedule**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 176, 687, 536, 580, 616, 475, 574

<b>Issues raised for Appendix 3, the Infrastructure Schedule with more specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
The Infrastructure Schedule is derived from evidence and gives a platform moving forward but the transport measures are not coordinated in a strategic way. 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.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Transport modelling has utilised the Pan Regional Transport Model which is an appropriate model for the transport evidence base. Even with SRN schemes only about half of the impact of Local Plan developments is mitigated. Further evidence is required 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.	616 (Highways England)
Infrastructure Schedule should be re-worded to secure the same objectives so far as any proposed housing allocations in Sileby are concerned.	515 (Sileby Parish Council)
Plan is not justified as it does not refer to providing safe access to cycle routes, particularly in Barrow/ Soar Valley.	117
Plan is not justified due to the impact on GP surgeries in Anstey which are oversubscribed	118

Question the policy approach for the provision of new religious institutions.	113
The policy wording for sites where new primary schools are proposed at Cossington, South Loughborough and Barrow, should provide for both land and build costs to be shared between the relevant sites and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan should include a land value alongside the sum identified for build costs.	555, 558, 631
The plan is not justified as it does not plan for public toilet; park rangers or a visitor centre for Watermead Country Park North	236
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	463
Appendix 3 needs to be amended to properly reflect Leicester City Council as a key delivery partner for the Charnwood Local Plan.	582 (Leicester City Council)

### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Appendix 3 Infrastructure Schedule comments**

Collaborative working with Leicestershire County Council, Leicester City Council and National Highways has resulted in a set of transport measures which will help to mitigate local plan growth through a balanced package of highway improvements and sustainable transport measures. The package is strategic because it has addressed the impact upon the strategic route network as well as having regard to consequential impacts upon the local route network. It has regard to the strategic framework of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan and other collaborative evidence base work. More detailed transport modelling is being undertaken and this will be an ongoing process to ascertain the full range of transport impacts and required mitigation. Continued constructive collaboration with National Highways and other partners will help to achieve this and work towards a coordinated approach to transport across the Borough is ongoing, supported by a Statement of Common Ground.

The Infrastructure Schedule is informed by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which is a live document and updated on a regular basis. The Infrastructure Schedule sets out known infrastructure requirements to facilitate the delivery of the Local Plan. It does not seek to set out all desirable infrastructure but focuses on the most important items.

It includes significant investment in new and improved cycle routes in accordance with Policy CC5, Sustainable Transport which clearly recognises the importance of cycling as a way of promoting modal shift from the private car.

The Council is seeking to ensure the delivery of new primary schools through developer contributions from sites which will yield more pupils. More detail is provided in a Statement of Common Ground. The Borough Council has also worked closely with the Clinical Commissioning Groups to identify health needs and we will continue to work closely to facilitate improvements to GP Surgeries which are most impacted by growth. Developer contributions will be negotiated to ensure that required improvements take place in accordance with local need and local health priorities.

#### **Appendix 4: Design Guidance**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 580

<b>Main Issue Raised</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Reference should be made to cycle facilities being provide in accordance with design guidance LTN 1/20	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Reference should be made to waste and bin storage space / accessibility standards.	580 (Leicestershire County Council)

#### **Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Appendix 4 Design Guidance comments**

The guidance contained in Appendix 4 is taken from the Council's current Design SPD which was adopted in 2020 following consultation. However the comments and the opportunities for providing further guidance in these areas is noted.

#### **Miscellaneous**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 3; 9; 23; 29; 30; 44; 45; 64; 71; 73; 83; 85; 91; 108; 123; 131; 151; 162; 163; 168; 176; 181; 191; 226; 236; 237; 238; 239; 242; 262; 271; 280; 299; 300; 304; 305; 320; 355; 371; 374; 376; 395; 396; 415; 432; 433; 454; 457; 466; 473; 481; 485; 489; 515; 523; 525; 536; 540; 545; 555; 556; 558; 564; 577; 580; 583; 587; 590; 591; 592; 597; 608; 611; 630; 631; 633; 640; 645; 652; 657; 664; 664; 668; 679; 703; 715; 722; 731; 734

<b>Miscellaneous issues relating to the environment with specific comments identified below:</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Charnwood should be smokeless and should encourage use of electricity rather than dark smoke fuels	23
Welcome site specific requirements for a sustainability assessment and encourage for other sites	591 (Environment Agency)
Green Infrastructure should also be reference to blue infrastructure para 8.9	591 (Environment Agency)
Plan should include toilet for rangers at Watermead Country Park	236
Considers that Ecology Assessment Report 2019 and Addendum 2021 as approach to LWS and candidate LWS needs to be reviewed as last updated 2008 and 2010.	371
Approach to biodiversity is not consistent with NPPF with regard to paragraph 35 which states that specific needs should be identified and addressed	457
The plans approach to biodiversity is not sound as there are not adequate measures when developers remove trees from sites.	703
Support EV policies where they are consistent with Wolds Neighbourhood Plan.	597 (Burton on the Wolds Cotes and Prestwold Parish Council)
Support for rewilding initiatives and article presented with representation.	396
<b>Respondents raising no comments on the Charnwood Local Plan</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>

	3 (Nottinghamshire County Council), 9 (The Coal Authority), 299 (Canal and Rivers Trust)
<b>Issues raised that certain sites should be allocated in the Local Plan</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Land at Gorse Hill, Anstey and Dobbies Garden Centre should be allocated	162, 734
<b>Issues raised in relation to the Council evidence on Local Green Space as it affects an area of land at Leconfield Road, Loughborough with specific comments including</b>	<b>Comment ID (PSLP/#)</b>
Plan not consistent with para 99 and Case Law regarding Local Green Space Policy EV/18 of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan 2004 was removed without consultation in accordance with 1 (f) of the 2013 Open Spaces Strategy. The Council failed to properly call for sites for Local Green Space	85, 131, 151, 163, 181, 523, 525, 191, 239, 262, 271, 280, 305, 300, 29, 415, 30, 44, 45, 376, 71, 73, 432, 433, 466 485, 540, 608, 722, 395, 657, 481, 489, 640, 715, 83, 91, 473
<b>Issues raised that the Council has not met legal duties</b>	
Not met Duty to cooperate ere Leicester City and Harborough	108
Council has failed to consult properly. Comments will be ignored.	374, 168, 123, 304, 463, 731, 592, 679, 645, 664
<b>Issues raised in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal Report</b>	
See separate document which sets out response to comments received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal report.	536, 555, 558, 577, 587, 226, 590, 355, 64, 734, 652, 631, 668, 633, <b>630</b> , 545, 583, 652
<b>Other comments received</b>	
Add reference to maps and diagrams in the text	580 (Leicestershire County Council)
Numbering within policies should be clearer	564
The plan does not clearly distinguish between strategic and non-strategic policies	566
The plan is a strong document which confronts opportunities and threats	611
Question approach regarding the provision of religious institutions	133
Plan should take proper account of Quorn Neighbourhood Plan, support Neighbourhood Plan policies being applied for windfall development proposals.	238 (Quorn Parish Council)
Local Plan should have smaller living spaces to hep households deal with ecosystem collapse and climate change.	703
Approach to logistics should prioritise sites near to railway lines	176

**Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Miscellaneous comments**

Regarding comments about Charnwood being smokeless, the Local Plan has been informed by an Air Quality Study.

With regard to wording suggestions from the Environment Agency, these are addressed with the Statement of Common Ground with that organisation.

The Council is satisfied that the ecology evidence that informed the local plan is robust and fit for purpose. The approach to biodiversity is positively prepared and justified and so is consistent with NPPF.

With regard to sites put forward for development, the Council has prepared a Sustainability Appraisal and a Site selection topic paper which clearly explain the strategy and sites that were selected for allocation in the Local Plan.

With regard to the Council's evidence on Local Green Space, the Council considers its evidence to be robust and fit for purpose and the method is reasonable in the light of NPPF and PPG. Regarding call for Local Green Space sites, there was a specific question on this in the Draft Charnwood Local Plan 2019 as follows immediately after the draft policy and open space and recreation. Issues related to policy in 2004 Borough of Charnwood Local Plan not being saved is not considered relevant to Pre Submission Draft of the Charnwood Local Plan.

The Council has prepared a statement which demonstrates that it has complied with the Duty to Cooperate. The Statement of Consultation demonstrates how the Council has met its duties regarding consultation on the Local Plan.

A separate response has been prepared for comments relating to the Sustainability Appraisal.

The Council is open to wording or presentational suggestions which improve the clarity of the document.

Page 3 of the Pre-Submission Draft of the Charnwood Local Plan sets out a schedule of strategic and non-strategic policies.

**Issues raised in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal Report**

Comments made by (PSLP/) 64, 106, 127, 145, 148, 172, 220, 226, 316, 330, 340, 355, 378, 381, 411, 414, 526, 534, 536, 541, 546, 547, 555, 558, 559, 561, 564, 570, 575, 577, 587, 590, 595, 598, 619, 621, 622, 630, 631, 633, 668, 738

Main Issue Raised	Comment ID (PSLP/#)
An additional development strategy option of high rise development should have been considered.	738
Queries relating to approach taken to the assessment of Cotes as an option, particularly relating to whether it should be considered a new settlement or not.	330 (Shepshed Town Council), 411
Queries relating to approach taken to the assessment of the scale of growth in Loughborough.	145, 148, 316
Queries relating to approach taken to the assessment of Watermead Lane, Loughborough as an	598

option.	
Queries relating to approach taken to how impacts were assessed for particular sites, for example how the potential for mitigation was considered.	536, 559, 561, 570, 619, 622, 630
Whether suitable criteria have been used for Sustainability Appraisal.	127, 340, 381, 541
How the results of the Sustainability Appraisal have been used to determine the most appropriate development strategy.	64, 172, 355, 414, 526 (East Goscote Parish Council), 534
Queries relating to the assessments of individual sites against particular criteria	220, 226, 378, 555, 558, 575, 577, 587, 590, 621, 631, 633

<b>Council's Response to Main Issues raised in relation to Sustainability Appraisal Report comments</b>	
<p>An option that prioritised high rise living is not considered to be a reasonable approach on its own as it would not deliver the scale or type of housing that is needed across the Borough. Other urban concentration options were included within the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The Council has extensively studied the relationship between Cotes and Loughborough and the challenges posed by the River Soar for travelling between the two settlements. This information was used to inform the categorisation of development at Cotes as a new settlement. This affected the options in which Cotes was considered but not how the impacts of that option were assessed as part of the SA process. Having identified the Hybrid Option as the most appropriate this was then used as the basis for site selection.</p> <p>The proposed levels of growth within Loughborough do not exceed the amount identified as potentially giving rise to significant negative effects. A number of options for development to the south-west of Loughborough were assessed, including overlapping sites to consider options at different scales and the most recently promoted site boundaries for the land off Watermead Lane. The potential for negative landscape impacts was a key determinant in the site selection process in this area. Shepshed is the second largest settlement in the Borough and a sustainable location for growth.</p> <p>The SA is a consistent assessment at a point in time used to inform decision making. All sites were assessed in the same way and potential mitigation measures have not been taken into account. In some cases the Council has responded to appraisal findings and information about sites by reducing the scale of the allocation.</p> <p>The SA considers a full range of issues without prioritising any single one over the others. The SA has been prepared in accordance with relevant legislation and guidance.</p> <p>Responses to issues relating to the use of SA to inform the development strategy, site assessment and selection are set out in an addendum to the Development Strategy and Site Selection Topic Paper.</p>	

## **Conclusion**

Appendix 2 illustrates that the requirements of Regulation 22(1)(c)(v) have been met and demonstrates that the consultation on the preparation of the local plan has been undertaken in accordance the adopted SCI.