



<u>RepID</u>	<u>Representation</u>	<u>Nature</u>
5526	<b>MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> Misterton with Walcote Parish Council is concerned that the consultation process has not been used to inform a number of policies proposed in the Harborough Local plan. This does not encourage participation, as the public has had no opportunity to express its views concerning these policies and indeed it seems that some new policies are entirely at odds with the opinions expressed in the earlier consultation. <b>Change To Plan Sought:</b> ? <b>Response:</b> The overriding purpose of the Local Plan is to deliver sustainable development in appropriate locations to meet needs whilst identifying areas for protection. A wide range of factors, including feed back from the options consultation, were considered in arriving at the spatial strategy set out in the Submission Local Plan.	Object

<u>RepID</u>	<u>Representation</u>	<u>Nature</u>
6599	<b>Mr Niles Holroyde [6378]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> I believe that insufficient publicity has been given to the allocation of a strategic development site on Scraftoft Golf Course. At the very least I would have expected the opportunity to view and discuss these plans at an exhibition or public meeting held in the village. <b>Response:</b> A drop-in event was held at Scraftoft early in the Local Plan consultation period and the consultation was extended by 2 weeks to allow further time for the submission of representations.	Object

<u>RepID</u>	<u>Representation</u>	<u>Nature</u>
6617	<b>BITTESWELL with BITTESBY Parish Council (Ms Cathy Walsh) [2612]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> General concerns raised are summarised as; - Policy descriptions are less precise and open to many interpretations, compared to earlier Development Plans - 'District' should be inserted into the document title, to reflect the geographical area covered - Specified method of consultation, via the online consultation portal, is a barrier to community involvement, and contrary to regulations - choice of the minimum 6 week period for consultation, stifles the process - the replacement of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies of the 2001 Local Plan, by the Proposed Submission Local Plan is explicitly inconsistent with the NPPF, and unsound. <b>Response:</b> Policies have been prepared to aid the determination of planning applications and manage the delivery of sustainable development. 'District' is omitted from the title to differentiate it from the Harborough District Local Plan (2001). All documents were available online and at deposit points. A copy of the Plan and Policies Maps were supplied to Parish Councils. Consultation was extended by two weeks. The Local Plan has been prepared as the Core Strategy pre-dates the NPPF and is non-compliant in some respects.	Object

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6633 **CIr Rosita Page [4254]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Access to consultation form made difficult, which disadvantaged ordinary residents.

Public advertising in local media very limited.

Access to information and evidence documents for members & public to make educated decisions was limited. Not clear what's valid, what's superseded, confusing and not all in 1 place.

Mistakes and discrepancies in supporting information, some was not taken into consideration.

Evidence has not been readily available throughout the process and parishes and other stakeholder have not been given the timeframe to consider background information.

**Response:**

Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the regulations. The consultation was extended by 2 weeks to give more time for representations. Details will be set out in the Consultation Statement which will accompany the submission of the Local Plan.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7468 **Mr Michael Lenihan [5268]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The methods adopted by Harborough District Council for it's public consultation is extremely poor.

- The website is difficult to navigate and very confusing.

- A document as vital and important to every resident in the District should offer as many ways as possible to respond to it.

- It would seem to have been developed to discourage people from making any comment.

- It is possible that the use of electronic communication is easier and less time consuming for the officers, but everyone in the District has the right to have their say, not just the tech savvy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

TOO LATE but easier access to responding should have been in place.

**Response:**

The consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the regulations. The consultation documents were available to view at deposit points. Whilst the online submission of representations was encouraged, paper representation forms were available.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6130 **MR Michael Wilcox [5164]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The location of the policies map is not clear and I cannot find them within the supporting documentation

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The document should identify specifically what the policies map is and reference its location

**Response:**

The Policies Map is available to view on the Council's website and formed part of the suite of documents available during the consultation period.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6239 Mrs Maggie Pankhurst [4875]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Consultation process was:

undemocratic  
difficult to participate in

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Inspector to consider how residents might have responded if they had better access to the process

Improved consultation processes in future.

**Response:**

Noted. Consultation took place in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5423 Mrs Jan Butcher [4328]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The wording of the objective is too generic - the proposed Local Plan does meet real local need based on data and is therefore unsound and unjustified. It makes sweeping broad brush assumptions that are used to justify poor decisions which are to the detriment of the rural nature of the district

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Sentence 1 : add " to be properly evidenced and based on local data"

**Response:**

It is considered that the Local Plan is sound, balancing meeting development needs whilst protecting the overall rural character of the district.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5566 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plan covers a period of 2011 to 2031 but on no occasion have I found there to be any Key Performance Indicators (KPI) within this proposal. There should be a comprehensive table of intentions set against dates when each of these should be realised. Only by this means can compliance with this plan be determined.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan should include a series of dates and KPIs against which performance of HDC can be measured

**Response:**

Monitoring Framework Key Indicators are set out in Appendix K.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6681 Rugby Borough Council (Mr Martin Needham) [6402]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Matters of employment and housing on Duty to Co-operate should be agreed between relevant authorities to ensure overall need has been properly accounted for and to avoid over-provision. It is queried whether the position of the other HMA authorities on employment and unmet housing need has been agreed between appropriate authorities and if the Duty to Co-operate has been satisfied.

**Response:**

DtC Statement sets out approach to discussions with neighbouring authorities and DtC discussions are on-going.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6711 Oadby and Wigston Borough Council (Mr Jamie Carr) [6413]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Paragraph 1.5.4 This paragraph needs to ensure that the wording reflects the time periods of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan appropriately. The Strategic Growth Plan covers the period to 2050, however treats the period's pre 2031 and post 2031 very differently. Pre 2031, the housing and employment Objectively Assessed Needs for the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA, set out within the HEDNA, will be delivered through each of the local authorities individual Local Plan's. The Strategic Growth Plan therefore focuses on the period post 2031, for which it identifies a notional housing need.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6883 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No evidence has been submitted that this Local Plan will enable HDC of establish a 5-year land bank for housing needs. This continues to leave HDC at the mercy of speculative developers, the effects of which will be borne by its Parishes. Any detailed planning in the Local Plan relating to housing development is therefore largely pointless, and unable to be secured.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

confirm that HDC is establishing a 5 year land bank for housing needs

**Response:**

The Housing Trajectory at Appendix G sets out the expected annual housing delivery throughout the plan period. From 2018/19 and every year throughout the plan period the trajectory demonstrates at least a five year housing land supply of deliverable housing land.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7216 Mr Stuart Fraser [990]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I feel that the city of Leicester should provide housing for its own population as there is much unused/unoccupied land in the city. Neighbouring Local Authorities should also use their own land for development and not encroach onto Harborough District territory. This is to preserve Harborough's territory as a green space for the health and recreation of the whole Counties population.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Harborough District Authorities could advise and support neighbouring authorities on improving their development.

**Response:**

Harborough has a legal duty to engage constructively on key issues that affect more than one local authority area and to ensure that such issues are addressed adequately within the Local Plan. Meeting identified objectively assessed housing need across the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area is one such issue.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7400 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Duty to Cooperate statement published alongside the Proposed Submission Plan refers to a new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which is being prepared by the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities and is likely to be completed in January 2018. With unmet need having already been identified within the HMA, the distribution of this unmet need will need to be addressed through both the SGP and updated MOU. There are therefore still considerable uncertainties regarding the distribution of housing growth across the HMA and Harborough District Council may still be required to accommodate a proportion of the identified unmet housing need.

As the Harborough District Plan is being advanced before these issues have been fully resolved, this is considered to be an unsound basis upon which to prepare the Harborough District Local Plan.

**Response:**

It is considered that the contingency allowance on top of the overall housing requirement (as explained in H1 Explanation) along with IMR1 (Implementation, Monitoring and Review) provide a sound basis for meeting any unmet need the scale of which has yet to be identified.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7633 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Duty to Cooperate was not fully adhered to by consulting all neighbouring LA's in any of the early stages. There are only notes of DtoC meetings from May and July 2017. These minutes state foregone conclusions without having followed proper democratic process.

**Response:**

Work in relation to the Duty to Cooperate has been ongoing through the Local Plan preparation process, not only in relation to the preparation of background evidence but also in relation to the the emerging spatial strategy and policies.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5680 Mrs DL Evans [4444]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst I am not a fan of expanding our town, I believe that the proposals are making the best of a bad requirement

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6687 North West Leicestershire District Council (Ian Jordan) [6199]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I can confirm that we have reviewed your Local Plan - Submission documents and do not wish to make any comments at this consultation stage.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6721 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Priorities SP1 and SP2 welcomed. One of the key housing issues refers to 'making an appropriate contribution to meeting the established and justified unmet housing needs of other authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire housing market area'

As you are aware, noted at paragraph 5.1.6, Leicester City formally declared an unmet housing need arising in the administrative area of the city in a letter to each local authority in the housing market area in early 2017. The scale of unmet need in the City will become clearer as Leicester's local plan progresses, however it is likely to be significant.

**Response:**

Noted. It is considered that the contingency allowance on top of the overall housing requirement, along with Policy IMR1 provides a sound basis for meeting any unmet need the scale of which has yet to be identified.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6832 Homes and Communities Agency [5784]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The HCA respectfully request that the Stretton Hall Farm site is included as a Reserve Site, to be developed in the event that the District cannot demonstrate a 5 year Housing Land Supply and/or in response to emerging unmet housing needs within the HMA. The Stretton Hall site should also be included as a Strategic Site within the anticipated early review.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5568 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The liason with adjacent Councils seems to be inadequate.

Significant benefits could be realised by more close and more frequent inter action with for example Daventry District Council

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Regular meetings wih adjacent councils should be held with prior advertisement, invitations to the public and a detailed agenda made available.

**Response:**

Harborough has a legal duty to engage constructively on key issues that affect more than one local authority area and to ensure that such issues are addressed adequately within the Local Plan. There has been on-going cooperation with neighbouring local authorities during the Plan's preparation.

**RepID** **Representation**

5681 Mrs DL Evans [4444]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Harborough is already about to develop outside of the bowl in which it is sited. Further development should only be what is required of our area, not others.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Only propose what HDC has to

**Response:**

Harborough has a legal duty to engage constructively on key issues that affect more than one local authority area and to ensure that such issues are addressed adequately within the Local Plan. Meeting identified objectively assessed housing need across the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area is one such issue.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

7206 Mr Stuart Fraser [990]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Other Local Authority areas should provide housing for their population within their own districts.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Advise neighbouring Authorities of their obligations.

**Response:**

Other Local Authorities are under the same duty as Harborough DC to ensure that strategic priorities are addressed under the Duty to Cooperate.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

7435 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Duty to Co-operate Statement does not explicitly confirm that all neighbouring authorities (outside Leicester & Leicestershire HMA) will be meeting their own OAHN in full.

It is considered that the Council has co-operated on an on-going basis with neighbouring authorities especially those authorities within the Leicester & Leicestershire HMA. Therefore there has been legal compliance with the requirements of the Duty to Co-operate but satisfactory outcomes from that process, in particular meeting unmet needs in the HMA, are not yet concluded which is an unsound basis on which to prepare a Local Plan. The Leicester & Leicestershire HMA authorities approach of deferring into the future via Local Plan Reviews the solution to identified unmet housing needs should not be condoned.

There is only limited reference to Strategic Growth Plan.

HBF may wish to comment on any Statement of Common Ground.

**Response:**

It is considered that the contingency allowance on top of the overall housing requirement (as explained in H1 Explanation) along with IMR1 (Implementation, Monitoring and Review) provide a sound basis for meeting any unmet need the scale of which has yet to be identified.

---



**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

7623 Taylor Wimpey [6529]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is unclear at this stage whether there will be unmet housing need within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area and whether this would be further exacerbated as a result of the Harborough Local Plan progressing ahead of other Local Authorities within the Housing Market Area. This is an unsound basis on which to prepare a Local Plan and therefore the current version of the plan cannot be considered positively prepared, effective or consistent with national policy. It is considered that the Council has not fulfilled the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Whilst it is accepted the Council has, in its opinion, made some allowance for unmet housing need from other Local Authorities within the Housing Market Area to be accommodated these are not adequately quantified and is not agreed as part of a Memorandum of Understanding. It is considered that the Council has not fulfilled the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate.

The Council should not progress its Local Plan to submission for examination without the prior knowledge of the housing distribution across the Housing Market Area. Full and appropriate consideration needs to be given to the possibility of Harborough District increasing its housing provision to accommodate development which can not be delivered within adjacent authorities.

**Response:**

It is considered that the contingency allowance on top of the overall housing requirement (as explained in H1 Explanation) along with IMR1 (Implementation, Monitoring and Review) provide a sound basis for meeting any unmet need the scale of which has yet to be identified.

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6746 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Priorities SP1 and SP2 welcomed. One of the key housing issues refers to 'making an appropriate contribution to meeting the established and justified unmet housing needs of other authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire housing market area'

As you are aware, noted at paragraph 5.1.6, Leicester City formally declared an unmet housing need arising in the administrative area of the city in a letter to each local authority in the housing market area in early 2017. The scale of unmet need in the City will become clearer as Leicester's local plan progresses, however it is likely to be significant.

**Response:**

Noted. It is considered that the contingency allowance on top of the overall housing requirement, along with Policy IMR1 provides a sound basis for meeting any unmet need the scale of which has yet to be identified.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6826 Homes and Communities Agency [5784]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The inclusion of Stretton Hall Farm as a Reserve Site would help HDC accommodate unmet need from neighbouring authorities, as well as contribute to its own rolling 5 year housing land supply, and would be in compliance with the guidance contained within the NPPF and would add substantial weight to the soundness argument.

**Response:**

Noted. It is considered that the Local Plan is sound. The identification of 2 Strategic Development Areas along with the other allocations is adequate to ensure a 5 year housing land supply from 2018/19 and over the plan period.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7509 Mr Steve Louth [5609]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the strategic priorities identified in the Local Plan, and in particular the objective of meeting housing needs for both Harborough District and the wider Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA).

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5430 Mrs Jan Butcher [4328]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This objective is about enabling the massive expansion of Magna Parya which is hugely damaging to the area in environmental terms, has no evidential basis of need and does not reflect any strategic vision in terms of effects for UK PLC.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Include "subject to detailed sustainability evidence - open to scrutiny by local people"

**Response:**

The strategic priorities have emerged from liaison with the prescribed bodies.

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the whole Plan, and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5876 Mr Stuart Craven [5876]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is already a considerable amount of vacant warehousing in the surrounding area without adding to it with this proposal. The employment that this proposal will require will have to come from outside the area adding to the congestion and poor air quality in Lutterworth

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove the additional warehousing from the plan

**Response:**

The strategic priorities have emerged from liaison with the prescribed bodies.

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the whole Plan, and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7271 Prologis UK Ltd. [5661]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

HDC has not fully met the Duty to Cooperate when identifying a strategic extension to Magna Park, reasons stated as:

- proposed scale would have significant cross boundary implications including for; Leicester & Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and the W.Midlands, therefore the Duty to cooperate & evidence base requires such cross-boundary consideration
- scale proposed (in ha) not justified by the evidence cited (L&LSDSS, HEDNA)
- not clear in demonstrating or assessing vacant floorspace at Magna Park or the likelihood and impact of probable redevelopment (given age of buildings)
- concentrating proposed scale of development in this part of Harborough will have serious implications for the delivery of sustainable economic development in the rest of Leicestershire.
- proximity and scale of development will impact on the delivery of DIRFT III, and Daventry's ability to deliver their employment / GVA aspirations
- HDC has not given due consideration to concerns raised by Daventry DC, that an assessment be prepared to demonstrate that the level of employment planned for Magna Park is justified
- criterion BE2.2b demonstrates acceptance of concern, to consider in context of plan-making. HDC consideration of such assessment as disproportionate / non-conclusive (as per DtoC statement) undermines its inclusion.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

HDC has failed to justify delivering such a substantial extension to Magna Park, and have not secured agreement with all the relevant authorities. Until this work is done Prologis and RRSLP consider that the plan is unsound and should not proceed.

**Response:**

The strategic priorities have emerged from liaison with the prescribed bodies.

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the whole Plan, and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal.

**RepID** **Representation**

5682 Mrs DL Evans [4444]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Best proposal for a bad requirement

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

5433 Mrs Jan Butcher [4328]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The wording is too generic and does not take into account sustainability and community relations impacts. It should also look for a fair distribution across the Harborough District but the vague wording allows for unsustainable concentrations which adversely affects local service provision

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Include " subject to through review of sustainability and impact upon community relations with full engagement with local people". Sites will be located to ensure a fair distribution across Harborough District to balance service delivery demands

**Response:**

This is a high level description of the strategic priorities which need to be addressed by the Local Plan. Allocations and criteria relating to the provision of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation are set out in Policy H6.

**RepID** **Representation**

5684 Mrs DL Evans [4444]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

There is already adequate traveller sites around MH, some of which are conveniently placed by surrounding council districts. Current plans have no additional proposed sites.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

5683 Mrs DL Evans [4444]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As far as I could tell there has been no proposed improvements to current infrastructure

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Add infrastructure improvements

**Response:**

Individual site specific policies and the Infrastructure policies provide the context for the delivery of infrastructure improvements to accompany new development.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5685 Mrs DL Evans [4444]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No infrastructure improvements proposed

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Add in traffic movement improvements

**Response:**

Infrastructure improvements are set out site specific policies for housing/employment as necessary.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6703 Oadby and Wigston Borough Council (Mr Jamie Carr) [6413]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Under the Duty to Cooperate, Oadby and Wigston Borough Council, Leicester City Council, Harborough District Council and Leicestershire County Council have produced a joint piece of evidence base relating to highway capacity and infrastructure. Through this work, it has been acknowledged by all parties that certain growth areas within Harborough District will impact the highway infrastructure within the Borough. There is an agreed approach for dealing with the impacts, which will be set out in a Joint Statement. The Borough Council advises that the Joint Statement is submitted to the Inspector once it has been agreed by all parties involved.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6827 Homes and Communities Agency [5784]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The HCA supports SP5 in principle and confirms that the development of the Stretton Hall Farm site would contribute to plans to improve the connectivity of SE Leicestershire through Section 106 contributions, to improve walking, cycling and bus connections, and potentially contribute to the improvement of the strategic highway network, in particular the important A6 corridor, and support the aims of the Midlands Connect initiative, which in turn would support the Governments objectives for the West Midlands Engine.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5687 Mrs DL Evans [4444]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

But there is no further room to squeeze

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

6995 Mrs Maureen Stell [6406]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

One of the few points where Broughton Astley gets a mention!

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5688 Mrs DL Evans [4444]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

There are still green nature spaces within HDC area

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5689 Mrs DL Evans [4444]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The improvements to High Street & St Mary's Road are a good idea. Not sure that we need any more retail though.

**Response:**

Noted. Further retail floorspace is required in accordance with recent evidence provided by the Retail Study Update 2017.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5575 Mr John Martin [5974]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Houses are currently being built on flood plains without due consideration to the effects this has on land and communities upstream of these developments.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan should be absolutely clear as to which land is considered liable to flooding and any development plans should not include these sites.

Full evaluation of the upstream damage that results for such developments should be carried out.

**Response:**

Evidence provided by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2017 has been taken into account in allocating land within the Local Plan.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5690 Mrs DL Evans [4444]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The flood plain around Farndon Fields Farm is over developed already and the additional houses are almost inevitably going to cause issues with flooding

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Keep pond/lake and create overflow/river re-route by bridleway at Farndon Fields Farm

**Response:**

Evidence provided by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2017 has been taken into account in allocating land within the Local Plan.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5691 Mrs DL Evans [4444]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Not aware of any issues

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5394 KIBWORTH HARCOURT Parish Council (Dr Kevin Feltham) [3789]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No mention of the A6 Air Quality Management Area declared for the Kibworths in July 2017.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The impact of heavy goods vehicles and traffic more generally on noise and air pollution in Lutterworth town centre and on the A6 through the Kibworths will have been reduced and the environmental quality of these areas improved, thereby enabling their historic cores to be enhanced and appreciated more fully.

**Response:**

Given that the AQMA has only recently been declared, the approach to its management has yet to be clarified. Therefore it is considered pre-emptive to refer to it in the Vision in advance of the preparation of the management plan and clarity about what actions will be required to seek to address the issue. There is, however, specific reference to The Kibworths AQMA at 17.1 and in the Spatial Portrait. AQMAs are referred to in Policy IN2: Sustainable transport and accompanying explanation.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5695 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I cannot understand why we have to wait until 2031 to have for example no housing built on a floodplain, such a target can be made available today not in 14 year's time

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There should be targets and achievements set against real time say in 5 year increments.

**Response:**

The vision makes it clear that no new development will be located in areas of low flood risk over the plan period. The target is for no major developments to be permitted contrary to Environment Agency flooding advice over the plan period.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5932 MR Michael Wilcox [5164]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is insufficient detail within the plan to identify the local needs of the future proposed developments such as Doctors, schools, shops , parks, recreation centers,pubs etc.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Large developments become further removed from existing facilities or exceed their capabilities and it is necessary for such developments to have bespoke facilities which need to be identified and allowed for.

**Response:**

Policies within the Plan as a whole aim to deliver the necessary infrastructure, services and community facilities to accompany housing development.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5957 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Market Harborough as a town is losing its character and identity. The proposed development either already committed or on new sites laid out in the local plan, will turn the town into an over congested sprawling area. Community facilities have not grown - difficulties getting doctors appointments and under funding of local schools. Valued community hubs such as the Red Lion in Great Bowden has been allowed to close. The range of shops are no longer diverse enough and residents are likely to travel to other towns/cities to shop.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The quantity of housing in the area requires consideration given the local infrastructure and the amenities available to residents.

**Response:**

The policies in the Plan aim to deliver the necessary infrastructure, services and community facilities to accompany housing development.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5998 Mrs Maggie Pankhurst [4875]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The vision states that the district will have a diverse and thriving economy. However the plans for employment are mainly about renewing and increasing warehouse land and creating over 10,000 new jobs in this sector. Jobs in the warehouse/distribution sector are clustered around low/unskilled jobs. These jobs will mainly be filled by people commuting in who do not spend their money or pay taxes locally. It is difficult to see therefore how the proposals for employment align with the vision for the future of employment in the district.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

- Keep the vision for a diverse and thriving economy
- Delete BE2:2
- Insert a policy of promoting HD as an area for new businesses as well as expanding established businesses. The businesses should cover a wide range of business areas - see the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership list of business sectors which HDC sign up to - and cover a wide range of employment opportunities.

**Response:**

The policies in the Plan need to be read as a whole. There are employment policies aimed at the provision of land for a range of employment uses.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6292 Mr Richard Beer [6263]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

To provide a district of rural villages and market towns you need to define what these entities are and their sustainable size within the definition. This avoids paying lip service to the concept and would set the maximum limits of development in order to retain their essential characteristics. For example Broughton Astley could hardly now be called a village, it is surely a small town in its current and proposed size.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

As above define what a market towns and villages are. Without a clear view to this there are no limits to development.

**Response:**

The various levels of the settlement hierarchy are set out in Appendix F. This sets out where settlements sit within the hierarchy and a description of the approach to development, thus forming the basis of the spatial strategy. It is not considered necessary to go into this detail in the vision.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6319 Mrs Kathleen Rowell [4871]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The stated vision in this Plan is a nonsense, the proposal for Lutterworth and Magna Park means the vision of improvement cannot be met, quality of life for all in that area will be negatively impacted.

why does HDC make responding to the consultation online so difficult, think beyond planning staff and think residents, I suspect HDC do not want comments.

Requests for paper copies were resisted by HDC staff and only gained by persistence.

The HDC vision is an insult, whoever proposed it will not be living near Magna Park, not if they care about their quality of life

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Deletion of the planned expansion of Magna Park

**Response:**

The vision and objectives set out aspirations for the District. Consultation took place in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6338 Magna Park is Big Enough (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Air quality or light pollution will not be improved in Lutterworth; HGV and other vehicle traffic will not sufficiently be reduced from the proposals in L1; the proposed significance of Strategic distribution will contradict Key issue 3 and out-commuting will not be improved. See attachment for further detail.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No commitment to Magna Park within BE2; improved road infrastructure early in any Lutterworth SDA that goes ahead.

**Response:**

The vision and objectives set out aspirations for the District. The Local Plan contains a number of policies to facilitate growth in the economy. See responses to BE2 for further details in respect of Magna Park.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6637 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The vision and objectives are lordable but the policies with in the LP do not reflect the desired aims to achieve these objectives.

To secure a wide range of skilled jobs for an highly educated population has always been a supported council policy.

The objective, stopping young people from leaving the district is not served by focusing mainly on providing unskilled, temporary, low paid jobs in the logistic industry.

A focus on sustainable , diverse and vibrant job market is not possible without creating the opportunities.

**Response:**

Noted. It is considered that the plan's policies will contribute to achieving the vision.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7486 Mr John L. Marlow [1704]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is salutary to read this pious declaration on page 2 and realize that the officers and Members of the District Council have no intention whatsoever of carrying out such a range of policies and it is risible to suggest that the Plan in any way represents a VISION FOR THE DISTRICT IN 2031.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5618 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire support Harborough's Local Plan vision, particularly as it relates to the countryside.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6303 HUNGARTON Parish Council (Mr Andrew May) [2640]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Hungarton Parish Council agrees with the vision for the District.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6502 GREAT GLEN Parish Council (Lesley Sanderson) [2635]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

we support the vision shown

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6823 Homes and Communities Agency [5784]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The HCA fully supports the process Harborough District Council has undertaken. The HCA will continue to work positively with Harborough District Council and Partners to support housing delivery within the District and wider Housing Market Area, using the range of investment and other possible interventions that are available to the Agency. The HCA wishes to make representations to the Submission Draft Local Plan, specifically in regard to the surplus landholding at Stretton Hall Farm which extends to 96.6ha. The site is adjacent to the border of Oadby and Wigston Borough Council and the Leicester Principle Urban Area (PUA).

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7383 Sport England (Steven Beard) [4436]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support as promotes healthy and safe lifestyles.

- There will be better access to the countryside and an improved range of open spaces for local people to enjoy
- increased provision for walking and cycling, and improved access to public transport for new development will have contributed to a reduction in the District's carbon footprint.
- Communities will have access to improved social, recreational, sports, health and educational facilities.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7404 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Gladman support the Harborough Local Plan Vision and in particular the statement that in 2031 residents will benefit from increased access to suitable housing, a wider range of local skilled jobs and high quality services and facilities. Gladman also support the main focus for development being the market towns, the settlements near the edge of Leicester, Broughton Astley and the rural centres.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7585 Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance [6527]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Our clients support the overall vision and objectives for the District as set out in the Plan up to 2031.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7616 Taylor Wimpey [6529]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support is given to the sentiments of the Vision for the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5668 Mrs Maria Lockley [5818]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

What a load of rubbish. HDC has demonstrated over the years that it has no interest in or respect for its rural areas. All it wishes to do is dump more development anywhere it can, preferably as far away from its own back yard as possible. The Shires are famed for their idyllic rural villages; we do not want them all turning into towns. HDC is too cosy with greedy developers who prefer building on greenfield sites, (as opposed to redevelopment) because it is easier, cheaper and provides more big bucks profit for them.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scrap it. The formulation of a new Plan is a costly exercise for cosmetic purposes only. HDC has driven horse and cart through the old Plan. Why should a new one be any different?

**Response:**

Noted. Policies within the Plan aim to balance development needs with minimising the impacts of development. As such Option 1: Rural Focus was not carried forward in favour of options with a more urban focus.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6562 Mr David Goddard [6344]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The character of areas should not be changed by the need to build.

New housing should be sympathetic to existing densities and dwelling types,

We should ensure that protected wildlife is not impacted by pressure to build everywhere. Our wildlife is our natural heritage. It should be respected wherever it is found.

In addition to the above - services are already stretched in Harborough and the roads are crowded. Without more schools, shops and surgeries you could be creating social problems and unhappiness. People are already becoming unhappy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The density of housing should be reviewed. This has traditionally been a town / semi-rural area. People who like living in crowded cities are free to move there. I like it as a rural area.

Wildlife has been disrespected to the point where the law could be broken. At least one dishonest statement has been made by one builder that unchallenged will lead to the law being broken. Normally one should be able to depend on the local authority to keep everything honest. I have lost confidence because trust has broken down.

**Response:**

Policies within the Plan aim to balance development needs with minimising the impacts of development.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5619 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire is pleased to see the emphasis on safeguarding local heritage and sensitive landscapes which are particularly important in this district.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6504 GREAT GLEN Parish Council (Lesley Sanderson) [2635]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the distribution of housing as proposed

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6737 Mr Carl Hunt [861]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I agree with this objective on the understanding that APPROPRIATE means sustainable developments and Parish Council objections carry weight.

I wish for Sutton in the Elms to be stated as a settlement in its own right - on the basis that it has heritage dating to at least the 11thC, is mentioned in the Domesday Book and fundamental to its heritage is the Quaker Cottage and the Baptist Church, both holding significant historical interest.

**Response:**

Omission noted.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7160 Mr Peter Mitchell [959]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I support this statement as it embodies the principle of sustainability , whereby the quality of the environment both social and with regard to physical characteristics are respected.

**Response:**

Noted.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5620 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Hedna figures for housing appear to be inflated in the light of past trends and new demographic data.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No wording for this

**Response:**

The HEDNA is considered to be a robust evidence document that details the required housing over the plan period. The HEDNA calculated the objectively assessed need in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance and used official demographic projections as the starting point.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5622 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The total is 640 dpa in the submitted plan.

In reaching this number a succession of stages have been undertaken, each of which increase overall housing need. These may be overlapping and optimistic.

a. The HEDNA OAN figure is considerably higher than the need, either economic or demographic.

This is given further weight by the recently published 2016 National Population Projection from the Office of National Statistics, which assume a lower level of both immigration and fertility, as well as a lowering of gains in life expectancy.

b. The OAN includes 15% added to the trend figure. Is this justified?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Not sure

**Response:**

The HEDNA is considered to be a robust document that details the required housing over the plan period. The 15% OAN adjustment is justified on the basis of providing flexibility of housing delivery over the Plan period and allowing to meet a proportion of unmet housing need from the HMA.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6638 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plan appears to focus mainly on the provision of housing rather than placing an additional focus on providing variety and access on suitable housing that will meet the needs and the diversity of residents.

The Harborough District has an above national average of an aging population and a larger focus should have reflected the needs of these residents by ensuring policies advocate more bungalows.

Provision of Extra Care and Specialist Accommodation is not deliverable .Targets are too high and policies remits are confusing.

**Response:**

Taken as a whole the Plan's polices will deliver a mix of housing for a diverse range of accommodation needs.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6506 GREAT GLEN Parish Council (Lesley Sanderson) [2635]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

we support the establishing and meeting the objectively assessed housing needs and land requirements for the District to 2031 with sufficient flexibility in provision to ensure that the Government's 5 year housing land supply requirements can be met in future;

**Response:**

Noted



**RepID Representation**

5672 Mrs Maria Lockley [5818]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is just a feeble attempt to disguise HDC's true purpose, which is to fulfil its already "done-deal" promises to developers over the Magna Park expansion.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scrap the Plan. Why waste time on a new one? HDC does just as it wishes now, with no reference to the views of the Taxpayer.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID Representation**

6012 Mrs Maggie Pankhurst [4875]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The focus on large scale warehouse/distribution will not achieve Key issue 3. To enable this Key Issue HDC needs to focus on a wider range of business development in the area - new areas that we currently don't have so that those people who are commuting out can find the type of employment they want in the district. It is an established fact that there are few higher skilled/paid jobs in warehousing and a concentration of low/unskilled jobs the are low paid and often insecure/seasonal.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete policy BE2:2 and insert a policy more in line with the Leicester and leicestershire Enterprise Partnership policy of encouraging development across a wide range of business sectors.

**Response:**

Policy BE1 allocates employment land across the District for a range of other B class uses, including provision within the proposed East of Lutterworth SDA.

---

**RepID Representation**

6190 Mr Michael Bates [6242]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The local economy of Lutterworth will not expand unless the issue of heavy traffic is addressed by the provision of a major A road by-pass to relieve through traffic on the A426. Making Lutterworth a more pleasant environment should be used to attract a better mix of jobs in both the services and innovative engineering sectors providing a broader scope of quality employment for the expanded local population. This in turn will reduce the level of commuting, improving the environment and will expand the local economy enabling better education, medical and social services to be provided.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The addition of a major A road by-pass of the A426 is a priority requirement if the full potential of developing Lutterworth and the surrounding area is to be met.

**Response:**

The provision of a spine road as part of the proposed East of Lutterworth SDA is predicted to remove some through traffic currently travelling through the centre of Lutterworth in the long term.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7015 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

An allocation of the size in Policy BE2 would lead to a vast number of employment opportunities. Unemployment in the area is very low, the majority of the workforce required for an allocation of this size would have to be recruited from outside the district. Key Issue 3 of the Local Plan highlights that there is a requirement for more opportunities for 'higher skilled residents' in the district. 74% of the opportunities are for essential/basic jobs, the people filling these roles will commute from areas where unemployment is higher and house prices are lower.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

BE2 sets out the policy approach to strategic distribution but does not allocate sites. Policy BE1 allocates employment land for a range of other B class uses, including provision within the proposed East of Lutterworth SDA.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7376 Dr Seb Giudice [6332]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plans for Harborough make no reference news types of employment such as engineering and technology. These are growth areas that MH are not attracting. Instead we are focusing on service and retail industries. These sectors only attract a lot of low wage roles a only a few well paid ones. Instead engineering and technology sectors will attract far more of the latter.

By 2031 automation and technology developments will mean that retail, services, and distribution centres will not need a significant workforce. Relying on these traditional sectors is setting Harborough up for failure

**Response:**

Policy BE1 allocates employment land for a range of B class uses. It takes into account the latest need evidence (HEDNA) and factors in other issues, including the need to replace poorer quality employment floorspace, Council/LLEP economic aspirations, and local circumstances.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7384 Sport England (Steven Beard) [4436]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Key Issue - growth in the economy and Objective 2. Employment:  
Sport England would advise of our economic value of sport toolkit  
<https://www.sportengland.org/research/benefits-of-sport/economic-value-of-sport/>  
and more generally  
<https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157347/report.aspx>

**Response:**

Noted

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5670 Mrs Maria Lockley [5818]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Nonsense. HDC would not know inappropriate development if it bulldozed through the Council Offices.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scrap the Plan. HDC is wedded to inappropriate development and the ruination of rural life.

**Response:**

Noted

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7024 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The original Magna Park site was built on a former RAF aerodrome which could be considered as a brownfield site. The two outstanding planning applications for the proposed Magna Park expansion area are for land which is currently agricultural land. This conflicts with paragraphs 111 and 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): The proposed submission of the Harborough Local Plan 2011 to 2031 does not consider whether there are any brownfield sites which could be used in preference to the agricultural land currently proposed.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The Strategic Employment Land Availability Assessment undertook an assessment of potential sites (brownfield and greenfield) to accommodate B use classes (employment). This assessment forms part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5623 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire thoroughly supports this policy.

**Response:**

Noted

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6507 GREAT GLEN Parish Council (Lesley Sanderson) [2635]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the restriction of growth within the country side whilst maintaining rural diversification

**Response:**

Noted

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5671 Mrs Maria Lockley [5818]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Window dressing only. The best way of preserving wildlife habitats is not to promote unnecessary building on green fields in areas where it is not required. HDC has a appalling record in this respect because it is too hand-in-glove with greedy developers.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scrap the Plan. 2031? HDC could not manage to work within it for six months.

**Response:**

The LPA disagrees.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6478 Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Bullet points are not doing enough to address this.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Paragraph 114 of the NPPF states that LPAs should 'set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure'. You should be mapping the habitats that you have and identifying wildlife corridors (including habitat permeability studies) and this should inform creating new habitat, linking areas of habitat and improving existing areas of habitat. The plan should also include the management of networks of biodiversity and GI.

**Response:**

The bullet points are a summary of the key issue. The 5 policies within Chapter 9: Green Infrastructure address in detail the protection and provision of green infrastructure. Policies relating to individual allocations within Part C (Places and Sites) address the delivery of site specific green infrastructure.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7025 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The original Magna Park site was built on a former RAF aerodrome which could be considered as a brownfield site. The two outstanding planning applications for the proposed Magna Park expansion area are for land which is currently agricultural land. This conflicts with paragraphs 111 and 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): The proposed submission of the Harborough Local Plan 2011 to 2031 does not consider whether there are any brownfield sites which could be used in preference to the agricultural land currently proposed.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The Strategic Employment Land Availability Assessment undertook an assessment of potential sites (brownfield and greenfield) to accommodate B use classes (employment). This assessment forms part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.

**RepID Representation**

6508 GREAT GLEN Parish Council (Lesley Sanderson) [2635]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support addressing the biodiversity deficit in the District through the provision of multifunctional greenspace that includes a range of habitats and linkages to established habitats, as part of all new development;  
\* safeguarding the recognised areas of high biodiversity and geo diversity.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

7007 Mr Simon Smith [4996]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The unjustified proposed conclusion of an additional 700000sqm of development for distribution in the current draft local plan, in conflict with the current core strategy and local plan options document recommendations, is directly in conflict with this policy of targeting emissions in greenhouse gases and climate change as there is no employment requirement in the district from the weight of evidence so workers will be commuting long distances adding to emissions from vehicles.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

take note of this policy and develop smaller scale industrial sites adjacent to employment need.

**Response:**

The Local Plan is being prepared to replace the Core Strategy and the Options consultation took place as part of its preparation. BE2 recognises that there is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a substantial contribution to long term non-rail served strategic warehouse, logistic and distribution development in Leicester and Leicestershire.

**RepID Representation**

5625 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support this

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6120 Mr Peter Jones [6225]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Every encouragement should be given to low carbon technology investments to promote reduced energy emissions -especially in relation to domestic CHP. This policy demands more than lip service at a time when (as this consultation closes ) major domestic estates continue to be consented without insistence on shared heat generation from boreholes or electricity from PV as standard. Here in North Kilworth retrospective consents on large areas of non SUDS compliant developments are a fact. Hopefully these new policies will be implemented and enforced.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6809 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Environment Agency welcomes the inclusion of, and wording of Key issue 6.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5437 Mr David Jones [4742]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Delete the words where possible from this section

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete the words 'where possible' from this section

**Response:**

It is considered that the current wording is appropriate.

**ReplD** **Representation**

5574 Mr John Martin [5974]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Retail needs are not really considered within the plan.

To think that in 2017 a house wife with children living in a new house on Ashton Rise for example will do her weekly shop at a store 800m away on foot is not realistic

Villages that are considered sustainable by definition should have a post office, shop and public house is not an appropriate definition as this situation can and does change frequently, witness the number of recent pub closures in the villages between Harborough and Lutterworth

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan should contain definitions of sustainability that are fluid and that can be revisited on a regular basis, say every 5 years. The dates of these reviews should be included in the plan

**Response:**

It is considered that access to key services is a sound basis on which to define the settlement hierarchy. There is a recognition that over time service provision in settlements may change and this is set out in Appendix F. Any change in the level of services, which impacts on the sustainability of a settlement, will form part of the considerations taken into account in future monitoring and review of the Plan, and in the determination of planning applications.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

6351 Cotesbach Parish Council (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6283]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not positively prepared and Not justified - Policy L1 or RT1 have not committed to improving Lutterworth town centre retail opportunities. Resources have not been invested into committing retail allocation in Lutterworth, or identifying S016 or other monies to support an enhancement of the town centre.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Commitment to Town Centre retail and amenity space is needed to maximise the opportunity of supposed traffic decrease

**Response:**

The level of need demonstrated by the retail study is lower in Lutterworth than in Market Harborough and much of this is accounted for by the SDA so much of the local provision should be there in order to make the settlement sustainable. The Council is not aware of land available for retail in Lutterworth town centre so anticipates that this will come forward on windfall sites.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6203 Mr Michael Bates [6242]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The local plan does not support the development of Lutterworth Town Centre as there is no provision for the addition of a major A road by-pass of the A426 around Lutterworth. Currently the amenity retail area of the town is not a pleasant area to visit due to the heavy goods traffic along the A426. Without a major review of the road infrastructure, Lutterworth Town centre will become moribund and run down requiring people to travel to Rugby or Market Harborough for non-food shopping or becoming more reliant on the internet for discretionary purchases.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Add a major A road by-pass around Lutterworth.

**Response:**

In the long term the provision of the spine road delivered through Policy L1 will result in a reduction in traffic congestion and pollution in Lutterworth town centre.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6509 GREAT GLEN Parish Council (Lesley Sanderson) [2635]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We strongly support maintaining, and where possible improving, the vitality and viability of the service centres in the District, so reducing the need to travel, while preserving, and where possible enhancing, the predominantly rural character of the District; sustaining the strength of town centres against the threat of 'leakage' to other centres and use of on-line shopping, realising rural vitality and making appropriate retail provision in Market Harborough, the Key Centres and local centres.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5933 MR Michael Wilcox [5164]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The significant scale of the proposed developments will exacerbate further the current congestion within local towns and villages and connecting roads. Also associated will be an increase in pollution as well as traffic noise.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Supporting amenities such as shops, schools, parks, recreation centers, pubs etc should be identified and included in the developments. The intent that such developments restrict car use and encourage walking and cycling is untrue and not achieved in practice

**Response:**

Traffic modelling demonstrates that, given the junction improvements to be made, increases in traffic can be accommodated.



**RepID Representation**

6524 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We are concerned that the Plan has no overall strategic view of transport issues throughout the District, including the integration of traffic generated by different policies. We are concerned that the cumulative effect of these allocations (L1, BE1bii, BE2 and BE4.1.f) may have unforeseen consequences for the road network which have not been addressed.

**Response:**

Traffic modelling demonstrates that, given the junction improvements to be made, increases in traffic can be accommodated.

**RepID Representation**

6750 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Propose inclusion of wording referring to Leicester - 'addressing road infrastructure constraints affecting the Leicester urban fringe and within Leicester itself...'

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Key Issue 8: Transport - propose inclusion of wording referring to Leicester - 'addressing road infrastructure constraints affecting the Leicester urban fringe and within Leicester itself...'

**Response:**

Wording of Key issue 8 first bullet point to be reworded. Modification proposed to read: 'mitigating the highways and transportation impacts of new development within and, where necessary, beyond the District'.

**RepID Representation**

7009 Mr Simon Smith [4996]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

A large scale development of distribution at Magna Park does not fit with this policy from the weight of evidence on road vehicle air pollution and the use of the A5 and Lutterworth solution monitoring.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Recognise the transport and highways pollution issues on the A5.

**Response:**

Traffic modelling demonstrates that, given the junction improvements to be made, increases in traffic can be accommodated.

**RepID Representation**

5395 KIBWORTH HARCOURT Parish Council (Dr Kevin Feltham) [3789]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Pleased to see The Kibworths included in this Key Issue.

**Response:**

Noted.

**ReplID** **Representation**

5624 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support this

**Response:**

Noted

**ReplID** **Representation**

6887 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The District is over-provided in its provision for Gypsy needs, both geographically - weighted so heavily towards the Lutterworth/Ullesthorpe/Gilmorton/Claybooke Parishes - but also not helped by HDC's repeated retrospective approval of unauthorised developments that have taken place to date.

Developments have taken place at Ullesthorpe in defiance of a hearing at Coventry Crown Court on 10th May 2010. This has been subsequently over-ruled on legal advice - an interesting case of Planning have precedence over a Legal Ruling.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the allocation of gypsy provision.

Spread the allocation more equitably around the HDC

Comply with Legal Rulings

**Response:**

The need for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation is based on up to date, robust evidence (The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2017).

**ReplID** **Representation**

6510 GREAT GLEN Parish Council (Lesley Sanderson) [2635]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support the council addressing the needs of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople communities by providing suitable accommodation to meet the needs of these communities.

**Response:**

Noted

<u>RepID</u>	<u>Representation</u>	<u>Nature</u>
6888	<b>Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> The potential provision for Affordable Housing and Sheltered Accommodation is unconvincing <b>Change To Plan Sought:</b> Convince us this will be achieved <b>Response:</b> H2 and H4 are based on up to date need and viability evidence.	<b>Object</b>

<u>RepID</u>	<u>Representation</u>	<u>Nature</u>
7403	<b>Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> Gladman consider that Objective 1 should be reworded slightly to state that the Local Plan will meet the housing needs of the district in full and meet a proportion of the identified unmet housing needs of the HMA as a whole. <b>Response:</b> The District's housing requirement includes an allowance for unmet need of other Districts. It is not considered necessary to specify this in Objective 1.	<b>Object</b>

<u>RepID</u>	<u>Representation</u>	<u>Nature</u>
6828	<b>Homes and Communities Agency [5784]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> The Stretton Hall Farm site can provide for a range of housing needs, including affordable homes, self-build plots, specialised care homes and a range of housing types and sizes. Its development would improve local sustainability and provide a range of community facilities and benefits, green infrastructure and improvements to the highway network. <b>Response:</b> Noted	<b>Support</b>

<u>RepID</u>	<u>Representation</u>	<u>Nature</u>
6340	<b>Magna Park is Big Enough (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6279]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> Policy BE2 is not promoting sustainable growth through more jobs meeting local employment need; out-commuting will not decrease; such a high density of logistics in the area will deprive other employment opportunities in the region <b>Change To Plan Sought:</b> No commitment to Magna Park within BE2 <b>Response:</b> The Local Plan needs to be read as a whole. In addition to BE2, other policies within the Local Plan allocate land for a range of employment uses to meet identified need and protect the most valued existing employment areas.	<b>Object</b>

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6639 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

To secure a wide range of skilled jobs for an highly educated population has always been a supported council policy. The objective, stopping young people from leaving the district is not served by focusing mainly on providing unskilled, temporary, low paid jobs in the logistic industry.  
A focus on sustainable , diverse and vibrant job market is not possible without creating the opportunities.

**Response:**

The Local Plan needs to be read as a whole. Taken together policies within the Local Plan allocate land for a range of employment uses to meet identified need and protect the most valued existing employment areas.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6890 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Much play is made of the intention to improve the quality of jobs available in the District, yet the biggest influx will be in low-grade jobs in Distribution. There is little apparent input into quality engineering, scientific or manufacturing employment opportunities.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Acknowledge that employment in the District is more or less full, and make a more conscious effort to improve attract and improve the higher skilled jobs that the Plan calls for.

**Response:**

The Local Plan needs to be read as a whole. In addition to BE2, other policies within the Local Plan allocate land for a range of employment uses to meet identified need and protect the most valued existing employment areas.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7029 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* unemployment in the area is low
- \* workforce to meet allocation in Policy BE2 would commute-in from outside the District
- \* out-commuting of skilled workers will not be reduced
- \* 81% if the current Magna Park workforce commute from outside Harborough District postcodes
- \* unemployment lower than regional and national averages
- \* public transport is inadequate

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

These comments relate to BE2 specifically and are addressed in responses to that policy. The purpose of the objective is to set out the guiding principles for the policies.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6891 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Magna Park development is a clear breach of a requirement to first utilise ex-industrial land. Further development will take place on wholly agricultural land, and the entire scheme is unsustainable in that such development can never be reversed. This is made all the more reprehensible in that the development proposals are entirely speculative.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reconsider the scope and environment effects of adding 700,000 square feet of warehousing and abandon plans to expand Magna Park

**Response:**

The Strategic Employment Land Availability Assessment undertook a comprehensive assessment of the availability of alternative sites for strategic distribution, including brownfield sites.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6198 Mr Michael Bates [6242]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The lack of a major A road by-pass to relieve through traffic on the A426 in Lutterworth does not meet the criteria for infrastructure improvement in and around Lutterworth.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Add a major A road by-pass to the A426, north of Lutterworth to link with the A5 and the proposed Lutterworth East development. Restrict heavy goods vehicles from passing through Lutterworth and a weight restriction on vehicles accessing existing industrial sites within the town.

**Response:**

L1 provides the potential to deliver an eastern relief road for Lutterworth which can deliver significant environmental benefits for the town centre.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6893 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Unfunded fine words

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Present budget proposals

**Response:**

Sites specific allocation policies and infrastructure related policies will ensure that infrastructure is delivered alongside development where necessary.

---

<u>RepID</u>	<u>Representation</u>	<u>Nature</u>
7385	<p><b>Sport England (Steven Beard) [4436]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> Sport England supports this objective.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Noted</p>	Support
6894	<p><b>Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> Unfunded fine words</p> <p><b>Change To Plan Sought:</b> Present actual budgeted proposals</p> <p><b>Response:</b> This objective is not dependent on budgetary provision. HC2 and HC3 aim to prevent the unnecessary loss of community facilities, allow for suitable diversification and support the provision of new provision facilities through the development management process.</p>	Object
6294	<p><b>Mr Richard Beer [6263]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> The proposed development at Burnmill Farm put the Ridgeline at risk and the coniferous tree screen planted by the farmer is incompatible with the local environment and should be replaced before any development is allowed.</p> <p><b>Change To Plan Sought:</b> replant the existing coniferous tree screen with mixed deciduous trees which are native to the area</p> <p><b>Response:</b> MH3 specifies that existing trees should be retained, particularly at the northern boundary of the site, and that any new planting provision should use native species.</p>	Object
5626	<p><b>Ms Caroline Pick [4194]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Noted.</p>	Support

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6479 **Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

The contents of the Harborough Local Plan Proposed Submission do not appear to be trying to comply with this objective.

**Response:**

The objectives set out the guiding principles for the policies in the Local Plan as a whole. Not all policies in the Plan will meet individual objectives to the same degree. The Local Plan must meet the development needs of the District to 2031.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6206 **Mr Michael Bates [6242]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Lutterworth has a number of minor historic buildings including some fine examples of 18th Century country town houses. Without improvement to the local environment, particularly the reduction in heavy goods traffic through the town, the area will not attract the people or organisations who will be prepared to use and maintain these important heritage buildings.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Improve the road infrastructure to make Lutterworth a pleasant place to live in and visit allowing it to recover its country town character and community.

**Response:**

The provision of a relief 'spine' road as part of the East of Lutterworth SDA provides the potential to deliver relief to the town centre which can deliver substantial environmental benefits.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6643 **Cllr Rosita Page [4254]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Objective 7 to protect the historic environment is also compromised by policy BE2 . The protection of heritage is highly supported by the NPPF and featured in the draft Growth Plan but the policy is not strong enough. The objectives and policies are contradicting themselves in places.

**Response:**

The objectives set out the guiding principles for the policies in the Local Plan as a whole. Not all policies in the Plan will meet individual objectives to the same degree. The Local Plan must meet the development needs of the District to 2031.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6896 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Magna Park clearly puts the Mediaeval facility at Bittesby at risk.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Refuse development permission of Magna Park

**Response:**

The objectives set out the guiding principles for the policies in the Local Plan as a whole. Not all policies in the Plan will meet individual objectives to the same degree. The Local Plan must meet the development needs of the District to 2031.

**RepID** **Representation**

6121 Mr Peter Jones [6225]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Villages such as North Kilworth have developed a series of plans over 3 decades culminating in the latest Neighbourhood Plan yet overscale, improperly coloured bricks, expansion of housing numbers have blighted our village scene in that period. Due control needs to be exercised on random developer builders seeking to maximise returns and a more sympathetic approaches are required to local homeowners with a track record of visual enhancement to the street scene.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

5627 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy.

**Response:**

Noted



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6212 **Mr Michael Bates [6242]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Without the provision of a major A road by-pass of the A426 around Lutterworth, the existing Market Town character will be lost due to the impact of heavy goods through traffic creating a polluted and unpleasant place to live, visit or invest. Most of the "old and character" areas of Lutterworth are affected by the A426 road.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Provide major changes in local A road infrastructure to take heavy goods through traffic away from the town.

**Response:**

The provision of a relief 'spine' road as proposed as part of the East of Lutterworth SDA provides the potential to deliver an eastern relief road which can deliver substantial environmental benefits to the town centre.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5628 **Ms Caroline Pick [4194]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7386 **Sport England (Steven Beard) [4436]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

With particular reference to bringing forward strategic development areas of East Lutterworth and Scraftoft (policy SC1) with regard to Active design - Sport England, in conjunction with Public Health England, has produced 'Active Design' (October 2015), a guide to planning new developments that create the right environment to help people get more active, more often in the interests of health and wellbeing. <http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/>

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6222 Mr Michael Bates [6242]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The local plan does not provide any solution to a reduction in the use of motor vehicles. The lack of a major change to the A road infrastructure around Lutterworth will condemn the town to a local ghetto devoid of any meaningful facilities which will increase the need for people to use private transport to travel greater distances to shop and secure other services. There is no vision to develop an environmental light railway/tram system to compete with existing forms of polluting public and private transport.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove heavy goods transport from areas of local habitation particularly around existing towns such as Lutterworth. Develop a plan to provide a more environmentally friendly public transportation such as a light railway/tram system to connect local towns and larger "villages" to major infrastructure hubs such as Rugby and Leicester.

**Response:**

An environmental light railway/tram system to serve Lutterworth is not a viable option. The provision of a relief 'spine' road as part of the East of Lutterworth SDA provides the potential to deliver an eastern relief road which can deliver substantial environmental benefits to the town centre.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6641 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Reducing impact of traffic on local communities in Objective 10 is not a deliverable policy in line with the proposal of policy BE2.

**Response:**

Objective 10 is not a policy. The objectives set out the guiding principles for the policies in the Local Plan as a whole. Not all policies in the Plan will meet objectives to the same degree.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6752 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Propose adding wording 'and therefore will help to encourage active and healthy lifestyle choices'.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Add wording to Objective 10 'and therefore will help to encourage active and healthy lifestyle choices'.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6899 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Development at Magna Park will exacerbate road usage by car and also truck. There is no provision for additional road capacity, while the A5 is acknowledged to be over-stretched, but with no plans to update it before 2030. The possible sanctioning of a development of this scale without a rail link is in breach of National Guidelines

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There is very little forward thinking in this section of the Plan. What effect will there be on commercial activities in the area of the declared banning of carbon-fuelled cars by 2040? The benefits of non-carbon burning cars will be offset by the additional diesel heavy vehicles in the area, since I am not aware of any feasible way of replacing diesel use in commercial vans and heavy trucks

**Response:**

The objectives set out the guiding principles for the policies in the Local Plan as a whole. Not all policies in the Plan will meet objectives to the same degree.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5629 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5913 Dr I.D. v.d. Ploeg [4817]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

It would be useful to have separate bicycle paths such as in the Netherlands. This would be much safer and encourage people to be more active and would allow families to exercise together improving health in the area.

**Response:**

Noted. The provision of measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle is required under Policy IN2.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5716 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This section does not take into consideration the recently approved plans to develop in flood plains

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Define flood plains accurately and ensure future compliance with strict enforcement.

**Response:**

The Local Plan takes into account the latest evidence provided by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2017 and directs development away from areas of flood risk. The approach to managing flood risk is set out in CC3.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7021 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* Policy BE2 does not comply with Objective 11
- \* history of flooding in area connected to Policy BE2
- \* no evidence that flood risks downstream to outstanding Magna Park planning applications have been assessed
- \* no mention of these flood issues in the Local Plan
- \* concerns raised verbally and in response to planning applications on several occasions
- \* flooding has escalated as Magna Park has expanded

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

BE2 does not make allocations for strategic distribution but sets a cap. Policy CC3 sets out the approach to managing flood risk against which planning applications will be assessed.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6810 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Environment Agency supports the content of Objective 11 since it is in general conformity with the requirements of the NPPF.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6226 Mr Michael Bates [6242]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The local plan does not provide any solution to reducing pollution from motor vehicles and heavy goods transport. Within the time frame of the plan some reduction in pollution from personal transport can be expected it is very unlikely that this will apply to heavy goods vehicles which currently blight the area around Lutterworth. This plan is an opportunity to provide the basis for significantly reducing local pollution by investment in local changes to the existing A road infrastructure around Lutterworth and planning for the re-introduction to a local rail network.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Include for some major A road alterations around Lutterworth to remove heavy goods through traffic. Provide some advanced planning to re-introduce a light rail system to connect existing local towns and larger villages to major infrastructure hubs in rugby and Leicester to reduce the need for commuting by polluting personal transport.

**Response:**

The re-introduction of a local rail network to serve Lutterworth is not a viable option at present. The provision of a relief 'spine' road as part of the East of Lutterworth SDA provides the potential to deliver an eastern relief road which can deliver substantial environmental benefits to the town centre.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6900 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As previously represented, development at Magna Park will exacerbate pollution problems in an area already afflicted by high particulate readings.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Refuse development of Magna Park

**Response:**

The objectives set out the guiding principles for the policies in the Local Plan as a whole. Not all policies in the Plan will meet objectives to the same degree. See responses to BE2.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6902 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Given HDC's apparent failure to make a 5-year land bank provision of housing, local NDP schemes will remain at the mercy of speculative development. Since NDPs require public funding to make them happen, this is potentially a cyclative waste of money.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Confirm that the Local Plan will indeed establish a 5-year land bank for housing development.

**Response:**

Appendix G (Housing Trajectory) sets out the expected annual housing delivery throughout the plan period. From 2018/19 and every year throughout the plan period, the housing trajectory demonstrates at least a five year supply of deliverable housing land.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7382 TUR LANGTON Parish Council (Alison Gibson) [2688]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The general hierarchy of the LP and NP needs to be more clear at para. 1.6. The LP gives an overview of the policies, but if the NP aims to control a particular aspect of development that the LP is in favour of, the mechanism for how this is applied should be clarified. i.e. Any restrictions that the NP aims to apply will be based on evidence, and reviewed by the planning authority, which is more focussed and relevant than the general policies in the LP.

**Response:**

It is considered that 1.6 sets out sufficient detail/context in relation to neighbourhood planning.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5630 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire is convinced that Neighbourhood Planning is an important way of protecting the countryside and encouraging social cohesion.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7089 Bloor Home Ltd [4935]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Soundness

For the reasons set out in the full text of the representation, Bloor Homes object to Policy SS1, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:

- has not been positively prepared
- is not justified in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not properly considered reasonable alternative strategies;
- is not effective in that some allocation sites will not deliver the scale of development the Submission Plan currently assumes, and the identified needs will not therefore, be met; and
- is inconsistent with national policy

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Revise policy as follows:

- The plan period should be extended to 2036.
- Part 2: the housing requirement should be increased to reflect the extended plan period to 2036 and the concerns raised in the objection to Policy H1.
- Part 2: include reference to the allocation of additional sites, most notably at Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby, given the PUA's position within the settlement hierarchy and relationship to Leicester.
- Part 4: requires further clarification of the specific development requirements of this policy to support the regeneration and development objectives in the neighbouring City of Leicester and Oadby & Wigston Borough.
- Part 9: delete.

**Response:**

Consideration was given to extending the Plan Period to 2036, but this was rejected on the basis that a 15 year time period is desirable rather than required and that the identification of growth beyond 2031 should be in the context of the Strategic Growth Plan. Given this, there is no requirement for additional dwellings over and above commitments and the Scraftoft North SDA. Criteria 4 seeks to ensure development in this location does not undermine the delivery of development on derelict and brownfield land elsewhere. Deletion of SS1 (9) would be contrary to the NPPF which states that housing should be located where it enhances or maintains the vitality of rural communities and that local planning authorities avoid new isolated homes in the countryside.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7257 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

12. Query whether the settlement hierarchy requires further consideration, to enable settlements which are better serviced than others in the same tier of the hierarchy to be more clearly distinguished and potentially receive more development.

**Response:**

The settlement hierarchy was established through the Core Strategy adopted in 2011 and was considered sound then. There has been no significant change in circumstances since. Policy SS1 (7) recognises that Fleckney, Great Glen and The Kibworths provide more services and facilities than the other Rural Centres. To introduce additional levels in the hierarchy would unnecessarily complicate the policy. The settlement hierarchy is considered to continue to be sound, but could be reviewed in due course once the East of Lutterworth SDA, the Broughton Astley Neighbourhood Plan developments, the proposals for Fleckney and the committed development in Great Glen and Kibworth have worked through. Such a review could take account of any proposals in the Strategic Growth Plan and could consider the merits of the distinction between the smaller Rural Centres and the Selected Rural Villages in the light of changes in key services provision over the next 5 years. This is a matter for the next review of the Local Plan.

**ReplD Representation**

**Nature**

7342 Davidsons Developments Ltd, Jelson Ltd & Parker Strategic Land Ltd [6507]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

To help address the identified housing needs of the HMA, the Local Plan should allocate the Scraptoft East SDA for an additional 2,700 homes over the Plan period (3,900 homes total including the Scraptoft North site).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Policy SS1, part 2.a.iii - should be amended to refer to the Scraptoft East SDA for 3,900 dwellings;

**Response:**

This level of housing development is in excess of the requirement for the plan period. There is no need for additional dwellings over and above commitments and the Scraptoft North SDA. It is not needed in order to ensure infrastructure provision for Scraptoft North nor to ensure comprehensive development of the area, since the large amounts of development already permitted can be developed independently. To exceed this amount of development by building on the land indicated would threaten the identity of the communities of Scraptoft and Thurnby / Busby by building on land between them, identified as Green Wedge, by extending development into countryside to the east and by introducing housing at a rate which would be too fast to enable new residents to be integrated into the communities. Decisions on any further allocations in this area can be left until after the approval of the Strategic Growth Plan, thus ensuring comprehensive strategic planning of the south and east Leicester periphery.

**ReplD Representation**

**Nature**

7441 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is concern that some settlements have been incorrectly placed within this tiered hierarchy for example Broughton Astley is designated above Fleckney. It is recommended that the Council re-examines such flaws before submission of the Local Plan for examination.

**Response:**

The settlement hierarchy was established through the Core Strategy adopted in 2011 and was considered sound then. There has been no significant change in circumstances since. Broughton Astley has twice the population of Fleckney and possesses a secondary school, which Fleckney does not. The settlement hierarchy is considered to continue to be sound, but could be reviewed in due course once the East of Lutterworth SDA, the Broughton Astley Neighbourhood Plan developments, the proposals for Fleckney and the committed development in Great Glen and Kibworth have worked through. Such a review could take account of any proposals in the Strategic Growth Plan and could consider the merits of the distinction between the smaller Rural Centres and the Selected Rural Villages in the light of changes in key services provision over the next 5 years. This is a matter for the next review the Local Plan.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7594 Bidwells (Mr Robert Love) [4663]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We are supportive of the allocation of housing for Rural Centres. We consider that Fleckney represents a sustainable village with good access to local amenities and services. The settlement is ideally placed to deliver some level of housing growth for the District in order to meet local housing need and support village amenities and services. It is noted that Policy H1 identifies provision of a minimum of 295 dwellings at Fleckney. Object: Change Required: Allocate housing towards sustainable locations in accordance with the hierarchy and ensure a balanced distribution of housing to meet the need of urban and rural communities.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Allocate housing towards sustainable locations in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and ensure a balanced distribution of housing to meet the need of urban and rural communities.

**Response:**

A substantial allocation has been made in order to ensure early delivery of some housing (in addition to recent commitments). Further allocations are to be left to the Neighbourhood Plan in support of Local Plan Objective 14 and the Council's commitment to decision making by local communities about their own future.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5882 LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Consortium strongly supports the Council's spatial strategy for distribution of growth. It is clear that Harborough District Council has arrived at the most appropriate strategy, in accordance with national policy, to deliver the development requirements of the area. The spatial strategy closely aligns with the objectives of higher level strategic plans such as the Strategic Growth Plan and the Strategic Economic Plan.

Alternate spatial strategies would not achieve sustainable development by failing to ensure that sufficient land of the right type is in the right place to support growth.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6702 Mr and Mrs Sellers [6412]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the proposed spatial strategy for growth set out in Policy SS1. The NPPF and the Draft Local Plan are underpinned by a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. It is therefore considered rational to direct development towards locations that are within close proximity to a wide range of employment opportunities and local services and facilities. As outlined above, we consider Great Easton to be a sustainable location with a wide range of services and facilities, and as such we support its identification as a Selected Rural Village, which is expected to support residential development of an appropriate scale.

**Response:**

Noted.



**RepID** **Representation**

6756 Amanda Burrell [4075]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support hierarchy.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

6824 Homes and Communities Agency [5784]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In principle, the HCA supports development near to the edge of Leicester, but notes the historic emphasis for development to the east of Leicester and considers that this should be rebalanced with development to the South East, namely the Stretton Hall Farm site. This would prevent over-development to the east, spread the benefits of new development outwards, provide flexibility for housing supply, avoiding a significant amount of development coming forward in one area at the same time. HCA contends that such a rebalancing of development would support the position that the settlement strategy has been positively prepared and justified.

**Response:**

While noting the points made, it is considered that these issues should be addressed as part of the Strategic Growth Plan for Leicester and Leicestershire. It is premature to make decisions on such a major growth point in advance of the SGP and too late in the Local Plan to consider this. To introduce this site at this stage would involve revisiting earlier consultation (on the Options document) and assessments (on the Options and Selected Options) and could delay the Local Plan, and therefore the delivery of much needed housing and employment growth by up to two years, contrary to the NPPF and Government policy more generally.

**RepID** **Representation**

6936 Mrs Maureen Stell [6406]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Lutterworth and Magna Park are close to the M1, M69, A14 and M6 and are the best choice for major developments. Housing has been fairly distributed around the Rural Centres.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6975 Family Carr [6455]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the proposed spatial strategy for growth set out in Policy SS1. The NPPF and the Draft Local Plan are underpinned by a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. It is considered rational to direct development towards locations within close proximity of employment opportunities and local services and facilities. We consider Great Glen to be such a sustainable location; as such we consider it's Rural Centre classification appropriate where development is expected to meet the needs of the settlement and the surrounding area. We propose the allocation of Land off London Road, Great Glen for residential development.

**Response:**

Noted, but there is no need for additional allocations in Great Glen in order for it to meet its proportionate share of the requirement for the plan period, given the extent of current commitments.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7306 Mr and Mrs Welton [6497]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the proposed spatial strategy for growth set out in Policy SS1: Spatial Strategy. The NPPF and the Draft Local Plan are underpinned by a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. It is therefore considered rational to direct development towards locations that are within close proximity of a wide range of employment opportunities and local services and facilities. As outlined above, we consider Market Harborough to be a sustainable location with a large number of key services and facilities and as such we support its identification as the Sub-Regional Centre, which is expected to be a focus for development.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7406 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Gladman support the Spatial Strategy as set out in Policy SS1 including the identification of Fleckney as a Rural Centre and Great Bowden as a Selected Rural Village which will be one of the main focuses for rural development.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7511 **Mr Steve Louth [5609]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

The distribution of development set out in Policy SS1 The Spatial Strategy, and in particular the identification of Selected Rural Villages (SRVs) to accommodate appropriate levels of growth, is supported.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7527 **Natural England (Mr Sean Mahoney) [4428]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We have already provided comments on previous iterations of the Local Plan and have nothing further to add here except to welcome the commitment to continue to liaise with Natural England, the Environment Agency, the Lead Local Flood Authority and other stakeholders over the mitigation measures to protect the integrity of Misterton Marshes SSSI from any impacts arising from the proposed East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area. As a statutory consultee, we would also expect to be consulted on the associated planning applications.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7532 **Mr & Mrs Sandercock [6522]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We support the proposed spatial strategy for growth set out in Policy SS1. The NPPF and the Draft Local Plan are underpinned by a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. It is therefore considered rational to direct development towards locations that are within close proximity to a wide range of employment opportunities and local services and facilities. We consider North Kilworth to be a sustainable location with a wide range of services and facilities, and as such we consider it appropriate for identification as a Selected Rural Village, which are expected to accommodate an appropriate scale of residential development.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5994 SCRAPTOFT Parish Council (Mr P Elliot) [4520]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

ss1 clause 1 does not manage development and settlement in the best way regarding Scraptoft Thurnby and Bushby, as this will lead to an over development of the area, Scraptoft having already had over 750 houses built over the last 6 years.

The residential road network around Scraptoft is not capable of sustaining a further 2500 cars on its already congested roads.

The loss of the green wedge to the north of Scraptoft would result in a loss of countryside turning Scraptoft into an urban environment, and the loss of its village status.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scraptoft Nature reserve should be retained..

Reduction of the number of houses in the proposed Scraptoft North Development.

Traffic from Scraptoft North should be routed away from the roads in Scraptoft Village

**Response:**

Noted. The site-specific matters here are addressed in response to Policy SC1. A reduction in numbers would impact viability and the ability to meet needs.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6944 Miss Claire Orton [6451]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

negative-increased use of narrow Hamilton Lane Road junction, increased traffic, noise, pollution, adverse effect of character of local conservation area, decrease of already reduced green areas in village, effect on house prices

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce number of houses

Create access roads that don't lead to or from Hamilton Lane

Create public open space (with outdoor gym, safe play space) for walking as part of the plan, protect current green wedges and increase amount of green space easily accessible for residents to access/walk-even if this borders housing development.

Provide very clear, pictorial representations of the proposed developments in hard copy to each of the addresses in the relevant area by post. Provide very clear and easy to respond to (i.e in hard copy/FREEPOST) documentation to enable all residents to have their say in an easily accessible way.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy SC1 addresses issues relating to open space, the green wedge and impact on the Conservation Area. House prices are not a planning issue. As set out in Policy SC1 the SDA will be subject to a master plan which will be subject to public engagement by the Council and the promoters.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7568 Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby & Bushby and Scraptoft are next to Leicester but have a poor transport links by bus, so a car is essential. This means development is not sustainable and they are not 'appropriate locations'. Object as unsound in relation to transport links.

**Response:**

Policy SC1 (3, l m and n) require improvements to the bus service and measures to improve its use. This may include extension to service 55 which provides a 20 minute service to Nether Hall.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7045 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support as sound. However, Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council has concerns in relation to inadequate infrastructure - see comments given under SC1 below. It is vital that, should the Scraftoft North SDA be approved, it be developed as a well-planned, high quality living environment - ie a planned community and not just another housing development.

**Response:**

Noted. Detailed comments to be addressed under Policy SC1.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7507 Westleigh Developments Ltd [423]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the proposed spatial strategy in Policy SS1. The NPPF and the Draft Local Plan are underpinned by a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. It is therefore considered rational to direct development towards locations that are within close proximity to a wide range of employment opportunities and local services and facilities. As outlined above, Thurnby benefits from a good functional relationship with Leicester and the facilities and services available in the city. We support Thurnby's identification as part of the Leicester Principal Urban Area. We propose land south of Grange Lane, Thurnby for residential development.

**Response:**

Noted. There is no need for additional dwellings in the Thurnby area over and above commitments and the Scraftoft North SDA, totalling c.2,200 dwellings or c. 150 per annum over the remaining plan period. However the site identified is for about 21 dwellings only and so below the level at which allocations would be made. It could be allocated through the Neighbourhood Plan or progressed through the development management process in which case it would be judged against the criteria in Policy GD2.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6682 Mr and Mrs Gowling [6400]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the proposed spatial strategy for growth set out in Policy SS1: Spatial Strategy. The NPPF and the Draft Local Plan are underpinned by a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. It is therefore considered rational to direct development towards locations that are within close proximity to a wide range of employment opportunities and local services and facilities. We consider Market Harborough to be a sustainable location with a large number of key services and facilities, and therefore we support its identification as the Sub-Regional Centre, which is expected to be a focus for development across the plan period.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7469 Jelson Homes Limited [3965]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the Council's view that Market Harborough should be a 'Sub- regional Centre' and we support the overarching strategy to locate the highest proportion of development in the higher order settlements.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6085 Mr Ivan Crane [6014]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We broadly support the settlement hierarchy, specifically the inclusion of Broughton Astley as a Key Centre. This reflects its scale and service provision. However, our objection is that this place in the hierarchy is not reflected in the allocation of any new housing development to Broughton Astley. The 1,170 dwellings allocated on other sites referred to in part iv. of policy SS1, should include a housing provision for Broughton Astley, yet H1 fails to make this provision.

Our full case is set out in response to Policy H1.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Policy SS1, should be amended to include a housing provision for Broughton Astley.

**Response:**

There is no need to allocate sites in Broughton Astley. Enough sites to meet its proportionate share of housing requirements have already been provided in the made Neighbourhood Plan. These are included in commitments and do not form part of the 1,170 dwellings in SS1 (2 a iv).

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6229 Mr Michael Bates [6242]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Lutterworth cannot be developed as a key centre under the current plan as there is no provision to reduce through traffic on the A426 within the town boundaries. Development within the town will only come if it is made a more pleasant place to live, do business or invest.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A major road by-pass on the A426 to avoid Lutterworth is required improve the environment within the town and encourage people to live, work and invest in Lutterworth.

**Response:**

A potential benefit of the East of Lutterworth SDA its potential to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGVs, through Lutterworth town centre in the long term. A by-pass cannot be funded without contributions from development.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7351 **Davidsons Developments Limited [4740]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Policy SS1 identifies a clear settlement hierarchy and states that development should be directed towards appropriate locations in accordance with this hierarchy; however, the second part of the policy fails to allocate development according to the hierarchy. Sustainable locations such as Broughton Astley should be considered for development.

Part 6 of Policy SS1 states that the Local Plan seeks to maintain and improve the character and environment of the market towns of Lutterworth and develop Broughton Astley but the plan will not deliver this without further land allocated for housing development at Broughton Astley.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Allocate housing towards sustainable locations in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and ensure a balanced distribution of housing to meet the need of urban and rural communities. Further allocation of land for housing are requested at Broughton Astley.

**Response:**

Noted. There is no need for further allocations in Broughton Astley which already meets more than its proportionate share of the housing requirements through the allocations in its Neighbourhood Plan.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7488 **Mr John L. Marlow [1704]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Public response from Broughton Astley:

Representations were invited following the publication of the Core Strategy in 2010. At the end of the ten week consultation period on the 23rd of December 2010 only FOUR separate submissions had been made by residents of Broughton Astley. Experience teaches me that to make detailed submissions to the District Council during the Core Strategy and subsequent Neighbourhood Plan process has been a complete waste of my time and I leave it to the others to oblige on this occasion. I SUSPECT THAT THE RESPONSE FROM RESIDENTS OF BROUGHTON ASTLEY WILL BE VERY SMALL.

**Response:**

Noted. The Local Plan contains very little specifically about Broughton Astley because it is covered by the made Neighbourhood Plan which provides for its development needs over the plan period.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7489 **Mr John L. Marlow [1704]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

A VILLAGE CENTRE FOR BROUGHTON ASTLEY: Neither the County nor the District Council has ever taken the trouble to prepare a plan for the integration of development within the village from 2010 onwards. I made my own suggestion in August 2011 (see attached) but it is sad to see the manner in which it has been mauled by Jelsons and the District Planning Department.

Worse still, there were promises given that the old village centre in Main Street would be 'revitalized' but apart from tinkering with the public car park next to the Co-Operative store nothing has been done in the last seven years.

**Response:**

These site-specific comments are not relevant to the Local Plan which does not contain policies on Broughton Astley as these are all contained in the Neighbourhood Plan.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7493 Mr John L. Marlow [1704]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The pressing need for leisure and recreational provision in Broughton Astley was emphasised by ward Councillors in 2010. Despite this and the subsequent making of the Neighbourhood Plan monies are to be diverted to Lutterworth and Market Harborough with Broughton Astley being abandoned by the District Council. My concern has always been at its deepest in relation to the careless and random approach towards HOUSING across the whole District, and particularly at Broughton Astley, not only in terms of numbers but also in the woeful standard of housing design exhibited by developers at Broughton Astley.

**Response:**

Development for leisure and recreation and for housing in Broughton Astley is addressed through the made Neighbourhood Plan. The allocation of funding for implementation of leisure facilities is not a matter for this Local Plan. The Local Plan will mean that the distribution of housing development across the District will not be 'random'. The design of housing will in future be subject to Policy GD8.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7562 Manor Oak Homes [6524]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Manor Oak Homes recommend that the Council introduce criteria to distinguish Key Centres as any settlement with over 5ha of dedicated employment land and a secondary school. The Kibworths has both of these facilities and should therefore be classified as a Key Centre.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

On the strength of the above assessment, it is considered that the Kibworths has been incorrectly identified as a Rural Centre and that it should instead be a Key Centre. Policy SS1 is therefore unsound as it fails to accurately assess the nature of the Kibworths' role in the settlement hierarchy and is therefore not based on the thorough consideration of reasonable alternatives (in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 182) to justify the inclusion of the Kibworths as a Rural Centre as opposed to a Key Centre.

In order to respond to the fundamental concerns raised above and to enable the preparation of a sound Local Plan, the following changes are required:

\* The proposed settlement hierarchy should be reconsidered based on clear criteria used to distinguish between Key Centres and Rural Centres. Manor Oak Homes recommend that Key Centres are defined as settlements with: over 2,500 dwellings; all 6 key facilities; at least 5ha of dedicated employment land; and a secondary school.

\* The Kibworths should be included as a Key Centre and not a Rural Centre and assumptions regarding its sustainability for development should be reviewed accordingly.

**Response:**

The settlement hierarchy was established through the Core Strategy adopted in 2011 and was considered sound then. There has been no significant change in circumstances since. Following further development, there may be a case for including Fleckney, Great Glen and The Kibworths with Broughton Astley as Key Centres. However, Broughton Astley is more than twice the size of The Kibworths. The settlement hierarchy is considered to continue to be sound, but could be reviewed in due course once the East of Lutterworth SDA, the Broughton Astley Neighbourhood Plan developments, the proposals for Fleckney and the committed development in Great Glen and The Kibworths have worked through. Such a review could take account of any proposals in the Strategic Growth Plan. This is a matter for the next review of the Local Plan.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6378 Hallam Land Management Limited [5311]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Council's spatial strategy for distribution of growth is supported. Harborough District Council has arrived at the most appropriate strategy, in accordance with national policy, to deliver the development requirements of the area. The spatial strategy closely aligns with the objectives of higher level strategic plans such as the Strategic Growth Plan and the Strategic Economic Plan.

In this context, the strategy supports the development of further appropriate and developable land around Lutterworth. Therefore, as explained in representations submitted to this Local Plan elsewhere, Land South of Lutterworth Road fits in with the overall spatial strategy

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6948 Mrs Maureen Stell [6406]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Broughton Astley is already building over 500 new houses and a commercial site. Is being developed. This is hardly mentioned in the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Noted. It is not mentioned because the allocations to more than meet its needs were made through the Neighbourhood Plan.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7470 Jelson Homes Limited [3965]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the Council's view that Broughton Astley is a 'Key Centre' within the District.

**Response:**

Noted .

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5914 Dr I.D. v.d. Ploeg [4817]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It would be useful to look at facilities with more nuance. It is no good saying a village is a centre because there is a bus service (not a good one), that there is a doctors' surgery (when in fact it is full) etc. So, there need to be accessible facilities before it is decided to build there.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Not to use a list of tick boxes but to look at the actual facilities that are really available and to allow village life to exist instead of making villages into towns. I don't know whether the plan is legally compliant as I am not a lawyer but I can only submit if I say it is so I have ticked yes.

**Response:**

The suggested nuanced criteria would be impractical to apply even if the information was available since these factors vary over time. The scale of development proposed reflects the settlement hierarchy and level of existing service and facility provision.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5362 Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd [5909]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no clear distinction between the designation of settlements to the various tiers of the settlement hierarchy.

Based on the available evidence, it is clear that Fleckney forms one of the most sustainable settlements and accordingly it should be designated as a Key Centre.

Even if Fleckney is able to be justified to be a Rural Centre, the sustainability of growth at this settlement needs to be taken into account in the policies.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Designate Fleckney as a Key Centre

**Response:**

The evidence does not support Fleckney being allocated as a Key Centre, since it lacks several key services such as a secondary school or leisure centre and has a much smaller population than Broughton Astley.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6256 The Cooperative Estates (Richard Lomas) [3906]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Co-op supports the recognition of Houghton on the Hill as a Rural Centre in the Settlement Hierarchy under Policy SS1 (1d).

**Response:**

Noted

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6266 David Wilson Homes East Midlands [6254]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Policy SS1 identifies The Kibworths as a Rural Centre, which given the level of facilities and services within the settlement is considered appropriate. The supporting text notes that of the Rural Centres "The Kibworths and Great Glen are the largest with significant village centres offering a range of shops and services" and "The Kibworths benefit from a secondary school."

**Response:**

Noted.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6966 Mr O Tebbs [5208]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the identification of Ullesthorpe as a Rural Centre, bearing in mind the facilities and services available there.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5438 Mrs Jan Butcher [4328]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The designation of the Claybrookes as an SRV is unfair and incorrect. The Parish Council has demonstrated that the policy has been reverse engineered on a numbers of occasions to support an early decision by Officers rather than policy being developed using evidence. Claybrooke does not meet the safe and acceptable walking distance requirements and development in this location is unsustainable due to lack of facilities and limited access to public transport.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove SRV status from The Claybrookes

**Response:**

The decision to make The Claybrookes (as well as Great Easton with Bringhurst and Church and East Langton) combined SRVs is fully supported by the evidence as set out in the Report to the Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel on 17 October 2016 and is supported as an approach by paragraph 55 of the NPPF which states that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6175 Mrs Valerie Deacon [6122]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Why is it that the two separate villages of Parva and Magna have been amalgamated for the purposes of housing developments? This has not happened in other areas of the District, e.g. The Langtons. Harborough District Council appear to make up the rules to fit their plans, not based on documentary evidence.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Removal of SRV status from the Claybrookes.

**Response:**

The decision to make The Claybrookes (as well as Great Easton with Bringhurst and Church and East Langton) combined SRVs is fully supported by the evidence as set out in the Report to the Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel on 17 October 2016 and is supported as an approach by paragraph 55 of the NPPF which states that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.

---

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6594 EAST LANGTON and CHURCH LANGTON Parish Council (Alison Gibson) [2624]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

East Langton Parish is classed as a Selected Rural Village, one of only three settlements where two villages have been grouped together as a result of walking distances to Church Langton Primary School.

The impact is to increase the housing requirement for the Parish to 30, and East Langton which would otherwise be treated as an unsustainable location for housing is required to take a significant number (although the Local Plan doesn't distinguish between villages in terms of location for housing so it could therefore increase the requirement for Church Langton if no suitable East Langton sites come forward.).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The villages of Church Langton and East Langton should not be grouped together.

**Response:**

The decision to make Church and East Langton (as well as Great Easton with Bringham and The Claybrookes) combined SRVs is fully supported by the evidence as set out in the Report to the Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel on 17 October 2016 and is supported as an approach by paragraph 55 of the NPPF which states that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6625 Claybrooke Magna Parish Council (Mrs J P Butcher) [4737]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposal to designate the Claysbrookes as an SRV is unsound. Using a facility where alcohol is served, a pub, as a key criterion to locate housing is discriminatory under the Equality Act. Protected groups will be excluded from its use due to religious beliefs - the aim to promote inclusive communities is failed. Evidence shows the SRV policy has been reverse engineered to meet an Officer-led original decision without due governance. Plus, Magna is not within the required "safe, acceptable walking distance" of the school in Parva and development is unsustainable so does not meet LP policy or NPPF

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove 'public house' from SRV criteria list for discriminatory reasons outlined.

Remove 'the Claybrookes' as an SRV.

**Response:**

The decision to make The Claybrookes (as well as Great Easton with Bringham and Church and East Langton) combined SRVs is fully supported by the evidence as set out in the Report to the Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel on 17 October 2016 and is supported as an approach by paragraph 55 of the NPPF which states that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. The existence of a public house is a recognised measure of the sustainability of a community because it offers a social centre as well as the potential to host other community facilities (e.g. a shop or post office). The sale of alcohol does not prevent its use by those whose religion does not permit alcohol. The evidence shows that the primary school is within safe walking distance.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6732 TILTON ON THE HILL Parish Council (Jenny Saville) [2686]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Tilton on the Hill should be reclassified in the settlement hierarchy as 'Other Villages and Rural Settlements'.  
No GP surgery or primary school within acceptable walking distance. The library van calls monthly, 4 residents access this service, thus a threat of withdrawal. Post office is an outreach service two afternoons a week, with staff departure closure possible. Public house closed on 20th July and will remain so for the foreseeable future.  
Tilton has a shop.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The re-classification of Tilton from Selected Rural Village to Other Villages and Rural Settlements

**Response:**

Closure of the public house is noted. However, the community has access to 2 key services within the village.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7336 Barwood Homes [6492]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Settlement Profile for Great Bowden confirms that with 4 out of the 6 key services, it has the level of services to become upgraded from a Selected Rural Village to a Rural Centre. Barwood Homes considers that the spatial strategy for the district should be amended so that Great Bowden is upgraded from a Selected Rural Village to a Rural Centre.

**Response:**

The proximity of Great Bowden to Market Harborough means that it does not perform a Rural Centre role as defined owing to its close relationship with Market Harborough. Even if it were to be reclassified as a Rural Centre, the housing requirement is still likely to be exceeded by the amount of committed development.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5436 Mrs Jan Butcher [4328]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Object to the spatial strategy. Conflicts in part with HDC's own data ; specifically Claybrooke Magna PC has submitted considerable evidence to show it should not be selected as an SRV but HDC has refused to listen ; indeed policies within the Local Plan have been changed retrospectively without due process or effective governance in order to justify the designation. There needs to be proper consultation that actually involves listening to local people and reviewing the evidence properly, not simply a tick box exercise going through the motions to justify a decision

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan should exclude The Claybookes from SRV designation

**Response:**

This is the first time that the policies in the Local Plan have been subject to consultation. They have not been changed retrospectively.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7148 Marrons Solicitors (Mr Matthew Roe) [4620]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support Bitteswell's allocation as a Select Rural Village based on the level of local services and proximity to the strategic road network

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7153 Alpha Investments [6478]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support due to settlement size, services and strategic road network proximity

**Response:**

Note. Not clear whether this refers to a particular settlement or the hierarchy generally.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7352 Davidsons Developments Limited [4740]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We welcome the allocation of housing for Selected Rural Villages and consider that Dunton Bassett and Gilmorton represent a sustainable village with good access to local amenities and services. These settlements ideally placed to deliver some level of housing growth for the District to meet local housing need for rural communities and support village amenities and services.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5810 Mr Paul Johnson [953]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Development should not be focussed solely on the market towns and a few larger villages - this is contrary to the requirements of the Framework and will not positively provide opportunities for communities to thrive, be mixed and balanced and will instead act as a barrier to otherwise appropriate, small scale housing. As such, the objectives of the Framework will not be met at the expense of one aspect of it.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Some modest scale organic growth should be allowed for taking account of local circumstances (i.e. location within other built form, previously land uses, etc.) as well as the scale, form, character and context to be framework compliant and to allow communities to thrive.

**Response:**

The Core Strategy approach to distribution (outside the SDAs) was found sound in 2011 and is in line with the principles of sustainable development which is the golden thread running through the NPPF. It is not contrary to the NPPF which states that development should be located where the need to travel will be minimised. Locating rural development away from Rural Centres and SRVs would increase travel by unsustainable modes. Nevertheless, some small scale development for local needs, and the conversion, rebuilding or replacement of existing buildings is allowed at settlements outside Rural Centres and SRVs. Allowing general housing at locations within the built form of such settlements would lead to excessive amounts of unsustainable development given the number of settlements (67) below SRV level, the extent of such 'infill' sites and their attractiveness to the market.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6744 Mr Carl Hunt [861]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I wish for Sutton in the Elms to be stated as a settlement in its own right - on the basis that it has heritage dating to at least the 11thC, is mentioned in the Domesday Book and fundamental to its heritage is the Quaker Cottage and the Baptist Church, both holding significant historical interest.

**Response:**

The Settlement Profile for Broughton Astley states that Sutton in the Elms forms part of the Broughton Astley local community but still retains an element of physical separation from the main village. As such the separate identity of Sutton in the Elms is recognised.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6925 Mrs Janet McKeag [6426]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The opinions of the people who live in the village where the proposed development is sited should be the first consideration.

Research shows there are already enough planning consents in place to meet demands until 2020.

Brexit will influence the decreased need for housing.

Loss of habitat will worsen the biodiversity in these areas.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan should allow building on green sites in these villages ( or other areas ) .

**Response:**

The Plan must make provision for the period beyond 2020 to 2031 at least. While the opinions of local people are important, they are not the only factor in determining both the amount and location of development. There is no evidence of the impact of Brexit on house demand. The loss of habitat and impact on biodiversity are addressed in Policies GD2 c and GI5.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5781 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is not clear that all houses designed, built, planning submitted, planning approved etc prior to the date of the finalisation of this plan have or will be incorporated into the total numbers proposed..

This plan is for the period 2011 to 2031

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Make it clear what is or is not included and provide absolute numbers against the time frame of this plan.

**Response:**

The plan includes commitments and completions to 31 March 2017. The housing figures will be updated to include completions and commitments from 1st April 2011 to 31st March 2018 before adoption of the Local Plan.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5936 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The number of dwellings given is an approximate number with no means of checking when or how this target has been reached

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Give an absolute number of dwellings and indicate how progress towards this target is to be measured

**Response:**

In accordance with good practice, figures are expressed as 'about' to avoid spurious precision which is not necessary. H1 defines whether they are minima or maxima or 'about' depending on the circumstances. This does not prevent monitoring which will be done as described Chapter 12 and Appendix K.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6636 CPRE Leicestershire (Mr Richard Windley) [4376]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire believes these housing figures are too high. An OAN of 463 for Harborough based on the 2031 trends assumptions would seem more than adequate to meet the genuine demographic and economic needs of Harborough. There is no clear reason for a market signals uplift or for additional housing to meet the need at Magna Park, which is amply provided for already. Please see attached document.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Housing figures should be recalculated.

**Response:**

The Council does not accept that the housing figures are inflated and considers that they are a well evidenced reflection of need with additional reasonable flexibility to meet growth at Magna Park, unmet needs from elsewhere and unexpected factors such a delay, non-implementation and market choice.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7169 Mr Nelson Renner [6137]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Local Plan period does not comply with the NPPF requirement to plan for a 15-year time horizon. Additional information within the Leicester Housing Market Area is emerging in January 2018, which could place greater demands on Harborough District to accommodate unmet housing needs. The Local Plan does not robustly address the Duty to Cooperate. It is expected that the adoption of the Local Plan will have to be delayed to address these unmet housing needs. Any delay will reduce the plan period further, and the local plan will not be in accordance with the NPPF.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Extend the plan period to 2036, the same timescale used within the Objective Housing Need Assessment. In doing so, the plan would comply with the NPPF requirements for a 15-year time horizon, with an added margin to take account of further changes required to housing numbers.

**Response:**

The 15 year plan period is not a NPPF requirement. The NPPF states that Local Plan should 'be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon.' The Council is confident that it has addressed Duty to Cooperate matters, as set out in its Duty to Cooperate Statement, and that there will be no delays from this source. Consideration was given to extending the Plan Period to 2036, but this was rejected partly on the basis that the identification of growth beyond 2031 should be in the context of the Strategic Growth Plan.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7440 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Council state that this housing provision will cater for unmet needs from elsewhere in HMA, slower than expected delivery, non-implementation of existing consents, economic change, and flexibility and choice in the housing market. This is somewhat confusing. The housing need that the Council is proposing to meet should be clearly stated. Furthermore the derivation of that housing need should be based on evidence which is transparent and easily understood. It is recommended that the Council provides further clarification by undertaking additional work on its OAHN and housing requirement before the Harborough Local Plan is submitted for examination. Implications of the Government's proposed standard methodology should be considered.

**Response:**

The housing need that is being met is clearly stated in paragraph 5.1.3 as 532 dwellings per annum, based on the evidence in the HEDNA. The housing requirement is also clearly stated in paragraph 5.1.4 as 557 dwellings, after taking account also of the evidence in the Magna Park Employment Growth Sensitivity Study. The provision after that relates to the other factors referred to in the representation. It is not possible to be more specific about the amount of this that will constitute Leicester's unmet need pending further work by them on their Local Plan. Once known this will also form part of the housing requirement. It is considered that there will remain sufficient flexibility in the provision figure (640 pa) to cover the other factors. The plan is to be submitted before 31 March 2018 so the implications of the Government's proposed standard methodology are not relevant.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7476 Jelson Homes Limited [3965]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Jelson's concern centres on the total number and proportion of all dwellings (58%) expected to be delivered by the 2 proposed SDA's.

Extremely concerned that;

- the entire strategy (market & affordable housing) is heavily reliant upon 2 large scale, complex SDA's and is high risk
- the evidence from experience (in Leics) suggests that the SDA/SUE approach has not yet been proven to be successful in securing housing delivery.
- the experience of Airfield Farm (6yrs since original permission, yet to deliver a dwelling) highlights the long lead in periods required for SDA's
- the SDA's won't deliver in the timescales set out in the proposed housing trajectory

Overall the strategy places too much reliance on a small number of large sites and anticipated delivery rates are wholly unrealistic, making it ineffective and unlikely to deliver the required level of housing.

Jelson do not object to SDA's as a matter of principle. However, aspirations for them need to be realistic and they should form part of a balanced approach allowing a range of smaller sites in a wider range of locations.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is considered that the Draft Local Plan can only be considered sound if either

- a) the reliance on the SDAs is reduced by allocating additional development to smaller but equally sustainable settlements , or
- b) the Draft Local Plan includes a clear strategy for allowing development to come forward in other locations if delivery issues with the SDAs arise.

**Response:**

The two SDAs only account for 21% of total provision over the plan period, or 26% dwellings not yet built. There are already nearly 5,500 existing commitments (comprising 53% of unbuilt provision) to deliver in the early years of the remaining plan period. Nevertheless the Council is committed to working collaboratively with the SDA promoters to deliver the SDAs in accordance with the agreed delivery rates in the plan period, including the establishment of a dedicated delivery team and Planning Performance Agreements. In this way the Council will learn from the Airfield Farm (Market Harborough SDA) experience. There is no need to allocate further smaller sites since, in addition to commitments, nearly 1,200 dwellings are allocated on such sites in Market Harborough and Fleckney and over 1,000 will come forward on non-allocated and Neighbourhood Plan sites, most of which will be attractive to the market, including self-build. The plan already includes, in Policy IMR 1, a clear strategy by which development could come forward in the medium term in the event of unexpected delays in SDA delivery. This proposes an early review which will enable emerging factors such as the Strategic Growth Plan, new previously unassessed sites and the Local Plans of adjoining authorities to be taken into account in a comprehensive and strategic manner rather than committing prematurely to 'reserve sites' that have not been fully assessed, either in terms of their site-specific issues and benefits or in terms of their strategic fit.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

7586 Messers Herbert [6535]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Objections are made to SS1 "The spatial strategy", Policy H1 "Provision of new housing, Policy BE1 "Provision of new business development" and Policy BE2 "Strategic distribution" insofar as the draft Plan not is not:

- \* Positively Prepared as it fails to meet objectively assessed development needs and infrastructure requirements;
- \* Justified in that the plan is not based on the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives;
- \* Effective in that the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- \* Consistent with national policy as the plan does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF.

The landowners object to the failure of the Council to recognise the potential to:

- \* Identify land within Whetstone Pastures as a future logistics park; and more over
- \* Recognise the ability of land within Whetstone Pastures to deliver a new Garden Village as part of a large strategic allocation extending over the administrative boundaries of both Blaby and Harborough.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proposed Modifications

21 In order to make the Plan sound it is submitted that the following modifications are made:

- \* SS1 - The Spatial Strategy amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future housing and logistics needs for the Harborough District during the period 2011 to 2031;
- \* Policy H1 - Provision for new housing similarly amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future housing needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031;
- \* Policy BE1 - Provision of new business development similarly amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future logistics needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031; and
- \* Policy BE2 - Strategic Distribution to be amended to make provision for future logistics needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031.

22 The precise wording of any changes should be carefully considered through cross-party working with Blaby to recognise, not only the cross-boundary nature of the Garden Village but also, that the majority of the land needed to deliver the Garden Village falls within Blaby.

**Response:**

The Council has not been formally asked to consider inclusion of a Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures in the Local Plan, either at Options stage or subsequently. Although it was aware of the potential for strategic distribution at a new motorway junction in this location, and indeed considered this as part of the Second Interim SA Report Appraising Options for Strategic Distribution Growth (Feb 2016), it considered that the scheme was insufficiently advanced to be included in the Local Plan and that it would be included, if necessary, in a future review of the Local Plan following approval of the Strategic Growth Plan for the period beyond 2031. It also does not meet the criteria for provision set out in the SPSS (2014) and SPSS Update (2016) in that it does not form an extension to an existing strategic distribution site. With regard to the proposed garden Village, it is premature to make decisions on such a major growth point in advance of the SGP and too late in the Local Plan to consider this as an alternative/addition to the SDAs, with delivery likely to be post 2031. To introduce this site at this stage would involve revisiting earlier consultation (on the Options document) and assessments (on the Options and Selected Options) and could delay the Local Plan, and therefore the delivery of much needed housing and employment growth, contrary to the NPPF and Government policy.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

7590 Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance [6527]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst our client does not wish to explicitly comment on the merits or otherwise of individual sites proposed for allocation, a key issue of soundness for any local plan is whether the proposed housing allocations are deliverable and likely to result in the required level of completions.

To ensure that the plan is positively prepared and stands the best chance of meeting identified housing need, the Council should consider the allocation of developable reserve sites together with a suitable mechanism to allow their release during the plan period, as may be necessary.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

To ensure that the plan is positively prepared and stands the best chance of meeting identified housing need, the Council should consider the allocation of developable reserve sites together with a suitable mechanism to allow their release during the plan period, as may be necessary.

**Response:**

The two SDAs only account for 21% of total provision over the plan period, or 26% dwellings not yet built. The Council is committed to working collaboratively with the SDA promoters to deliver the SDAs in accordance with the agreed delivery rates in the plan period. The plan already includes, in Policy IMR 1, a clear strategy by which development could come forward in the medium term in the event of unexpected delays in SDA delivery. This proposes an early review which will enable emerging factors such as the Strategic Growth Plan, new previously unassessed sites and the Local Plans of adjoining authorities to be taken into account in a comprehensive and strategic manner rather than committing prematurely to 'reserve sites'.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

5361 Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd [5909]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There are objections to the methodology employed within the HEDNA with regard to UPC; whether the projections have been rebased appropriately; the shortfall which has already accrued not being taken account of; the artificial adjustment of commuting rates; and the employment rates disregarding the participation rates of cohorts, being inconsistent with Government projections, and relying upon a fundamental change in behaviour.

The distribution of the unmet needs across the HMA is unavailable, but it would appear that the Local Plan does not make sufficient allowance.

There is also no contingency which is required to align with the NPPF.

See full text.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The assumptions within the HEDNA should be clarified and/or amended to ensure that they are consistent with best practice, Inspectors findings elsewhere, justified, and policy-off.

Once this is done, the Memorandum of Understanding should be prepared and put to consultation prior to submission.

This evidence is necessary to determine the appropriate housing requirement and contingency for inclusion in the Local Plan.

**Response:**

It is considered that the HEDNA is consistent with best practice and is fully justified. No concerns were raised about it by the Inspector at the North West Leicester DC Local Plan Hearing.

With regard to the level of contingency allowed for in the Local Plan, this is considered to be adequate on the basis of information available.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6672 Rugby Borough Council (Mr Martin Needham) [6402]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not clear from the plan or supporting evidence how the impact and effects of the proposals on the highway network and transport outside of the Leicestershire boundary has been considered. The Jacobs Preliminary Impact Assessment 2016 appears to exclude areas outside of Leicestershire, even though there are main routes adjoining or crossing into neighbouring counties (A5 and A426, near to Magna Park and Lutterworth proposals), and analysis is not apparent in other documents. Query whether sufficient consultation has taken place with Warwickshire County Council Highways Authority. Unclear how the figures used in the Jacobs Preliminary Transport Assessment 2016 relate to the local plan targets. Clarification should be given as to how the total amount of growth proposed in the plan has been tested in the assessment and appropriate mitigation identified.

**Response:**

Warwickshire County Council Highways Authority has subsequently confirmed that they have no objections to the Harborough Proposed Submission Local Plan (please see the Duty to Co-operate Statement for further details). The Jacobs Preliminary Transport Assessment 2016 is a robust assessment of the transportation implications of the Local Plan development options and forms part of the transportation and highways evidence base which has informed the preparation of the Local Plan.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7632 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no correlation of the figures in H1 (refers in 5.1.8 to 557 per annum or 11140 over the plan period) and SS1 2a which states a minimum of 12800 (but should state a maximum). All of this is very confusing and it will be difficult to implement and to achieving a clear basis on which a 5 year housing supply is calculated which is clear and defensible.

**Response:**

The figure of 11,140 (557 per annum) is the housing requirement after adding 25 dwellings per annum to the OAN in the HEDNA (532 per annum). The housing provision of 12,800 (640 per annum) adds a further contingency of 15% to take account of potential unmet needs arising from Leicester City plus other factors as listed in paragraph 5.1.10. All this is clearly set out in paragraphs 5.1.3 to 5.1.11 of the Local Plan. The 5 year housing land supply will be based on the housing requirement, currently 557 per annum (see paragraph 5.1.8) but rising from this once the extent of Leicester's unmet need to be met in the Harborough District is known and agreed.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6257 The Cooperative Estates (Richard Lomas) [3906]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Co-op supports the Council's aim of delivering a minimum of 12,800 dwellings over the Plan period.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6715 Oadby and Wigston Borough Council (Mr Jamie Carr) [6413]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Harborough Local Plan Spatial Strategy makes provision for the development of a minimum of 12,800 new homes between 2011 and 2031. This is above the Objectively Assessed Need for the District of Harborough of 10,640 new homes over the same period, as identified in the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment.

Policy SS1 Spatial Strategy is consistent with the evidence base relating to the wider Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area and as such, is supported by Oadby and Wigston Borough Council.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7258 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

13. In general terms the distribution of housing across the settlement hierarchy is supported; however, considers that there needs to be more clarity regarding the future housing needs of key settlements and seeks more flexibility for future housing numbers for smaller settlements.

**Response:**

Noted. The future needs of key settlements are set out in background evidence. NPPF states that development should be located where the need to travel will be minimised. Locating rural development away from Rural Centres and SRVs would increase travel by unsustainable modes. Policy GD4 sets out criteria for housing in the countryside. Allowing general housing at locations within such settlements would lead to excessive amounts of unsustainable development given the number of settlements (67) below SRV level, the extent of such 'infill' sites and their attractiveness to the market.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5631 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We do not understand why Magna Park requires 1000 additional houses.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

None proposed

**Response:**

Magna Park does not require 1000 dwellings. The additional housing requirement identified by the Magna Park Employment Sensitivity Study is 500 dwellings over the plan period.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6164 Mr Sam Weller [5081]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Development east of the the M1 can never be integrated into Lutterworth and so would not work.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Development should be considered on brown-field sites along Leicester Road and on land south of the A4303. The golf course could be moved to land east of the M1.

**Response:**

The proposed SDA would be a separate community but well-connected to Lutterworth by sustainable transport. Brownfield sites would be insufficient to meet the requirement. Relocation of the golf course would not deliver the benefits of long-term traffic reduction in Lutterworth town centre. Dealt with in more detail in response to reps on Policy L1.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5633 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire does not understand where the housing figures for Scraftoft have come from. They are certainly not in the Neighbourhood Plan. Are these houses proposed as part of the duty to co-operate with Leicester City? If so how was the figure arrived at?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This is more a question than a specified change

**Response:**

The Neighbourhood Plan was prepared in the context of the 2011 Core Strategy. The figures in the Local Plan include a proportionate share of the requirement for Scraftoft/ Thurnby and Bushby but also meet the District-wide demographic need, including the flexibility to contribute towards unmet needs in Leicester City, as necessary.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6595 Mr Niles Holroyde [6378]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scale and nature of development.  
Loss of Nature Reserve  
Loss of trees on Golf Course.  
Traffic disruption  
Impact on social infrastructure

**Change To Plan Sought:**

At the very least there needs to be a policy link between the provision of the new Leicester Eastern Bypass and the release of any development land at Scraftoft Golf Course.

**Response:**

Mitigation for these issues is contained in Policy SC1. Provision of the 'new Leicester bypass' is not going to take place until after the plan period and so to await this would mean that the SDA would not meet housing needs for 2011-2031.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6616 Mr David Campbell [6269]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft has been intensively built in a short space to time. It should be more evenly distributed throughout the district.

**Response:**

There is spread of development between the three major urban areas, with this SDA being sustainable because of its proximity to Leicester City and the Leicester Principal Urban Area.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6725 Ms Shaveen Akhtar [4979]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The area is saturated with houses and cars already. Further development will completely overpower the local community and identity.

The congestion on Station Lane in peak hours is evidence that the nature of the area has been transformed and will be further with this development proposal. Also, the infrastructure is not present to support the population growth intended.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Please build elsewhere.

**Response:**

Infrastructure, including off-site highway mitigation measures, is provided for through Policy SC1.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7549 Jelson Ltd [221]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

To help address the identified housing needs of the HMA, the Local Plan should allocate the Scraptoft East SDA for an additional 2,700 homes over the Plan period (3,900 homes total including the Scraptoft North site).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Local Plan should allocate the Scraptoft East SDA for an additional 2,700 homes over the Plan period (3,900 homes total including the Scraptoft North site).

Policy SS1, part 2.a.iii - should refer to the Scraptoft East SDA for 3,900 dwellings.

**Response:**

Most of the additional land proposed was considered and rejected in the analysis of the potential Scraptoft SDA included in the Options Consultation (Sept- Oct 2015). This amount of additional development would be in on top of commitments of 950 dwellings as well as 1200 in the proposed SDA at Scraptoft North. An additional 2,700 dwellings is unlikely to be deliverable within the plan period. Building on the land indicated would threaten the identity of the communities of Scraptoft and Thurnby / Busby by building on land between them, identified as Green Wedge, by extending development into countryside to the east and by introducing housing at a rate which would be too fast to enable new residents to be integrated into the communities. To introduce this site at this stage would involve revisiting earlier assessments (on the Options and Selected Options) and could delay the Local Plan, and therefore the delivery of much needed housing and employment growth by at least a year, contrary to the NPPF and Government policy more generally. Decisions on any further allocations in this area can be left until after the approval of the Strategic Growth Plan, thus ensuring comprehensive strategic planning of the south and east Leicester periphery.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5445 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Sound.

This is supported provided the necessary infrastructure such as roads, schools , public transport, health facilities are provided at the time of construction and are fit for purpose. Existing services of this nature are under immense pressure and unable to support the proposed number of dwellings and residents .

A planned community is not just another housing estate.

A major concern is that the consequential traffic flow through Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby without major highway improvements will make existing inadequate roads more dangerous and affect Community cohesion .

What regard has been paid to Air Quality for existing residents?

**Response:**

Noted. Policy SC1 requires the infrastructure be provided in line with specified trigger points. Policy requires a sustainable and high quality living environment and a masterplan. Improvements to traffic circulation are proposed to relieve traffic in village centre.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6261 The Cooperative Estates (Richard Lomas) [3906]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- The Local Plan should allocate 790 dwellings rather than relying on Neighbourhood Plans to deliver these allocations.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete reference to 1,170 dwellings in (iv) and substitute with reference to 1,960 dwellings.

Delete reference to 790 dwellings on non-allocated sites or sites to be allocated in neighbourhood plans for Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages;

**Response:**

The Local Plan allocates some 79% of the residual requirement with a further 5% on windfall sites in the urban areas. Only 16% is to be found on unallocated sites, including through neighbourhood plans. This is considered to be a modest amount, considering the Council's support for local decision-making as set out in Local Plan Objective 14. The Council has a good record in encouraging and supporting neighbourhood plans and a large number have already been delivered with sufficient allocations to meet their Local Plan housing requirements. The strength of the housing market also means that smaller sites can be expected to come forward through the development management process. To allocate small sites would considerably delay the Local Plan process.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6394

**Catesby Property Group (Mr Edward Barrett) [5772]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Currently the Harborough Local Plan is considered unsound because it fails to identify sufficient allocations to ensure that the full objectively assessed housing need for District is met. At present, too much of the District's residual housing requirement is proposed to be delivered on non-allocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans. Relying on these mechanisms to deliver a significant proportion of the District's housing requirement provides no guarantee that the Local Plan will deliver the District's identified housing need.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to make the Plan sound, it is considered that Policies SS1 and H1 should be modified to identify additional residential allocations in Fleckney. This modification is necessary to increase the percentage of the District's residual housing requirement which will be delivered on allocated sites. At present, over half (56%) of Fleckney's minimum housing requirement is proposed to be delivered on sites allocated in a Neighbourhood Plan. In order to provide the greatest certainty that the minimum housing requirement for the settlement will be delivered, it is considered that an additional allocation on land south of Kilby Road, Fleckney should be identified. Any forthcoming Neighbourhood Plan would then have the opportunity to identify additional allocations over and above the minimum requirement.

In order to make the Plan sound, Policy F1 should be amended to allocate land south of Kilby Road, Fleckney for 150 homes. The site is situated to the west of Fleckney, accessed from Priest Meadow. It has capacity for 150 dwellings. The site is well located for local services and facilities in Fleckney village centre and was judged to be deliverable over 0 to 5 years in the SHLAA. The SHLAA identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Fleckney.

Accompanying these representations is a Vision Framework for the proposed residential allocation on land south of Kilby Road, Fleckney. A separate Location Plan for the site is also enclosed. The enclosed Vision Framework demonstrates that the 7 hectare site is deliverable and capable of appropriately accommodating up to 150 dwellings.

**Response:**

The Local Plan allocates some 79% of the residual requirement with a further 5% on windfall sites in the urban areas. Only 16% is to be found on unallocated sites, including through neighbourhood plans. This is considered to be a modest amount, considering the Council's support for local decision-making as set out in Local Plan Objective 14. The Council has a good record in encouraging and supporting neighbourhood plans, including at Fleckney, and a large number have already been delivered with sufficient allocations to meet their Local Plan housing requirements. The strength of the housing market also means that smaller sites can be expected to come forward through the development management process.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7444 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is concern over the reliance on non-allocated and / or Neighbourhood Plan allocations to meet a significant proportion of the District's residual HLS. This provides no guarantee that the Local Plan itself will deliver the District's housing needs. It is suggested that further allocations in lower rural tiers of the settlement hierarchy are needed.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is suggested that further allocations in lower rural tiers of the settlement hierarchy are needed.

**Response:**

The Local Plan allocates some 79% of the residual requirement with a further 5% on windfall sites in the urban areas. Only 16% is to be found on unallocated sites, including through neighbourhood plans. This is considered to be a modest amount, considering the Council's support for local decision-making as set out in Local Plan Objective 14. The Council has a good record in encouraging and supporting Local Plans, and a large number have already been delivered with sufficient allocations to meet their Local Plan housing requirements. The strength of the housing market also means that smaller sites can be expected to come forward through the development management process. To allocate small sites would considerably delay the Local Plan process and risk delay to the delivery of the larger and more important strategic sites.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7614 Taylor Wimpey [6529]

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst support is given to the settlement hierarchy contained within Draft Policy SS1, this policy does not specifically direct any development to Broughton Astley despite the settlement being identified as capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment. Passing reference is made to 'made Neighbourhood Plans'.

Policy SS1 criteria v) and vi) make allowance for 'non-allocated' and 'windfall sites' but these are directed to the less sustainable settlements in the District rather than the Key Centres. This is not considered to be a positively prepared policy.

This approach is similarly repeated at Draft Policy GD2 'Settlement Development' and Draft Policy H1.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is considered that the Harborough Local Plan should not remain silent about growth at Broughton Astley within the emerging plan over the period 2011 - 2031. Broughton Astley is a Key Centre within the District which can accommodate growth. Robust evidence should be provided about the capacity of the settlement to accommodate additional growth notwithstanding the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Broughton Neighbourhood Plan (2014) was prepared in the context of the Harborough District Core Strategy and covers the plan period 2013- 2028. The Broughton Neighbourhood Plan recognises at section 3.16 that "The Plan will be reviewed periodically to ensure that it takes into account possible changes in national planning policy or to the Harborough District strategic planning policy framework." As such the Neighbourhood Plan will be reviewed during the lifetime of the District Plan and Harborough District Council should be setting a strategic framework to assist this review.

Furthermore paragraph 1.6.7. of the Proposed Submission Local Plan states "...neighbourhood plans should be in general conformity with all policies in this Local Plan."

**Response:**

There is no need for further allocations in Broughton Astley which already meets more than its proportionate share of the housing requirements through the allocations in its Neighbourhood Plan. To allocate additional land for development in the absence of need for development and contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan would undermine confidence in the neighbourhood planning process.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7407 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Gladman consider the Local Plan to be justified in identifying land to deliver a minimum of 12,800 dwellings in order to provide a 15% contingency in the supply of housing land in order to allow for possible future circumstances affect the supply of housing in the district.

Gladman have some concerns with the Local Plan providing about 790 dwellings on non-allocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans as there is no guarantee that this source of housing land supply will actually be delivered. In order to ensure that the Local Plan is actually deliverable. The Council will need robust evidence to prove that this source of supply will come forward within the plan period.

**Response:**

The Local Plan allocates some 79% of the residual requirement with a further 5% on windfall sites in the urban areas. Only 16% is to be found on unallocated sites, including through neighbourhood plans. This is considered to be a modest amount, considering the Council's support for local decision-making as set out in Local Plan Objective 14. The Council has a good record in encouraging and supporting Local Plans, and a large number have already been delivered with sufficient allocations to meet their Local Plan housing requirements. The strength of the housing market also means that smaller sites can be expected to come forward through the development management process

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5606 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

please clarify if this means villages other than those designated as selected rural villages or rural centres. If so should it not refer as development 'in the open countryside. Where Neighbourhood Plans have been made in selected rural villages and sites designated, there should be restrictions on development of sites outside the designated areas - otherwise it ridicules Neighbourhood Planning.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In selected Rural Villages, where development sites have been designated through Neighbourhood Planning, development will be allowed only if there is an overriding proven local need.

**Response:**

This refers to windfall sites in the urban areas of Market Harborough, Lutterworth, Broughton Astley and the Principal Urban Area. In calculating the windfall allowance no account was taken of villages outside the Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages since there is a presumption against development there (SS1 9) except in very exceptional circumstances (Policies GD 4 and 5 and H3). Any dwellings coming forward under these exceptional policies, as well as through neighbourhood plans that are in general conformity with the Local Plan, would be de minimis.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6547 Mrs Linda Bryan [6238]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I hope the District Plan will allow for reasonable development within the village to ensure its future as a community rather than an exclusive private estate for the few.

**Response:**

Arnesby does not meet the criteria for a Selected Rural Village as it only has one of the key services (a primary school). However Policy GD4 does permit housing on small sites of no more than 4 dwellings which are physically and visually connected to the settlement and which meet a local need for housing.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7587 Messers Herbert [6535]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Objections are made to SS1 "The spatial strategy", Policy H1 "Provision of new housing, Policy BE1 "Provision of new business development" and Policy BE2 "Strategic distribution" insofar as the draft Plan not is not:

- \* Positively Prepared as it fails to meet objectively assessed development needs and infrastructure requirements;
- \* Justified in that the plan is not based on the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives;
- \* Effective in that the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- \* Consistent with national policy as the plan does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF.

The landowners object to the failure of the Council to recognise the potential to:

- \* Identify land within Whetstone Pastures as a future logistics park; and more over
- \* Recognise the ability of land within Whetstone Pastures to deliver a new Garden Village as part of a large strategic allocation extending over the administrative boundaries of both Blaby and Harborough.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

21 In order to make the Plan sound it is submitted that the following modifications are made:

- \* SS1 - The Spatial Strategy amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future housing and logistics needs for the Harborough District during the period 2011 to 2031;
- \* Policy H1 - Provision for new housing similarly amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future housing needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031;
- \* Policy BE1 - Provision of new business development similarly amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future logistics needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031; and
- \* Policy BE2 - Strategic Distribution to be amended to make provision for future logistics needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031.

22 The precise wording of any changes should be carefully considered through cross-party working with Blaby to recognise, not only the cross-boundary nature of the Garden Village but also, that the majority of the land needed to deliver the Garden Village falls within Blaby.

**Response:**

The Council has not been formally asked to consider inclusion of a Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures in the Local Plan, either at Options stage or subsequently. Although it was aware of the potential for strategic distribution at a new motorway junction in this location, and indeed considered this as part of the Second Interim SA Report Appraising Options for Strategic Distribution Growth (Feb 2016), it considered that the scheme was insufficiently advanced to be included in the Local Plan and that it would be included, if necessary, in a future review of the Local Plan following approval of the Strategic Growth Plan for the period beyond 2031. It also does not meet the criteria for provision set out in the SPSS (2014) and SPSS Update (2016) in that it does not form an extension to an existing strategic distribution site.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6717 Oadby and Wigston Borough Council (Mr Jamie Carr) [6413]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Spatial Strategy also makes provision for upwards of 58 hectares of employment land between 2011 and 2031. Policy SS1 Spatial Strategy is consistent with the evidence base relating to the wider Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area and as such, is supported by Oadby and Wigston Borough Council.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5942 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Is the land to the east of Lutterworth to be developed as an extension to the warehousing existing? If this is the case then the area allocated does not match the requirements of future employment. Warehousing demands a large area of land with relatively few jobs

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Give a better explanation of what is to happen at the east of Lutterworth

**Response:**

The warehousing proposed south-east of junction 20 (13 has.) is for non-strategic distribution (less than 9,000 sq m). The remaining allocation at east of Lutterworth (10 has.) is for general employment use (B1 and B2).

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7250 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The County Council supports the new employment land allocated in association with the Lutterworth SDA and recognises a similar approach is not necessarily appropriate with the Scraftoft North SDA with opportunities to access existing B use employment sites and proximity and ease of access to the City for employment.

**Response:**

Noted.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5553 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The LLEP studies identify a need for additional (i.e. new build) non-rail served warehousing/ distribution space in Leicestershire. The 700,000 sq.m proposed in BE2 'Strategic Distribution' exceed the forecast for the entire LLEP area for 2031 while ignoring consents given by councils in Leicestershire since 2014, which themselves meet the minimum forecast requirements up to 2031, thus contributing to a potential significant over-supply of warehousing/ distribution space and the skewing of the job market towards low-skilled, low-paid jobs, heavy in-commuting from areas with higher unemployment and a mismatch with available housing.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Policy BE2 should either be dropped or amended to retain the council's 2011 Core Strategy (policy 7j) which rules out extending Magna Park. Harborough has already breached the Core Strategy in 2016 by approving 15/00919/FUL, a 100,844 sq.m. warehouse/distribution centre for DHL on land adjoining Magna Park. The Core Strategy stated &quot; ... there are more suitable locations and sites (both rail and non rail-linked) than Magna Park within the region and sub-region to meet forecast need for strategic distribution to 2026.&quot; (Paragraph 5.73). The Submission Plan does not now make the opposite claim, i.e. that there aren't any &quot;more suitable locations&quot; within the region, so nothing has changed.

**Response:**

These concerns are best addressed in response to representations received in relation to Policy BE2.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5783 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This type of development generates poor quality, low payed jobs and the area proposed sees already large numbers of people travelling daily to existing warehousing

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Re consider the location of more warehousing

**Response:**

Previous evidence has explored employment and skills within the sector, and examined common misconceptions. Although operatives and elementary positions account for a higher proportion of jobs across the sector, compared to the whole economy, the sector does provide jobs across all occupational groupings appropriate to skill levels across the qualification spectrum. Policy BE2 seeks to reduce the amount of in-commuting from outside the District and to increase the use of sustainable modes.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6375 Mr Kevin O'Neill [6290]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plan does not address properly:

- impact on traffic levels on both main routes and through villiages;
- currrent and future air quality issues;
- projected employment expectations from logistics developments which will be largely automated in the future;
- affordability of homes in the area and the increasing volume of commuters from outside the area;
- management of historic finds as the area is developed;

The plan appears to exhaust/exceed all the planned logistics development until 2031 in one hit and the plan does not provide for rail transport.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan does not show that:

- traffic will be managed within acceptable levels;
- air quality will be maintained at safe levels;
- there is/will be an available working population without driving up comuting into the area;
- future jobs derived from logistics developments will exist when the focus is on automation of warehouse operatinos.

**Response:**

These concerns are best addressed in response to representations received in relation to Policy BE2.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7274 Prologis UK Ltd. [5661]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Object for the following reasons:

- amount of employment land quoted in SS1.2c does not reflect an up to date position (no Ref. to planning consent 15/00919/FUL)
- it fails to clearly set out the scale and distribution of new employment development, including strategic B8, as a total minimum or maximum amount
- not based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements
- doesn't robustly justify the amount, more than double the requirement, for road-based strategic B8 development
- approach conflicts with strategic aims of NPPF, to reduce carbon emissions, and the National Networks Policy Statement (NPS) which prioritises distribution & warehousing sites served by rail.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to address the conflicts identified above and ensure that Policy SS1(2) (c) is sound, it is requested that Harborough Council:

1. Provides an up to date assessment of their existing employment commitments and allocations which is reflected in the drafting of the policy. This should include strategic B8 development given the scale of the proposals.
2. Provides evidence justifying why it is appropriate for the Council to extend Magna Park and justify why it is appropriate for the District to allocate more than double the requirement for non-rail served sites required in Leicestershire as well as delivering in excess of the gross land requirement for strategic B8 development for Leicester and Leicestershire by 2031 in one location.
3. Provides evidence that the Council has robustly fulfilled its duty to cooperate with regards to meeting the concerns of Daventry and North West Leicestershire in terms of allocating in excess of the identified need for the whole of Leicester and Leicestershire in one location.

**Response:**

These concerns are best addressed in response to representations received in relation to Policy BE2.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7588 Messers Herbert [6535]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Objections are made to SS1 "The spatial strategy", Policy H1 "Provision of new housing, Policy BE1 "Provision of new business development" and Policy BE2 "Strategic distribution" insofar as the draft Plan not is not:

- \* Positively Prepared as it fails to meet objectively assessed development needs and infrastructure requirements;
- \* Justified in that the plan is not based on the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives;
- \* Effective in that the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- \* Consistent with national policy as the plan does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF.

The landowners object to the failure of the Council to recognise the potential to:

- \* Identify land within Whetstone Pastures as a future logistics park; and more over
- \* Recognise the ability of land within Whetstone Pastures to deliver a new Garden Village as part of a large strategic allocation extending over the administrative boundaries of both Blaby and Harborough.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

21 In order to make the Plan sound it is submitted that the following modifications are made:

- \* SS1 - The Spatial Strategy amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future housing and logistics needs for the Harborough District during the period 2011 to 2031;
- \* Policy H1 - Provision for new housing similarly amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future housing needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031;
- \* Policy BE1 - Provision of new business development similarly amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future logistics needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031; and
- \* Policy BE2 - Strategic Distribution to be amended to make provision for future logistics needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031.

22 The precise wording of any changes should be carefully considered through cross-party working with Blaby to recognise, not only the cross-boundary nature of the Garden Village but also, that the majority of the land needed to deliver the Garden Village falls within Blaby.

**Response:**

The Council has not been formally asked to consider the inclusion of a Garden Village at Whetstone Park in the Local Plan, either at Options stage or subsequently. Although it was aware of the potential for strategic distribution at a new motorway junction in this location, and indeed considered this as part of the Second Interim SA Report Appraising Options for Strategic Distribution Growth (Feb 2016), it considered that the scheme was insufficiently advanced to be included in the Local Plan and that it would be included, if necessary, in a future review of the Local Plan following approval of the Strategic Growth Plan for the period beyond 2031. It also does not meet the criteria for provision set out in the SPSS (2014) and SPSS Update (2016) in that it does not form an extension to an existing strategic distribution site.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7330 **IDI Gazeley [168]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Supported because it recognises:

- the role the district plays in the sector
- Magna Park's role in the sector
- that with more employment there's a chance out-commuting for work could reduce
- consistency with LLEP Strategic Economic Plan & Midlands Engine for Growth strategy
- the evidence base commissioned by LLEP / Leicestershire authorities
- the need for a min. quantum of 608,000sq.m in the county, provided in market-facing locations, offering plots to meet increasing size needs of sector, with a sequential approach to site selection

**Response:**

Noted

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5784 **Mr John Martin [5974]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The land that is proposed for the SDA is quality farm land and other brownfield sites should be given priority

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Re visit these proposals

**Response:**

The importance of brownfield land is recognised by Objective 3 and Policy GD2 (2). However brownfield land is not sufficient to meet development needs.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6753 **Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Page 21, Section 3 - Propose the inclusion 'good accessibility to key destinations ' within this sentence.

**Response:**

This is implied by the reference to supporting employment areas, shopping centres and community facilities nearby. Policies L1 and SC1 refer to bus service improvements and other sustainable transport measures.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5910 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support provided that the SDAs do actually become high quality living environments, this needs to be monitored. A planned community is not just another housing estate.

**Response:**

Noted. Monitoring is proposed under Policy IMR1 and Appendix K (Objective No. 9 , page 280)

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6002 SCRAPTOFT Parish Council (Mr P Elliot) [4520]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I support this Policy providing the Scraptoft north development improves the infrastructure in the following ways:-  
GP surgery, Schools, Leisure Centre, Library, community café, and Shops.

I also consider that the development must safeguard the identity of Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby, particularly in regard to the traffic planning put into place entering and exiting the development.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy SC1 requires infrastructure provision, although it would be unrealistic to expect a leisure centre to be funded from this development. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5995 SCRAPTOFT Parish Council (Mr P Elliot) [4520]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I believe that Clause 4 fails as it does not safeguard the community's of Scraptoft Thurnby and Bushby. The Scraptoft North Development will render these villages just part of the expanding Leicester urban sprawl.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduction in the number of houses built at Scraptoft North particularly on the nature reserve.  
Retention of the Green wedge. to the north of Scraptoft Lane and to the west of Hamilton Lane.  
Buffer zone's between Scraptoft North and Hamilton Lane of Leicester.

**Response:**

Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5911 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support as safeguarding the identity of existing communities is vital and is not just about regenerating and developing the City ,Oadby and Wigston.

Furthermore developments should be planned and not just another housing estate tacked onto our villages.

Thurnby,Bushby and Scraftoft are already subject to immense pressure on road networks,schools health facilities etc. Existing services of this nature are at full capacity. A major concern to residents is that the consequential , increased traffic flow through these villages will make what are already inadequate roads in the heart of these villages even more dangerous and further worsen air quality .

**Response:**

Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby; but the council also has a duty to Cooperate with adjoining authorities in order to help meet their housing needs. Polcy SC1 addresses the other issues raised.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6758 Amanda Burrell [4075]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

It is essential to protect the identities of Thurnby, Bushby and Scraftoft.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7047 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

It is essential to safeguard the identity of existing communities in Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby.

**Response:**

Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7569 Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

This is essential as development encroaches.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5962 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The level of planned development in Market Harborough will intrinsically devalue it as a market town and an attractive place to live. As a resident the town is extremely difficult to get around and the proposed development will only increase congestion. It will no longer be compact in nature but a sprawling area of housing development. None of these areas have a core at the heart to promote community and 'getting to know your neighbour'. The town will become sterile and lose the ability to attract visitors that contribute to the economy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Level of development needs addressing unless facilities (Health, education, general infrastructure) in the town are adequate for the increase in the number of residents

**Response:**

Noted. Market Harborough housing allocation policies allow for infrastructure provision to be delivered in accordance with housing development.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6051 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is unclear what consolidate means in this instance.

Infrastructure is insufficient to support the level of development already planned and until highways and other infrastructure issues are addressed there should be no more housing development around Market Harborough and business development should be strictly managed.

Market Harborough has already been allocated large numbers of housing developments through the SDA, off Kettering Road and at off Northampton Road. It is important to get infrastructure in place before such developments are completed.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Define consolidate

**Response:**

The policy is 'subject to traffic and environmental constraints'. Policies MH1 - MH5 all require a financial contribution to the mitigation measures outlined in the Market Harborough Transport Strategy and each policy has specific infrastructure requirements.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5374 Ms Debs de Vries [5918]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The M1 will divide Lutterworth from the proposed development to the east. Integration will be impractical and effectively a new mini town would be left stranded and separate - not a community, a dormitory town. Shopping malls that are destined to part of this development will drain attention from the already struggling small market town of Lutterworth. If you want to improve the area then build nearer to Magna Park many of the jobs in Magna Park are low paid warehousing and people would benefit from low cost or social housing nearer to their place of employment

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Consider building new low cost homes near to Magna Park along the stretch of road from Coventry road to the rear of the A5. Many of the Magna Park jobs are low paid warehousing jobs. People walk or cycle to work. Low cost housing is desperately needed in the area to support young people and the needs of Magna Park, who bring in employees from further afield including Europe.

**Response:**

Although the SDA is intended to be largely self-contained, measures are also required by Policy L1 to ensure good sustainable transport and pedestrian links to Lutterworth for higher order services such as secondary schools, hospital and superstores. Shopping malls are not proposed, just a small supermarket and/or local shops to meet convenience needs. The spine road will enable environmental improvements to the town centre in the long run. Provision of new housing nearer to Magna Park instead would not have this benefit and would also not be large enough to meet all the District's housing needs.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6262 The Cooperative Estates (Richard Lomas) [3906]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Co-op objects to the unhelpful distinction made between Fleckney/Great Glen/The Kibworths and other Rural Centres, as implied in the expression "...and to a lesser extent...". These settlements share the same status within the Settlement Hierarchy. Although some may be physically smaller than others, they all offer the provision of facilities and services sufficient to warrant recognition as Rural Centres, rather than Selected Rural Villages or Key Centres.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete "...and to a lesser extent..." from the policy text

**Response:**

The Council considers this distinction, inserted in response to County Council observations, to be helpful to distinguish the Rural centres with a wide range of facilities from those that only just pass the 5 key services threshold. While this does not translate directly into policy, it does reflect the geographical reality. There is no suggestion that the smaller centres do not qualify as Rural Centres.

---



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6267 David Wilson Homes East Midlands [6254]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Part 7 of the policy seeks to "enable Fleckney, Great Glen, and The Kibworths and, to a lesser extent, Billesdon, Houghton on the Hill, Husbands Bosworth, and Ullesthorpe to operate as Rural Centres providing housing, business, retail, leisure, and community facilities."

DWH supports these elements of policy SS1. However DWH does not support the fact that no additional housing is proposed above existing completions and commitments in Kibworth, as set out in relation to Policy H1.

**Response:**

Including existing commitments, Kibworth already has sufficient housing land to meet its proportionate share of housing needs after provision of the SDAs. There is no need for further housing development.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6968 Mr O Tebbs [5208]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support this policy

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5634 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6759 Amanda Burrell [4075]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Protection for designated open space within all settlements welcomed.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6634 CPRE Leicestershire (Mr Richard Windley) [4376]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire believes the housing figures for Harborough to be inflated. Please refer to the attached document.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

the evidence base needs to be revised as the figures arrived at are too high. Alternative figures need to be considered.

**Response:**

The Council does not accept that the housing figures are inflated and considers that they are a well evidenced reflection of need with additional reasonable flexibility to meet growth at Magna Park, unmet needs from elsewhere and unexpected factors such a delay, non-implementation and market choice.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7244 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Leicestershire Highways Authority is content that the draft submission document is appropriately evidenced and also appropriately deals with transportation considerations at this stage in the planning process.

Subject to HDC's continued commitment to the policies and delivery approaches set out within the document, the LHA supports the submission of the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6645 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Recognises a fair geographical spread, long term strategic growth by providing a diverse, fair, economic strategy across the region and Leicestershire placing resources where there is need and higher unemployment. Policy BE2 in this LP adds considerably more than the identified long term requirement of non -rail storage /logistics to a already considerable land bank of logistics permissions granted but not build out.

Furthermore BE2 is disadvantaging other operators in other geographical areas by oversaturating the market.

**Response:**

The L&L SDSS Update 2016 confirms that its requirement is a minimum only and describes various market trends indicating the potential for more demand during and after the plan period. The figure in Policy BE2 is a maximum that can be accommodated without additional housing provision (based on the objective of increasing self-containment at Magna Park) and is subject to the criteria in the policy.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5439 Mrs Jan Butcher [4328]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Development, other than minor infill in the Claybrookes is unsustainable due to lack of services and facilities. It does not meet the sustainable transport requirements of the NPPF having a restricted bus service that does not meet local commuting needs . There is no evidence of local need for anything like the proposed scale. The character of the village will be destroyed

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove SRV designation from the Claybrookes

**Response:**

The level of development proposed for The Claybrookes is actually lower than would be required to meet its requirement based on the distribution methodology in the Local Plan, which reflects the approach contained in the adopted Core Strategy. This was done to take account of the limitations of the two SHLAA sites identified in Claybrooke Magna. The combined settlement benefits from a primary school and a public house. Although the NPPF (para 34) states that developments should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised, it also states that this needs to take account of other NPPF policies in rural areas. Para 55 states that, to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. The Claybrookes are an example of this. The Claybrookes have an hourly bus service Monday- Saturday to Lutterworth, Magna Park, Burbage and Hinckley. There is potential to enhance this bus service as part of the proposals to expand Magna Park. A permission has subsequently been granted for 38 dwellings, reducing the requirement to 12 dwellings.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6476 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Villages that are considered sustainable by definition should have a post office, shop and public house - this is not an appropriate definition as this situation can and does change frequently, witness the number of recent pub closures in the villages between Harborough and Lutterworth

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan should contain definitions of sustainability that are fluid and that can be revisited on a regular basis, say every 5 years. The date of these reviews should be stated in the plan.

**Response:**

It is recognised that there is a danger that these facilities could close outside the scope of planning powers, but Policies HC and HC3 seek to limit this. Local communities have also made use of Community Right to Bid powers. As stated in Appendix F, the level of services will be continuously monitored and changes in provision will be taken into account in future monitoring and review of the Local Plan (see Appendix K) and in decisions on planning applications. All Local Plans are expected to be reviewed every 5 years in any event and Policy IMR 1 commits to this.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7059 Cllr Simon Galton [4845]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Previous Regional and County plans have consistently highlighted the constrained nature of the transport network to the south and south east of the Leicester PUA. Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby are remote from the strategic road network and there are physical and infrastructure capacity constraints. I am there concerned about these settlements being placed at the top of the hierarchy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Consider modifying the settlement hierarchy.

**Response:**

It is not Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby that are at the top of the settlement hierarchy, but rather the Leicester Principal Urban Area. The issue of public transport access is being addressed through Policy SC1 (3, l m and n) supported by Policies IN1 and IN2.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7570 Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby, Bushby and Scraftoft are next to Leicester but have a poor transport links by bus, so a car is essential. This means development is not sustainable. Object as unsound in relation to transport links.

**Response:**

Policy SC1 (3, l m and n) requires improvements to the bus service and measures to improve its use. This may include extension to service 55 which provides a 20 minute service to Nether Hall.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6972 Mr O Tebbs [5208]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the principle that Rural Centres should provide the focus for rural development

**Response:**

Not Applicable

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6511 GREAT GLEN Parish Council (Lesley Sanderson) [2635]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Parish Council support this approach to the NPPF

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6635 CPRE Leicestershire (Mr Richard Windley) [4376]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire has some concerns about the housing figures in the HEDNA and the optimistic forecasts for growth. See attached document.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

N/A

**Response:**

The Council does not accept that the housing figures are inflated and considers that they are a well evidenced reflection of need with additional reasonable flexibility to meet growth at Magna Park, unmet needs from elsewhere and unexpected factors such a delay, non-implementation and market choice.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6053 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This statement leads to a developer led system - in working proactively the District Council should include negotiations with other partners and stakeholders including Parish Councils who need to have an opportunity help to find joint solutions to secure development that is not only based on developers needs.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

When considering proposals for development the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It will work proactively and collaboratively with applicants, and stakeholders including Parish Councils (where they exist) to find joint solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental condition of the District.

**Response:**

Noted.

The Council is committed to working positively with local communities where they wish to develop a neighbourhood plan and to supporting them through the statutory processes. This includes ensuring that neighbourhood plans are in general conformity with strategic policies, as set out in this Harborough Local Plan, together with minerals and waste local plans.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5499 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Sound/ support. It should be noted that despite the proximity of Thurnby, Bushby and Scraptoft to the City, this can by no means be the only measure of sustainability. Public transport links are poor, the Drs surgery and the village schools are believed to be at capacity .

Can a location be considered sustainable when its road network is inadequate?

HDC should be protecting the make up of the District and not allowing the absorption of key settlements into the City of Leicester.

**Response:**

Noted.

Thurnby, Bushby and Scraptoft are identified in the settlement hierarchy as sustainable, with further information available in Appendix D: Spatial Portrait.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6683 Mr and Mrs Gowling [6400]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy GD1: Achieving Sustainable Development, we strongly support the inclusion of the Policy in the Draft Harborough Local Plan in line with Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. We are encouraged by the Council's desire to positively consider proposals that contribute to the sustainable development of the District.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6705 Mr and Mrs Sellers [6412]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy GD1: Achieving Sustainable Development, we strongly support the inclusion of this Policy within the Harborough Local Plan in line with Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. We are encouraged by the Council's desire to positively consider proposals that contribute to the sustainable development of the District.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6976 Family Carr [6455]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy GD1: Achieving Sustainable Development, we strongly support the inclusion of this Policy within the Harborough Local Plan in line with Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. We are encouraged by the Council's desire to positively consider proposals that contribute to the sustainable development of the District.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7307 Mr and Mrs Welton [6497]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy GD1: Achieving Sustainable Development, we strongly support the inclusion of this Policy in the Harborough Local Plan in line with Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. We are encouraged by the Council's desire to positively consider proposals that contribute to the sustainable development of the District. We consider that the proposed development at Land off Harborough Road, Market Harborough should be viewed favourably in respect of the economic, social and environmental strands that comprise sustainable development.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7354 **Davidsons Developments Limited [4740]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

GD1: A positive approach to development within the District is welcomed. It is also welcomed that applications will be approved without delay where possible.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7408 **Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Gladman are fully supportive of the inclusion of the policy on Sustainable Development. The ethos of sustainable development is key to assessing planning proposals, it is the golden thread running through the NPPF.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7515 **Westleigh Developments Ltd [423]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy GD1: Achieving Sustainable Development, we strongly support the inclusion of this policy in the Harborough Local Plan in line with Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. We are encouraged by the Council's desire to positively consider proposals that contribute to the sustainable development of the District.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7534 **Mr & Mrs Sandercock [6522]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy GD1: Achieving Sustainable Development, we strongly support the inclusion of this Policy in the Harborough Local Plan in line with Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. We are encouraged by the Council's desire to positively consider proposals that contribute to the sustainable development of the District.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7595 **Bidwells (Mr Robert Love) [4663]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

A positive approach to development within the District is welcomed. It is also welcomed that applications will be approved without delay where possible.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No changes required

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7598 **Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance [6527]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Policy GD1 establishes that HDC will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. This policy confirms that planning applications that accord with the Development Plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In light of its consistency with relevant provisions of the NPPF which reinforce a presumption in favour of sustainable development, our clients support the provisions of this policy.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7604 **Taylor Wimpey [6529]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Support is given to Policy GD1 Achieving sustainable development. It seeks to reiterate the sentiments of the 'Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development' found at paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Response:**

Noted

---



**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5963 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Planning applications on sites allocated in the local plan should not be rushed through without due diligence. In particular the Burnmill Farm site, full ecological, archeological, flood risk assessments and consideration of existing residents should be taken into account. On paper, the site may appear to be sustainable but in reality there are many issues that need to be addressed. Localised flooding, problems with access in the winter (inability to access the higher end of Kingston Way), evidence of Great Crested Newts and other protected species and issues to access of the farm e.g. Delivery vehicles.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Applications for development of sites allocated in the local plan should not be approved until it has been independently examined and adopted.

**Response:**

Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria, which will be fully considered and implemented through the planning application process.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6056 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Comment rather than objection - Some weight could be given here to Neighbourhood Plans where they exist..

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Add reference to Neighbourhood Planning - this thread could be linked more throughout the whole plan.

**Response:**

Noted.

Reference to Neighbourhood Planning in sections 1.6 and 4.1.3. The Council is committed to working positively with local communities where they wish to develop a neighbourhood plan and to supporting them through the statutory processes. This includes ensuring that neighbourhood plans are in general conformity with strategic policies, as set out in this Harborough Local Plan, together with minerals and waste local plans.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5945 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The planning application process is becoming biased in favour of the developer by these statements

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reword the clause that states "where no plans exist or are out of date" to a more equitable position where each application is determined by the council with no previous constraints

**Response:**

Noted.

Rewording not supported as alternative wording conflicts with the NPPF paragraph 14.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5491 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Object to this proposal but if it is carried, in addition to the criteria set out, a stipulation that Green Wedge Land must not be developed also needs to be included.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Specify that development in Areas of Separation and Green Wedges will not be permitted.

GD2 is not totally clear. Surely this should just apply to Rural centres and Rural villages ? The wording could give rise to unwarranted development which exceeds settlement allocation.

**Response:**

Policy GD7 sets out appropriate development in Green Wedges. Para 1.1.8 explains that the Local Plan must be read as a whole and that more than one policy is likely to apply.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6268 David Wilson Homes East Midlands [6254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This policy effectively provides a framework for considering potential windfall sites. By specifying that appropriate development is acceptable adjacent to the existing or committed built up areas of Rural Centres, the Plan should be regarded as being positively prepared and flexible.

However, because of the requirement for the policy to not significantly exceed the housing targets set out at Policy H1 of the Local Plan, DWH does not support the policy. Further comment is provided in relation to Policy H1 itself.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7205 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Diana Cook) [4253]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This ridicules the allocation of sites through Neighbourhood Planning and seems to offer any sites around a selected rural village as potential for building. Where sites have been allocated in Neighbourhood Plans including reserve sites there should be no open invitation to develop further.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

exclude parishes where Neighbourhood Plans have designated sites including reserve sites

**Response:**

Where Neighbourhood Plans have been made and are considered in conformity with the Local Plan, the Neighbourhood Plan carries the same status as the Local plan with regards to making decisions on planning applications.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5363 Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd [5909]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Pegasus Group support the principles established by the first part of this policy, namely that sustainable development is supported both within and adjacent to the built-up area. This is necessary to provide the necessary unallocated development requirements of the draft Local Plan in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6062 Shire Homes [6203]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

My clients are supportive of the encouragement given to the development of land within or contiguous with the existing built up area of the settlements listed, particularly in respect of the Rural Centre of Fleckney where my clients own land at High Street (see attached location plan). This site has been consistently promoted for residential development throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy and Local Plan and it is currently being considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Group where it is understood that it is favoured because it is well located in relation to services and facilities.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6089 Mr Ivan Crane [6014]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the principle of replacing the limits to development with this policy, it will add in-built flexibility to the Plan to enable sustainable development to come forward in appropriate locations.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6379 Hallam Land Management Limited [5311]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The policy ensures that the Plan is positively prepared and provides flexibility as the Plan can respond to changing needs.

This policy is in effect to provide a framework for considering potential windfall sites, adding flexibility and ensuring District meets its housing target. Therefore, where there are sites that are known now that meet the criteria in the policy these should be allocated. For instance, Land South of Lutterworth Road, Lutterworth meets the criteria in the policy.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

6429 Mr Harry Capstick [6293]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Policy GD2- SOUND

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

6706 Mr and Mrs Sellers [6412]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the proposed strategy for locating growth within or contiguous to the built up area of Selected Rural Villages, such as Great Easton. We consider that the proposed development at Land rear of 22 Broadgate is of an appropriate scale that reflects the size of the village and the level of service provision.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

6953 Mrs Maureen Stell [6406]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

A fair distribution of housing.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7048 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support as sound. However, it is felt that paragraph 1 is unclear and needs revisiting. Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council makes the general point that as worded it could give rise to unwarranted development which exceeds settlement allocation across the district. The only circumstance under which development should be allowed, is if allocated housing numbers are not being delivered.

**Response:**

GD2 1 wording refers to sustainable settlements only and for development outside of site allocations.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7097 **Bloor Home Ltd [4935]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

The aspiration of Policy GD2 to enable the development of unallocated sites in sustainable locations that accord with the Local Plan's spatial strategy is welcomed.

The policy should not be seen as an alternative to allocating sufficient appropriate development sites in the Local Plan.

The criteria proposed within the policy is considered generally appropriate, albeit that they need to be considered in the context of the site's specific circumstances.

**Response:**

Noted

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7308 **Mr and Mrs Welton [6497]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We support the proposed strategy for locating growth within or continuous to the built-up area of settlements as identified in Policy GD2: Settlement Development. We consider that the proposed development of Land off Harborough Road, Market Harborough reflects the size of the town and level of service provision available. The site is visually well connected to the town; the site is bound to the east by existing residential properties and is located less than 185 metres from a large-scale committed development to the north-east.

**Response:**

Noted.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7355 **Davidsons Developments Limited [4740]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

The principle of development on sites within or adjoining the existing or committed built up area is welcomed. Notwithstanding this, further consideration to the implementation of this policy may be required. It would be useful to have an indicative level of development for growth or for an acceptable level of provision within a settlement. It is also suggested that provision for development which facilitates the delivery of services or facilities is considered acceptable within or adjacent to the settlement boundary.

**Response:**

Noted. Please see para 4.3.4.

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

7472 **Jelson Homes Limited [3965]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Fully support the intention of the Council to replace the existing 'limits to development' policy (a policy that is contrary to the policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework [ NPPF / the Framework]) with a policy which encourages sustainable development within or adjacent to existing settlements.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

7516 **Westleigh Developments Ltd [423]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We support GD2 and the proposed strategy for locating growth within or contiguous to the built up area of settlements. We consider that the proposed development at Land South of Grange Lane is of an appropriate scale that reflects the size of Thurnby and the level of service provision. The site is visually and physically well connected to the village and services within the village are within an appropriate walking distance. Development of the site for up to 28 units would be of an appropriate scale for the village and can be designed in a manner that respects and enhances the local character and distinctiveness, without impacting on the separation of settlements.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

7535 **Mr & Mrs Sandercock [6522]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We support the proposed strategy for locating growth within or contiguous to the built up area of Selected Rural Villages, such as North Kilworth, outlined in Policy GD2: Settlement Development. We consider that the proposed development at Land off Station Road is of an appropriate scale that reflects the size of the village and the level of service provision.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

7596 **Bidwells (Mr Robert Love) [4663]**

**Nature**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

The principle of development on sites within or adjoining the existing or committed built up area is welcomed. Further consideration to the implementation of this policy may be required.

It would be useful to have an indicative level of development for growth or for an acceptable level of provision within a settlement. It is also suggested that provision for development which facilitates the delivery of services or facilities is considered acceptable within or adjacent to the boundary.

Redevelopment of previously developed land is welcomed; however, consideration of the viability implications of PDL should be considered depending on the site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Consideration of the viability implications of PDL should be considered depending on the site specifics.

**Response:**

Noted.

Para 4.3.4 states: 'While the term 'significantly exceed' in criterion a should be interpreted by the decision-maker in the context of local circumstances, as a rule of thumb the target should not normally be exceeded by more than about 10%'. Viability considerations are considered elsewhere - please see particularly H2.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

5364 **Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd [5909]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The definition of other proposals needs to be clarified within the Policy so that this provides a clear framework for decision takers. The other proposals which should be capable of consideration in this Policy should be limited to those which are subject to firm commitments (allocations or planning permissions) and which have been demonstrated to be developable.

Furthermore, as set out in response to Policy H1, the target for the delivery of new homes in Fleckney is not effective, positively prepared, justified or consistent with national policy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Further clarity needs to be added to the term 'other proposals';

**Response:**

'Other proposals' is considered to include site allocations and commitments.

---

**RepID Representation**

6264 The Cooperative Estates (Richard Lomas) [3906]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy GD2 is ambiguous and should be deleted.

Moreover, the Council has not adduced the evidence to explain why the more conventional Limits to Development (as utilised in the Saved Core Strategy and Local Plan) are not appropriate in the new Local Plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete Policy GD2 and provide further justification as to why conventional Settlement Boundaries are not appropriate for the Local Plan

**Response:**

Limits to development are not considered to be in compliance with the NPPF and are based on the 2001 Local Plan, due to be 17 years out of date at the time of adoption. Appeal decisions have removed appropriate weight to be given to existing limits to development. A move towards development based on sustainable settlements is considered compliant with the NPPF.

---

**RepID Representation**

6978 Mr O Tebbs [5208]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We would only support this policy if it were to specifically recognise the role of Rural Centres as the focus for rural development. It is still more sustainable for these Centres to accept further development, even if there has been development in the past, so long as the new proposals do not adversely affect the character of the settlement and can still be accommodated without creating undue strain on existing infrastructure.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Provide indication that preference will be given to status in the hierarchy.

**Response:**

Policy H1 provides a housing target for all Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages, with the targets taking into account the settlement hierarchy.

---

**RepID Representation**

7337 Barwood Homes [6492]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst this approach is not generally objected to, the wording of Policy GD2 Part 1(a) provides difficulty in determining applications for 'development within or contiguous with the existing or committed built up area of...Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages' where the Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages in question do not have an identified target set out in Policy H1. There is no explanation of the approach to fact that there is no target for Great Bowden. Policy GD2 Part 1(a) would prohibit 'development within or contiguous with the existing or committed built up area of' Great Bowden, Husbands Bosworth, The Kibworths and Ullesthorpe.

**Response:**

All Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages have an identified target in Policy H1, with the exception of those that have a 0 additional dwelling target due to existing completions and commitments.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7411 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst Gladman support in principle Policy GD2, we object to criterion (a) which sets an arbitrary target for growth in individual settlements based upon the proposal not cumulatively leading to the housing requirement set out in the Local Plan being exceeded by more than 10%. Criterion is unnecessary and contrary to NPPF as it artificially restricts potentially sustainable development from coming forward. The remaining criteria in Policy GD2 provide sufficient protection against unsustainable development including ensuring that the proposal reflects the size of settlement concerned and level of service provision within (criterion (b))and that it respects the form and character of settlement (criterion (c)).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Criterion (a) should be deleted from Policy GD2 to ensure that it is sound.

**Response:**

Flexible allowance to allow for local circumstances, however the Local Plan housing trajectory allows for sufficient sites to meet housing needs to 2031 and allows for a 5yr supply of housing.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5365 Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd [5909]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This element of the Policy duplicates the previous criterion and Policy H1 and is therefore unnecessary.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Deletion of this Policy criterion.

**Response:**

Noted. However no duplication considered as Policy H1 refers to site allocation and settlement target figures to meet housing needs, whereas Policy GD2 refers to site specific proposals to either meet settlement targets and to development over and above identified housing targets of Policy H1.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7615 Taylor Wimpey [6529]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst support is given to the settlement hierarchy contained within Draft Policy SS1, this policy does not specifically direct any development to Broughton Astley despite the settlement being identified as capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment. Passing reference is made to 'made Neighbourhood Plans'.

Policy SS1 criteria v) and vi) make allowance for 'non-allocated' and 'windfall sites' but these are directed to the less sustainable settlements in the District rather than the Key Centres. This is not considered to be a positively prepared policy.

This approach is similarly repeated at Draft Policy GD2 'Settlement Development' and Draft Policy H1.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is considered that the Harborough Local Plan should not remain silent about growth at Broughton Astley within the emerging plan over the period 2011 - 2031. Broughton Astley is a Key Centre within the District which can accommodate growth. Robust evidence should be provided about the capacity of the settlement to accommodate additional growth notwithstanding the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Broughton Neighbourhood Plan (2014) was prepared in the context of the Harborough District Core Strategy and covers the plan period 2013- 2028. The Broughton Neighbourhood Plan recognises at section 3.16 that "The Plan will be reviewed periodically to ensure that it takes into account possible changes in national planning policy or to the Harborough District strategic planning policy framework." As such the Neighbourhood Plan will be reviewed during the lifetime of the District Plan and Harborough District Council should be setting a strategic framework to assist this review.

Furthermore paragraph 1.6.7. of the Proposed Submission Local Plan states "...neighbourhood plans should be in general conformity with all policies in this Local Plan."

**Response:**

The made Broughton Astley Neighbourhood Plan outlines a high level of housing allocations, together with supporting infrastructure, considered sufficient to meet housing needs.

Broughton Astley is a large village with all key services and many other amenities, including a secondary school, which lead to it being designated a key centre. However, it is recognised as not enjoying the range of shops and services expected for the size of its population. The Broughton Astley Neighbourhood Development Plan (made 2014) aims to improve services and facilities for the community.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7155 Alpha Investments [6478]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Policy GD2 is supported as it specifies that appropriate development is acceptable adjacent to the existing or committed built up areas of Selected Rural Villages. As such, the policy ensures, in accordance with paragraph 14 of the Framework, that the plan is positively seeking opportunities to meet the development needs of the area as well as providing a sufficient degree of flexibility so that the Plan can respond to changing needs. Other local authorities have similar policies to this in recently adopted Local Plans.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6058 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Needs to reaffirm the importance of separation areas  
suggest reword item

**Change To Plan Sought:**

suggest reword

e. it does not harmfully diminish the physical and/or visual separation of neighbouring settlements and does not encroach upon defined separation areas or Green Wedges.

**Response:**

Areas of Separation, to prevent coalescence of settlements, are outlined in Policy GD6, together with para 4.3.6 of the Explanation.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5635 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7338 Barwood Homes [6492]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Barwood Homes supports the approach to separate reference to 'previously developed land which is not of high environmental value' within GD2(Part 2), thus meaning that such development is not subject to criteria (a-d) of GD2 Part 1. This approach would allow the development of appropriate previously developed land to come forward within all settlements. However, it is considered that this approach needs to be made clearer within the policy, as it is important and in accordance with national policy.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7356 Davidsons Developments Limited [4740]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Redevelopment of previously developed land is welcomed; however, consideration of the viability implications of PDL should be considered depending on the site specifics.

**Response:**

Noted. Viability is considered elsewhere - please see H2.

**RepID Representation**

5525 Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd [5909]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The 10% limit will actively constrain a five-year land supply being restored and maintained.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The 10% limit should be removed.

**Response:**

Flexible allowance to allow for local circumstances, however the Local Plan housing trajectory allows for sufficient sites to meet housing needs to 2031 and demonstrates provision of a 5yr supply of housing.

---

**RepID Representation**

6353 Cotesbach Parish Council (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6283]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Regarding paragraph 4.3.3, the Lutterworth SDA cannot be considered a sustainable development and meeting NPPF guidelines. There is not evidence to highlight the risk of splitting Lutterworth into two through the M1 causing a divided community, therefore the Policy L1 is not congruent with NPPF. Focus needs to be on improvement of the town centre to demonstrate that the vitality of rural communities can be enabled. The Sustainability Assessment 2015 highlights the significant distance from rail infrastructure.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Look closely at the improvements available to Lutterworth Town Centre (retail opportunities from reduced traffic)

**Response:**

Policy L1 proposes the allocation of an East of Lutterworth SDA, subject to policy criteria. These include criteria 3 which requires the masterplan to create a sustainable, high quality and largely self sufficient settlement, a range of community facilities. Criteria 5 explains that the Council will develop traffic management measures to remove or minimise the passage of heavy goods vehicles through the centre of Lutterworth.

---

**RepID Representation**

5863 TUR LANGTON Parish Council (Alison Gibson) [2688]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is very open to abuse. This policy states that all of these forms of development WILL be permitted. There are no control measures to limit any attempted abuse. The explanation states that these are the types of developments "in appropriate circumstances" but gives no guidance on what these circumstances are.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Control measures should be added to limit attempted abuse

Guidance should be provided, focussing on the key aspects that are likely to cause harm in the countryside, such as damage to landscape, traffic, noise, etc.

**Response:**

The policy defines the types of development which are acceptable in the countryside, in appropriate circumstances, to support a thriving rural economy. Developments required for the extraction, transportation or working of minerals and associated with waste disposal are determined by Leicestershire County Council. Criterion k refers to services and facilities such as village shops, libraries, community halls.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6018 Mrs Maggie Pankhurst [4875]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This section would seem to preclude development at MP as per BE2;2

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete BE2:2

**Response:**

Noted. Potential modification required.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6090 Mr Ivan Crane [6014]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We object to this policy since it is overly restrictive. It places tight controls on rural development, which conflicts with paragraph 28 of the NPPF. Criterion g), h) and l) are particularly restrictive and we object to the policy being presented as a 'closed list' of acceptable uses, which are in direct conflict with the NPPF paragraph 28 support for "all types of business and enterprise in rural areas".

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This policy should be amended to be in line with NPPF paragraph 28. It should be made clear that the types of development listed are not a 'closed list' and criterion l) should be re-worded as follows:

"other uses which promote a strong rural economy through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings."

**Response:**

Noted. Rural Economic Development is supported as set out in Policy BE1 2a-d. In addition, GD3 1e allows for development that allows for the continuation of an existing enterprise, facility or operation that is compatible with its setting in the countryside. GD3 1a allows for 'uses which would help to diversify the rural economy', which together with 1e is considered to conform with NPPF para 28.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6092 Mr Ivan Crane [6014]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We object to this policy since it is overly restrictive. It places tight controls on rural development, which conflicts with paragraph 28 of the NPPF. Criterion g), h) and l) are particularly restrictive and we object to the policy being presented as a 'closed list' of acceptable uses, which are in direct conflict with the NPPF paragraph 28 support for "all types of business and enterprise in rural areas".

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This policy should be amended to be in line with NPPF paragraph 28. It should be made clear that the types of development listed are not a 'closed list' and criterion l) should be re-worded as follows:

"other uses which promote a strong rural economy through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings."

**Response:**

Noted. Rural Economic Development is supported as set out in Policy BE1 2a-d. In addition, GD3 1e allows for development that allows for the continuation of an existing enterprise, facility or operation that is compatible with its setting in the countryside. GD3 1a allows for 'uses which would help to diversify the rural economy', which together with 1e is considered to conform with NPPF para 28.

**RepID Representation**

6983 Mr O Tebbs [5208]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Infilling should be allowed in all settlements, including those categorised as "other villages and rural settlements (such as Leire), because this will ensure their long-term life. All settlements should be allowed to grow in proportion to their size and not just via affordable or exception housing. These settlements should not be considered as open countryside.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Extend policy to include all settlements

**Response:**

Proposed approach not considered to be sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF. Development is proposed in sustainable location with suitable access to services and facilities. Please see GD4 for circumstances in which housing development in the countryside is considered appropriate.

---

**RepID Representation**

7332 IDI Gazeley [168]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

GD3 fails to account for Policy BE2.2 the delivery of which will require development in the countryside for a use which Policy GD3 doesn't support.

Policy BE2.2 is not accompanied by a site allocation. Therefore, as drafted, GD3 is neither positively prepared nor effective. Should a site or sites ultimately be allocated for Policy BE2.2, then the suggested change to Policy GD3 would clearly not be necessary.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

To make GD3 sound we suggest simply adding a new criterion 'j. the delivery of strategic distribution development in accordance with Policy BE2.2 ' to refer to BE2.2, and to renumber the remaining criteria.

**Response:**

Noted. Potential modification required.

---

**RepID Representation**

7499 National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr A R Yarwood) [6074]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

In Policy GD3, there needs to be a recognition that Gypsy and Traveller sites are acceptable outside settlements. This is crucial to the delivery of sufficient sites.

**Response:**

Provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites is set out in Policy H6.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7506 National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr A R Yarwood) [6074]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

In Policy GD3, there needs to be a recognition that Gypsy and Traveller sites are acceptable outside settlements. This is crucial to the delivery of sufficient sites.

**Response:**

Provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites is set out in Policy H6.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5492 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support A to I, these criteria should ensure the continuation and steady realistic growth of rural communities. Agriculture, tourism and local small businesses are the life blood of small rural communities. However, mineral extraction and waste development can act in a retrograde step for such communities Should a reference to excluding development in areas of Separation also be included?

**Response:**

Noted. Appropriate development within areas of separation is set out in Policy GD6.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7526 Dr Andrew Moltu [6001]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Arnesby is not the chocolate box village the Parish Council like to imply.

There are many areas that could support infill building that have been left unused offering nothing to the outlook or service of the village.

The district plan should facilitate reasonable development and not be used as a blunt tool for those who will object to all development.

I believe trained planners are better skilled to make these decisions than residents with Nimby agenda.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7387 Sport England (Steven Beard) [4436]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support Policy GD3 - b. outdoor sport and recreation and associated buildings and

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5947 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The use of renewable energy production has limited benefits where wind turbines are proposed.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Put greater emphasis on renewable energy generation from solar panels fitted to dwellings, factory buildings or warehouses

**Response:**

Policy GD3 d is not prescriptive with regards to the nature of the renewable energy production, with Policy CC2 setting out further detail with regards to renewable energy.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6094 Mr Ivan Crane [6014]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We object to this policy since it is overly restrictive. It places tight controls on rural development, which conflicts with paragraph 28 of the NPPF. Criterion g), h) and l) are particularly restrictive and we object to the policy being presented as a 'closed list' of acceptable uses, which are in direct conflict with the NPPF paragraph 28 support for "all types of business and enterprise in rural areas".

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This policy should be amended to be in line with NPPF paragraph 28. It should be made clear that the types of development listed are not a 'closed list' and criterion l) should be re-worded as follows:  
"other uses which promote a strong rural economy through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings."

**Response:**

Noted. Rural Economic Development is supported as set out in Policy BE1 2a-d. In addition, GD3 1e allows for development that allows for the continuation of an existing enterprise, facility or operation that is compatible with its setting in the countryside. GD3 1a allows for 'uses which would help to diversify the rural economy', which together with 1e is considered to conform with NPPF para 28.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6091 Mr Ivan Crane [6014]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We object to this policy since it is overly restrictive. It places tight controls on rural development, which conflicts with paragraph 28 of the NPPF. Criterion g), h) and l) are particularly restrictive and we object to the policy being presented as a 'closed list' of acceptable uses, which are in direct conflict with the NPPF paragraph 28 support for "all types of business and enterprise in rural areas".

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This policy should be amended to be in line with NPPF paragraph 28. It should be made clear that the types of development listed are not a 'closed list' and criterion l) should be re-worded as follows:  
"other uses which promote a strong rural economy through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings."

**Response:**

Noted. Rural Economic Development is supported as set out in Policy BE1 2a-d. In addition, GD3 1e allows for development that allows for the continuation of an existing enterprise, facility or operation that is compatible with its setting in the countryside. GD3 1a allows for 'uses which would help to diversify the rural economy', which together with 1e is considered to conform with NPPF para 28.



**RepID** **Representation**

7049 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

5935 MR Michael Wilcox [5164]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The policy effectively permits development everywhere and there are too many provisos such that it is an encouragement to developers to seek approval given this open door policy

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Areas should be identified by maps showing where development will normally not be allowed so that residents and developers have some clarity

**Response:**

Policy GD4 is restrictive with regards to new dwellings in the countryside, subject to policy criteria.

**RepID** **Representation**

6061 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Add exclusion of development in separation areas to policy

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Outside Market Harborough, Key Centres, the Principal Urban Area, Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages, and land adjoining them, but excluding Green Wedges, and separation areas, new residential development will be permitted where it is the following

**Response:**

Development within Areas of Separation is outlined in Policy GD6.

**RepID** **Representation**

5493 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Sound/ support.

As with GD3.1 these criteria will hopefully ensure the steady continuation of small rural communities and rural businesses.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6548 Mrs Linda Bryan [6238]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I hope the District Plan will allow for reasonable development within the village to ensure its future as a community rather than an exclusive private estate for the few.

**Response:**

Arnesby is not identified as a Selected Rural Village due to its lack of services and facilities. The settlement is therefore not considered sustainable, however Policy GD4 1a would apply, with additional housing permitted through identification in Neighbourhood Plans.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7051 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7525 Dr Andrew Moltu [6001]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Arnesby is not the chocolate box village the Parish Council like to imply.

There are many areas that could support infill building that have been left unused offering nothing to the outlook or service of the village.

The district plan should facilitate reasonable development and not be used as a blunt tool for those who will object to all development.

I believe trained planners are better skilled to make these decisions than residents with Nimby agenda.

**Response:**

Arnesby is not identified as a Selected Rural Village due to its lack of services and facilities. The settlement is therefore not considered sustainable, however Policy GD4 1a would apply, with additional housing permitted through identification in Neighbourhood Plans.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5366 Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd [5909]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This policy criterion is unnecessary as such schemes are permissible under Policy GD2.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete this policy criterion.

**Response:**

Criteria 1a of Policy GD4 refers to small sites (up to 4 dwellings only) for settlements in the countryside, not identified as sustainable in Policy H1. Policy GD2 refers to all levels of proposed developments within or contiguous with the existing built up area of sustainable settlements.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6986 Mr O Tebbs [5208]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We consider there should be the opportunity for small scale market housing in all settlements to ensure their continued vibrancy and vitality.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The policy should take account of this.

**Response:**

Settlements not identified as a Selected Rural Village due to their lack of services and facilities are therefore not considered sustainable, however Policy GD4 1a would apply, with additional housing permitted through identification in Neighbourhood Plans.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6609 Mrs Linda Bryan [6238]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Planners have recognised inappropriate land designations; I hope the District Plan will allow for reasonable development within the village of Arnesby to ensure its future as a community rather than an exclusive private estate for the few.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5864 TUR LANGTON Parish Council (Alison Gibson) [2688]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The control measure in para b7 would need to be strictly applied ie if a house is built to serve a supposed need, then if this need does not exist later (i.e. if the house is placed on the open market) then it should be removed. Our fear is that the enforcement officer would not be able to enforce this against a determined developer.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The control measure needs to be strictly applied

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

6096 Mr Ivan Crane [6014]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We object to this policy since it is overly restrictive. It places tight controls on rural development, which conflicts with paragraph 55 of the NPPF. Paragraph 55 supports new dwellings for rural workers where there is an essential need "to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside". The additional restrictions are clearly in conflict with this and are taken from Annex A of PPS7 (revoked by the NPPF). This inherent conflict with national policy frustrates the delivery of sustainable development and as such fails the NPPF paragraph 182 tests of soundness.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This policy should be amended to be in line with NPPF paragraph 55.

**Response:**

Noted. The policy provides greater clarity over the 'essential need' that the NPPF requires to be demonstrated.

**RepID** **Representation**

5865 TUR LANGTON Parish Council (Alison Gibson) [2688]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is a reapplication of the exceptional design clause in PPS7. In the past, it has been used to justify large and obtrusive houses in very prominent locations, aiming to provide housing at the very top end of the housing market, which is not consistent with the aims outlined in the explanation. This does/will attract very determined developers because of the high returns available. Innovation and exceptional quality are very loosely defined and subjective criteria.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Some further guidance should be provided on the application of this clause

**Response:**

Policy GD4 1c is considered to be in compliance with para 55 of the NPPF.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5611 **STOUGHTON Parish Council (Coco Connor) [2677]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Stoughton Parish Council strongly argue against the possible loophole 4.7.3 'the re-use of redundant or disused buildings to enhance the immediate setting'.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Stoughton Parish Council strongly argue that this possible loophole should read as follows: 'the re-use of redundant or disused buildings for like for like for like purposes to enhance the immediate setting'. For example, agricultural buildings must only be replaced with new agricultural buildings with no change of use being permitted.

**Response:**

Noted. The Policy is considered to accord with para 55 of the NPPF and permitted development legislation allowing for the conversion of buildings.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5973 **Mrs N Stanley [1279]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The Burnmill Farm site is originally located outside the area for development. Due To its location it should be excluded to protect the rural appearance of the town from the North. this is even more important with the proposed development of the Airfield Farm site. The proposed development by David Wilson Homes (exhibition October 2017) shows that the density is too high for the peripheral location of the site and out of character with the existing development e.g. The design is too grid like and not flowing.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This allocated site should be reconsidered due to its proximity to the Grand Union Canal and location outside the existing boundary line.

**Response:**

Policy MH3 sets out relevant policy criteria for the development of Burnmill Farm. Existing limits to development are not considered in compliance with the NPPF.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6572 **Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The development of Scraftoft would be detrimental to its distinctiveness as a village with a "conservation centre" if you allow such a large amount of houses to be built here on top of what we have already have had built.

Our Nature Reserve is on the historic site of Scraftoft's WWII prisoner of war camp and so helps preserve the history as well as the wildlife of the village.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Nature Reserve remains protected and intact for the good of the surrounding area but the council does its duty to provide maintenance on it.

**Response:**

Policy SC1 sets out relevant policy criteria for the development of the Scraftoft North SDA.

**RepID Representation**

5494 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Sound/ Support

Once attractive and historic landscapes/ settings have been developed they are lost to both current and future generations.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

6684 Mr and Mrs Gowling [6400]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

With regards to Policy GD5: Landscape and Townscape Character we fully support the requirement for new development to be sensitive to the landscape setting and the settlement's distinctiveness. Any development scheme at Land at Northampton Road would be underpinned by the findings of a comprehensive Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment which would identify key viewpoints of and within the site. In addition, any design would be positively prepared to ensure that it provides a high quality and inclusive design that maintains a sense of place and reflects the distinctiveness of the town.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

6707 Mr and Mrs Sellers [6412]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the requirement for new development to be sensitive to the landscape setting and the settlement's distinctiveness. The site to the rear of 22 Broadgate, Great Easton is bound to the east and west by existing and proposed residential development, and as such development of the site would be viewed as a continuation of development within the village envelope. Any development scheme would be positively prepared to ensure that the site provides a high quality and inclusive development design that makes a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of Great Easton.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

6977 Family Carr [6455]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the requirement for new development to be sensitive to the landscape setting and the settlement's distinctiveness, as outlined in Policy GD5: Landscape and Townscape Character. Any development at Land off London Road, Great Glen would be positively prepared to ensure the provision of a high quality and inclusive development design. The scheme would seek to ensure that it respects the site's rural context and make a positive contribution to the local character.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7052 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Councils supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7309 Mr and Mrs Welton [6497]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

With regards to Policy GD5: Landscape and Townscape Character we fully support the requirement for new development to be sensitive to the landscape setting and the settlement's distinctiveness. The proposed development at Land off Harborough Road has been positively prepared with the provision of a high quality and inclusive design at the core of the development objectives. As outlined previously, the materials selected for the scheme are considered to be well related to the site's rural location and will complement the natural features of the site to create a unique, high quality development.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7517 Westleigh Developments Ltd [423]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Re: GD5, we fully support the requirement for new development to be sensitive to the landscape setting and the settlement's distinctiveness. Any development of the Land South of Grange Lane, Thurnby would be positively prepared to ensure the provision of a high quality and inclusive development. Any scheme would seek to ensure that it makes a positive contribution to the local character and respects the site's edge of settlement location.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7536 Mr & Mrs Sandercock [6522]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

With regards to Policy GD5: Landscape and Townscape Character we fully support the requirement for new development to be sensitive to the landscape setting and the settlement's distinctiveness. Any development of the Land off Station Road, North Kilworth would be positively prepared to ensure the provision of a high quality and inclusive development design. Any scheme would seek to ensure that it makes a positive contribution to the local character and respects the site's rural context.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6573 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft is a village and this development will be detrimental to this. We will lose our "distinctiveness and be swallowed up into Hamilton.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Harborough should point out to Leicester City Council the amount of new building already taking place in Hamilton and the future development of 5000 houses in Barkby Thorpe so other places on the NW, W and S of Leicester should be looked at for further development NOT Scraptoft.

**Response:**

Policy SC1 sets out relevant policy criteria for the development of the Scraptoft North SDA.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5636 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6574 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft under these proposals will lose a substantial part of its Nature Reserve as well as the recreational and wildlife habitat of the Golf Course. The WWII prisoner of war camp which has been a significant feature within living memory for Scraptoft residents will also be lost. The harm to the conservation village from even more vehicles travelling through it on a daily basis will also be substantial.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Harborough should be protecting us as a "First Village" in Harborough rather than throwing us under the bus!

**Response:**

Policy SC1 sets out relevant policy criteria for the development of the Scraptoft North SDA.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5637 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7412 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Clause (b) of Policy GD5 sets out that proposals should avoid the loss of features of landscape, townscape, historic/heritage, wildlife or geological importance. Whilst this is understandable, it should be recognised that any adverse impacts that a proposal has on these issues should be factored into the planning balance when making a decision rather than it being a sole reason for refusing any application.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6298 Mr Richard Beer [6263]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The amount of houses allocated at up to 90 is too many to achieve proper protection of the ridgeline where the conifer tree screen is incompatible with the local area and the housing density means that the woodland is not wide enough to screen effectively. The conifer screen will itself become an eyesore as they grow to at least 20m high

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the number of houses allocated to this area and require the replacement of the conifers with compatible tree species with a deeper barrier to protect the visual aspect of the ridgeline from the North.

**Response:**

Policy MH3 sets out relevant policy criteria for the development of the Burnmill Farm allocation.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6575 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The development at Scraptoft will NOT safeguard public views or landmarks as the prisoner of war camp and nature reserve are to be substantially reduced to have 1200 houses built on to a village!

Having already had significant new buildings gone up in Scraptoft and Thurnby we have already seen what really happens - new houses seen through the windows of the church, trees with TPOs cut down to make way for another house/garage etc, developments eating up the fields surrounding us so there is NO BELIEF that things will be safeguarded in the future.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

NO building to take place on the nature reserve and prisoner of war camp.

Other places developed within Harborough district that do not have these important wildlife and historical features.

**Response:**

Policy SC1 sets out relevant policy criteria for the development of the Scraptoft North SDA.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6897 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plans to substantially expand Magna Park would irretrievably alter the skyline and views from Cotesbach over the Swift Valley.

Our village is only 2 miles from the current site and these massive expansion plans would half that distance bringing immense new buildings even closer to what is supposed to be a peaceful rural area.

Although our village has no street lighting at all, our skyline is already brightly lit up by the spaceships that are the existing Magna Park.

How much more light blight will we have to suffer if these monstrous plans are approved on 23/11/17 by HDC?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not expand Magna Park.

**Response:**

Policy BE2 sets out relevant policy criteria for the development of strategic distribution in proximity to Magna Park.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5638 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5572 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The green wedge that currently lies between Harborough and Lubenham was the subject of much argument when the planning applications for the Airfield Farm developments were under discussion. The results were that this green wedge would remain. However I cannot find reference to this land being listed within the current plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The local plan should contain a schedule of green wedges that includes the land separating Lubenham from Market Harborough

**Response:**

The area between Lubenham and Market Harborough is a designated Area of Separation in the Lubenham Neighbourhood Plan. It is therefore considered unnecessary to identify the Lubenham/Market Harborough Separation Area in GD6 (and on the Policies Map) as it already forms part of the Development Plan.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5577 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Burnmill Farm proposal is in an area of separation. Any development in the area could set a precedent for further development and 'creep' into other land units. For example recent sale of pony paddock adjacent to this proposed development could request planning permission for a smaller development. The planted tree line has separated this land unit from the area of separation as a whole and would be deemed as more acceptable, however it still remains as the designated Area of Separation.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Burnmill Farm site should be reconsidered to ensure that the area of separation is not diluted.

**Response:**

MH3 Burnmill Farm allocation does not form part of the Market Harborough/ Great Bowden Area of Separation as defined in the 2001 Local Plan and its inclusion within the revised Area of Separation boundary is not justified by evidence provided by the Area of Separation Review 2017.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5616 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Include in Policy GD6 the Lubenham - Market Harborough separation area as defined in the Lubenham Neighbourhood Plan Policy LNP01 and also mentioned in the Parish Profile for Lubenham which states ' an area of separation must be maintained to protect the village's individual character and physical separateness. '

**Change To Plan Sought:**

1. Areas of separation, shown on the policies Map, are designated between
  - a. Great Bowden and Market Harborough; and
  - b. Lubenham and Market Harborough and
  - c. Bitteswell, Lutterworth and Magna Park
2. Development in the Areas of Separation will only be permitted where it would not compromise, either alone or in conjunction with other existing or proposed development, the effectiveness of the Area of Separation in protecting the identity and distinctiveness of these settlements.

Lubenham separation area - see proposed change below. Text at 4.11.3 also should be amended to read Policy LNP01 to ensure that of the Lubenham Neighbourhood Plan defines an area of separation between Lubenham and Market Harborough to preserve a visual separation from the settlement of Market Harborough and retain the distinctive character and separate identities of Lubenham and Gartree..

The Lubenham separation area should also be defined on the Policies Map .

**Response:**

It is considered unnecessary to identify the Lubenham/Market Harborough Separation Area in GD6 (and on the Policies Map) as it already forms part of the development plan through its designation in the Lubenham Neighbourhood Plan.

**RepID** **Representation**

5790 FLECKNEY Parish Council (Mr J Flower) [2626]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Areas of Separation designated and shown on the Policies Map should include the area of land between the Fleckney Parish boundary to the south-east of the Village and the built area of Saddington Village because of its importance to both settlements.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Designate the area of land between Fleckney and Saddington as an Area of Separation.

**Response:**

GD6 focuses on maintaining separation between Great Bowden/Market Harborough and Bitteswell/Lutterworth/Magna Park. Criterion e. of GD2 applies in other areas where development proposals could harmfully diminish the separation between neighbouring settlements.

**RepID** **Representation**

5871 Mr Paul Henry [6165]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The current Kingston Way and Bates Close development is characterised by its remote nature (on the edge of the Town of Market Harborough and its quiet and open plan layout. The addition of a further 90 dwellings accessed only by Kingston Way will be deleterious on the wellbeing and rights of existing residents in the current development and those in neighboring Great Bowden due to the increase in traffic and its frequency in traversing between Burnmill Road, Alvington Way and the Development on Burnmill Farm(MH3)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove the development at MH3 from the plan.

**Response:**

MH3 Burnmill Farm allocation does not form part of the Market Harborough/ Great Bowden Area of Separation as defined in the 2001 Local Plan and its inclusion within the revised Area of Separation boundary is not justified by evidence provided by the Area of Separation Review 2017.

**RepID** **Representation**

6849 Mr David Hart [6181]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This objection relates to the Burnmill Farm proposal which is in an area of separation, and if approved would represent another significant step in the merger of Great Bowden with Market Harborough. It would increase the likelihood of further creep of development into other land units with potential access from the new development. There would also be the potential for inter-visibility particularly at night (e.g. to/from Leicester Lane)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The principle of safeguarding the Area of Separation between Market Harborough and Great Bowden is a core aspect of HDC planning policy. The location of this development would appear to be contrary to plans to protect the Area of Separation raising clear doubts as to the suitability of this location for development

**Response:**

MH3 Burnmill Farm allocation does not form part of the Market Harborough/ Great Bowden Area of Separation as defined in the 2001 Local Plan and its inclusion within the revised Area of Separation boundary is not justified by evidence provided by the Area of Separation Review 2017.

**RepID Representation**

7189 Mr Peter Taylor [6461]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed development of Burnmill Farm encroaches on the space between Market Harborough and Great Bowden which is designated as an area of separation.

The development will be seen from Great Bowden and the Grand Union Canal.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The number and style of house should be reviewed and reduced in number and height.

**Response:**

MH3 Burnmill Farm allocation does not form part of the Market Harborough/ Great Bowden Area of Separation as defined in the 2001 Local Plan and its inclusion within the revised Area of Separation boundary is not justified by evidence provided by the Area of Separation Review 2017.

**RepID Representation**

7502 Messrs Haynes [2780]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Register our objection to Policy GD6 as it has not objectively assessed the area and has included the built area of Valley Farm yard in the area of Separation. This area is not required or needed for the adequate protection of the 1.4 kilometre gap between Bitteswell and Magna Park.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The area of land to the west of Bitteswell, including the existing farm buildings site and adjoining land be excluded from the area of separation. This will still provide sufficient separation between Bitteswell and Magna Park, but not unnecessarily designate an area already largely built upon and an active farmyard.

**Response:**

Whilst the farm yard is included within the designated area in line with the Area of Separation Study, GD6 (2) allows for development within Areas of Separation where it would not compromise the effectiveness of the designation.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7548 Trustees of the Bowden Settlement [6481]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Land off Burnmill Road (land rear of Top yard Farm) is well suited to a residential allocation and whilst the SHLAA (May 2016) states development could occur within a 6-10 year time frame, the site is available now.

Comments provided in the Area of Separation Review 2017 are noted, however the west of Unit 3 is very different to the east of Unit 3, and as such the representation site will not contribute to the coalescence between Market Harborough and Great Bowden, as it is already self-contained/screened.

The site should be removed from the Area of Separation and allocated for residential development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We submit that the site should be removed from the Area of Separation and allocated for residential development.

**Response:**

The inclusion of this land within the Area of Separation is justified and supported by the evidence provided by the Area of Separation Review 2017. GD6 (2) allows for development within Areas of Separation where it would not compromise the effectiveness of the designation.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7559 Trustees of the Bowden Settlement [6481]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Land off Main Street, Great Bowden should be removed from the Area of Separation. Comments provided in the Area of Separation Review 2017 confirm that part of the site provides only a secondary benefit to the Area of Separation. It is considered that all of the representation site should only provide limited benefit due to the screening of the site.

We suggest that the site should be removed from the defined Area of Separation, and allocated for a Village Green-style small residential development of up to 15 dwellings.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove the site the defined Area of Separation, and allocate for a Village Green-style small residential development of up to 15 dwellings.

**Response:**

Evidence provided by the Area of Separation Review (2017) supports the inclusion of this land in the Area of Separation.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5496 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support the designation of Areas of Separation

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5639 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7214 Mr Peter Mitchell [959]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

It is important for the maintenance of Great Bowden to remain an identifiable community to have separation land between it and MH. It would be tragic if its identity was lost as has happened to Little Bowden

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7555 Trustees of the Bowden Settlement [6481]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the removal of the land from the Area of Separation.

We suggest given the site's location and my client's control of number 54 The Ridgeway, the site would make an appropriate residential allocation to fill the unallocated numbers within the district.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

5791 FLECKNEY Parish Council (Mr J Flower) [2626]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Areas of Separation designated and shown on the Policies Map should include the area of land between the Fleckney Parish boundary to the south-east of the Village and the built area of Saddington Village because of its importance to both settlements.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Areas of Separation designated and shown on the Policies Map should include the area of land between the Fleckney Parish boundary to the south-east of the Village and the built area of Saddington Village because of its importance to both settlements.

**Response:**

GD6 focuses on maintaining separation between Great Bowden/Market Harborough and Bitteswell/Lutterworth/Magna Park. Criterion e. of GD2 applies in other areas where development proposals could harmfully diminish the separation between neighbouring settlements.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5819 Mr Paul Longhorn [6098]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plan says that there should be an area of separation between employment sites and habitations. In this case it says that this will be required between the development and Lutterworth and Bitteswell. No mention is made of a similar separation between the development and Ullesthorpe and Cotesbach.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Provide a separation between the development and Ullesthorpe and Cotesbach.

**Response:**

Distances between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe/Cotesbach are such that an Area of Separation is not needed. BE2 does not allocate sites for strategic distribution but rather sets a maximum on future development to 2031. Currently there is no development to separate from the villages.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6017 Mrs Maggie Pankhurst [4875]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Include Ullesthorpe and Cotesbach in this section

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Include Ullesthorpe and Cotesbach in this section

**Response:**

Distances between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe/Cotesbach are such that an Area of Separation is not needed. BE2 does not allocate sites for strategic distribution but rather sets a maximum on future development to 2031. Currently there is no development to separate from the villages.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6072 Margaret R Dr Reynolds [6078]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Why is no green area of separation proposed between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe?

**Response:**

The distance between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe is such that an Area of Separation is not needed. BE2 does not allocate sites for strategic distribution but rather sets a maximum on future development to 2031. Currently there is no development to separate from the village.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6182 Mr Kevin Gregson [6220]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No where in the plan have I found that there will be a preservation of green land between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe, which deeply concerns me to the plan ineffectiveness.

**Response:**

The distance between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe is such that an Area of Separation is not needed. BE2 does not allocate sites for strategic distribution but rather sets a maximum on future development to 2031. Currently there is no development to separate from the village.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6452 Mrs Kathleen Rowell [4871]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I support this statement but ask why there is no equal statement to separate Magna Park from Claybrooke and Ullesthorpe?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Insert statement to separate Magna Park from Claybrooke and Ullesthorpe.

**Response:**

Distances between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe/Claybrooke are such that an Area of Separation is not needed. BE2 does not allocate sites for strategic distribution but rather sets a maximum on future development to 2031. Currently there is no development to separate from the villages.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6907 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The intention is not question Bitteswell's right to a Separation Zone. Rather to insist that a Separation zone is established between Ullesthorpe and Magna Park.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Separation Zone required between Ullesthorpe and Magna Park

**Response:**

The distance between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe is such that an Area of Separation is not needed. BE2 does not allocate sites for strategic distribution but rather sets a maximum on future development to 2031. Currently there is no development to separate from the village.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7095 SWINFORD Parish Council (Katherine Clarke) [2678]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy GD6 of the proposed Local Plan suggests an Area of Separation should be implemented between Bitteswell/Lutterworth/Magna Park, to maintain separation of both Lutterworth and Bitteswell from Magna Park. There is no mention in the proposed Local Plan of maintaining an Area of Separation between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe who are equally at risk.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan or enhance Policy GD6 to include an area of separation between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe.

**Response:**

The distance between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe is such that an Area of Separation is not needed. BE2 does not allocate sites for strategic distribution but rather sets a maximum on future development to 2031. Currently there is no development to separate from the village.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7132 North Kilworth Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [6469]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy GD6 of the proposed Local Plan suggests an Area of Separation should be implemented between Bitteswell/Lutterworth/Magna Park, to maintain separation of both Lutterworth and Bitteswell from Magna Park. There is no mention in the proposed Local Plan of maintaining an Area of Separation between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe who are equally at risk.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan or enhance Policy GD6 to include an area of separation between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe.

**Response:**

The distance between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe is such that an Area of Separation is not needed. BE2 does not allocate sites for strategic distribution but rather sets a maximum on future development to 2031. Currently there is no development to separate from the village.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7156 Alpha Investments [6478]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The identification of our client's site within the Area of Separation is considered to result in the plan failing the soundness test at paragraph 182 of the Framework, primarily because it is not considered to be justified when the Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study is taken into account.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Please see attached documentation

**Response:**

The inclusion of this land within the Area of Separation is justified and supported by the evidence provided by the Area of Separation Review 2017. GD6 (2) allows for development within Areas of Separation where it would not compromise the effectiveness of the designation.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7180 Gilmorton Parish Council (Mr Julian Kent) [6472]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Noting the significant increase in the size of Lutterworth, Gilmorton Parish Council would like to establish a defined area of separation, to ensure the identity of the village is not compromised.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Create a green wedge area within the plan between Lutterworth East and Gilmorton.

**Response:**

There is no development in place at present which affects the village of Gilmorton therefore an Area of Separation is not necessary.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7196 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Diana Cook) [4253]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Include a further item to include Lubenham to Market Harborough Separation area as designated in the made Neighbourhood Plan

**Change To Plan Sought:**

add c Lubenham and Market Harborough

**Response:**

The area between Lubenham and Market Harborough is a designated Area of Separation in the Lubenham Neighbourhood Plan. It is therefore considered unnecessary to identify the Lubenham/Market Harborough Separation Area in GD6 (and on the Policies Map) as it already forms part of the development plan.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6063 Mr Brian Poulter [4826]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

With the recent continual planning applications the three locations are almost merged. Thus losing their identity. As our area is still rural i.e. not urban, these areas must be kept separate and have their own identity

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6204 Mr David Jones [4742]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The area of separation between Lutterworth, Bitteswell and Magna Park is vitally important. It is bitterly disappointing that planning permission has already been granted on appeal for 250 houses in this area.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6675 Mr David Gair [4381]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

This area has already been breached due to failure of HDC Planning Department to produce a Five Year Plan. Those permissions granted that breach the area of separation should be revoked.

**Response:**

The lack of a 5 year housing land supply engages paragraph 14 of the NPPF. There is no mechanism for permissions to be revoked.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5513 LUTTERWORTH TOWN COUNCIL Parish Council (Andrew Ellis) [2656]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Development in the Areas of Separation should not be permitted

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Development in the Areas of Separation will not be permitted

**Response:**

Such a restriction would go beyond the purpose of the policy and prevent development which would not impact unduly on the area's separation function.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5948 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There should be no developments allowed in the areas of separation during the period of this plan

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Rewrite the above to ensure areas of separation are maintained as such

**Response:**

Such a restriction would go beyond the purpose of the policy and prevent development which would not impact unduly on the area's separation function.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6274 David Wilson Homes East Midlands [6254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Wording of part 2 is considered appropriate as it is more flexible and less restrictive than saved Policy EV/3 of the 2001 Local Plan.

A qualifying statement, requiring Neighbourhood Plan AoS designations to meet the Council's AoS criteria should be incorporated into Policy GD6.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

As such, a qualifying statement, requiring Neighbourhood Plan AoS designations to meet the Council's AoS criteria should be incorporated into Policy GD6. A similar caveat is provided in Policy G14 in relation to Local Green Spaces, where the following wording is proposed:

Further Local Green Space may be identified in Neighbourhood Plans providing it meets the relevant criteria in relation to scale, beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity, or ecological value and it does not conflict with the strategic policies of this Local Plan.

**Response:**

GD6 is not identified as a strategic policy for neighbourhood planning purposes. Unlike Local Green Space, the criteria for Areas of Separation are not set out in the NPPF.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5640 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7054 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

5731 Mrs Claire Sixt [6092]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The planned housing development on the site of part of the Burnmill Farm, to the north of Kingston Way and Bates Close compromises the Area of Separation between Market Harborough and Great Bowden, leaving barely two small fields between them. Moreover, it does so in a manner which damages a valuable landscape, which is important for a variety of wildlife using this mixed agricultural and small forestry land as a corridor, including deer, foxes, fieldmice, hedgehogs, owls and raptors.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The housing development on the land of the Burnmill Farm should not be given permission to proceed.

**Response:**

MH3 Burnmill Farm allocation does not form part of the Market Harborough/ Great Bowden Area of Separation as defined in the 2001 Local Plan and its inclusion within the revised Area of Separation boundary is not justified by evidence provided by the Area of Separation Review 2017.

**RepID** **Representation**

5949 Mr John Martin [5974]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The area of separation between Market Harborough and Lubenham was promised to be established and maintained until at least 2031 at the public meeting when the planning application by Linden Homes as part of the Airfield Farm SDA was allowed. This does not appear in the plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Include an area of separation between Market Harborough and Lubenham based on the position as present on March 2017

**Response:**

It is considered unnecessary to identify the Lubenham/Market Harborough Separation Area in GD6 (and on the Policies Map) as it already forms part of the development plan through its designation in the Lubenham Neighbourhood Plan.

**RepID** **Representation**

7037 **Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Policy GD6 of the proposed Local Plan suggests an Area of Separation should be implemented between Bitteswell/Lutterworth/Magna Park, to maintain separation of both Lutterworth and Bitteswell from Magna Park. There is no mention in the proposed Local Plan of maintaining an Area of Separation between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe who are equally at risk.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If Policy BE2 is retained a the Local Plan should allow for an area of separation between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe.

**Response:**

There is no justification for an Area of Separation between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe as BE2 does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

**RepID** **Representation**

7177 **Mr Nelson Renner [6137]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The area of separation between Scraftoft and Thurnby Bushby has been deleted without any technical consideration of evidence. The Green Wedge that has replaced the Area of Separation covers a different area. There has been no justification for the change. There is also no technical justification or evidence provided to support the exclusion of land from what was the Area of Separation south of Covert Lane, land that has now been excluded from the new Green Wedge designation.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Area of Separation should be reinstated with the boundary amended to take account of planning permissions granted within the existing boundary. There is no valid reason to extend the Area of Separation boundary and no valid reason to change the Area of Separation to a Green Wedge.

**Response:**

Taken as a whole the area covered by the proposed Leicester/Scraftoft/Bushby Green Wedge is considered to meet the 4 specified aims of green wedge designations set out in GD7 not just a separation function. The inclusion of the land to the south of Covert Lane would not support the function of the Green Wedge as proposed and therefore its inclusion is not justified.

**RepID** **Representation**

7193 **LUBENHAM Parish Council (Diana Cook) [4253]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The Lubenham Separation area should be afforded the same priority as the Great Bowden separation area - both villages are adjacent to Market Harborough. Residents have expressed their views through the Lubenham Neighbourhood Plan and therefore it should be included in the Policy above

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Add Lubenham Separation area in GD6 policy

**Response:**

It is considered unnecessary to identify the Lubenham/Market Harborough Separation Area in GD6 (and on the Policies Map) as it already forms part of the development plan through its designation in the Lubenham Neighbourhood Plan.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5588 Mr Ian Ball [5065]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Houses will be built on the golf course. But they should not touch the nature reserve. It is still working and providing flora fauna and wildlife, deer and kingfisher specifically. The builders proposal of a buffer zone is meaningless and will lose those benefits forever.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

must not touch the nature reserve.

Find these proposals for access very unlikely and with no consideration to the bigger picture i.e. access to A47, and Thurnby junction can't cope at rush hour already. The inspector must ensure that the plan and build proper infrastructure

**Response:**

There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA and meet housing requirements. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge fulfils the 4 functions set out in GD7. The most valuable part of the LNR in biodiversity terms will be replaced by a Local Wildlife Site.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6431 Mr Peter Freeston [6315]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I am objecting to the proposed change of status to the green wedge, or reducing it in any way because Scraptoft has already had over 700 houses built in the last 7 years, and more housing is proposed for Thurnby village, thus changing the village status of these two areas irrevocably.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Brown field sites within the area should be considered for additional housing needs.

**Response:**

The proposed Leicester/Scraptoft/Bushby Green Wedge together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as village. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge with an extension to the south of Covert Lane. The extent of completions and commitments is recognised, but this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing requirements, including unmet need from Leicester City.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6475 Emma Lee [4250]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I am concerned by the proposed green wedge at Scraptoft North - it doesn't provide enough of a buffer between Scraptoft and Leicester and encroaches on the Local Nature Reserve.

**Response:**

Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge fulfils the 4 functions as set out in GD7, including maintaining the separation of Scraptoft from Leicester City. The most valuable part of the LNR in biodiversity terms will continue to be protected by designation of a Local Wildlife Site.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6576 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft Neighbourhood Plan 2016 shows golf course and nature reserve as essential Green Wedge. They fulfil functions of Green Wedge. Building on these areas would be detrimental to Scraptoft and Leicester residents. Plan is not fit for purpose as contrary to benefitting residents by allowing open space for sport/recreational and health and wellbeing aspects. Green Wedge is also essential to prevent flooding. Scraptoft is an important village with a rural history and a conservation status. Developers likely to insist on more of Green Wedge for housing in order to build the necessary infrastructure half way through.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Surely the importance of the Green Wedge and areas of separation surrounding Scraptoft outweigh the need for housing to be built on it during the next 15 years by Harborough? Other areas VERY nearby such as Hamilton and Barkby Thorpe are already in the process of being developed or have had plans passed for such development to help Leicester fulfil its quota. Harborough need to be standing up and fighting for us as a village.

**Response:**

The Neighbourhood Plan was prepared in the context of the Core Strategy which had a much lower level of housing need. Given its sustainable location, there is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA and meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge continues to fulfil the 4 functions of a Green Wedge as set out in GD7. The most valuable part of the LNR in biodiversity terms will be replaced by a Local Wildlife Site. Together these designations will help to protect the character of Scraptoft village.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6601 Mrs Patrica Green [6072]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The green wedge between Hamilton Lane and Hall Road is also an important part of our village identity and should be kept as such.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The land between Hall Road and Hamilton Lane should be left as a green wedge.

**Response:**

There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA and meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge fulfils the 4 functions as set out in GD7, including maintaining the separation of Scraptoft from Leicester City.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6630 Cllr Simon Galton [4845]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst supporting the Green Wedge policy and in particular, the proposed new area of green wedge east of Station Lane and south of Covert Lane covering the Thumbby Brook Valley and extending into Bushby, a more logical boundary for the new area of green wedge would be along Covert Lane to the point where it turns south. The larger area currently forms part the Separation Area in the Core Strategy and in the made Scraptoft Neighbourhood Plan.

**Response:**

The boundary of the Green Wedge has been drawn so as to ensure that the area fulfils the 4 functions of a green wedge and is effective. Extending the northern boundary to Covert Lane would not strengthen the Green Wedge's function and therefore is not justified.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7101 Bloor Home Ltd [4935]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Soundness

For the reasons set out in full text of representation, Bloor Homes object to Policy GD7, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:

- is not justified in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not properly considered reasonable alternative strategies.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proposed Change

Delete the Green Wedge designation that applies to the area between Thurnby / Bushby and Scraptoft.

**Response:**

Taken as a whole the proposed Leicester/Scraptoft/Bushby Green Wedge fulfills the 4 functions of a green wedge as set out in GD7. It is not expected that all parts of a green wedge fulfill all 4 functions. Designation of the Green wedge recognises that the role the area will play in the future.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7192 Mr Nelson Renner [6137]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no technical evidence to support the introduction of a new Green Wedge designation between Scraptoft and Thurnby. The justification cited is a landscape character assessment that identifies parcels of land with capacity to accommodate residential development. This is enhanced further when existing permitted development is completed, improving the relationship of this land to the urban edge.

There has been no justification to warrant the introduction of Green Wedge restrictions on this land, similar in nature to designating the site as Green Belt.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete the Green Wedge designation. If the designation is to be retained for the purposes of protecting the character of Scraptoft, then a more tightly defined area running along the higher land to the south of Covert Lane should be considered. The lower lying land within the Thurnby Brook valley is suitable for residential development and is of equal or greater landscape capacity than the surrounding land parcels.

**Response:**

The proposed extent of the Leicester/Scraptoft/Bushby Green Wedge is justified in light of the housing requirement set out in the Local Plan and the recognition that has an important role to play in protecting Scraptoft village from merging with other built up areas to the south and west, guiding future growth at the PUA settlements, allowing for recreational opportunities and providing improvements to recreational opportunities.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7210 Mrs Julie Freeston [6486]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I object to changing the status or reducing the area of the Green Wedges as this will mean the loss of identity for the individual villages and increased traffic for the whole area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The existing Green wedges should be retained.

**Response:**

There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA and meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge fulfils the 4 functions as set out in GD7, including maintaining the separation of Scraptoft from Leicester City. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A Transport Assessment will be submitted to accompany any planning application.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7220 nicholas fielden [5185]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I object to the REDUCTION of the Green Wedge as agreed in Scraptoft Neighbourhood plan 2016. The plan is not fit for purpose as contrary to benefitting residents by allowing open space for sport/recreational and health and wellbeing aspects the plan takes these things away. Scraptoft is an important village with a rural history and a conservation status. Surely the importance of the Green Wedge and areas of separation surrounding Scraptoft outweigh the need for housing to be built on it during the next 15 years by Harborough.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Green wedges have HUGE importance in maintaining physical and mental health of a society therefore Harborough should be reconsidering reducing the one in Scraptoft and looking elsewhere to plan for housing in the future. Harborough should be saving this Green Lung for the benefit of Leicester citizens too.

**Response:**

The Neighbourhood Plan was prepared in the context of the Core Strategy which had a much lower housing requirement. There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA to meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge will fulfil the 4 functions as set out in GD7.

**ReplD Representation**

**Nature**

7345 Davidsons Developments Ltd, Jelson Ltd & Parker Strategic Land Ltd [6507]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We support proposed allocation at Scraftoft North for 1,200 new homes over the Plan period (Policy SC1). However, we do not consider the Local Plan Proposed Submission to be sound due the increase in housing needs identified in the Housing and Economic Development Assessment (HEDNA) for the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA). To help address the identified housing needs, the Local Plan should allocate the Scraftoft East SDA for an additional 2,700 homes over the Plan period (3,900 homes total including the Scraftoft North site). Further detail is provided in the Covering Letter (see attached) and Masterplanning document.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Policy GD7 - the extent of the Leicester/Scraftoft/Bushby green wedge should be amended as proposed in the Masterplanning document

**Response:**

The proposed extent of the Leicester/Scraftoft/Bushby Green Wedge is justified in light of the housing requirement set out in the Local Plan and the recognition that has an important role to play in protecting Scraftoft village from merging with other built up areas to the south and west, guiding future growth at the PUA settlements, allowing for recreational opportunities and providing improvements to recreational opportunities.

**ReplD Representation**

**Nature**

7414 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Green wedges within Leicester and Leicestershire are a strategic issue to be considered through the Duty to Cooperate and the Strategic Growth Plan to ensure that development needs can be met in full across the HMA. Green wedge designations are not referred to in national policy, however they are not in of themselves inconsistent with the Framework. Notwithstanding this, the boundaries of green wedges are often historic in nature due to them having been formulated alongside the now outdated evidence of development needs that underpinned previous local plans.

**Response:**

The boundaries of the Green Wedges as defined as considered effective in light of accommodating the housing requirement and ensuring that Green Wedges meet their stated functions.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7518 Westleigh Developments Ltd [423]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We are strongly opposed to the allocation of our site within the proposed Thurnby/Leicester/Oadby Green Wedge, as identified by Policy GD7. We consider that the proposed development site does not perform the functions of a green wedge, as outlined above, and therefore propose its removal from the Green Wedge. The primary function of the proposed green wedge is to prevent the merging of settlements. However, the proposed development site is bound on three sides by existing residential development. Development of this site would not contribute to the merging of settlements, would be complementary to the existing built form. Site is in private ownership and is not used for recreational purposes.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove site from proposed Green Wedge.

**Response:**

Taken as a whole the proposed Leicester/Scraptoft/Bushby Green Wedge fulfills the 4 functions of a green wedge as set out in GD7. Preventing the merging of settlements is one of those functions and it is not expected that all parts of a green wedge fulfill all 4 functions.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7554 Jelson Ltd [221]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We do not consider the Local Plan Proposed Submission to be sound due the increase in housing needs identified in the Housing and Economic Development Assessment (HEDNA) (January 2017) for the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA).

To help address the identified housing needs, the Local Plan should allocate the Scraptoft East SDA for an additional 2,700 homes over the Plan period (3,900 homes total including the Scraptoft North site).

Policy GD7 - the extent of the Leicester/Scraptoft/Bushby green wedge should be amended as proposed in the Masterplanning document.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Policy GD7 - the extent of the Leicester/Scraptoft/Bushby green wedge should be amended as proposed in the Masterplanning document. That states: "A wedge of green space is proposed between Scraptoft and Thurnby & Bushby, extending from Station Lane and fanning out into the countryside. This will protect the existing settlements as separate entities and create an attractive wedge of open space that connects the proposed new development with the countryside. The existing public right of way that runs west to east will be retained within this wedge."

**Response:**

The proposed extent of the Leicester/Scraptoft/Bushby Green Wedge is justified in light of the housing requirement set out in the Local Plan and the recognition that has an important role to play in protecting Scraptoft village from merging with other built up areas to the south and west, guiding future growth at the PUA settlements, allowing for recreational opportunities and providing improvements to recreational opportunities.

<b>RepID</b>	<b>Representation</b>	<b>Nature</b>
5774	<p><b>Mr Morris Naylor [6093]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> The green wedges should be retained as they are as they are an important part of the abundant wildlife that frequents Scraptoft. If possible it should be larger than shown and have limited access to the public so as not to reduce their habitat.</p>	Support
6214	<p><b>Cllr Simon Galton [4845]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> The green wedge policy is strongly supported. Although an unprecedented level of development has taken place / is planned the green wedges between Leicester, Scraptoft, Thurnby and Stoughton have ensured that the historic core of the villages remain separate and distinct from the the City. Consultations at parish, district and county level over many years have consistently shown strong community backing for the green wedge policy. A more logical northern boundary for the new area of green wedge east of Station Lane would be Covert Lane.</p>	Support
6104	<p><b>Mr Colin Derrick [6149]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> Strongly support the location and extent of the Leicester, Thurnby and Oadby Green Wedge together with the Leicester, Scraptoft and Bushby Green Wedge. The Green Wedges are vital inorder to ensure retaining the discreet identity of these settlements and preventing their further merger.</p> <p>Green Wedges are vital for protecting and conserving valued landscape which I and other residents feel not only improves the quality of their lives/environment but provides a green lung and thus, helps with air quality.</p>	Support
5820	<p><b>Mr James Hudson [4948]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> I agree that the green wedge as proposed is maintained to ensure there is green space on the slopes between Scraptoft village and the dwellings already in the valley near Thurnby brook.</p>	Support
6655	<p><b>SCRAPTOFT Parish Council (Mr P Elliot) [4520]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> Strongly support retention of the green wedge between Scraptoft and Leicester, together with extension to Scraptoft and Bushby Green Wedge.</p>	Support
6474	<p><b>Emma Lee [4250]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> Welcome the green wedge proposals for Thurnby/Leicester/Oadby.</p>	Support
5447	<p><b>Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> Strongly Support.</p> <p>I strongly support the location and extent of the Leicester, Thurnby and Oadby Green Wedge together with the Leicester, Scraptoft and Bushby Green Wedge.The Green Wedges are vital inorder to ensure retaining the discreet identity of these settlements and preventing their further merger.</p> <p>Green Wedges are vital for protecting and conserving valued landscape which I and other residents feel not only improves the quality of their lives/environment but provides a green lung and thus, helps with air quality.</p>	Support

- 5641 **Ms Caroline Pick [4194]** **Support**  
**Representation Summary:**  
CPRE Leicestershire supports green wedge policy where there is no other protection but we feel the district should work towards designations such as AONBs.
- 5862 **Mr Lee Geraghty [6160]** **Support**  
**Representation Summary:**  
I support the continuation of the Leicester Thurnby and Oadby Green Wedge as it is vital to protecting the settlements of Thurnby and Bushby. I also support the extension of the Leicester, Scraftoft, Bushby Green Wedge.  
Green Wedges are vital for protecting and conserving valued landscape which I and other residents feel improves the quality of their lives and environment. Green Wedges are also vital for providing a green lung and thus helping with air quality.
- 7057 **THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]** **Support**  
**Representation Summary:**  
Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound. The two Green Wedges are vital to ensuring non-coalescence with Leicester City and Oadby and for providing a 'green lung' into the countryside. The Parish Council strongly supports the extension of the Leicester, Scraftoft, Bushby Green Wedge, noting that Leicester City is itself including the Green Wedge in its Local Plan.
- 7571 **Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]** **Support**  
**Representation Summary:**  
Agree with location and extent of Thurnby, Bushby and Scraftoft Green Wedges. Support as plan meets the soundness requirements.
- 7579 **Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]** **Support**  
**Representation Summary:**  
We are pleased that the Thurnby Brook Valley is to be protected by a Green Wedge. Support as plan meets the soundness requirements.
- 6666 **Mr Anthony Dyer [4282]** **Support**  
**Representation Summary:**  
Support the continuation of the Leicester, Thurnby and Oadby Green Wedge as a defence against this threat.  
  
We also support the extension of the Leicester, Scraftoft and Bushby Green Wedge.
- 7567 **Janet Thompson [6503]** **Support**  
**Representation Summary:**  
I support for the continuation of the Leicester Thurnby and Oadby Green Wedge which is vital to these settlements. I also support the extension of the Leicester, Scraftoft, Bushby Green Wedge.
- 7350 **Ian & Sue Johnson [6173]** **Support**  
**Representation Summary:**  
We just wanted to say that we wholeheartedly support the proposed green wedges for Thurnby, Bushby and Scraftoft. We found the consultation at the White House helpful.

6039 **Mrs Margery Bush [6209]** **Support**

**Representation Summary:**

I know the importance and benefits of the Thurnby and Oadby Green Wedge. Extending the Leicester, Scraftoft, and Bushby Green Wedge would be highly beneficial also.

The Green Wedge is protecting and conserving our landscape, our air quality and our environment's ecological diversity. In this way it has a clear and positive impact on physical and mental health in our communities.

The Green Wedge is not only protecting the landscape and quality of life in the here and now. It is a means of ensuring that future generations inherit clean air, a well-balanced ecosystem and a naturally beautiful landscape.

7608 **Mr D Robinson [6214]** **Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Supports the continuation of the Leicester Thurnby and Oadby Green Wedge as it is vital to protecting the settlements of Thurnby and Bushby. Also supports the extension of the Leicester, Scraftoft, Bushby Green Wedge. Green Wedges are vital for protecting and conserving valued landscape which I and other residents feel improves the quality of their lives and environment. Green Wedges are also vital for providing a green lung and thus helping with air quality.

5925 **Mrs Pamela Parker OBE [6167]** **Support**

**Representation Summary:**

I support the continuation of the Leicester, Thurnby and Oadby Green Wedge as it is vital to protecting the settlements of Thurnby and Bushby . I also support the extension of the Leicester, Scraftoft and Bushby Green Wedge.

Green Wedges are vital for protecting and conserving valued landscape which I and other residents feel improves the quality of their lives and environment. Green Wedges are also vital for providing green lung and thus, helping with air quality.

6106 **Mr Ian Hollis [6219]** **Support**

**Representation Summary:**

I support the continuation of the Leicester Thurnby and Oadby Green Wedge as it is vital to protecting the settlements of Thurnby and Bushby. I also support the extension of the Leicester, Scraftoft, Bushby Green Wedge.

Green Wedges are vital for protecting and conserving valued landscape which I and other residents feel improves the quality of their lives and environment. Green Wedges are also vital for providing a green lung and thus helping with air quality."

**Response:**

Noted.

---

<u>RepID</u>	<u>Representation</u>	<u>Nature</u>
--------------	-----------------------	---------------

5937	<b>Scraftoft Parish Council (Ms Sally Skyrme) [6009]</b>	<b>Support</b>
	<b>Representation Summary:</b>	
	We support the green wedge for Leicester/Scraftoft/ Bushby and welcome the new area of Green wedge on the upper slopes of the Thurnby Brook Valley south of Covert Lane. However, SPC objects to the loss of the Green Wedge to the north of the village.	
	<b>Response:</b>	
	Noted.	

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6667 Mr William Richmond [4078]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

For many years, there has been pressure to extend development of Leicester and Oadby to encompass the rural villages of Stoughton, Thurnby and Bushby which have a completely different character. In the past, Harborough District Council policy has been to designate certain areas as Green Wedge to prevent coalescence with the urban neighbours and I strongly support of the continuation of this policy in the new Plan.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7563 Ian & Sue Johnson [6173]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We wholeheartedly support the proposed green wedges for Thurnby, Bushby and Scraftoft. We found the consultation at the White House helpful.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6577 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraftoft is an important village with a rural history and a conservation status. Harborough should be fighting to retain this for us or else we might as well be ceded over to Leicester City Council. Surely the importance of the Green Wedge and areas of separation surrounding Scraftoft outweigh the need for housing to be built on it during the next 15 years by Harborough.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet for changes

**Response:**

There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraftoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA and meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge fulfils the 4 functions as set out in GD7, including maintaining the separation of Scraftoft from Leicester City.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5772 Mr Morris Naylor [6093]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

It is vital to the people of Scraftoft to retain all of the green wedge area surrounding the village.

**Response:**

Noted.



**RepID** **Representation**

5775 Mr Morris Naylor [6093]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

This will keep the identity of the village

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

5939 Scraftoft Parish Council (Ms Sally Skyrme) [6009]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support a green wedge

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

6065 Mr Brian Poulter [4826]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Each of these locations should remain separate. We are in a rural community not urban and rural settings must be preserved otherwise we become a city.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

6123 Mr Peter Jones [6225]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

It is particularly important to retain the Green Wedges between North and South Kilworth otherwise there is too great a danger of future sprawl to the east and/or west of the road connecting them.

**Response:**

There is no Green Wedge proposed between North and South Kilworth. This is open countryside and as such is covered by GD3 and GD4.

**RepID** **Representation**

5940 Scraftoft Parish Council (Ms Sally Skyrme) [6009]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support a green wedge

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6578 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft Golf Course provides a footpath for walkers and ramblers linking people from Leicester (along Keyham Lane West and Hamilton Lane) directly to the countryside. The nature reserve provides a peaceful and open space for both residents and wildlife to enjoy - essential for good mental wellbeing. Building on both of these key parts to the Green Wedge would therefore be highly detrimental to both Scraptoft and Leicester residents. See attached sheet.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet

**Response:**

There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA and meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge fulfils the 4 functions of a Green Wedge as set out in GD7, benefitting local residents and protecting the character of Scraptoft village. The most valuable part of the LNR in biodiversity terms will be replaced by a Local Wildlife Site designation. The SDA will incorporate open space provision. The Golf course is to be relocated in conjunction with the SDA.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5941 Scraptoft Parish Council (Ms Sally Skyrme) [6009]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support a green wedge

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6579 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft Neighbourhood Plan 2016 shows golf course and nature reserve as essential Green Wedge. They fulfil functions of Green Wedge. Building on these areas would be detrimental to Scraptoft and Leicester residents. Plan is not fit for purpose as contrary to benefitting residents by allowing open space for sport/recreational and health and wellbeing aspects. Developers likely to insist on more of Green Wedge for housing in order to build the necessary infrastructure half way through. See attached sheet.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet

**Response:**

The Neighbourhood Plan was prepared in the context of the Core Strategy which had a much lower housing requirement. There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA to meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge will fulfil the 4 functions as set out in GD7. The SDA will incorporate open space provision. The Golf course is to be relocated in conjunction with the SDA.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6580 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft Neighbourhood Plan 2016 shows golf course and nature reserve as essential Green Wedge. They fulfil functions of Green Wedge. Building on these areas would be detrimental to Scraptoft and Leicester residents. Plan is not fit for purpose as contrary to benefitting residents by allowing open space for sport/recreational and health and wellbeing aspects. Green Wedge is also essential to prevent flooding. Scraptoft is an important village with a rural history and a conservation status. Developers likely to insist on more of Green Wedge for housing in order to build the necessary infrastructure half way through. See attached sheet for details.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet

**Response:**

The Neighbourhood Plan was prepared in the context of the Core Strategy which had a much lower housing requirement. There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA to meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge will fulfil the 4 functions as set out in GD7, including maintaining separation from Leicester City. The SDA will incorporate open space provision. The golf course is to be relocated in conjunction with the SDA.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

5943 Scraptoft Parish Council (Ms Sally Skyrme) [6009]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

But a school playing field is not a suitable use because it would restrict public access. It would also change the character and give it a more urban feel.

**Response:**

Whilst public access may be restricted, school playing fields are an acceptable use as they are open in character.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

5656 Mrs Sarah Salisbury [6090]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

If the Nature reserve is withdrawn it will greatly effect the local wildlife environment, we have seen Monk jac Dear, sparrows, hawks, bats, pheasants, partridge, foxes, rabbits, hares, kingfisher, magpies, crows, blackbirds and snakes.

We have had an increase of these animals as trees down covert lane have been destroyed due to recent houses being built and this status is under threat for even more houses! WHY??

A report has been done by a Leicester City council which confirms if this status is withdrawn then it WILL effect the local wildlife.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Nature reserve status to remain in place!

**Response:**

There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA and meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. As part of this proposal the most valuable parts of the Local Nature Reserve in biodiversity terms will be protected by Local Wildlife Site designation.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6473 Emma Lee [4250]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Support Green Wedges, however, I am concerned that allowing recreational facilities, particularly school playing fields, may restrict access to green wedge by members of the public, counter to the aims of the proposal

**Response:**

The provision of recreational opportunities is one of the 4 functions of Green Wedges. There is no expectation that all parts of Green Wedges will be publically accessible.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6581 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft Neighbourhood Plan 2016 shows golf course and nature reserve as essential Green Wedge. They fulfil functions of Green Wedge. Building on these areas would be detrimental to Scraptoft and Leicester residents. Plan is not fit for purpose as contrary to benefitting residents by allowing open space for sport/recreational and health and wellbeing aspects. Green Wedge is also essential to prevent flooding. Scraptoft is an important village with a rural history and a conservation status. Developers likely to insist on more of Green Wedge for housing in order to build the necessary infrastructure half way through. See attached document.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet

**Response:**

The Neighbourhood Plan was prepared in the context of the Core Strategy which had a much lower housing requirement. There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA to meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge will fulfil the 4 functions as set out in GD7, including maintaining separation from Leicester City. The SDA will incorporate open space provision. The golf course is to be relocated in conjunction with the SDA.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7388 Sport England (Steven Beard) [4436]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support GD7 2a. permitting development if it relates to outdoor leisure, sporting or recreation facilities including school playing fields, cycleways, footpaths or bridleways.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID Representation**

6582 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

See attached sheet for reasons why I object to the development of the Green Wedge at Scraptoft and why it is contrary to point b.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet

**Response:**

The Neighbourhood Plan was prepared in the context of the Core Strategy which had a much lower housing requirement. There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA to meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge will fulfil the 4 functions as set out in GD7, including maintaining separation from Leicester City. The SDA will incorporate open space provision. The golf course is to be relocated in conjunction with the SDA.

---

**RepID Representation**

5944 Scraptoft Parish Council (Ms Sally Skyrme) [6009]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support a Green Wedge

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID Representation**

6583 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The nature reserve and golf course bring much needed biodiversity not only to Scraptoft but also to those in the urban area of Hamilton. Due to the building on woodlands in Scraptoft and fields at Hamilton this Green Wedge with all of its trees is needed even more than ever.

See attached sheet for further reasons why I object to the development of the Green Wedge at Scraptoft and why the plan is contrary to point c.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

see attached sheet

**Response:**

The Neighbourhood Plan was prepared in the context of the Core Strategy which had a much lower housing requirement. There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA to meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge will fulfil the 4 functions as set out in GD7, including maintaining separation from Leicester City. The most valuable part of the LNR in biodiversity terms will be replaced by a Local Wildlife Site and the SDA will incorporate open space provision. Taken together the proposals will ensure that green networks and open spaces are delivered and corridors for biodiversity are incorporated within development.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6584 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Object to the development of the Green Wedge at Scraftoft. It is contrary to point d. Scraftoft Golf Course provides a footpath for walkers and ramblers linking people from Leicester directly to the countryside. The nature reserve provides a peaceful and open space for both residents and wildlife to enjoy - essential for good mental wellbeing. Plan is not fit for purpose as contrary to benefitting residents by allowing open space for sport/recreational and health and wellbeing aspects. The plan takes these things away.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet

**Response:**

There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraftoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA and meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge fulfils the 4 functions of a Green Wedge as set out in GD7. The most valuable part of the LNR in biodiversity terms will be replaced by a Local Wildlife Site. Open space will be incorporated into the SDA. Taken together these will provide the opportunity for health and well being, and may improve public access to green space.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6585 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

How can building 1200 houses and infrastructure on the Green Wedge be considered small scale?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

see attached sheet

**Response:**

The proposed Scraftoft North SDA will replace the Green Wedge. It is accepted that the development is not small scale.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6586 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraftoft Neighbourhood Plan 2016 shows golf course and nature reserve as essential Green Wedge. They fulfil functions of Green Wedge. Building on these areas would be detrimental to Scraftoft and Leicester residents. Plan is not fit for purpose as contrary to benefitting residents by allowing open space for sport/recreational and health and wellbeing aspects. Green Wedge is also essential to prevent flooding. Scraftoft is an important village with a rural history and a conservation status. Developers likely to insist on more of Green Wedge for housing in order to build the necessary infrastructure half way through.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet

**Response:**

There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraftoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA and meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge fulfils the 4 functions of a Green Wedge as set out in GD7, benefitting local residents and protecting the character of Scraftoft village. The most valuable part of the LNR in biodiversity terms will be replaced by a Local Wildlife Site. The golf course is to be relocated in conjunction with the SDA.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6459 Mr Matt Vaughan-Smith [6338]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I fully support the continuation of the Leicester Thurnby and Oadby Green Wedge as it is critical to protecting the settlements of Thurnby and Bushby. To ensure their distinctiveness. I also support the extension of the Leicester, Scraftoft, Bushby Green Wedge. Green Wedges are vital for protecting and conserving valued landscape which I and other residents feel improves the quality of their lives and environment. Green Wedges are also vital for providing an enjoyable environment for health and well being... a green lung and thus helping with air quality.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5602 Mr Mark Weller [6071]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The current scale of the Scraftoft North plans are unsound. The reduction of green wedges would essentially make Scraftoft a suburb of Leicester and no longer a village. The doubling of the number of houses in the area would be beyond the current roads to cope with traffic. The majority of roads out of Scraftoft are have speed bumps or road narrowing. The A47 Station Lane junction is already at capacity and leads to mile long queues. Any additional roads would destroy more of what should be kept.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The scale of this proposed development should be massively reduced to minimise its impact.

**Response:**

Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge fulfils the 4 functions as set out in GD7, including maintaining the separation of Scraftoft from Leicester City. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A Transport Assessment will be submitted to accompany any planning application.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5722 Ms Fiona Ashberry [5935]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Building on the Keyham Lane fields will mean that Scraftoft will no longer exist as a village but be part of Leicester City - a continuation of Netherhall..

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No building should happen along the edge of Keyham Lane.

**Response:**

The proposed Green Wedge and Local Wildlife Site, together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft as a village.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6143 Mr Brian Quinn [6227]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I support the idea of the Green Wedge and if Harbough is taking this seriously then one would expect to see more areas being identified as green wedge not existing ones being reduced.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Retain the existing green wedges. And continue identifying new ones

**Response:**

Given their relationship with Leicester City, Scraftoft/Thurnby and Bushby are sustainable locations for development. There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraftoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA to meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge will fulfil the 4 functions as set out in GD7.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6157 Mrs Helen Taylor [6109]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As recently as 2015, the HDC Green Wedge Review recommended that "the extent and scale of the Green Wedge is appropriate and should be protected in the consideration of scale of development to be directed towards Scraftoft.. The proposed plans will result in a drastic reduction in the size of the Green Wedge and I feel will not prevent "the coalescence and maintain the physical identity of adjacent settlements". Our property is located within the Wedge and we will be surrounded by a housing estate that in effect links to Netherhall and Hamilton.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Keep green Wedge as it is or at least provide more separation .

**Response:**

The 2015 Green Wedge Review - Draft Technical Update recognised that the boundaries of Green Wedges would need to take into account the strategy to meet development needs across the District to 2031. In order to meet housing requirements, including unmet need from Leicester City, there is a need to amend Green Wedge boundaries. When taken as a whole, the redefined Green Wedge meets the 4 functions of a Green Wedge, benefitting local residents and protecting the character of Scraftoft village.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6587 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This proposal is contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan of 2016 and would swallow up most of the Green Wedge. See attached sheet for map and objection.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See previous Green Wedge objections sheet attached

**Response:**

The Neighbourhood Plan was prepared in the context of the Core Strategy which had a much lower housing requirement. There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraftoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA to meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge will fulfil the 4 functions as set out in GD7.



**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7299 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Residents of Scraftoft will see their living environment deteriorate due to loss of green wedge and the wildlife it provides a home for - essential part of VILLAGE life. Rural aspect decreased which is important for mental health/well-being.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Smaller developments located across Harborough NOT pushed on to ONE village.

**Response:**

There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraftoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA and meet housing requirements, including any unmet need from Leicester City. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge fulfils the 4 functions of a Green Wedge as set out in GD7, including maintaining separation between Leicester City and Scraftoft. The most valuable part of the LNR in biodiversity terms will be replaced by a Local Wildlife Site.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7572 Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We are pleased with the extent of this Green Wedge and that the Thurnby Brook Valley is to be protected by a Green Wedge. Support as plan meets the soundness requirements.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7573 Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support as plan meets the soundness requirements.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6426 **Dr Faiz Ismail [6312]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

I support the continuation of the Leicester Thurnby and Oadby Green Wedge as it is vital to protecting the settlements of Thurnby and Bushby. I also support the extension of the Leicester, Scraftoft, Bushby Green Wedge.

Green Wedges are vital for protecting and conserving valued landscape which I and other residents feel improves the quality of their lives and environment. Green Wedges are also vital for providing a green lung and thus helping with air quality."

**Change To Plan Sought:**

to maintain and enforce the green wedge

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5607 **STOUGHTON Parish Council (Coco Connor) [2677]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Stoughton Parish Council strongly support this clause.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5926 **Mrs Pamela Parker OBE [6167]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

I support the designation of the Leicester, Thurnby and Oadby Green Wedge as it is vital to protecting the settlements of Thurnby and Bushby .

I also support the extension of the Leicester, Scraftoft and Bushby Green Wedge.

Green Wedges are vital for protecting and conserving valued landscape which I and other residents feel improves the quality of their lives and environment. Green Wedges are also vital for providing green lung and thus, helping with air quality.

Attached Files: None

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5979 Mrs Anne Steventon [6183]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I support the continuation of the Leicester, Thurnby and Oadby green wedge as it is vital to protect the villages of Thurnby and Bushby. If this land is eroded, the villages will be subsumed by the Leicester urban sprawl and they will lose their character. I also support the extension of the Leicester, Scraftoft and Bushby green wedge. It is imperative that we protect these green lungs for the villages, improving air quality. It is a well advertised fact that Leicester city has very high pollution levels and anything which can protect the outlying villages from this, should be maintained.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6668 Mrs Kirsty Volpe [6410]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I support this plan because Stoughton is a non sustainable village which needs protection from increasing traffic through the area, and further development.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7574 Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support as plan meets the soundness requirements.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5975 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The outline design of the Burnmill Farm site from David Wilson Homes is poor in design, with high density for the location of the site, grid like with blocks of dwellings. It shows retained farm access along the existing track however this could prove hazardous with poor visibility to the new access on Kingston Way as it will be at a right angle to it. The farm track is also next to LEAP area and given the type of vehicles that use the track e.g. HGV carrying grain min 15 tonne, combine harvesters this could be a danger.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The local plan should give consideration to the location of a development site so that overdevelopment doesn't happen in peripheral areas.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process which will consider the details of access arrangements.

**RepID** **Representation**

6754 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Suggest the inclusion within this section that 'any adverse impacts identified on the highway network will be subject to appropriate mitigation.'

**Response:**

Noted. Policy IN2 sets out policy criteria in relation to sustainable transport and the need for appropriate mitigation, as necessary.

**RepID** **Representation**

5642 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

6688 Mr and Mrs Gowling [6400]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the objectives of Policy GD8: Good Design in Development, good planning and good design are inseparable and we are pleased that this has been identified by this policy. Any scheme at locations MH2 & MH 6 would be sensitively designed to protect the residential amenity of the neighbouring residents through the retention and enhancement of the existing boundary vegetation. Furthermore, the design of any development scheme would give significant regard to balancing residential requirements with those of existing and proposed employment land uses; to ensure that all land users experience an appropriate level of amenity.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

6709 Mr and Mrs Sellers [6412]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the objectives of Policy GD8. Good planning and good design are inseparable and we are pleased that this has been identified by policy. Any development proposal at Land rear of 22 Broadgate, Great Easton would maintain and enhance the existing boundary features to ensure that the views and residential amenity currently experienced to the south, east and west of the site are retained. The site would also seek to include an area of Public Open Space which could be positioned to enable key views of the open countryside, seen through the site from Broadgate, to be preserved.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6979 Family Carr [6455]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the objectives of Policy GD8. Good planning and good design are inseparable and we are pleased that this has been identified by this policy. Any development scheme at Land off London Road, Great Glen would be designed to protect the residential amenity of existing properties located to the east and west of the site through the retention of the existing boundary hedgerow and enhancement with additional planting. Any development would seek to utilise materials that are complementary to the local vernacular to ensure that the development is well integrated into the local street scene.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7058 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7140 Leicestershire & Rutland Sport (Mr Harry Venning) [4380]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Leicester-Shire & Rutland Sport would support this principle. We would also extend this to consider all facilities and spaces that can accommodate physical activity and sport, including school sites. New schools should consider both design that reflects need for community access, as well as Community Use Agreements (CUAs) to ensure that these facilities remain available for public use out of school hours, allowing more opportunities for Harborough residents to be physically active.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7310 Mr and Mrs Welton [6497]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the objectives of Policy GD8: Good Design in Development, good planning and good design are inseparable and we are pleased that this has been identified by this policy.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7519 Westleigh Developments Ltd [423]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the objectives of Policy GD8: Good Design in Development, good planning and good design are inseparable and we are pleased that this has been identified by this policy. As previously outlined, any development scheme for Land South of Grange Lane, Thurnby would be positively prepared to ensure a high quality and inclusive development design. Any proposal would be designed to protect the residential amenity of existing properties located to the north, east and west of the site by strengthening the landscaping of the site's boundaries and limiting development height to 2 storeys.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7537 Mr & Mrs Sandercock [6522]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the objectives of Policy GD8: Good Design in Development, good planning and good design are inseparable and we are pleased that this has been identified by this policy. Any development scheme at Land off Station Road, North Kilworth would be positively prepared to ensure a high quality and inclusive design.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7597 Bidwells (Mr Robert Love) [4663]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We consider that the aspiration for good design within developments as set under the policy is welcome

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No change

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5721 Kevin Verbruggen [6099]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

GD8. 1a.

The Burnmill Farm proposed development DOES NOT respect the distinctiveness of the settlement. The area in question is distinctive for its row of attractive trees near the top of the ridge; which are seen, recognised and admired from a significant distance.

Any development of housing will disrupt the appearance of the distinctive trees, even when sited behind the trees. The landscape will subsequently be materially worsened, which is unacceptable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Burnmill Farm proposed development will NOT be permitted to go ahead, as it contravenes this element.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria including the retention and improvement of existing hedgerows and trees and the planning application process.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7410 Historic England (Mrs Emilie Carr) [5702]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Criteria c is welcomed.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5873 Mr Paul Henry [6165]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Layout and Siting (MH3), both in itself and relation to adjoining dwellings, spaces and views, is inappropriate and unsympathetic to the appearance and character of the local environment around Great Bowden and Kingston Way. The site is located in a residential area where occupiers reasonably expect a level of amenity concurrent with the property and existing surroundings. The new development by reason of the use of Bates Close as an the site access is likely to result in noise, disturbance and nuisance to the detriment of existing residents and their residential amenity and enjoyment of their property.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove site MH3 from the plan

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process including consideration of the access arrangements.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5875 Mr Paul Henry [6165]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposal at MH3 represents an inappropriate form of development within the Green Belt and in the absence of any special circumstances would by its inappropriateness have a harmful impact on the open, rural and undeveloped character of the Green Belt.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove development MH3 from the local plan or require access to the Site from the Leicester Road.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process. The site does not fall within Green Belt.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5733 Mrs Claire Sixt [6092]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Using Bates Close and Kingston Way as the access route for the proposed Burnmill Road housing development will have an unacceptable and overbearing impact on the lives of current residents. This road is too narrow for lorries to use in the construction phase: it has five speed humps which will make lorry use hazardous. Cars could not pass a lorry moving in the opposite direction at two points in the road; current residents also need on-street parking. Additional traffic from the new development at peak times of work and school travel will cause gridlock and unacceptable congestion.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If the development is to be built at all, access should be from the Burnmill Road, using the existing access farm road, which is wider than the 5ft wide single-track access road with no pavements at the end of Kingston Way proposed by David Wilson Homes. There is enough land between the current farm access road and the reservoir to allow a standard width road with passing places and pavements. Hedgerows and trees removed for the road could easily be reinstated nearby for wildlife corridor use.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process including consideration of the detailed access arrangements.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5874 Mr Paul Henry [6165]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed development at site MH3 by reason of its size, depth, width, height and massing would have an unacceptably adverse impact on the amenities of the properties immediately adjacent to the site and the surrounding area by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy and visually overbearing impact. The proposals for internal circulation within the site are unacceptable and will create conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular movements thereby creating a safety hazard.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove site MH3 from the Plan

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process including consideration of design and highway arrangements.



**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5877 Mr Paul Henry [6165]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed development at MH3 is over-bearing, out-of-scale or out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity. The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered: it is on a Green Field site and building here would both diminish the view over green fields and be prominent from most angles within the existing development on Kingston Way therefore reducing the social amenity for existing residents .

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove MH3 from the local Plan or alternatively create another site access point from the Leicester Road.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6300 Mr Richard Beer [6263]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

David Wilson proposed development at Burnmill farm is inconsistent with this objective in that in order to reduce the impact on the neighbouring properties on Bates Close and Kingston Way and protect the Ridgeline to the North will just squeeze the houses into the middle

**Change To Plan Sought:**

To avoid the over concentration of houses reduce the overall number by one third to allow for proper protection of the Ridgeline and be sympathetic to the existing properties bordering the proposed area.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process including consideration of design and residential amenity.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6588 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This development WILL have a significant adverse effect on our living conditions due to its overbearing impact of building 1200 houses in a conservation village which has already been expanded by over 700.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet

**Response:**

Noted. Policy SC1 proposes the allocation of an SDA at Scraftoft North, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5724 Kevin Verbruggen [6099]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

GD8. 1e ii.

Burnmill Farm proposed development. The access route of Bates Close and Kingston Way will create unnecessary activity and noise; and will create unnecessary road safety issues for children and pets in the existing neighbourhood.

This will have an adverse impact on living conditions.

It is noteworthy that a David Wilson development planner spontaneously expressed preference for the entrance to the development being via the farmers' lane (from Burnmill Road) who is already selling the land for the development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If the Burnmill Farm proposed development is to go ahead, then insist upon the sale & adaptation of the existing track - leading from Burnmill Road - to be the sole access point to the development. This would minimise the impact to affect significantly fewer community members.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process including consideration of the detailed access arrangements.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7416 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Gladman have some concerns with Policy GD8 and in particular with criterion e(ii). This criterion relates to noise, pollution etc. not having an adverse impact on amenity. This is considered to be contrary to guidance set out in the Framework as paragraph 109 refers specifically to development not causing unacceptable risk or being affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution. Criterion e(ii) of Policy GD8 should therefore be reworded to reflect this guidance.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Criterion e(ii) of Policy GD8 should therefore be reworded to reflect guidance in NPPF para 109.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy GD8 e.ii is considered to be in conformity with NPPF para 109 and adds further detail with regards to harm to residential amenity.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6304 Mr Richard Beer [6263]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed development at Burnmill farm will inevitably produce light spillage over the Ridgeline to the North unless the scale of the development is mitigated. This will not be compatible with this objective

**Change To Plan Sought:**

widen the woodland belt to the Ridgeline and reduce the number of houses by one third. Use LED street lighting to lessen the light spread

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5727 Kevin Verbruggen [6099]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Burnmill Farm proposal DOES NOT protect and enhance the existing landscape features and natural assets (including trees). The landscape will subsequently be materially worsened, which is unacceptable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Burnmill Farm proposed development will NOT be permitted to proceed.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria including the retention and enhancement of hedgerows and trees and the planning application process.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6745 Leicestershire & Rutland Sport (Mr Harry Venning) [4380]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Leicester-Shire & Rutland Sport would fully support the need for enhancing spaces and this element of the local plan. However we would also further promote ambitions to ensure that new developments are enhanced, through increased sport and recreation provision. We would support the ambition for enhanced and increased green infrastructure networks not only for recreational purposes but also for active travel, to and from work etc to provide opportunities for Harborough residents to be physically active and lead healthy lifestyles. Deign Guidance can be found via Sport England website <https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/active-design/>

**Response:**

The inclusion of Green ways and Green Corridors as a typology in the Open Spaces Strategy provides for this

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6390 Hallam Land Management Limited [5311]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is unclear what criterion k in respect of "making provision for specific groups in the community such as the elderly or those with disabilities" means in practice. There appears to be no reference or further detail in the explanation to the policy. It is neither clear what 'make provision' entails for a development proposal or what the Council considers 'specific groups' other than those listed.

HLM therefore object to the policy on the grounds that it is not consistent with the Framework in that it is not clear what is meant by the above criterion.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The policy and supporting text should be amended to make it clear what is meant by criterion k.

**Response:**

Noted.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

5734 Mrs Claire Sixt [6092]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposal to use Kingston Way and a narrow 5 ft wide extension with no pavements as the access route to the proposed new housing development on part of the Burnmill Farm will not provide sufficient access for refuse vehicles, while still allowing traffic to move around the refuse vehicles e.g., in the opposite direction. Refuse vehicles often use Kingston Way at the same time as other large HGVs which causes major problems even now at the two narrowest pinchpoints in the road, and with an additional 90 houses using the road, congestion and gridlock will be unacceptable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If the proposed development is to be built at all, then access for both construction and for the new residents should be from the Burnmill Road using the current farm access road widened up to the reservoir, and should not use Bates Close and Kingston Way.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process including consideration of the detailed access arrangements.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

5878 Mr Paul Henry [6165]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The development at MH3 would adversely affect highway safety or the convenience of road users particularly at the junction between Alvington Way and Bates Close which is already an area of congestion at busy times of the day. Further, Kingston Way is inaccessible in times of inclement weather when there is more than 1" inch of snowfall that accumulates on the road surface, given the increase in traffic caused as this is the only access and egress to the site can will during these times result in current and future residents being unable to easily access their property.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove site MH3 from the development and or require access to the site to be from the Leicester Road.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process including consideration of the detailed access arrangements.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

5980 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Burnmill Farm site - safe access is reduced as it is proposed that the existing farm track is to be retained. The farm track is at a right angle to the site entry and will cross the access from Kingston Way onto the site. Site lines and visibility is reduced as there is a double garage at the entry of the site and this will be a hazard to both users of the access road and the farm access. As with many new developments, parking is an issue and access is reduced with on street parking.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Alternative access should be considered on this development

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process including consideration of the detailed access arrangements.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5735 Mrs Claire Sixt [6092]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposal to use Kingston Way and Bates Close as the access route for the proposed new Burnmill Farm development is unsuitable and unsafe for pedestrians and especially for children walking to school. The proposed 5ft wide extension with no pavements at the end of Kingston Way will leave children walking on the highway at risk from traffic. Those from houses nearer the Burnmill Road would have to walk a long west and then all the way back east along Kingston Way to get to Robert Smyth or Ridgeway Schools, which most will use: this is entirely unsuitable and unsafe.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If the proposed development is to be built at all, access should be through a road built over the current Burnmill farm access road linking directly with the Burnmill Road, widened up to the reservoir (there is plenty of space for this) and with hedgerows and trees reinstated elsewhere to preserve the very important wildlife corridor.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process including consideration of the detailed access arrangements.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6202 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Add the need for buildings to be built to high standards of energy efficiency.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

designed to be highly energy efficient and incorporate where possible the use of renewable energy

**Response:**

Noted. Policy CC1 sets out relevant policy criteria with regards to mitigating climate change, including energy efficiency of buildings.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5736 Mrs Claire Sixt [6092]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposal to use Kingston Way and Bates Close as the access route for the proposed new Burnmill Farm development is a poor design which will impact on the quality of life of neighbouring occupiers in Kingston Road and Bates Close, and result in a disconnected development that fails to relate to its context (4.15). It will result in unacceptable gridlock and congestion on Kingston Way, especially at the two current narrowest points and the proposed 5 ft wide extension with no pavements. The new development will need its own direct access to the Burnmill Road, to avoid being isolated.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If the proposed development is to be built at all, access should be through a road built over the current Burnmill farm access road linking directly with the Burnmill Road, widened up to the reservoir (there is plenty of space for this) and with hedgerows and trees reinstated elsewhere to preserve the very important wildlife corridor.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH/3 proposes the allocation at Burnmill Farm, Market Harborough, subject to relevant policy criteria and the planning application process, which will fully consider access arrangements and the amenity of existing residents.

**RepID Representation**

7060 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

7389 Sport England (Steven Beard) [4436]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support policy GD8 - Design which in explanation refers to our guidance on active design. We would ask if the use of active design would be made stronger by reference in the policy. It should also be referenced in SC1, MH1, MH2 and LH1.

**Response:**

Noted. Considered too restrictive and onerous to include in the policy wording.

**RepID Representation**

7144 Tarmac Trading Ltd [4914]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is important at District-level to identify mineral safeguarding areas to ensure that mineral resources are not unnecessarily sterilised by non-minerals development. Minerals safeguarding areas should be included within the Local Plan for parcels of land which have been allocated for sand and gravel working within the latest draft of the Leicestershire MWLP. There is potential for our client's interests at Husbands Bosworth and Shawell to be impacted upon by non-minerals development that would threaten allocated sites in the MWLP. We support inclusion of GD9 but it relies on the Leicestershire County Council Minerals Local Plan for the identification of mineral safeguarding areas.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Please see attachment - specifically 'Additional Comment'

**Response:**

Policy GD9 relies on the Leicestershire County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan for the identification of mineral safeguarding areas. Policy GD9 seeks to permit non-exempt development subject to the policies of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Additional site allocations within the Harborough District Local plan is not considered necessary.

LCC support the approach of Policy GD9, with the areas referred to appropriately safeguarded by the existing adopted Minerals Core Strategy and Development Control DPD and in the emerging Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5890 LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The provisions within Policy GD9 are supported to ensure mineral resources are not unnecessarily sterilised. It is suggested that the explanation should also emphasise the importance of viability as well as the practicality of prior extraction. For instance, the Consortium, have reviewed the mineral resources of the East of Lutterworth SDA. Evidence provided with these representations confirms that it would not be practicable to exploit the mineral resource in this area due to economic and environmental constraints. This includes the prohibitive measures required to protect the SSSI and the watercourses in the area.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7061 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5418 **Mr Bob Jones [5911]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Wishful thinking to assume we can limit housing growth from 1356 applications PA to 322!!

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Recalculate the numbers from what you aspire it be to reflect the pressures heading towards us

**Response:**

Noted. Nature of objection not clear.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5997 **Market Harborough & the Bowdens Charity [6192]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The quoted housing numbers will need to be reviewed in the light of the recent five year housing land calculation methodology statement and the phasing of release will need to allow for the inevitable delay in the provision of housing numbers from the several large strategic sites, upon which the LPA are relying, but which will inevitably lag, thereby resulting in an increased short and medium term housing land need. As a consequence additional short and medium term housing lands will need to be identified.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The housing numbers will need to be reviewed and additional short term sites built into the system

**Response:**

Recent 5 year supply calculations are not relevant to the Local Plan, since they relate to the situation without Local Plan allocations. Sufficient short term sites are available to ensure that a 5 year land supply exists at adoption.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6046 **Messrs Bufton [6195]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The quoted housing numbers will need to be reviewed in the light of the recent five year housing land calculation methodology statement and the phasing of release will need to allow for the inevitable delay in the provision of housing numbers from the several large strategic sites, upon which the LPA are relying, but which will inevitably lag, thereby resulting in an increased short and medium term housing land need. As a consequence additional short and medium term housing lands will need to be identified.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Housing numbers will need to be reviewed and additional short term housing sites identified.

**Response:**

Recent 5 year supply calculations are not relevant to the Local Plan, since they relate to the situation without Local Plan allocations. Sufficient short term sites are available to ensure that a 5 year land supply exists at adoption.

---



**RepID Representation**

6086 Mr Ivan Crane [6014]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We object to the exclusion of Broughton Astley, one of the most sustainable in the district, from this policy. With no explanation for this the Plan cannot demonstrate a robust and transparent evidence base in accordance with paragraph 182 of the NPPF. Modest growth at Broughton Astley would be in accordance with the scale of the settlement, its place in the settlement hierarchy or in comparison to other settlements. Preventing growth of a sustainable settlement is contrary to the NPPF which requires the planning system to play an active role in guiding sustainable solutions.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Policy H1 should be amended to include a housing provision for Broughton Astley.

**Response:**

The following additional wording is proposed to expand para 5.1.17, 'In relation to Broughton Astley, the Kibworths, Husbands Bosworth, Ullesthorpe, Great Bowden, and North Kilworth, the residual housing requirement is zero due to the high level of recent completions and ongoing housing commitments'.

**RepID Representation**

6124 Mr Peter Jones [6225]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There appear to be no references to North Kilworth.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Include a reference to North Kilworth

**Response:**

The following additional wording is proposed to expand para 5.1.17, 'In relation to Broughton Astley, the Kibworths, Husbands Bosworth, Ullesthorpe, Great Bowden, and North Kilworth, the residual housing requirement is zero due to the high level of recent completions and ongoing housing commitments'.

**RepID Representation**

6276 David Wilson Homes East Midlands [6254]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

DWH objects to the fact that no additional housing is proposed for Kibworth.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A more flexibly worded policy which would enable future housing development in Kibworth is recommended.

**Response:**

The housing requirement for Kibworth is zero due to the high level of previous completions and existing commitments. The following additional wording is proposed to expand para 5.1.17, 'In relation to Broughton Astley, the Kibworths, Husbands Bosworth, Ullesthorpe, Great Bowden, and North Kilworth, the residual housing requirement is zero due to the high level of recent completions and ongoing housing commitments'.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6285 Mr. Douglas Jackson [5686]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Table B1 considers completions and commitments since 31 March 2017. The statement in Policy H1 that the housing allocations take into account existing commitments etc. can only be true at one point in time. Clearly in the case of Great Glen, it does not take into account 170 houses the committee resolved to approve in March.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The text of H1 should be altered to say that it takes account of commitments as of 31 March 2017.

**Response:**

Noted. Table B1 actually relates to completions and commitments to 31 March 2017, not since. The additional dwellings referred to were approved in May 2017 and will be taken into account in updating the housing figures before examination, leading to a zero requirement in Great Glen.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6287 Mr. Douglas Jackson [5686]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The housing need has already been enhanced by 15% in the HEDNA which is questionable in itself - it is effectively going beyond the remit of providing an objectively assessed need. This is further enhanced by Magna Park. The Council has uplifted this a further 15% without good justification bearing in mind that under-delivery is catered for by the 20% buffer, which the Council is currently applying due to under-delivery. Incidentally, the council front loads the next 5 years with the newly identified need which is not sound as this is not a historic shortfall.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The 15% enhancement of housing numbers should be removed.

**Response:**

The 15% uplift in the provision of housing land over the housing requirement of 557dpa is considered appropriate for the reasons set out at para 5.1.10. This is not considered to be catered for in the 20% buffer, since this purely moves delivery forward from later on in the plan period, rather than increasing land provision. Furthermore, the 20% buffer may not be required in future once the Council is able to demonstrate there is no persistent under-delivery in relation to need.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6383 Hallam Land Management Limited [5311]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The policy does not allocate sufficient land to ensure a 5 year housing land supply on adoption. Furthermore, the policy does not boost significantly the supply of housing in accordance with the NPPF.

HLM own land South of Lutterworth Road, Lutterworth, which is suitable, available and achievable and should be allocated in the Local Plan to meet housing needs and ensure a 5 year supply on adoption.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Land South of Lutterworth Road, Lutterworth, is suitable, available and achievable and should be allocated in the Local Plan to meet housing needs and ensure a 5 year supply on adoption.

**Response:**

The Housing Trajectory at Appendix G demonstrates a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land from the expected date of adoption of the plan in 2018/19. Omission sites will be considered should further housing land be required.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6430 Mr Harry Capstick [6293]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

A target number of dwellings should be stated for Husbands Bosworth, as per other rural centres and for consistency with Table D21 (Settlement hierarchy) and policy GD2.

Residential development site off Theddingworth Road, Husbands Bosworth proposed (location plan, elevations and design statement attached to submission).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Identify target number of dwellings for Husbands Bosworth.

**Response:**

The housing requirement for Husbands Bosworth is identified as zero due to the high level of previous completions and existing commitments. This site size is below the level at which strategic allocations are being made, but the site could be pursued through the Neighbourhood Plan (if pursued) or the DM process, subject to Policy GD2 and other relevant policies. The following additional wording is proposed to expand para 5.1.17, 'In relation to Broughton Astley, the Kibworths, Husbands Bosworth, Ullesthorpe, Great Bowden, and North Kilworth, the residual housing requirement is zero due to the high level of recent completions and ongoing housing commitments'.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6656 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Explain that a dwelling could be an flat. Policy should reflect a need for flats to aid the accumulation of social housing. Para. 5.1.8 refers to 557dpa or 11140dw over the plan period. Policy SS1 2a states a minimum of 12800dw but should state a maximum. Figures confusing and difficult to implement or achieve a clear basis for calculating a 5 year housing supply which is defendable. No 5 year housing supply achieved previously with a far lower annual housing requirement. Unrealistic to add a 20 % buffer to OAN as unlikely to be achieved, possibly rendering the Plan impotent.

**Response:**

The definition of dwellings does include flats. H1 Explanation explains the difference between the housing requirement of 557 dpa and the provision of housing land to provide for a total of 12,800 dwellings. Adoption of the Local Plan will provide sufficient land through a combination of specific allocations, existing commitments, windfalls and residual housing targets to deliver the 5 Year Housing Supply requirement.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6747 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Appreciate on going work on an Memorandum of Understanding and the inclusion of a contingency of housing land of 15% over and above the plans housing requirement. We would wish the plan to go further to meeting Leicester City's unmet needs now, for example, by setting aside a specific amount of housing land to help meet our unmet need, in advance of full agreement on HMA wide housing distribution.

**Response:**

In the absence of clarity about the extent of unmet need arising from Leicester City, nor clarity about the distribution of such need throughout the remainder of the HMA, it is very difficult at this stage to identify the specific scale of land needed to meet this need. As such, provision of land through the contingency is considered the most pragmatic solution at present.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6927 Mrs Louise Duke [6449]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is too much traffic in Market Harborough already. More houses will bring more cars. Schools are already stretched, doctors cannot cope with the amount of patients they have.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The number of new houses should be reduced dramatically.

**Response:**

Each of the housing allocations in Market Harborough requires financial contributions towards provision of the mitigation measures identified through the Market Harborough Transport Study, as well as site specific mitigation measures.

**RepID Representation**

6997 Mr O Tebbs [5208]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We consider it is misleading to specify minimum (or maximum) numbers of dwellings in Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages, because the suitability of sites should be assessed on their relative sustainability, taking account of the settlement's position in the hierarchy. All Rural Centres, including Ullesthorpe, should be seen as a focus for further rural development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Omit housing numbers specified for the above settlements and provide criteria base for acceptability.

**Response:**

Noted. The housing requirement figures take account of existing levels of commitments and completions in each settlement.

**RepID Representation**

7104 Bloor Home Ltd [4935]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy H1 is considered unsound on the basis that it:

- has not been positively prepared as it is not based on a strategy that will ensure that the objectively assessed housing needs, including unmet development requirements arising in Leicester, will be met within the plan period;
- is not justified in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not properly considered reasonable alternative strategies;
- is not effective in that some allocation sites will not deliver the scale of development the Submission Plan currently assumes, and the identified needs will not therefore, be met;&
- is inconsistent with national policy

Now broken down into individual reps: 7646/7647/7648/7649/7650/7651

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proposed Change:

To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan:

- Policy H1 should identify a housing requirement for a plan period to 2036 (to provide a 15-year time horizon).
- That requirement should reflect the up to date, full and objectively assessed needs for housing and economic development within the District and wider HMA, based on the findings of the HEDNA and the Final MOU between the HMA Authorities that addresses the likely unmet need arising in Leicester City and Oadby & Wigston.
- The housing trajectory should reflect a realistic timescale for the delivery of the SDAs.
- The Local Plan should then identify sufficient deliverable and developable supply of housing land / sites to meet that need in sustainable locations in the District, notably at the PUA.
- That should include the allocation of the land off Uppingham Road, Bushby.

**Response:**

Para 5.1.4 explains that the housing requirement does include the additional 25 dwellings identified through the Magna Park Employment Growth Sensitivity Study. The plan period is considered appropriate and to accord with NPPF para 157. The contingency is considered sufficient to meet its objectives, as set out in para 5.1.10. The 20% contingency uplift in the provision of housing land over OAN is considered to be sufficient to meet both the need for flexibility and contingency to meet any delays in delivery and to help meet unmet needs arising from Leicester City. However, in the absence of a declaration from Leicester City about the scale of unmet need, it is clearly not possible within the Local Plan to identify the exact scale of Harborough's contribution to meeting this need.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7259 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) supported by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) should inform and provide strategic guidance to the development of later SPDs and Neighbourhood Plans. In considering the distribution of housing in the lower tiers of the hierarchy the Plan needs to demonstrate that those key centres and rural centres with neighbourhood plans will deliver housing numbers based on the current OAN rather than those contained within existing plans which were based on an earlier, much lower, OAN. Without this clarity the methodology could be open to criticism.

**Response:**

This is not considered to be a significant issue because of the close liaison between Harborough District Council and neighbourhood planning groups, most neighbourhood plans have been prepared on the basis of the most up to date information available about the scale of housing requirement for their settlement(s). A number of neighbourhood plans have included a contingency to allow for any increase in housing requirement. Where the Local Plan includes a strategic policy, this policy will supercede any relevant policy within a neighbourhood plan.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7339 Barwood Homes [6492]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

it is considered that Great Bowden should be identified as a Rural Centre and an appropriate housing target assigned accordingly.

The relationship between Policy H1 and Policy GD2 needs to be addressed and explained in more detail.

In so far as Policy H1 relates to the Policies Map and Inset Plans, Barwood Homes considers that there is no justification for omitting Bowden Sawmill from the limits to development for Great Bowden. The site is intensively developed brownfield land that directly adjoins the settlement; the Harborough Local Plan limits to development should therefore be revised to include the site.

**Response:**

Great Bowden is not considered to perform the role of a Rural Centre, owing to its close relationship with Market Harborough. It is therefore considered that Great Bowden should remain identified as a Selected Rural Village. The Proposed Submission Local Plan does not include Limits to Development. There is no requirement for further housing development in Great Bowden and the site size is below the level at which strategic allocations are being made, but the site could be pursued through the Neighbourhood Plan or the DM process, subject to Policy GD2 and other relevant policies.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7357 Davidsons Developments Limited [4740]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The provision of a contingency is welcomed. However, it is suggested that a contingency of just 15% will fail to meet the targets of Policy H1. It will not meet the FOAN for the market area as well as the other objectives of the contingency including providing for potential unmet need, lack of delivery from housing allocations and permitted sites and changing economic circumstances.

The sites at Broughton Astley, Gilmorton and Dunton Bassett represent achievable, suitable and deliverable sites to support the necessary housing growth for the District. The sites would contribute towards the Council's housing requirements, expected further unmet need from Leicester City/Oadby and Wigston Borough and 5 year housing supply.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Ensure the housing requirements meet the FOAN for the market area and other objectives of the contingency identified above including providing for potential unmet housing need from Leicester City Council and Oadby and Wigston Borough Council, lack of delivery from housing allocations and permitted sites and changing economic circumstances; identify DDL's sites at Broughton Astley, Gilmorton and Dunton Bassett as housing allocations.

**Response:**

There is no requirement in Broughton Astley and the site sizes at Dunton Bassett and Gilmorton are below the level at which strategic allocations are being made. The sites could be pursued through the DM process, subject to Policy GD2 and other relevant policies. The Gilmorton site has recently been approved for 42 houses and this will appear in the 31 March 2018 update of housing figures.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7395 Fox Bennett (Mr Tim Fox) [1497]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Consider that there will be a shortfall in the number of dwellings built over the plan period and the plan will not therefore be sound.

Policy H1 identified land for a minimum of 4660 houses during the plan period to 2031.

The policy states that at Fleckney, for example, a minimum of 295 dwellings will be required for which the only allocation is for land at Arnesby Road where 130 dwellings has been identified.

Consider that additional land should be allocated for dwellings to be designated at sites such as Land at Saddington Road, Fleckney and Land at Thurnby as identified in the attached plans.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Consider that additional land should be allocated for dwellings to be designated at sites such as Fleckney and Thurnby as identified in the attached plans.

This will enable the Council to meet the requirements for provision of dwellings.

**Response:**

Omission sites will be considered should further housing land be required. The remaining land at Fleckney will be allocated through the neighbourhood plan. The Council has a good record in encouraging and supporting neighbourhood plans, including at Fleckney, and a large number have already been delivered with sufficient allocations to meet their Local Plan housing requirements. The site at Fleckney is way in excess of what is required to meet requirements in any event. It has not been submitted or assessed through the SHLAA. The site at Thurnby is within the established Green Wedge.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7417 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst Gladman raise no major issues with the approach the HEDNA has taken re: demographic and economic elements of housing needs assessment, given the severity of the affordability issue within the district and the Government's focus on tackling affordability through recent consultation on assessing housing needs, it is considered that a 15% uplift to address Market Signals is not sufficient.

Given affordability evidence and recent Inspectors'

decisions on Market Signals, Gladman consider that an uplift of 20% would be a more appropriate to address market signals. It is considered that the full OAN for Harborough, taking account of the Magna Park Sensitivity Study should be 581dpa.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is considered that the full OAN for Harborough, taking account of the local adjustment factor for the Magna Park Sensitivity Study, should be 581dpa.

**Response:**

Noted. The HEDNA is considered to provide a robust and accurate assessment of OAN, taking adequate account of affordability issues within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7432 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Gladman are promoting land north of Leicester Lane, Great Bowden for residential development(Appendix 2 of attachment). The 2.52 hectare site presents an ideal opportunity to create a sustainable, high quality residential development situated in a sought-after location. The site is capable of coming forward within the next 5 years and Gladman consider that the site is capable of delivering 40-60 dwellings of varying sizes, types and tenures (including affordable housing).

The site is in a sustainable location and is available, achievable and deliverable and as such, it should be allocated in the Harborough Local Plan for residential development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Land north of Leicester Lane should be allocated for residential development.

**Response:**

There is no requirement for further development in Great Bowden. This site size is below the level at which strategic allocations are being made, but the site could be pursued through the Neighbourhood Plan or the DM process, subject to Policy GD2 and other relevant policies.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7443 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is important that the Council's proposed housing distribution recognises the difficulties facing rural communities in particular housing supply and affordability issues. The NPPG emphasises that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided. The proposed distribution of housing should meet the housing needs of both urban and rural communities.

**Response:**

The settlement profiles and services / facilities audit work has been used to classify each settlement in a hierarchy according to its relative sustainability. SS1 is informed by the settlement hierarchy with a focus on locating development at those settlements in the higher levels of the hierarchy. The Plan has therefore sought to 'take account of the different roles and character of different areas' (NPPF para 17) and to meet the following requirement of the NPPF (para 55): 'to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities'.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7477 Jelson Homes Limited [3965]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Jelson is unconvinced that sufficient account has been taken of the requirement to address unmet need from Leicester City in the overall district housing target.

It is unclear from Table B.1 and the Plan generally, to what extent if at all, the targets take into account the need to provide housing within Harborough to meet the unmet need from Leicester City. This is another reason why there is a pressing need to add flexibility in the Plan to be able to deliver housing in a range of locations which meet the needs of both Harborough and the City.

**Response:**

In the absence of clarity about the extent of unmet need arising from Leicester City, or clarity about the distribution of such need throughout the remainder of the HMA, it is very difficult at this stage to identify the specific scale of land needed to meet this need. As such, provision of land through the contingency is considered the most pragmatic solution at present.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7512 Mr Steve Louth [5609]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Consideration should be given to the allocation in the Local Plan of sites across all tiers of the settlement hierarchy for which growth is planned. For Selected Rural Villages (SRVs) where options for growth are limited, and/or Neighbourhood Plans which allocate housing sites are not being taken forward, the allocation of sites in the Local Plan will ensure the delivery of sufficient levels of development across the full range of the settlement hierarchy.

**Response:**

Housing allocations within SRVs are not considered necessary given the preparation of neighbourhood plans, their allocation of non-strategic sites in SRVs and the use of policy GD2 to guide planning applications for development on non-allocated sites.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7538 Mr & Mrs Sandercock [6522]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst fully supporting the recognition that the housing requirements outlined in H1 are a minimum and the level of flexibility that this element of the policy provides, we are concerned that the policy does not identify a minimum residential requirement for North Kilworth. As a Selected Rural Village, it is considered to be an appropriate location for growth. All of the Selected Rural Villages, with the exception of North Kilworth, have an identified minimum requirement in Policy H1, and as such abstaining from allocating a minimum requirement for North Kilworth should be considered to be unjustified.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Identify minimum requirement for North Kilworth in Policy H1.

**Response:**

North Kilworth already has sufficient commitments and allocations through its Neighbourhood Plan to meet its requirements. Any further development could come forward through the DM process subject to Policy GD2 and other relevant policies. The following additional wording is proposed to expand para 5.1.17, 'In relation to Broughton Astley, the Kibworths, Husbands Bosworth, Ullesthorpe, Great Bowden, and North Kilworth, the residual housing requirement is zero due to the high level of recent completions and ongoing housing commitments'.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7550 Trustees of the Bowden Settlement [6481]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Land off Burnmill Road (land to rear of Top Yard Farm) is immediately adjacent to Great Bowden's settlement boundary and considered sustainable.

Whilst the SHLAA identifies the site is considered potentially suitable over the next 6 to 10 years, it is available and deliverable now. Our clients have demonstrated through the instruction of a technical transport note that there are suitable accesses available.

We submit that the site should be removed from the Area of Separation and allocated for residential development, with a high quality design complementary to adjacent housing being a requirement of the Authority.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The site should be removed from the Area of Separation and allocated for residential development

**Response:**

Evidence provided by the Area of Separation Review (2017) supports the inclusion of this land in the Area of Separation. Great Bowden already has sufficient commitments to meet its housing requirements.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7556 Trustees of the Bowden Settlement [6481]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We support the removal of the Land to rear of the Ridgeway (see attached map) from the Area of Separation, and suggest given the site's location and my client's control of number 54 The Ridgeway, the site would make an appropriate residential allocation to fill the unallocated numbers within the district. The site could potentially accommodate circa 45 dwellings at a standard density of 30 units per hectare.

The entire site is in single ownership and is immediately deliverable, and this is recognised by the 2016 SHLAA which identifies the land could be brought forward in the next 5 years.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We recommend Land to the rear of the Ridgeway is allocated for residential development of circa 45 dwellings.

**Response:**

This site size is below the level at which strategic allocations are being made, but the site could be pursued through the DM process, subject to Policy GD2 and other relevant policies.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7560 Trustees of the Bowden Settlement [6481]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Land off Main Street, Great Bowden is well suited to a residential allocation and whilst the SHLAA (May 2016) states development could occur within a 6-10 year time frame, the site is available now. The site is suitable for a small residential allocation of up to 15 dwellings and the representation site will not contribute to the coalescence between Market Harborough and Great Bowden, because the site is self-contained and screened. We suggest that the site should be removed from the defined Area of Separation, and allocated for a Village Green-style small residential development of up to 15 dwellings.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove from Area of Separation and allocate site for a Village Green-style residential development of up to 15 dwellings.

**Response:**

Evidence provided by the Area of Separation Review (2017) supports the inclusion of this land in the Area of Separation. Great Bowden already has sufficient commitments to meet its housing requirements. This site size is below the level at which strategic allocations are being made, but the site could be pursued through the Neighbourhood Plan or the DM process, subject to Policy GD2, GD6 and other relevant policies.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7591 Messers Herbert [6535]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Objections are made to SS1 "The spatial strategy", Policy H1 "Provision of new housing, Policy BE1 "Provision of new business development" and Policy BE2 "Strategic distribution" insofar as the draft Plan not is not:

- \* Positively Prepared as it fails to meet objectively assessed development needs and infrastructure requirements;
- \* Justified in that the plan is not based on the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives;
- \* Effective in that the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- \* Consistent with national policy as the plan does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF.

The landowners object to the failure of the Council to recognise the potential to:

- \* Identify land within Whetstone Pastures as a future logistics park; and more over
- \* Recognise the ability of land within Whetstone Pastures to deliver a new Garden Village as part of a large strategic allocation extending over the administrative boundaries of both Blaby and Harborough.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to make the Plan sound it is submitted that the following modifications are made:

- \* SS1 - The Spatial Strategy amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future housing and logistics needs for the Harborough District during the period 2011 to 2031;
- \* Policy H1 - Provision for new housing similarly amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future housing needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031;
- \* Policy BE1 - Provision of new business development similarly amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future logistics needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031; and
- \* Policy BE2 - Strategic Distribution to be amended to make provision for future logistics needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031.

22 The precise wording of any changes should be carefully considered through cross-party working with Blaby to recognise, not only the cross-boundary nature of the Garden Village but also, that the majority of the land needed to deliver the Garden Village falls within Blaby.

**Response:**

In the absence of clarity about the extent of unmet need arising from Leicester City, or clarity about the distribution of such need throughout the remainder of the HMA, it is very difficult at this stage to identify the specific scale of land needed to meet this need. As such, provision of land through the contingency is considered the most pragmatic solution at present.

Omission sites will be considered should further housing land be required. However, The Council has not been formally asked to consider inclusion of a Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures in the Local Plan, either at Options stage or subsequently. Although it was aware of the potential for strategic distribution at a new motorway junction in this location, it considered that the scheme was insufficiently advanced to be included in the Local Plan and that it would be included, if necessary, in a future review of the Local Plan following approval of the Strategic Growth Plan for the period beyond 2031. With regard to the proposed garden Village, it is premature to make decisions on such a major growth point in advance of the SGP and too late in the Local Plan to consider this as an alternative/ addition to the SDAs. To introduce this site at this stage would involve revisiting earlier consultation (on the Options document) and assessments (on the Options and Selected Options) and could delay the Local Plan, and therefore the delivery of much needed housing and employment growth, contrary to the NPPF and Government policy more generally. Moreover it is unclear at this stage to what extent any housing proposed would be within Harborough District and therefore the extent to which it would meet the District's requirement.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7599 Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance [6527]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Given current uncertainty over the extent of any unmet need within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA, this is not a sound basis upon which the Plan can reasonably progress. Any such unmet need must be considered fully at this stage in order to ensure compliance with the tests of soundness, and any relevant provisions of the NPPF. The Plan cannot be considered positively prepared, effective or consistent with national policy. If the Council continues with this approach, it will not have demonstrated the Duty to Co-operate.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

HDC should not progress its Local Plan to submission for examination without full knowledge of the extent and spread of housing distribution across the wider Housing Market Area. The Council must afford full consideration to the possibility of Harborough District increasing its housing provision to accommodate development which can not be delivered within neighbouring authorities.

**Response:**

Given the Government's priorities for local authorities to deliver sufficient housing and ensure local plans are in place, the approach taken is considered to be appropriate and pragmatic given the circumstances. The extent of unmet need arising from Leicester City's stated inability to meet their OAN is not yet known. As such, the Plan takes a pragmatic approach, providing sufficient flexibility in its provision of housing land to contribute towards meeting Leicester's unmet need, once the extent of unmet need is declared. To delay the Plan until such time as the extent of Leicester's unmet need is declared is considered inappropriate and a further risk to ensuring the delivery of much needed housing.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7617 Armstrong Rigg Planning (Mr Geoff Armstrong) [4700]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy H1 is unsound as it is not positively prepared. It fails to allocate any additional housing to the Kibworths and in is unjustified in doing so as it fails to consider the needs of the Kibworths as a settlement or the role that further development at a smaller scale to the previously proposed SDA could play in delivering community benefits such as the much needed new primary school (Enclosure 2);

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to respond to the fundamental concerns raised above and to enable the preparation of a sound Plan, the following changes are required:

\* Allocate additional land for housing to account for the shortfall against current estimates at the two SDAs (see Enclosures 3 and 4) and to ensure that the Local Plan delivers the OAHN plus a 15% contingency to account for genuinely unpredictable circumstances.

\* Revise Policy H1 to set a minimum housing target in the Kibworths of circa 450 homes. As demonstrated in the promotion of our client's land to the West of Warwick Road and at St Wilfrid's Close (Enclosures 6 and 7, respectively), this level of development would help to meet the shortfall resulting from under-delivery at the SDAs and would also deliver a new primary school to meet a critical local need.

**Response:**

There is no requirement for further housing in Kibworth given the strategy in Policy SS1. The approach to housing distribution calculates the housing requirement for each sustainable settlement during the 2011 - 2031 period and deducts previous completions since 2011 and existing commitments. Whilst some of those completions do relate to the previous Local Plan housing land allocation at KB1, there were nonetheless delivered within the current plan period, and as such, contribute towards meeting the current OAN for the District and meeting the housing requirement within Kibworth. The Local Plan makes adequate provision for unpredictable circumstances as set out in paragraph 5.1.10, given the evidence that only about 5% permissions are not delivered. Delivery of planning gain such as a new primary school cannot be a reason for allowing a development which is otherwise not acceptable.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7624 **Armstrong Rigg Planning (Mr Geoff Armstrong) [4700]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Land to the West of Warwick Road, Kibworth Beauchamp should be allocated for up to 400 dwellings, together with a new 2 form entry primary school in response to acute capacity issues at the existing school and to provide additional housing in a sustainable location that can assist in making up for an anticipated shortfall in the Council's predicted delivery at Lutterworth and Scraftoft North SDA (Enclosure 6); and

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to ensure that the Local Plan can be considered sound, we recommend that our client's site is included as an allocated site as follows:

Policy K2 - Land to the West of Warwick Road, Kibworth Beauchamp is allocated for the development of 400 dwellings and a new 2 form of entry primary school.

**Response:**

There is no requirement for further housing in Kibworth given the strategy in Policy SS1. The Council is committed to working collaboratively with the SDA promoters to deliver the SDAs in accordance with the agreed delivery rates in the plan period. The plan already includes, in Policy IMR 1, a clear strategy by which development could come forward in the medium term in the event of unexpected delays in SDA delivery. This proposes an early review which will enable emerging factors such as the Strategic Growth Plan, new previously unassessed sites and the Local Plans of adjoining authorities to be taken into account in a comprehensive and strategic manner. Delivery of planning gain such as a new primary school cannot be a reason for allowing a development which is otherwise not acceptable.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7625 **Armstrong Rigg Planning (Mr Geoff Armstrong) [4700]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Land at St Wilfred's Close, Kibworth Beauchamp should be allocated for up to 45 residential units to provide additional housing in a sustainable location that can assist in making up for an anticipated shortfall in the Council's predicted delivery at Lutterworth and Scraftoft North SDA (Enclosure 7).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to ensure that the Local Plan can be considered sound, we request that our client's site is allocated as a housing site as follows:

Policy K3 - Land at St Wilfrid's Close, Kibworth Beauchamp is allocated for the development of up to 45 residential units.

The scheme upon which there exists a resolution to grant comprises 45no. retirement living apartments.

While our client has every intention of implementing that permission once it is issued, they would it noted that the site is equally suitable for open market housing. In this regard they request that the allocation be on the basis of a C3 residential use providing flexibility for the site to come forward for either retirement properties or open market housing.

**Response:**

There is no requirement for further market housing development in Kibworth. This site size is below the level at which strategic allocations are being made, but the site could be pursued through the DM process, subject to Policy GD2 and other relevant policies, if the scheme referred to does not progress.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7646 Bloor Home Ltd [4935]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The HEDNA does not take account of the proposed major extension to Magna Park within the M6, M69 and M1 triangle (700,000m2 of B8 floor space) in the period to 2031. The Council's Magna Park Employment Growth Sensitivity Study 2017 concludes that in order to align this employment growth and housing provision, the housing requirement should be increased by 25dpa above the HEDNA OAN figures. That should be appropriately reflected in the housing requirements established in Policies SS1 and H1.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan:

- That requirement should reflect the up to date, full and objectively assessed needs for housing and economic development within the District and wider HMA, based on the findings of the HEDNA and the Final MOU between the HMA Authorities that addresses the likely unmet need arising in Leicester City and Oadby & Wigston.

**Response:**

It is - please see para 5.1.4.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7649 Bloor Home Ltd [4935]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Submission Plan fails to allocate sufficient housing sites to meet even the identified housing requirement, let alone providing sufficient flexibility. Notably Policy H1 does not allocate specific sites at the Rural Centres or Selected Rural Villages, instead seemingly relying on Policy GD2. This is not a positive plan led approach to ensuring the delivery of sustainable development to meet identified housing needs as required by NPPF. There is no certainty that there are deliverable or developable sites available in those locations. Policy GD2 should only be used to complement Policy H1.

Furthermore entirely unrealistic assumptions in terms of both the timing and rate of delivery at the SDAs have been embedded in the Local Plan Housing Trajectory (Appendix G. The folly of the District Council's delivery assumptions is clearly evidenced by the experiences of other Local Authorities in the HMA.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

- The housing trajectory should reflect a realistic timescale for the delivery of the SDAs.  
- The Local Plan should then identify sufficient deliverable and developable supply of housing land / sites to meet that need in sustainable locations in the District, notably at the PUA.

**Response:**

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment demonstrates sufficient deliverable or developable sites are available to meet housing land requirements as set out in Policy H1.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7650 Bloor Home Ltd [4935]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Given the concerns raised over H1 and SS1, Bloor Homes are of the view that the PUA could and should accommodate further development in order to ensure the District's Housing Needs are met and to meet a proportion of the unmet housing need stemming from Leicester within the plan period. The PUA is positioned at the top of the proposed settlement hierarchy that underpins the Submission Plan, and further development at Thurnby and Bushby (over and above that already committed and the proposed allocation of the SDA) would entirely accord with Harborough's established development strategy and housing objectives.

In that context there is additional land available adjacent to the committed site that would be an entirely appropriate development allocation for accommodating an element of that further growth on the edge of the PUA (125 dwellings).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

- The Local Plan should then identify sufficient deliverable and developable supply of housing land / sites to meet that need in sustainable locations in the District, notably at the PUA.
- That should include the allocation of the land off Uppingham Road, Bushby.

**Response:**

Omission sites will be considered should further housing land be required.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7652 Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance [6527]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Land north-east of Kibworth Harcourt is considered a suitable option for a possible reserve site. The site would contribute well to the achievement of sustainable development as per relevant guidance of the NPPF, including necessary economic, social, and environmental roles. Moreover, the inclusion of strategic development area at Kibworth would be likely to increase significantly the robustness of the plan to providing more flexibility and a clear contingency to assist the Council in demonstrating an adequate housing land supply in the latter half of the plan period.

The provision of a bypass at Kibworth has been a longstanding aim for the Council. Strategic mixed use development at Kibworth could be utilised to secure an appropriate level of developer funding towards the provision of a bypass at Kibworth. Our clients' land ownership is well placed to facilitate such a proposal.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The site is considered a suitable option for a possible reserve site.

**Response:**

Omission sites will be considered should further housing land be required.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7626 Taylor Wimpey [6529]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plan is silent about growth at Broughton Astley. It is unclear whether there will be unmet housing need within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area and whether this would be further exacerbated as a result of the Harborough Local Plan progressing ahead of other Local Authorities within the Housing Market Area. This is an unsound basis on which to prepare a Local Plan and therefore the current version of the plan cannot be considered positively prepared, effective or consistent with national policy. It is considered that the Council has not fulfilled the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Whilst it is accepted the Council has, in its opinion, made some allowance for unmet housing need from other Local Authorities within the Housing Market Area to be accommodated these are not adequately quantified and is not agreed as part of a Memorandum of Understanding. It is considered that the Council has not fulfilled the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate.

The Council should not progress its Local Plan to submission for examination without the prior knowledge of the housing distribution across the Housing Market Area. Full and appropriate consideration needs to be given to the possibility of Harborough District increasing its housing provision to accommodate development which can not be delivered within adjacent authorities.

**Response:**

The Local Plan has been prepared on the basis of the provision of land for 12,800 new dwellings. This provides for a total of 20% contingency over and above the District's OAN figure. This represents a pragmatic approach to the issue of unmet need arising from Leicester City, the scale and distribution of which are both currently undeclared.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5398 KIBWORTH HARCOURT Parish Council (Dr Kevin Feltham) [3789]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Pleased to see exclusion of The Kibworths from this list of Rural Centres being allocated more housing. The Kibworths have accepted over 1,000 either already constructed and occupied, being constructed or with outline planning permission.

However, there needs to be an extra explanatory paragraph giving reasons why The Kibworths, despite being the largest Rural Centre, has not had any further houses allocated in the Local Plan to 2031.

**Response:**

The following additional wording is proposed to expand para 5.1.17, 'In relation to Broughton Astley, the Kibworths, Husbands Bosworth, Ullesthorpe, Great Bowden, North Kilworth, the residual housing requirement is zero due to the high level of recent completions and ongoing housing commitments'.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5891 LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Consortium support the Council's approach to the provision of new housing being specified as a minimum figure and identifying a housing supply over and above the District's own needs to address unforeseen circumstances and unmet needs elsewhere. The Settlement Hierarchy is the most appropriate strategy to deliver growth co-locating strategic housing and economic development in those areas with the greatest propensity to give access to services and facilities by sustainable modes of transport, aligned with the investment strategies of the sub-regional economic bodies.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6829 Homes and Communities Agency [5784]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The reduction of the 20% buffer to 5% from 2018/19 onwards is noted, but needs to be considered in the context of the Council's shortly anticipated 5 year housing land supply update and the cross boundary housing needs. It is proposed that draft Policy H1 be amended to include the wording as set out in the main representation, which is drawn from the Inspectors comments on the recent Scarborough Borough Council Local Plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

As a significant land holder and housing delivery partner for Harborough District Council.

**Response:**

The proposed wording is not considered necessary, since the existing policy GD2 replaces the previous limits to development and sets out appropriate criteria to ensure development is delivered in appropriate locations in line with SS1. In addition Policy IMR1 and Appendix K set out how delivery will be monitored and any failure to meet the 5 year supply dealt with.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7311 Mr and Mrs Welton [6497]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy H1: Provision of New Housing, we fully support the recognition that the housing requirements outlined in this policy are a minimum and the level of flexibility that this element of the policy provides. We support the identification of Market Harborough as an appropriate location for the delivery of a minimum of 1,140 new dwellings. We consider that the proposed development of Land off Harborough Road for 15 new 2-bedroom low energy apartments is an appropriate scale and will deliver a scheme that makes a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of Market Harborough.

**Response:**

This site size is below the level at which strategic allocations are being made, but the site could be pursued through the DM process, subject to Policy GD2 and other relevant policies.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7513 Mr Steve Louth [5609]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We broadly support the distribution of development as defined in Policy H1 Provision of New Housing, and the proposed levels of development in the SRVs being expressed as minima.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5842 Mr Peter Canham [6145]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Over the last 7 years we have had 724 new houses built in the village with a further 1200 proposed. Has anyone surveyed the road structures in and out of the village, they are chaotic and dangerous. We have 1 paper shop, 1 small co-op, 1 pub. The fishing lake has been taken from us, now you are proposing to take away the Golf Club and Nature Reserve. What is next?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I do not have any modifications other than the 1200 houses should not be built.

**Response:**

Scraptoft is identified within the Settlement Hierarchy as part of the Leicester Principal Urban Area since it forms part of the built up area of Leicester. As such it is considered capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment. Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. Policy SC1 also requires the provision of retail and community facilities. The golf course will be related nearby and the Nature Reserve (which never operated as such) will be replaced by a Local Wildlife Site covering the most valuable area of grassland.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6159 Mrs Helen Taylor [6109]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This area of Scraptoft has already had more of its fair share of development recently, I thought with the completion of Goodridge development we would have fulfilled our quota of housing now it is proposed to build 1200 houses. This plan came to the table at a very late stage and involves basically building on most of the green wedge here including a nature reserve. By building on the golf course Scraptoft will be losing yet another facility. Also the road infrastructure would require major modification and it is very hard to see how this can be done.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

build elsewhere

**Response:**

Scraptoft is identified within the Settlement Hierarchy as part of the Leicester Principal Urban Area since it forms part of the built up area of Leicester. As such it is considered capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment. Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6540 Miss Chloe Bibby [6241]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft doesn't have the infrastructure to support this scale of development. Village, junctions and one-way system will become congested. Land should be found beyond the boundaries of the LNR and Golf Course for housing or lower the target for Scraptoft.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the housing target for Scraptoft.

**Response:**

Thurnby, Bushby and Scraptoft are within the Leicester Principal Urban Area and as such considered appropriate for housing growth given the relative ease of access to the range of higher order health, education, cultural and retail services and employment opportunities available within Leicester City. SC1 requires appropriate mitigation of the effects of additional traffic on the road network.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6596 Mr Niles Holroyde [6378]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scale and nature of development.

Loss of Nature Reserve

Loss of trees on Golf Course.

Traffic disruption

Impact on social infrastructure

**Change To Plan Sought:**

At the very least there needs to be a policy link between the provision of the new Leicester Eastern Bypass and the release of any development land at Scraptoft Golf course.

**Response:**

Polict SC1 hi) requires provision of green corridors along Scraptoft Brook to retain its value as an important wildlife corridor, including designation of part of the area as a Local Wildlife Site. SC1 s) requires retention and enhancement of visually important hedgerows and boundary trees, particularly along the northern boundary of the site. SC1 x) requires retention of habitat connectivity by enhancing or sensitively replacing the habitat value of existing herb-rich grassland, scrub, hedgerows and ponds. SC1 also requires provision of: a two form entry primary school; contributions towards secondary school; a neighbourhood centre; and green infrastructure. SC1 also requires a package of measures to mitigate the impact of additional traffic on the highway network, as well as a number of measures to encourage use of alternative transport, including: well connected street patterns; improved connections to existing cycling routes; a minimum of 20 minute frequency bus service; public transport infrastructure; a travel plan and green travel package for residents.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7438 Mr Lewis Johnson [5631]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Cut the number of houses, so that the Scraptoft Local Nature Reserve can be left alone. This would also reduce the traffic problem, that will result from new traffic heading south and east, that will travel through the narrow lane of Scraptoft, Thurnby & Stoughton

**Response:**

Land to the north of Scraptoft is allocated and expected to deliver approximately 1,200 houses in order to help meet the District's housing requirement and make a contribution to unmet needs arising from Leicester City. A lower number may not deliver the required infrastructure, such as the primary school.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7520 Westleigh Developments Ltd [423]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We support the recognition that the housing requirements are a minimum but we are concerned that development within the Leicester PUA is to be located within a single Strategic Development Area [SDA] on land north of Scraptoft. Given the high level of infrastructure that is required for such large strategic developments, there are often substantial delays between their initial identification and the first delivery of housing. We believe the Local Plan should identify a number of smaller housing sites that could assist in the short-term delivery of housing in the PUA. Therefore we propose the allocation of Land South of Grange Lane, Thurnby for residential development.

**Response:**

The site size is below the level for which strategic allocations are being made. The site is within the established Green Wedge.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5982 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

With the commitment of 1500 houses already on the Airfield Farm site, another 1140 in Market Harborough itself will overpower the town with infrastructure such as roads becoming unsustainable. Areas such as the roundabout at Aldi/Lidl is gridlocked and it can take a lot of time to travel through the town. The town doesn't have the capacity to increase road space and due to the location of these sites residents will be reliant on cars. The Airfield Farm site will end up linking with Alvington Way to avoid the town, increasing traffic on this road.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Level of proposed development should be addressed especially in the peripheral locations unless it can be shown that it will not effect the road capacity.

**Response:**

Each of the Market Harborough housing allocations requires a financial contribution to the mitigation measures outlined in the Market Harborough Transport Strategy, together with relevant necessary highway works and provision of parking and cycle parking facilities.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6003 Market Harborough & the Bowdens Charity [6192]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

For reasons set out in separate representations, there is a short term need for additional housing allocations, consequently further consideration should be given to making allocations for housing on two sites owned by my clients. Such an allocation would help to meet the inevitable short term shortfall in housing release whilst also benefitting the wider community via the work of the land owning charity.

1. Approximately 0.33ha of land at the head of Stevens Street.
2. Paddock land extending to 1.33ha immediately to the north of the proposed Airfield Farm access bridge off Leicester Road.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The identified lands should be allocated for future residential development.

**Response:**

The sites are smaller than the level identified for strategic allocations but could come forward through the DM process subject to Policy GD2 and other relevant policies. Site 1. is identified as open space (allotments) and is subject to Policy GI2.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6005 Market Harborough & the Bowdens Charity [6192]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The draft plan is defective in that it does not address the future pattern of land use and development of the very prominent and strategically important lands at the town's main northern gateway. This is all that loop of land to the east of the Grand Union Canal , and west of the Leicester Road.

Clearly there is potential to coordinate a pattern of uses on these mainly Brownfield lands that enhance the entrance to the town and at the same time results in all the land being put to high value beneficial uses.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This land should be designated as a strategic development area with a presumption in favour of development and/or redevelopment with a range of commercial, leisure and residential uses.

**Response:**

The sites are smaller than the level identified for strategic allocations but could come forward through the DM process subject to Policy GD2 and other relevant policies.

---

**RepID Representation**

6047 Messrs Bufton [6195]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

For reasons set out in separate representations, there is a short term need for additional housing allocations, consequently further consideration should be given to making an allocation for housing on land owned by my client at Leicester Lane, Great Bowden. The land in question extends to approximately 1ha, is &quot;brownfield&quot; being in use at present as a commercial sawmill, and is situated between the existing developed edge of the village and the recently consented Gladman site immediately to the west.

My client is on the point of entering into an agreement with a national developer.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Include the land as shown on the attached as being within an area for future residential development.

**Response:**

The site is below the level at which strategic allocations are being made and there is no requirement for further land in Great Bowden to be brought forward through the Neighbourhood Plan. It could be considered through the DM process subject to Policy GD2 and other relevant policies.

**RepID Representation**

6606 Mr & Mrs M Banks [1335]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We attended MH exhibition but despite detailed layouts for more saturation housing, which clearly we don't need, nothing mentioned about improving infrastructure and surrounding roads. Such development is not sustainable. The town can barely cope now, without thousands more cars in the area with nowhere to park. People will shop elsewhere as a result and stores will close.

We urge that no more houses are built in the town and surrounding villages until some sanity is brought to the planning process and developers really contribute to improving surrounding roads and infrastructure etc and the council find a new parking site.

**Response:**

Each of the Market Harborough housing allocations requires a financial contribution to the mitigation measures outlined in the Market Harborough Transport Strategy, together with relevant necessary highway works and provision of parking and cycle parking facilities.

**RepID Representation**

7340 Castlerow Property Investments Ltd [6458]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Site allocations are based on an inaccurate assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal and the housing trajectory is based on sites which are fundamentally flawed or which have been delayed. Additional sites are required which are deliverable in the short term, land at Clack Hill (A/MH/HSG/50) is such a site. See full text.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Land at Clack Hill should be reassessed in light of a recent transport statement which shows that access is achievable and supporting documents which demonstrate that the site is deliverable. Additional sites which are deliverable within the next 5 years are required to ensure a 5 year land supply.

**Response:**

Omission sites will be considered should further housing land be required. The site was considered for allocation but rejected on landscape grounds.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7500 **Jelson Homes Limited [3965]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

If MH1 and MH2 deliver fewer dwellings than allocated, as per their dwelling capacity identified in the SHLAA 2016, this would result in a shortfall of 155 homes across sites allocated for residential development in Market Harborough. This, coupled with the 100 dwellings needed to meet the full requirement of 1,140dw in Market Harborough, would result in an overall shortfall of 255 homes (a quarter of the total).

To address this shortfall, Jelson encourage the Council to consider allocating its site the north of Market Harborough for residential development. Further detail, a location plan and an appraisal of the sites merits is provided in Section 5 of the full representation.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We encourage the Council to allocate an additional site for residential development in Market Harborough within the draft HLP.

A site to the north of Market Harborough, in Jelson's ownership, with capacity to deliver 353dw is proposed for allocation.

**Response:**

Omission sites will be considered should further housing land be required. The site is in an area of high landscape sensitivity and Medium Low Landscape Capacity for development.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5383 **Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Unrealistic to expect Market Harborough to accommodate a further 1140 dwellings by 2031. The Town already has to accommodate 2000 new dwellings but the residents have not been able to monitor the impact. No guarantee infrastructure can be provided. Competition between major sites could delay house building and provision of local centres.

If the Council requires more land they should look at sites which adjoin Airfield Farm, a development of 1400 dwellings, and benefit from the local facilities to be provided.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Consider more new housing allocations for Market Harborough on land adjoining Airfield Farm.

**Response:**

Para 5.1.10 explains that the housing land supply includes a contingency to allow for unforeseen circumstances in the delivery of housing land. It is unlikely that further housing development at Airfield farm could be delivered within the plan period.

---

**RepID Representation**

5373 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

see our response to MH1

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete the allocation for Overstone Park

**Response:**

Noted. A planning application has been submitted for the site, and includes extensive landscape assessment, including a landscape assessment to inform the layout of the site commissioned by HDC. Criteria MH1 1k requires that the layout and design is shaped by a suitable LVIA, whilst criteria MH1 1e requires necessary highway works and sustainable transport measures.

---

**RepID Representation**

5375 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not Sustainable- does not accord with Government Policies.A major intrusion of built development in to essential rural setting of attractive Market Town Site is remote from major facilities of the Town- not connected.

detrimental to views from adjacent countryside and Brampton Valley Way; boundaries are defined by land ownership and County boundary, not natural features.

Will create unacceptable levels of Traffic in the Town; no practical alternatives in public transport.; not within reasonable walking or cycling distance of facilities.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete this allocation. The Council should consider further housing development adjoining the SDA at Airfield Farm, where a new community is to be created.

**Response:**

Noted. A planning application has been submitted for the site, and includes extensive landscape assessment, including a landscape assessment to inform the layout of the site commissioned by HDC. Criteria MH1 1k requires that the layout and design is shaped by a suitable LVIA, whilst criteria MH1 1e requires necessary highway works and sustainable transport measures.

The site has Moderate / Low Landscape Sensitivity and Medium to High Landscape Capacity for development.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5376 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

While the principle of housing is accepted as an alternative to industry the development should not be allowed to go ahead until the traffic problems encountered in Northampton Road, Springfield Street to St Mary's Rd have been resolved. The Market Harborough Transport Strategy 2016 is just a wish list. Projects not designed and approved, any land required is yet to be acquired, finance and programme not available. Not sustainable to require just a contribution to academic proposals. The Local Centre at Western Avenue should be enhanced by the Council

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Programme development in relation to Highway improvements or delete allocation.

**Response:**

Noted. Final MH Transport Study has since been approved by LCC (12th December), and will be approved by HDC in February 2018. The Study contains costed schemes, towards which the policy requires financial contributions. The prioritisation of schemes will be determined by the impact of specific schemes, as evidenced through forthcoming Transport Assessments.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6689 Mr and Mrs Gowling [6400]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy H1: Provision of New Housing, we fully support the recognition that the housing requirements outlined in this policy are a minimum and the level of flexibility that this element of the policy provides. In addition, we fully support the allocation of our land at Northampton Road, Market Harborough for residential development up around 350 dwellings as set out by Part 2(b) of the Draft Policy. As previously stated, we consider the site has the capacity to deliver approximately 350 dwellings with associated vehicular access, pedestrian links, public open space, car parking, landscaping and drainage.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5422 Mr Michael Major [4083]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Land off Burnmill Road - The land identified for housing is prima agricultural land and should be retained for that purpose. Other land is available for development which is less harmful to the environment e.g. near the old airfield

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Local Plan showing the land off Burnmill Road should amended to show it remaining as agricultural land

**Response:**

Insufficient capacity to expand permitted Airfield Farm development to accommodate housing needs in the plan period. The central part of the site has Medium High Capacity for development, with the western end having Medium capacity and the eastern end having Medium Low capacity. This would need to be taken into account in the site layout in response to Policy MH3 (1) (f) and (h).

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5737 Mrs Claire Sixt [6092]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This development will severely damage an important wildlife corridor for deer, foxes, hedgehogs, fieldmice, voles, owls and raptors moving between Harborough and Bowden. It should not be located here. If it must be located here, then the small forest must be retained or reinstated nearby, access must be via the current farm access road, widened up to the reservoir (there is space), with passing spaces and pavements, but with the hedgerows and trees reinstated nearby to preserve the wildlife corridor. Access cannot be via Kingston Way and Bates Close: this will cause unacceptable gridlock, congestion and risk to pedestrians.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It would be best if the development were not located here. If it must be located here, then the small forest must be retained or reinstated nearby, access must be via the current farm access road, widened up to the reservoir (there is space), with passing spaces and pavements, but with the hedgerows and trees reinstated nearby to preserve the wildlife corridor.

**Response:**

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology consultation and planning application process as appropriate. Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5760 Mrs Sarah Tandy [6115]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Poor access  
Bad development  
Drainage

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In particular an alternative access needs to be found, the farm is currently accessed by a track from the top of Burnmill Road, can this not be widened and then the development could be kept separate from the existing roads

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water suppliers will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5870 **Mr Paul Henry [6165]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The Harborough local plan is also being developed for a requirement for circa 12,800 dwellings. The site MH3 which is subject to this proposal seeks to have a maximum of 90 dwellings it is surplus to the overarching aims of the plan and therefore not justified given its position and restrictions to local access. The development plan document, on which the public have been consulted, already identifies other more suitable sites which have more ready access and which will provide the extra housing stock required in order to meet the quota of the required extra 4660 houses.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove the requirement for the proposed development at MH3 which is surplus to requirements.

**Response:**

MH3 contributes to the provision of a supply of housing land to meet both the housing requirement plus a contingency to help meet unmet need from elsewhere within the HMA and to allow for possible future circumstances affecting the supply of housing land. Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5985 **Mrs N Stanley [1279]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Given the peripheral location of their site, the density is too high. The local plan states the Alvington Way has the capacity for additional vehicles but does not take into account the increase in traffic once the Airfield Farm development is completed. Airfield Farm/Alvington Way will become 'ring road to avoid the town'. Alvington Way was designed as access to residents only not a rat run as it has now become. Is it necessary to use this site given the already committed development at the Airfield Farm site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The development of the Airfield Farm site should be considered in relation to development of Alvington Way in particular the increase in traffic through Alvington Way

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6561 Mr David Goddard [6344]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Due to the presence of protected species, by stopping this development now you will be preventing the law from being broken.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Nothing should happen that will harm the newts in any way.

An independent ecologist (possibly appointed by Leicester and Rutland Wildlife Trust) should detail exactly what considerations should be taken if the land is to be developed. Natural England and the county ecologist can also give you legal advice.

**Response:**

No evidence has been submitted of the existence of protected species (newts) on this site. Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. In accordance with Policy MH3 (1)(c) further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology consultation and planning application process as appropriate.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6734 Christine Forde [6158]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Site Access not big enough  
Drainage is of concern  
Too many houses planned for road infrastructure  
Mix of housing types.  
Ecological impact. Insufficient evidence for comprehensive survey  
Road Infrastructure Impact.  
Area Impact.  
Drainage capacity planning.  
Sustainable drainage plugs into Victorian drainage system on Burnmill Road  
Archaeological Impact.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Different access road  
Fewer houses in keeping with the area  
Not building on this site

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required. Landscape and ecological assessments and the policy should influence the proposed layout and design of any scheme.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5345 mr stephen keogh [5727]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The traffic on the Leicester Road in this area is already congested and this proposed road will be next to some prestige houses that have been built. It is already very difficult to pull out onto the Leicester road without anymore traffic flow being added to it. Why when you have got other housing options would you build a bridge which will cost tens of millions of pounds. At the moment Lutterworth has one of the worst air pollution problems in the UK. More traffic ,More pollution

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build some where where you have not got to build a multi million pound bridge to add to an already overburdened Leicester Road / Bill Crane way. Where you will have to bring Gas / Electric / water services across the M1  
Move electric pylons.

**Response:**

Junction improvements, including on the A426 and A4303, will be delivered in advance of commencement. Improvements to the A5 are not required to serve the SDA. Traffic modelling indicates that the spine road will result in reductions in traffic through the town centre in the long term. Policy L1 3y requires noise and air quality mitigation measures for proposed dwellings adjoining the M1, and not moderate or worse adverse impact upon air quality within the Lutterworth AQMA.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5355 Mr Gerard Growney [5881]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Lutterworth is already meeting its social obligations with 4 (or more) new housing developments in the year 2016 - 2017 alone. The idea to build a 1500+ dwelling development to the East of the M1 will destroy the local existing Lutterworth community and identity. It will saturate the existing local resources and compromise the ability of the local schools to deliver their mandate of high quality education. It will turn a Market Town with some identity into an urban sprawl, diluted from any persona and will reduce the quality of living of the existing residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Instead of Lutterworth East, an adjunct to Lutterworth, why not look to build a whole new town with its own identity. There is plenty of Green space in the district. Or even change the plans for the extension of Manga Park (which is absolutely not required at all) and look to build on that targeted land.

**Response:**

L1 requires the development to provide appropriate educational, community, enviornmental and highways infratsructure to meet the needs of its new residents.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5675 Mr Anthony Brookes [5991]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

My objection relates to the complete lack of provision for road infrastructure to support this building, and the impact on Lutterworth, not the principle of build itself. A "spine road" is muted, which if like Brookfield Way, is completely inadequate. A Bypass of Lutterworth is required from the proposed bridge over the m1 north of Lutterworth to jct 20 of the M1 running adjacent to the motorway. Normal estate roads can feed off this road. Equally there needs to be a weight limit on the Town centre to reduce pollution, and direct traffic to the new road

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Details of required infrastructure for Roads, but also policing, schools and other amenities.

**Response:**

A high speed by-pass on the route currently shown would have an adverse impact on the proposed SDA and its links with Lutterworth town centre, although detailed work on the scale, design and exact alignment of the spine road would be done as part of the master plan. Traffic modelling indicates that the spine road will result in reductions in traffic through the town centre in the long term.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5855 Mrs Gillian Groom [6152]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The road infrastructure south of Lutterworth on the A426 cannot cope with the existing traffic levels. Since the changes to the A14 junction this is the main route from M1 south to M6 North. This is congested every day and if there are any incidents on the M1 south of junction 20, (at least 2-3 incidents every week) this road becomes gridlocked. This also results in the village of Shawell being used as a relief road for cars. Shawell has already sent representations to Harborough district and Leics CC re the problems this is causing.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Until there is a plan to address this there should be no further building in Lutterworth and any of the surrounding communities that need to travel via Lutterworth and the A426.

**Response:**

Junction improvements, including on the A426 and A4303, will be delivered in advance of commencement. Improvements to the A5 are not required to serve the SDA. Traffic modelling indicates that the spine road will result in reductions in traffic through the town centre in the long term.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6650 Mr Alberto Costa MP [6053]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I have been closely following the plans for the large-scale development known locally as 'Lutterworth East' for some time. I acknowledge that while these plans have not yet been finalized, they are nevertheless a source of some concern for my constituents. Given that these are 'embryonic' plans, I am unable to commit fully until I see further detailed plans.

**Response:**

Noted



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6673 Rugby Borough Council (Mr Martin Needham) [6402]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Jacobs Preliminary Impact Assessment 2016 appears to exclude areas outside of Leicestershire, even though there are main routes adjoining or crossing into neighbouring counties (in Rugby Borough's case the A5 and A426, near to Magna Park and Lutterworth proposals), and analysis is not apparent in other documents. Query whether sufficient consultation has taken place with Warwickshire County Council Highways Authority to ensure the local plan's implications on cross-county matters have been taken into account.

It should be considered how the proposals for growth in Rugby Borough's proposed Local Plan (currently being examined by the Planning Inspectorate) have been taken into account. Further consultation with Warwickshire County Council is encouraged.

**Response:**

Consultation with Warwickshire County Council Highway Authority has taken place and further liaison is expected prior to Submission of the Local Plan.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7164 Mrs Elaine Chapman [6416]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

In principal I support the development of housing-we need more housing to meet demand. However I do have concerns regarding the scale of this development and the fact that the infrastructure might not be upgraded at the same pace as housing is created. Lutterworth does need investment into its infrastructure, the towns roads are at capacity at many time of the day and other services such as the GP surgery are only just fit for current purpose. Any development that takes place in and around Lutterworth must be supported by an equal investment into services.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A development of this scale MUST be supported by an equal commitment to developing services that will be put under greater pressure due to the housing development.

**Response:**

L1 requires the development to provide appropriate educational, community, enviornmental and highways infratsructure to meet the needs of its new residents.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5367 Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd [5909]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The distribution of growth across the district and particularly to Fleckney is not justified and fundamentally undermines the soundness of the Local Plan, the achievability of the Vision of the Local Plan, and is contrary to the NPPF.

See full text and attachment.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The housing numbers for Fleckney, which provides one of the most sustainable settlements in the district and the most sustainable Rural Centre, need to be increased to provide for growth which is at least consistent with the less sustainable Rural Centres of Great Glen and The Kibworths. This would necessitate a requirement in excess of the 474 homes planned at Great Glen and in excess of the 519 homes planned at The Kibworths.

**Response:**

The scale of new housing to be provided in individual settlements reflects the roles of different places in the settlement hierarchy and existing levels of commitments and completions. There is no evidence to support the contention that Fleckney is more sustainable than Kibworth, given that it has no secondary school.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6396

**Catesby Property Group (Mr Edward Barrett) [5772]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Currently the Harborough Local Plan is considered unsound because it fails to identify sufficient allocations to ensure that the full objectively assessed housing need for District is met. At present, too much of the District's residual housing requirement is proposed to be delivered on non-allocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans. Relying on these mechanisms to deliver a significant proportion of the District's housing requirement provides no guarantee that the Local Plan will deliver the District's identified housing need.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to make the Plan sound, it is considered that Policies SS1 and H1 should be modified to identify additional residential allocations in Fleckney. This modification is necessary to increase the percentage of the District's residual housing requirement which will be delivered on allocated sites. At present, over half (56%) of Fleckney's minimum housing requirement is proposed to be delivered on sites allocated in a Neighbourhood Plan. In order to provide the greatest certainty that the minimum housing requirement for the settlement will be delivered, it is considered that an additional allocation on land south of Kilby Road, Fleckney should be identified. Any forthcoming Neighbourhood Plan would then have the opportunity to identify additional allocations over and above the minimum requirement.

In order to make the Plan sound, Policy F1 should be amended to allocate land south of Kilby Road, Fleckney for 150 homes. The site is situated to the west of Fleckney, accessed from Priest Meadow. It has capacity for 150 dwellings. The site is well located for local services and facilities in Fleckney village centre and was judged to be deliverable over 0 to 5 years in the SHLAA. The SHLAA identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Fleckney.

Accompanying these representations is a Vision Framework for the proposed residential allocation on land south of Kilby Road, Fleckney. A separate Location Plan for the site is also enclosed. The enclosed Vision Framework demonstrates that the 7 hectare site is deliverable and capable of appropriately accommodating up to 150 dwellings.

**Response:**

Omission sites will be considered should further housing land be required.

The Local Plan allocates some 79% of the residual requirement with a further 5% on windfall sites in the urban areas. Only 16% is to be found on unallocated sites, including through neighbourhood plans. This is considered to be a modest amount, considering the Council's support for local decision-making as set out in Local Plan Objective 14. The Council has a good record in encouraging and supporting neighbourhood plans, including at Fleckney, and a large number have already been delivered with sufficient allocations to meet their Local Plan housing requirements. The strength of the housing market also means that smaller sites can be expected to come forward through the development management process.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7605 Bidwells (Mr Robert Love) [4663]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst Policy H1 identifies provision for a minimum of 295 dwellings at Fleckney, only provision for 130 dwellings at 'land at Arnesby Road' has been identified within the policy. Policy H1 it does not fully identify where provision for all of the 295 dwellings will be allocated at Fleckney. For Policy H1 to allocate this level of housing for Fleckney, we consider that both Policy H1 and the Policies Map should identify where this housing provision is to be delivered by specifying it within the policy text and identifying its location as a housing allocation in the Policies Map.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Ensure the housing requirements meet the FOAN for the market area and other objectives of the contingency identified above including providing for potential unmet housing need from Leicester City Council and Oadby and Wigston Borough Council, lack of delivery from housing allocations and permitted sites and changing economic circumstances; identify the site off Longgreay, Fleckney as a housing allocation.

**Response:**

Omission sites will be considered should further housing land be required. The Local Plan allocates some 79% of the residual requirement with a further 5% on windfall sites in the urban areas. Only 16% is to be found on unallocated sites, including through neighbourhood plans. This is considered to be a modest amount, considering the Council's support for local decision-making as set out in Local Plan Objective 14. The Council has a good record in encouraging and supporting neighbourhood plans, including at Fleckney, and a large number have already been delivered with sufficient allocations to meet their Local Plan housing requirements. The Council considers that it has made adequate contingency provision to meet the factors identified. There is no longer a need to meet unmet need in Oadby and Wigston in the plan period.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5792 FLECKNEY Parish Council (Mr J Flower) [2626]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

That the allocation of development sites is made through the neighbourhood planning process rather than the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Para 16.1.3 explains that of the minimum target of 295 dwellings for Fleckney, the Local Plan allocates land off Arnesby Road for 130 homes, leaving the remainder to be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan. Given the strategic importance of the delivery of homes in Fleckney, it is appropriate that a strategic allocation is made through the Local Plan.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6067 Shire Homes [6203]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

It is noted that at paragraph 5.1.17 of the Plan the figures expressed are residual ones (i.e. not included completions and commitments) and taking this into account, the target of 295 dwellings for Fleckney is supported given the good level of services and facilities that exist in the village. My clients site at High Street has the potential to yield c60 dwellings (together with retail floorspace on the site frontage within the Local Centre). It is well located and could provide an excellent range of dwelling sizes and tenures.

**Response:**

The site is below the level at which strategic allocations are being made. It could be considered for allocation in the Fleckney Neighbourhood Plan or through the DM process subject to Policy GD2 and other relevant policies.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5653 mrs Emma Andrew [4997]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Main Street at the end nearest the village, then almost to the Fleckney sign is subject to residents parking on one side of the road. Given the twisty nature of the road, poor visibility and narrow footpaths, it is unsuitable for the extra traffic associated with such a large development. This road is unsafe and impractical. The existing residents along the road have no space for alternative parking.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Much too big an allocation of new homes for this road. With the David Wilson development already earmarked to go ahead are this many houses really needed?

**Response:**

Policy F1 b requires necessary highways works and sustainable transport measures in accordance with an approved transport assessment and travel plan, including integrating public footpaths crossing the site into the design and layout.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6070 Shire Homes [6203]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Notwithstanding my clients support for the overall target of 295 dwellings for Fleckney, the allocation of land at Arnesby Road for 130 dwellings (a significant proportion of the overall quantum of development in the village) without reference to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan risks full consideration of the views of the Parish Council who are preparing the Plan not taking place. It is understood that my clients site at High Street is favoured for allocation in the NP - this would potentially cause confusion if different sites were allocated in different documents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Modify the Plan to allow the choice of allocated in Fleckney to be made by the Parish Council as part of the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan or alternatively, allocate both sites at Arnesby Road and High Street

**Response:**

Para 16.1.3 explains that of the minimum target of 295 dwellings for Fleckney, the Local Plan allocates land off Arnesby Road for 130 homes, leaving the remainder to be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan. Given the strategic importance of the delivery of homes in Fleckney, it is appropriate that a strategic allocation is made through the Local Plan.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5793 FLECKNEY Parish Council (Mr J Flower) [2626]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

That the allocation of development sites is made through the neighbourhood planning process rather than the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Para 16.1.3 explains that of the minimum target of 295 dwellings for Fleckney, the Local Plan allocates land off Arnesby Road for 130 homes, leaving the remainder to be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan. Given the strategic importance of the delivery of homes in Fleckney, it is appropriate that a strategic allocation is made through the Local Plan.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6987 Family Carr [6455]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We consider that Great Glen has the capacity to accommodate a greater quantum of development than the 35 dwelling minimum requirement proposed. Great Glen has a wide range of key services and facilities, including a GP, a Primary School, Leicester Grammar School, a Convenience Store and a Post Office. The village also benefits from good connectivity to higher order settlements such as Leicester, Oadby and Market Harborough and the services and employment opportunities available in these settlements. It is an attractive settlement where people want to live.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We consider that Great Glen has the capacity to accommodate a greater quantum of development than the 35 dwelling minimum requirement proposed.

We propose the formal allocation of Land off London Road, Great Glen as a strategic residential development. The site has capacity for c.150 dwellings which will assist to meet both the District's needs and any unmet needs arising from Oadby and Wigston Borough or Leicester City.

**Response:**

The main consideration is not that sites are available but that there is no requirement for further development on this scale in Great Glen, given the strategy set out in Policy SS1. Sufficient flexibility has also been included in the Local Plan's housing provision to make a substantial contribution to meeting Leicester's unmet need, subject to further work to be undertaken on the City's Local Plan and the Memorandum of Understanding between HMA authorities. Oadby and Wigston have no unmet need in the plan period.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7367 Millers Homes [3959]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This representation identifies that whilst the general development strategy is supported, modifications need to be made to the Council's housing delivery strategy to ensure the proposed housing numbers are met and can accommodate any unmet need. The reliance on strategic allocations and the willingness of neighbourhood plans to allocate sites is an over presumptuous strategy to meet the required housing numbers.

Land to the north of Oaks Road (northern parcel), Great Glen offers a suitable development opportunity to meet any future increase in housing numbers and redistribution of housing growth across the Harborough District Plan Period.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Increase housing target figure for Great Glen and allocate land to the north of Oaks Road (northern parcel) for housing

**Response:**

There is no requirement for further development on this scale at Great Glen given the strategy in Policy SS1.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7566 **Millers Homes (Helen Dawkins) [3960]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Modifications need to be made to the Council's housing delivery strategy to ensure the proposed housing numbers are met and can accommodate the likely increase of the housing need of neighboring authorities. Land to the north of Oaks Road (northern parcel), Great Glen offers a suitable development opportunity to meet any future increase in housing numbers and redistribution of housing growth. The proposed site is deliverable in that it is available now, situated in a sustainable location and achievable in terms of delivering new housing within the next five years.

**Response:**

There is no requirement for further development on this scale at Great Glen given the strategy in Policy SS1.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6981 **Family Carr [6455]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

With regards to Policy H1: Provision of New Housing, we fully support the recognition that the housing requirements outlined in this policy are a minimum and the level of flexibility that this element of the policy provides. We support the identification of Great Glen as an appropriate location to support residential development.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6269 **The Cooperative Estates (Richard Lomas) [3906]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Policy H1 should identify suitable allocations within each settlement, sufficient to deliver the minimum housing requirement identified in the Local Plan. This would not prevent subsequent Neighbourhood Plans making additional allocations, which are in general conformity with the Local Plan.

Additionally, land at Stretton Lane in Houghton on the Hill should be allocated for up to 36 dwellings. The suitability and deliverability of this site is supported by the Local Plan evidence base.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Local Plan should identify sufficient allocations to deliver the 790 dwellings (minimum) anticipated to arise from Neighbourhood Plan allocations. These should include 36 dwellings at Stretton Lane, Houghton on the Hill.

**Response:**

The size of this site is below the level for strategic allocations; allocation should be a matter for the Neighbourhood Plan. The Council is committed to supporting Neighbourhood Plans (see Objective 14)

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5356 Mr Gerard Growney [5881]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Bitteswell, as with Lutterworth is already meeting its social obligations with 4 (or more) new housing developments in area in the year 2016 - 2017 alone. The idea to build a dwelling development to the East of the M1 will destroy the local existing Lutterworth/Bitteswell community and identity. It will saturate the existing local resources and compromise the ability of the local schools to deliver their mandate of high quality education. It will turn a villiage with some identity into an urban sprawl, diluted from any persona and will reduce the quality of living of the existing residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

why not look to build a whole new town with its own identity. There is plenty of Green space in the district. Or even change the plans for the extension of Manga Park (which is absolutely not required at all) and look to build on that targeted land.

**Response:**

L1 requires the development to provide appropriate educational, community, enviornmental and highways infrastructure to meet the needs of its new residents. The scale of development required within Harborough is insufficient to operate as a new town and provide all the necessary facilities, services, infratructure and employment opportunities. No sites for a potential new town have been identified. Nevertheless the SDA will create a sustainable, high quality and largely self-sufficient settlement as set out in Policy L1 (3).

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7167 Alpha Investments [6478]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Policy H1 identifies minimum housing requirements for the Selected Rural Villages, including Bitteswell (a minimum of 30). The fact that these are expressed as minimum requirements is supported as it incorporates a degree of flexibility into the policy. Marrons Planning does have concerns that the housing trajectory at Appendix G would not ensure a 5 year housing land supply on adoption and thinks this should be addressed by the Local Plan prior to submission to the Secretary of State.

**Response:**

Noted.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6568 EAST LANGTON and CHURCH LANGTON Parish Council (Alison Gibson) [2624]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

East Langton Parish is classed as a Selected Rural Village, one of only three settlements where two villages have been grouped together as a result of walking distances to Church Langton Primary School.

The impact is to increase the housing requirement for the Parish to 30, and East Langton which would otherwise be treated as an unsustainable location for housing is required to take a significant number (although the Local Plan doesn't distinguish between villages in terms of location for housing so it could therefore increase the requirement for Church Langton if no suitable East Langton sites come forward.).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The villages of Church Langton and East Langton should not be grouped together

**Response:**

The co-joining of Church and East Langton for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school, as well as the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5440 Mrs Jan Butcher [4328]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As The Claybrookes should not be designated as an SRV as that policy is unsound, see earlier comments, the housing allocation is unjustified

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove the target of 50 house for the Claybrookes and reallocate

**Response:**

The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby', as well as the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

**RepID Representation**

5518 Mr Neville Karai [6022]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Speeding Traffic  
Congestion  
Pedestrian Safety  
Pollution, Noise and lack of sustainable facilities to support new development

**Change To Plan Sought:**

By pass roads and limited access

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services and of guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of small-scale infill or limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives.

**RepID Representation**

5550 Mrs Maria Lockley [5818]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Claybrookes are big enough already and far too big for local amenities, which have dwindled as the community has grown. The doctors' surgery and primary school are full to bursting. Traffic speeding through the villages is horrendous and the quality of village life seriously eroded.

There is no evidence at all of any demand for more housing here. Through its own ineptitude, HDC has itself in a mess over housing allocations and is trying to stick new homes anywhere and everywhere it can. Also to legitimize schemes passed already which contravene the existing plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scrap the new Plan in its entirety. In any case, it is merely a sham. HDC is working outside the existing Plan now, so why should anyone believe they will abide by any other.?

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services and of guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of small-scale infill or limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools. The fact that the existing school is near capacity does not mean that this will continue to be the case in the future; in any event the school may currently rely on parents driving in from outside the villages which is an unsustainable travel pattern. In the absence of an up to date Local Plan there is a presumption in favour of granting permission. Once the Local Plan is adopted proposals must accord with it.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5597 Mr Neil Blackhall [5817]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

50 new houses at The Claybrookes

1. would require development on green field land having a detrimental impact on the rural landscape
2. Would reduce the green wedge between Claybrooke Parva and Claybrooke Magna destroying the individual heritage of these settlements which date back to Anglo-Saxon times
3. Would increase pressure on Claybrooke School where there is already a significant issue with parking outside (and consequent reduction in usable road width) on a dangerous bend in Main Road, Claybrooke Parva

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The maximum number of new houses in The Claybrookes should be 10 so that it can be achieved by infill and have minimal overall impact.

I believe that the plan is not JUSTIFIED as the houses could be built elsewhere.

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services and of guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5600 Dr ANGELA WINTER [4965]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

1. would require development on green field land, having a detrimental impact on the rural landscape
2. Would reduce the green wedge between Claybrooke Parva and Claybrooke Magna destroying the individual heritage of these settlements which date back to Anglo-Saxon times
3. Would increase pressure on Claybrooke School where there is already a significant issue with dangerous parking outside on a sharp bend in Main Road, Claybrooke Parva which makes driving through the area hazardous.
4. There are already long queues to get onto the A5 at Woodway Lane (from Parva) and High Cross in a morning

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The maximum number of new houses should be capped at 10 to avoid having a material impact on the villages and rural environment.

The plan is not JUSTIFIED as the houses could be build elsewhere.

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services and of guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5603 Mrs Linda Hollingworth [6035]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Claybrooke Magna should not have been registered as SRV. The council changed the goalposts to be able to include the village as SRV after the residents had proved it did not meet the original requirements for SRV status. Therefore, object to further housing development in Claybrooke Magna. Infrastructure, lack of local services including schools doctors, etc. not sustainable if increase in housing. Congested parking on dangerous road bends by school dangerous for all.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove SRV status from Claybrooke Magna

**Response:**

The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school and of guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5655 Mr Alan Pettifer [6091]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Both Claybrookes should remain independent. These are little rural villages and people live here because of that reason. They cannot sustain extra housing, which brings with it extra traffic. There are no shops, 1 pub and an oversubscribed school. The cars parked around the school in the morning and evening is horrendous and very dangerous as they are parked all over the pavement. There is also a very limited bus service. People live in villages to look at countryside not houses and traffic.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The villages should remain villages and not turned into towns just to satisfy local councils who live too far away to care.

**Response:**

The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby' and of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools. The fact that the existing school is oversubscribed does not mean that this will continue to be the case in the future; in any event the school may currently rely on parents driving in from outside the villages which is an unsustainable travel pattern.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5657 Mr Rob Harrop [6085]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Claybrooke Parva and Claybrooke Magna do not meet the criteria for an SRV.

The school in Parva will soon be at capacity with the already approved planning consent.

Significant health and safety issues outside of the school already without increasing congestion.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove SRV status.

Plan improvements to street lighting between the villages of Magna and Parva.

Plan for better enforcement of speed limits in the two villages.

**Response:**

The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby' and the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools. The fact that the existing school is near capacity does not mean that this will continue to be the case in the future; in any event the school may currently rely on parents driving in from outside the villages which is an unsustainable travel pattern.

---

**RepID Representation**

5744 Mrs Christine Horsfall [5326]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no such village as "the Claybrookes". There are two villages with separate Parish Councils. Claybrooke Magna has one public house. Claybrooke Parva has a church and a small primary school. There is green space between the villages. Therefore the planning rules which should apply to each village is for small developments of up to 6 houses in either village. The Harborough Local Plan has already broken planning rules by allowing a development of 38 houses in Claybrooke Magna, this permission should be revoked as the change of status has not been consulted on.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Current regulations should be followed for all villages, not ignored in convenient cases.

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services and of guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

---

**RepID Representation**

5789 Mrs SM Eales [6125]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- 1..Already building approx 40 house on a new development in Claybrooke Parva
2. There is no provision for schools - Parking around the school is already dangerous mornings and afternoons
3. No provisions for doctors surgery-
4. Secondary schools are also full

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build on brownfields site

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services and of the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of small-scale infill or limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5794 Claybrooke Parva Parish Council (mr ian robertson) [6117]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Claybrooke Parva and Claybrooke Magna do not meet the criteria for an SRV.

The school in Parva will soon be at capacity with the already approved planning consent.

Significant health and safety issues outside of the school already without increasing congestion.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Plan improvements to street lighting between the villages of Magna and Parva.

Plan for better enforcement of speed limits in the two villages.

**Response:**

The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby', as well as the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools. The fact that the existing school is near capacity does not mean that this will continue to be the case in the future; in any event the school may currently rely on parents driving in from outside the villages which is an unsustainable travel pattern.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5804 John Eales [6129]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We should use more brown fields sites Village is already full -- schools doctors etc- We may need our farmland in the future to grow crops

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Cannot sell the houses built in Ullesthorpe All new properties should be built on Brown fields sites where possible. IN future we will need all the farmland to sustain the growing population

**Response:**

Given the nature of the District, the use of brownfield land is limited and insufficient to meet housing requirements.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5983 Mr J R Deacon [5980]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

HDC in giving the Claybrookes SRV status did not follow due process. There is no policy documents to support their reasons for allocating this status. When representations were made by the PC to HDC on the reasons (rules) used by HDC, HDC changed the reasons (rules) to support the status. These rules were not used elsewhere in the district. A flagrant breach of democracy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove the SRV status on the Claybrookes.

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services and of guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of small-scale infill or limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

The decision to make The Claybrookes (as well as Great Easton with Bringhurst and Church and East Langton) combined SRVs is fully supported by the evidence as set out in the Report to the Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel on 17 October 2016.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6022 Mr Richard Lockley [6161]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I object to this proposal..

Local services are already under pressure and are at full or near full capacity.

Over forty new houses are already being built or planned in Claybrooke Magna for which there will be insufficient capacity to cope.

Volume and speed of traffic is a constant problem particularly at school times.

Parking by parents at the school is unacceptable and dangerous for motorists and pedestrians alike, especially children.

The Claybrookes are individual historic villages with their own characters, not commuter towns!

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If additional houses are really necessary they should be allocated to existing commuter towns and not by allocating them to and spoiling villages that are unable to sustain such development.

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services and of the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of small-scale infill or limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools. The recently approved housing will count towards the target in Policy H1.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6156 Mr Neil Ridley [5231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This area currently has very limited amenities and would be unable to sustain such development. Claybrooke School is already struggling to cope with the current demand and would not be able to cope. There are not the employment opportunities in the area to sustain the development. Therefore this would become a dormitory settlement with inhabitants commuting out of the area, increasing traffic and lowering air quality. The local roads are not suitable to cope with this level of increase, particularly connections with the A5, with both Woodway Lane and High Cross.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete this option from the plan

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services as well as the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools. The fact that the existing school is near capacity does not mean that this will continue to be the case in the future; in any event the school may currently rely on parents driving in from outside the villages which is an unsustainable travel pattern.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6170 Mrs Valerie Deacon [6122]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Why is it that the two separate villages of Parva and Magna have been amalgamated for the purposes of housing developments? This has not happened in other areas of the District, e.g. The Langtons. Harborough District Council appear to make up the rules to fit their plans, not based on documentary evidence.

In addition there are severe parking problems around Claybrooke School, which have the potential to cause a death or injury to someone. Further housing can only increase this danger.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Removal of SRV status to the Claybrookes.

**Response:**

The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby', as well as the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools. The decision to make The Claybrookes (as well as Great Easton with Brighthurst and Church and East Langton) combined SRVs is fully supported by the evidence as set out in the Report to the Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel on 17 October 2016.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6327 S Craven [6233]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Development of either Claybrooke Magna or Parva would be totally unacceptable due to the lack of facilities, the school doesn't have much room and with parents parking along the main street is an accident waiting to happen.

With the existing developments going ahead we are already seeing the roads breaking up due to the increased traffic of trucks, and we have seen no investment in the local services that should be provided by the section 106 payment as it seems to go 'elsewhere' within the district.

Increased noise, pollution and traffic will all have an impact on the villages.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We should be seeking to develop brown field sites and insisting that any new builds ease the burden on services such as water and electricity, there simply is no excuse for ALL new buildings to have solar panels and rain water harvesting. We have a duty to reduce the burden on the planets resources.

**Response:**

The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby', as well as the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools. The fact that the existing school is near capacity does not mean that this will continue to be the case in the future; in any event the school may currently rely on parents driving in from outside the villages which is an unsustainable travel pattern.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6382 Mr Rob Harrop [6085]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Claybrooke Parva and Claybrooke Magna are two separate and independent villages with their own parish councils and distinct identity. Residents of Parva do not wish to be part of a collective that will change the unique nature of their village. Neither have the facilities to meet the Criteria for an SRV.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove the SRV status

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services, as well as the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6385 Mrs Carole Allen [6291]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Claybrooke Parva and Claybrooke Magna do not meet the criteria for an SRV.

Claybrooke Parva school will soon be reaching capacity, there is already planning consent granted in Claybrooke Magna that is likely to fill any remaining vacancies.

Parking around the school at peak times is hazardous and a significant health and safety concern with vehicles unable to see the congestion around the bend in the road.

There are no shops in the villages and no Dr's surgery the nearest one being in Ullesthorpe that is already at breaking point.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Introduce Parking restrictions around school

Extend school

provide Dr's surgery and shop.

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services, as well as the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions, to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6444 Mrs Nicola Long [6300]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The village has NO local services and by building more houses pressure will be put on the already full to capacity primary school. parking outside of the school is dangerous now with vehicles on both sides of the road on a blind bend.

Traffic is already very severe through the village. 50 more houses will mean traffic will increase dramatically. It is already a dangerous road to walk along through the village to school and as a dog walker I see Vehicles travelling far too fast through the village using it as a cut through from the A5.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not build any more housing developments in the village, one is more than enough and will put increased pressure on the school and lead to increased traffic. There are no local services in Claybrooke Magna.

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services and of the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6532 Emma Ridley [5234]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete this proposal from the plan

**Response:**

Noted. The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services, as well as the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions, to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6558 Mrs Teresa Ashley [6369]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There are 2 villages not one and should be assessed separately. They are both small villages which do not have the infrastructure to support more housing. The school has no room to expand and parking around it is dangerous. The road are not maintained enough for increased traffic that new housing would create.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The villages should be treated as 2 and should not be selected rural villages as independently they do not meet the criteria.

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services, as well as the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6843 Zoe Ridley [5242]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Amenities already stretched, but no improvements planned  
Transport links constrained  
safety and air quality issues  
loss of open space

**Change To Plan Sought:**

remove from plan

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services, as well as the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7301 Ms Julie Fairgrieves [6143]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no justification for Claybrooke Magna being given selected rural village status. It is planners deciding to totally ignore local opinion in favour of perusing their own interests.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The identification of Claybrooke Magna as a selected rural village be deleted from the Plan.

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services, as well as the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7347 Mrs Jennifer Toone [6083]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There already exists a very dangerous problem in both Claybrooke Magna and Parva with traffic coming from the A5 at High Cross driving at high speed through these villages. Parking outside Claybrooke Primary School at dropping off and collecting time means a serious accident is waiting to happen. It is therefore unsafe in the extreme for local children to walk to Claybrooke School. It can only become more dangerous if the proposed large developments in both villages go ahead.

Keep Claybrooke Magna and Parva as they are now NO MORE DEVELOPMENT PLEASE

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services, as well as the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7349 Mr Richard Toone [6084]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Strongly object to any further housing developments in Claybrooke Magna and Parva. It is already most unsafe to walk to Claybrook School due to speeding traffic and the parking situation at the school. Any increase on pressure here is to invite a fatality. Local services, already under pressure, cannot cope with an increase in the population of these rural communities.

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services, as well as the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7381 mrs susan walker [6354]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no justification for Claybrooke Magna being given Selected Rural Village status. It is the planners totally ignoring local opinion.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The identification of Claybrooke Magna as a Selected Rural village be deleted from the plans.

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services, as well as the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form or limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7452 **Mr Michael Lenihan [5268]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

There is no justification for Claybrooke Magna being given selected rural village status. It is planners deciding to totally ignore local opinion in favor of pursuing their own interests.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The identification of Claybrooke Magna as a selected rural village be deleted from the Plan.

**Response:**

The adjoining Claybrookes have been identified together as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services, as well as the guidance in para 55 of the NPPF that 'where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in villages nearby'. As such, the adjoining villages of the Claybrookes are considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of or limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives. The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5867 **Mr. Peter Ernest Kay Fuchs [6124]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Ref A/DB/HSG/02 - Land between Church Lane and the Mount, Dunton Bassett - The plan shows outlined in red part of the area for which outline planning permission ref. 16/01401/OUT was sought earlier in 2017, and which was refused by the Planning Community. This area shown is half for which outline permission was sought and so could not possibly contain the 42 houses suggested.

Ref: A/BA/HSG/12 run off from this area has severely flooded the houses shown on its south-western boundary.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The area ref: A/DB/HSG/02 should not be included in this plan.

**Response:**

Noted. These sites are not allocated in the Local Plan. Any planning applications would be considered in the normal way.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7531 **Mr Steve Louth [5609]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The site north of Coopers Lane, Dunton Bassett could readily accommodate more than the 40 dwellings and is suitable, available and achievable, and could be brought forward in the short term for the delivery of housing, making a meaningful contribution to the supply of housing in Harborough District. Access is easily achieved from Coopers Lane, with bus stops adjacent to the site's southern boundary. The site is very accessible to the services and facilities within the village itself, whilst its location on Coopers Lane ensures that any development here would respect the historic core of the village.

**Response:**

The size of this site is below the level identified for strategic allocations, but could be brought forward through the DM process, subject to Policy GD2 and other relevant policies.

**RepID** **Representation**

7163 Gilmorton Parish Council (Mrs Yvette Walters) [6476]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Concerns regarding number of new houses. Village unable to sustain. Roads not able to cope with increased traffic.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the number of new homes.  
Improve the road network

**Response:**

Gilmorton has been identified as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services. As such, Gilmorton is considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

7165 Gilmorton Parish Council (Mr Julian Kent) [6472]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Item 6f indicates an increase in the number of dwellings in Gilmorton by 25 homes. At present we are faced with growth of approximately 200 homes either from approved developments or those progressing through the planning process. The infrastructure within the Village is not suitable to accommodate this level of growth. The village and surrounding countryside road system is not suitable for the inevitable increase in traffic flow, exacerbated further by the lack of any public transport.

**Response:**

Gilmorton has been identified as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services. As such, Gilmorton is considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of small-scale infill or limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6712 Mr and Mrs Sellers [6412]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the recognition that the housing requirements outlined in this policy are a minimum and the level of flexibility that this element of the policy provides. We support the identification of Great Easton as an appropriate location for the delivery of a minimum of 30 dwellings. As previously outlined, we consider that the proposed development of Land rear of 22 Broadgate for up to 8 dwellings would be an appropriate scale of development for the village, and would deliver a scheme that could make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of Great Easton.

**Response:**

Noted. This site size is below the level at which strategic allocations are being made. The site is already a commitment.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5952 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plan to further expand Lubenham that currently has no shop, no post office and no facilities other than those provided by independent charities is flawed. The numbers proposed remain unclear bearing in mind the current level of houses being built, recently built (since 2011 the start of the plan period) or expected to be allowed.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The position of Lubenham as sustainable is questionable and a review of its current facilities should be made every five years. An absolute number of houses to be built within the village should be stated and how progress towards this target is being made

**Response:**

Lubenham has been identified as a Selected Rural Village for the purposes of distributing housing growth, in recognition of the number of key services, size and relationship with other services. As such, Lubenham is considered suitable for rural development, primarily in the form of small-scale infill or limited extensions to help address economic, social or community objectives.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6209 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Sites for more than this number of dwellings have been allocated through the Lubenham NDP. Chapter is misleading on allocating housing numbers and allocations already identified through Neighbourhood Plans and other completions.

We are told that figures are calculated on population size. Lubenham is a Parish of 4 settlements yet development is not supported in 3 parts of the Parish. Therefore Lubenham Village grows disproportionately as outlying settlements are not considered sustainable. Lubenham has also provided for over 1,000 dwellings through the Airfield Farm development in the Parish.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Provide details of the formula used to identify numbers for selected rural villages and make it clear that in some cases sites are already designated through Neighbourhood Plans. Demonstrate that the policy is justified.

**Response:**

The Lubenham NP was made after 31 March 2017. Allocations in made Neighbourhood Plans are included in commitments (see Table B.1) and this will be reflected in updates to the housing figures, including in Policy H1, before submission. The housing requirement for Lubenham reflects the number of households in Lubenham village, rather than the parish as a whole.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7213 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Diana Cook) [4253]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It should be clarified that these numbers are designated as sites in Lubenham neighbourhood Plan. currently it could be read as 35 in addition to those designated.

Also query why some selected rural settlements are allocated no further development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Clarify how numbers are arrived at and define that numbers have been defined in specific Neighbourhood Plans

**Response:**

Table B.1 makes it clear that commitments includes sites allocated through neighbourhood plans. The Lubenham NP has been made since 31 March 2017 and the figures will be updated accordingly. The following additional wording is proposed to expand para 5.1.17, 'In relation to Broughton Astley, the Kibworths, Husbands Bosworth, Ullesthorpe, Great Bowden and North Kilworth, the residual housing requirement is zero due to the high level of recent completions and ongoing housing commitments'.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5853 Mrs Gillian Groom [6152]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The rural centres and selected rural villages, have a minimum housing target, however without a cap on these numbers, there is a danger that the rural nature of these communities will be destroyed by over development. This is contrary to the overall objectives of maintaining the look and feel of Market Harborough district see point 2.1.1 Local Plan Vision, first statement.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In addition to a minimum housing requirement there should be a maximum cap. Once this cap is attained these villages should be treated with respect to planning permission as the "other villages" that do not have a minimum housing threshold.

**Response:**

GD2 1 a) is considered to cover this point.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6618 BITTESWELL with BITTESBY Parish Council (Ms Cathy Walsh) [2612]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The HEDNA is not capable of being considered an objective assessment, as it is prepared by GL Hearn who also work with the house building industry. Housing need appears to have increased from 350dpa (2011-2031) in 2011 to 557dpa in 2017, an uplift of 60%, without explanation. Either the figure in 2011 was wildly understated or the present figure is grossly overstated.

**Response:**

GL Hearn has undertaken similar studies for a number of housing market areas across the country and brings expert understanding of housing market dynamics and demographics. The completed study is an evidence document based on demographic, economic and social trends and therefore objective in its outcome. The work has been undertaken in a professional manner under the management of a Steering Group of officers. Furthermore no officer or member of the Council has had any relationship with GL Hearn which would compromise the objectivity of the final report. The apparent increase in housing need is explained by reference to the previous East Midlands Regional Plan, which was based upon a policy decision to direct growth within Leicestershire to urban areas and areas in need of regeneration. As such, the policy required fewer new dwellings to be provided in Harborough than would otherwise have been required.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7467 Mr Robert Ogden [6505]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is a complete imbalance in the proposals. It would appear that a line has been drawn across the district following the route of the A6 road and all "hard landscaping" development proposals concentrated to the west of this road with the consequential loss of agricultural land particularly in the southwest corner in the Lutterworth area and very little to the east of this road. Times change, circumstances alter; the plan leaves little room to accommodate such events.

**Response:**

Scraptoft North SDA is a substantial proposal and is to the east of the route of the A6.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6648 Mr Alberto Costa MP [6053]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I do, in principle, agree with the Government's guidance that further, more expansive housing building is required nationally. This is in line with national population increases and the large number of people either wishing to take their first step onto the housing ladder or awaiting social/affordable housing via a local authority/housing association.

However, I should like to see 'appropriate' house building, whereby new developments will be built in an environmentally sound manner and will be built to meet the crucial economic and domestic needs of my constituents in South Leicestershire and other residents within the District.

**Response:**

These issues are covered by requirements contained within policies H2, H3, H4, H5, CC1, CC2, CC3 and CC4.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6619 BITTESWELL with BITTESBY Parish Council (Ms Cathy Walsh) [2612]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Increase in housing due to Magna Park Expansion, of an additional 25dpa, appears to explicitly disregard the advice of GL Hearn in relation to Table 89 (used for arriving at the OAN of 532dpa for Harborough) - " The conclusions recognise that there is no need to adjust upwards the assessed need to support economic growth when the demographic and economic-led projections are compared with one another at the HMA level, and that economic growth in individual authorities could therefore be supported by agreeing an alternative distribution of housing provision through the Duty to Cooperate."

**Response:**

The proposed increase in the housing requirement from the OAN of 532dpa to 557dpa does not increase the OAN itself. Instead it recognises the need to reconsider the distribution of housing need / provision by the Leicester and Leicestershire local authorities arising from potential growth at Magna Park, as advised at paras 12.73 and 12.74 of the HEDNA. The figure of the additional 25dpa arises from the Magna Park Employment Growth Sensitivity Study (2017), undertaken by GLHearn on behalf of the Council, which follows from, and adds to the advice contained within the HEDNA. Para 1.7 of the study explains the role of the study and reaffirms the findings of the HEDNA in relation to strategic distribution, confirming that strategic distribution could influence the spatial distribution of housing need within the HMA rather than justify higher housing provision relative to the OAN.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6646 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Important detail of employment /logistic provision and the correlation thereof was omitted from HEDNA until very late in the process. The Magna Park Employment Growth Sensitivity Study was a late add on, not available until July 2017, and has not been objectively assessed , scrutinised. The scenarios used disregard all previous evidence, consultation results and a democratic members decision. To raise self-containment to 25 % in an area of low unemployment without effective policies and no means of enforcement seems unachievable.

**Response:**

The Local Plan seeks to increase self-containment through a number of policies, as set out at Appendix E (page 244). BE1 seeks to ensure delivery of sufficient land to meet the requirement for employment, as set out in the HEDNA and also factors in the supply side, including the need to replace poorer quality existing supply and take account of economic aspirations, reflecting the ambition of the emerging Harborough Economic Development Strategy. This policy provides a range of employment land across the District to meet the needs for varying types of general employment. BE2 includes criteria 2c and 2d to seek to increase self containment at Magna Park and so contribute to increasing self containment of the District as a whole to 25%.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6678 Rugby Borough Council (Mr Martin Needham) [6402]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The August 2017 Magna Park Employment Growth Sensitivity Study is welcome, although it's queried whether the position of the other HMA authorities on employment and unmet housing need has been agreed between appropriate authorities and if the Duty to Co-operate has been satisfied.

It is acknowledged that the expansion of Magna Park will result in an increase to the overall housing requirement from 532 to 557dpa to align the housing with the employment growth and that this will also meet some unmet need from elsewhere in the HMA. However, the position and extent of unmet housing need across the HMA is not clear.

**Response:**

The Duty to Cooperate Statement sets out how the Council has complied with the Duty to Cooperate to date in preparing the Local Plan. This will be submitted with the Local Plan. Duty to Cooperate work is continuing.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7439 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

An adjustment of +25 dwellings per annum is in itself modest and unlikely to achieve Objective 2 of the Local Plan.

The figure of 11,140 dwellings (557 dwellings per annum) is set out in the supporting text of Policy H1 as the District's housing requirement. This housing requirement excludes any contribution to meeting declared quantified unmet housing needs from elsewhere in the Leicester & Leicestershire HMA.

**Response:**

The list of 22 policies which address Local Plan Objective 2 is set out at Appendix E (page 244). Para 5.1.7 sets out the plan requirement of 557 dpa. Para 5.1.10 goes on to explain that policy H1 provides for delivery of the plan requirement, plus an additional 15% contingency in the supply of housing land in order to allow for possible future circumstances affecting the supply of housing in the District, including the potential need to help meet unmet need from elsewhere within the HMA.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7648 Bloor Home Ltd [4935]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Local Plan is not compliant with the DTC in terms of the housing requirement proposed in Policies SS1 and H1. There has not yet been a positive outcome to DTC engagement that will ensure that housing needs in the HMA will be properly identified and then effectively provided for.

The Submission Plan suggests that the 20% uplift in the housing requirement will provide for a potential unmet need arising elsewhere in the HMA in the future. However, that uplift provides an appropriate mitigation strategy within the Local Plan for unforeseen circumstances in relation to meeting its own needs. It cannot provide for unmet housing needs arising elsewhere under the DTC.

This is a critical matter which needs addressing and it is not appropriate to seek to defer this issue to a review of this Local Plan. Leicester's unmet need is arising now and needs addressing in this Local Plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

That requirement should reflect the up to date, full and objectively assessed needs for housing and economic development within the District and wider HMA, based on the findings of the HEDNA and the Final MOU between the HMA Authorities that addresses the likely unmet need arising in Leicester City and Oadby & Wigston.

**Response:**

Policies H1 and SS1 take a pragmatic approach to the level of housing provision in Harborough District during the plan period, taking into account the as yet unspecified unmet need arising from Leicester City. Policy H1 provides for a contingency in the supply of housing land to allow for the potential need for Harborough to help deliver some of Leicester City's unmet need and to provide a contingency in the event of unforeseen circumstances affecting delivery.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7653 Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance [6527]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the Council has to some extent sought to co-operate with neighbouring authorities in the HMA, the preparation of the plan against a backdrop of the above uncertainty is problematic. Any provisions to address this declared unmet need from LCC and OWDC are not yet agreed as part of any up-to-date memorandum of understanding between authorities in the HMA. Therefore until such a time, it can not yet be clear that the Council has fulfilled the requirements of the Duty to Co-operate.

Without fully addressing any unmet need in the HMA, the Plan cannot be considered positively prepared, effective or consistent with overarching national policies. The Plan cannot be found sound at such a time where uncertainty on the extent of any identified unmet need has not yet been accounted for.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Plan cannot be found sound at such a time where uncertainty on the extent of any identified unmet need has not yet been accounted for.

**Response:**

Policies H1 and SS1 take a pragmatic approach to the level of housing provision in Harborough District during the plan period, taking into account the as yet unspecified unmet need arising from Leicester City. Policy H1 provides for a contingency in the supply of housing land to allow for the potential need for Harborough to help deliver some of Leicester City's unmet need and to provide a contingency in the event of unforeseen circumstances affecting delivery.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7265 **Melton Borough Council (Planning Policy Manager) [3946]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We do not have any matters of concern with Harborough District Council Local Plan Proposed Submission considering there are no proposed allocations for future development near our shared borders, and considering that your housing target has allowed room for HMA unmet need.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5368 **Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd [5909]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The five-year land supply must be assessed against the housing requirement to accord with national policy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Paragraph 5.1.8 needs to be amended to accord with national policy, with the five-year land supply being assessed against the housing requirement.

**Response:**

Noted. This is confirmed at para 5.1.8.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5372 **Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The Housing Requirement is unrealistic. Not convinced house builders can deliver compared with previous completions. Not sustainable to make allowances for slow take up or non take up of housing allocations.. Unsound -bad example.Council has other ways of dealing with these issues.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce housing target across District to a more realistic figure  
Before any more land allocated for housing in Market Harborough the works listed in MHST2016 SHALL BE CARRIED OUT. IN ADDITION AN ALTERNATIVE ROUTE AROUND THE TOWN FOR EAST-WEST TRAFFIC SHALL BE PROVIDED AND THE KETTERING ROAD BRIDGE OPENED TO 2 WAY TRAFFIC.

**Response:**

Para 5.1.10 explains that the housing land supply includes a contingency to allow for unforeseen circumstances in the delivery of housing land.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6647 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

A buffer of 20% was applied by a proper democratic process to assist other LA's with unmet housing needs (not yet evidenced)in March 17. Not adhering to a proper democratic process the 20% buffer was split into 15 % unmet need and 5 % ( 5.1.9 ) to meet the impact of policy BE 2. These figures were already placed in all the draft Local Plan documents before being agreed by the Executive in September 17. How can the Local Plan, with no provisions / policies, to enforce secure the ambitious commitment to house Magna Park workers in the district ?

**Response:**

The Local Plan seeks to increase self-containment through a number of policies, as set out at Appendix E (page 244). BE1 seeks to ensure delivery of sufficient land to meet the requirement for employment, as set out in the HEDNA and also factors in the supply side, including the need to replace poorer quality existing supply and take account of economic aspirations, reflecting the ambition of the emerging Harborough Economic Development Strategy. This policy provides a range of employment land across the District to meet the needs for varying types of general employment. BE2 includes criteria 2c and 2d to seek to increase self containment at Magna Park and so contribute to increasing self containment of the District as a whole to 25%.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7456 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Re: 5 year housing land supply.  
The Council's calculation is based on OAHN figure of 532 dwellings per annum rather than the housing requirement of 557 dwellings per annum which is incorrect.

It is clear that further site allocations are needed to demonstrate a 5 YHLS on adoption to maximize housing supply the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Further site allocations are needed to demonstrate a 5 YHLS on adoption.

**Response:**

Para 5.1.8 confirms that 557 dpa will be the basis for calculating the 5YHS. The Housing Trajectory at Appendix G demonstrates from 2018/19 and every year throughout the plan period at least a five year supply of deliverable housing land.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7647 Bloor Home Ltd [4935]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposal to incorporate an uplift of 20% above the OAN into the housing requirement in Policies SS1 and H1 is therefore, supported. However, the uplift must be applied to the true OAN (i.e. the HEDNA OAN plus the recommended uplift to reflect the growth of Magna Park) and across the extended plan period to 2036.

Moreover, the housing requirement uplift should not be used as both a contingency guarding against a shortfall in delivery in the District and a potential contribution to unmet needs arising elsewhere in the Housing Market Area (HMA). Unmet needs arising in the wider HMA must be directly addressed, and should form a specific part of the overall housing requirement with a shortfall contingency uplift applied to the total requirement.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

That requirement should reflect the up to date, full and objectively assessed needs for housing and economic development within the District and wider HMA, based on the findings of the HEDNA and the Final MOU between the HMA Authorities that addresses the likely unmet need arising in Leicester City and Oadby & Wigston.

**Response:**

Policies H1 and SS1 take a pragmatic approach to the level of housing provision in Harborough District during the plan period, taking into account the as yet unspecified unmet need arising from Leicester City. Policy H1 provides for a contingency in the supply of housing land to allow for the potential need for Harborough to help deliver some of Leicester City's unmet need and to provide a contingency in the event of unforeseen circumstances affecting delivery. This can not form a specific part of the overall housing requirement, since the extent of unmet need arising from Leicester City is not yet known, nor the distribution of this across the HMA. The housing requirement of 557 dpa represents the OAN, as set out in the HEDNA, plus the additional requirement of 25dpa arising from growth at Magna Park, which in itself represents a redistribution from elsewhere within the HMA and contributes to meeting unmet housing needs.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7448 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed overall HLS is 12,800 dwellings against a housing requirement of 11,140. Therefore there is contingency of circa 11% in the proposed HLS to cater for unmet needs from elsewhere in HMA, slower than expected delivery, non-implementation of existing consents, economic change, and flexibility and choice in the housing market. This level of contingency is below the DCLG presentation slide from the HBF Planning Conference September 2015 (see attached) which illustrates a 10 - 20% non-implementation gap together with 15 - 20% lapse rate.

**Response:**

Housing land provision for 12,800 houses represents a 14.9% increase above the housing requirement of 557 dpa. Research into non-implementation rates in Harborough suggests this is significantly below that set out in the DCLG presentation.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6211 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Please make it clear how settlements have been chosen as Selected Rural Villages. Services have changed since this original designation was made - we no longer have an hourly bus service or a shop. Also please make it clear how housing numbers have been decided for each settlement and how this relates to the options in the previously published options papers and numbers designated through Neighbourhood Plan sites.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Make it clear how selected rural villages and housing allocations within them are chosen - also does this mean the village ,the whole parish or a settlement. within the parish. Also please define housing numbers in relation to allocated sites in Neighbourhood Plans

**Response:**

Lubenham retains 2 key services (school and public house), which have been used to define it as a selected rural village. Please see Appendix F.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5352 Malcolm Tedd [5862]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I believe that at least 50% of any new housing should be council-owned council housing, so that the very serious current housing problem can at least be properly addressed by one of our local councils.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See above.

**Response:**

Noted. This is outside the scope of the Local Plan.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5892 LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The provision of affordable housing is supported. However, it is recommended that the Council simply make reference to the latest assessment of affordable housing need rather than specifying the tenure split in the policy. It is also suggested that the policy provide additional flexibility for large scale developments that would be delivered over numerous phases, in order to allow a reasonable degree of flexibility within each phase.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Make reference to the latest assessment of affordable housing need rather than specifying the tenure split in the policy.

Provide additional flexibility for large scale developments that would be delivered over numerous phases.

**Response:**

The tenure split is included in the policy to provide certainty and clarity to landowners, prospective developers, RSLs and communities. Criterion 5 is considered to provide sufficient flexibility to cover this issue. It can also be covered by the inclusion of delivery and phasing arrangements as provided for in Policy L1 (2).

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5953 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Does the percentage stated take into account the number of affordable houses NOT to be built on the Linden Homes site? On the SDA overall 40% would amount to about 600 dwellings but the percentage needed to reach this target is now considerably higher. Linden Homes development was allowed with NO affordable housing

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Rewrite this section to give the intended percentage (40 and the overall percentage now required to meet this target)

**Response:**

The requirement seeks to deliver the need for affordable housing as identified through the Leicester and Leicestershire HEDNA, including an estimate of the backlog of households currently in need and a prediction of future need. Criteria 5 allows for flexibility in provision to take account of viability considerations.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6084 william davis (mr james chatterton) [5796]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Policy does not take into account the variations within the district noted within the supporting viability study and should be altered to acknowledge the changes within the district. This is not viable nor in accordance with the NPPF

**Change To Plan Sought:**

the Policy should be changed to appreciate the varied affordable housing requirements across the district and not adopt a blanket approach.

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6305 Mr Richard Beer [6263]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

40% affordable/social housing on the Burnmill farm development site is not suitable for this site. It is not in keeping with the surrounding houses and the distance to any amenities will make it difficult for some of the residents to obtain what they need. It will inevitably mean increased car journeys for the simplest of tasks

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the number of houses to be built and the percentage of affordable homes on this site to 25%.

**Response:**

The site is identified as a sustainable site for the provision of both market and affordable housing. Failure to meet the requirements on this site will mean increased provision elsewhere which would be difficult to obtain.

**ReplID** **Representation**

6333 Mr Steven West [6147]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Currently the Alvington Way estate has no affordable housing and because of this is a desirable area to live.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

By splitting up the allocation of affordable housing, across the whole site, not grouping them all in one area.

**Response:**

The proposed change to the plan is not considered likely to be successful in helping to create 'sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities' as required by the NPPF (para 50). Para 5.3.8 states that sites will be designed to help create balanced communities and avoid over-concentration of one form of housing.

**ReplID** **Representation**

6389 Hallam Land Management Limited [5311]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Council will be aware that whether a development is viable or not can change over time due to a multitude of factors. Therefore, whilst paragraph 5.3.9 of the supporting text cites the recent evidence, "Local Plan Viability Assessment, 2017" as justification, the Council should amend the text to recognise that this evidence is a snapshot in time.

In addition, it is recommended that the Council simply make reference to the latest assessment of affordable housing need rather than specifying the tenure split in the policy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Whilst paragraph 5.3.9 of the supporting text cites the recent evidence, "Local Plan Viability Assessment, 2017" as justification, the Council should amend the text to recognise that this evidence is a snapshot in time.

It is recommended that the Council simply make reference to the latest assessment of affordable housing need rather than specifying the tenure split in the policy.

**Response:**

The tenure split is included in the policy to provide certainty and clarity to landowners, prospective developers, RSLs and communities. Criteria 5 is considered to provide sufficient flexibility to cover this issue.

**ReplID** **Representation**

6620 BITTESWELL with BITTESBY Parish Council (Ms Cathy Walsh) [2612]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The delivery of affordable housing in the district has consistently fallen short of the annual target, of the total number of dwellings built in the last 5 years only some 16% were affordable. The present passive strategy of securing affordable dwellings solely by means of the spin-off from market housing developments has proved ineffective. Additional mechanisms for delivery are needed.

**Response:**

The Local Plan deploys the mechanisms for achieving affordable housing delivery which are within the gift of the local planning authority. These include the requirement for affordable housing as set out in policy H2 and the consideration of rural exception sites through policy H3.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6657 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

40 % is not viable or sustainable and will not aid the provision of affordable housing when up to now only 19 % was achieved and at present only 4000 units are outstanding to be build.

**Response:**

The requirement seeks to deliver the need for affordable housing as identified through the Leicester and Leicestershire HEDNA, including an estimate of the backlog of households currently in need and a prediction of future need. It is shown to be viable by the Local Plan Viability Statement 2017 as referred to in para 5.3.9. Criteria 5 allows for flexibility in provision to take account of viability considerations.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7034 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Is 40% affordable housing viable or deliverable? This amounts to 1,100 affordable housing units for the proposed Lutterworth East development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Re-assess the requirement of 40%.

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District as stated in para 5.3.9.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7040 SWINFORD Parish Council (Katherine Clarke) [2678]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Is 40% affordable housing viable or deliverable? This amounts to 1,100 affordable housing units for the proposed Lutterworth East development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reassess the percentage of affordable housing required on new developments.

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District as stated in para 5.3.9.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7108 **Bloor Home Ltd [4935]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Soundness:

For the reasons set out in full text of representation, Bloor Homes object to Policy H2, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:

- is not justified in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not properly considered reasonable alternative strategies; and
- is inconsistent with national guidance in that it does not fully reflect the Government's objective to ensure affordable housing requirements are not prohibitive to the delivery of sustainable development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proposed Changes:

To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan:

- The policy should include Affordable Housing quantum and mix requirements that do not undermine the viability of schemes and delay / prevent sustainable development; and
- The policy should include sufficient flexibility to allow development to respond to site-specific constraints, evidence of need and the provision of other forms of affordable housing.

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District as stated in para 5.3.9.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7135 **North Kilworth Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [6469]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Is 40% affordable housing viable or deliverable? This amounts to 1,100 affordable housing units for the proposed Lutterworth East development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reassess the percentage of affordable housing required on new developments.

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District as stated in para 5.3.9.

---



**ReplID** **Representation**

7359 Davidsons Developments Limited [4740]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no justification for the Council to apply the higher figure of 40% affordable housing provision as a blanket figure across the whole District when their latest evidence base suggests otherwise. It is suggested that affordable housing provision reflects the Council's evidence base in terms of viability across different areas of the District; flexibility within the policy should allow for provision of Starter Homes.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is suggested that affordable housing provision reflects the Council's evidence base in terms of viability across different areas of the District; flexibility within the policy should allow for provision of Starter Homes

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District as stated in para 5.3.9.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

7418 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Gladman object to 40% affordable housing requirement on all relevant housing sites. The Council's latest evidence on viability (Local Plan Viability - Residential Options Viability Interim Report) sets out that the viability of sites varies between 30% and 40% affordable housing provision and there are likely to be trade-offs between infrastructure and affordable housing provision on a number of sites. It is concerning that Council has chosen to set the affordable housing requirement of 40% as this may render some schemes unviable thereby necessitating lengthy/detailed viability discussions on a site by site basis to ensure that housing requirement is met.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The provision of 40% affordable housing on all sites does not reflect the latest evidence base.

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District as stated in para 5.3.9. The evidence quoted is an interim report.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

7457 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

If the Local Plan is to be compliant with the NPPF development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that viability is threatened (paras 173 & 174). The residual land value model is highly sensitive to changes in its inputs whereby an adjustment or an error in any one assumption can have a significant impact on viability. Therefore it is important that the Council understands and tests the influence of all inputs on the residual land value as this determines whether or not land is released for development. The Harman Report highlighted that "what ultimately matters for housing delivery is whether the value received by land owners is sufficient to persuade him or her to sell their land for development".

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment 2017 includes sensitivity analyses to demonstrate the impact of changes in its assumptions, as stated in para 5.3.9.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7458 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is recommended that based on its own viability evidence the Council should re-consider the affordable housing provision set out in Policy H2. It is suggested that differential affordable housing provision by sub-market, site size and / or site typologies is more appropriate than the currently proposed "blanket" approach.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is suggested that differential affordable housing provision by sub-market, site size and / or site typologies is more appropriate than the currently proposed "blanket" approach.

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District as stated in para 5.3.9.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7483 Jelson Homes Limited [3965]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Jelson supports H2 clause 1 in principle. However, it has serious concerns as to whether the SDAs will be capable of delivering 40% affordable housing provision because;

- large scale residential developments are often unable to deliver due to viability issues (e.g. Melton Local Plan Focussed Changes reduced requirement for its proposed SDA's from 37% to 15% due to detailed viability assessment)
- we're not convinced it will deliver the affordable housing requirement for the District (206 dwellings per annum)
- there is no definitive evidence or detailed analysis (including in the Local Plan Viability Assessment) which proves that the SDA's can deliver 40%.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to ensure affordability issues are addressed, to the greatest extent possible, the range of sites to be allocated should include a larger number of smaller sites adjacent to existing settlements where viability concerns are less acute.

**Response:**

The conclusions of the Local Plan Viability Assessment quoted are useful in highlighting the need to consider the economic viability of each phase of each SDA, in recognition of the high level of infrastructure investment required within some phases.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7600 Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance [6527]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

A Local Plan Viability - Residential Options Viability Interim Report was published in April 2016. This report established that viability varies between 30-40%. Whilst our clients support the mechanism for providing affordable housing and the potential for off-site commuted sums where necessary, we consider that a policy requirement which better reflects the stated viability range of 30-40% as per the evidence base may be more suitable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A policy requirement which better reflects the stated viability range of 30-40% as per the evidence base may be more suitable.

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District as stated in para 5.3.9. The evidence quoted in the objection is an interim report.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7606 Bidwells (Mr Robert Love) [4663]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The latest evidence base for affordable housing is contained within the Local Plan Viability Interim Report - Residential Options Viability, prepared by Aspinall Verdi and published April 2016. This report demonstrates that viability varies between 30% - 40%. We consider that there is no justification for the Council to apply the higher figure of 40% affordable housing provision as a blanket figure across the whole District when their latest evidence base suggests otherwise. Policy H2 needs to consider the level of affordable housing requirements to ensure that an effective viability of the Local Plan can be undertaken.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Suggested that the previous affordable housing policy within the adopted Core Strategy is retained.

**Response:**

The latest evidence of affordable housing need is set out in the Leicester and Leicestershire HEDNA (2017). This sets out the need as 206 dpa within Harborough between 2011 and 2031. The affordable housing requirements have been assessed by the later Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017), which demonstrates that both the required percentage and mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments across the District in accordance with the guidance set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance. The evidence quoted in the objection is an interim report.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5450 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support/ Sound.

There is a need for affordable housing within Harborough District and the proposed level of 40% for schemes of more than 10 houses in the District would go some way towards meeting this. Priority for affordable housing should be given to those with connections with the settlement or have previously moved away from the settlement.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

5643 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6213 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

There is insufficient affordable housing and low cost purchase housing the 40% should be maintained except in very exceptional circumstances and viability assessments thoroughly checked

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6775 Amanda Burrell [4075]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support all these criteria.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6988 Family Carr [6455]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy H2: Affordable Housing, we support the requirement for residential developments of more than 10 dwellings to provide 40% of affordable housing on site. As previously stated, our clients have stated their willingness to meet this requirement, subject to the appropriate viability assessment.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7005 Mrs Maureen Stell [6406]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

40% should be a minimum with a higher percentage on large sites to meet the national need for young and old single people, young families and those retiring and wanting to downsize.

**Response:**

Noted. However, it is unlikely that a larger proportion would be viable on large sites which have high infrastructure costs.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7062 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7312 Mr and Mrs Welton [6497]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

With regards to Policy H2: Affordable Housing, we support the requirement for residential developments of more than 10 dwellings to provide 40% of affordable housing on site. In relation to the proposed development of 15no. 2-bedroom low-energy apartments at Land off Harborough Road, the clients are will to meet this requirement subject to the appropriate viability assessments.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7521 Westleigh Developments Ltd [423]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

With regards to Policy H2: Affordable Housing, we support the requirement for residential development to provide a proportion of affordable housing on site. As previously stated, the clients have stated their willingness to meet this requirement, subject to the appropriate viability assessment.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7539 Mr & Mrs Sandercock [6522]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the requirement for residential developments of more than 10 dwellings to provide 40% of affordable housing on site. As previously stated, the clients are willing to meet this requirement, subject to the completion of the appropriate viability assessment.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5809 Mr Paul Johnson [953]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The size threshold referred to is not justified and does not stem from national planning policy. In the absence of a specific justification, it will act as a barrier to housing delivery, not being positively prepared or seeking to boost the supply of housing. Other design and density policy will successfully cover the objective of ensuring development is appropriate in scale and form to the context.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This element of the proposed policy should be omitted.

**Response:**

Accepted. A modification is proposed to delete H2 1c to ensure consistency with national Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 23b-031-20161116.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6279 David Wilson Homes East Midlands [6254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Objection to the specification of tenure split in the policy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is recommended that the Council simply make reference to the latest assessment of affordable housing need rather than specifying the tenure split in the policy.

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District. Criteria 5 allows for flexibility in provision to take account of viability considerations.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7260 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

15. The integration of the social element of housing for older people and specific groups should be incorporated within the quantum and mix of affordable housing in order to mitigate any negative effect on site viability.

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District as stated in para 5.3.9. Criterion 5 allows for flexibility in provision to take account of viability considerations.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7360 Davidsons Developments Limited [4740]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We consider Policy H2 should consider the Government's emerging proposals for a new definition of affordable homes when the NPPF is update. A proposed affordable housing tenure mix of 75% affordable/social rent and 25% low cost home ownership is too prescriptive and could prevent the delivery of homes. Flexibility within the policy should allow for provision of Starter Homes.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Flexibility within the policy should allow for provision of Starter Homes

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District as stated in para 5.3.9. The breakdown reflects the findings of the HEDNA. Criteria 5 allows for flexibility in provision to take account of viability considerations. Policy H2 2b) requires 25% 'low cost home ownership products' in anticipation of the Government's changes to the definition of affordable housing.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7419 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Gladman object to the prescriptive approach to tenure split set out in Policy H2. This is based on the HEDNA report and is a snapshot in time. Requirements may change dependent upon the location and timing of an application and flexibility needs to be applied to the requirements set out in Policy H2 to ensure that the tenure mix on a particular site is reflective of the needs of the local population at the time of the application.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

To be given the opportunity to discuss our representations further

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District, as stated in para 5.3.9. The breakdown between tenures reflects the findings of the HEDNA. Criterion 5 allows for flexibility in provision to take account of viability considerations.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7459 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed affordable housing tenure mix of 75% affordable / social rent and 25% intermediate is unduly prescriptive. The Council should consider the Government's proposals for Starter Homes as set out in the Housing White Paper whereby the Council may deliver Starter Homes as part of a mixed package of affordable housing alongside other affordable home ownership and rented tenures determining the appropriate level of provision for the locality in agreement with developers. The Council has identified a need for 54 Starter Homes per annum.

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District as stated in para 5.3.9. Criterion 5 allows for flexibility in provision to take account of viability considerations. Policy H2 2b) requires 25% 'low cost home ownership products' in anticipation of the Government's changes to the definition of affordable housing. The source of information concerning the 'need' for starter homes is not clear.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7601 Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance [6527]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed affordable housing tenure mix is described as 75% affordable/social rent and 25% intermediate housing. We consider this to be unnecessarily prescriptive. This policy should be reworded to reflect greater flexibility so as not to unduly preclude delivery. We note with interest the Government's proposals for Starter Homes as set out in the Housing White Paper. This indicated that the delivery of starter homes may be considered as part of a mixed package of affordable housing, alongside proposed affordable ownership and tenure splits. Wording which better reflects this emerging position would ensure greater appropriateness and soundness of this policy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This policy should be reworded to reflect greater flexibility so as not to unduly preclude delivery.

We note with interest the Government's proposals for Starter Homes as set out in the Housing White Paper. This indicated that the delivery of starter homes may be considered as part of a mixed package of affordable housing, alongside proposed affordable ownership and tenure splits.

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that both the required percentage of affordable housing and the mix of tenures are viable across a range of housing developments in the District as stated in para 5.3.9. The breakdown reflects the findings of the HEDNA. Criterion 5 allows for flexibility in provision to take account of viability considerations. Policy H2 2b) requires 25% 'low cost home ownership products' in anticipation of the Government's changes to the definition of affordable housing.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7565 Rentplus [6349]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The flexibility of this policy set out in terms of tenure split is very positive, and should enable developers such as Rentplus to bring forward appropriate housing proposals that respond to local needs. The policy should allow for the full range of affordable housing tenures and models, including rent to buy.

The reference to 'low cost home ownership' is preferable to 'intermediate' but should be amended to 'affordable home ownership' to more fully reflect the current and proposed definition of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The reference to 'low cost home ownership' should be amended to 'affordable home ownership' and further reference to the full range of these (rent to buy, starter homes and built to rent) included within the supporting text to provide clarity.

**Response:**

Noted. Certainty regarding the Government's changes to the definition of affordable housing awaited.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5578 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This policy (H2) should be more specific. 75% affordable or socially rented is too vague and could be 15% socially rented and 60% 'affordable' 10% + 65% or other. If policy B2 goes through there will be a demand for socially rented housing in Lutterworth East SDA as wages on Magna Park are low and will no doubt remain so, making it impossible to buy. Also many employees are temporary or on zero hours contracts, making mortgages unavailable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

To include a meaningful percentage of social housing, in accordance with recent government announcements.

**Response:**

Criteria 5 allows for flexibility in provision to take account of viability considerations and the approach contributes towards creating mixed and balanced communities.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6690 Mr and Mrs Gowling [6400]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

With regards to Policy H2: Affordable Housing, we support the requirement for residential developments of more than 10 dwellings to provide 40% of affordable housing on site. As previously stated, our clients have stated their willingness to meet this requirement, subject to the appropriate viability assessment.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5579 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I feel that the figure of 10 is too high. Harborough DC has in recent times been requiring an affordable element in smaller developments than this. We need more mixed housing, not developments of up to 10 dwellings affordable only to a few.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the threshold for affordable housing to dwellings.

**Response:**

The threshold reflects current Government guidance, contained within the national Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 23b-031-20161116.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6569 EAST LANGTON and CHURCH LANGTON Parish Council (Alison Gibson) [2624]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

As this requires adjacent developments approved within a five year period be treated as one for purposes of affordable housing the Parish Council supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7481 McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd [6521]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We note the reference to implementation on a case by case basis in Para 5.3.10 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan in relation to extra care schemes and other types of supported living schemes. We welcome this approach, however it should be stressed where Extra Care accommodation falls under use class C2 it should not be liable for affordable housing.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5872 TUR LANGTON Parish Council (Alison Gibson) [2688]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Reference should be made here to the NP.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reference should be made here to the NP.

**Response:**

To ensure longevity of the Local Plan, references to specific NPs are not made.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6603 Mr. Douglas Jackson [5686]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Unlawful and conflicts with NPPF because it excludes material considerations. It will act as a Trojan Horse for subsequent development which would be refused had it been considered first so impossible to limit the effect of the policy to its intended scope. Conflicts with Neighbourhood Plans. Vaguely worded; and required criteria cannot be legally enforced. Contradictory, as allows properties to be sold or let to non-local people. Unsound because the stated aim would be much better achieved by prioritising access to affordable and social housing generally using existing mechanisms.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The policy should be deleted.

**Response:**

A local connection policy will be agreed per scheme between the relevant Housing Association and the Council. This will ensure that dwellings are let or sold to those who are in need of accommodation and on the Council's housing register and will include lettings and ownership criteria.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6739 KIBWORTH HARCOURT Parish Council (Dr Kevin Feltham) [3789]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Needs a definition of 'small'.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

As it is written, developers will propose developments and then put pressure on the council because there is no definition of 'small'. Why not include a figure, e.g. 10?

**Response:**

Noted. The definition of small will differ with the size of the settlement.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5580 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

House prices in Harborough are the highest in the county, especially in villages such as our own. This policy will help attract or retain households on lower incomes and help maintain or develop a mixed community.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5644 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted.

<u>RepID</u>	<u>Representation</u>	<u>Nature</u>
6776	<b>Amanda Burrell [4075]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> Support all the criteria in this policy. <b>Response:</b> Noted	Support
7063	<b>THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound. <b>Response:</b> Noted	Support
5413	<b>Mr Allan Gaunt [5932]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> It is needed <b>Response:</b> Noted	Support
6742	<b>BURTON OVERY Parish Council (Mrs Kate Barker) [4360]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> 'Burton Overy Parish Council presumes that the policy has not changed the current requirement for parish councils to be instrumental in decision making about housing need.' <b>Response:</b> A local connection policy will be agreed per scheme between the relevant Housing Association and the Council. This will ensure that dwellings are let or sold to those who are in need of accommodation and on the Council's housing register and will include lettings and ownership criteria.	Support

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6605 Mr. Douglas Jackson [5686]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

If it is doubtful that the requirements of the policy e.g. that the housing should remain affordable in perpetuity, can have any force in law. The explanation states that the housing should remain as affordable housing for local people in perpetuity, yet admits that the housing may be let to someone not fulfilling the criteria so it will not be left empty. This is a contradiction, it cannot be available for local people if someone else can have it because of a brief hiatus.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The entire policy H3 should be deleted. Please see my comments on H3.1

**Response:**

The cascade mechanism will be used to ensure that an affordable dwelling is not left empty. It will be applied each time the property is re-let

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6218 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Please the meaning of define small numbers.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

state a maximum number for clarity - small could mean anything - small compared to what?

**Response:**

Noted. The definition of small will differ with the size of the settlement.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6604 Mr. Douglas Jackson [5686]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

20% of the housing could be a quite disproportionate amount of the value. It is unrealistic to expect the Council to evaluate reams of data provided by developers for market justification and the default will be to approve it or risk legal challenge.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The whole policy H3 is unworkable and should be deleted as noted in my comments to H1.1

**Response:**

The Council's Viability advisers will assist, as required.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6088 **william davis (mr james chatterton) [5796]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Policy is not viable and places unnecessary pressure on the private sector.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

the policy should be altered to acknowledge that specialist housing triggers should be higher in order to create more balanced and sustainable communities

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment 2017 confirmed the economic viability of this policy.

**RepID** **Representation**

7110 **Bloor Home Ltd [4935]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Soundness:

For the reasons set out in full text of representation, Bloor Homes object to Policy H4, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:

- is not justified in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not properly considered reasonable alternative strategies; and
- is inconsistent with national guidance in that it does not fully reflect the Government's objective to ensure the housing requirements are not prohibitive to the delivery of development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proposed Changes:

To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan the evidence required to support the imposition of the housing requirements must be provided and the cumulative impact on the viability of sustainable development examined.

**Response:**

Policy H4 criteria 1b i) and ii) are considered to provide sufficient flexibility and take account of individual circumstances to ensure effective delivery of specialist housing without undermining delivery of general housing. The Local Plan Viability Assessment (2017) demonstrates that the requirements of the policy are viable across a range of housing developments in the District.

**RepID** **Representation**

7485 **Jelson Homes Limited [3965]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Supportive of policies to address particular needs for specialist housing / extra care / bungalows. However, this specific policy is too rigid.

Many housing developers, including Jelson, do not have the capability to design and build out specialist housing. Therefore, this would require a housing developer to 'pair up' with a sheltered housing / extra care provider to deliver a policy compliant scheme. There is no evidence of a desire from such providers to operate in this way and to take on a range of small sites in dispersed locations. Management of such facilities would be extremely difficult and inefficient.

This policy will complicate & have a detrimental impact on the ability of developers to deliver large schemes of 100+ dwellings.

**Response:**

Policy H4 criteria 1b i) and ii) are considered to offer sufficient flexibility. The statement that there is no evidence of a desire from providers to team up with developers is not justified by the objector. Evidence that they are unwilling would be needed in order to justify a change in policy.

**RepID** **Representation**

5645 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

6778 Amanda Burrell [4075]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Essential to consider the needs of residents who need/will need specialist housing in the District.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7065 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7420 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Gladman support Policy H4 as it seeks to encourage the development of specialist accommodation for older people including both extra care and sheltered accommodation. However, there needs to be flexibility exercised in the implementation of the Policy as there may be circumstances where it is inappropriate to provide such accommodation on all sites over 100 units including a lack of need for such accommodation in the location of the application.

**Response:**

Policy H4 criteria 1b i) and ii) are considered to offer sufficient flexibility.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7478 **McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd [6521]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We would like to express our support, in general terms, for Policy H4 'Specialist housing' which incorporates support for 'Sheltered and Extra Care Accommodation' within both residential areas and within residential developments of over 100 dwellings.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6280 **David Wilson Homes East Midlands [6254]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Objection to part 1b of policy H4

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The relationship between this policy requirement and the proposed requirement for 4% Part M Category 2 in Policy H5 should be made clearer.

Further evidence on whether consultation with extra care providers has taken place should be provided.

Any further government guidance on the issue of specialist housing should be taken into account during the Local Plan preparation process as it may impact upon the proposed requirements at part 1 b) of the Policy H4.

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment confirmed the economic viability of this policy in conjunction with H5 and H2. Any changes to Government policy in this respect may require a modification to the policy once there is sufficient clarity concerning the changes.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6658 **Cllr Rosita Page [4254]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

More emphasis needed to ensure specialist housing is provided , policy impossible to achieve and confusing. Is the 10% on top of 40% affordable ?

**Response:**

The Local Plan Viability Assessment confirmed the economic viability of this policy. Yes.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7035 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Lutterworth is surrounded by a great number of villages who are all facing the same problem, there are not enough properties for elderly people wishing to downsize. There is a definite need for extra care provision. On the proposed Lutterworth East development implementation of this policy would allow for 275 properties of this nature, is this sufficient, particularly when considered against the 40% affordable housing requirement.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reassess the requirement of 10%.

**Response:**

Noted. It is not considered realistic to require a higher proportion.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7039 SWINFORD Parish Council (Katherine Clarke) [2678]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Lutterworth is surrounded by a great number of villages who are all facing the same problem, there are not enough properties for elderly people wishing to downsize. There is a definite need for extra care provision. On the proposed Lutterworth East development implementation of this policy would allow for 275 properties of this nature, is this sufficient, particularly when considered against the 40% affordable housing requirement.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reassess the percentage requirement of specialist housing.

**Response:**

Noted. It is not considered realistic to request a higher proportion.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7134 North Kilworth Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [6469]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Lutterworth is surrounded by a great number of villages who are all facing the same problem, there are not enough properties for elderly people wishing to downsize. There is a definite need for extra care provision. On the proposed Lutterworth East development implementation of this policy would allow for 275 properties of this nature, is this sufficient particularly when considered against the 40% affordable housing requirement.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reassess the percentage requirement of specialist housing.

**Response:**

Noted. It is not considered realistic to request a higher proportion.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7464 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The HBF recognise that all households should have access to different types of dwellings to meet their housing needs. Therefore planning for a mix of housing needs should focus on ensuring that there are appropriate sites allocated to meet the needs of specifically identified groups of households such as the elderly without seeking a specific housing mix on individual sites. Indeed the housing needs of older people is a diverse sector so the Local Plan should be ensuring that suitable sites are available for a wide range of developments across a wide choice of appropriate locations. Delete H4 (1b).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Policy H4 Bullet Point (1b) should be deleted.

**Response:**

Provision through H4 (1) (b) could yield approximately 400 specialist housing units and therefore make a significant contribution to meeting identified needs.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6219 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Specialist housing is very necessary

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7482 McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd [6521]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Specialist accommodation for the elderly also usually provides an element of care and communal facilities at an additional cost to the developer. This requires a critical mass of residents in order to be feasible and small scale developments of specialist housing for the elderly could not be realistically asked to provide or maintain such facilities. It is therefore unlikely to expect the provision of specialist accommodation for the elderly to be met piecemeal in general needs housing developments.

Given the critical need for older persons accommodation in Harborough District there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable housing and in particular specialist housing which is being proposed on suitable sites.

**Response:**

Provision through Policy H4 (1) (b) could yield approximately 400 specialist housing units and therefore make a significant contribution to meeting identified needs.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7479 **McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd [6521]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

We consider that the best approach towards meeting the diverse housing needs of older people is one that encourages both the delivery of specialist forms of accommodation such as sheltered / retirement housing and Extra Care accommodation. While we commend the council for the inclusion of Policy H4 'Specialist Housing which seeks to meet the need for accommodation for the elderly population we believe that the supporting text should be amended to reflect that most forms of extra care accommodation should be classified as Use Class C2.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7114 **Bloor Home Ltd [4935]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Soundness:

For the reasons set out in full text of representation, Bloor Homes object to Policy H5, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:

- is not justified in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not properly considered reasonable alternative strategies; and
- is inconsistent with national guidance in that it does not fully reflect the Government's objective to ensure the housing requirements are not prohibitive to the delivery of development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proposed Changes:

To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan the evidence required to support the imposition of the housing standards and self build requirements must be provided and the cumulative impact on the viability of sustainable development examined. The policy should then also be revised to incorporate an appropriate caveat in relation to scheme viability and the importance of considering demand as well as need in relation to the required mix of housing.

**Response:**

The viability of the policy has been tested through the Local Plan Viability Assessment 2017. Part 2 of the policy is considered consistent with NPPF para 50. Criteria 4 is considered appropriate to help deliver the Government's objective relating to self build and custom build homes.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5893 **LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The aims of the policy overall are supported. However, whilst the Council's plan wide viability deems the policy generally viable, this can change over time and therefore the requirements as specified should also allow for variation where there are viability or practical considerations.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Allow for variation where there are viability or practical considerations.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

7066 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7313 Mr and Mrs Welton [6497]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the requirement of Policy H5: Housing Density, Mix and Standards for new development schemes to deliver housing at an appropriate density and include a range of dwelling types and sizes. The proposed development at Land off Harborough Road has been designed to provide new dwellings at a density that is considered to respect the rural nature of the site's location on the western edge of Market Harborough. The scheme will provide a mix of 2 bedroom apartments ranging from approximately 1,000 sq. ft. to 1,200 sq. ft.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7522 Westleigh Developments Ltd [423]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the requirement of Policy H5: Housing Density, Mix and Standards for new development schemes to deliver a range of housing types and sizes. Any development scheme at Land South of Grange Lane, Thurnby would deliver a mix of property types and sizes, including bungalows, terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings ranging in size from 2 to 5 bedrooms.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7540 Mr & Mrs Sandercock [6522]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the requirement of Policy H5: Housing Density, Mix and Standards for new development schemes to deliver a range of housing types and sizes. Any development at Land off Station Road, North Kilworth would provide a mix of property types and sizes, including a mix of 2 to 4 bedroom dwellings which would include a mix of bungalows, semi-detached and detached houses.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5880 Mr Paul Henry [6165]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed density of housing on the Burnmill Farm development MH3 is out of keeping with the existing density in the adjoining development. The increase in property density is also out of line with the requirement to reduce property density further out from the Town centre. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the site access problem being solely via Bates Close and Kingston way..

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove the development of Site MH3 from the local plan and or require access to the site from the Leicester Road

**Response:**

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be submitted with, and inform the layout and design of, any proposed planning application. The site access is not relevant to this Policy, although as currently proposed it does limit the capacity to 90 dwellings.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6069 Mr Brian Poulter [4826]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Lutterworth East will require a substantial assistance in meeting this. The centre of Lutterworth is too far for walking. As far as I'm aware there is no bus provision.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy L1 requires a bus service to be provided. Pedestrian and cycle links are also proposed.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6093 william davis (mr james chatterton) [5796]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

the Policy does not incorporate a demonstrated need within the district

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Policy must be altered to incorporate viability, need and the variations within the district

**Response:**

It is considered that the standards are viable.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7421 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy H5 sets out that new housing development should meet nationally described space standards. The Written Ministerial Statement of 25th March 2015 confirms that the optional new national technical standards should only be required through Local Plans if they address a clearly evidenced need and where the impact on viability has been considered. It is therefore important that the Council has undertaken a local assessment which evidences the need for adoption of the Nationally Described Space Standards rather than relying on circumstantial evidence. The Council do not seem to have undertaken such an assessment.

**Response:**

It is considered that the standards are viable.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7460 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

If the Council wishes to adopt the NDSS this should only be done by applying the criteria set out in the NPPG. The NPPG sets out that where a need for internal space standards is identified, local planning authorities should provide justification for requiring internal space policies. Local Planning Authorities should take account of the following areas:

- need: criteria must be justified by local evidence;
- viability: the impact on viability should be considered in particular an assessment of the cumulative impact of policy burdens; and
- timing: should take into consideration any adverse effects on delivery rates of sites included in the housing trajectory.

**Response:**

It is considered that the standards are viable.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6095 william davis (mr james chatterton) [5796]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Point 1c discusses the adoption of the optional higher water efficiency standards. The Housing standards review dictates that reduced water consumption was solely applicable to areas classed as water stressed. The Har-borough District Water Cycle Study (2015) highlights that only the eastern area of the district is under stress. Therefore, in order for the Policy to be in accordance with the NPPF paragraph 173 viability requirements, it should be deleted and made more specific to areas that it applies to. A blanket approach to water efficiency standards is not justified.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Policy needs to be removed as it is not justified

**Response:**

The whole of the District is considered to be moderately water-stressed and the viability implications of this policy were considered through the Local Plan Viability Assessment 2017. As such, the requirement is considered to be justified.

**RepID Representation**

7362 Davidsons Developments Limited [4740]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is not necessary to require adherence to Building Regulations within a development plan policy and therefore this reference should be omitted.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Omit reference to Building Regulations

**Response:**

The whole of the District is considered to be moderately water-stressed and the viability implications of this policy were considered through the Local Plan Viability Assessment 2017. As such, the requirement is considered to be justified. The policy refers to the Building Regulations as part of a description. It does not repeat the Regulations as a policy, but defines a percentage of dwellings to which the Regulations described shall be applied. Definition of this percentage is a valid planning policy.

---

**RepID Representation**

7422 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy H5 requires new housing to be designed to meet higher water efficiency standards of 110 liters per person per day. The Written Ministerial Statement of 25th March 2015 confirms that the optional new national technical standards should only be required through Local Plans if they address a clearly evidenced need and where the impact on viability has been considered. The Housing Standards Review also set out that reduced water consumption rates should only be applied in water stressed areas. Given that only the eastern part of district suffers from water stress then the blanket approach is not justified.

**Response:**

The whole of the District is considered to be moderately water-stressed and the viability implications of this policy were considered through the Local Plan Viability Assessment 2017. As such, the requirement is considered to be justified.

---

**RepID Representation**

7465 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Written Ministerial Statement dated 25th March 2015 confirms that "the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG". If the Council wishes to adopt the higher optional standard for water efficiency the Council should only do so by applying the criteria set out in the NPPG. The Housing Standards Review was explicit that reduced water consumption was solely applicable to water stressed areas. The Water Cycle Study (2015) only identifies the east of the District as suffering from water stress. The Council's blanket policy approach is not justified and Policy H5 (1c) should be deleted.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Policy H5 (1c) should be deleted.

**Response:**

The whole of the District is considered to be moderately water-stressed and the viability implications of this policy were considered through the Local Plan Viability assessment. As such, the requirement is considered to be justified.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6685 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Policy H5 refers to new housing being designed to meet the optional water efficiency standard (110 litres/per person/per day).

The Environment Agency in their document entitled 'Water Stressed Areas Final Classification (2013)' has advised the Secretary of State that the areas classified as 'Serious' in the final classification table should be designated as 'Areas of serious water stress'. The Anglian Water company area is considered to be such an area. Anglian Water is the water undertaker for part of Harborough District.

Therefore we would support the optional water efficiency standard being applied within Harborough District.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

7279 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

The Anglian Water company area is considered to be an 'Area of serious water stress'. Anglian Water is the water undertaker for part of Harborough District.

Therefore we would support the optional water efficiency standard being applied within Harborough District.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6097 **william davis (mr james chatterton) [5796]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

he Policy is inconsistent with national policy and is unsound. The demand and character of any area within a district varies greatly, which will play a major role in determining what housing mix is appropriate. This Policy should therefore be altered to enable adaptability and flexibility in response to local market demand and the character of the area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

the Policy should be removed and allow for discussion in relation to mix on a site by site basis

**Response:**

Disagree. The policy seeks to ensure housing mix reflects evidence of local need. GD8 ensures suitable and sensitive design.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7361 Davidsons Developments Limited [4740]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is important to remember that development cannot only provide for existing demand, it can also address the aspirations of an area. For example, young families could be attracted to an area through the provision of family accommodation whereas the elderly would have different housing requirements.

It is recommended that Policy H5 is amended to include variations to the policy where evidence is provided to support any deviation. The required housing mix density for housing developments in different locations across the District needs to reflect the market in these locations and the local housing need.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Suggested amendment proposed to accommodate appropriate housing mix on sites.

**Response:**

H5 criterion 2 requires that the mix is informed by the latest evidence of need.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7461 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy H5 Bullet Point (2) should be deleted.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Policy H5 Bullet Point (2) should be deleted.

**Response:**

Disagree. H5 2) seeks to provide for a range of house types to meet the latest evidence of need, in conformity with NPPF para 50.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7607 Bidwells (Mr Robert Love) [4663]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is recommended that Policy H5 is amended to include variations to the policy where evidence is provided to support any deviation. The required housing mix density for housing developments in different locations across the District needs to reflect the market in these locations and the local housing need.

It is not necessary to require adherence to Building Regulations within a development plan policy and therefore this reference should be omitted.

We consider that proposed residential and associated development of the land off Longgreay, Fleckney is suitable to provide a mix of housing size, types and tenure.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Suggested amendment proposed to accommodate deviation from the policy in exceptional circumstances; omission of reference to Building Regulations

**Response:**

Noted. Criterion 2 enables such flexibility in relation to local needs, as stated in para 5.9.6. Criterion 3 refers to the Building Regulations as part of a description. It does not repeat the Regulations as a policy, but defines a percentage of dwellings to which the Regulations described shall be applied. Definition of this percentage is a valid planning policy.

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6691 **Mr and Mrs Gowling [6400]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the objectives of Policy H5: Housing Density, Mix and Standards and the requirement for new development schemes to deliver a range of housing types and sizes. Any development of Land at Northampton Road, Market Harborough would deliver a mix of property types and sizes, including bungalows, terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings ranging in size from 1 to 5 bedrooms.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6716 **Mr and Mrs Sellers [6412]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the requirement of Policy H5: Housing Density, Mix and Standards for new development schemes to deliver a range of housing types and sizes. Any development of Land rear of 22 Broadgate could deliver a mix of property types including semi-detached and detached houses ranging in size from 3 to 4 bedrooms.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6990 **Family Carr [6455]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the requirement of Policy H5: Housing Density, Mix and Standards for new development schemes to deliver a range of housing types and sizes. Any development at Land off London Road, Great Glen would deliver a mix of property types and sizes, including bungalows, terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings ranging in size from 1 to 5 bedrooms.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6100 **william davis (mr james chatterton) [5796]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

4% of homes in residential developments of over 100 homes meeting the accessible and adaptable building standards. It is acknowledged the Policy has been established through need, as the 2017 HEDNA displays a requirement for future adaptable homes in the district and wider region. However, although paragraph 5.9.7 of the Plan refers to the requirement having been viability tested we can find no evidence of this being the case in the 2016 Viability Assessment, that appears in the Council's published evidence. Unless the Council can demonstrate otherwise, therefore the policy conflicts with national planning policy and is unsound.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

there is no evidence within the viability study to support the policy, therefore it should be removed in favor of a site by site discussion with developers

**Response:**

Please see viability evidence contained within the Local Plan Viability Assessment 2017.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6282 **David Wilson Homes East Midlands [6254]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Objections to the proposed requirements in part 3 of the policy

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The relationship between the proposed Part M Category 2 requirement and how it relates to general housing need and the specialist housing which is proposed by Policy H4 should be made clearer.

The Council should consider whether this requirement is justified in light of the HEDNA conclusions.

**Response:**

Evidence of need from the HEDNA is considered to justify the need to provide for occupiers who require a greater degree of accessibility and adaptability.

---

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

5894 LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The evidence in respect of the provision of 4% of dwellings as Part M, Category 2, is not substantive enough to warrant this requirement. The HEDNA 2017 (para. 9.24 and 9.25) only makes broad assumptions nationally and regionally about need, and the report highlights the limitations of the evidence. It is also unclear how this figure relates to general housing need and specialist housing required in policy H4.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend requirement in light of above objections, and base any amendment on robust evidence.

7423 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy H5 requires 4% of dwellings proposed on sites of 100 dwellings or more to meet the accessible and adaptable standards in Building Regulations, Part M, Category 2. If the Council wish to introduce the higher accessibility standards then they need to undertake a local assessment which evidences the need for such standards. The Council do not seem to have undertaken such an assessment.

7462 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

If the Council wishes to adopt the higher optional standards for accessible & adaptable homes the Council should only do so by applying the criteria set out in the NPPG (ID 56-005 to 56-011). All new homes are built to Building Regulation Part M standards so it is incumbent on the Council to provide a local assessment evidencing the specific case for Harborough which justifies the inclusion of M4(2) optional higher standards for accessible / adaptable homes in its Local Plan policy. M4(2) should only be introduced on a "need to have" rather than "nice to have" basis therefore Bullet Point (3) should be deleted.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Bullet Point (3) should be deleted.

**Response:**

See para 5.9.7 for explanation of the evidence for such standards.

---

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6101 william davis (mr james chatterton) [5796]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The policy is unsound, and unjustified. It will place unnecessary pressure on the private sector and result in a future under supply of homes for the district

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is considered that the Council should adopt a positive approach to attaining an appropriate level of self-build homes without placing unnecessary pressure on major and medium sized house builders. The use of exception sites or specific allocation of sites for Self-build/Custom build should be considered as options that would effectively, efficiently and sustainably add to these figures (including perhaps Council owned land).

**Response:**

It is unclear what unnecessary pressure this criteria will result in or why this would result in an under-supply of land. The Council does not own suitable sites and, if it did, would prioritise affordable housing provision. The size of sites likely to be suitable would be below the level for allocation as strategic sites.

---

**RepID Representation**

6283 David Wilson Homes East Midlands [6254]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Objection to part 4 of policy H5

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Council should consider either removing or rewording this part of the policy.

**Response:**

H5 clause 4 seeks to support the delivery of self-build and custom build dwellings in support of the Government's clear intention in this respect.

**RepID Representation**

7424 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the concept of Self Build/Custom Build Housing is supported, Gladman have concerns regarding Policy H5 as the inclusion of plots on large scale sites does not add to the supply of houses overall (it merely changes the housing mix from one product to another). It is also difficult to assess how it will be implemented given issues around working hours, site access, health and safety etc. that are associated with large scale development sites. The percentage of provision on sites should be determined on detailed need evidence which the Council has not produced. Provision of these plots should be subject to viability testing.

**Response:**

The provision of self build does not need to add to the supply - it is included in the total housing requirement and so is part of the provision to meet that need. The issues concerning access etc. could be solved through careful selection of appropriate areas within the larger site for such housing. The viability of the policy has been tested through the Local Plan Viability Assessment.

**RepID Representation**

7463 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The HBF supports custom build in principle for its potential contribution to overall housing supply. However the Council's approach to self / custom build should be positively undertaken to increase the total amount of new housing developed rather than by a restrictive policy requirement for inclusion of such housing on allocated sites. Such positive policy responses include supporting development on small windfall sites as well as allocating more small sites. The Council's proposed policy approach only changes the house building delivery mechanism from one form of house building company to another without any consequential additional contribution to boosting housing supply. Detailed data from the Register is not available via the Council's website so it is impossible to determine if the Council's proposed policy approach of requiring self-build plots on large housing sites is justified. Furthermore the Council has not undertaken any viability assessment of this policy proposal.(see attached)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Bullet Point (4) should be deleted.

**Response:**

The provision of self build does not need to add to the supply - it is included in the total housing requirement and so is part of the provision to meet that need. The Local Plan only allocates strategic sites of about 100 dwellings or more, but applications on windfall sites would be supported in principle. However expressions of support do not amount to a policy, although a minor amendment to this effect could be made to paragraph 5.9.8. The viability of the policy has been tested through the Local Plan Viability Assessment.

**RepID Representation**

7487 Jelson Homes Limited [3965]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The success of such a policy, to deliver land for self-build and custom-build dwellings, is entirely dependent upon its detail. We feel that such a complicated matter should be set out in a policy of its own.

It is imperative that the Council provide detailed, robust evidence and guidance to support this policy to ensure that it does not become a difficult and onerous point for both developers and the local planning authority. It may even be worth looking to provide a supplementary planning document to provide a robust guide to delivering this policy.

Policy will have a detrimental impact on the ability of developers to deliver large schemes of 250+ dwellings.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We feel that such a complicated matter should be set out in a policy of its own.

**Response:**

It is considered that policy in relation to self-build and custom-build is appropriately located within the Local Plan as part of Policy H5.

---

**RepID Representation**

5746 Mrs Janette Ackerley [5952]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The statement suggests that the density of housing should reflect the local circumstances but it does not seem to make any link to the aging population of our District and the need to provide bungalows for those who do not need supported accommodation but often need to downsize. this only appears in rural exception sites. There does not appear to be any assessment of the number of single occupancy units compared to family units.

**Response:**

H5 criteria 2) requires that major housing should provide a mix of house types that is informed by up to date evidence of housing need.

---

**RepID Representation**

5747 Mrs Janette Ackerley [5952]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There are Travelling Showpeople sites in the district that are under occupied or not occupied at all. There would appear to be a reduction in the overall need for show people sites as there is a reduction in attendance at fairgrounds nationally

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No increase in provision for Travelling showpeople

**Response:**

An increase in Travelling Showpeople need is demonstrated in the GTAA evidence. It is noted that at present local need in Leicestershire is low, however a background need exists in the district to 2031.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5955 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Where does the number of 5 pitches come from, this number is totally inadequate bearing in mind the size of this community living on approved sites and non approved sites

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Revisit the number of pitches required, define who is eligible to live on these sites and define the meaning of traveller. Demonstrate how progress towards the target (revised) is being made

**Response:**

The need for 5 additional pitches is demonstrated in the GTAA, and is based on the latest definition of Gypsies and Travellers in national planning policy (PPTS). A further need arising from 'unknowns' is identified. The Local Plan allocates 5 pitches to meet identified needs, with an additional reserve site of 10 pitches to meet future unknown need.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6627 Cllr Geraldine Robinson [2493]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Lutterworth already has 6 sites in and around the town. Already provide an over provision of gypsy, traveller and showman's sites in the area. Two sites on Moorbarns Lane, Lutterworth which have stood empty for 3 years. To date, both sites remain unoccupied. There is no substantial need for 26 more plots and its therefore unsound decision making.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

H6 Gypsy, Traveller and Showman Accommodation - Re-evaluation of the Policy.

THIS PLAN SEEM TO FOCUS ON ADDING TO THE ALREADY EXISTING NEGATIVE EFFECT OF GYPSY, TRAVELLER AND SHOWMAN'S PROVISION, MAGNA PARK AND WIND TURBINES BY INCREASING THIS PROVISION RATHER THAN EXERCISING A FAIR GEORGRAPHICAL SPREAD.

**Response:**

An increase in Travelling Showpeople need is demonstrated in the GTAA evidence. It is noted that at present local need in Leicestershire is low, however a background need exists in the district to 2031. Existing site on Moorbarns Lane is occupied.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6660 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

GTAA was not an open and public consultation.

There would be no requirement for additional Showpeople plots if officers would stop supporting present sites for housing development against planning inspectors advice thus losing the district the existing provisions.

Travelling Showpeople plots have been allocated to non- guild members , there have been statements to the fact that there are no further requirements.

5.11.2 refers to the amount of pitches for G/T and showpeople. However, Parish Council's have unsuccessfully requested up-dates on site occupation. It is therefore assumed that the illustrated figures are questionable as there have been no detailed evaluations.

**Response:**

No public consultation on needs required, the GTAA assesses existing provision and need, with a statutory duty to meet identified needs.

An increase in Travelling Showpeople need is demonstrated in the GTAA evidence. It is noted that at present local need in Leicestershire is low, however a background need exists in the district to 2031. Comment with regards to existing sites is considered incorrect with regards to housing development, and no evidence provided with regards to guild and non guild members.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7634 Mrs Louise Duke [6449]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is enough provision for travellers in our community already, albeit it is not actually in Market Harborough it is pretty much on the border.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No further travellers pitches.

**Response:**

Noted. The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment identifies a need for a minimum of 5 additional pitches in the district to 2031. Sites at Braybrooke and Justin Park and their proximity to Market Harborough are noted, however these are not within Harborough District,

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5569 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plan includes proposals to provide suitable sites for gypsies and travellers but there is no definition of the meaning of the words used. For example how often do travellers have to travel to be considered as travellers?

HDC some years ago was asked by central Government to list sites suitable for these people but no such list was prepared resulting in an increase in non registered sites with little council control

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Clear definitions of the terms used should be prepared and maintained. The number of sites given remains open to question as does the number of residents allowed per site.

**Response:**

Definitions are contained within Government guidance



**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5705 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Using the words "travellers" is misleading as most of the people so defined do not travel but remain in one place. Alternatively enforced movement of "static" travellers should be introduced say every two years.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Clear definitions should be made for all of the categories of people included within this section.

**Response:**

Noted

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5449 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support these proposals /Sound.

**Response:**

Noted.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5754 Mr Graeme Bonser [6113]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- Losing green further belt land in an area adjacent to significant development proposed in the Core strategy
- Losing visual and landscape value from local footpaths and bridalways "not in keeping of setting"
- Changing agricultural to residential use within green belt
- Infill development between villages of Claybrooke Parva/Ullesthorpe.
- The proposal is not located within a reasonable distance to a settlement, has inadequate access to a range of services. Does not have suitable highway access and is detrimental to public safety. It is therefore contrary to Core Strategy policy CS4.
- Not council owned land nor planning proposal has been submitted for location

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Traveller sites should be located in areas where there are suitable facilities and locations for the site  
Sites should be distributed equally throughout the district for the benefit of traveller communities.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5802 John Eales [6129]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I believe that one gypsy camp site is enough in the immediate area

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Perhaps one could be sited elsewhere

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7471 Mr Robert Ogden [6505]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

General concerns and particular concerns re traveller sites (Policy H6) and Magna Park (Policy BE2)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See above

**Response:**

Allocated sites have been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7494 National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr A R Yarwood) [6074]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In H6 we strongly support the recognition in section 2ci and 2cii that allocation of pitches needs to have regard to potential changes affecting those who meet the definition of gypsies and Travellers and to meet the "unknown" need.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5384 Mr Neil Blackhall [5817]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is already a gypsy/traveller site with consent for caravan use at Wells Close, Woodway Lane, Claybrooke Parva and further sites nearby at Mere Lane, Ullesthorpe and to the SW of Lutterworth. If there is a need for additional gypsy/traveller sites, then it seems to me that Claybrooke Parva and its locale already have more than their fair share. Therefore this site is not JUSTIFIED.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete 2 a

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva (3 pitches) as shown on the Policies Map;

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5399 Dr ANGELA WINTER [4965]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

1. There are already nearby gypsy sites at Mere Lane, Ullesthorpe and Wells Close, Woodway Lane, Claybrooke Parva.
2. Spinney View Farm is within the village of Claybrooke Parva and I am concerned if these three pitches are allowed, it will further negatively impact the nature of the rural village of Claybrooke Parva.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove text H6 2 a

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

The site will be subject to a planning application process.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5441 Mrs Jan Butcher [4328]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is a disproportionate provision within this Ward already. Where is the evidence for such a concentration is this part of the District? Our resources are already stretched so any increase is not sustainable.

Planning Appeal 14/00603/FUL confirmed that provision in Claybrooke Parva would be damaging to the countryside, unsustainable and injurious to community relations. The justification for the Inspector's ruling remains unchanged.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Provision for pitches at Parva to be removed and reallocated

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

The appeal decision refers to a different site at Claybrooke Parva.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5519 Mr Neville Karai [6022]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I am concerned that a specific designation of the site within a small rural community, that has no amenities, support infrastructure will put pressure on the local community. I have a strong belief that I moved to an area of natural beauty which will be affected by this change of designation. There is already council provided accommodation in the area .

**Change To Plan Sought:**

An out of village area could be considered that is neutral to other villages in the area.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5520 Mr Guy Weatherall [6023]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Existing provision is under utilised and could be expanded if necessary. The proposed site erodes Claybrooke-Ullesthorpe separation. The proposed site is flood-prone.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Ensure better utilisation of existing provision at Mere Lane Ullesthorpe. Expand the Mere Lane site if necessary.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria, including provision of a suitable drainage scheme.

Expansion and intensification of existing sites, including at Mere Lane, Ullesthorpe is not currently recommended.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5719 **mr Damian Neville [5868]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

My objection is based upon the

- damage to the countryside with this development
- the negative effects on the natural environment
- inappropriate development of farm land within area of natural countryside/ green belt
- disturb the character of the area
- the declined application for the Gypsy/traveller accommodation on Woodway lane Claybrooke Parva

**Change To Plan Sought:**

decline the plan and support the increase occupancy of the existing traveller site in Ullesthorpe.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

Expansion of an existing site at Mere Farm, Ullesthorpe is not recommended by Leicestershire County Council Multi Agency Traveller Unit.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5745 **Mrs Christine Horsfall [5326]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This is an opportunistic application for use of agricultural land. The fact that the land has been neglected is irrelevant and indeed has probably benefitted wildlife. There is a traveller site a few miles away outside Ullesthorpe and a Showmens' site on the outskirts of Lutterworth. A recent report has shown that there is only a shortage of 780 pitches nationally with most of these needed in the south east as travellers move to find work. Therefore this application is unnecessary and probably would not be enforced leading to a larger number of pitches being provided.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Permission not to be granted.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

The site is located on brownfield land.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5753 Mr Ian Robertson [5573]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* Evenly distribute Gypsy/Traveller sites/pitches based on per capita residents throughout the district.
- \* Utilise the sites that already exist that have spaces,

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The geographical imbalance of sites should be addressed and the sites/pitches evenly distributed.

Rather than starting another new site at Spinney Farm make an additional 3 pitches on the Ullesthorpe site which would be easier to manage.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

Expansion of existing sites has been assessed and not recommended in the case of Mere Farm, Ullesthorpe.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5756 Mr Graeme Bonser [6113]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- Land use change from agricultural to residential within a green belt.
- No planning application has been made or approved for "earmarked" location
- The proposal is not located within a reasonable distance to a settlement, and has inadequate access to a range of services. It does not have suitable highway access and is detrimental to public safety. It is therefore contrary to Core Strategy policy CS4.
- Area in question is infill development in between 2 villages.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

-Identification of earmarked sites should consider how evenly dispersed sites are throughout the district for benefit of traveller communities and locals.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

Land not identified as green belt or infill development.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5770 Claybrooke Parva Parish Council (mr ian robertson) [6117]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Evenly distribute Gypsy/Traveller sites/pitches based on per capita residents throughout the district.  
Utilise the sites that already exist that have spaces.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The geographical imbalance of sites should be addressed and the sites/pitches evenly distributed.

Rather than starting another new site at Spinney Farm make an additional 3 pitches on the Ullesthorpe site which would be easier to manage.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.  
Expansion and intensification of existing sites has been investigated through the Study and is not recommended in relation to Mere Farm, Ullesthorpe.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5787 Mrs SM Eales [6125]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is already a Gypsy site nearby at Ullesthorpe. We don't need another one locally.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A new site should be found elsewhere

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6028 **Mr Richard Lockley [6161]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

I object to this proposal.

This is an unwarranted intrusion into the countryside.

There is already a Gypsy and Travellers site close by in Woodway Lane, Claybrooke Parva. This has been unused since permission was granted for it and clearly demonstrates a lack of demand for such further provision in this area.

There is little point in making provision in a location that is not geographically suitable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If additional provision is required allocate it in locations that will be occupied and not lie unused.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6144 **Mr J R Deacon [5980]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Why is it necessary to have another G/T site when there is already one in Mere Lane. Why are the majority of G/T sites on the eastern side of the District. They should be spread over the District. Why has HDC included this site when HM Inspector's ruling on Planning Appeal 14/00603/FUL remains unchanged.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Move to another location on the west of the District.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6321 Mr Alan Pettifer [6091]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We have enough new dwellings proposed for this village. Any more people will make the traffic worse. The school is over subscribed and we have no amenities to speak of. The proposal will be damaging to the countryside and the character of this SMALL village. There is no shop, no doctors and one pub. Why is the district council so keen to spoil are village. People live here to look at countryside NOT buildings of any description. Residents children should be able to live here, but they can't.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It shouldn't be allowed.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria. Leicestershire County Council as Education Authority has not raised capacity issues relating to the school.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6323 Mrs Kathryn Bonser [4981]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* Seems unfair to the traveller community to house them near each other in one area. Travellers should be spread out across the county so as not to make them feel segregated from the rest of the county.
- \* Local area around Spinney Farm is already under threat from the expansion of Magna Park. This would be taking more countryside away from local people.
- \* Increase in traffic would be detrimental to the local area
- \* How has planning permission been granted for this site?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposed camps should be spread out across the county

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria. Site is a proposed allocation only, no planning permission has been granted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6341 Mrs Rachael Edgley [5299]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This site does not have safe access to amenities. By the general habit of humans the shortest route is always taken to places so by foot there is no safe access to encourage zero carbon foot print by motivating people to walk to the nearby shop, pub, hairdressers and butcher. Recent applications near to the site were turned down due to Highways deeming it being unsatisfactory and harm being greater than good. Site next an area with listed buildings and an area of ridge and furrow.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

As travellers site it should be located closer to the A5 as it would make travelling easier.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6433 Z Hornsby [6317]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I Object for two reasons:

There is already one travellers site within the parish. This site is not full and has capacity - there is no need for a second site within the same parish where amenities are already stretched to breaking point.

A planning proposal was rejected by Harborough Council for building houses on land off Claybrooke Road, Ullesthorpe as public access to village amenities on foot was not a safe option. Why then are they now proposing to permit a travellers site adjacent to this land using the same village access and consider this a safe option?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A more suitable site should be used

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6446 Barry Richardson [6327]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

That the proposed site would not be beneficial to either Claybrooke Parva or Ullesthorpe also that a site which is already in the local.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

That the site at Ullesthorpe is extended, that if this site is already full

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

Expansion or intensification of Mere Farm, Ullesthorpe, is not recommended.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6559 Mrs Teresa Ashley [6369]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is green land and travellers pitches and associated infrastructure would damage the countryside. There is a site in Ullesthorpe which is not at capacity and could accommodate 3 more pitches.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Expand Ullesthorpe travellers site to have more pitches.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

Expansion or intensification of existing site at Mere Farm, Ullesthorpe is not recommended by Leicestershire County Council Multi Agency Traveller Unit.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6622 Claybrooke Magna Parish Council (Mrs J P Butcher) [4737]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

72% of the pitches provided across the District are in Lutterworth and surrounding villages with 30% of the whole District's provision being in the villages of Ullesthorpe and Claybrooke Parva. What is the evidence of need for this hugely distorted distribution strategy? Concentrating the pressure in one area makes service delivery unsustainable.

This is an unsustainable location in terms of NPPF; lacking facilities and employment and having limited public transport.

Planning Appeal 14/00603/FUL confirmed that provision for G/T in Parva would be damaging to the countryside, unsustainable and injurious to community relations. The justification for the Inspector's ruling remains.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove G/T provision in Claybrooke Parva.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

Planning appeal refers to a different site.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6980 Mr Simon Smith [4996]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

How can some people with local ties be denied planning and others be encouraged to bring the same rural green field site forward. for larger development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Continue with HDC historic policy on the spinner view farm site of no residential use in line with previous proven policy for reasons of fairness and transparency.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.  
The site is a brownfield site, with previous unauthorised occupation.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7207 Mrs Rachael Edgley [5299]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is already a travellers site in close proximity of this site and another in development. There is no requirement for another in this area of Claybrooke and Ullesthorpe.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Should have more spread out sites to help those that attend the sites regularly

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7303 Ms Julie Fairgrievs [6143]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Nothing has happened since the site (Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva) was refused to make it acceptable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The identification of this site for Gypsy, Travellers and show people's accommodation be deleted from the Plan.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7346 Mrs Jennifer Toone [6083]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is already a gypsy/traveler site just outside Ullesthorpe and I see no need for another in this area of beautiful countryside.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7433 Nicholas Jenkins [4902]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I believe the Local Plan is "finger in the air" and the report on site Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva and inaccurate. If the Landover has offered the site, why was the site report done using Google and not a site visit? According to report 2.13 three attempts should have been made.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Spinney View Farm does not satisfy the criteria of Local Plan H6.

4b. Located safe walking distance to a settlement (yes to Claybrooke Parva only has a primary school) (no to Ullesthorpe, shop, school & surgery. 45 houses between Ullesthorpe & Claybrooke refused on appeal as unsafe road crossing).

4c. Claybrooke has no services or facilities other than Primary School.

4g. iv The fields on the site flood and it is an area of "shifting sand".

The site report by the Consultants is at fault:

The site is East of Claybrooke Parva - not South.

Many enforcement issues including preventing people living on the site.

Consultant lists planning history; why have they not listed enforcement history?

Flood Zone 1 intrigues me as the fields regularly flood in winter & the land is low lying. The path mentioned is not a public footpath but a bridleway & much used. The whole site is visible from the bridleway along all the site's Western boundary. Ecology: not mention is made to the large pond (Conseration Area) to NW of site beside bridlepath. See attachments

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria, including provision of a suitable drainage scheme.

Previous occupation of the site was unauthorised and not by a Gypsy or Traveller.

In addition to meeting the criteria set out in Policy H6, all Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites that come forward through the allocations and enabling policy will be subject to relevant planning application considerations, including the need for relevant ecology surveys.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7454 **Mr Michael Lenihan [5268]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Nothing has happened since the site was refused to make it acceptable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The identification of this site for gypsy, traveler and showpeople accommodation be deleted from the Plan.

**Response:**

The site referred to is a separate site on Wells Close, Claybrooke Parva, where an application was refused and appeal dismissed on access requirements.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7629 **Mr Robert Ogden [6505]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Consistent with the above observation of imbalance, all the existing and proposed traveller sites apart the site at Keyham are concentrated around the Lutterworth and Market Harborough areas. Another site between Ullesthorpe and the Claybrookes is not needed nor is it desirable. Additional provision should be made in the eastern half of the district where at present there is a shortage.

**Response:**

Noted.

The Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study assessed all existing sites for potential expansion together with potential new sites. Existing sites at Greenacres, Market Harborough, together with Mere Farm, Ullesthorpe, are not considered acceptable to expand on the advice of the Leicestershire Multi Agency Traveller Unit.

No sites have been proposed or found for the eastern side of the district except for existing sites around Keyham. The identified need for a minimum of an additional 5 pitches as identified in the GTAA is district wide, and not location specific.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7635 **Mr Allan Whittaker [6064]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Over representation in the area of 'Gypsy Traveller' plots, very few local facilities, increased high risk of road accident involving children, disruption to the local countryside, ground not suitable for habitation due to flooding. Not strategic as the land is owned by members of the 'Gypsy Traveller' population.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

More substantial populations of Harborough district are under-represented with Gypsy Traveller facilities compared to Ullesthorpe and Claybrooke. Allocation of plots should be considered in under represented areas.

The only reason Claybrooke is in consideration is the land is owned by members of the Gypsy Traveller community. This is not really a basis of a strategic plan.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria, including provision of a suitable drainage scheme.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7636 **Zoe Ridley [5242]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The local area already has two other sites within one mile of this proposed location. The local amenities are unable to cope with more sites and is already being negatively impacted by the location of the other two sites. The local schools of Ullesthorpe and Claybrooke are unable to cope with the increased demand placed upon them.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove from the local plan

**Response:**

Noted. The site is allocated for up to 3 pitches only, an equivalent of 3 additional dwellings. Leicestershire County Council as Education Authority has not indicated capacity issues at either school.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7637 **Mr Neil Ridley [5231]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The local area already has two sites, Mere land and Woodway Lane. The additional site will put additional strain on local facilities that are already struggling to cope. Both Ullesthorpe and Claybrooke Schools are being negatively impacted by the requirements placed on them.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This proposed location should be removed from the local plan

**Response:**

Noted. The site is allocated for up to 3 pitches only, an equivalent of 3 additional dwellings. Leicestershire County Council as Education Authority has not indicated capacity issues at either school.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7638 **Mrs Maria Lockley [5818]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

There tends to be a degree of apprehension over these sites, not least because some receive unfavourable publicity. Without a great deal of care over their location, local harmony is difficult to achieve, this being to the detriment of all parties.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scrap the Plan.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7639 Mrs Valerie Deacon [6122]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

30% of the District's provision is already around the Claybrookes and Ullesthorpe. It would be disadvantageous to increase the provision in this, due to the fluctuating demand on services.

Provision should be spread across the whole of the District, to ensure fairness and spread of resources.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No further increase in provision in this part of the District.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

The Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study assessed existing sites for potential expansion together with assessing new potential sites. No sites have been proposed elsewhere in the district.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7641 Mrs Linda Hollingworth [6035]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There are already enough traveller sites in the local area. The existing sites could be slightly extended to accommodate extra travellers without creating additional sites.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Extend existing sites to give extra accommodation.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria, including provision of a suitable drainage scheme.

Expansion and intensification of existing sites, including at Mere Lane, Ullesthorpe is not currently recommended.

---



**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7645 mr chris colton [6151]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This site seems highly unacceptable given that there is currently an extremely large already established site at Mere Lane. The allowance of this will then be both sides of Ullesthorpe. It seems highly unacceptable to allow another the other side of the village.

I note that there is no plan to expand or place new sites near Market Harborough and surrounding areas. Just Lutterworth and Ullesthorpe areas.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

this site should be scrapped completely and you should rethink your entire stance against this, I appreciate and understand that gypsies and travellers have the right to housing but why can this not be expanded on the current site?

**Response:**

Noted. Site is allocated for up to 3 pitches in total, in contrast to existing Mere Farm site of 40 pitches. The Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study assessed all existing sites for potential expansion together with potential new sites. Existing sites at Greenacres, Market Harborough, together with Mere Farm, Ullesthorpe, are not considered acceptable to expand on the advice of the Leicestershire Multi Agency Traveller Unit.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7654 Emma Ridley [5234]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The local area already has two sites, Mere Lane and Woodway Lane. The proposed site will put additional and unnecessary strain on the local facilities that are already struggling to cope. Both Ullesthorpe and Claybrooke Schools are being negatively impacted by the requirements placed on them.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete this option from plan.

**Response:**

Noted. The site is allocated for up to 3 pitches only, an equivalent of 3 additional dwellings. Leicestershire County Council as Education Authority has not indicated capacity issues at either school.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6659 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Provision at Bonham's Lane is not required and the special status of the site should be recognised.

**Response:**

Land at Boneham's Lane, Gilmorton has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

The site is allocated as a reserve site, to meet future accomodation needs, subject to critiera.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7640 Gilmorton Parish Council (Mrs Yvette Walters) [6476]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no evidence showing the need for the existing site on Bonehams Lane be increased from the present 6 pitches to 16 pitches - an increase of 10 pitches. This site was originally intended for a close family unit and should remain as such.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the number of proposed pitches.

**Response:**

Noted. The site at Boneham's Lane, Gilmorton is allocated as a reserve site, to meet future accommodation needs due to either a change in the definition of Gypsies and Travellers, or to meet identified 'unknown' needs of those that may meet the current definition.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7642 Gilmorton Parish Council (Mr Julian Kent) [6472]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no evidence showing the need for the existing site on Bonehams Lane be increased from the present 6 pitches to 16 pitches - an increase of 10 pitches. This site was originally intended for a close family unit and should remain as such.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not increase the number of pitches.

**Response:**

Noted. The site at Boneham's Lane, Gilmorton is allocated as a reserve site, to meet future accommodation needs due to either a change in the definition of Gypsies and Travellers, or to meet identified 'unknown' needs of those that may meet the current definition.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7242 Kettering Borough Council (Ms Julia Baish) [6480]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

It is recognised that Policy H6 includes a site for 10 pitches as a reserve site to meet needs arising from any changes to the definition of Gypsy and Travellers or to meet needs of the identified 'unknown' Gypsy and Traveller population. The principle of including a reserve site is supported.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7501 National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr A R Yarwood) [6074]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In H6 we strongly support the recognition in section 2ci and 2cii that allocation of pitches needs to have regard to potential changes affecting those who meet the definition of gypsies and Travellers and to meet the "unknown" need.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6354 Cotesbach Parish Council (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6283]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not Justified - better consideration needs to be given to the access of the Moorbarns Lane site with it being so close to the school and residential area  
A site appears to already have been identified without planning permission granted or material considerations given

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The site should not be part of the plan

**Response:**

The site has previously benefitted from planning permission for 18 plots in total. Permission expired in January 2018.  
The allocation is subject to criteria, including provision of a safe access.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7496 National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr A R Yarwood) [6074]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Criterion a) is unnecessary and unduly restrictive. There will be situations where limited ancillary commercial activity is appropriate and acceptable. If commercial activity would be unacceptable at the particular location for which permission is being sought, then this could be controlled by a planning condition.

**Response:**

Commercial use for parts of Gypsy and Traveller sites is not supported. For Travelling Showpeople new sites / extensions, these are not subject to criteria 5a.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7503 National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr A R Yarwood) [6074]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We have the following concern relating to section 5:

\* Criterion a) is unnecessary and unduly restrictive. There will be situations where limited ancillary commercial activity is appropriate and acceptable. If commercial activity would be unacceptable at the particular location for which permission is being sought, then this could be controlled by a planning condition.

**Response:**

Commercial use for parts of Gypsy and Traveller sites is not supported. For Travelling Showpeople new sites / extensions, these are not subject to criteria 5a.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5755 Mr Ian Robertson [5573]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the Spinney Farm site is away from the road and would be largely unobtrusive (provided the authorities could enforce only 3 pitches) there is still a concern about the safety of walking on the paths at night or in the winter for children walking to either the Ullesthorpe or Claybrook schools as they are unlit, very dark, and dangerous. The same would apply to walking to the surgery in Ullesthorpe as part of that journey (the bridge over the brook) has no footpath at all.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Change the plan to place the site where footpath access is safe.

**Response:**

Noted.

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5771 Claybrooke Parva Parish Council (mr ian robertson) [6117]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the Spinney Farm site is away from the road and would be largely unobtrusive (provided the authorities could enforce only 3 pitches) there is still a concern about the safety of walking on the paths at night or in the winter for children walking to either the Ullesthorpe or Claybrook schools as they are unlit, very dark, and dangerous. The same would apply to walking to the surgery in Ullesthorpe as part of that journey (the bridge over the brook) has no footpath at all.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Change the plan to place the site where footpath access is safe.

**Response:**

Noted.

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6377 Mr Rob Harrop [6085]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Re: Land at Spinney View Farm. The route to the nearest school in Claybrooke Parva crosses a very narrow bridge with no footpath in a derestricted stretch of road and no street lighting. I don't consider safe for adults let alone primary age children.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Find a more appropriate site,

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria, including provision of a safe access. The site is north of the bridge mentioned, and therefore the bridge does not need to be crossed to access the school.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6387 Mrs Carole Allen [6291]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Safety would be a concern for any children on the site walking to school on dimly lit paths in the winter.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Improve Lighting and Footpaths

**Response:**

Noted.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7497 National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr A R Yarwood) [6074]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Criterion b) is too restrictive. Sites which are within walking distance of a settlement will usually be unavailable as Gypsy and Traveller sites due to affordability, availability and local opposition. In allocating new sites, it is reasonable for the local authority to first consider such locations, but such a rigid approach could prevent suitable sites from coming forward in other suitable locations. Local authorities need to be realistic about the availability of alternatives to the car in accessing local services.

**Response:**

Noted.

The PPTS states: 'Local planning authorities should very strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan'. Criteria 5b is considered to be in conformity with this paragraph of the PPTS.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7504 National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr A R Yarwood) [6074]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We have the following concern relating to section 5:

\* Criterion b) is too restrictive. Sites which are within walking distance of a settlement will usually be unavailable as Gypsy and Traveller sites due to affordability, availability and local opposition. In allocating new sites, it is reasonable for the local authority to first consider such locations, but such a rigid approach could prevent suitable sites from coming forward in other suitable locations. Local authorities need to be realistic about the availability of alternatives to the car in accessing local service"

**Response:**

Noted.

The PPTS states: 'Local planning authorities should very strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan'. Criteria 5b is considered to be in conformity with this paragraph of the PPTS.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6223 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Does this mean that a large settlement can have a traveller site of the same size?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

sites in rural areas must proportionately respect the scale of, and not dominate, the nearest settled community, and avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure.

**Response:**

The PPTS states: 'Local planning authorities should ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of, and do not dominate, the nearest settled community, and avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure'.

Criteria 5c is considered to be in conformity with paragraph 25 of the PPTS.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6380 Mr Rob Harrop [6085]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Re: land at Spinney View Farm. There is insufficient screening and the site is prone to flooding

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Find a more appropriate site

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria, including provision of a suitable drainage scheme and landscaping.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7643 Claybrooke Parva Parish Council (mr ian robertson) [6117]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Experience from other sites such as Ullesthorpe suggest that "prevent adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the locality and on neighbouring uses" is difficult to manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Place the site where activity can be effectively monitored and managed.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7644 **Mr Ian Robertson [5573]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Experience from other sites such as Ullesthorpe suggest that "prevent adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the locality and on neighbouring uses" is difficult to manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Place the site where activity can be effectively monitored and managed.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6381 **Mr Rob Harrop [6085]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Re: Land at Spinney View Farm. The site is prone to regular flooding, surely this puts peoples' health and safety at risk.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Find a more appropriate site

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria, including provision of a suitable drainage scheme and landscaping.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6395 **Mrs Carole Allen [6291]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Distribute equally around Harborough District

**Change To Plan Sought:**

More evenly spread around Harbourough District

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7498 National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr A R Yarwood) [6074]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We strongly oppose criterion 7b) which is not in accord which paragraph 22e) of PPTF, which advises against restricting sites to those who have local connections.

**Response:**

Noted. However, Section 7 related to rural exception sites only, not all new site provision, and is considered to be in conformity with Policy D - para 15 of the PPTS.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7505 National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr A R Yarwood) [6074]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

In section 7, we strongly oppose criterion b) which is not in accord which paragraph 22e) of PPTF, which advises against restricting sites to those who have local connections.

**Response:**

Noted. However, Section 7 related to rural exception sites only, not all new site provision, and is considered to be in conformity with Policy D - para 15 of the PPTS.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6301 HUNGARTON Parish Council (Mr Andrew May) [2640]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is an error in the policy map for Keyham which shows land south of Ingarsby Road which is incorrectly defined as Existing Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Policy map for Keyham needs redrawing

**Response:**

Amendment to Policies Map for Keyham proposed to remove site 'land south of Ingarsby Road'.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7241 **Kettering Borough Council (Ms Julia Baish) [6480]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

KBC was consulted on the GTAA, but the Council has concerns about its outputs. Specifically that there is a significant level of potential need which is unknown at this stage, and that need could be greater than identified sites.

Given the cross boundary issues between Harborough, Kettering and Daventry Districts, KBC want to ensure that any need which is generated from households within Harborough is fairly represented and provision to meet need is identified within Harborough District through this Local Plan, and that families are then not required to find sites within neighbouring districts to meet a site shortfall.

**Response:**

The high level of 'unknowns' in the GTAA is noted, however the Local Plan includes a reserve site for future development, with criteria including if sufficient evidence is provided that the identified 'unknown' population does meet the PPTS definition.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6224 **LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The LPA should be able to demonstrate that it has a 5 year land supply for Gypsy and traveller sites - is this the case?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The LPA demonstrates that it has a 5 year land supply for Gypsy and Traveller sites.

**Response:**

The GTAA identifies a total need of 5 Gypsy and Traveller pitches to 2031. The Local Plan includes site allocations of 5 pitches plus a reserve site for 10 pitches.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7353 **Mr Ray Middlemas [5866]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Lack of trust and lack of consideration for established town and village residents.

A seemly one sided approach to favoring gypsy/travelers development.

**Response:**

Land at Spinney View Farm, Claybrooke Parva has been assessed through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Identification Study as suitable, available and achievable, subject to policy criteria.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6649 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Full Council has always voted to encourage and promote knowledge based industries to the district but policies or actions do not actively reflect this ambition.

**Response:**

The policy allows for a range of B Class land uses. Knowledge based industries do not correlate to a specific B Class land use and could be accommodated on allocated sites.

The emerging Economic Development Strategy 2017 (and preceding Open for Business Prospectus) is not sector based- see paragraph 6.1.3 of the Local Plan.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6749 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy proposes that an additional 58.8ha will be allocated. HEDNA forecasts a need between the range of 44 and 51 ha for Harborough (2011-2031).

However, Table B11 confirms that of that forecast HEDNA need, 16.5ha has already been built. Therefore, only between 27.5ha and 34.5ha is required to be allocated. An additional 58.5 ha has been allocated which is between 24 and 31 ha over provision. On top of this Paragraph 6.1.13 also allows an unspecified additional amount of employment in neighbourhood plans.

Therefore the City Council seeks further justification for the over provision of employment land in Policy BE1.

**Response:**

Policy BE1 explanation acknowledges that the Plan makes provision in excess of the HEDNA minimum figure (para 6.1.9), giving a narrative rather than figure-based justification. Further technical detail will be made available in the Business & Employment Topic Paper at submission.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7129 Tarmac Trading Ltd [4914]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Promotion of a portion of a Tarmac landholding (the site) at Gibbet Lane, Shawell, for future employment use within the plan period. The site is appropriate for employment uses, namely B1 (Business) and B2 (General Industrial) and non-strategic Storage and Distribution (B8), at the cessation of mineral operations at Shawell Quarry. Consider that the site has been under-scored in SA. The application of the methodology used by Council to assess sites' potential for employment allocation is not considered to be consistent or sound. The evidence used to inform the employment allocations' site selection is erroneous and inconsistent. See attachment.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Please see attachment

**Response:**

The SELAA (2017) assessed the site as 'Not currently developable'. Detailed concerns about the SA site appraisal, undertaken independently by AECOM, are noted. To accord with SS1(1), on the balance of evidence and considering the reasonable alternatives, the site was not selected for allocation in the Local Plan.

The SELAA (2017) assessed the site as 'Not currently developable', on the basis that it is not currently suitable or available for employment development until the cessation of mineral extraction activity. Separate representation by LCC (as Minerals Authority) states that full restoration of the site is a condition of the minerals planning consent and that it should be considered a greenfield site (not PDL).

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7254 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The consented site at Gaulby Road, Billesdon (a former highways depot), should be shown as a commitment.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The consented site at Gaulby Road, Billesdon (a former highways depot), should be shown as a commitment.

**Response:**

The Gaulby Road (Billesdon) site is allocated in the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan, and is counted as a commitment as per the reference in Policy SS1 clause 2bi.

Duplication between the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans is generally avoided, and only large commitments are shown on the Policies map.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7593 Messers Herbert [6535]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Objections are made to SS1 "The spatial strategy", Policy H1 "Provision of new housing, Policy BE1 "Provision of new business development" and Policy BE2 "Strategic distribution" insofar as the draft Plan not is not:

- \* Positively Prepared as it fails to meet objectively assessed development needs and infrastructure requirements;
- \* Justified in that the plan is not based on the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives;
- \* Effective in that the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- \* Consistent with national policy as the plan does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF.

The landowners object to the failure of the Council to recognise the potential to:

- \* Identify land within Whetstone Pastures as a future logistics park; and more over
- \* Recognise the ability of land within Whetstone Pastures to deliver a new Garden Village as part of a large strategic allocation extending over the administrative boundaries of both Blaby and Harborough.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to make the Plan sound it is submitted that the following modifications are made:

- \* SS1 - The Spatial Strategy amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future housing and logistics needs for the Harborough District during the period 2011 to 2031;
- \* Policy H1 - Provision for new housing similarly amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future housing needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031;
- \* Policy BE1 - Provision of new business development similarly amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future logistics needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031; and
- \* Policy BE2 - Strategic Distribution to be amended to make provision for future logistics needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031.

22 The precise wording of any changes should be carefully considered through cross-party working with Blaby to recognise, not only the cross-boundary nature of the Garden Village but also, that the majority of the land needed to deliver the Garden Village falls within Blaby.

**Response:**

The SELAA (2017) assessed the proposed site as 'Not currently developable' due to site access restrictions. The provision of a new, all movement junction on the M1, to the agreement of Highways England would be needed to make the site developable. The Council has not been formally asked to include either a Logistics Park or a Garden Village at Whetstone Park in the Local Plan, either at Options stage or subsequently. Although it was aware of the potential for strategic distribution at a new motorway junction in this location, and indeed considered this as part of the Second Interim SA Report Appraising Options for Strategic Distribution Growth (Feb 2016), it considered that the scheme was insufficiently advanced to be included in the Local Plan and that it would be included, if necessary, in a future review of the Local Plan following approval of the Strategic Growth Plan for the period beyond 2031. With regard to the proposed Garden Village, it is premature to make decisions on such a major growth point in advance of the SGP and too late in the Local Plan to consider this as an alternative/ addition to the SDAs submitted in 2015 for consideration.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7612 Mr & Mrs D & B Robinson [6474]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is provision in policy BE1 for further rural economic development in the policy which permits future employment sites within or well related to Rural Centres and selected Rural Villages where certain criteria are met. However, a reliance on the development management system to provide additional employment sites through windfall development is not a robust strategy. Therefore, given the amounts of housing permitted in Great Glen and the promotion of the area as a sustainable settlement, the lack of employment provision within the village is not a strategy which can be said to be positively prepared and therefore sound.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Allocation of site at Mount Farm, London Road, Great Glen

**Response:**

The consideration of sites for potential employment development did not identify any reasonable alternatives in Great Glen. Provision to meet HEDNA requirements is made by BE1 (1). Additional windfall development in Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages is covered by BE1 (2).

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7613 Mr & Mrs D & B Robinson [6474]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed allocation is well related to the existing settlement of Great Glen. It is relatively unconstrained and was identified as being developable in the 2016 SHLAA. The provision of an allocated employment site in this location is addressing a recognised need given that there is no existing employment space within the settlement and that future housing will put greater pressure on out commuting reducing the sustainability and self-containment of the settlement. An employment allocation should be included for Great Glen in accordance with Fleckney and The Kibworths which were justified due to the levels of housing growth coming forwards.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Allocation of Land at Mount Farm, London Road, Great Glen.

**Response:**

The consideration of sites for potential employment development did not identify any reasonable alternatives in Great Glen. Provision to meet HEDNA requirements is made by BE1 (1). Additional windfall development in Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages is covered by BE1 (2).

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7067 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7251 **Leciestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

8. The proposed portfolio of B use employment land in the Local Plan, which will provide the opportunity to deliver a range of jobs and economic prosperity in the District and wider area, is supported.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7252 **Leciestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

16. The County Council requests that planning consents at Airfield Business Park, Market Harborough (BE1.1a (ii)) should be shown as existing commitments.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

16. The County Council requests that planning consents at Airfield Business Park, Market Harborough (BE1.1a (ii)) should be shown as existing commitments.

**Response:**

The site is identified as an allocation in preference to a commitment as its delivery is relied upon to meet land requirements to 2031. Para 6.1.13 acknowledges that several sites, including this site, have the benefit of outline planning consent.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6692 **Mr and Mrs Gowling [6400]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy BE1: Provision of New Business Development, we fully support the recognition that the development requirements outlined in this policy are a minimum and the level of flexibility that this element of the policy enables. We fully support the allocation of land at Compass Point Business Park, Northampton Road for the development of 5ha of employment land use. We consider that our clients land at Northampton Road has the capacity to accommodate 2.3ha of 5h allocation for employment land; the site could provide floor space for Use Class B1 facilities, associated parking, servicing and landscaping.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5676 Mr Anthony Brookes [5991]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Totally inadequate road provision. The A426 is regularly gridlocked from the M6 to the A5 and A5 to the Lutterworth Roudabout. In addition 3000 lorries pass through the centre of Lutterworth every day. Pollution is extremely high and will rise. For the expansion to be granted, there must be dual carriage provision provided BEFORE the expansion. This may be other agencies not involved with the Local plan, but the omission is a major failing of this plan. It cannot be sound without improvements to road infrastructure

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A clear plan and commitment from which ever agencies : Leicestershire CC, Highways England or whoever to provide adequate infrastructure to enable this expansion without impacting further on Lutterworth itself.

**Response:**

Junction improvements on existing roads would be done in advance of the development's commencement. It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this. Traffic modelling indicates that the spine road will result in reductions in traffic through the town centre in the long term.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7398 Wells McFarlane (Trevor Wells) [3916]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We wish to register our objection to Policy BE1 as it is not effective or justified when considered against reasonable alternatives.

Specifically, we object to the following:

1. the lack of sufficient options/ alternatives for the delivery of employment land in Lutterworth during the early stages of the Plan;
2. the absence of suitable allocations for the provision of B1 office use.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Additional land should be allocated to provide a greater level of certainty that adequate employment land will be delivered in Lutterworth in the short to medium term.

Additional land close to the town centre should be allocated to ensure the delivery of a greater range of employment types (including smaller scale B1 office use).

**Response:**

Land south of Lutterworth Road / Coventry Road (Policy L2) has been allocated to improve short to medium term provision in Lutterworth in recognition of the delivery trajectory for the East of Lutterworth SDA (Policy L1). Provision for B1 uses will be delivered via Policy L1 and L2.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7413 Wells McFarlane (Trevor Wells) [3916]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As part of this Local Plan consultation we wish to put forward 'Land to the west of Rugby Road, Lutterworth' as a proposed allocation for B1 office/ retail uses. The allocation of the site is justified when considered against reasonable alternatives and would improve the effectiveness of the Plan by ensuring the timely delivery of employment and retail uses.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Land to the west of Rugby Road, Lutterworth' should be allocated for B1 office/ retail uses in the Local Plan. The allocation of the site would contribute positively to the Local Plan's effectiveness by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth in accordance with national policy (NPPF, para 7 - emphasis ours).

**Response:**

The site is proposed Local Green Space and has not been put forward previously for employment uses. Provision to meet HEDNA requirements is made by BE1 (1). Land south of Lutterworth Road / Coventry Road (Policy L2) has been allocated (and consented) to improve short to medium term provision in Lutterworth in recognition of the delivery trajectory for the East of Lutterworth SDA (Policy L1).

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6355 Cotesbach Parish Council (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6283]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not positively prepared as the Local Plan itself (para 6.1.9) recognises allocation of BE1 above the suggested HEDNA figure, it recognises the land as Grade 2 high agricultural quality (para 15.2.11 in LE1) and was previously consulted upon as a Motorway Service Station, but now there is no requirement for this due to an active planning application less than 4 miles away. This reinforces the lack of required need.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Lutterworth SDA B1 / B2 allocation should be removed, there is no clear call for sites any more at this location

**Response:**

The HEDNA identifies minimum requirements for employment land, which it states (para 11.2) do not include an assessment of the supply or quality of existing employment land and premises, and should be interpreted in this context. Further technical detail to support the approach taken will be made available in the Business & Employment Topic Paper at submission.

Para 6.1.10 states viability as the reason for the inclusion of 13ha to the south of the A4304 as part of East of Lutterworth SDA (BE1 Clause 1b.ii). The promoters state that this development is necessary to fund the up-front infrastructure costs of delivering the SDA and have submitted cashflow evidence to support this.



**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

5527 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plan has not demonstrated a need for this development (paragraph 15.2.11). In the consultation document, the land was proposed for a Motorway Service Area (to which the Parish Council also objected) - there is no information provided to justify this reallocation.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

Para 6.1.10 of LP states that the site is allocated in order to support the viability of the wider East of Lutterworth SDA. The promoters state that this development is necessary to fund the up-front infrastructure costs of delivering the SDA and have submitted cashflow evidence to support this.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

5824 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The allocation of land to the south of the A4304 opens land further to the south to development pressure as there is no natural or landscape barrier distinguishing the allocated site from its surroundings. Therefore it is not in accordance with policy GD8d.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

The site is well located in relation to the highway network and is allocated in order to support the viability of the wider East of Lutterworth SDA. The promoters state that this development is necessary to fund the up-front infrastructure costs of delivering the SDA and have submitted cashflow evidence to support this.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

5825 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The allocation has not been tested through consultation as it differs fundamentally from the proposals in Harborough's consultation document.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

No statutory obligation for LPA's to consult on Options. Proposed submission consultation meets regulatory requirements.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5827 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Land to the south of the A4304 is grade 2 agricultural land, a limited resource and comparatively scarce within Harborough District. In its Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2014, development was discouraged on land quality 1, 2 and 3a. Thus the Parish Council contends that development on this site is contrary Harborough District Council's own selection criteria and is contrary to policy GI5.3

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

The site is included for the reasons set out in para 15.2.11 of Policy L1, which acknowledges its status as best and most versatile agricultural land. The accompanying SA for the LP, assesses the overall effects of Policy BE1 on the Natural Environment as a minor negative.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5828 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Access to the site is likely to cause excessive traffic congestion despite, or possibly because of, the access arrangements proposed.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

Traffic modelling for the Local Plan does not support this concern. No objection has been raised to the principle of employment development by the Highway Authority or Highways England.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6077 Lady Caroline Bach [4169]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no proven need for even more warehousing in this area, given the size of Magna Park and its proposed extension. Construction on this particular site will destroy the rural nature of this stretch of road between the M1 and the nearest village. There is no significant unemployment in this area, and it is known that Magna Park is employing staff from outside the area who travel to work, thereby contributing to pollution.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Allow the land to remain undeveloped.

**Response:**

The site is well located in relation to the highway network and is allocated in order to support the viability of the wider East of Lutterworth SDA. The promoters state that this development is necessary to fund the up-front infrastructure costs of delivering the SDA and have submitted cashflow evidence to support this.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6501 **MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Object to allocation because;

- plan has not demonstrated a need for this development (ref. Para 15.2.11)
- it opens up further land to the south of A4303 to development pressure, as no natural or landscape barrier with surrounding countryside
- it's not been tested through consultation, differs from Options stage proposal
- includes grade 2 agricultural land, so contrary to selection criteria and policy GI5.3
- access likely to cause excess traffic congestion (4 traffic light controlled junctions within 0.73 miles between site and A426) in combination with extra traffic generated by policies L1, BE2, BE4 and displaced from Lutterworth town centre.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Non stated.

**Response:**

Para 6.1.10 of LP states that the site is allocated in order to support the viability of the wider East of Lutterworth SDA. The promoters state that this development is necessary to fund the up-front infrastructure costs of delivering the SDA and have submitted cashflow evidence to support this. The site is well located in relation to the highway network. Para 15.2.11 of Policy L1, acknowledges its status as best and most versatile agricultural land. The accompanying SA for the LP, assesses the overall effects of Policy BE1 on the Natural Environment as a minor negative.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7253 **Leciestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

16. The County Council requests that planning consents at the land south of Lutterworth / Coventry Road, Lutterworth (BE1.1b (ii)) should be shown as existing commitments.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The County Council requests that planning consent at the land south of Lutterworth / Coventry Road, Lutterworth (BE1.1b (ii)) should be shown as an existing commitment.

**Response:**

The site is identified as an allocation in preference to a commitment as its delivery is relied upon to meet land requirements to 2031. Para 6.1.13 acknowledges that several sites, including this site, have the benefit of outline planning consent.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7627 **Armstrong Rigg Planning (Mr Geoff Armstrong) [4700]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The Kibworths need additional commercial and community infrastructure to help sustainably deliver both committed and required levels of growth, fill notable gaps in service provision (i.e. a petrol filling station), respond to the significant need identified in the HEDNA 2017 for office floorspace and to meet the priorities set by the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for providing increased opportunities for people to work from home.

The site at Land at Windmill Farm is suitable and available for the proposed development and is sustainably located at a key junction on the way into the Kibworths. As such we recommend that it is allocated as follows in

**Change To Plan Sought:**

we recommend that it is allocated as follows in

order to deliver the required infrastructure to support housing growth and ensure that the Local Plan can be considered sound at examination:

Policy KJ - Land at Windmill Farm, Kibworth Harcourt is allocated for a mixed-use development comprising offices, a petrol filling station, a pre-school and live-work units.

**Response:**

Provision to meet HEDNA requirements for office development is made by BE1 (1). With regard to the other uses proposed, there is no requirement for further housing development in the Kibworths over and above commitments and no evidence has been provided of need for the proposed live-work units. The other suggested uses are not provided for by allocations in the Local Plan.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6228 **LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

In rural areas consideration must be given to the impact of traffic and road safety

**Change To Plan Sought:**

add a clause relating to road safety and traffic use.

**Response:**

Concerns addressed by Policy GD8 (Good Design in Development) and Policy IN2 (Sustainable Transport) which require that development must meet a high standard of design including consideration of safe access and highway impacts and where necessary provide mitigation measures.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6125 **Mr Peter Jones [6225]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Qualified support on the basis that enforcement action is taken. Here in North Kilworth we have witnessed ad hoc development of an unsustainable industrial estate from a green field site with permissions granted retrospectively. This is unfair to those who seek to follow the letter of the law.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7275 Prologis UK Ltd. [5661]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Reasons summarised as:

- does not provide a clear and comprehensive approach as para 6.1.7 / Table B.10 excludes strategic distribution
- Table B.11 Sources of Employment Land Supply needs to be updated to accurately reflect the position (i.e. planning consent 15/00919/FUL)
- unclear whether the plan meets objectively assessed employment need because the Council has not provided all the evidence to justify that the approach to general new business development combined with strategic B8 development is justified.
- overall employment land requirement not robustly justified. Further work needed to justify that this amount is appropriate and deliverable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to address the conflicts identified above and ensure that Policy BE1 is sound, it is requested that the Council:

1. Provide a table setting out a clear strategy for all employment land needs for the period 2011-2031. This should include office (B1), industrial (B2), general distribution (B8) and strategic distribution (B8) so there is a clear hierarchy of need.

**Response:**

Policy BE1 deals with employment uses, excluding strategic distribution (units in excess of 9,000sq.m.) as stated in para 6.1.1. Explanation acknowledges the Plan makes provision in excess of the HEDNA minimum figure (para 6.1.9), giving a narrative rather than figure-based justification. Further technical detail to be provided in a Business & Employment Topic Paper at submission.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5528 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The allocation has not been tested through consultation as it differs fundamentally from the proposals in Harborough's consultation document.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

BE2 (1) defines the boundary of Magna Park and is aimed at maintaining and safeguarding it as a leading distribution hub. BE2 (2) does not allocate land for further strategic distribution but rather identifies a cap along with specific criteria against which development proposals will be assessed. Consultation has been carried out in line with the regulations.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5720 mr Damian Neville [5868]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

not being strategic, not focused on meeting the employment needs of the area, leads to the over population of warehousing, which is not linked to railway connectivity within Leicestershire  
-pollution due to increase traffic, the impact of this site has not been factored into the midlands connect strategy. the increase volume of HGV and commuters will have adverse impacts on the already over crowded roads.  
-Will only increase in-commuting due to the low levels of unemployment in the area  
-adverse effect on the countryside+natural beauty of the area.  
-it will disturb / ruin the character of the area

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Leave the countryside as is.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough District to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5803 John Eales [6129]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Why do we need more greenfield building when already built warehouses are empty  
Surely we must consider that we will need all the farmland to grow own crops to sustain our growing population and our trade deficits.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Use brown field sites and leave the building of warehouses to the Dirft/Crick area where the train/rail and road network exist.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. The SELAA (2017) demonstrates that the number of brownfield sites assessed as potentially developable for employment uses within the District is limited.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5854 Mrs Gillian Groom [6152]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This will not significantly increase employment, either in terms of numbers or increase to non-minimum wage roles. Residents of the Lutterworth area seeking professional roles will in the most part will still have to commute to Rugby (& London via Train), Coventry, Northampton, Leicester and Birmingham. The road infrastructure around Lutterworth does not currently support existing traffic volumes. The plan does not address the A426 south of Lutterworth, (route from M1 south to M6 North). Since changes to A14 junction, this road is congested, and any incident on M1 south of junction 20 results in gridlock.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The usage of A426 and the impact on surrounding villages (eg Shawell, which many car drivers use as a relief road to A426) should be fully understood and a highways plan established to ensure these problems are resolved before any further industrial development. The mix of commercial buildings should be reviewed to establish more facilities to enable more non minimum wage roles to be established in the Lutterworth area.

**Response:**

Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. Policy BE1 makes allocations for a further 59ha of general employment land across the breadth of B class uses (office, industrial, non-strategic B8) and Policy BE3 seeks to safeguard existing employment areas. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6288 Ms Margaret Deaville [6258]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I object to the expansion of Magna Park for the following reasons  
 1 The increase in traffic, particularly Heavy Goods Vehicles  
 2 the resultant air pollution, noise pollution and light pollution  
 3The destruction of green countryside and resultant damage to flora and fauna' upsetting the already fragile ecosystem  
 4 the extra strain on housing schools and medical centres where there is already a shortage of GPs  
 5 Problems on the M1, M6, M69 or A5 will inevitably lead to increased traffic through the local villages  
 THIS IS COMPLETELY UNACCEPTABLE

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The expansion of Magna Park should be abandoned

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound. Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6297 R Coventry [5883]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Pollution, insufficient road networks around villages used for cut through to Magna Park, loss of green space, A5 not fit for purpose, Over a thousand local people have objected to this proposal for very valid reasons and yet no-one listens.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No expansion.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6526 Mr Ian Reid [6197]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposals are unsound they fail to account for approved developments at the rail connected site at DIRFT. If approved the proposals would lead to an erosion in the quality of life for the residents of Lutterworth and surrounding villages due to (A) the lack of proposed investment in the infrastructure of the A5 and A426 which have congestion issues already (B) The area has very low levels of unemployment therefore employees for future developments will be drawn from surrounding areas the addition of thousands of additional vehicle movements on the village "rat runs" will be detrimental .(99)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

An additional 100,000 sq mts of warehousing has already been approved at Magna Park if further space is required it should be located elsewhere in the county which has many potential alternatives.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6837 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Magna Park plans are immense. Logistics centres should be built at locations with railheads or at motorway junctions. The road infrastructure around Magna Park struggles to cope with the existing traffic volumes.

Leicestershire is one of the worst counties in the country for road fatalities.

HGVs don't follow approved routes; travelling dangerously through tiny villages on minor rural roads.

It's smarter to build warehouses nearer to the people who would take up the new jobs being created. The area around Magna Park has 0.4% unemployment.

Lutterworth has some of the worst air quality in Leicestershire, failing to meet EU standards.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There should be no further material expansion of Magna Park. The local road infrastructure cannot support more HGV and commuter car traffic. The people living in the Lutterworth area should not be subjected to having to breathe even more polluted air. We have to live here!

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan have been assessed, including Policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound. Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of local employment opportunities, traffic congestion, and commuting.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6911 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is an entirely speculative and opportunist proposal from Gazeley and DBS Symmetry. Previous form from Gazeley confirms that proposals are put forward purporting to have an end-user secured when they do not.

It beggars belief that the area in the Local Plan entirely mirrors the applications made by Gazeley and DBS, suggesting that HDC Planning Department might as well step aside.

More significantly , it prejudices and excludes any application by any other third party keen to develop the site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

By securing such &quot;exclusivity&quot; for the two applicants the planning process and indeed the Planning Department itself should be subject to extreme scrutiny.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Policy BE2 provides for additional development up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. The policy does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6989 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* far exceeds forecasted need
- \* not strategic
- \* no consideration to planning consents since 2014
- \* lead to a huge Over-supply of warehousing
- \* does not allow spread across the LLEP area
- \* huge influx of workers from outside the District
- \* exacerbation of local congestion and traffic issues
- \* over-loading of local villages
- \* additional commuter traffic
- \* conflicts with available housing in the area

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Removal of Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

HEDNA states the future strategic warehouse requirement for the HMA to 2031 as a minimum figure, split between rail-served and non rail-served, which is not disaggregated to districts. The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence (SDSS 2014/2016) indicates a strong case for Harborough district to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need.

The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound. Para 5.1.4 of the LP sets out how the impact of Policy BE2 on housing requirements has been assessed and addressed.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7630 Mr Robert Ogden [6505]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is noted that the plan allows for the expansion of Magna Park subject to certain criteria, one of which is the effect of traffic flows on the local roads and A5. The area around Magna Park does not have an unemployment problem consequently any expansion will create commuter traffic to and from the site as well as increase the flows of HGVs servicing the site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan should state emphatically that no expansion of the Magna Park be entertained until, i. there is an unemployment crisis in the Lutterworth district and ii. The A5 trunk road is majorly improved along its whole length from the M1 to the M42 with a dual carriageway and safety improvements at all its junctions with the minor roads with which it interconnects.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6993 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* allocation fundamentally different to previous consultation documents
- \* figure has not been tested through consultation
- \* two outstanding applications for warehousing in this area totalling 700,000 sq. m
- \* not a strategic allocation but an allocation to accommodate to outstanding planning applications
- \* contradicts Core Strategy
- \* there are more suitable sites (both rail and non rail-linked) within the region and sub-region to meet forecasted need

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

No statutory obligation for LPA's to consult on Options. Proposed submission consultation meets regulatory requirements. The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Local Development Plan Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011). The policies in the LP are based on a proportionate and up-to-date evidence base including that which informs policy BE2. The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence indicates a strong case for Harborough district to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6807 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Allow some flexibility in activity on a predominantly B8 site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Drop restriction to B8 only and allow a modest proportion of industrial (manufacturing and R&D) activity on sites above a certain size.

**Response:**

Magna Park is a dedicated distribution/logistics site. Evidence supports maintaining a restricted B8 use class. Policy BE2.1 criteria b and c allow for limited flexibility for uses ancillary to B8.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7334 IDI Gazeley [168]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The policy is less ambitious than it should be. Magna Park is unique and the prospect of growth presents an opportunity promote it as the centre of a logistics cluster.

The value that the logistics cluster is able to return is very significantly increased by the addition of complementary uses. With this in mind Gazeley propose amendments to policy BE2.1 to acknowledge the cluster benefits of concentrating logistics businesses around Magna Park and the consequences for the growth of related but ancillary activities that support or are spun out of the cluster.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend BE2.1b to read: any new building or the change of use of an existing building is only for Class B8, ancillary uses to Class B8, or for a use for which a location as part of the Magna Park logistics cluster is necessary and beneficial

**Response:**

Noted. Policy BE2(1) (b) is intended to prevent the dilution of B8 uses on the site and safeguard Magna Park as a specialist strategic storage and distribution site for large scale operators. The suggested change confuses the issue of B8 buildings (including ancillary uses) and buildings for other uses, which are covered by (c).

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5530 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

\* The allocation is excessive. The plan provides no evidence of the need for an allocation of this size which has been labelled as 'political' by Harborough's own councillors at the meeting on 18th September.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. However, the policy does not allocate land for strategic distribution. It sets out a cap and specific criteria against which proposals will be considered.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6342 Magna Park is Big Enough (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not Justified - if any non-strategic storage and distribution allocation was permitted, this policy constrains any potential benefit that may result from the development, specifically "logistics academies". Specifically limiting the scale of such a site as "proportion in scale" is restrictive.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

n/a

**Response:**

Policy BE2.1 applies to the existing Magna Park site and is unrelated to potential additional development forming an extension to or adjoining the site.

**RepID Representation**

7266 dbymmetry [5502]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The allocation is to make provision for strategic scale storage and distribution uses. Criterion 1a) ensures that unit sizes are not less than 9,000 m2. On this basis it seems to me that Criterion c) could be simplified to state:

'The primary use of the premises will be within Class B8. Other uses should be ancillary in function or be relevant associated uses, for example a lorry park driver facilities.'

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Replace criterion c) with: The primary use of the premises will be within Class B8. Other uses should be ancillary in function or be relevant associated uses, for example a lorry park driver facilities.

**Response:**

Policy BE2(1) (b) and (c) are intended to prevent the dilution of B8 uses on the site and safeguard Magna Park as a specialist strategic storage and distribution site for large scale operators. The suggested change to criterion c) does not perform the function intended of it (i.e. to allow a limited amount of small-scale development that is ancillary to the S & D uses).

---

**RepID Representation**

7335 IDI Gazeley [168]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The policy is less ambitious than it should be. Magna Park is unique and the prospect of growth presents an opportunity promote it as the centre of a logistics cluster.

The value that the logistics cluster is able to return is very significantly increased by the addition of complementary uses. With this in mind Gazeley propose amendments to policy BE2.1 to acknowledge the cluster benefits of concentrating logistics businesses around Magna Park and the consequences for the growth of related but ancillary activities that support or are spun out of the cluster.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend criterion BE2.1c to read: the proposal for any non-strategic storage and distribution use is proportionate in scale and function to Magna Park's strategic storage and distribution use.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy BE2(1) (b) and (c) are intended to prevent the dilution of B8 uses on the site and safeguard Magna Park as a specialist strategic storage and distribution site for large scale operators. Removal of the word 'small-scale' weakens this while 'proportionate in scale' could involve a very large development (especially in relation to the whole Park). Moreover 'proportionate in function' is unhelpful.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5353 Mr Mark Phillip [5869]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no demand for more warehousing in this area  
Any jobs created will not benefit local people  
Jobs created will increase traffic flow into the area, not reduce it as stated as an objective in the plan.  
The extra traffic will blight Lutterworth further with bad air quality and a town 'ruled' by HGV's  
There is not sufficient highway infrastructure  
The site is nowhere near a viable railhead.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan should state clearly (as it did previously) that no expansion to Magna Park will be permitted.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs /skills. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5360 Mrs VB Weller [5372]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The inclusion of extensions to Magna Park etc are still supposedly subject to planning and have not been passed. If the planning process has any integrity, these parts should be removed immediately. We have been assured it is not a 'done deal'. Why then is it an integral part of this long term plan? It should not be there.  
Also, Lutterworth is already saturated with lorries and warehouses and this proposal will only aggravate the situation. It does nothing to either enhance the area nor offer any kind of diversity of employment.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Take this out of the plan. It is dishonest to include it.  
Put industry on brownfield sites, not on green fields.  
Find new less destructive solutions for industry and employment in the Lutterworth area.

**Response:**

Policy BE2 provides for additional development up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It will have full weight on adoption of the Local Plan. The policy does not allocate land for strategic distribution.  
The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the district, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the district and wider labour market.  
The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5385 Mr Neil Blackhall [5817]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

1. The proposed development is on green field land.
2. Is not served by a rail terminal (unlike nearby DIRFT).
3. Lutterworth has less than 1% unemployment, so new jobs are not required.
4. Any jobs will be low-skilled and not "reduce the dependence of Harborough's residents on commuting" by creating higher paid jobs.
5. It will destroy the archaeological site of Bittesby.
6. It will destroy footpaths and walking routes for local residents and visitors.

Therefore it is not JUSTIFIED

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete BE2 2

Additional development of up to 700,000 sq.m. for non rail-served strategic storage and distribution (Class B8) use will be permitted where it would:

and sections a - f

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. Policy BE2 is criteria based and provides a quantitative maximum on development. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution. Proposals will be considered against the criteria, BE2.2a in respect of geographical location and BE2.2e. in respect of highways impact. The Local Plan, read as a whole, contains general development, green infrastructure, and built heritage policies to guide development. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**ReplID Representation**

5400 Dr ANGELA WINTER [4965]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

1. The proposed development is on green field land.
2. Is not served by a rail terminal (unlike nearby DIRFT).
3. Lutterworth has less than 1% unemployment, so new jobs are not required.
4. Any jobs will be low-skilled and not "reduce the dependence of Harborough's residents on commuting" by creating higher paid jobs.
5. It will destroy the archaeological site of Bittesby.
6. It will destroy footpaths and walking routes for local residents and visitors.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove text BE2 clause 2 and sections a-f

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The Local Plan contains general development, green infrastructure and built heritage policies to guide development. The sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**ReplID Representation**

5401 Mr Peter Hill [5915]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This conflicts with planning requirement CC1 mitigating climate change, and National Planning Policy Framework (page 94) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with the climate change Act 2008. Goods vehicles emit over 30% of UK transport CO2 emissions and this expansion will increase this. Freight should be diverted to rail transport to reduce this. The additional jobs will increase commuter journeys by car exacerbating the problem. No improvement in public transport has been proposed nor any requirement for facilities to be provided for electric vehicles. The proposal will also increase the traffic problems on national roads and locally.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not expand Magna Park, work towards a national policy that takes freight off the roads using new or existing rail terminals.  
Make it a planning requirement that all new building development meets BREEAM Excellent or Outstanding (not just a pious hope that developers will take it up themselves - they wont unless forced)  
Similarly with electric vehicle charging points and infrastructure.

**Response:**

The Local Plan is to be read as a whole. Major development proposals, such as those in accordance with Policy BE2 will also need to accord with policy CC1. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound. Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of local employment opportunities, traffic congestion, and commuting. The Local Plan also contains general development, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5411 Mrs Emma Parsons [5944]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

700,000 is opportunistic not strategic.  
road network is not viable to support increased traffic.  
no need for more jobs.  
not near a rail network.  
won't help local residents employment will all be in warehouse work rather than a diverse range.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Plans are already approved for 100,000 sqm expansion to Magna Park which is more than sufficient. No further plans should be approved but sites elsewhere in the region should be considered which will avoid a huge area of similar jobs and loss of countryside in one location.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire.  
There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills.  
Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. in a sequentially favourable location and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.  
The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5443 Mrs Jan Butcher [4328]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is an unsustainable proposal without proper and sound evidence of need. Viable infrastructure is not in place to support such huge expansion. The area is already dominated by Magna Park and the rural surroundings must not be irrevocably damaged even further. The roads are already congested and unsafe as (see accidents data re on junctions on the A5 in Magna Park area). Conflicts with the NPPF requirements re sustainable transport and climate change - NPPF emphasis is , rightly, on facilitating rail transport.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No major expansion to Magna Park to be permitted

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire.  
There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.  
Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable landscape impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour working' only. A modification is proposed as follows:  
'ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not...'  
The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5452 **MS Alison Abraham [5895]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The A5 and adjacent road infrastructure is not currently adequate for any further traffic. 700,000 sq mtrs is far too much and seems to be very convenient as it happens to be the total of the outstanding applications. DHL plan has already been approved. Magna Park is not on a rail head like Dirft - also being expanded and is also going to impact the A5. Not that many unemployed in the area so more commuters on the road.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Ideally do not expand Magna Park further. If expansion is deemed necessary do not flow down the A5 - infill the land opposite existing site which is smaller and will be less visually impacting and not take away any further farm land or effect Bittesby village.

**Response:**

The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence indicates a strong case for Harborough District to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5483 **Mr Trevor Robinson [5986]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The proposal for 700000sqmetres of units is far beyond the capabilities of the local infrastructure to cope with. It is opportunist on the part of developers who wish to maximise their profits at the expense of the locality. There are empty units on the DERFT site with rail access and more speculative units being built on the southern edge of Lutterworth. I believe this proposal is being Railroaded by Political decisions and is not justified on the basis of need. The knock-on effect on local roads, traffic, schools and pollution will be appalling.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Turn down the application for any further expansion of Magna Park

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan have been assessed, including Policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5486 **Mr Graham Ruff [4814]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

#This size of development is not needed  
#It will not meet local employment needs  
#It will increase commuting  
#It will increase HGV movements  
#It is not at a railhead  
#Local roads are already inadequate

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete the proposal for the 700000 sq mts expansion at Magna Park and its surroundings

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other. Policy BE2 does not allocate land for strategic distribution but sets out a maximum of 700,000sq.m. of additional development and specific criteria against which planning applications will be considered.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5489 **Mr Peter Williamson [5998]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Using up more valuable countryside in the Lutterworth area.  
Significant increase in commuting to and from Magna Park  
No immediate plans for improving the transport infrastructure on and around the A5  
This development will have a significant impact on air pollution.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove the proposal of 700,000 square metres of expansion at Magna Park

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan have been assessed, including Policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 is criteria based and provides a quantitative maximum on development. No site allocation is made in respect of Policy BE2. Proposals will be considered against the policy's criteria.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5501 Mrs June Whiting [4950]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- 1 Empty capacity at present Magna Park. Rail head sites preferred.
- 2 Excess warehouse building at M. P, will deprive county of alternative sites.
- 3 Proposal is opportunist not strategic.
- 4 Even more commuter traffic.
- 5 Lack of spread of employment opportunities.
- 6 HGV pollution and traffic jams in A5 bottlenecks.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There should be a National Strategy for the distribution of warehouses as the Midland area will soon be over-run with these unsightly ugly buildings.

**Response:**

National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire.

There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5502 Mrs Julia Pearson [6002]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There are several warehouses that are empty at Magna Park. There isn't strong evidence that additional warehousing, of such large proportions, is necessary. There are very low levels on unemployment in the local area - less than 1.6%. This will mean that employees will have to commute to MagnaPark, increasing traffic and pollution, on less than adequate roads. If employees move into the area this will impact on our current infrastructure which is already under pressure from increasing population, especially housing, GP practices and dentists etc. This will also impact on our greenspace.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I would like the proposal to allow 700,000 sq metres of new warehousing at Magna Park to be removed from the Local Plan. As 100,000 sq m has already been agreed there should be no further expansion. Other parts of Leicestershire would be more suitable with strong transport links available. We do not need any more low skilled employment in the area.

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the District, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5504 Mrs Jaqueline Strong [4069]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This development exceeds identified need. and matches exactly an outstanding planning application  
 Development not justified as it would offer mainly lower skilled jobs not the higher skilled employment - goal in the local plan.  
 Out commuting would not be reduced - another goal in the local plan.  
 Saturates area with distribution parks causing employment problems  
 Infrastructure needs required with cost falling on Government  
 No evidence provided  
 See attached paper.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove this item from the strategic plan.

**Response:**

Policy BE2 provides for additional development up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It will have full weight on adoption of the Local Plan.  
 The objectives of the Local Plan are the guiding principles for the policies set out in the plan. The policies of the Local Plan should be read as a whole and in combination they represent a reasonable and sustainable spatial strategy for development to 2031, which is considered sound.  
 Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the local plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5512 LUTTERWORTH TOWN COUNCIL Parish Council (Andrew Ellis) [2656]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

HDC Core Strategy stated there was no need for 700,000sq. m of strategic storage therefore this policy is deemed unsound.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove policy

**Response:**

The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011), the policies of which pre-date the the National Planning Policy Framework. The policies in the LP are based on a proportionate and up-to-date evidence base including that which informs policy BE2.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5515 **S Hopkins [6015]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

700,00 sq mtrs has only been considered because it's line with a private company's planning application - it is not strategic.

This is an area of low unemployment - there is no need for the low level job opportunities for the people of this area, and new houses will just add to the traffic issues and air pollution.

The roads around the area are already hugely congested.

Air quality in this area is already poor - please consider the health of us and our children.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan to allow 700,000 sq mtrs of warehousing at Magna Park should be scrapped.

100,000 has already been agreed. It would be wrong to place so much of one type of business in the same small space. It does not allow for a diverse culture in an area. It would be fairer to the whole country to spread opportunities further afield.

The plan should include improving the current poor air quality rather than planning to destroy it further.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5523 **Mr Dennis O'Neill [6025]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Magna Park is already one of, if not the biggest such park of its kind in Europe. Increasing its size is both disproportionate and unnecessary as it will increase congestion, increase pollution, and increase the number of vehicles traversing the area each day, to the great detriment of air quality, the rural aspect of the area and the ability for residents and existing businesses to go about their business smoothly and without being hampered or inconvenienced by long queues of increasingly irate drivers.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Magna Park has long been described as an out of town development and that it will at no point encroach on Lutterworth. This plan and the local plan and other plans will allow Lutterworth to be completely subsumed by development that its current infrastructure is completely incapable of supporting. It can't support things as they are now.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5524 Mr Dennis O'Neill [6025]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This plan is completely disproportionate to the area's needs and ability to withstand future development. The current infrastructure, amenities and services cannot cope with the current level of traffic and business use, so to add yet more will be overstretching the roads, services and air quality beyond breaking point. It also bears no relation whatever to competing developments in Rugby, Corby and the surrounding area, so there is every chance that any such development will be left empty and all the destruction to the rural area caused will be rendered pointless.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan should be scrapped and sent back to the drawing board.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 sets a maximum of 700,000sq.m. along with specific criteria to be used in the consideration of proposals. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5534 Mrs Martine Blackburn [5228]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I strongly object because:

Increased traffic from both lorries and workers commuting throughout the day and night will inevitably cause more accidents and congestion in the immediate area. Additionally, local motorway networks and villages will be adversely affected.

An increase in pollution - air, light and noise, is of huge concern given the unacceptable levels already registered.

The natural environment will be affected negatively and biodiversity in the area will be reduced significantly.

Finally, the HDC Core Strategy CS 7 h specifically restricts further development at Magna Park unless there is a proven need, which has not yet been established.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Development to Magna Park should only be allowed once all existing warehousing in the area (including Rugby and DIRFT developments) is full.

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.

A modification is proposed to amend the criterion f to read 'ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not....'

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5546 Mrs Maria Lockley [5818]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As a point of principle, I oppose the drawing up of a new Local Plan in its entirety. The existing Plan has many years to run and this is simply a ploy by HDC to steamroller through even more unpopular and unnecessary development. As far as Magna Park is concerned, it has resulted already in vastly increased road traffic and damage to wildlife and the environment. The proposed extension would gobble up huge areas of agricultural land which, post-Brexit, will be much needed for food production, as well as destroying valuable wildlife habitats around the field margins.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scrap the whole Plan. It is simply a device by HDC to pass schemes already "on the nod", as well as legitimizing those which have been passed already but which contravene the existing Local Plan.

**Response:**

LPA's are required to maintain an up to date Development Plan, undertaking regular review. The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011) which pre-dates the NPPF and so is out of date. The policies in the LP are based on a proportionate and up-to-date evidence base including that which informs Policy BE2.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5560 Mr Philip Ashton [6052]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no evidence for the requirement for additional B2 Strategic Distribution, with unoccupied warehousing on current sites in Magna Park, even new build warehousing empty after 2 years and also on many nearby sites.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scale back the volume from 700,000 sq m to 100,000 sq m

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5561 Mr Philip Ashton [6052]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No evidence for a requirement of 700.00 sq m

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scale back to 100,000sqm

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m.and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5581 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Please see our comments on SS1, the Spatial Strategy, 2c.Strategic storage and distribution;  
[The LLEP studies identify a need for additional (i.e. new build) non-rail served warehousing/ distribution space in Leicestershire. The 700,000 sq.m proposed in BE2 'Strategic Distribution' exceed the forecast for the entire LLEP area for 2031 while ignoring consents given by councils in Leicestershire since 2014, which themselves meet the minimum forecast requirements up to 2031, thus contributing to a potential significant over-supply of warehousing/ distribution space and the skewing of the job market towards low-skilled, low-paid jobs, heavy in-commuting]

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Same reference to SS1 as above;  
[Policy BE2 should either be dropped or amended to retain the council's 2011 Core Strategy (policy 7j) which rules out extending Magna Park. Harborough has already breached the Core Strategy in 2016 by approving 15/00919/FUL, a 100,844 sq.m. warehouse/distribution centre for DHL on land adjoining Magna Park. The Core Strategy stated &quot; ... there are more suitable locations and sites (both rail and non rail-linked) than Magna Park within the region and sub-region to meet forecast need for strategic distribution to 2026.&quot; (Paragraph 5.73). The Submission Plan does not now make the opposite claim, i.e. that there aren't any &quot;more suitable locations&quot; within the region, so nothing has changed.]

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum requirement for strategic distribution in Leicester and Leicestershire. There is strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5591 Mr Ian Robertson [5573]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* It will not create a greater breadth of employment opportunities.
- \* It will not lead to opportunities for local skilled workers to save out commuting.
- \* Positions will be filled by those having to commute into Magna Park.
- \* It is not rail served.
- \* There is no provision to improve the road network in the surrounding area.
- \* It will have an unacceptable impact on the environment and the landscape.
- \* It will contribute to the poor air quality in the area.
- \* It is likely to lead to an oversupply of warehousing/distribution land.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The local plan should be modified to not include any major expansion of Magna Park over and the above the 100,000 sq mtrs recently approved.

Reconsider how the strategic aims can be met. Further research is required to identify how any expansion of Magna Park could provide an environment that generates higher skilled, higher knowledge-based employment such as the creation of a science and technology park to attract hi tech and innovative businesses. This will fulfil the criteria for:

"Reducing dependence of Harborough's residents on commuting and increasing wage rates by providing a breadth of employment alternatives, including more opportunities for Harborough's higher skilled residents"

The result would be:

- \* Avoid the mass creation of low skilled jobs that would not be filled by local residents.
- \* Avoid the unnecessary loss of productive farmland and impact on the landscape
- \* Avoid adding to the already high levels of traffic congestion and exacerbating the already non-compliant levels of air pollution particularly in Lutterworth.

**Response:**

Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provision made for business and employment in the Local Plan. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of local employment opportunities, traffic congestion, and commuting. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable landscape impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour working' only. A modification is needed as follows:  
'f. ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not...'

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5592 Mr Ian Robertson [5573]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

BE2 2

The evidence for the additional 700k sq mtrs is that there are currently two planning applications equating to this total. Our summation is therefore that the proposal is purely opportunistic / tactical hence not strategic or focused on employment needs in the area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See Changes in BE2 Clause 1 representation

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5593 Mr Ian Robertson [5573]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* It is not rail served.
- \* There is no provision to improve the road network in the surrounding area.
- \* It will have an unacceptable impact on the environment and the landscape.
- \* It is likely to lead to an oversupply of warehousing/distribution land.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Concentrate on developing the others sites in the East Midlands region (as it happened not in our district) which already are or are planned to be rail served.

**Response:**

National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable landscape impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour working' only. A modification is proposed as follows: 'f. ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not....'.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5601 Mrs Linda Hollingworth [6035]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Infrastructure will not support increase in traffic.

Air pollution already one of the highest in the country - any increase will lead to increased respiratory problems particularly for the elderly and children.

Loss of wildlife and recreation space.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Magna Park is already big enough

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5621 Margaret R Dr Reynolds [6078]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The fact that there are already applications for this amount of additional warehousing suggests a political decision.

There have previously been suggestions that this would lead to an over supply.

Unemployment is low in the Lutterworth area so increased numbers of commuters from outside will add to the congestion on the roads. New jobs are also unlikely to offer a variety of skill-based roles.

Why is no green area of separation proposed between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Previous proposals for 100,000 sq mts or even 279,000 sq mts could be reinstated.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills.

The distance between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe is such that an Area of Separation is not needed.

---

**RepID Representation**

5646 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire thinks that the evidence for 7,000 sq m conveniently concurs with the two outstanding planning applications for this area of warehousing. We believe that this proposal is opportunistic and not strategic.

Reports (the LLEP SDSS, 2017) indicate that there is less demand than in this HDC policy. Putting a huge area of warehousing at Magna Park, in an area of low unemployment would be disadvantageous when it could be developed in other areas of the county that have already developed this specialism and have higher unemployment.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Unable to reword

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence (SDSS 2014/2016) indicates a strong case for Harborough district to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the district and wider labour market.

**RepID Representation**

5673 Mrs Christine Horsfall [5326]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This planning application is not strategic, a planning application has been made for a 700,000 sq m and this figure has been used co-incidentally in the local plan. There is no evidence that this area is needed, warehousing is frequently advertised as available in Magna Park. There is no business advantage in grouping such a large number of distribution centres on one site and, in terms of employees, distributing the warehouses across a larger area would result in shorter commutes to work and hence less pollution.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Ideally there should be no expansion of this site as there is full employment in the local area and any jobs which are provided are generally of low skill and therefore do not enhance the skills and standard of living in the area. This is rural area of productive farmland with excellent public access for walking and horse riding.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5694 Mr David Burton [4710]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The projected shortfall of floor space for non-railserved sites is based on flawed analysis. Why is a &quot;high&quot; demand assumed and why is the already agreed Mere Lane development ignored.? This gives a false impression of future shortfall (Table 2.4 LLSDS Update)..

There is no evidence presented supporting both developments at Magna Park, as this would result in gross over-provision by 40+ ha, even at 2036.

Ullesthorpe must be protected from any further impact of growth at Magna Park. An effective green barrier would be essential, even if only part of this ill-conceived plan goes ahead.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Revise the forecasts downwards, taking account of the points raised above.

Do not propose both developments at Magna Park. If further expansion is really considered necessary then only put forward the smaller DB Symmetry development which have a less severe impact on local villages and valuable historical assets of national importance (Bittesby ancient village).

Also a green barrier must be maintained between Ullesthorpe and MP - this would be severely threatened if the IDI Gazeley development went ahead.

Better still, propose no further expansion at all in the Magna Park area in favour re-siting development at of other areas where there is genuine employment need (and ideally at a rail head).

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. BE2 does not allocate land for strategic distribution but rather sets a maximum on future development to 2031 along with specific criteria against which proposals will be considered. Any planning permission for strategic distribution on sites forming an extension to Magna Park during the plan period (2011-31) form part of the 700,000 sq. m. allowed for in BE2.2. The distance between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe is such that an Area of Separation is not needed.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

5723 mr ian quick [6105]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposal is for a virtual doubling of Magna Park but:

1 there is no evidence of demand for more warehousing capacity in the area

2 unemployment in the Lutterworth area is very low so the 10,000 jobs[an estimate I have heard ]would mainly have to be filled by people from other areas.

3 This would have a massive impact on the amount of traffic around Lutterworth..

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete the 700,000sq m planning application from the local plan

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

**ReplID** **Representation**

5728 Mrs Christine Ratcliffe [6107]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The two planning applications already submitted indicates a strong possibility that warehouse space may be left empty, as it is currently on the existing site where I walk every week. There are currently unfilled vacancies. The case for further jobs is not true.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Magna Park is big enough. Development at both Rugby, Daventry and Broughton Astley will be more than enough to meet local needs.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire.

There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

**ReplID** **Representation**

5748 Mrs Janette Ackerley [5952]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I do not believe that there is a need for 700 000sq m of additional distribution allocation when the Core Strategy proposed no increase. This is too great an increase.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Go back to the original proposal of an increase in the region of 400 000sq m

**Response:**

The policies in the LP are based on a proportionate and up-to-date evidence base including that which informs Policy BE2.

The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence indicates a strong case for Harborough District to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5750 Mrs Kathleen Rowell [4871]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Warehousing should be strategic not speculative  
Future warehousing should be rail served  
Unemployment low so more low paid jobs not needed  
Increased road congestion  
Increased air and noise pollution  
Loss of productive agricultural land  
Just fulfilling developers want for 700,000 sq Mts does not justify this proposal  
Should not be a political decision based on greed

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Deletion of proposal to allow 700,000 sq mts expansion of Magna park  
Future expansion of warehousing should be strategic not speculative and near rail heads

**Response:**

National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.  
The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire.  
There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills.  
The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5751 Mrs Tina Boseley [6112]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This will lead to over supply of land for warehouses. There are already empty warehouses on magna park that can not be filled without additional warehouses being added.  
Will increase traffic in and around surrounding area. The A5 is already inadequate without the addition of more lorries and commenters.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete the proposal of 700,000 sq mts . Leave the 100;000 sq mts that have been approved. The remaining area to be taken up by other parts of the country.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire.  
There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.  
The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5761 Mr Graeme Bonser [6113]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- Potentially over supply of warehousing (Brexit impact unknown too)
- Not meet employment needs outlined in Key Issue 3.
- Increase pressure on infrastructure, with no railhead service or improved highways planned until at least 2030.
- Increased emissions inconsistent with National policy
- 700000 m warehousing opportunistic, not strategic when considering other developments in local area meeting National needs better and local employment needs.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In consultation 3 options were provided for Magna Park expansion:

100000 sq m

279000 sq m

779000 sq m

As the 100000 sq m has been granted in effect this plan approves the remaining 700000 sq m of expansion. The plan should thus include no further expansion at Magna Park, The remaining could be better located in other areas of the county better suited in infrastructure and local employment terms. This would also relieve pressure on existing infrastructure in the area and improve air quality for local residents.

This after all is a PLAN FOR LOCAL RESIDENTS!

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. The policy provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. along criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5765 Claybrooke Parva Parish Council (mr ian robertson) [6117]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- It will not create a greater breadth of employment opportunities.
- \* It will not lead to opportunities for local skilled workers to save out commuting.
- \* Positions will be filled by those having to commute into Magna Park.
- \* It is not rail served.
- \* There is no provision to improve the road network in the surrounding area.
- \* It will have an unacceptable impact on the environment and the landscape.
- \* It will contribute to the poor air quality in the area.
- \* It is likely to lead to an oversupply of warehousing/distribution land.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The local plan should be modified to not include any major expansion of Magna Park over and the above the 100,000 sq mtrs recently approved.

Reconsider how the strategic aims can be met. Further research is required to identify how any expansion of Magna Park could provide an environment that generates higher skilled, higher knowledge-based employment such as the creation of a science and technology park to attract hi tech and innovative businesses. This will fulfil the criteria for:

"Reducing dependence of Harborough's residents on commuting and increasing wage rates by providing a breadth of employment alternatives, including more opportunities for Harborough's higher skilled residents"

The result would be:

- \* Avoid the mass creation of low skilled jobs that would not be filled by local residents.
- \* Avoid the unnecessary loss of productive farmland and impact on the landscape
- \* Avoid adding to the already high levels of traffic congestion and exacerbating the already non-compliant levels of air pollution particularly in Lutterworth.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the Plan will create jobs across the skill range.

---

**RepID Representation**

5766 Claybrooke Parva Parish Council (mr ian robertson) [6117]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- It will not create a greater breadth of employment opportunities.
- \* It will not lead to opportunities for local skilled workers to save out commuting.
- \* Positions will be filled by those having to commute into Magna Park.
- \* It is not rail served.
- \* There is no provision to improve the road network in the surrounding area.
- \* It will have an unacceptable impact on the environment and the landscape.
- \* It will contribute to the poor air quality in the area.
- \* It is likely to lead to an oversupply of warehousing/distribution land.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Concentrate on developing the others sites in the East Midlands region (as it happened not in our district) which already are or are planned to be rail served.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. Specific criteria in Policy BE2.2 set out requirements in respect of local employment opportunities, traffic congestion and commuting. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other.

**RepID Representation**

5776 Wibtoft parish council (Mr Mark Pierpoint) [5302]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is sufficient employment in our area and strained access roads , increasingly busy roads as workers and contractors travel from further afield to work from any extra buildings and warehouses.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Without an infrastructure & transport road review and dual carriageways from Rugby all the way through to Hinckley expansion or effective traffic calming which isn't possible on a major trunk road

**Response:**

The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence indicates a strong case for Harborough District to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need.  
The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

5788 Mrs SM Eales [6125]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

1. New warehouses not needed already many empty ones
2. Why use good farmland when there are brownfield sites available..
- 3 Already clogged roads A5 not wide enough for lorries
- 4 IS the UK able to be self sufficient in future with food production if all the farmland is built upon??

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Use brownfield sites

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

The SELAA (2017) demonstrates that the number of brownfield sites assessed as potentially developable for employment uses within the District is limited.

---

**RepID Representation**

5795 mrs josephine human [5093]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Employment in Lutterworth is extremely low so this new employment is not for people in Lutterworth. That means there are going to be a large additional amount of cars on our roads. Already we have a issue at the A5 roundabout with the level of cars using that roundabout. Minor roads are also being hit by cars now speeding down them i.e. Ashby Lane.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No expansion required.

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the District, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

5798 mr anthony cooke [5960]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The local infrastructure of roads and community services such as schools & doctors cannot support a development of this size. Air and light pollution will damage the local environment.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Stop the plan completely.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. The Policy sets a cap with accompanying criteria. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5807 Mrs Elizabeth Keenan [5192]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Warehousing should be strategic not speculative  
Future warehousing should be rail served  
Unemployment low so more low paid jobs not needed  
Increased road congestion  
Increased air and noise pollution  
Loss of productive agricultural land  
Just fulfilling developers want for 700,000 sq Mts does not justify this proposal  
Should not be a political decision based on greed

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Deletion of proposal to allow 700,000 sq mts expansion of Magna park  
Future expansion of warehousing should be strategic not speculative and near rail heads

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. in a sequentially favourable location and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5812 Mr Paul Longhorn [6098]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

On the basis of the previous draft of the local plan there is no call for this amount of warehouse distribution space. LLEP SDSS, 2017 has indicated that it may not even be required across the whole of Leicestershire ; it therefore seems unsound to place the entire requirement on the extreme of the county within close proximity to other large scale distribution schemes.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reject the applications for Magna Park

**Response:**

The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011) which pre-dates the NPPF and is out of date. The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market, providing for a range of jobs/skills. Policy BE2.2 sets out a maximum of 700,000sq.m. and criteria against which proposals will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5817 Mr Paul Longhorn [6098]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plan aims to increase the diversity of skilled employment opportunities. This development would only restrict further the variety of jobs available within the area. The number of high skilled jobs created by the plan would be very small

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove this part of the plan or relocate it to areas across the district with a greater need of employment.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5818 MR christopher dodd [4923]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This development is not conducive to the local environment. It will adversely affect road traffic and air quality. It will not have any impact on job requirements within the Lutterworth and surrounding villages.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It should be shelved completely or moved to an area where the jobs are needed and will not have such an environmental impact on small pockets of residences.

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5821 Mr Paul Longhorn [6098]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

National Planning policy says that major distribution sites should be located with access to Rail freight points such as DIRFT. The development plans to provide a lorry depot to shuttle containers between Magna Park and DIRFT. This is patently paying lip service to the national plan when there is already adequate distribution at the DIRFT railhead.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove the planned development from the plan.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5840 Mr Nicholas Darlison [6144]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I feel that such a large development will result in a substantial reduction of quality of life for those who have decided to buy a home and live in the surrounding area.

I consider the argument put forward by those who propose this development to be inaccurate and untruthful.

This is another one of those developments designed to put more money into the pockets of already inconsiderate persons.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I suggest that this development is considered for relocation at any number of more appropriate sites. Xhamster

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5849 Alison Anderton [6006]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Magna Park is already too big, we do not need this as we have relatively low unemployment, an increase again on traffic and pollution including light pollution.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build this near DIRFT further down the A5 where the road and rail infrastructure is already in place.

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the District, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5851 Mrs Debbie Ketteringham [6150]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Magna Park is big enough. The road infrastructure is already overloaded. The resulting air quality locally is a danger to residents health. Surrounding Towns and villages are already suffering the impact of the current development. Surrounding countryside should be preserved not covered under tonnes of concrete and tarmac which would increase flood risk again impacting on local residents while profiting big business. You must know this is wrong, please do the right thing and stop this nonsense

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Stop further development of Magna Park completely

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5858 Mr David Jones [4742]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

An additional 700,000 sale metres is a major unsubstantiated increase from the previous limit of 400,000 sq metres.

Such a large development at this non rail serviced location would adversely affect the nearby Daventry Rail Freight Terminal.

It would also significantly increase HGV and other traffic on the A5 , particularly at the Gibbet roundabout and on the A426 to & from the M6 junction 1.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Retain existing limit of 400,000 sale metres for strategic at Magna Park and on adjacent land

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5897 Mr Peter Roberts [6169]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

700,000 sq mts is opportunist not strategic

- It will lead to an over supply of land for warehousing
- It will not meet the employment needs of Harborough residents as outlined in Key Issue 3 e.g. greater breadth of employment alternatives, increased wage rates, opportunities for higher skilled residents
- Will increase in-commuting and not reduce out-commuting
- Not on a railhead
- No adequate highway infrastructure and non planned before 2030.

Will adversely effect local residents quality of life

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete the proposal to allow 700,000 sq mts of expansion at Magna Park.

- The Local Plan should be modified to include no major expansion at Magna Park, 100,000 sq mts have already been approved and the remaining area could be taken up by other parts of the county. This would avoid a massive concentration of similar jobs, loss of countryside and traffic congestion in one small area.
- 

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other. The objectives are the guiding principles for all policies and the Local Plan needs to be read as a whole. Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5901 Mrs Janet Roberts [6171]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

700,000 sq mts is opportunist not strategic

- It will lead to an over supply of land for warehousing
- It will not meet the employment needs of Harborough residents as outlined in Key Issue 3 e.g. greater breadth of employment alternatives, increased wage rates, opportunities for higher skilled residents
- Will increase in-commuting and not reduce out-commuting
- Not on a railhead
- No adequate highway infrastructure and non planned before 2030

Will disrupt local community- already to large a development- Traffic disruption and a blight on the rural landscape. Light pollution. No benefit to local community.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete the proposal to allow 700,000 sq mts of expansion at Magna Park.

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the District, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other. Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2 set out requirements in relation to local employment opportunities and commuting.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5912 Mrs Gweneth Thorp [4830]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Exponential increase in traffic already causing problems for the population, any further increase would stretch the present road system to beyond breaking point. With government cutbacks, the likelihood of Highways England being able to fund the enormous amount of work required is NIL in my opinion.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

With BREXIT, the requirement for this type of development is totally delusionary, therefore it is not remotely unnecessary and should be deleted from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of; traffic congestion and commuting. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development and infrastructure policies to guide development.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5916 Dr I.D. v.d. Ploeg [4817]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no need to increase employment. All that will happen is an increase in traffic, pollution, congestion etc as workers will need to be shipped in or they will need extra affordable housing.

I don't know whether the plan is legally compliant as I am not a lawyer but I can only submit if I say it is so I have ticked yes.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Change unusable buildings into ones that are appropriate for this day and age.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market, providing for a range of jobs/skills.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5917 Dr I.D. v.d. Ploeg [4817]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No increase in Magna Park and changing unusable buildings into ones that are appropriate for this day and age.

It will increase traffic and pollution. There is low unemployment so instead people will be transported in.

Noise pollution will increase.

Buildings that are not fit for purpose need to be knocked down and rebuilt appropriately instead of using green or farm land.

I don't know whether the plan is legally compliant as I am not a lawyer but I can only submit if I say it is so I have ticked yes.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No increase in Magna Park and changing unusable buildings into ones that are appropriate for this day and age.

It will increase traffic and pollution. There is low unemployment so instead people will be transported in.

Noise pollution will increase.

Buildings that are not fit for purpose need to be knocked down and rebuilt appropriately instead of using green or farm land.

**Response:**

Policy BE2 clause 1 applies to the existing Magna Park safeguarding and supporting its redevelopment for strategic storage and distribution use.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5931 **Suzanne Hayto [5666]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This amount of warehousing is just not needed in this area, this is proven by the existing Magna park not currently full. Surely a more strategic approach would be far more beneficial?

We do not need the low paid employment in this area.

Massive impact on road congestion, air/noise/light pollution, agricultural land

Fulfilling developers want for 700,000 sq Mts does not justify this proposal - greed??

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Exclude the proposal in the plan to allow 700,000 sq mts expansion of Magna park.

**Response:**

There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Occupation rates will fluctuate over time. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5938 **MR Michael Wilcox [5164]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The previous core strategy established in conjunction with residents defined that no further expansion of Magna Park would be allowed. It also stated that there were adequate alternate sites available within the district for future development.

Additionally two major developers have submitted planning application for the 700,000 sq m referred so this clause solely seeks to satisfy the wishes of the developers contrary to current policy and the wishes of most residents

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete the additional development provision

**Response:**

The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011) which pre-dates the NPPF and is out of date. The policies in the LP are based on a proportionate and up-to-date evidence base including that which informs Policy BE2. The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Policy BE2 provides for additional development up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5971 Mr J R Deacon [5980]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Core Strategy, which is still a legal document, stated that there would be no expansion of Magna Park unless a railhead was provided. This new proposal makes no provision for a railhead. It also seems strange that the proposal of 700,000 sq m is the same total as the 2 proposed planning applications lodged with HDC. This smacks of coercion and corruption between the applicants and HDC.

There is already massive expansion of warehouse distribution sites at Dirft, Rugby, Hinckley and the East Midlands. Why do we need more in this area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No further expansion of Magna Park should be allowed as already 100,000 sq m has been approved for expansion.

**Response:**

The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011). The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Policy BE2 provides for additional development up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5993 Mr Alan Pankhurst [4876]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- 700,000 sq mts is an over supply of non-rail land for warehousing
- this will not achieve the objectives of the Local Plan in term of employment
- the proposal favours the needs of developers not residents
- the full consequences for residents have not been considered or given any weight.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete the 700,000 sq mts development from BE2.:2

Insert into the plan a policy to encourage business development which is high value and requires a wide range of skills including more high skilled employees. To do this HDC should commit to marketing the qualities of HD and providing support to companies who may wish to move here.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range. The objectives of the Local Plan are the guiding principles for the policies set out in the plan. The policies of the Local Plan should be read as a whole and in combination they represent a reasonable and sustainable spatial strategy for development to 2031, which is considered sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5999 Mrs Maggie Pankhurst [4875]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

1. BE2 will not achieve the vision and objectives of the Local Plan - in fact it may work in completely the opposite direction.
2. 700,000 sq mts will lead to an over supply of non-rail distribution land and will not share the employment across the county.
3. The infrastructure, particularly roads, will not support the increase in size of MP.
4. Employment needs of HD residents will remain unmet and people will still commute out.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete BE2:2 and replace it with a policy to encourage new business development in line with Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership objectives e.g. across a broad range of business sectors and job skills. Also to support existing businesses to expand and develop. Particular focus on new technologies and higher skilled jobs.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6007 Mr Jason Laphorne [6194]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It doesn't meet the requirement for local jobs.

The infrastructure is already at breaking point and this will push it over the edge with no major plans to increase the roads. No railway near by

The beautiful countryside will be ruined.

700,000 sq mts is simply greedy

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove the proposal of 700,000 sq mts it is simply not needed especially as one proposal for 100,000 mts has already been granted. This is a sensible expansion size and will not disrupt too greatly on the surrounding areas whilst improving and increasing Magna Park sufficiently.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. Criterion f. seeks to ensure proposals avoid unacceptable environmental, community or landscape impacts.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6015 Mrs Maggie Pankhurst [4875]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not sustainable because of the poor highway infrastructure and lack of local labour pool.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete BE2;2 and replace with a policy on encouraging a wider range of businesses into the area and developing current businesses. This would bring a wider range of jobs, many of which may appeal to those who currently commute out. Also perhaps be clearer about how many jobs we actually need in the area and don't over provide as this brings commuting issues.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. Any additional development under policy BE2 (2) will continue to serve the job needs of the district, HMA and wider area.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6020 Mr Timothy Ottevanger [6003]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy BE2 clause 2 fails to explain why the council's Core Strategy regarding Magna Park should no longer apply. It does provide a justify going beyond what independent studies state has happened, i.e. that identified needs have already been met. It ignores developments close to Magna Park across the district boundary which also serve the 'golden triangle'. It has been poorly researched and is driven by an anxiety to satisfy two developers with outstanding outline applications for warehousing/distribution centres.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposed approval for up to 700,000 sq.m, warehousing/distribution space should be dropped.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire.

There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. in a sequentially favourable location and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6031 Mr Richard Lockley [6161]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I strongly object to this proposal.

The resulting increase in traffic volume on the A5 would be unsustainable.

The A5 is already heavily congested particularly at peak times. Queues are the norm.

The increase in both air and light pollution is not acceptable.

The loss of vast areas of open countryside and farmland with the resulting loss of wild life habitat cannot be tolerated.

In reality such developments create only relatively low numbers of poor quality jobs.

The negatives far outweigh any positive gains.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

scrap this proposal

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. sets out requirements in respect of traffic congestion. The Local Plan also contains general development, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6043 Mr Roger Jones [5328]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

b. Provision of strategic distribution facilities.

There is generous available provision, with rail, M1 and A5 connections, at DIRFT, only 5 miles away. Additionally, provision is being provided at junction 1 of the M6, 3 miles away.

e. The above will add considerable traffic to the same road network as any addition to Magna Park. Without these additions yet being on stream, there are already tailbacks and hold-ups, particularly on the M6-A5 link road (A426).

f. The extension of Magna Park will be extremely detrimental to the environment adjacent to the village of Ullesthorpe, both visually and practically.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposed extension of Magna Park should be rejected.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire.

There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. in a sequentially favourable location and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6073 Mr Brian Poulter [4826]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is confusion as to 700,000 sq. m. Does this include the two planning applications currently lodged with HDC? If it does it is supported. However, if the 700k is an addition to those two applications it is not acceptable. The local area is already subject to excess of heavy & light vehicle traffic both on larger roads as well as B class roads (rat-runs). Additional traffic will bring the roads in the area to 'grid lock'. At certain times of the day The Whittle roundabout on the A4303/A426 is 'grid-locked' now.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The A426 from the A5 to the A4303 should be dual carriageway. Plus to be agreed certain roads be excluded from being access to Magna Park.

**Response:**

Any planning permission for strategic distribution on sites forming an extension to Magna Park during the plan period (2011-31) form part of the 700,000 sq. m. allowed for in BE2.2.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound. Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of traffic congestion and commuting.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6098 John Goodacre [4117]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Council has asserted that there are more suitable sites elsewhere in the County. It has ignored recent completions and commitments which meet minimum forecasts of need, as pointed out in the recent Sustainability Appraisal.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Policy BE2 should be excluded from the Local Plan.

Failing that, it should be amended so as to retain the council's 2011 Core Strategy (policy 7j) which rules out the possibility of extending Magna Park.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6105 Mrs Margaret Foster [6159]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Contrary to Key Objective 3 as it will not provide higher skill employment opportunities. Contrary to Objective 2 and Policy BE2.2 as it will not create new jobs that meet local employment needs. Unemployment in the Harborough District is negligible. 60% of the Magna Park workforce already travels from outside the district. Substantial increase in commuting, further pressure on the area particularly on already overcrowded local roads/rat runs through villages. No adequate highway infrastructure. Not consistent with National Planning Framework with regard to rail freight access. Deprives other areas of Leicestershire of potential employment opportunities.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove this speculative element altogether from the Local Plan. A vast development such as this is not needed!

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of local employment opportunities, traffic congestion, and commuting. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6110 Mrs Shiela Carlton [4847]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There should be no further development of warehousing for storage and distribution in this area. The proposed expansion is too large, exceeds all estimates of need (LLSDSS study) and there are many other sites needing local employment in other areas of Leics. It will add substantial traffic to already congested roads. Clearly the proposal is made solely in response to developers' pending planning applications and it seem that approval will inevitably follow without testing by representations from local residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The policy decision, approved in 2011, to confine B8 warehousing for storage and distribuion at this site to its then footprint should be maintained in the new Local Plan.

**Response:**

The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence indicates a strong case for Harborough District to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6113 Mr Kevin Gregson [6220]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- No strategy to the plans
- There will be an over-supply of warehousing which will be damaging to the local area
- Employment needs for the local area will not be met
- There will be an increase in commuting and traffic from outside the local area
- The current highway infrastructure has not been designed to cope with such an increase in traffic

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove the proposal to allow the 700,000 square metres of expansion to Magna Park. As the 100,000 square metres plan has already been granted it seems that application and the additional application for 279000 square metres were somewhat pointless given that if the proposal for 779000 square metres is approved as this would approve the two outstanding applications. The local plan should be changed so that there is no major expansion to Magna Park.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will also create jobs across the skill range. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6114 Mrs Pam Burton [6222]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is not any justification for the 700,000 sq m of development other than it is approximately what the two interested developers have applied for. The L&L SSSD suggests that this would provide an OVERSUPPLY of non-railserved warehousing for all of Leicestershire beyond 2031, therefore restricting development elsewhere in the county, and appears to be an entirely opportunistic inclusion in the Local Plan.

Low unemployment locally would mean more in-commuting as most MP workers already live outside the district, with an attendant increase in traffic and pollution. Development beside a scheduled momunment is not safeguarding our historic heritage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove any expansion of MP outside of the airfield site from the plan.

**Response:**

The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence indicates a strong case for Harborough District to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development, climate change, heritage and infrastructure policies to guide development

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6115 Mrs Shiela Carlton [4847]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I object to both the expansion of the existing Magna Park site and also to the approval of warehousing for storage and distribution on any other nearby land, in close proximity and accessing the same local roads (A5, A426, A4303)

This is unsustainable development in relation to generation of vehicular traffic and also adverse effects on the open, rural character of the local landscape. It has adverse effects on residents' access to amenities and facilities, will pass on a deterioration of the environment to the next generation and therefore is in conflict with the NPPF.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Smaller scale employment centres should be considered under policy BE1, concentrating on rural and agricultural diversification, tourism, design, craft and science/technology-based enterprises which add higher economic value to the District and offer higher-skilled and better-paid jobs. This would be more consistent with other policy decsions and plans at both District and County level. By definition, smaller scale installations would generate less traffic.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. Policy BE1 makes allocations for a further 59ha of general employment land across the breadth of B class uses (office, industrial, non-strategic B8) and Policy BE3 seeks to safeguard existing employment areas. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6117 miss Samantha Hughes [6224]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is little need to destroy the beautiful landscape as the area has a low unemployment rate. I am also led to believe that Magna Park, currently does not have a full capacity of employment, therefore extending is pointless.

The increase of traffic not only due to building but also more commuters would affect my business as I drive around the area and cannot afford any further delays, I already get delays around the A5, yet there are no plans to improve this.

There is no mention of preserving green space where I live.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the space the sq meters proposed to reduce the major proposal of 700 sq ft.

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its polices, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6132 1948 Luba Lockett [6226]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The 700000 sq m is solely the amount being requested by developers per recent planning applications and the planning policy should not be adjusted to suit developers.

Furthermore the current structure plan clearly states no further expansion of Magna Park and that there are adequate other suitable sites within the district.

Further expansion will severley increase traffic and pollution and already the A5 is almost impossible or too dangerous to cross due to high speed dense traffic

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete this amendment which is unnecessary and against the wishes of most residents

**Response:**

Policy BE2 provides for additional development up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It will have full weight on adoption of the Local Plan.

The Local Plan will entirely replace the Harborough District Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011). The policies in the LP are based on a proportionate and up-to-date evidence base including that which informs policy BE2.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6154 Mr Neil Ridley [5231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposal is opportunities not strategic  
Research does not support the expansion in a single area of Leicestershire  
Jobs created will not benefit the local area, but will have significant negative impact in terms of traffic, congestion and resulting air quality

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposal should be deleted. The local plan should be amended to include no major expansion at Magna Park

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 sets out a maximum of 700,000sq.m. and criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6162 Mrs Valerie Deacon [6122]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I am given to understand that the Core Strategy states that there would be no further development of Magna Park without the provision of a railhead. There are no plans for such a railhead.

Magna Park is already huge, it is dwarfing the surrounding villages and making travel and quality of life a misery.

What a co-incidence that the propopsal for 700,000 sq metres is the same as that required to complete the two proposed planning applications that have already been lodged with HDC!

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No further expansion of Magna Park is required.

**Response:**

The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011). The policies in the LP are based on a proportionate and up-to-date evidence base including that which informs Policy BE2.  
Policy BE2 provides for additional development up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It will have full weight on adoption of the Local Plan.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6174 Mr Sam Weller [5081]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Magna Park is big enough. The lorries and private cars clog the road network and pollute the environment, and the number of road accidents is unacceptable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Development should be adjacent to motorways for instance at DIRFT, Rugby Gateway, and not bring any more lorries along the A5. or A4303.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of traffic congestion. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6207 Mrs Helen Farquharson [5364]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The expansion of MP by 700,000 sq mts will not contribute to the vision and objectives of the LP. It will in fact do the opposite.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete BE2:2 and insert a policy which supports a broad range of types of business - new and existing - which will bring a variety of jobs to the area and help to stop out commuting, reduce in commuting and bring prosperity to the area around Lutterworth.

**Response:**

The objectives of the Local Plan are the guiding principles for the policies set out in the plan. The policies of the Local Plan should be read as a whole and in combination they represent a reasonable and sustainable spatial strategy for development to 2031, which is considered sound. Appendix E (Local Plan Objectives) gives detail regarding which policies address which objectives and the links to relevant key issues and strategic priorities.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6217 Mr James Farquharson [6207]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

BE2:2 will not achieve the objectives of the LP and will create a less diverse local economy with many disadvantages for local residents - road congestion etc.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete BE2:2 and create a policy which will bring diverse employment opportunities that meet the needs of the resident profile.

**Response:**

It is important that the Local Plan is read as a whole, in combination the policies are intended to address the Strategic Priorities (para 1.5.3), deliver the Vision (section 2.1) and deal with the Key Issues (section 2.2). Appendix E (Local Plan Objectives) gives detail regarding which policies address which objectives and the links to relevant key issues and strategic priorities.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6221 Susan Jukes [4760]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

1. Elements of the consultation process appear undemocratic and decisions are being made in the wrong order.
2. The proposal to add so much more warehousing space at Magna Park fails the Local Plan tests of soundness. It would be inappropriate strategically and economically, and damaging environmentally. It would lead to too much land in one place being devoted to distribution warehousing, and an insufficient variety of employment opportunities to satisfy identified need in the district. Serious traffic problems would arise from drawing enough employees from further afield, using a road network ill-equipped for the influx.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Given that 100,000 extra square feet have already been approved next to Magna Park, this further proposal should be removed from the Local Plan so that the job opportunities, and environmental costs, are spread more widely. Further development of distribution sites should be strictly planned as part of a regional strategy that takes impartial account of need, sustainability and environmental cost.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6278 Mrs Claudia Helen Woodward [6257]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This proposal is opportunist and is not focused on the needs of employment in this district. There is no demand for non-rail warehousing

Providing this many acres in this location will potentially lead to over supply and not allow spread across the county

Will increase in commuting. And there is no planned highway infrastructure

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The change is to delete any proposal to expand Magna Park, with the exception of the three options proposed during the 2015 local plan consultation

Avoiding a massive concentration of low skilled jobs and traffic congestion in a small area

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire.

There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

---



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6281 Mrs Melanie Turley [6236]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

\* Our surrounding roads and highways are already congested with vehicles coming and going from The Magna Park development. Small village roads cannot cope with the extra loads. There's been many a near accident.

\*Noise and air pollution are a huge concern for the public living in and around Lutterworth. Magna Park extensions will only add to the already most polluted town in the country.

\* This expansion isn't necessary there are much better rail and motorway links over at Rugby and Crick.

Proposals concerning Magna Park represent an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside,And have a massive impact on the surrounding area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Don't pass this expansion ....simple

**Response:**

Although there may be commercially attractive sites elsewhere in the HMA, some existing commitments for non rail-served strategic and allocated sites in neighbouring non-Leicestershire authorities, in the context of the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, market signals and in the absence of an upper limit to forecast demand, this should not restrict the growth of an existing and expanding sector.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual polices, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6286 Mr Ian Bell [6260]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Significant negative impact on the village of Ullesthorpe (traffic flow, noise, emmissions). The key point is that there are other options to expand the park that are less impactful on neighbouring villages/populated areas. Build to the South or Southwest of the existing park.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build to the South or south west. For any development, planted bunding around any DC should be forced to ensure the buildings are fully obscured within 5 yrs.

**Response:**

Policy BE2 is criteria based and provides a quantitative maximum on development. No site allocation is made in respect of Policy BE2. Proposals would be considered in accordance with stated criteria, BE2.2a in respect of geographical location and BE2.2e. in respect of highways impact. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development and infrastructure policies to guide development.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6290 mr john Norbury [6259]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plan allows for upto 700,000sq mts expansion which is opportunist not within strategic requirements. Existing warehouse space is available. Does not meet local employment needs.will increase in borne commuting on already busy roads.No adequate highway infrastructure no be planned before 2030.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I am asking for the local plan to delete the proposal for 700,000sq mts of expansion in magna park and reduce it to no more than 100,000 sq mts as shown in consultation in 2015 as option A.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6295 Mrs Deborah Day [6264]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Unsustainable, major impact on wildlife reducing habitat and increasing noise, light and exhaust pollution. Rural habitat of villagers destroyed. Increased congestion on already congested roads - farmland destroyed for warehousing.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Not to destroy any more green belt land for the provision of warehousing. To stop any further development going ahead.

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual polices, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6296 Mr Tony Jukes [5576]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Summary

I object to this proposal being included in the Local Plan because

1. There is no economic argument for such a concentration of the same type of jobs in an area of low unemployment, where there is also potentially an over-supply of distribution sites within a small radius.
2. The costs in terms of traffic congestion and environmental detriment would significantly outweigh any possible economic benefits.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Change

Major expansion at Magna Park should be removed from the Local Plan and the existing (2011 to 2028) Core Strategy commitment to no expansion reinstated.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market and strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills.

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6320 Mrs Kathryn Bonser [4981]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* The extra employment is not needed in the area and will not benefit the people of Harborough.
- \* The road infrastructure is not suitable.
- \* Will lead to a surplus of warehouses

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Not allow any more major expansion of Magna Park. A large area has already been granted and the extra space should be shared across the county to spread out the employment, traffic and loss of countryside.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

HEDNA states the future strategic warehouse requirement for the HMA to 2031 as a minimum figure, split between rail-served and non rail-served, which is not disaggregated to districts

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6322 **Phil Hague [6273]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This is an area of low unemployment so almost all future employees will need to commute. This, with the extra traffic generated by additional businesses will increase traffic issues and already high pollution levels in this area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Local plan should be modified to restrict any further development of Magna Park.

**Response:**

Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6324 **S Craven [6233]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Increased Traffic, noise and pollution.  
Develpoment elsewhere in the vacinity  
Lost of green field for agriculture  
Lost of wildlife and habbitat

**Change To Plan Sought:**

IF, and only IF the plan is accepted, part of the planning concent should stipulate that the roof's need to be covered in solar panels and wind turbines should be installed. The site MUST develop it's own power and be 'off grid', as we have a national power shortage which develpoment such as this will only contribute to.

There simply is NO excuse.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6325 **Mrs. Mary Rolleston [6272]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed additional development is unsustainable and unnecessary.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scrap the proposal to allow 700,000 square metres of expansion at Magna Park and build these warehouses in other parts of the county. This would avoid the problems of traffic congestion and preserve the rural character of the surrounding area.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6326 Dorothy Fletcher [6274]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is already adequate supply of warehousing in this area as can clearly be seen by the number of large warehouses to let, and other projects in progress on the A5 corridor, particularly towards DIRFT with its rail link.

This proposal will erode the green space and rights of way that Ullesthorpe enjoys.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Restrict further growth of Magna Park.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. BE2.2 sets a cap for further strategic distribution and criteria against which planning applications will be considered. This includes one to prevent unacceptable environmental, community or landscape impact.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6328 Mr Alan Pettifer [6091]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Magna Park is already too big, extending it will cause massive traffic congestion especially on the surrounding villages whose roads are too small to accommodate large vehicles. Plus the A5 will become gridlocked with lorries. Also in line with the new government policies on Diesels, the air pollution will be massively increased affecting everyone. There is also the effect on the environment turning green fields into concrete hangers. This in turn will destroy any local wildlife and their habitats. You won't see the sky anymore also because of the light pollution.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Magna Park should stay as it is.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable landscape and environmental impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour working' only. A modification is needed as follows:

'f. ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not...'

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6329 Dr Stephen Osgerby [5906]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no strategic justification for the figure of 700000 sq m. This is based on two current planning applications so is purely opportunistic.

Local unemployment is low and unsuited to low level manual jobs that this development will generate.

Local roads are congested. The traffic study is flawed and takes no account of the frequent lengthy queues that build up on the A486 between the M6 and A5.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Development of Magna Park should be limited to levels that have limited impact on environmental factors in neighbouring areas.

Priority should be given to developments at or near existing railheads.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6331 J Bradley [4909]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The local area has enough warehousing to sustain jobs for the local population & is detrimental to creating a diverse employment structure within the area. Any expansion of Magna Park will increase traffic congestion & pollution with the additional trucks & commuter vehicles It will attract to a road structure that cannot cope at peak times. It is very clear that the council has written this plan to coincide with current planning applications & not based on what the area really needs.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The exspanion of Magna Park should be rejected & any modest development should be confined to the current footprint.

**Response:**

Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6334 Mrs Rachael Edgley [5299]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The harm of this outways the benefit if any.

Monopoly of area by developers.

Lack of infrastructure.

Making the plan fit what is there so not a long term plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

rather than all being absorbed in one hit the sites sheds should be applied for individually giving a time gap between applications to allow for other sites to be found outside of the Lutterworth area by other potential developers

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6339 Mr Brian Fowler [5675]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This proposal is based on very flawed evidence. There is no evidence that Magna Park requires additional warehousing. Vast areas of land are being converted at the former Rugby Wireless Station site and there is more than enough capacity for further growth at the DIRFT site. Both of which are closer to motorway access and Rail Freight access affording easier lorry access. Proposals to build a further 700,000 sq metres on a site that is only accessible from the already overused A5 road can only be seen as speculative and has no relationship to real warehousing requirement

**Change To Plan Sought:**

As the whole scheme is non justified, the only change necessary is to reject it as a whole. Sufficient development space is already catered for with the previously agreed enlargement of the current Magna Park Site

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities. Overall Policy BE2.2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. in a sequentially favourable location and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6343 **Magna Park is Big Enough (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6279]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

It is not positively prepared to allocate B8 based on exactly the same floorspace as two outstanding planning applications.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No commitment to Magna Park within BE2

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Policy BE2 is positively prepared as it provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6363 **Ian Lewis [4810]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The additional development is unsustainable and will cause a serious impact on traffic congestion, air pollution and damage the countryside.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove all proposals to build additional warehouses around the Magna Park area.

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6364 **Ian Lewis [4810]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This will be more than double the size of the current site. This is not required.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Increase capacity in an area where this is a rail link and an area of high unemployment.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6374 Mrs Rebecca Laphorne [5904]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This proposal will cause a serious impact on traffic congestion and air pollution in the small village of Ullesthorpe. The village does not have the infrastructure, services or facilities to cope with the level of proposed development. The proposal will significantly impact lifestyle and will completely destroy the rural character of the environment.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Magna park does not need to be larger. Congestion is already significant. This proposal should not go ahead.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual polices, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6405 Monks Kirby Parish Council (mr Bill Woolliscroft) [6296]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Monks Kirby parish council represents an area adjacent to the proposed expansion of Magna Park, to the west within Warwickshire.

The Councils concerns are the affect on the local infrastructure and in particular the A5.

The A5 at present is overcrowded and no plans are in place to upgrade. This is recognised by the Midlands Connect Strategy 2017 - 2030. Any further expansion will exacerbate the issue. MK will suffer unduly as if the main trunk route becomes congested the more minor routes through our Parish, unsuited to greater traffic flows, will be overused by both HGVs and staff commuting.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Monks Kirby suggest that before further expansion is considered at Magna Park, the A5 trunk route should be upgraded to accept the increased traffic flows that will follow.

This should be considered alongside the other expansion plans, agreed and proposed, along the A5.

Considering the effects of each case separately, does not give a correct picture of the overall effect.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of; traffic congestion and commuting. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development and infrastructure policies to guide development.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6425 Mrs Diana Howlett [6307]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Currently small rural communities co exist with the expansion of Magna Business Park and Lutterworth. However I feel quite simply the site is big enough, and that we have had our share of development. By eating further into the countryside adjacent to Ullesthorpe, Bitteswell and Lutterworth will inevitably destroy the natural hinterland/ boundary between industry and rural living. The effects on the environment will change the area for good, having a very detrimental effect on public health, both physically and mentally. Any economic benefits for the area are very short term and of minimal impact for the local community.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

To leave the site as it is and work to improve the problems we already suffer as a result of warehousing. This includes, traffic, pollution, and an explosion of zero hours contracts that has done more to exacerbate local poverty than resolve it.

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its polices, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6411 Mr Richard Nikolic [6302]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We have enough ware house space in this area and your own local plan states we should have less ware house space not more.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Stick to your own plan that states we need less warehouse space not more.

**Response:**

HEDNA states the future strategic warehouse requirement for the HMA to 2031 as a minimum figure, that is not disaggregated to districts. The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence (SDSS 2014/2016) indicates a strong case for Harborough District to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6435 **Z Hornsby [6317]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

I object to the proposal on the following grounds: employment in the local area is already at optimum levels and an increase in warehousing and therefore employment requirements can only be met from a population outside of the area. This then in turn will put an increase on the housing market which is already over subscribed and can only put undue pressure on the traffic in the area, particularly that on the A5 which is already operating at maximum often very dangerous conditions which can only be made much worse by this proposal.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This option should not be give consideration in this area which has no capacity to manage the consequences of the proposal

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the District, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6441 **Mrs Sheila Paddon [6318]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

There is not demand for this amount of non- rail warehousing, as shown by research (LLEP SDSS 2017). Bringing 10,000 largely low- skilled jobs to an area with an unemployment rate of less than 2%, where already 60% of staff travel from outside the area, is not good planning. The local roads are already congested, the A5 is known to be inadequate and pollution levels in Lutterworth are very high. There is insufficient safeguarding of local countryside eg no green barrier for Ullesthorpe & Cotesbach. Not in keeping with national plan as not near rail.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No further expansion at Magna Park

**Response:**

The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence indicates a strong case for Harborough District to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need.

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the district, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the local plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

Distances between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe/Cotesbach are such that an Area of Separation is not required.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6442 Mrs Rae Scott [6289]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is not the need for the amount of warehousing proposed  
The Lutterworth area has a very low employment rate so workers would have to travel from afar  
There would be a huge increase in the amount of traffic in an already congested area  
The extremely congested A5 road would not cope  
Surrounding villages would have increased traffic at change over times from workers commuting  
There would be greatly increased pollution in an area of residential housing and several schools  
An increased development at Magna Park would deprive other areas of Leicestershire with greater needs including high employment from developments

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The development of warehousing should be scrapped or greatly reduced

**Response:**

The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence indicates a strong case for Harborough District to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need.  
The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the district, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.  
Policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6443 Mrs Nicola Long [6300]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I object strongly to the proposed plan for the extension of magna park. As a resident of claybrooke magna i will see increases levels of traffic not only through the village but on the already busy A5. This will lead to high levels of pollution and huge losses to the wildlife in the area.  
I chose to live in Claybrooke because of its rural and peaceful location, this will all be ruined by expanding Magna Park and making the whole area look like a gigantic distribution centre with lorries everywhere!

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Magna park is big enough we don't need or want it any bigger.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.  
The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.

---

**RepID Representation**

6451 Mrs Kathleen Rowell [4871]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The agricultural land at Bittesby is productive land and Policy GD3 should be applied. This proposed speculative development would not bring sufficient benefit to outweigh the harm.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete this clause as it at odds with Policy GD3 Development in the countryside.

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including Policy BE2, have been assessed, are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal and the plan is considered to be sound. The Local Plan should be read as a whole. Additional criterion to be added to Policy GD3 to allow for delivery of strategic distribution in accordance with BE2.2.

---

**RepID Representation**

6458 Ms Claire Gill [6336]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This proposal is not justified. It does not meet the employment needs of the district community, will negatively impact on the road systems and environment, and is a significant risk to the reputation and financial sustainability of Harborough. The proposal will not increase the diversity of employment opportunities in this area, nor will it bring employment benefits to borough residents. Significant developments within a 10-mile radius are already providing sufficient opportunities for this type / level of workforce, and there is a concern that this does not meet a market need.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Removal of this aspect of the plan

**Response:**

The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence (SDSS 2014/2016) indicates a strong case for Harborough District to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6471 Mr Jonathan Davies [6033]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The road traffic generated by such a disproportionately large extension will significantly overload the rural roads in and between the villages in the vicinity of the site. This will increase road safety dangers, air emissions, and impact on the health of those living, working, being educated and walking in those areas.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not permit additional development at the site unless mitigating factors are put in place before any further development in commenced to reduce the impacts above to the same as or less than those existing at present

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2.2 criterion f. is intended to prevent unacceptable environmental, community or landscape impact but currently refers only to the impacts of '24 hour working'. A modification is proposed as follows:  
'f. to ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not....'

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6513 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Object to policy / this allocation because;

- proposal differs from that at Options stage and has not been tested via consultation
- contrary to Key Objective 3
- its excessive and plan provides no evidence of need for this scale of development
- it will not create new jobs to meet local needs, contrary to Key Objective 2 and policy BE2 clause 2.c
- insufficient labour so commuting will increase substantially
- congestion is inevitable, in combination with policy L1 and intensification of use via policy BE4.1.f, particularly at M1 Junction 20 contrary to BE2.2.e

**Change To Plan Sought:**

None stated.

**Response:**

There is no statutory obligation for LPA's to consult on Options. The Proposed Submission consultation met the regulatory requirements. The objectives of the Local Plan are the guiding principles for the policies set out in the plan. It is important that the Local Plan is read as a whole. The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6531 Emma Ridley [5234]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

700,000 sq mts is opportunist not strategic

§ It will lead to an over supply of land for warehousing

§ It will not meet the employment needs of Harborough residents as outlined in Key Issue 3 e.g. greater breadth of employment alternatives, increased wage rates, opportunities for higher skilled residents

Will increase in-commuting and not reduce out-commuting

Not on a railhead

No adequate highway infrastructure and none planned before 2030.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete the proposal to allow 700,000 sq mts of expansion at Magna Park.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6534 Mr John Allcoat [6361]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scale of provision too large and not necessary; little unemployment locally, will encourage commuting and extra traffic, increases pollution affecting health, doesn't provide skilled jobs, currently vacant warehouses in Rugby.

Increased traffic on A5 and roads in villages in combination with housing proposed in Lutterworth.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2.2 sets out a maximum of 700,000sq.m. for additional development and criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6546 Daventry District Council (Mr Tom James) [3954]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Level of growth;

- not based on an assessment of capacity, which should consider at least all factors proposed as policy criteria.
- Further cross-boundary work with stakeholders required to fully take into account the potential impact of different growth scenarios, which could in turn indicate the amount of floorspace to be provided
- not justified by evidence (L&L SDSS - non-railed served need of 152 hectares by 2031)
- quantum of 700,000 square metres equates to an area of approximately 327 hectares and is in excess of the identified need in one location.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Revisions to the quantum of floorspace provided for under policy BE2 subject to the outcomes of further work.

**Response:**

Proportionate evidence, for what is a national sector, has where appropriate been prepared jointly with other LPA's. The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Policy BE2.2 sets a cap for additional development in a sequentially favourable location and criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6557 Gwen Edwards [6365]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is a developer-led policy as planning applications are already being considered for doubling the size of Magna Park. Such development does not comply with Policy BE2 in terms of the huge amount of additional road traffic, congestion and pollution generated by the development. It will attract commuters from outside HDC area, given its position on the A5. It will be detrimental to the provision of rail distribution on sites close by which do have good rail links. There is very low unemployment in the area and so it will attract workers from outside.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The policy should be deleted and Magna Park should not be allowed to double in size.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. in a sequentially favourable location and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6612 Mrs Joy Burgoine [4726]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is virtually no unemployment in Lutterworth and possibly 75% of the employees at Magna Park have to travel to work in cars. Our town will be gridlocked on a regular basis. Plus the doubling of Magna Park and Symmetry which will, in themselves, bring chaotic congestion into the area. I therefore object to the local plan as it stands at the moment.

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the District, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6623 Claybrooke Magna Parish Council (Mrs J P Butcher) [4737]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No demonstrable need for the proposed amount of non rail-served strategic development, and the siting of this amount at Magna Park will have a negative impact on the sustainability of Lutterworth and its surrounding. Road infrastructure, not stated for any appreciable upgrades during the Local Plan period, is incapable of handling the increased demand and out-commuting will vastly increase as a result.

There are other, rail-served sites both nearby and crucially in other parts of the District and County. No economies of scale to be gained by siting a large proportion of the County's strategic warehousing in one place.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend to no further expansion of Magna Park.

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the District, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6626 **Cllr Geraldine Robinson [2493]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

700,000 sq m of warehousing is not required in an area of no unemployment. This will create an unacceptable increase in traffic flow on already congested roads.

No rail link

Will provide an over-supply of low paid, unskilled jobs.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

BE2 Strategic Distribution - The proposed modification to the road network is inadequate for the huge increase in traffic.

THIS PLAN SEEM TO FOCUS ON ADDING TO THE ALREADY EXISTING NEGATIVE EFFECT OF GYPSY, TRAVELLER AND SHOWMAN'S PROVISION, MAGNA PARK AND WIND TURBINES BY INCREASING THIS PROVISION RATHER THAN EXERCISING A FAIR GEORGRAPHICAL SPREAD.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the District, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6652 **Mr Alberto Costa MP [6053]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

In concern of the proposed expansion of Magna Park, I should like to reiterate once again my objections to these proposals as originally outlined following my election as MP in 2015. In keeping with the thoughts and concerns of many of my constituents, I believe that the proposed expansion would be counter-productive to the local area's needs and to residents in terms of pollution and congestion, where the town of Lutterworth has historically experienced detrimental issues.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of local employment opportunities, traffic congestion, and commuting. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6654 Cllr Rosita Page [4254]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

At options stage the public objected to a major expansion of Magna Park. The Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report rejected an Option of 700,000sq.m.

Comments from members and residents ignored, evidence flawed, contradiction to previous evidence applied and proper process not followed in order to accommodate a policy that advocates unnecessary over allocation of storage /logistic provision to coincide with applications submitted which will be decided before this plan is evaluated.

This policy is ambiguous, will saturate and monopolise the non- rail storage and logistic market to the disadvantage of neighbouring authorities. This policy supports greed and does not identify need.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough District to continue contributing towards meeting the future needs of the sector. Policy BE2 provides for additional development up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It will have full weight on adoption of the Local Plan.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6665 Mr John Rowlands [5342]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No rationale for figure of 700,000 square metres of additional development for non rail-served strategic storage and distribution.

Exceeds forecast demand for non rail-served storage and distribution sites for Leicestershire.

Contrary to the Local Plan Vision.

Objective 2 (Employment), not addressed.

New jobs: same skill types already exist at Magna Park, so largely not filled by local people; out-commuting not reduced; in-commuting would increase.

Increased traffic congestion from HGV/commuter traffic, increased vehicle pollution, loss of natural environment.

A5 upgrade not complete until 2030, so road infrastructure inadequate.

Not a rail-served site, therefore not consistent with national policy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Local Plan should be modified to remove the proposal for 700,000 square metres of additional development for non rail-served strategic storage and distribution next to the existing Magna Park. Planning permission for 100,000 square metres of additional storage and distribution warehousing at Magna Park has already been granted. Any further development should be within the forecast demand for storage and distribution area, and should be in other parts of Leicestershire.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will also create jobs across the skill range. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

---

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6674 Rugby Borough Council (Mr Martin Needham) [6402]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Jacobs Preliminary Impact Assessment 2016 appears to exclude areas outside of Leicestershire, even though there are main routes adjoining or crossing into neighbouring counties (A5 and A426, near to Magna Park and Lutterworth proposals), and analysis is not apparent in other documents. Query whether sufficient consultation has taken place with Warwickshire County Council Highways Authority to ensure the local plan's implications on cross-county matters have been taken into account.

The August 2017 Magna Park Employment Growth Sensitivity Study is welcome, although it is queried whether the position of the other HMA authorities on employment and unmet housing need has been agreed between appropriate authorities and if the Duty to Co-operate has been satisfied.

It should be ensured that the draw of employment from surrounding areas as a result of the expansion of Magna Park has been fully considered and also factored in by other authorities, in order to ensure there would not be over provision in the market area as a whole.

It should be ensured that the impacts of the proposals on cross boundary matters have been fully considered, and that due regard has been given to Rugby Borough's proposed growth.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

Warwickshire County Council has confirmed its commitment to work in partnership, to accommodate the development in the plan. The Council has cooperated with relevant authorities on housing and employment matters.

The Local Plan provides additional housing needed to support growth at Magna Park, aligning its housing and economic strategies. Policy BE2.2 criterion c. and d. address this issue.

No third party evidence has been submitted to substantiate allegations of negative impact. As policy BE2(2) is criteria based and does not propose expansion or allocate a site, further evidence gathering is not considered to be proportionate.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6676 Mr David Gair [4381]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The scale of supporting infrastructure developments are nowhere near adequate to support these developments together with the large number of other distribution units that are being built in th the so called Golden Triangle stretching from Atherstone to Milton Keynes. Lutterworth has been an Air Quality Improvement Zone for the last 10 years and nothing has been done to alleviate the pollution. This development has to make things worse.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delay this development to give time to carry out a strategic overview, and define the regional infrastructure needed to support these developments in a way that minimises impact; particularly the impact of traffic.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of local employment opportunities, traffic congestion, and commuting. The East of Lutterworth SDA (Policy L1) will deliver a spine road which is predicted to remove some through traffic currently travelling through the centre of Lutterworth, helping to improve air quality.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6677 Mr Scott Munton [5000]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Very low levels of unemployment in Harborough District (Less than 2% "Office for National Statistics 2017") which will result in increased commuting adding further congestion and pollution. Adding a further 10,000 of similar type jobs at Magna Park would contradict one of the local plan goals to reduce out-commuting, An additional 100,000 sq mtrs of warehousing has already been agreed along with further developments only a few miles off Magna Park which will lead to over supply of warehouse land. NPPF states that there is a preference for warehouse/distribution sites to be based on railheads.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete the proposal allowing 700,000 sq mts of expansion at Magna Park. In the 2015 Local Plan consultation three options were proposed , Option A of 100,000 sq mtrs, Option B of 279,000, Option C of 779,000. These options are the sum of 3 planning applications, the first having already been granted, the current proposal of 700,000sq.m. would allow the approval of 2 outstanding applications. The plan should be modified to no further major expansion of Magna Park with 100,000 sq mtrs already being approved this is sufficient. Other parts of the country should take up the remaining area.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

---

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6727 Mr John Blackburn [6418]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The planned development will have a definite impact on local roads, especially the A5. This is already a dangerous road at certain times of the day particularly around the Wibtoft section. Further traffic will cause further congestion and accidents.

There will be an increase in pollution from lorries and additional commuting traffic as well as further light pollution.

Local wildlife and and vegetation will be adversely affected.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Further consultation with experts at a national level.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. Criterion f. of the policy is intended to prevent unacceptable environmental, community or landscape impacts but currently only refers to the impacts of '24 hour operations'. A modification is proposed as follows:

'f. ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not....'

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6817 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

700,000 sq. m., taken together with other development in the area, takes us far beyond forecast need.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Drop the paragraph as 700,000 sq. m., taken together with other development, takes us far beyond forecast need.

**Response:**

HEDNA states the future strategic warehouse requirement for the HMA to 2031 as a minimum figure, split between rail-served and non rail-served, which is not disaggregated to districts. The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence (SDSS 2014/2016) indicates a strong case for Harborough District to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6830 Maureen Perkins [5663]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Further development of Magna Park is NOT essential, there are already Warehouses standing empty the past 2 years, Already an over supply of warehousing. Research has indicated there is no requirement for this type of warehousing where it does not link up with rail-freight terminals. We do not need a rail link.

Un-Employment is already low in Lutterworth and people are being brought in, which causes more congestion, traffic problems and pollution. Increased HGV traffic causes toxic particles which will eventually cause, serious medical issues, including heart attacks, strokes etc. Should residents of Lutterworth be subjected to this toxic air.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Local Plan should be modified to include NO major expansion as 100,000 sq mts have already been approved in 2015's consultation. Therefore avoiding a massive concentration in one area. Spread the employment possibilities throughout Leicestershire.

An alternative would be to follow Option B of 279,000 sq mts or less.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6833 Mr Kevin O'Neill [6290]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plan does not address properly:

- impact on traffic levels on both main routes and through villages;
- current and future air quality issues;
- projected employment expectations from logistics developments which will be largely automated in the future;
- affordability of homes in the area and the increasing volume of commuters from outside the area;
- management of historic finds as the area is developed;

The plan appears to exhaust/exceed all the planned logistics development until 2031 in one hit and the plan does not provide for rail transport.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of local employment opportunities, traffic congestion, commuting , and environmental/ community/landscape impacts. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development, heritage and community asset, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6839 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Magna Park plans are immense.

Logistics centres should be built at locations with railheads or at motorway junctions.

The road infrastructure around Magna Park struggles to cope with the existing traffic volumes.

Leicestershire is one of the worst counties in the country for road fatalities.

HGVs don't follow approved routes; travelling dangerously through tiny villages on minor rural roads.

It's smarter to build warehouses nearer to the people who would take up the new jobs being created.

The area around Magna Park has 0.4% unemployment.

Lutterworth has some of the worst air quality in Leicestershire, failing to meet EU standards.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There should be no further material expansion of Magna Park. The local road infrastructure cannot support thousands more HGVs and commuter cars traffic. The children living in Lutterworth should not be expected to breathe even more traffic polluted air, stunting their growth and health prospects. We have to live here!!

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan have been assessed, including Policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound. Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of local employment opportunities, traffic congestion, and commuting.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6852 Mr Scott Munton [5000]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Currently there are two outstanding planning applications for 700,000 square meters of warehousing on which your evidence is based indicating the proposal is not strategic but opportunist not focusing on meeting employment needs of the district. In addition creating 10,000 similar type jobs at MP would not achieve one of the Local Plan goals of reducing out-commuting, Currently over 60% of MP employees travel in from outside the district, I see no evidence this would change, There are very low levels of unemployment in Harb Dist less than 2% with MP suffering recruitment issues now -we don't need this here.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete the proposal to allow 700,000 sq mrs of MP expansion. In the Local Plan consultation of 2015 the three options suggested were 100,000 sq mrs Opt A, 279,000 Opt B and 779,000 opt C, these options are the total of the 3 planning applications to expand MP, the first of which 100,000 sq metres has already been accepted, the current proposal for 700,000 would allow 2 further applications to be approved, therefore this should be altered to no further development at Magna Park avoiding loss of our countywide, massive traffic congestion and pollution

**Response:**

Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. in a sequentially favourable location and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6870 Mr Allan Whittaker [6064]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The land for 700,000 sq.m will impact on the landscape of local rural villages and well as reducing agricultural land in the local area

The current site is already visible from Bitteswell, Ullesthorpe and Claybrooke and will encroach further into the make up of the rural communities

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan should not include expansion of Magna Park. It has no local benefits to the population

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable community, landscape and environmental impacts but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour operations' only. A modification is needed as follows:

'f. ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not...'

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6885 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Magna Park plans are immense. Logistics centres should be built at locations with railheads or at motorway junctions. The road infrastructure around Magna Park struggles to cope with the existing traffic volumes.

Leicestershire is one of the worst counties in the country for road fatalities.

HGVs don't follow approved routes; travelling dangerously through tiny villages on minor rural roads.

It's smarter to build warehouses nearer to the people who would take up the new jobs being created. The area around Magna Park has 0.4% unemployment.

Lutterworth has some of the worst air quality in Leicestershire, failing to meet EU standards.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There should be no more material expansion of Magna Park.

The local road infrastructure is inadequate and cannot cope with existing traffic volumes.

The plan to expand Magna Park will inevitably generate thousands more HGVS & commuter car journeys in the Lutterworth area.

The children living in and around Lutterworth should not be condemned to breathe even more traffic polluted air, stunting their growth and damaging their future health prospects.

The air quality should be routinely and regularly monitored to ensure it always meets safe & healthy standards.

The public demands action to safeguard our health.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6889 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Any material expansion of Magna Park would irretrievably erode the segregation area between Magna Park and Cotesbach, Bitteswell and Lutterworth itself.

Our village of Cotesbach is approximately 2 miles away from Magna Park site. It's clearly visible from our homes and lights up our night sky.

Our village, for energy saving reasons and to avoid light blight, has no street lights but it is now illuminated by the spaceships that are Magna Park.

The plans to substantially expand Magna Park would bring new warehouses to around a mile away further increasing the night light blight, noise & traffic congestion.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There should be no more material expansion of Magna Park.

The local road infrastructure is inadequate and cannot cope with existing traffic volumes.

The plan to expand Magna Park will inevitably generate thousands more HGVS & commuter car journeys in the Lutterworth area.

The children living in and around Lutterworth should not be forced to breathe even more traffic polluted air, stunting their growth and damaging their future health prospects.

**Response:**

Criterion f. within Policy BE2.2. seeks to ensure that development, including 24 hour operations, does not have an unacceptable environmental, community and landscape impact on the area. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development and infrastructure policies to guide development. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6904 Mrs Clare Robertson Smith [4993]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This proposal exceeds the demand for such warehousing across the whole of Leicestershire and such a concentration in a very small area cannot be justified. The unemployment levels in Harborough District are very low so commuter levels would rise and other areas of the County would be deprived of the employment opportunities.

The local road system cannot cope with the greatly increased commuter and HGV traffic associated with all the distribution centres already in existence in the immediate area, so a huge expansion would be crippling.

The over-development on green field land on this scale cannot be justified.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not include the additional development of Magna Park in the Local Plan. An area of 100,000 sq m has already been approved so any further storage and distribution should be located elsewhere in the County. This part of Harborough District does not need such a high concentration of low skilled jobs and cannot cope with the traffic congestion, which is having a detrimental effect on the air quality particularly in the centre of Lutterworth.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire.

There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of local employment opportunities, traffic congestion, and commuting. The local plan, read as a whole, also contains general development, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development. The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6909 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The two massive plans to expand Magna Park do risk detriment to our bio-diversity, eco systems and natural wildlife within the rural Swift Valley.

To plan to build 7 new O2 Arenas or Millennium Domes is bound to impact immensely upon the rurality of our area.

So will the thousands of additional HGVs & commuter cars belching out their poisonous emissions, which damages the health of all species.

As a resident of Cotesbach, which is approximately 2 miles to the south east of Magna Park, I am gravely concerned about the adverse impact this substantial amount of building will cause.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not materially expand Magna Park or build in the rural Swift Valley fields between Cotesbach, Magna Park & Lutterworth.

**Response:**

Policy BE2.2 does not allocate land for strategic distribution. Policy BE2.2 sets out a maximum of 700,000sq.m. along with specific criteria to address environmental, community and landscape impacts, and improve local economic benefits. The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal. The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6913 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The massive plans to substantially expand Magna Park would significantly increase the carbon emissions and footprint of our supposedly rural area.

Not only in its construction phase but due to the thousands of additional HGVs & commuter cars that would flood out onto our inadequate local road transport network.

Lutterworth already experiences some of the worst quality air in the County, which can only deteriorate still further with all these extra motor vehicles belching out their poisonous emissions.

These developments pose a grave public health issue as well as increasing the carbon footprint of the hitherto rural area around Lutterworth.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not materially expand Magna Park.

Safeguard the air quality and health of those people living and working in and around Lutterworth.

Reduce the carbon emission in this supposedly rural area.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 does not allocate land for strategic distribution. Rather it sets a maximum of 700,000sq.m. additional strategic distribution along with criteria against which planning applications will be considered. These criteria, along with other Local Plan policies, seek to minimise and mitigate environmental, community and landscape impacts, and improve local economic benefits.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6914 Mrs Sharon Palmer [6443]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Local roads around Magna Park are already over-crowded. Adding more HGVs and commuters using cars will create even more bottlenecks on the A5. This increased traffic will have a negative impact on people living nearby.

I think that there is little unemployment in Lutterworth. If more jobs are created at Magna Park these would probably be low pay, low skilled jobs, like the kind on offer now. There seems to be difficulties in recruiting for these jobs meaning people are travelling from further afield, having more impact on local congestion. We need opportunities for higher skilled people who live locally.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I would like to see no major expansion at Magna Park to improve the quality of life for the local community, and to protect the countryside.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the local plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6915 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Objections on the grounds of speculative but irreversible nature of this development. Also, in terms of employment implications (quality and number), environmental damage, pollution and effect on air quality, overloading of existing transport infrastructure without commitment of extra resources, non-compliance with national identification of need for rail-served facilities, failure to take account of similar developments not only in the county but also in neighbouring counties.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See above - Magna Park is not a viable development proposal.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6931 Jim Palmer [6444]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

key objections:

- The plan doesn't create suitable employment - it creates low skilled jobs. There is already shortage of people locally for these role types leading to commuting in from surrounding areas.
  - This leads to more cars & trucks along road infrastructure which is clearly inadequate, and not planning significant upgrades.
  - the proposal isn't strategic. It's designed to fit a couple of current planning applications leading to over- supply, and does not focus on rail-linked warehousing.
  - This has significant environment impact - contributing to global warming.
- This plan is not well considered or strategic.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Basically the change that I would like to see is the removal of the paragraphs referring to the "700,000 sq mts of expansion at Magna Park", and replaced to state there should be no major expansion at Magna Park.

The additional low-skilled jobs should be more evenly balanced around the county, to reduce commuting as employers are already competing for scarce employment resources in the local area.(but outside the district boundary), and to fit more strategically.

This would avoid major congestion, and minimise the degraded environmental impact (from roads, green spaces, air quality) for local residents both inside and outside the Harborough Council area.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

---



**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6932 Jim Palmer [6444]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I'm a local graduate who recently started full-time employment. I have to travel outside the area for skilled work. My journey is already delayed by a congested A5.. This proposal will only make things significantly worse.  
I'm in my 20s with long-term lung problems, so am concerned that this proposal will only worsen the air quality of where I live. Proper plans to address A5 congestion have not been included, nor proposals to link distribution to the rail line.  
Please consider the health of your local residents and do not increase the warehousing in this area

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I suggest the plan should not add more warehousing jobs in the area and limit the expansion of Magna Park

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan have been assessed, including Policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6933 Mr Simon Smith [4996]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The local plan options presented to the public whilst compiling the draft local plan stated that the 700000 sqm option was not the desired option to be included as there was not a requirement for this scale of non rail served distribution in this locality or surrounding area. the evidence does not support this option. Any new post options consultation evidence generated appears to have been excessively weighted towards justifying 2 planning applications. totalling 700000 sq metres. And pacifying a costly judicial review on HDC plannings process being brought by one applicant

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan should give greater weight to the current core strategy policy on Magna park.  
The local plan options consultation gave more weight of evidence towards allowing a smaller volume of additional distribution development in the locality.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire.  
There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.  
Policy BE2 provides for additional development up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. The policy does not allocate land for strategic distribution. The policy will have full weight on adoption of the Local Plan.

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6934 **Mr Sam Palmer [6450]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

As a local graduate who's recently started full-time employment I have to travel outside the area for skilled work. I am already delayed along a congested A5,. This proposal will only make things significantly worse.

I'm in my 20s with long-term lung problems, so am concerned that this proposal will only worsen the air quality around my home as proper plans to address A5 congestion have not been included, nor proposals to link distribution to the rail line.

Please consider the health of your local residents and do not increase the warehousing in this area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I suggest the plan should not add more warehousing jobs in the area

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6935 **Mr Sam Palmer [6450]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

I am writing as a student expecting to graduate in the next 8 months and living within a mile of Magna Park.

I like the local environment and Harborough area, but am looking for a local plan to create a range of jobs & skill types in the area. There are already plenty of relatively low skilled distribution jobs in the area. I am looking for more highly skilled technical jobs so I don't have to move away from the region to work, or contribute to further congestion by commuting along the already congested local roads

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I object to the plan adding major warehousing capacity in an already over-loaded area.

**Response:**

Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the local plan. Policy BE1 makes allocations for a further 59ha of general employment land across the breadth of B class uses (office, industrial, non-strategic B8) and policy BE3 seeks to safeguard existing employment areas. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6939 Miss Jo-Ann Allcoat [6230]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- It is opportunist & not strategic
- There is no employment need
- It will increase traffic, congestion, pollution & danger lives.
- It does not benefit residents in the surrounding areas

**Change To Plan Sought:**

3 options for Magna Park were proposed in the consultation period in 2015:-

- Option 1 100,000 sq mts
- Option 2 279,000 sq mts
- Option 3 779,000 sq mts

These options are the sum of 3 planning applications to expand Magna Park. The first application has already been granted & the current proposal for 700,000 sq mts would allow the approval of the two outstanding applications.

The Local Plan should be changed to allow no major expansion at Magna Park, or at least to follow the previously supported Option 2 of 279,000 sq mts.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan have been assessed, including Policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6996 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* allocation is fundamentally different from previous consultation documents
- \* the allocation has not been tested through consultation
- \* there are two outstanding planning applications for warehousing in this area conveniently amounting to the size of this allocation
- \* not a strategic allocation, an allocation to accomodate outstanding planning applications
- \* contradict the Core Strategy
- \* there are more suitable sites elsewhere in the region and sub-region

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

No statutory obligation for LPA's to consult on Options. Proposed submission consultation meets regulatory requirements.

The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Local Development Plan Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011). The policies in the LP are based on a proportionate and up-to-date evidence base including that which informs policy BE2.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6999 Miss Ruth Thompson [5348]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

From my understanding of the local plan option consultation there was no weight of supporting evidence for an extremely large scaled development upto 700,000 sq mts in the magna part area and location. 700,000 sq mts is unjustified for inclusion, it exceeds the requirements for non-rail served freight distribution in the whole of Leicestershire. There are more environment and pollution friendly sights directly adjacent to motorways already being built and developed within the larger area, some of which are rail served which is the governments preferred strategy. There is no evidence for more low skilled jobs

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I commented on the local plan prepared option document where option for 700,000 of development was not preferred or suitable option to be included in the plan. The local plan should be developed nearer to the approved policy in the current core strategy and any options in line with the preferred lower development limits as justified by the evidence at the time of public options consultation.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. Policy BE2.2 does not allocate land for strategic distribution but rather sets a cap and criteria against which proposals will be considered. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7014 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy BE2 conflicts with the statement 'the district will have a diverse and thriving economy', by allowing such a large expansion in one sector which is low paid and low skilled the opposite effect will be achieved. In the District, there are approximately 45,000 working people, the creation of c.10,000 new jobs would represent a gross over-supply. If the vision is to achieve a more diverse economy why is HDC not following the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP) strategy which aims to encourage a broad range of business development, HDC have signed up to this strategy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The Plan provides for a range of employment uses to meet identified need. BE2 is just one of the policies aimed at delivering a diverse economy.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7030 Mr James Wilson [6297]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

National Planning Policy Framework states that rail freight is preferable and that warehousing and distribution sites should have access to rail. There are other locations close to Magna Park where this is possible

The A5 is already an inadequate road for current traffic volumes. No major upgrading is envisaged

This would lead to a clear oversupply of warehousing. There are already empty units at this location

Ullesthorpe village already experiences HGV traffic which should not be using High Cross Road where there is a 7.5T limit except for loading. this is not policed and will inevitably be worse in future

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Deletion of the proposal to allow 700,000 square metres of Magna Park expansion. There is real risk of a high concentration of low skilled, low paid jobs in the area. These developments and job opportunities could & should be distributed across the county to offer others the job opportunities and reduce real risk of congestion. 100,000 sq metres of development has already been approved and this should be the limit

**Response:**

Although there is no such statement as suggested in the NPPF, National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities. The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7038 Mrs Abigail Wilson [6004]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Research has shown the demand for non-rail freight warehousing is lower than this across the WHOLE county. This indicates an oversupply in a small area. National Policy preferences are to have distribution sites with rail freight access

The local road infrastructure is already under pressure and the A5 is inadequate already. There is no indication of major upgrades. Commuting into the location will increase putting further pressure on the infrastructure

There is no mention of green space preservation between Magna Park and Cotesbach or Ullesthorpe

There are already empty units now without further development

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Removal of the proposal to allow 700,000 sq mts of further development at Magna Park.

Minimum change should be an amendment to allow no more than the already approved 100,000 sq mts

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

Distances between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe/Cotesbach are such that an Area of Separation is not required, with currently no development to separate from these villages. BE2 does not allocate sites for strategic distribution but rather sets a maximum cap on future development to 2031.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7056 SWINFORD Parish Council (Katherine Clarke) [2678]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

\* allocation exceeds forecasted need for non-rail served warehousing and distribution space for the entire LLEP area to 2031

\* no consideration given to planning consents given since 2014 r currently under construction

\* will lead to an over-supply on non-rail served warehousing and distribution space

\* will lead to an influx of workers from outside the district exacerbating local congestion and traffic issues

\* further overloads local villages with commuter traffic

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

In the absence of an upper limit to forecast demand, a number of reasonable options for different scales and locations of growth have been tested. The evidence suggests that there is a case for Harborough District to continue contributing towards meeting the future needs of the sector. The transport and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound. Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of local employment opportunities, traffic congestion, and commuting.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7083 Zoe Ridley [5242]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

700,000 sq mts is opportunist not strategic  
It will lead to an over supply of land for warehousing  
It will not meet the employment needs of Harborough residents as outlined in Key Issue 3  
e.g. greater breadth of employment alternatives, increased wage rates, opportunities for higher skilled residents  
Will increase in-commuting and not reduce out-commuting  
Not on a railhead

**Change To Plan Sought:**

remove from plan

**Response:**

In the absence of an upper limit to forecast demand, a number of reasonable options for different scales and locations of growth have been tested. The evidence suggests that there is a case for Harborough district to continue contributing towards meeting the future non rail-served needs of the sector. In the context of the NPPF a criteria based policy is proposed, which allows for a level of growth which has considered the interrelationship with housing needs, and plans positively for a growing sector. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. It is therefore strategic.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7096 North Kilworth Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [6469]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* allocation exceeds forecasted need for non-rail served warehousing and distribution space for the entire LLEP area to 2031
- \* no consideration given to planning consents given since 2014 r currently under construction
- \* will lead to an over-supply on non-rail served warehousing and distribution space
- \* will lead to an influx of workers from outside the district exacerbating local congestion and traffic issues
- \* further overloads local villages with commuter traffic

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Proposed submission consultation meets regulatory requirements.  
Policy BE2 provides for additional development up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It will have full weight on adoption of the Local Plan.  
HEDNA states the future strategic warehouse requirement for the HMA to 2031 as a minimum figure, split between rail-served and non rail-served, which is not disaggregated to districts. In the absence of an upper limit to forecast demand, a number of reasonable options for different scales and locations of growth have been tested. The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence (SDSS 2014/2016) indicates a strong case for Harborough district to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need.  
Policy BE2 seeks to reduce the amount of in-commuting from outside the District and to increase the use of sustainable modes. The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7107 Mrs Anne Rowlands [5357]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No objective reasons stated for figure of 700,000 square metres additional development for non rail-served strategic storage/distribution.

Exceeds objective forecast demand for non rail-served sites for Leicestershire.

More labour supply in other parts of the county rather than Harborough District.

A5 road infrastructure currently inadequate to carry high volume of HGV traffic.

Will result in increased in-commuting and more commuter-traffic congestion.

700,000 square metres more would lead to over-provision of warehouse floorspace.

Area around Magna Park is unspoilt countryside, so not encouraging effective re-use of land.

Development not at rail-served site, so not consistent with national policy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Local Plan should be modified to delete the proposal for 700,000 square metres of additional development for non rail-served strategic storage and distribution adjacent to the existing Magna Park. Planning permission has already been given for 100,000 square metres of additional storage and distribution warehousing at Magna Park. Any further storage and distribution development should align with the forecast demand for storage and distribution floor area, and should be located in other areas of Leicestershire.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire.

There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. in a sequentially favourable location and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7201 **Mr Hannah Palmer [6485]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

I am writing as a student expecting to graduate in the next 8 months and living within a mile of Magna Park.

I like the local environment and Harborough area, but am looking for a local plan to create a range of jobs & skill types in the area. There are already plenty of relatively low skilled distribution jobs in the area. I am looking for more highly skilled technical jobs so I don't have to move away from the region to work, or contribute to further congestion by commuting along the already congested local roads

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I object to the plan adding major warehousing capacity in an already over-loaded area

**Response:**

Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. Policy BE1 makes allocations for a further 59ha of general employment land across the breadth of B class uses (office, industrial, non-strategic B8) and Policy BE3 seeks to safeguard existing employment areas. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan have been assessed, including Policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7218 **Mr Matthew Palmer [6491]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

I live near Magna Park and use the A5 every week day to get to school. The traffic is always heavy and this can cause lots of delays. Adding more lorry traffic from Magna Park, if it expands, will make this worse. It will cause more pollution for the local environment

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I would like it if Magna Park did not expand anymore

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7222 Mrs Janet McKeag [6426]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not needed  
Not wanted  
Not near a rail freight depot  
will destroy habitat

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not allow development

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7276 Prologis UK Ltd. [5661]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Reasons for objection are summarised as:

- the Council has not taken full account of evidence in the L&LSDSS, particularly that a geographical spread of sites is offered, this scale of development in 1 location is not justified
- the implications of directing a substantial amount of growth to Magna Park go beyond the defined FEMA / HMA and have not been robustly considered
- agreement has not been reached within the Leicestershire Planning Authorities, County Council, LEP that Magna Park is the correct location for this scale of development
- the policy has the potential to; impact negatively on the operation of the country's leading SFRI (DIRFT), deter investment & implementation of the DCO approved NSIP project (DIRFT III) and impact negatively on the delivery of national planning policy
- the policy has the potential to undermine modal-shift and the associated on-going educational process
- its highly likely that development at Magna Park will displace demand for units at DIRFT III (non-rail and rail served schemes do not compete on a level playing field) and have implications on labour availability
- the evidence, including the Sustainability Appraisal, is based on pre-determined assumptions to justify approval of planning applications for Magna Park and any alternatives have not been robustly considered
- the MP Employment Growth Sensitivity Study does not justify the scale of allocation at Magna Park, it provides evidence justifying additional housing needed to support growth
- the U-Turn from current Core Strategy policy CS7 is not fully justified by the evidence
- preparation of policy has not taken account of necessary cross-boundary discussions with neighbouring authorities (WNJPU, DDC)

In summary the policy fails to meet the tests of soundness because it:

1. has not take account of cross-boundary discussions with neighbouring authorities,
2. has not justified the amount of strategic B8 needed in Harborough, or that Magna Park is the most reasonable location out of all alternatives.
3. conflicts with the overall aims of the NPPF and NNNPS, to reduce carbon emissions and prioritise sites served by rail.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to address the conflicts identified and ensure that BE2 is sound, it is requested that Harborough Council:

1. Undertakes further consultation with neighbouring authorities as it is clear that the duty to cooperate has not been fulfilled with regards to the justification of the extension to Magna Park. It is clear from comments made by Daventry and North West Leicestershire that they are not convinced that Policy BE2 is effective or justified. Harborough Council has failed to justify delivering such a substantial extension to Magna Park and have not secured agreement with all the relevant authorities. Until this work is done Prologis and RRSLP consider that the plan is unsound and should not proceed.
2. Provides evidence justifying why it is appropriate for the Council to extend Magna Park and justify why it is appropriate for the District to allocate more than double the requirement for non-rail served sites required in Leicestershire as well as delivering in excess of the gross land requirement for strategic B8 development for Leicester and Leicestershire by 2031 in one location.
3. Provides evidence that the Council has robustly fulfilled its duty to cooperate with regards to meeting the concerns of Daventry and North West Leicestershire in terms of allocating in excess of the identified need for the whole of Leicester and Leicestershire in one location.

**Response:**

The policies in the Local Plan are based on an up-to-date and proportionate evidence base including that which informs policy BE2. Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. in a sequentially favourable location and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities. The Duty to Cooperate Statement details actions and outcomes undertaken throughout plan preparation to discharge this statutory obligation, and the Plan is considered sound.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7278

**Miss A Tiktin [6043]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This proposal does not adhere to national policy and it's proposed location does not aid the local or regional economy; as well as having a dangerous impact on the local community and environment. It therefore completely fails to fulfill its own objectives.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

To remove this proposed unnecessary and overwhelmingly detrimental suggestion from the Plan.

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual polices, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other. NPPF paragraph 31 merely states that neighbouring authorities should work together to develop strategies to provide infrastructure to support development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges. It does not exclude non rail-served facilities. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

Policy BE2 (2) (b) addresses the relationship with DIRFT.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7295 Ms Julie Fairgrievies [6143]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The effect of the expansion of Magna Park has serious issues associated with it (increased traffic, pollution, light pollution, loss of habitat) which are being ignored.

Extensive objection to policy, not democratic.

Proposal doesn't follow due process and evidence is biased. No rail-head, will encourage commuting and other locations better placed to meet need e.g. DIRFT.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposal to increase the size of Magna Park be deleted from the Plan.

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other. NPPF paragraph 31 merely states that neighbouring authorities should work together to develop strategies to provide infrastructure to support development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges. It does not exclude non rail-served facilities. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

Policy BE2 (2) (b) addresses the relationship with DIRFT.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7344 Mrs Jennifer Toone [6083]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

More heavy traffic, more pollution, definite loss of wildlife due to habitat loss.

NO THANK YOU - ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7348 Mr Richard Toone [6084]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Further development at Magna Park would increase the level of pollution and traffic level more and diminish the quality of life of the local population. The threat to wildlife in the area would be catastrophic.

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound. The Local Plan contains general development, green infrastructure, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development, including Policy GI5 on biodiversity.

Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable environmental impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour operations' only. A minor modification is needed to read:

'f. ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not....'

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7358 Mr Ray Middlemas [5866]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Magna Park employs less people per sq mt than a chip shop .

The roads are already dangerous.

No demand for warehousing.

What jobs are created is at a massive cost to our countryside.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No further expansion of Magna Park is needed.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7366 Mrs D J Nichol [6016]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

700,000 sq mtrs of new warehousing is excessive. Magna Park has increased traffic flow in the Lutterworth area. Extra huge warehouses likely to lead to excessive traffic congestion on the A5 and M1 junction link.

Expansion would bring more jobs, but there is virtually no unemployment in the area. New jobs are most likely to be filled by people commuting from the Leicester city fringes, which will increase traffic. Some of this space could provide a medium size housing estate, suitable for existing Magna Park workers would then not have to travel across Lutterworth town to commute to work.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Limited expansion of Magna Park's existing warehouse space. A medium size housing estate could be built to support existing Magna Park workers, this could be located on land allocated for warehouse expansion in the Harborough Plan.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the district, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the district and wider labour market. The local plan approach includes additional housing needed to support growth at Magna Park to align the housing and economic strategy.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7373 Mr Ian Germon [6027]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Plan includes 700,000 square meters expansion at Magna Park. Given the impact this will have on air quality and traffic congestion in the Lutterworth area, this is totally unacceptable.

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7377 Mr Peter Osborn [6018]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I object to a further expansion of Magna Park which does not comply with the Local Plan for the area.

\* 100,000 sq mtr has already been granted.

\* The current proposal for 700,000 sq mtr would allow the approval of a further 2 outstanding applications for expansion of the site. Why is there a need for further expansion when there is another planned around the M69/A5 junction with a rail link.

Why increase the commuter traffic of low paid workers from outside the area when unemployment in Harborough and particularly Lutterworth is as low as 2%

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Expansion of Magna Park is NOT necessary.

**Response:**

The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Local Development Plan Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011) which pre-dates the NPPF and is out of date. The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 allows for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. And sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution. Any planning permission for strategic distribution on sites forming an extension to Magna Park during the plan period (2011-31) form part of the 700,000sq.m. allowed for in BE2.2.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7394

**Mrs Avril Tunstall [4922]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

- \* Opportunistic proposal - not geared to meeting local employment needs
- \* Amount of land exceeds county's demand for warehousing - create oversupply, deprives jobs elsewhere
- \* Unsuitable site for more warehouses - very low local unemployment, unlikelihood of filling job vacancies
- \* Won't increase employment alternative breadths, or meet local employment needs,- skilled work needed
- \* Fails to reduce out- commuting, but increases in-commuting
- \* Area lacks necessary highway infrastructure - A5 already inadequate
- \* Magna Park has no rail head - NPPF preferred option
- \* Breaches NPPF by increasing air pollution in air quality management area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan says that permitting expansion at Magna Park relies on it increasing job opportunities for local residents; not leading to road congestion, (especially on the A5); and its 24 hour operation not having an unacceptable impact on the environment. As these criteria are currently not met, and it is very unlikely that they will be in the future, then this clause should be excluded from the local plan. The clause "there will be no further major expansion of Magna Park" should be added.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire.

There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. in a sequentially favourable location and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution.

National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7434 Nicholas Jenkins [4902]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

700,000 sq mtr is overstated as 100,000sq mtr has already been approved.

Not a railhead.

This is opportunistic, driven by potential income to be received, political, oversupply of warehousing land needed. The need for the whole county is proposed here & not spread across the county.

It is not increase wage rates (more likely keep them low). Will not create breadth of employment opportunities. Will not produce more opportunities for Harborough's higher skilled.

Will create more in-commuting & not reduce out-commuting.

Highway & local road infrastructure is already insufficient and no upgrade is planned before 2030.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Local Plan should be modified in order that some of the required space is spread over the county. It should not include 700,000 sq mtr at Magna Park.

100,000 sq mtr has already been approved at Magna Park. The remaining space should give others in the county to benefit from employment close to their homes to reduce county wide commuting & pollution.

There would be no major/dangerous concentration of jobs in one locality nor major loss of countryside amenity, agricultural land, congestion, increased pollution - all in one small area. This plan will in effect (bar a couple of fields) join Lutterworth, Bitteswell, Bittesby, Ullesthorpe & Claybrooke Parva.

The 2015 Local Plan consultation offered three options for the expansion of Magna Park. Our objection to no fourth option of "Nil" was dismissed. The options were:

Option A - 100,000 sq mt.    Option B - 279,000 sq mt    Option C - 779,000 sq mt

Cont/ on separate Word doc.

Page 4 Cont/d

'Coincidentally' these options were the sum of three planning applications at the time to expand Magna Park. Sham democracy again? Only giving us options that give Harborough the answer they had already decided upon?

The first application/option had already been granted. 700,000 sq mtr in effect allowing the approval of the two outstanding applications due to be considered in November 2017. This is too close to the end of the Consultation period and long before the Local Plan is accepted.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7450 Mr Michael Lenihan [5268]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The effect of the expansion of Magna Park has serious issues associated with it which are being ignored.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposal to increase the size of Magna Park be deleted from the Plan.

**Response:**

Noted. The issues are not identified.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7455 Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council (Ms Rachel Dexter) [6520]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

H&BBC have concerns about the level of employment growth proposed at Lutterworth, and the findings of the Magna Park Employment Sensitivity Study.

H&BBC are not supportive of BE2 because it would:

- \* Increase the levels of out commuting from the Borough
- \* Potentially limit future employment growth within other Leicester and Leicestershire HMA Districts, particularly Hinckley and Bosworth
- \* Increase the saturation of Strategic Distribution in one area
- \* Increase pressure on the A5 and the junction at the M69

If objections are not sustained, proposals under BE2.2 should contribute to the A5 Expressway and provide improvements to the A5.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. The Local Plan approach includes additional housing needed to support growth at Magna Park to align the housing and economic strategy therein. This is sufficient to allow for a potential improvement in the district level of self-containment. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Infrastructure contributions are covered by Policy IN1 and IN2 (1).

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7473 Mr Robert Ogden [6505]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

General concerns and particular concerns re traveller sites (Policy H6) and Magna Park (Policy BE2)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See above

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7474 Mr Peter Bailey [6019]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The A4303, A426, and the A5 are already very congested as they connect with main routes from and to the M6 (especially to and from the North). The development of Magna Park and DIRFT (together with the latter's new town development) will further increase the strain on these routes. In my opinion, the developments planned should not go-ahead without the infrastructural problems of the A426, A4303 and A5 being solved.

**Response:**

Specific criteria within Policy BE2 (2) set out requirements in respect of traffic congestion. The local plan, read as a whole, also contains general development, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development.

The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7545 Mrs Susan Walker [6354]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The effect of an expansion of Magna Park comes with serious issues with it, which are being ignored.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposed plan to Magna Park must be deleted from the plan.

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the Plan and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7592 Messers Herbert [6535]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Objections are made to SS1 "The spatial strategy", Policy H1 "Provision of new housing, Policy BE1 "Provision of new business development" and Policy BE2 "Strategic distribution" insofar as the draft Plan not is not:

- \* Positively Prepared as it fails to meet objectively assessed development needs and infrastructure requirements;
- \* Justified in that the plan is not based on the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives;
- \* Effective in that the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- \* Consistent with national policy as the plan does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF.

The landowners object to the failure of the Council to recognise the potential to:

- \* Identify land within Whetstone Pastures as a future logistics park; and more over
- \* Recognise the ability of land within Whetstone Pastures to deliver a new Garden Village as part of a large strategic allocation extending over the administrative boundaries of both Blaby and Harborough.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to make the Plan sound it is submitted that the following modifications are made:

- \* SS1 - The Spatial Strategy amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future housing and logistics needs for the Harborough District during the period 2011 to 2031;
- \* Policy H1 - Provision for new housing similarly amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future housing needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031;
- \* Policy BE1 - Provision of new business development similarly amended to recognise the potential of a new Garden Village at Whetstone Pastures to meet future logistics needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031; and
- \* Policy BE2 - Strategic Distribution to be amended to make provision for future logistics needs for the Harborough District within the period 2011 to 2031.

The precise wording of any changes should be carefully considered through cross-party working with Blaby to recognise, not only the cross-boundary nature of the Garden Village but also, that the majority of the land needed to deliver the Garden Village falls within Blaby.

**Response:**

The proposal and associated infrastructure was insufficiently advanced to be included in the Local Plan. The site does not meet the sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended in the SDSS (2014) and SDSS Update (2016) in that it does not form an extension to an existing strategic distribution site.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6453 Mrs Kathleen Rowell [4871]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I support this statement but question it's true worth if the speculative Magna Park expansion of 700,000 sq Mts is allowed, clearly it would be worthless.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete this proposal as it is at odds with criteria 2e of policy GD7 Green Wedges.

**Response:**

Noted. There is no Green Wedge in the vicinity of Magna Park.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7255 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

LCC supports the approach taken to strategic storage and distribution at Magna Park, informed by recent evidence commissioned by HDC. It supports additional strategic distribution proposals needing to meet the six criteria, which sets a limit of 700,000 sqm. for non-rail-served strategic B8 use in the Plan period.

Whilst recognising the desire to concentrate strategic distribution at Magna Park, the proposal in Policy BE2.2 to allocate sites capable of delivering units of at least 9,000 sqm is seen as logical, as is the desire to stimulate economic growth by delivering sites that meet regional and sub-regional demand.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7333 IDI Gazeley [168]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The policy is less ambitious than it should be. Magna Park is unique and the prospect of growth presents an opportunity promote it as the centre of a logistics cluster.

The value that the logistics cluster is able to return is very significantly increased by the addition of complementary uses. With this in mind Gazeley suggest amendments and additions to policy BE2. We also request that a site allocation be made.

The additional criteria proposed are covered by generic policies elsewhere in the Plan. However, the scale and nature of BE2 development merits a more specific set of criteria.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend BE2.2e to read: mitigate significant adverse impacts on the strategic and local road network to achieve nil detriment or better

Delete BE2.2 criterion f.

Add the following 10 additional criterion to BE2.2;

- include measures to encourage car-sharing, cycling and sustainable alternatives to private car use;
- include measures for regular community liaison;
- include measures for publicly accessible green infrastructure;
- optimise the bio-diversity of the site and its capacity to sequester greenhouse gases;
- make use of optimal technologies for the construction of buildings and their operation to reduce resource consumption and optimise the use of renewable energy sources;
- achieve the highest practicable environmental standards for buildings;
- adopt a design approach to the buildings, materials and lighting to minimise the visibility of the buildings during the day and at night time;
- site buildings and service infrastructure to respect the character of the landscape;
- site gatehouses, yards and HGV circulation routes so that visual intrusion and noise beyond the site is minimised; and
- mitigate landscape and visual impacts using, in particular, tree planting and other species that will optimise carbon sequestration.

**Response:**

Noted. The Local Plan is intended to be read as a whole, duplication between policies has been avoided. Policy BE2(2)e in combination with policy IN2 are intended to mitigate the effects of additional development on the transport network. Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable landscape and environmental impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour operations' only. A modification is needed as follows:

'f. ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not...'

The setting of an upper limit within the policy allows for flexibility in responding to market demand.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7379 Kay Wilson [4896]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

- \* No requirement for further development at Magna Park
- \* Requirement for railhead linked development not met at Magna Park
- \* Proposal is linked to opportunity and is not a strategic solution
- \* Does not link to employment requirements for Harborough District - i.e. more high skilled jobs at increased wage rates
- \* Will lead to increased commuting leading to
- \* Increased traffic on roads that are already recognised as inadequate
- \* Will bring no benefit to local residents

**Change To Plan Sought:**

During the consultation period consideration was given to 3 options for development at Magna Park. Option A, the smallest proposal, was for an increase of 100,000m2, which correlates to an application which has already been approved. The Local Plan should be amended to state there should be no further expansion of Magna Park beyond the 100,000m2 already approved. This would prevent an increase in traffic congestion leading in turn to reduction in air quality and noise pollution, and also prevent a loss of valuable farm land and historic sites.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5517 Mr Neville Karai [6022]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I am concerned about the current levels of traffic, road infrastructure, pollution and safety in the local region that will end up backing onto the proposed development. The current roads between villages that surround the area are already becoming 'rat runs' for traffic at high speed in rural areas. The areas are badly lit and pedestrian and wildlife is not readily seen and footpaths are in short supply.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A major upgrade would be required of the A5 to be dual carriageway minimum in the area and truck weight restrictions would need to be in place for all inter village traffic.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of; traffic congestion. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development.

---



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5539 dr elaine Carter [4431]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed 2 additional spaces adjoining onto Magna Park will be too big for the local infrastructure, making a massive impact on local traffic and highways

**Change To Plan Sought:**

the additional site space should be smaller, and better provision made for additional traffic

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5582 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Council has not reversed its previous claim that there are more suitable sites elsewhere. It has ignored recent completions and commitments which meet minimum forecast need, as pointed out in the AECOM Sustainability Appraisal 2017, as well as developments only a very few miles away in another county.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Withdraw this statement. The policy, if approved will lead inexorably to an over-supply of warehousing/ distribution centres in the county and wider region.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum requirement for strategic distribution in Leicester and Leicestershire. There is strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5991 Mr Christopher Sharpe [6185]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is not effective as it would lead to an oversupply of warehousing in the area as there have been millions of square meters agreed within this area over the past years,

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend the proposed 700,000 sq meters to a more effective size of under 300,000 sq meters

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6358 Cotesbach Parish Council (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6283]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no evidence of the process that the call for sites has lead to the figures outlined here and in the suggested location. It has not been a transparent process since the consultation in 2015 and the location and allocation is clearly based on 2 existing applications that are due for decision before this Local Plan will be approved.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The location at magna park cannot be specified, it is purely based on 2 existing applications. Call for sites needs to be made transparent.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. in a sequentially favourable location and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution. The policy will have full weight on adoption of the Local Plan.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6463 Mrs Christine Brookes [6342]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The existing site is big enough to meet local warehousing needs. There are empty units on the existing site and I believe this to be a purely speculative aspect of the plan, constructed to include two outstanding planning applications that have been heavily criticised as too large and surplus to the needs of the Harborough area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Significantly reduce the area designated as an extension to warehouse provision atMagna park.

**Response:**

Policy BE2 provides for additional development up to 700,000sq.m. and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It will have full weight on adoption of the Local Plan.

No specific site is allocated as an extension to Magna Park.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6973 Mr Simon Smith [4996]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The existing Magna Park is a Brownfield site distribution should not be based on adjacent Green field sites just because the Magna park owners have a historic option on the land to purchase at lower historic land values. in conflict with a scheduled ancient monument site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Asume more closely the existing core strategy policy based approved processes and evidence on evidence.

**Response:**

The SELAA (2017) demonstrates that the number of brownfield sites assessed as potentially developable for employment uses within the district is limited. Policy BE2 provides for additional development of up to 700,000sq.m. in a sequentially favourable location and sets out criteria against which planning applications will be considered. It does not allocate land for strategic distribution. Proposals would be considered in accordance with sthe policies of the plan read as a whole, including Policy HC1 on heritage assets.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7071 SWINFORD Parish Council (Katherine Clarke) [2678]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* allocation is fundamentally different from previous consultation documents
- \* there are two outstanding planning applications for warehousing in this area totalling 700,000 sq. m
- \* it is not a strategic allocation but an allocation to accommodate the two outstanding applications
- \* conflicts with the Core Strategy
- \* there are more suitable sites within the region and sub-region to meet forecasted demand

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Proposed submission consultation meets regulatory requirements. The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Local Development Plan Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011). The policies in the LP are based on a proportionate and up-to-date evidence base including that which informs policy BE2. The policy does not allocate a site/s or propose expansion, but will allow additional development subject to certain criteria.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7099 North Kilworth Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [6469]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* allocation is fundamentally different from previous consultation documents
- \* there are two outstanding planning applications for warehousing in this area totalling 700,000 sq. m
- \* it is not a strategic allocation but an allocation to accommodate the two outstanding applications
- \* conflicts with the Core Strategy
- \* there are more suitable sites within the region and sub-region to meet forecast demand

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Proposed submission consultation meets regulatory requirements. The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Local Development Plan Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011). Policy BE2 (2) does not allocate a site/s or propose expansion, but allows for additional development subject to certain criteria. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5453 MS Alison Abraham [5895]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no rail link to Magna park. Dirft at Crick has the rail link and that is already being expanded. We will have too much warehousing in the area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not expand Magna Park

**Response:**

National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. It also acknowledges that rail-served and road based distribution complement each other. NPPF paragraph 31 merely states that neighbouring authorities should work together to develop strategies to provide infrastructure to support development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges. It does not exclude non rail-served facilities. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5583 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Doubling the size of non-rail linked centres such as Magna Park risks undermining nearby SRFIs and conflicts with the government's National Policy Statement for National Networks.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Drop policy BE2

**Response:**

National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6087 Mr Timothy Ottevanger [6003]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

A number of SRFIs already exist, are under construction or being planned within or close to the LLEP area, and another which is not a strategic one. Cheaper non rail-served sites have the potential to undermine the economic viability of such sites because of lower costs. The NPS states the environmental advantages of SRFIs but the plan ignores these.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Withdraw BE2

**Response:**

National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6344 Magna Park is Big Enough (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not Justified - what evidence is within the supporting information to demonstrate that Magna Park expansion will not have an adverse impact on further SRFIs? Prologis at DIRFT III had already objected to 15/01531/OUT on grounds of market saturation risk

**Change To Plan Sought:**

n/a

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6464 Mrs Christine Brookes [6342]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no rail freight facility in the immediate vicinity therefore an increase in road traffic/decrease in rail freight would be inevitable should this extension be permitted.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reconsider extension and look elsewhere for proximity of Rail heads.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

**ReplD** **Representation**

6861 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Cheaper non-rail-linked strategic distribution centres are likely to undermine the viability of nearby existing and future SRFIs because of lower construction costs, and are more environmentally damaging. Policy BE2 is in conflict with the NPS

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The only way to abandon this unachievable condition is to drop Policy BE2 in its entirety.

**Response:**

HEDNA states the future strategic warehouse requirement for the HMA to 2031 as a minimum figure, split between rail-served and non rail-served, which is not disaggregated to districts. The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence (SDSS 2014/2016) indicates a strong case for Harborough district to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need. Criteria BE2.2 b. addresses the potential impact of additional development on SFRIs.

**ReplD** **Representation**

6916 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Impossible to accept that the Magna Park proposal does NOT have an adverse effect on the DIRFT railhead development

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reject the Magna Park development

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criterion b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

**ReplD** **Representation**

6946 Mr Simon Smith [4996]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Daventry district council have indicated that excessive over development and over supply of distribution space in the area, (magna park or other distribution sites) will have an adverse effect commercial viability at DIRFT and DIRFT 2 distribution centre which has the governments preferred SRFI rail served distribution. and is located also joining the motorway for HGV Movements.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

to include reference to and take account of Daventry district councils representation under the duty to co operate.

**Response:**

Noted. Criteria BE2.2 b. acknowledges this issue.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6998 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* DIRFT, a large SFRI site is located a few miles along the A5
- \* no evidence that demonstrates Magna Park allocation will not have an adverse effect on further SFRIs, particularly DIRFT
- \* NPS strongly supports SFRIs
- \* no rail freight assets at Magna Park
- \* further SFRI planned for the M69/A5 junction
- \* conflicts with NPPF

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence indicates a strong case for Harborough district to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need. National policy supports a modal shift for freight traffic towards rail based distribution where appropriate. Policy BE2.2 criteria b. is included to ensure that the any additional development has no adverse effect on the delivery of existing or further Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) within or serving the HMA and neighbouring authorities.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7064 SWINFORD Parish Council (Katherine Clarke) [2678]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* large SFRI, DIRFT, a few miles southbound along the A5
- \* no evidence that the Magna Park allocation will not have an adverse impact on further SFRIs
- \* over-saturation of the area
- \* no rail freight assets at Magna Park
- \* NPS strongly support SFRIs
- \* new SFRI planned around the M69 / A5 junction
- \* conflicts with paragraph 31 of the NPPF

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

HEDNA states the future strategic warehouse requirement for the HMA to 2031 as a minimum figure, split between rail-served and non rail-served, which is not disaggregated to districts. The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence (SDSS 2014/2016) indicates a strong case for Harborough district to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need. Criteria BE2.2 b. addresses the potential impact of additional development on SFRI's. There is no evidence that the maximum scale of development (there is no allocation) will have an impact on SFRIs; this is the appropriate test. There is no conflict with paragraph 31 of the NPPF which merely encourages joint working on large scale infrastructure such as SFRIs. It does not exclude road-only provision.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7267 **dbymmetry [5502]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

May be difficult for a developer to demonstrate, because:

- proving a negative would be onerous, especially if a competing developer claimed that consent would impact upon ability and deliverability of another site. Planning system doesn't exist to prevent competition.
- a developer has to address other potential SRFIs which may be at various stages in the planning process and may not secure a grant of planning permission.
- reference to SRFIs 'serving' other neighbouring authorities and Leicestershire could result in an extensive analysis of potential impact.

Purpose of this Criterion would be clarified if reworded, see change to Plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend criteria to read 'Support or at least no substantial impact upon the delivery of committed SRFIs located within Leicestershire and the neighbouring authorities.'

**Response:**

SFRI's have a long development pipeline. The explanatory text at para. 6.3.2 lists SFRI's to be considered, and para 6.3.11 states that the scope of Environmental and Economic Impacts Assessments for additional development is to be agreed with the LPA at the outset. While planning should not prevent competition between uses of the same type, it can discriminate between types of uses with different planning / sustainability merits.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5410 **Mr John Whitehead [5943]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

My two points are:

- (1) Lutterworth enjoys low unemployment and already seems to attract many workers from outside of Town, including most employees at Magna Park, therefore additional employment will merely increase commuting into Town
- (2) If the warehouses are staffed by robots rather than humans (if not now but in the future), then potential employment would be rather less than quoted, although lorry numbers would be unaffected.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Further enlargement of Magna Park should be discouraged.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market, providing for a range of jobs/skills. Policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5454 MS Alison Abraham [5895]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is little unemployment in the area currently. A lot of the current workforce commute into the area adding to the chaos on the A5 and other local roads. Warehouse work does not appeal to many of the younger generation who have degrees and feel they should be working in the field of expertise.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not expand Magna Park

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the District, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5484 Mr Trevor Robinson [5986]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The addition of 10000 extra low skill jobs in the area will cause massive increases in commuter traffic particularly through local villages as up to 60 % of existing workers already live outside the Harborough area. The employment rate in the area is already very high and the implication that this will create high skilled jobs through training and apprenticeships is a fallacy. The A5 trunk road is inadequate for the projected traffic increase.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Donot allow any further expansion of the Magna Park sites

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the District, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

The transport impacts effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5529 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The allocation is contrary to Key Objective 3 as it will not provide employment 'for Harborough's higher skilled residents'.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. However, growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5531 **MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The allocation is contrary to Objective 2 (p17) and Policy BE2.2.c as it will not 'create new jobs that meet local employment needs' or 'increase employment opportunities for local residents'. This is because in the whole of Harborough District there were only 1200 people registered unemployment from April 2016 - March 2017 (<https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157143/report.aspx#tabempunemp>) a rate of 2.6%, well below 4.2% for the East Midlands and 4.7% nationally.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the District, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5562 **Mr Philip Ashton [6052]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

No Evidence of the need in Lutterworth for this type of employment so will add to the in commuting on already inadequate road infrastructure.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scale back the planned expansion

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. Policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5584 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There are too few unemployed in the district to fill more than marginally any growth in jobs at Magna Park. The shortfall will be met by in-commuting by private car (as now) with consequent effects on congestion and air quality.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Again, policy BE2 should be abandoned

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the district, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the district and wider labour market.

Policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5594 Mr Ian Robertson [5573]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* It will not create a greater breadth of employment opportunities.
- \* It will not lead to opportunities for local skilled workers to save out commuting.
- \* Positions will be filled by those having to commute into Magna Park.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Further research is required to identify how any expansion of Magna Park, or development elsewhere, could provide an environment that generates higher skilled, higher knowledge-based employment such as the creation of a science and technology park to attract hi tech and innovative businesses.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range. Policy BE2 seeks to reduce the amount of in-commuting from outside the District and to increase the use of sustainable modes.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5767 Claybrooke Parva Parish Council (mr ian robertson) [6117]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* It will not create a greater breadth of employment opportunities.
- \* It will not lead to opportunities for local skilled workers to save out commuting.
- \* Positions will be filled by those having to commute into Magna Park.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Further research is required to identify how any expansion of Magna Park, or development elsewhere, could provide an environment that generates higher skilled, higher knowledge-based employment such as the creation of a science and technology park to attract hi tech and innovative businesses.

**Response:**

Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. Policy BE1 makes allocations for a further 59ha of general employment land across the breadth of B class uses (office, industrial, non-strategic B8) and Policy BE3 seeks to safeguard existing employment areas. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5797 Mr A Adcock [3747]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Employment in the area is some of the highest in the country, indeed already over 60% of the Magna Park workforce already commute in from outside the HDC area. The current proposals predict an increase in workforce of over 6,000 largely low skilled jobs. I object strongly to the expansion of Magna Park by 700,00 sq mts as it would not improve local employment and would have a serious impact on the local transport system, particularly the A5 which we understand is not scheduled for improvement until 2030 at least.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

As with all development the infrastructure improvements MUST be at least conditional of the planning approval, and ideally carried out BEFORE the development takes place.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market, providing for a range of jobs/skills. However, growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5861 Mr David Jones [4742]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Harborough district has virtually full employment .Unemployment rate is approx 1.0% - one of the lowest in the. UK.

Consequently such development merely attracts workers from out of district up to 40 miles away substantially increasing traffic along major and local roads

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The wording of this clause to be amended to read ' it can be clearly demonstrated is that it will increase employment opportunities for local residents including training and apprenticeships '

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5978 Mr J R Deacon [5980]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Further expansion of Magna Park would not help employment within the area as unemployment is at an all time low. The vast majority of employees would be from outlying areas which would result in increased traffic flow and pollution.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No further expansion of Magna Park.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2.2 criterion c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6034 Sally Sharpe [6208]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As a professional recently looking for work there was no high skilled, high paid jobs advertised within Magna Park most of the jobs where low skilled, low paid and temporary with gaps to fill these positions. Increasing the amount of capacity would only increase the amount of low skilled, low paid and temporary jobs and not increase the employment opportunities creating a greater gap and need to recruit from outside of the community

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend the local plan to target industries more suited to high skilled, high paid jobs such as IT or engineering

**Response:**

Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range. Previous evidence has explored employment and skills within the sector, and examined common misconceptions. Although operatives and elementary positions account for a higher proportion of jobs across the sector, compared to the whole economy, the sector does provide jobs across all occupational groupings appropriate to skill levels across the qualification spectrum.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6116 Mrs Shiela Carlton [4847]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This cannot increase employment opportunities for local residents as:

1. there is very low unemployment in the area (less than 1%)
2. about 75% of storage and distribution jobs offered will continue to be lower-skilled low-paid, on insecure contracts with limited conditions
3. over 53% of local residents are already high-skilled and qualified, or in the process of achieving higher skills.

Expanded site employment of 19,200 will be wrong sort of jobs to recruit local residents and will only result in pulling in more commuting workers from a wider area..Already, most workers commute 10 miles+ to work at Magna Park.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Smaller specialist enterprises with higher paid jobs.

**Response:**

Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. Policy BE1 makes allocations for a further 59ha of general employment land across the breadth of B class uses (office, industrial, non-strategic B8) and Policy BE3 seeks to safeguard existing employment areas. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6167 Mrs Valerie Deacon [6122]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Harborough and surrounding districts do not have an unemployment problem. Therefore employees would travel in from further afield, therefore exacerbating the traffic problems on an already congested infrastructure.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No further expansion of Magna Park.

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the district, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the district and wider labour market.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6205 Mr Timothy Ottevanger [6003]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Local Plan provides a mismatch between the availability of labour (i.e. job seekers) in the district and future job vacancies created by policy B2. It will encourage more unregulated car travel over longer distances to what is a rural location.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Drop policy BE2. HDC has not reversed its position that there are more suitable sites elsewhere, closer to where jobs are needed and where access is easier.

**Response:**

The evidence suggests that there is a case for Harborough District to continue contributing towards meeting the future needs of the sector. Providing more jobs and housing, including in locations accessible to Magna Park, cannot in itself prevent commuting but over time it provides housing and employment choices which could affect commuting patterns into and out of the District.

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6345 Magna Park is Big Enough (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not justified - if the Local Plan's aim is to enhance the skilled worker based within HDC, Magna Park is not necessarily going to achieve this based on the profile of logistics workers alone. Less than 20% are managerial, and 74% are "essential / basic" jobs (National Skills Survey referenced in IDI Gazeley 15/01531/OUT ADDITIONAL INFO -UPDATE TO ES CH5 - SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS 731431). This does not align with the profile of employment in Leicestershire, with 53% of employment at managerial or professional level (LLEP SDSS 2016).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

n/a

**Response:**

Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. Policy BE1 makes allocations for a further 59ha of general employment land across the breadth of B class uses (office, industrial, non-strategic B8) and Policy BE3 seeks to safeguard existing employment areas. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

**ReplID** **Representation**

6365 Ian Lewis [4810]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The unemployment rate is currently very low in Lutterworth, Magna Park currently struggle to recruit staff. Lutterworth is an area with too much low skill and low age jobs available.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Lutterworth needs high skilled / waged jobs

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the District, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. In combination the Local Plan's Business and Employment policies will create jobs across the skill range.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

6391 Mr Rob Harrop [6085]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is almost full employment in the area, therefore any newly created jobs will need to be filled for outside the area. In addition the jobs by nature will be low-skilled with very little opportunity for apprenticeships of the right type to encourage higher paid, higher skilled employment.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Any future development in the area needs to encourage higher skilled and more knowledge-based organisations to provide the right type of opportunities that will encourage local young people to aspire to higher levels of education that these opportunities require and can provide.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. Policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough. Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

6400 Mrs Carole Allen [6291]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Employment opportunities for residents in the surrounding villages will be limited as the positions available will be primarily be low skilled leading to further congestion on the roads by those having to commute into Magna Park.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Avoid traffic congestion and non compliant levels or air pollution.

**Response:**

Although operatives and elementary positions account for a higher proportion of jobs across the sector, compared to the whole economy, the sector does provide jobs across all occupational groupings appropriate to skill levels across the qualification spectrum.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6465 Mrs Christine Brookes [6342]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Lutterworth/Harborough area already has full employment and the majority of current magna park employees are resident outside the Lutterworth/Harborough district.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reconsider such a large extension to the same site and concentrate on creating sustainable employment opportunities within local communities in individual towns/villages.

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the district, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6841 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It's far more intelligent to build warehouses nearer to those people who would actually take up the new jobs being created.

The area around Magna Park has extremely low unemployment - rates of < 0.4%.

The thousands of new jobs being promised by the Magna Park expansion plans would therefore have to be filled by people who live well outside of the area, forcing them to having lengthy commutes into the Lutterworth area; generating even more traffic congestion & pollution around Magna Park.

These needlessly lengthy commutes can only add to the dreadful air quality in and around Lutterworth.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There should be no more material expansion of Magna Park. It should not be permitted.

The local road infrastructure is inadequate and it cannot cope with the existing traffic volumes.

The plan to massively expand Magna Park will inevitably generate thousands more HGVS & commuter car journeys in and around the Lutterworth area.

The children living in and around Lutterworth should not be condemned to breathe even more traffic polluted air, stunting their growth and damaging their future health prospects.

We have to live here!!

Please think again HDC.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. Policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan have been assessed, including Policy BE2, and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6845 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plans to substantially expand Magna Park would NOT increase employment opportunities for local residents.

Unemployment levels in and around the Lutterworth area are extremely low, less than 0.4%.

The wage rates for most of the promised new jobs will be relatively low.

Those who would, in actuality, take up these promised new jobs would live elsewhere condemning them to lengthy commutes.

Why not build the warehouses nearer to areas of higher unemployment where the locals would welcome them?

Surely, that's only common sense!

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build these massive new warehouses nearer to those people who would take up and value these new job opportunities, including training and Apprenticeships.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. Policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6863 Mr Allan Whittaker [6064]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The local area will not support Magna Park expansion as the local population is technically fully employed

The industry generally support low level warehouse or admin jobs with a high lever of agency worker. This type of further employment adds no value to the local area.

Workers increasingly come from further afield increasing traffic congestion further

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Distribution centres should be located where local populations need the employment to suit local or national distribution needs

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the Dstrict and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. Policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6919 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No evidence has been put forward to support the suggestion that 10,000 jobs will be created by the Magna Park development. These figures have not been questioned nor tested.

More to the point, these jobs will be very largely unskilled, and in direct contradiction of HDC's declared determination of improving the quality of jobs in the District.

Such a volume of low skilled - and therefore low-paid - workers will have to be housed by a far more sweeping use of Affordable housing than the Plan has indicated, otherwise commuting to Magna Park will be even more extensive.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reject the Magna Park development

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the Local Plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range. The policy seeks to increase employment opportunities for local residents and increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within the District.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6960 Mr Simon Smith [4996]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No evidence for a high percentage of low skilled distribution jobs within HDC

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Alter include Majority middle to high skilled employment opportunities

**Response:**

Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

Growth at Magna Park is only part of the provisions of the local plan. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

7000 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* unemployment in the area is very low
- \* majority of workforce would have to be recruited from outside the District
- \* 74% of jobs created will be 'essential/basic'
- \* Key Issue 3 of the Local Plan highlights the requirement for more opportunities for 'higher skilled' residents in the District
- \* Objective 2 of the Local Plan highlights the need to reduce out-commuting, this will not be met by this allocation
- \* workforce will commute from areas where unemployment is higher and house prices are lower

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the district, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the district and wider labour market.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

7076 SWINFORD Parish Council (Katherine Clarke) [2678]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* unemployment in the area is very low
- \* the majority of the workforce required for an allocation of this size would have to be recruited from outside the district
- \* supporting documents for application 15/01531/OUT states 74% of the employment opportunities will be for essential / basic jobs
- \* Key Issue 3 of the Local Plan states there is a requirement for opportunities higher skilled residents in the district
- \* the people filling the workforce requirements will commute from areas where unemployment is higher and house prices are lower

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the district, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. Providing more jobs and housing, including in locations accessible to Magna Park, cannot in itself prevent commuting but over time it provides housing and employment choices which could affect commuting patterns into and out of the district. Policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7102 North Kilworth Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [6469]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* large SFRI, DIRFT, a few miles southbound along the A5
- \* no evidence that the Magna Park allocation will not have an adverse impact on further SFRIs
- \* over-saturation of the area
- \* no rail freight assets at Magna Park
- \* NPS strongly support SFRIs
- \* new SFRI planned around the M69 / A5 junction
- \* conflicts with paragraph 31 of the NPPF

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

HEDNA states the future strategic warehouse requirement for the HMA to 2031 as a minimum figure, split between rail-served and non rail-served, which is not disaggregated to districts. The sequential approach and site selection criteria recommended by the evidence (SDSS 2014/2016) indicates a strong case for Harborough district to continue to make a contribution towards meeting future non rail-served need.

Criteria BE2.2 b. addresses the potential impact of additional development on SFRIs. There is no evidence that the maximum scale of development (there is no allocation) will have an impact on SFRIs; this is the appropriate test. There is no conflict with paragraph 31 of the NPPF which merely encourages joint working on large scale infrastructure such as SFRIs. It does not exclude road-only provision.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7103 North Kilworth Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [6469]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* unemployment in the area is very low
- \* the majority of the workforce required for an allocation of this size would have to be recruited from outside the district
- \* supporting documents for application 15/01531/OUT states 74% of the employment opportunities will be for essential / basic jobs
- \* Key Issue 3 of the Local Plan states there is a requirement for opportunities higher skilled residents in the district
- \* the people filling the workforce requirements will commute from areas where unemployment is higher and house prices are lower

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. But, policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. also state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills.

---

**RepID Representation**

5585 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

see comment on previous section

**Change To Plan Sought:**

as above

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the district, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the district and wider labour market.

Policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough.

---

**RepID Representation**

5814 Mr Paul Longhorn [6098]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The level of unemployment in this part of the district is low with a large part of the staff at the current Magna Park coming from outside the district. This development will therefore raise the level of commuters coming from outside the district. The extra jobs, said to be 10000, will only make matters worse even with the extra 1500 houses in Lutterworth.

This therefore fails in the Plans' aim to increase the level of 'in-commuting' within the district

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reject the Magna Park application

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. Policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough. The objectives of the Local Plan are the guiding principles for the policies set out in the plan which should be read as a whole. In combination they represent a reasonable and sustainable spatial strategy for development to 2031, which is considered sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6118 Mrs Shiela Carlton [4847]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Plan proposes that the present 19% of Magna Park workforce living within Harborough postcodes should be increased to 25%, but gives no indication of supporting evidence of need or means of achieving this. It would require about 5000 workers instead of present 1800 to fulfil this objective and thus is not feasible, especially when over 50% of local residents currently fill managerial, professional and associated support roles, of which are estimated to comprise only 24% of current site jobs, at best.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No expansion - concentrate on upgrading present workforce via training and better job terms & conditions. Plus aim to develop higher-value-added enterprises with better quality employment opportunities.

**Response:**

Policy BE2(2) allows additional development up to 700,000 sq. m. subject to certain criteria.

Development up to 700,000sq.m. is estimated to create an additional 9,700 net jobs for Harborough and 4,300 for Leicester & Leicestershire up to 2031. Para 5.1.4 of the Local Plan sets out how the impact of Policy BE2 on housing requirements has been assessed and addressed, which is sufficient to allow for a potential improvement in the level of self-containment of the District from 19% to 25%.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6346 Magna Park is Big Enough (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not positively prepared or Justified - there is no evidence to say that an increase in proportion of the workforce will come from Harborough District, with 81% of the existing Magna Park workforce coming from outside LE postcodes ((IDI Gazeley, 15/01531/OUT ADDITIONAL INFO-UPDATE TO ES CH5-SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS 6th JULY 2017). The HEDNA study suggests 79% of Magna Park employees do not live in the Harborough District. The 2017 Sustainability Appraisal suggests that up to 400,000sqm and 700,000sqm could reduce out-commuting but provides no evidence to suggest how or why.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

n/a

**Response:**

Policy BE2(2) allows additional development up to 700,000 sq m subject to certain criteria.

Development up to 700,000sq.m. is estimated to create an additional 9,700 net jobs for Harborough and 4,300 for Leicester & Leicestershire up to 2031. Para 5.1.4 of the Local Plan sets out how the impact of Policy BE2 on housing requirements has been assessed and addressed, which is sufficient to allow for a potential improvement in the level of self-containment of the District from 19% to 25%.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6466 Mrs Christine Brookes [6342]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Most employment opportunities will be for low grade jobs such as warehouse staff/drivers. No attempt would be made to draw in higher salaried jobs or professionals in such a development. This lack of diversity in employment will increase the amount of employees commuting from outside the Harborough district.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reconsider the amount of Warehouse provision in this extension and seek to provide more diverse employment opportunities elsewhere in the district.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills.

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6514 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Even if the workforce is hired in accordance with BE2.2.d there will still be substantial in commuting. We question HDC's ability to ensure compliance with this criteria or take action if breached.

**Response:**

The Policy will be implemented through a Section 106 agreement and monitored through Policy IMR1 and Appendix K.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6847 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The new jobs being created by the plans to massively expand Magna Park would NOT, in actuality, be materially taken up by people who live within the Harborough District, which has extremely low levels of unemployment of < 0.4%.

The majority of people working at the existing Magna Park do NOT reside in this district.

They travel, often long distances, often by car, in to work. Most of these jobs are paying relatively low wages.

This section presumes the new jobs could be taken up by local people. This is an erroneous assumption and it's very far from the truth.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build these warehouses nearer to those who would take up and value these new jobs.

Creating jobs in areas of low unemployment forces more long distance commuting; adding to traffic congestion & increasing air pollution.

Surely, that's only common sense.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs/skills. Criteria in Policy BE2.2 seek to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within the District and increase opportunities for local residents.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6859 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Most of the existing Magna Park workforce commute to and from the site from outside of the Harborough District.

If the massive plans to expand Magna Park are regrettably approved by HDC, the vast majority of the new jobs created will be taken up by people who also live outside the District.

The unemployment rate in the Lutterworth area is extremely low at rates of < 0.4%.

Therefore, this issue is of little relevance.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not materially expand Magna Park.

Build these massive new warehouse nearer to the people that would appreciate the new jobs created rather than unintelligently design a situation whereby the majority of the workforce are forced to commute lengthy distances to and from work for jobs that are mainly relatively poorly paid.

This only results in people on relatively low wages having to spend disproportionately high costs in travelling to and from work because of the lengthy commute distances involved.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the district and wider labour market. Policy BE2.2 criterion c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7002 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* no evidence to support this point
- \* 81% of existing workforce commutes from outside Harborough District postcodes
- \* 9689 extra jobs to be generated however in whole district there were only 1400 registered unemployed from July 16 to June 17
- \* unemployment in the District below East Midland and National average
- \* workforce would have to commute from outside the District
- \* public transport is inadequate
- \* impact on congestion and pollution
- \* local villages used as rat-runs

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Removal of Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the district, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the district and wider labour market. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered sound.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7080 SWINFORD Parish Council (Katherine Clarke) [2678]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* no evidence to support this point
- \* 81% of the existing Magna Park workforce commute from outside Harborough District postcodes
- \* an allocation of this size will generate c. 10,000 jobs, in the whole of the Harborough District from July 16 - June 17 there were only 1,400 people registered as unemployed
- \* unemployment in the area is below the regional and national average
- \* majority of the required workforce would have to commute from outside the district
- \* public transport in the area is inadequate

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the district and wider labour market. Providing more jobs and housing, including in locations accessible to Magna Park, cannot in itself prevent commuting but over time it provides housing and employment choices which could affect commuting patterns into and out of the district. Policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7105 North Kilworth Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [6469]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* no evidence to support this point
- \* 81% of the existing Magna Park workforce commute from outside Harborough District postcodes
- \* an allocation of this size will generate c. 10,000 jobs, in the whole of the Harborough District from July 16 - June 17 there were only 1,400 people registered as unemployed
- \* unemployment in the area is below the regional and national average
- \* majority of the required workforce would have to commute from outside the district
- \* public transport in the area is inadequate

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Providing more jobs and housing, including in locations accessible to Magna Park, cannot in itself prevent commuting but over time it provides housing and employment choices which could affect commuting patterns into and out of the district. Policy BE2.2 criteria c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7268 dbsymmetry [5502]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I believe some wording has been omitted from this Criterion to give effective meaning. I suggest adding the words 'to travel other than by private car' after 'Harborough District'.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend criterion 2d to read: 'include measures to enable an increase in the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough District to travel other than by private car'

**Response:**

The suggested change addresses modal shift amongst those already commuting from Harborough District, not an increase in the total proportion of workers commuting from within Harborough, as required in order to achieve the Local Plan's Objective 2 and described under Key issue 2.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5455 **MS Alison Abraham [5895]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The A5 can hardly cope with the existing traffic. If there is an issue on the M1 or M6 it comes to a standstill and all the local roads and villages suffer as a result.

More traffic is already desinted for the A5 as a result of the Dirft development and the new "village" being created outside of Rugby on the old BT site. It will be intollerable to the local residents - many of whom have already muted moving away if Magna Park gets any bigger.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not expand Magna Park

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of; traffic congestion. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development and infrastructure policies to guide development.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5482 **Mr Barry McHugh [5988]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

If the BE2 extension goes ahead there will certainly be lockdown on many occasions with additional lorry traffic on the A426 and A5 roads in the area. This will cause misery to local business and individuals alike.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I believe the BE2 extension should not go ahead. If there were suitable roads to cater for additional traffic it would be one thing, but in our area we have many single roads. This includes much of the A5 and all of the A426. These roads are incapable of taking the present traffic never mind a substantial increase which will inevitably happen.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of; traffic congestion. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development and infrastructure policies to guide development.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5511 **LUTTERWORTH TOWN COUNCIL Parish Council (Andrew Ellis) [2656]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Severe congestion currently occurs on the M6 Junction 1, Gibbet Island (A5) and the A426 Whittle Island.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

will lead to severe traffic congestion anywhere on the nearby strategic and local road network, particularly the A5, whether within Harborough District or outside; and mitigation will be required

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5532 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Already 75% of Magna Park workforce comes from outside the district. There's insufficient unmet employment need to reduce this figure, thus commuting will increase substantially. Magna Park Growth Sensitivity Survey concludes the allocation of 700000m<sup>2</sup> extra warehousing will generate 9689 extra jobs. Of these 6488 commuting outside Harborough District, whilst changing the assumptions used will see 7962 extra commuters from beyond district boundaries. Even if workforce is hired in accordance with policy BE2.2.d, there will still be a substantial increase in commuting. We also question HDC's ability to ensure compliance with this policy or to take action if it's breached.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Strategic distribution provides for a range of jobs / skills. In combination the Business and Employment policies of the plan will create jobs across the skill range. The Policy will be monitored in accordance with Policy IMR1 and Appendix K.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5533 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Along with allocations of housing land in policy L1, employment land in policy BE1.bii and intensification of use in policy BE4.1.f Misterton with Walcote Council is concerned that congestion is inevitable, particularly around junction 20 on the M1, contrary to policy BE2.2.e

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5540 dr elaine Carter [4431]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I think the proposals will lead to increased traffic and congestion

**Change To Plan Sought:**

the additional development should be on a smaller scale

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

**RepID Representation**

5541 dr elaine Carter [4431]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

there will be increased traffic and congestion, which will add to the increases caused by the development of Lutterworth East, this is too much development happening too quickly in one neighbourhood. and is such a large area needed for this development?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The additional area developed at Magna Park needs to be smaller

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

5564 Mr Philip Ashton [6052]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Already severe traffic congestion so how can this plan not lead to more traffic congestion and air pollution?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scale back the requirement. or build a fully interconnected Lutterworth North East bypass from M1 J19 to the A5

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound. Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of; traffic congestion. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development.

---

**RepID Representation**

5586 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The objective that development as envisaged should not lead to severe traffic congestion is not attainable as there are no plans within the plan period, other than that connected to 15/00919/FUL, to improve matters.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Improvements to the A5 and A426 are already needed whatever the outcome of this submission plan.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound. Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of; traffic congestion, and commuting. The local plan, read as a whole, also contains general development, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development.

---



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5595 Mr Ian Robertson [5573]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

\* Lutterworth is already seriously congested before an expansion to Magna Park and Lutterworth East add to the problem.

\* Parts of the A5 are already dangerous without the inevitable increase in traffic.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The local plan should be modified to not include any major expansion of Magna Park over and the above the 100,000 sq mtrs recently approved.

If any development has to happen provision for infrastructure upgrades should be committed now.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of; traffic congestion. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development and infrastructure policies to guide development.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5743 Mrs Christine Horsfall [5326]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I cross the A5 every day and drive along it frequently. The junction at High Cross is dangerous and difficult to use safely at busy times. When there is heavy traffic using the A5 drivers trying to cross or join take risks which lead to accidents, with more lorries these situations will increase leading to more accidents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not expand Magna Park.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of; traffic congestion. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development and infrastructure policies to guide development.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5768 Claybrooke Parva Parish Council (mr ian robertson) [6117]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

\* Lutterworth is already seriously congested before an expansion to Magna Park and Lutterworth East add to the problem.

\* Parts of the A5 are already dangerous without the inevitable increase in traffic.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The local plan should be modified to not include any major expansion of Magna Park over and the above the 100,000 sq mtrs recently approved. Depending on the test of "acceptability" it will not be able to comply with this clause.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of traffic congestion. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development and infrastructure policies to guide development.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5815 Mr Paul Longhorn [6098]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Traffic levels in and around the A5/Magna Park area will be badly affected by the resulting increase in the number of commuting workers coming from outside the district.

This area is currently congested during peak hours and the extra 10,000 workers will make this intolerable.

The adverse impact on pollution will be considerable

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reject the Magna Park applications

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5992 Mr Christopher Sharpe [6185]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The A5 is already congested and has been recognised as such. Adding more HGVs and commuters to already congested roads will inhibit the existing residents and commercial premises and make the site a local bottleneck and discourage the take up of proposed warehousing

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the size of the proposed development to decrease the volume of traffic

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6119 Mrs Shiela Carlton [4847]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Substantial additional traffic congestion will result. There are no Highways England plans or funding to improve the poor road condition and safety of the A5 between A 426 junction and M69 roundabout until after 2030. Although Magna Park continues to be the main generator of both commercial and commuter traffic, only minor developer contributions have been sought, A426 is traffic-jammed at most times of day, to detriment of local residents accessing local facilities for work, education, health and domestic requirements. Several key roundabouts are at or over planned capacity. Several rural villages suffer from overload of commuter traffic.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No expansion of warehousing for storage and distribution at or near Magna Park, but development of smaller scale enterprises generating less vehicle traffic and therefore less environmental damage.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6337 Mrs Rachael Edgley [5299]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

the A5 is already a very busy road at times of shift change and times that lorries are leaving and entering the logistics park here. No thought has been considered as to the traffic issues further towards the M69 where there are already areas prone to accidents

**Change To Plan Sought:**

changes to infrastructure such as roundabout at the main Claybrooke/Ullesthorpe junction and at the Hallows

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6347 Magna Park is Big Enough (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not justified or effective - what is the definition of "severe" as traffic assessments of the proposed Magna Par applications use different definitions of severe (Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic by the Institute of Environmental Assessment or the Department for Transport, DBSymmetry LLITM 15/00865/OUT-ADDITIONAL INFORMATION-APPENDIX 4-ADDENDUM NOTE 590751, February 2016)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

n/a

**Response:**

Policy BE2 (2) (f) and Policies IN2 and IN3 are intended to ensure that major developments deliver sufficient infrastructure. The current wording is considered to be NPPF compliant.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6388 Mr Rob Harrop [6085]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Traffic congestion in Lutterworth is already at an unacceptable level, with the resultant poor air quality issues.

Considering the low unemployment in the area, most of the proposed new employment opportunities will need to come from outside the area. Coupled with anticipated doubling of lorry traffic, the A5 will become a car park and alternative routes through the villages will be the inevitable result. So everyone gets affected

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reconsider the entire proposal, the infrastructure can't cope.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. Policy BE2.2 criterion c. and d. state the requirement for proposals to increase employment for local residents and to include measures to increase the proportion of the workforce commuting from locations within Harborough.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6398 Mrs Carole Allen [6291]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Parts of the A5 are already congested and there have been several accidents around Smockington Hollow expansion to Magna Park will only add to the problem.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Improve road network to cope with logistics and commuter traffic.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound. Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of traffic congestion. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development and infrastructure policies to guide development.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6467 Mrs Christine Brookes [6342]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This proposed extension to Magna park will lead to severe traffic congestion in the surrounding area, particularly on the A5. Any proposed upgrade of the A5 will have a temporary effect - and in any case is not due to be completed until 2030. Local amenities such as the bridle path between Willey and Ullesthorpe will be impossible to access.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Create a large corridor and a traffic light /crossing at the A5 junction with Willey. Best option is to disperse traffic by reconsidering decision to create a massive congestion of lorry freight in one area., as in this extension.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6515 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Concerned that congestion is inevitable, contrary to this criteria, in combination with policy L1 and intensification of use in policy BE4.1.f particularly around Junction 20 on the M1.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

None stated.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6854 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The local roads around Magna Park do not presently cope with the very heavy traffic volumes.

Plans to substantially increase the size of Magna Park, which is already Europe's largest distribution centre, will inevitably produce far more severe traffic congestion.

The A5 and A426 are already extremely busy leading to long traffic queues, gridlock and the inability to make journeys in a timely fashion.

Leicestershire already has one of the highest rates of road fatalities in the country.

The present site generates thousands of lorry journeys as well as thousands of commuter cars going to and from Magna Park.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not allow for any material expansion of Magna Park. Build these warehouses nearer to motorway junctions and railhead sites.

If you absolutely have to expand Magna Park, then you will have to invest in building substantially greater road capacity & safety.

To protect lives, please prohibit massive HGVs from travelling dangerously through our small villages and ensure matters are enforced with ANR and applying discouraging fines for the transgressors.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered sound.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6860 Mr Allan Whittaker [6064]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

M1 in Leicestershire and Northants is over populated currently and has accidents every/ most days blocking trade and travel in the local area. Any expansion will increase road congestion travelling north and south

The road between Rugby and the Gibbett island is busy to the extent of exhaustion this will eventually start to block M6 and M1 access from the motorway

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Increased distribution sites should be either North or South to service those populations so freeing the local road system

**Response:**

Noted. The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6920 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Evidence submitted on the impact of commuting on local traffic congestion at previous hearings into Magna Park 1 was totally ignored. It is disingenuous to suggest that further development at Magna Park will not magnify the problem. It also requires that HDC properly assesses traffic flows in the area and understands the use and applications of dual carriageways (additional queuing capacity, as it was described by one official at an earlier hearing)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Refuse the Magna Park development

**Response:**

Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market. The Local Plan approach includes additional housing needed to support growth at Magna Park to align the housing and economic strategy therein. The transport impacts of the Local Plan have been assessed, including Policy BE2, and the Plan is considered sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6974 Mr Simon Smith [4996]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

To double the size of magna park will lead to more road problems on the A5 which is not fit for purpose on certain sections within the locality from 5800 to 10000 extra employees and staff projected by idi Gazley also doubling HGV movements and ware houses with large scale LGV movements LGV movements seem to be overlooked on transport surveys.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Wait for highways agency to finish dealing of A5 as planned to mitigate any further development

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered sound. Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of local employment opportunities, traffic congestion, and commuting.

---

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

7004 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* evidence the A5 is inadequate
- \* no major upgrading of the A5 envisaged prior to 2030
- \* additional HGV volume and commuter traffic from the allocation will make the A5 inoperable
- \* surrounding villages already used as rat-runs
- \* inadequacy of the A5 will impact on business efficiency and the ability of the workforce to commute effectively
- \* various traffic assessments commissioned use different definitions for severe
- \* public transport in the vicinity is limited

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered sound. Specific criteria within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of traffic congestion and commuting.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

7085 SWINFORD Parish Council (Katherine Clarke) [2678]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* there is evidence that the A5 is inadequate
- \* no major upgrade to the A5 envisaged prior to 2030
- \* when the additional HGV volume and commuter traffic from an allocation of this size are factored in the A5 becomes inoperable
- \* surrounding villages already suffer from being used as rat-runs to avoid A5 congestion and as short-cuts for HGVs
- \* increased traffic flow through surrounding villages will impact on business efficiency and the ability of the workforce to commute effectively
- \* definition of severe is subjective
- \* public transport in the area is limited

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered sound. Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of local employment opportunities, traffic congestion, and commuting. The local plan, read as a whole, also contains general development, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development.



**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

7109 North Kilworth Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [6469]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* there is evidence that the A5 is inadequate
- \* no major upgrade to the A5 envisaged prior to 2030
- \* when the additional HGV volume and commuter traffic from an allocation of this size are factored in the A5 becomes inoperable
- \* surrounding villages already suffer from being used as rat-runs to avoid A5 congestion and as short-cuts for HGVs
- \* increased traffic flow through surrounding villages will impact on business efficiency and the ability of the workforce to commute effectively
- \* definition of severe is subjective
- \* public transport in the area is limited

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered sound. Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of; local employment opportunities, traffic congestion, and commuting. The local plan, read as a whole, also contains general development, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

5918 Dr I.D. v.d. Ploeg [4817]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

If it is going to happen, sort out the roads and stop nighttime activity and reduce pollution.

I don't know whether the plan is legally compliant as I am not a lawyer but I can only submit if I say it is so I have ticked yes.

**Response:**

Evidence indicates that distribution activity needs to operate 24 hours per day and seven days per week. Policy BE2(2)(f) is intended to ensure that such operations do not have an unacceptable impact. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6356 Cotesbach Parish Council (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6283]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Fundamental infrastructure problems along the A5, A426, Gibbets Roundabout, Whittle Roundabout and other junctions exist. The current applications that Policy BE2 is clearly based upon do not properly address this policy BE2 (1)e.

**Response:**

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound. The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011), which pre-dates the NPPF and so is out of date. Policies in the Local Plan will have full weight once it is adopted.

**RepID Representation**

6755 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Council supports wording that additional development would be permitted where it would not lead to severe traffic congestion....whether within Harborough District or outside.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

7269 dbsymmetry [5502]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

'Congestion' is not a term that is defined. It seems that the criterion would be more effective with the use of the word 'conditions' (see Change to Plan)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend criterion e to read: 'not lead to severe traffic conditions anywhere on the nearby strategic and local road network, particularly the A5, whether within Harborough District or outside'

**Response:**

Noted. The current wording is considered to be compliant with the NPPF.

**RepID Representation**

5456 MS Alison Abraham [5895]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The noise and light pollution is already bad so it will become worse.

The traffic coming through the villages is increasing and will become worse even in the evenings.

The landscape in the area is already dominated by Magna Park - expanding down the A5 will ruin the landscape in the immediate area. We have walks that will be ruined - wildlife areas wrecked, Bittesby village endangered,.

Access to existing footpaths taken away and making crossing the A5 impossible.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not expand Magna Park

**Response:**

Specific criteria within Policy BE2 (2) set out requirements in respect of traffic congestion, environment and landscape. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable landscape and environmental impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour operations' only. A modification is needed as follows: 'ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not...'

The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development, green infrastructure, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5587 Ashby Parva Parish Meeting (Mr Tim Ottevanger) [5196]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Traffic and light pollution are already a problem in the area. BE2 would double this. The proposed developments would be highly intrusive to some communities

Valuable agricultural land would be built on, thus reducing the UK's capacity to grow food at a time of rapid population growth. There has been no consideration of alternative brown field sites and no off-setting of loss of agricultural land against any gain.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

As previously stated.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed, and the plan is considered sound. Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of; traffic congestion and environmental, community and landscape effects associated with 24hour operations. The Local Plan, read as a whole, also contains general development, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5596 Mr Ian Robertson [5573]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Assuming a lot of the increased traffic travelling to and for the extended Magna Park will use the A5 24 hours a day I cannot envisage how this proviso is possible to achieve. As an example I stood on the road both in Claybrooke Parva and Claybrooke Magna (about a mile away from the A5) at just before midnight and the road traffic noise is clearly audible already before any increase in traffic is experienced. One can only presume air pollution will increase as a result also.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The local plan should be modified to not include any major expansion of Magna Park over and the above the 100,000 sq mtrs recently approved. Depending on the test of "acceptability" it will not be able to comply with this clause.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan have been assessed, including Policy BE2, and the plan is considered sound. Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable landscape impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour operations' only. A modification is needed as follows: 'f. ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not....'

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5769 Claybrooke Parva Parish Council (mr ian robertson) [6117]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Assuming a lot of the increased traffic travelling to and from the extended Magna Park will use the A5 24 hours a day I cannot envisage how this proviso is possible to achieve. As an example I stood on the road both in Claybrooke Parva and Claybrooke Magna (about a mile away from the A5) at just before midnight and the road traffic noise is clearly audible already before any increase in traffic is experienced. One can only presume air pollution will increase as a result also.

How can warehousing of that scale not have and unacceptable landscape impact?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The local plan should be modified to not include any major expansion of Magna Park over and the above the 100,000 square meters recently approved

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound. Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable landscape impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour operations' only. A modification is needed as follows:

'ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not...'

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5823 Mr Paul Longhorn [6098]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

6.3.11 says that "Environmental and Economic Impact Assessments for additional development schemes will be required to address impacts for the immediate locality and wider surrounding area, the scope of which is to be agreed with the Council at the outset"

Planning application due for approval on 23rd November, how will it be possible to achieve this in time.

Air, light and noise pollution from the 24 hour operation will be an appalling blight on the area with the consequent impact on local areas and inhabitants.

House prices must also be badly impacted with the consequent impact on individuals debt position.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan says that application will be approved, this cannot be right without Insisting upon a full impact analysis prior to approval

**Response:**

The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011) which pre-dates the NPPF and so is out of date. Local Plan policies will have full weight on adoption. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Specific criterion within Policy BE2.2. set out requirements in respect of traffic congestion and 24 operation. The Local Plan also contains general development, climate change and infrastructure policies to guide development.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5915 Dr I.D. v.d. Ploeg [4817]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Night time activity should be curtailed. It is already very audible at night. Any expansion will increase this and in addition it will come closer to houses and villages.

I don't know whether the plan is legally compliant as I am not a lawyer but I can only submit if I say it is so I have ticked yes.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No expansion

**Response:**

Evidence indicates that distribution activity needs to operate 24hours per day and seven days per week. Policy BE2(2)(f) is intended to ensure that such operations do not have an unacceptable impact.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6336 Mrs Rachael Edgley [5299]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

landscape will be damaged from light pollution and from traffic increase. Large unsightly buildings that are not masked.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Dont build them

**Response:**

Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable landscape impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour operations' only. A modification is needed as follows:

'ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not...'

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6366 Ian Lewis [4810]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

A 24 hour warehouse is going to cause unacceptable environmental, community and landscape impact in the area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not extend the Magna Park site.

**Response:**

Evidence indicates that distribution activity needs to operate 24 hours per day and seven days per week. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable landscape and environmental impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour operations' only. A modification is needed as follows:

'f. ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not...'

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6384 Mr Rob Harrop [6085]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The existing scale of Magna Park already generates significant traffic noise 24 hours a day. The drone from the A5 can be clearly heard in Claybrooke Parva and the SW winds blows its pollution across the fields to the village.

By doubling the volume of lorry traffic and the commuting workforce will significantly impact on the air quality and noise.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Use the rail network instead looking for ways to generate more business rates for HDC

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6386 Mr Rob Harrop [6085]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The existing traffic volumes using the A5 can clearly be heard in Claybrooke Parva 24hrs a day and with the prevailing SW winds, air pollution is adversely affected.

By doubling the volume of lorry traffic and the subsequent increase of commuters needing to use the route, the situation can only deteriorate. This will sadly affect the lives of the villagers of Claybrooke Parva

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Support the rail infrastructure instead of looking for ways to generate more business rates

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6397 Mrs Carole Allen [6291]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Increased traffic using the A5 24 hours a day will add further air pollution and road traffic noise that can already be heard from Claybrooke Parva.

The impact on Wildlife in the area of warehousing on the scale planned is unimaginable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Avoid unnecessary loss of productive farmland and countryside.

improve road network and decrease air pollution.

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the whole Plan, and its individual policies, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered sound.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6468 Mrs Christine Brookes [6342]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I strongly object. This proposed extension to Magna park will increase traffic and light pollution in the immediate vicinity and surrounding villages on a 24 hour basis, . Any proposed road upgrades will not solve this problem but will rather add to noise pollution in the nearby villages. The landscape will be permanently disfigured and wildlife habitats will disappear. Harborough District council would be seen to be prepared to safeguard their own environment by creating an industrial wasteland on a colossal scale in a corner of the district which does not impact on Leicestershire alone.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The planned extension to Magna park should be reconsidered on environmental grounds alone. The scale of the extension is disproportionate and harmful to the local environment.

**Response:**

Policy BE2 is criteria based and provides a quantitative cap on development. No site allocation is made in respect of Policy BE2. The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including Policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable landscape and environmental impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour operations' only. A modification is needed as follows: 'ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not....'

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6853 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The existing Magna Park operates 24/7/365 on shift working. This means thousands of commuter cars flood out to further congest local roads that cannot cope with this sudden surge in traffic volumes.

For those who unfortunately live near these blocked roads, it means lots of unbearable traffic noise and an even worse quality of air for us (and our children) to have to breathe. It is already insufferable and utterly unacceptable.

Plans to substantially expand Magna Park can only irretrievably make these matters far worse.

Please think about those who live around Lutterworth and remove these Magna Park plans.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If you care about the environment, community and landscape of the area, please do not permit any material expansion of Magna Park..

If you do have to proceed with these massive expansion plans, then please build bunds alongside the A426 to try and reduce the noise for those living in Cotesbach.

24 hour operations already create unacceptable consequences for those living around Magna Park.

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered sound. Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to ensure that 24 hour operations do not have an unacceptable environmental, landscape or community impacts.

**RepID Representation**

6921 Mr Hugh Robertson Smith [4229]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Self-evidently, Magna park 2 would have a detrimental environmental, community and landscape impact on the area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reject the Magna Park development

**Response:**

The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the Local Plan including Policy BE2 have been assessed and the Plan is considered to be sound. Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable landscape impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour operations' only. A modification is needed as follows: 'f. ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not....'

---

**RepID Representation**

6970 Mr Simon Smith [4996]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Proposed enlargement of Magna Park area in direct conflict with environmental and pollution targets. See Lutterworth town centre pollution levels above national targets and EU levels. In conflict with local and county authorities commitments to lower and meet targets on air pollution.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

accept you cannot potentially allow doubling of distribution size and number of workers commuting doubling HGV movements also increasing LGV traffic causing more congestion slower vehicles operating less environmentally and meet air quality

**Response:**

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the whole Plan, and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying sustainability appraisal. The transport impacts and sustainability effects of the local plan have been assessed, including policy BE2, and the plan is considered sound.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7006 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* original Magna Park site was a brownfield site
- \* proposed expansion utilises agricultural land
- \* conflicts with paragraphs 111 and 112 of the NPPF
- \* the proposed plan does not consider if there are any brownfield sites which could be used in preference to the agricultural land currently proposed
- \* visual and light pollution impact would be detrimental to the village of Ullesthorpe
- \* tree screening measures on the original site are still highly ineffective
- \* no proposed area of separation between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe
- \* unacceptable impact on environment, community and landscape

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The SELAA (2017) demonstrates that the number of brownfield sites assessed as potentially developable for employment uses within the district is limited. The agricultural land around Magna Park is mostly Grade 3b (moderate).

The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the whole Plan, and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.

A modification is needed to read 'ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not...'

Distances between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe/Cotesbach are such that an Area of Separation is not needed. BE2 does not allocate sites for strategic distribution but rather sets a maximum on future development to 2031. Currently there is no development to separate from the villages.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7092 SWINFORD Parish Council (Katherine Clarke) [2678]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* original Magna Park site is brownfield
- \* two outstanding applications both use agricultural land
- \* conflicts with paragraphs 111 and 112 of the NPPF
- \* the proposed submission does not consider whether there are any brownfield sites which could be used in preference to the agricultural land currently proposed
- \* visual and light pollution would be detrimental to local villages
- \* tree screening measures from the original Magna Park development are still ineffective

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Most of the agricultural land is Grade 3 b (moderate), not 'best and most versatile'. The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the whole Plan, and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. The plan is considered sound. Specific criterion within Policy BE2 (2) set out requirements in respect of traffic congestion, the impact of 24hr operations on the environment and commuting.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7112 North Kilworth Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [6469]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* original Magna Park site is brownfield
- \* two outstanding applications both use agricultural land
- \* conflicts with paragraphs 111 and 112 of the NPPF
- \* the proposed submission does not consider whether there are any brownfield sites which could be used in preference to the agricultural land currently proposed
- \* visual and light pollution would be detrimental to local villages
- \* tree screening measures from the original Magna Park development are still ineffective

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy BE2 from the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Most of the agricultural land is Grade 3 b (moderate), not 'best and most versatile'. The potential environmental, economic and social effects of the whole Plan, and its individual policies, including policy BE2, have been assessed and are set out in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. The plan is considered sound. Specific criterion within Policy BE2 (2) set out requirements in respect of traffic congestion, the impact of 24hr operations on the environment and commuting.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7270 dbymmetry [5502]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

A landscape impact is an environmental impact. As such the criterion could be simplified to read.

'Ensure that 24 hour operations do not have an unacceptable impact upon the environment, and the amenity of local communities.'

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend criterion f to read: 'Ensure that 24 hour operations do not have an unacceptable impact upon the environment, and the amenity of local communities.'

**Response:**

Noted. Landscape is a particular aspect of the environment that is important given the scale of the buildings proposed. Policy BE2 (2) (f) is intended to prevent unacceptable landscape and environmental impact but currently refers to the impacts of '24 hour operations' only. A modification is needed as follows:

'f. ensure the development, including 24 hour operations, does not...'

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6348 Magna Park is Big Enough (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The need has not been identified to be focussed at such high density in one area; there is no evidence to justify the correlation between housing allocation and B8 allocation; a sustainable reduction in out-commuting simply will not be achieved.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Evidence how Lutterworth SDA can be justified according to Magna Park employment; Do not commit to Magna Park specifically

**Response:**

The evidence only indicates a minimum need figure for strategic distribution across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is a strong case for Harborough to continue to make a contribution to long term non-rail served strategic distribution. Additional development at Magna Park will continue to serve the jobs needs of the District and wider labour market.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6819 Richard Whittington [6430]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Magna Park development goes against the Core Strategy 2006-2028 from 14/11/11.

There is very little unemployment in this area so, new employees would have to travel from outside the area therefore increasing traffic.

Would any apprenticeships be worthwhile for their future prospects?

The A426 is already overloaded and there are frequently queues from the M6 to the A5 in the afternoons.

I am a keen astronomer and would not welcome any further light pollution to an already over polluted area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This expansion is not needed in our area and will only lead to increased traffic, noise, pollution and damage to our environment and farmland.

There are many amenities needed in our area eg, doctor's surgeries, youth clubs, sports centres etc that would be far more beneficial to our communities.

**Response:**

The Local Plan will replace the Harborough District Core Strategy 2006-2028 (adopted in 2011). The policies in the LP are based on a proportionate and up-to-date evidence base including that which informs Policy BE2.

The Local Plan runs to 2031. Fluctuations in the level of unemployment are likely during this time period, alongside which the population within the District, HMA and wider surrounding area is growing. Magna Park is already one of the largest employment centres in the county and any additional development will continue to serve the jobs needs of the wider labour market.

The transport impacts of the Local Plan, including policy BE2, have been assessed and the plan is considered to be sound.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7261 **Leciestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

18. Policy BE3 on existing employment areas is supported; BE3.1 being seen as of particular relevance in ensuring that development meets the needs/demands of the wider sub-regional market in addition to local businesses in order to attract inward investment.

7068 **THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6230 **LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Support but this seems to be a strange inclusion in the business section - maybe more suited to the housing section. Also seems like a particular site or sites are under consideration for a change of use.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

More information required. - what sites are under consideration?

**Response:**

Clause 3 relates to the development on industrial / commercial land and is appropriately cited within Policy BE3.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5470 **Mr Andy Johnson [5688]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The general presumption should be that development should only take place if involves the replacement of existing buildings and the proposed use is allowed within the current planning permission. There should be no increase in the existing floorspace and development should have no visible or adverse impact on the surrounding area and roads. The site is in an isolated rural location with poor transport links and is unsuitable for development of any kind. If the site was not in its current use then it would not even be considered for development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Development should be restricted to replacing existing floor space and proposed activities should be within the uses currently allowed. There should be no increase in floor space or new uses allowed.

**Response:**

The criteria based policy, as drafted, meets the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development and its requirement to plan positively to support local development, while recognising that the range of uses needs to be closely controlled. Policy BE4 (1 a, b and f) and BE4 (2 a, b and e) do this. Policy BE4 (1 g) and BE4 (2 e) require highway improvements associated with development proposals.

**RepID** **Representation**

5424 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Ancillary is a very loose term and can be open to interpretation. Development should be restricted to the uses current allowed and no more.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Development and proposed activities should be restricted to the uses allowed in the current planning permission.

**Response:**

The terms 'ancillary' and 'to an existing legal and authorised use' are used intentionally to closely control development on a complex and sensitive site in a rural location. 'Ancillary' has a specific meaning in planning law. Ancillary uses are a smaller/secondary use that takes place within premises classified by their main use.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

7191 Mr Tim Smith [4679]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Maintenance and storage of aircraft if allowed to be subject to strict limits to protect the amenity of surrounding villages. Any development of p&t use to be subject to strict noise control.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Any development including those ancillary to existing uses to be subject to strict control measures to protect amenity of local residents.

**Response:**

Aircraft recycling is an existing legal and authorised use. BE4 (1 c) covers noise control for development proposals.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

7204 C Walton Ltd [6484]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The criteria is not sound as it prevents any new development other than development which is considered ancillary to the existing uses on site. Any future planning applications with employment generating uses for new companies allied with the range of sectors currently supported at BPG would therefore raise a conflict with the policy. In its current form, the policy is directly contrary to Para. 21 of the NPPF. The policy fails to comprehensively include all lawful and authorised uses on site, including the on-site research and development facilities, fleet management activities and the Events Centre.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend criterion a. as follows:

The proposed use is related to an existing use, or related to the business sectors supported by Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground including the proving and testing of motor vehicles, vehicle storage and fleet management, the events centre, the aircraft museum and related tourism activity, car auctions, and aircraft recycling, maintenance and storage;

**Response:**

The terms 'ancillary' and 'to an existing legal and authorised use' are used intentionally to closely control development on a complex and sensitive site in a rural location. The list is intentionally definitive not illustrative.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5426 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Association is a very loose term and is open to interpretation. This could allow uses with only a tenuous link to corporate entertainment and limit the ability of the planning authority to take action against unauthorised use. Corporate entertainment covers a wide range of uses, most of which would not be suitable for this location.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The use to be restricted to the uses allowed under the existing planning permission.

**Response:**

Development permitted by Policy BE4 must satisfy the criteria set out. Under this clause it must accord with both the 2009 Unilateral Undertaking and the terms of the Operational Plan. These legal agreements, between the site owner (respective successors or assigns) and HDC, contain obligations which apply and restrict the interpretation of the clause.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5428 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Noise monitoring is difficult to police and as a result noise restrictions are easily abused. There is regular use of the track at BPG before 9am at weekends and bank holidays which is an issue for local residents. This is a rural location and noise is more of an issue than in a built up environment.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In addition to the noise limits there should also be a limit on the hours in which noisy activity can take place. This should be a maximum of two hours a day.

**Response:**

Development permitted by Policy BE4 must satisfy the criteria set out. Under this clause it must accord with the stated documents. These legal agreements, between the site owner (respective successors or assigns) and HDC, contain obligations in respect of noise monitoring and hours of operation for permitted activities. Alleged abuse is a matter for enforcement, not planning policy.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5425 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Development should be no greater in terms of massing and bulk than currently exists (ie it should replace what is there) and the design and materials of replacement development should have no impact on the surrounding area. if necessary additional planting should be undertaken to screen development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Development should be no greater in terms of massing and bulk than currently exists (ie it should replace what is there) and the design and materials of any development should have zero impact on the surrounding area. Additional planting should take place to screen any new development.

**Response:**

The policy, as drafted, meets the requirements of the NPPF in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the requirement to plan positively to support local development, while recognising that the range of uses needs to be closely controlled. In this context the policy criteria (BE4 (1 d and e) and BE4 (2 b and c) adequately cover the issue.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5427 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The policy explanation states that there is a well established tree belt surrounding nearly the whole of BPG providing a good level of screening. This is not the case. Buildings and airplanes are visible from the surrounding area, particularly in the winter when the trees have shed their leaves. The tree belt has also been reduced/removed to accommodate various activities on the site. Poor landscaping also adds to the noise issue from the site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Planting should be undertaken to fill in and enhance the existing landscaping to ensure the development is not visible from the surrounding areas. New planting should ensure that the tree belt is effective in winter. No further development on the site should take place until this planting is completed.

**Response:**

Policy BE4 (1 e) adequately covers the retention, replacement and / or enhancement of existing perimeter tree planting related to development proposals.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5429 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Any additional development at BPG would result in increased traffic levels. Given that the road network serving BPG is rural and poor quality then any increase will impact on the local area. Currently traffic from the industrial estate uses the rear entrance from the site on to Mere Road. All traffic should be forced to use the main entrance on Bath Lane. There is no public transport serving the site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There should be no new development at BPG. Any development should be a replacement/upgrading of existing facilities. This would not increase traffic levels. Currently traffic from the industrial estate uses the rear entrance from the site on to Mere Road. All traffic should be forced to use the main entrance on Bath Lane.

**Response:**

Policy BE4 (1 h) and BE4 (2 g) adequately cover the access arrangements for development proposals.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7173 Gilmorton Parish Council (Mr Julian Kent) [6472]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We note this site is to be further developed. As a neighbouring parish, Gilmorton already carries a significant amount of traffic to / from the site via Lutterworth Rd and Mill Lane. These roads, plus Kimcote Rd, have new housing developments approved, which will also increase the traffic movements. We are concerned that the cumulative effect of this development will exacerbate the overall traffic situation and would request that further details of proposed improvements are provided that address the concerns of local residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

All traffic to and from Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground should be restricted to the trunk road system. Currently this only applies to vehicle delivery lorries and the majority of the cars sold at auction come south through Gilmorton along with trade plate drivers on their way to collect vehicles.

**Response:**

Noted. Proposals for development will be permitted where the criteria are met. Detailed consideration would be subject to a planning application, with planning conditions applied where necessary.

**RepID Representation**

7584 SHEARSBY Parish Council (Mr P Baildon) [4361]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We are concerned that the section devoted to BRUNTINGTHORPE does not recognise the cumulative and ever increasing number of applications over the last 30 years that have not alleviated the highways movements, damage to narrow country road verges, increasing vehicle use whether for "open days" sponsored days, car transporters, visitors, contractors etc all using either the access from the old A50 via Shearsby Crossroads or the village of Gilmorton.

**Response:**

Paragraph 6.7.3 recognises that the range of uses needs to be closely controlled and Policy BE4 (1 a, b and f) and BE4 (2 a, b and e) do this. Policy BE4 (1 g) and BE4 (2 e) require highway improvements associated with development proposals.

**RepID Representation**

5471 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no public transport in the area and all travel to BPG is by car. The road system infrastructure is poor and not suited to high volumes or large vehicles. Any increase in traffic levels would have an adverse impact on the local area. The roads are rural in nature and could not be upgraded without significant impact on the local area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The existing road system is not suitable for high volumes of traffic or large vehicles. There should be no improvement of the road system as this would have an adverse impact on the surrounding area.

**Response:**

Noted. Proposals for development will be permitted where the criteria are met. Detailed consideration would be subject to a planning application, with planning conditions applied where necessary.

**RepID Representation**

7172 Gilmorton Parish Council (Mrs Yvette Walters) [6476]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We note this site is to be further developed. As a neighbouring parish, Gilmorton already carries a significant amount of traffic to / from the site via Lutterworth Rd and Mill Lane. These roads, plus Kimcote Rd, have new housing developments approved, which will also increase the traffic movements. We are concerned that the cumulative effect of this development will exacerbate the overall traffic situation and would request that further details of proposed improvements are provided that address the concerns of local residents

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Ensure directional signs are provided. Monitor traffic flow and ensure road regulations regarding size of vehicles/speed are adhered to.

**Response:**

Noted. Proposals for development will be permitted where the criteria are met. Detailed consideration would be subject to a planning application, with planning conditions applied where necessary.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7231 C Walton Ltd [6484]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

In order to ensure compliance with the Framework, the Highways Authority need to exercise reasonable judgement.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend criterion g. as follows:

highway improvements are provided in accordance with the reasonable requirements of the highway authority taking into account total traffic to be generated by existing and proposed development within the Proving Ground and the Industrial Estate;

**Response:**

Proposed insertion considered unnecessary. All actions of a local authority have to be reasonable. If requirements are considered to be unreasonable they can be challenged through the appeals system.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5478 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I agree that all access and egress should be through the main gate on Bath Lane. However there is currently access to Bruntingthorpe Industrial Estate and BPG via a rear entrance on Mere Road. It would be impossible for the local authority to enforce access via the main gate if the rear entrance remains in existence. The entrance to Mere Road should therefore be closed immediately and definitely before any development can take place.

**Response:**

Policy BE4 (1 h) and BE4 (2 g) adequately cover the access arrangements for development proposals.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5472 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Development should be restricted to like for like replacement of existing buildings on the site. Use should conform to the uses currently allowed. There should be no intensification of development and any replacement of buildings should have no impact on the surrounding area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Development should be restricted to replacing existing floor space and proposed activities should be within the uses currently allowed. There should be no increase in floor space or new uses allowed.

**Response:**

The policy, as drafted, meets the requirements of the NPPF in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the requirement to plan positively to support local development, while recognising that the range of uses needs to be closely controlled. Policy BE4 (1 a, b and f) and BE4 (2 a, b and e) do this.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7234 **C Walton Ltd [6484]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The policy is not sound because it fails to support employment generating uses. Expressly prohibiting B1a Office use fails to account positively for the location, promotion and expansion of the knowledge driven, creative and high technology industries present at Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground and the needs of the employers to place high value employees, many of whom have office based technical roles; For example, BIAS has a total of 70 office based employees.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend 2. as follows:

Within the area of Bruntingthorpe Industrial Estate, as defined on the Policies Map, development for Class B uses will be permitted if:

**Response:**

B1a is a town centre use which should be concentrated in Market Harborough and Lutterworth in accordance with Policy RT2. Any exception to this would be subject to a sequential test on a case by case basis, but should not be enshrined in policy. Regardless of existing use, further unsustainable development of offices in this location should be discouraged as generating higher levels of employment than other uses and therefore of travel by private car in a rural location without access to public transport.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5473 **Mr Andy Johnson [5688]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Ancillary is a very loose term and can be open to interpretation. Development should be restricted to the uses allowed under the current planning permission.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Development should be restricted to the uses allowed under the current planning permission.

**Response:**

The term 'ancillary to an existing use' is used intentionally to closely control development on a sensitive site in a rural location. 'Ancillary' has a specific meaning in planning law. Ancillary uses are a smaller/secondary use that takes place within premises classified by their main use. Policy BE4 (2) permits certain B Class uses only, reflecting current permitted use, but excluding town centre uses for which an exceptional case would need to be made, including a sequential test in accordance with Policy RT2.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

7235 C Walton Ltd [6484]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The criterion is not sound as it is not positively prepared and prevents any new development other than development which is considered ancillary to the existing uses on the Industrial Estate. Any future planning applications with employment generating uses for new companies allied with the range of sectors currently supported at BIE would therefore raise conflict with the policy. In its current form the policy is diametrically opposed to Paragraph 21 of the NPPF.

**Response:**

The criteria based policy, as drafted, meets the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development and its requirement to plan positively to support local development, while recognising that the range of uses needs to be closely controlled on a complex and sensitive site in a rural location. Policy BE4 (2 b) allows further development within the context of a much required improvement to the physical environment. This accords with paragraph 21 of the NPPF which states that planning policies should recognise and seek to address potential barriers to investment, including a poor environment. Para 21 lists various actions relating to strategy for sustainable economic growth which the Local Plan in fact does. However, BPG does not have a major role in this strategy because of its unsustainable location.

**RepID** **Representation**

5474 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Any development should be restricted to replacing existing buildings. There should be no intensification or increase in the floor space on site either as ad hoc development or as part of master plan for the site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Any development should be restricted to replacing existing buildings. There should be no allowance for additional development or increase in floor space under the guise of a master plan or development brief.

**Response:**

The policy, as drafted, meets the requirements of the NPPF in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the requirement to plan positively to support local development, while recognising that the range of uses needs to be closely controlled. Policy BE4 (2 a, b and e) do this. It is unrealistic to expect that environmental improvements will be made without allowing some additional development, subject to the criteria in the policy.

**RepID** **Representation**

7236 C Walton Ltd [6484]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The above policy is not sound because the policy fails to account for the £10M investment which has been made at BIE over the previous 10 years, including refurbishments to Hangar T2 by Volvo (supporting c.15 jobs), the development of Royal Enfield's Research and Development Centre (80 jobs), the erection of a commercial vehicle paintshop for BIAS (30 jobs) and the erection of a Pre-Delivery Inspection building for BIAS (70 jobs). These developments have been granted planning permission with allied landscaping improvements which are currently in the process of being constructed. The refurbishment or redevelopment of the balance of the Industrial Estate should not require an approved masterplan to include development proposals already undertaken.

**Response:**

Landscape improvements on an ad hoc basis are no substitute for a comprehensive upgrade to the physical environment which would be achieved through the proposed development brief or master-plan. It is the piecemeal drip-feed of development proposals which causes concerns for local residents that could be assuaged by a planned approach.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5475 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Development should be no greater in terms of massing and bulk than currently exists (ie it should replace what is there) and the design and materials of replacement development should have no impact on the surrounding area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Development should be no greater in terms of massing and bulk than currently exists (ie it should replace what is there) and the design and materials of replacement development should have no impact on the surrounding area.

**Response:**

The policy, as drafted, meets the requirements of the NPPF in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the requirement to plan positively to support local development, while recognising that the range of uses needs to be closely controlled. Policy BE4 (2 c) adequately addresses this issue.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5476 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Any additional development at Bruntingthorpe industrial estate would result in increased traffic levels. Given that the road network serving the estate is rural and poor quality then any increase will impact on the local area. The policy explanation fails to state that the estate is accessed via an entrance on Mere Road. Heavy goods vehicles and high levels of traffic therefore use Mere Road which is a narrow rural road not designed for such traffic. The entrance to Mere Road should be closed and all traffic should be forced to use the main entrance on Bath Lane.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

All traffic from the industrial estate should be routed through the main entrance on Bath Lane. Highway improvements would not be appropriate in a rural setting.

**Response:**

Noted. Proposals for development will be permitted where the criteria are met. Detailed consideration would be subject to a planning application, with planning conditions applied where necessary. Policy BE4 (1 h) and BE4 (2 g) adequately cover the access arrangements for development proposals.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

5477 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Any additional development at BPG would result in increased traffic levels. Given that the road network serving BPG is rural and poor quality then any increase will impact on the local area. Currently traffic from the industrial estate uses the rear entrance from the site on to Mere Road. All traffic should be forced to use the main entrance on Bath Lane. There is no public transport serving the site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Any additional development at BPG would result in increased traffic levels. Given that the road network serving BPG is rural and poor quality then any increase will impact on the local area. Currently traffic from the industrial estate uses the rear entrance from the site on to Mere Road. All traffic should be forced to use the main entrance on Bath Lane. There is no public transport serving the site.

**Response:**

Noted. Proposals for development will be permitted where the criteria are met. Detailed consideration would be subject to a planning application, with planning conditions applied where necessary. Policy BE4 (1 h) and BE4 (2 g) adequately cover the access arrangements for development proposals.

**ReplID** **Representation**

7237 C Walton Ltd [6484]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

In order to ensure compliance with the Framework, the policy should be caveated to ensure that the Highway Authority are required to exercise reasonable judgement.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend criterion e. as follows:

highway improvements are provided in accordance with the reasonable requirements of the highway authority taking into account total traffic to be generated by existing and proposed development within the Proving Ground and the Industrial Estate;

**Response:**

Proposed insertion considered unnecessary. All actions of a local authority have to be reasonable. If requirements are considered to be unreasonable they can be challenged through the appeals system.

**ReplID** **Representation**

5432 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no public transport in the area and all travel to BPG is by car. There are no other modes of transport and it is fanciful to think that a travel plan could solve the traffic issues that would be created by additional development. Furthermore I doubt that the local authority has the resource to monitor a travel plan and therefore it is likely that the requirements of any such plan would not be adhered to.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Development that increases traffic to the site should not be allowed.

**Response:**

Noted. Proposals for development will be permitted where the criteria are met. Detailed consideration would be subject to a planning application, with planning conditions applied where necessary. It is not suggested that travel plan will solve the issues but it should form part of a range of measures.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7239 C Walton Ltd [6484]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The site owners welcome any initiative to create public transport access to the site. However, the site is not currently serviced by public transport. The policy is predicated on a non-sequitur (as no public transport services the site) and new development proposals would therefore be inherently conflicted. It is considered that the suggested policy is not sound, because it would potentially undermine proposals for sustainable economic development. It is unjustified and obviated by criteria d and e of the proposed policy, because the impacts arising from any additional development can be assessed.

**Response:**

Criteria 2f is complementary to other criteria 2d and 2e. A Travel Plan is a package of actions designed to encourage safe, healthy and sustainable travel options it is not predicated on or confined to forms of public transport. It is questionable whether any economic development on this site could be regarded as 'sustainable', but without a travel plan it would certainly not be.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5434 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I agree that all access and egress should be through the main gate on Bath Lane. However there is currently access to Bruntingthorpe Industrial Estate and BPG via a rear entrance on Mere Road. It would be impossible for the local authority to enforce access via the main gate if the rear entrance remains in existence. The entrance to Mere Road should therefore be closed before any development can take place.

**Response:**

Policy BE4 (1 h) and BE4 (2 g) adequately cover the access arrangements for development proposals.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5435 Mr Andy Johnson [5688]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Given the nature and location of the site any development (not just class B8) should be restricted in size to no more than 300sqm. However where development involves the replacement of buildings smaller than 300sqm then that development should be restricted to the size of the existing building. This would restrict the development of large scale industrial buildings and ensure that only small scale industrial use is carried out on the site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

All development (not just class B8) should be restricted in size to no more than 300sqm. However where development involves the replacement of buildings smaller than 300sqm then that development should be restricted to the size of the existing building. There should be no increase in overall floor space.

**Response:**

The criteria based policy, as drafted, meets the requirements of the NPPF in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the requirement to plan positively to support local development, while recognising that the range of uses needs to be closely controlled.

Criterion 2c ensures that new development would have no unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area. Criterion 2h is specific to Class B8 use to limit HGV traffic generation. A reduction to 300 sq m or an extension to other B uses would be unreasonably restrictive.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7240 C Walton Ltd [6484]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed policy is demonstrably not sound because any future planning applications with employment generating uses for in excess of 500msq Class B8 use allied with the range of sectors currently supported at BIE would raise a conflict with the policy. In its current form, the policy is directly contrary to Paragraph 21 of the NPPF. The policy, if applied now, would prevent the occupancy of Volvo on the site of Hangar T2, and the development of Royal Enfield's Research and Development Facility would be contrary to policy due to the incorporation of in excess of 500sqm of B8 floorspace in the building.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is suggested that criterion h. is entirely removed.

**Response:**

Criterion 2h is specific to Class B8 use to limit HGV traffic generation. Large scale storage and distribution uses are not appropriate to this rural location.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5919 Dr I.D. v.d. Ploeg [4817]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Noise pollution from airfields is know to increase blood pressure in the general population. There are enough airfields nearby. I don't know whether the plan is legally compliant as I am not a lawyer but I can only submit if I say it is so I have ticked yes.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No expansion

**Response:**

Policy BE5 is included in the Local Plan to provide a policy framework for Leicester Airport, against which which proposals for future development can be considered.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5480 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Sound / Support provided the criteria set out in the Proposed Local Plan are met in entirety and no additional traffic is generated.As stated the road network is poor . In addition hours of use together with noise levels need to be restricted, especially at night.

**Response:**

Noted. The issue of hours of use is best addressed as part of a planning application when the requirements of the particular user are known.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6653 SCRAPTOFT Parish Council (Mr P Elliot) [4520]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support, but have concerns about 500sq.m of B8 floor space.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy BE5 takes a criteria based approach to controlling development at the site. In addition to all other criteria, criteria 2.f. places a limit on the maximum size of any unit for B8 Class use in order to limit HGV traffic due to the site location and access.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7070 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7368 Farmcare Trading Ltd [6512]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The boundary for 'Leicester Airport' shown on the policies map is reflective of the aviation uses on site and this boundary is considered appropriate for aviation uses as set out by Policy BE5.

**Response:**

Noted.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6083 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Object .

I am concerned that this proposal, despite the conditions stated, would open the flood gates to the creation of an Industrial Estate in the middle of the countryside.

Increased traffic on poor road links to the site, and potential noise levels, are both of concern. The current road has I believe a 7.5 tonne weight restriction in place.

I feel that the criteria addressing the impact on the amenity of local residents are not strong enough and therefore open to being successfully challenged.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

d.traffic generated by the development is capable of being accommodated on the highway network and will not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of local residents;

This needs to be considerably tightened as it is far too wide and open to challenge

e. a Travel Plan is approved and implemented to increase access to the site by modes other than the private car;

Extremely Unlikely,there is no public transport to this site which is in open countryside.

f. any individual unit for Class B8 use does not exceed 500sq.m in gross floorspace.

This is far too large, I would suggest no more than 250 sq m.

**Response:**

Noted. It is considered that the criteria, together with the weight limit, are sufficient to safeguard local amenities and road safety.

---

**ReplD Representation**

**Nature**

7369 Farmcare Trading Ltd [6512]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is considered that the land allocated as 'complex north of Gartree Road' is unduly restrictive and the practicalities of the shape chosen by the LPA is arbitrary and will limit meaningful economic development. It is therefore recommended that additional land (shown in attachment) is allocated to accommodate suitable additional growth. The allocation should also include the go-kart facility as it is a brownfield site which would be suitable for development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend boundaries of the 'complex to the north of Gartree Road' to include additional areas identified and go-kart area.

**Response:**

Parcels of land at Leicester Airfield were assessed by the SELAA (2017) as 'Not currently developable'. Boundary of the North of Gartree Road complex is purposefully restrictive, not intended to be an allocation for a specified quantum of development, since the location does not accord with spatial strategy (SS1), reasonable alternatives considered are better located, and additional employment provision is not needed to meet HEDNA figures. The issues raised have been previously considered but no new justification has been provided. Policy BE5 takes a criteria based approach in preference to making a specific employment allocation.

**ReplD Representation**

**Nature**

5608 STOUGHTON Parish Council (Coco Connor) [2677]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Stoughton Parish Council strongly support this clause and also stress our strong opposition remains in relation to the continued noise disturbance from the Go Kart enterprise which currently resides at this site.

**Response:**

Noted.

**ReplD Representation**

**Nature**

7370 Farmcare Trading Ltd [6512]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The wording of the policy needs to be amended to omit criterion 'b' of the policy, to enable greater flexibility in the businesses that are able to locate to the site and support the overall activities at the airfield.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Omit criterion 'b'.

**Response:**

Without such a restriction, there would be no justification for allowing economic development in an unsustainable location. Provision to meet HEDNA requirements is made by Policy BE1 (1).

**RepID Representation**

7074 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Councils supports as sound. However, the Parish Council has concerns that the criteria addressing the impact on the amenity of local residents may not be strong enough and therefore open to being challenged. In particular, increased traffic on the road network around the airport and noise.

**Response:**

Noted. It is considered that the criteria are sufficient to safeguard local amenities.

**RepID Representation**

7371 Farmcare Trading Ltd [6512]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The wording of the policy needs to be amended to omit criterion 'f' of the policy, to enable greater flexibility in the businesses that are able to locate to the site and support the overall activities at the airfield.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Omit criterion 'f'.

**Response:**

Criterion 2.f. places a limit on the maximum size of any unit for B8 Class use in order to limit HGV traffic due to the site location and access.

**RepID Representation**

7073 Mr Michael Weedon [5353]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plan proposes a minimum of 10,000 sqm of comparison space, 8,000 of it in MH. While the revised Retail Study takes some notice of trends in comparison retail it does not go far enough. ONS figures show 16.6% of all retail online now, growing at c15% pa, the study assumes 13.2% rising to 16.3% in 14 years. LDC figures show a net loss c6% of comparison shops across GB since 2012. Convenience is (ONS) c7% online, the Study assumes it will rise to 5% by 2031. MH is overprovided with comparison (+9.8%) and underprovided (-7.7%) for Leisure.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Retail Study rightly recognises that forecasts beyond 2026 be treated with caution - then goes on to identify the largest need for growth after 2026. The forecast for comparison should be for no net change or, more realistically, a reduction. In MH in particular the 4,000 sqm on land off St Mary's Road should be removed from the plan.

**Response:**

The Harborough Retail Study Update has been prepared by retail consultants, taking into account forecast population growth based on the housing distribution set out in the housing trajectory. It is considered that the assumptions made in the evidence are robust. The mixed use site 'Land off St Mary's Road' (3,000sq.m gross) is allocated primarily for leisure, entertainment and tourism.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7401 Wells McFarlane (Trevor Wells) [3916]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We wish to register our objection to Policy RT1 as it is not effective or justified when considered against reasonable alternatives. Specifically, we object to the following:

1. the lack of sufficient options/ alternatives for the delivery of retail development in Lutterworth during the Plan period;
2. the absence of allocations for retail development in close proximity to the Lutterworth town centre.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Additional land should be allocated for retail development close to the existing town centre. This would support the vitality of the existing town centre and facilitate the logical expansion of the current retail offer in a sustainable location close to existing residential areas and bus routes. The proximity of existing markets, as well as the strategic highway network (including M1 motorway), would be commercially attractive and, as such, retail sites in this location would be highly deliverable.

**Response:**

The Retail Study Update 2017 identified a relatively modest increase in retail floorsapce for Lutterworth over the Plan period. Retail provision within the East of Lutterworth SDA will account for forecast convenience floorspace growth (up to 1000sq.m) and about a third of comparison floorspace growth. This will improve the sustainability of the new settlement, helping to prevent unnecessary car trips. The remaining need for 1000sq.m comparison floorspace will be absorbed by vacant units and windfalls sites assessed in accordance with RT2.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7415 Wells McFarlane (Trevor Wells) [3916]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As part of this Local Plan consultation we wish to put forward 'Land to the west of Rugby Road, Lutterworth' as a proposed allocation for B1 office/ retail uses. The allocation of the site is justified when considered against reasonable alternatives and would improve the effectiveness of the Plan by ensuring the timely delivery of employment and retail uses.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Land to the west of Rugby Road, Lutterworth' should be allocated for B1 office/ retail uses in the Local lan. The allocation of the site would contribute positively to the Local Plan's effectiveness by ensuring hat sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth in accordance with national policy (NPPF, para 7 - emphasis ours).

**Response:**

This site is included within one of Lutterworth's proposed Local Green Space designated under policy GI4 (Appendix I ref: LGS/LUTT/5 - River Swift Floodplain). The development of the site for B1 office/retail uses would not be consistent with its Local Green Space designation.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

5381 **Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The Car Park serves many businesses in the Town Centre and is well used. It contains parking for disabled, short term parking and parking for motor bikes and cycles. not sustainable to suggest any spaces should be lost or can be provided elsewhere. Not aware of suitable alternative sites. Retail floor space will require servicing which does not exist on the undeveloped land. Result in loss of parking and cause traffic conflicts. Drainage tanks have been built under the car park- part of flood relief. While we support efforts to enhance buildings, more positive action required.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This allocation should be deleted.  
Enhancement of existing shops supported but guidance can be included within RT2.

**Response:**

The scale of additional retail provision required in market Harborough is set out in the Retail Study Update 2017. The Council must identify sites to meet this need and the Common Car Park site is ideally located to contribute to future retail provision. Policy relating to the site specifies that there should be no net loss of car parking spaces within the town centre.

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

5960 **Mr John Martin [5974]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The development on the area known as the Commons Car Park in Market Harborough for retail use will mean a reduction in the spaces allocated for car parking. Market Harborough is already short of car parking facilities not taking into account the additional 1500 dwellings being built on the SDA

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Re consider the use of car parking spaces for retail development. With the existing supermarkets a review should be carried out into the real need for additional shops

**Response:**

The scale of additional retail provision required in Market Harborough is set out in the Retail Study Update 2017. The Council must identify sites to meet this need and the Common Car Park site is ideally located to contribute to future retail provision. Policy relating to the site specifies that there should be no net loss of car parking spaces within the town centre.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6420 Rockridge Properties Ltd [6256]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Neither of the sites identified as being suitable for retail development within draft policy RT1 3a and 3b are realistically deliverable and the Council will fail in making the desired provision by allocating retail use to unsuitable sites. St Mary's Road therefore provides a perfect opportunity to deliver on this objective particularly if this were better connected to the Springfield Retail Car Park (7.1.6) by enhanced crossings over the River Welland to better link the principal car parking provision with the Town Centre.

**Response:**

Whilst Land off St Mary's Road is allocated for leisure, entertainment and tourism uses, RT4 3a specifies that the site should deliver a mixed use scheme. A small scale element of residential and office development would be acceptable on the site providing it is complementary to the allocated use (leisure, entertainment and tourism) and secures the viability of the overall redevelopment scheme. Retail development would potentially impact on the Primary Shopping Area.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7280 Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We have no objection to the principle of development of the allocation of the Market Harborough sites for retail uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development. Similarly policy CC4 requires the use of SUDs on major development sites.

As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

**Response:**

Duplication noted. Modification proposed.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5412 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Any development needs to have regard to amenity of residents at Northbank

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete allocation

**Response:**

Minimising the impact of development on the amenity of existing and future residents is covered by criterion GD8e. There is no need to repeat this in RT1.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5961 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This clause in in conflict with Clause 7.. 3a above

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove the ambiguity beteen clauses 7.3a and clause 7..1v

**Response:**

Meaning of representation is unclear.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6393 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Commons car park is an important car park for those travelling from the west who wish to use the town centre. Car parking should be maintained on this site or very close by, as it also provides essential car parking that is accessible to the much used Doctors surgery that is close by. We do not yet know the results of the transport strategy and the implications that this may have for access to the Town Centre if proposals to make Abbey Street one way outbound are included, the Commons Car Park is even more important for local residents

**Change To Plan Sought:**

define where alternative car parks (providing an equal number of spaces) can be provided that would be within easy walking distance of Doctors surgery and Town Centre.

**Response:**

The policy relating to 'The Commons Car Park' in RT1 specifies that there should be no net loss of car parking spaces within the town centre as a result of the development. Some car parking provision will be retained on the site.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6695 Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Market Harborough Allocations: We have no objection to the principle of development of the allocation of the Market Harborough sites for retail uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development. Similarly policy CC4 requires the use of SUDs on major development sites.

As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

**Response:**

Duplication noted. Modification proposed.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5382 **Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

We feel that there is little scope for new development on this site- too late. It already provides valuable parking space for the Town Centre businesses. Development will require more parking and land for service vehicles. These have not been identified in the Plan. Wish to enhance buildings is supported but more positive action required.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This allocation should be deleted and any proposals dealt with under RT2

**Response:**

The scale of additional retail provision required in Market Harborough is set out in the Retail Study Update 2017. The Council must identify sites to meet this need and the Land off High Street site has the potential to contribute to future retail provision. Any redevelopment scheme could include an element of car parking. Alternative provision is available in the town.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7281 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We have no objection to the principle of development of the allocation of the Market Harborough sites for retail uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development. Similarly policy CC4 requires the use of SUDs on major development sites.

As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

**Response:**

Duplication noted. Modification proposed.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6696 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Market Harborough Allocations: We have no objection to the principle of development of the allocation of the Market Harborough sites for retail uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development. Similarly policy CC4 requires the use of SUDs on major development sites.

As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

**Response:**

Duplication noted. Modification proposed.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7262 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

19. The allocation of both convenience and comparison retail floor space within the Lutterworth East SDA in Policy RT1 is supported, as is the additional provision within Lutterworth town centre which will complement the development of the new local centre and maintain a balance across the expanded community.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6235 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

This is a comment rather than a supporting or objecting statement.

Market Harborough does lack a decent sized supermarket - all of the supermarkets we have are limited in their ranges compared to those in Corby Leicester Rugby and Kettering.

**Response:**

The Retail Study Update 2017 forecast a need for up to 1,800 sq.m additional convenience goods floorspace by 2021 and a further 1,300 sq.m by 2031 in Market Harborough.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6236 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Car based shopping is essential for those who use Market Harborough from the outlying villages - with few or no buses lack of suitable convenient car parking drives us to shop in Corby, Kettering, Rugby, Oadby or Wigston. To those living in rural villages including from Northamptonshire the car is an essential to get them to shops

Harborough District is made up of many villages residents do not all live within walking distance of the town centre. This approach disadvantages those who live in the rural areas of Harborough.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Increase car parking opportunities in order to accommodate growth through developments.

**Response:**

The policy relating to 'The Commons Car Park' in RT1 specifies that there should be no net loss of car parking spaces within the town centre as a result of the development.

**ReplD** **Representation**

7256 **Leciestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]**

**Nature**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

10. The emphasis on the vitality and viability of the town centres is supported, and the regeneration emphasis on Lutterworth town centre although it is considered there is scope to strengthen this further, beyond the focus on vacant units absorbing identified need in Lutterworth town centre.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

6076 **Mr Brian Poulter [4826]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Lutterworth town centre is already full of shops etc. There is little or no-scope for increasing. If more shops etc are made available then it will show the town has insufficient parking spaces to match the proposed facilities.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The town centre would have to be significantly altered/modified to increase it's number of buildings & increase the car parking facilities (it currently is already full & Lutterworth East will compound the problem.

**Response:**

The Retail Study Update 2017 identified a modest increase in the need for additional retail floorspace for Lutterworth. East of Lutterworth SDA will have some retail provision within the development to make it sustainable and reduce the need to travel. Proposals for new retail floorspace/town centre uses will be assessed in accordance with this policy.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

6071 **Shire Homes [6203]**

**Nature**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

My clients support the provision of additional shopping and business uses within the local centre area of Fleckney which includes their proposed development site at High Street. The scheme being prepared as a full planning application would include approximately 280 square metres of additional retail and other 'main town centre uses' and a replacement car park facility together with residential accommodation at first and second floors. Such a proposal would widen the available choice of retail facilities in the village to the benefit of existing and future residents.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7602 **INDIGO PLANNING (Mr Andrew Astin) [3831]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Policy RT3 requires new shopfronts to relate well in scale, proportion, material and decorative treatment to the façade of the building. In Conservation Areas changes will only be permitted where they contribute to the conservation and enhancement of the area's character or appearance.

The justification for the policy also notes that normally illuminated signage will not be permitted in Conservation Areas. There is no evidence to support the proposed objection to illuminated signage in conservation areas. Applications should be assessed in terms of their impacts and only where they will cause 'substantial harm' should development be restricted.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Applications should be assessed in terms of their impacts and only where they will cause 'substantial harm' should development be restricted. The policy should therefore be re-worded to reflect national planning policy, such that advertisements are only controlled in the interests of public safety and amenity or where they would individually or cumulatively result in 'substantial harm' to a heritage asset.

**Response:**

Whilst externally illuminated signs will generally be acceptable, it is internally illuminated signs/advertisements that will not normally be permitted in Conservation Areas. This is to ensure that shop fronts are sensitively designed to complement architectural details and historic features. This policy adds important local detail to national policy.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6237 **LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Attention should be paid to the facades of accommodation above some of the small shops. - in some cases they look unkempt and semi derelict - many of these are historical buildings they deserve some enhancement.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7409 **Historic England (Mrs Emilie Carr) [5702]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

This policy is welcomed.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7603 **INDIGO PLANNING (Mr Andrew Astin) [3831]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

There is no evidence to support the proposed objection to illuminated signage in conservation areas. Applications should be assessed in terms of their impacts and only where they will cause 'substantial harm' should development be restricted.

The policy should therefore be re-worded to reflect national planning policy, such that advertisements are only controlled in the interests of public safety and amenity or where they would individually or cumulatively result in 'substantial harm' to a heritage asset.

We trust that you will take these representations into consideration, however please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions in relation to the above comments.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There is no evidence to support the proposed objection to illuminated signage in conservation areas. Applications should be assessed in terms of their impacts and only where they will cause 'substantial harm' should development be restricted.

The policy should therefore be re-worded to reflect national planning policy, such that advertisements are only controlled in the interests of public safety and amenity or where they would individually or cumulatively result in 'substantial harm' to a heritage asset.

**Response:**

The sensitivity of Conservation Areas is such that internally illuminated signs and advertisement are generally not considered appropriate. This policy adds local detail to the NPPF.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7314 **Mr and Mrs Welton [6497]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

In relation to Policy RT4: Tourism and Leisure we support the identification of Market Harborough as a focal point for tourism development. The proposed development at Land off Harborough Road, Market Harborough will likely serve to enhance the attractiveness of the District for visitors due to the unique nature of the proposed low-energy development. The client's intend to make arrangements with Harborough District Council for the organisation of a series of open days during the construction period to enable others to learn more about the materials and techniques being used in the development, and how they can be utilised elsewhere.

**Response:**

Support for RT4 noted. There is no reference to Land off Harborough Road, Market Harborough in the Local Plan.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7491 Rockridge Properties Ltd [6256]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

To make any development viable along St Mary's Road it will be necessary to include a residential provision, together with retail and offices together with leisure, entertainment and tourism.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In conclusion therefore RT4 paragraph 3 of the draft Local Plan should be amended to:

"Land off St Mary's Road as shown on the Policies Map is allocated for residential, retail and offices together with leisure, entertainment and tourism"

Paragraph 7.7.7 should be amended to include:

"... a mixed use development to provide a combination of residential, retain, offices, a new hotel and/or a health and fitness centre and associated public house, bar or restaurant facilities.... "

We would urge the Council to amend the Plan accordingly.

**Response:**

Whilst Land off St Mary's Road is allocated for leisure, entertainment and tourism uses, RT4 3a specifies that the site should deliver a mixed use scheme. A small scale element of residential and office development would be acceptable on the site providing it is complementary to the allocated use (leisure, entertainment and tourism) and secures the viability of the overall redevelopment scheme. Amend 7.7.7 to reflect this. A retail element will not be acceptable due to potential impact Primary Shopping Area.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7282 Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We have no objection to the principle of development of the allocation of the Market Harborough sites for leisure, entertainment and tourism uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development. Similarly policy CC4 requires the use of SUDs on major development sites.

As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

**Response:**

Duplication noted. Modification proposed.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6259 Rockridge Properties Ltd [6256]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

To make any development viable along St Mary's Road it will be necessary to include a residential provision which will assist the Council in meeting its obligations under the Housing Allocations Policy H1.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If the Local Plan is to serve as a working document then its objectives need to be realistic and deliverable. Comprehensive development in the centre of a historic market town is never going to be possible and St Mary's Road offers the only practical opportunity for the Council to meet several of its obligations. However this needs to be mixed use rather than Tourism and Entertainment centric.

Amend RT4 para 3 to:

'Land off St Mary's Road as shown on the Policies map is allocated for residential, retail and offices together with leisure, entertainment and tourism.'

**Response:**

Whilst Land off St Mary's Road is allocated for leisure, entertainment and tourism uses, RT4 3a specifies that the site should deliver a mixed use scheme. A small scale element of residential and office development would be acceptable on the site providing it is complementary to the allocated use (leisure, entertainment and tourism) and secures the viability of the overall redevelopment scheme. Amend 7.7.7 to reflect this. A retail element will not be acceptable due to potential impact Primary Shopping Area.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6686 Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Land off St Mary's Road, Market Harborough: We have no objection to the principle of development of the allocation of the Market Harborough sites for leisure, entertainment and tourism uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development. Similarly policy CC4 requires the use of SUDs on major development sites.

As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we consider it unnecessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

**Response:**

Duplication noted. Modification proposed.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6240 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Support this policy with the addition below

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Please add subject to consideration given to traffic and highways issues and sufficient car parking being available.

**Response:**

These issues are dealt with in GD8 and IN2 and therefore do not need to be duplicated in this policy.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6418 Rockridge Properties Ltd [6256]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Paragraph 7.7.7 misdirects the Council in that the retail uses along St Mary's Road does not 'dilute the current retail offer' but rather presents a low cons opportunity for independent and local retailers and therefore complements the core retail provision. The success of the current Town Centre has made it unaffordable for the type of retailer the Council seeks to promote (para 7.3.3). By way of illustration in the past 3 years uses have changed at 43 St Mary's Road; financial services to a toy store, 57 St Mary's Road; solicitors to interiors retailer and 71 St Mary's Road; trade counter to antiques centre, independent retailers all.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If the Local Plan is to serve as a working document then its objectives need to be realistic and deliverable. Comprehensive development in the centre of a historic market town is never going to be possible and St Mary's Road offers the only practical opportunity for the Council to meet several of its obligations, however this needs to be mixed use rather than Tourism and Entertainment centric.

Amend RT4 para 3 to:

'Land off St Mary's Road as shown on the Policies map is allocated for residential, retail and offices together with leisure, entertainment and tourism.'

Amend para 7.7.7 to include:

'..a mixed use development to provide a combination of residential, retail, offices, a new hotel and/or a health and fitness centre and associated public house, bar or restaurant facilities...'

**Response:**

Whilst Land off St Mary's Road is allocated for leisure, entertainment and tourism uses, RT4 3a specifies that the site should deliver a mixed use scheme. A small scale element of residential and office development would be acceptable on the site providing it is complementary to the allocated uses (leisure, entertainment and tourism) and secures the viability of the overall redevelopment scheme. No change to RT4 but add sentence to 7.7.7 in explanation. A retail element will not be acceptable due to potential impact Primary Shopping Area.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7495 Rockridge Properties Ltd [6256]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Paragraph 7.7.7 misdirects the Council in that the retain uses along St Mary's Road does not 'dilute the current retail offer' but rather presents a low cost opportunity for independent and local retailers and therefore compliments the core retail provision. The success of the current Town Centre has made it unaffordable for the type of retailer the Council seeks to promote (Paragraph 7.3.3)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In conclusion therefore RT4 paragraph 3 of the draft Local Plan should be amended to:

"Land off St Mary's Road as shown on the Policies Map is allocated for residential, retail and offices together with leisure, entertainment and tourism"

Paragraph 7.7.7 should be amended to include:

"... a mixed use development to provide a combination of residential, retain, offices, a new hotel and/or a health and fitness centre and associated public house, bar or restaurant facilities.... "

We would urge the Council to amend the Plan accordingly.

**Response:**

Whilst Land off St Mary's Road is allocated for leisure, entertainment and tourism uses, RT4 3a specifies that the site should deliver a mixed use scheme. A small scale element of residential and office development would be acceptable on the site providing it is complementary to the allocated use (leisure, entertainment and tourism) and secures the viability of the overall redevelopment scheme. Amend 7.7.7 to reflect this. A retail element will not be acceptable due to potential impact Primary Shopping Area.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6722 Canal & River Trust (Mr Ian Dickinson) [4440]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

References to the Canal & River Trust's Destination Management Plan are not appropriate as this document has not been made publicly available; this document does not provide a definitive strategy for managing the Foxton Locks area and may well change during the life of the Local Plan. The reference to the Canal & River Trust potentially working with commercial accommodation developer partners is also inappropriate, as it suggests that this option may be prioritised over other options.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposed reference to the Destination Management Plan, and to working with commercial accommodation development providers as set out in paragraph 7.7.11 of the explanatory text to Policy RT4 should be removed, and we consider that the paragraph could be amended to read as follows:

7.7.11 The Canal and River Trust, as owner and operator of Foxton Locks, is working to identify how best to manage the area as a regional tourist destination in the future, including identifying necessary actions for stakeholders and apportioning resources accordingly. The proposed development is a Leicester and Leicestershire Economic Partnership (LLEP) priority through the Strategic Economic Plan, 2015 and there is future potential for the Canal & River Trust to work with the Council, LLEP, stakeholders and commercial development partners to progress a suitable scheme for the site. Any future visitor experience enhancement to Foxton Locks will be supported by the Council in partnership with the Canal & River Trust to help ensure that the future of the Locks is secured through appropriate sensitive sustainable development, providing this maintains and enhances the heritage asset in accordance with Policy HC1 Built heritage.

**Response:**

It is accepted that reference to the Canal & River Trust's Destination Management Plan is not appropriate. Wording at 7.7.11 to be amended.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6241 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Generally support, but more emphasis needed on local community heritage concerns - .

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Include mention of heritage content of Neighbourhood Plans and locally identified heritage assets including open space and village greens that may not otherwise be listed

**Response:**

Noted. Open space and village greens are covered by Policies GI2 and GI4. Local listing is adequately covered by paragraph 8.1.7.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7425 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy HC1 does not reflect the guidance contained in the Framework. Paragraphs 132 to 134 of the Framework relate specifically to designated heritage assets and highlight that the more important the asset the greater the weight that should be attached to it. The policies in the Local Plan therefore need to make such a distinction so as to ensure they are consistent with the Framework. Policy should distinguish between the two tests included in the Framework for designated heritage assets to ensure it is sound. Policy should also reflect NPPF para. 135 re: non-designated heritage assets to ensure soundness.

**Response:**

Agreed that the policies need to be consistent with the Framework and should distinguish between the two tests included in the Framework for designated heritage assets to ensure it is sound. Policy should also reflect NPPF para. 135 re: non-designated heritage assets to ensure soundness. Modification to Policy proposed.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5647 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6991 Family Carr [6455]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy HC1: Built Heritage, we support the requirement to protect, conserve and enhance local heritage assets in line with Paragraph 134 of the NPPF. Where a proposal will result in less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, Paragraph 134 of the Framework requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of a development scheme.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6718 Mr and Mrs Sellers [6412]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

With regards to Policy HC1: Built Heritage, we support the requirement to protect, conserve and enhance local heritage assets in line with Paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7147 Mr Simon Smith [4996]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Claybrooke water mill with is an operating water mill should be defined as a heritage asset and future developments with affect its commercial viability with regards to water course volumes and flows must be fully assessed and mitigated for weather it be to little water or too much. the policy BE2 for strategic distribution will directly impact on this heritage asset as they affect its headwaters at Bittesby.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The water mill should be a designated heritage asset within the local plan with appropriate monitoring and protection.

**Response:**

The Local Plan does not designate heritage assets. Claybrooke Mill is already a designated heritage asset (listed building) and is therefore covered by HC1. Listed buildings are not listed in the Local Plan but Appendix H Heritage assets shows where an up to date list can be found.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7364 Davidsons Developments Limited [4740]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This policy does not accurately reflect the heritage guidance in the NPPF (para 126)as it does not represent a positive strategy for heritage assets.

The requirement to adhere to the NPPF guidance is especially relevant to developments proposals which are considered to lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of heritage assets under paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

In this situation, it is necessary to assess the public benefits of the proposed development and then depending on the outcome of this assessment to undertake a balancing exercise under paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Change required to reflect heritage guidance in the NPPF to ensure there is a positive strategy for heritage assets.

**Response:**

Modification to policy proposed to reflect heritage guidance in the NPPF to ensure there is a positive strategy for heritage assets.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7609 **Bidwells (Mr Robert Love) [4663]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The requirement to adhere to the NPPF guidance is especially relevant to developments proposals which are considered to lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of heritage assets under paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

In this situation, it is necessary to assess the public benefits of the proposed development and then depending on the outcome of this assessment to undertake a balancing exercise under paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

This policy does not accurately reflect the heritage guidance in the NPPF as therefore it does not represent a positive strategy for heritage assets.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Change required to reflect heritage guidance in the NPPF to ensure there is a positive strategy for heritage assets.

**Response:**

Modification proposed to reflect heritage guidance in the NPPF to ensure there is a positive strategy for heritage assets.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6566 **Mr Niles Holroyde [6378]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

I would like to see the boundary of the Scraftoft Conservation Area restored to that which appeared in the Local Plan of 2001. Insufficient notification or justification for the removal from the Conservation Area of properties bounded by Main St and Stocks Road was made in 2012. To the extent that neither the Parish Council, my local Councillor or any of my neighbors actually realised that this had happened!

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Please restore the boundary of the Scraftoft Conservation Area to that shown on the proposals map of the 2001 Local Plan

**Response:**

The amendments to the boundary of the Scraftoft Conservation Area were carried out in 2007 and followed the process required at the time.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7426 **Historic England (Mrs Emilie Carr) [5702]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The provision of a built heritage policy is strongly welcomed, however it should be clearly strategic as emphasized by paragraph 156 of the NPPF. Without clarification in the Local Plan that the policy is strategic, the policy would not be considered to be sound.

Supporting text 8.1.12/13 should be shortened and amended to reflect the NPPF. By definition within the NPPF, enabling development is development that is not otherwise in accordance with adopted policy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It should be stated within the supporting text or an appendices to the plan that policy HC1 is strategic.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID Representation**

7075 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted .

**RepID Representation**

6723 Canal & River Trust (Mr Ian Dickinson) [4440]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

References to the Canal & River Trust's Destination Management Plan are not appropriate as this document has not been made publicly available. The requirement that future development should be in accordance with the Destination Management Plan is not justified, as this document does not provide a definitive strategy for managing the Foxton Locks area and may well change during the life of the Local Plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposed reference to the Destination Management Plan as set out in paragraph 8.1.14 of the explanatory text to Policy HC1 should be removed and we suggest that paragraph 8.1.14 could be amended as follows:

8.1.14 The policy sets out the Council's support for appropriate development of heritage assets for sustainable alternative uses, including for tourism and recreation. Foxton Locks is a nationally significant heritage asset within the District. It includes the Grade II\* flight of locks and other listed buildings associated with the Grand Union Canal and the Inclined Plane Scheduled Monument. The canal is also a Conservation Area. The Council has worked with the Canal & River Trust and its partners to deliver the first phase of improvements to the area. Further development must be suitably located and of an appropriate scale and design to ensure the protection of Foxton Locks as a nationally significant heritage asset.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID Representation**

7428 Historic England (Mrs Emilie Carr) [5702]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The provision of a built heritage policy is strongly welcomed, however it should be clearly strategic as emphasized by paragraph 156 of the NPPF. Without clarification in the Local Plan that the policy is strategic, the policy would not be considered to be sound.

Supporting text 8.1.12/13 should be shortened and amended to reflect the NPPF. By definition within the NPPF, enabling development is development that is not otherwise in accordance with adopted policy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Supporting text 8.1.12/13 should be shortened and amended to reflect the NPPF.

**Response:**

Noted. The text is based on HE guidance and provides useful explanation.

**RepID** **Representation**

5648 **Ms Caroline Pick [4194]**

**Nature**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

7390 **Sport England (Steven Beard) [4436]**

**Nature**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Support in principle Policy HC2. With regard to evidence, who demonstrates that a facility is no longer required. We are unsure what evidence is available to understand the demand, supply and needs for built sports facilities. This is even more relevant with regard to policy IN1.

**Response:**

Noted. The onus would be on the developer to demonstrate that a facility is no longer needed or no longer viable. Where applicable this would be assessed in light of the 'Refresh of Harborough District Community Infrastructure Assessment' and the upcoming 'Playing Pitch Strategy'.

**RepID** **Representation**

6813 **Mr Carl Hunt [861]**

**Nature**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

HDC to support the plans to build an affordable community swimming pool in Broughton Astley ahead of suggested alterations to Harborough Leisure Centre and Lutterworth Leisure Centre, that will provide Broughton Astley residents, local clubs and schools with facilities within easy reach of Broughton Astley and surrounding villages.

**Response:**

There are no plans to build a community swimming pool at Broughton Astley. Its inclusion in the Local Plan is not justified or deliverable.

**RepID** **Representation**

5498 **Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]**

**Nature**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Sound /Support. It is vital that communities which have had ,or are due to have ,substantial new development are supported by commensurate facilities with adequate capacity such as Doctors surgeries,schools and other community facilities. These need to be in place before new developments take place, otherwise existing residents are severely penalised.

Thurnby and Bushby have significant existing pressure on their Community facilities due to both large scale new development and also because residents from the City and from other out of catchment locations are taking up places in the village schools etc.

**Response:**

Noted. The trigger points balance developer cash flow with the requirement to provide community facilities. The Council is unable to require provision of services and facilities prior to development taking place.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5896 LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The East of Lutterworth SDA proposes to allocate a portion of a land for a replacement indoor sports centre for the town. It will be accessible to a large proportion of the population by walking, cycling or public transport. Therefore, given that this facility will serve the entirety of the town, it is suggested that criterion 3 of HC2 is revised to ensure that proposals will be acceptable that are accessible to the majority of the community by means other than a private car rather than solely by pedestrian routes.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is suggested that criterion 3 of HC2 is revised to ensure that proposals will be acceptable that are accessible to the majority of the community by means other than a private car rather than solely by pedestrian routes.

**Response:**

The provision of a replacement leisure centre is a requirement of L1 and therefore its general suitability as a location for such a community facility is established. HC2 applies to new community facilities in existing settlements and therefore reference to 'easy and safe walking distance' is appropriate.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6670 Mr Clive Grafton-Reed [4669]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The term permitted does not indicate any supported or conscious effort to achieve a more active population. The emphasis of the section appears to be on the maintenance of existing facilities without reference to addressing long standing deficits in provision.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Additional wording should be added to ensure action to resolve long recognised deficits in community facilities would be placed ahead of additions or enhancements to existing provision. An assumption of positive support for sustainable projects should added to ensure a broader spread of developments serving the wider population rather than focus simply on current faculties. It is silent on cooperation with other authorities, parish councils etc the assessment of leisure provision was not available in the supporting documentation and results from a recent survey were not available.

**Response:**

The policy supports the provision of new community facilities as well as maintaining existing facilities. The 'Refresh of Harborough District Community Infrastructure Assessment' and the upcoming 'Playing Pitch Strategy' identify deficits in provision and will be used to justify S106 contributions to meeting any deficits.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6984 Mrs Maureen Stell [6406]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Broughton Astley has planning permission for a new Leisure Centre which will be central to the village and within walking distance for most people. It is also planned to share land and parking with a Medical Facility. Where is this recognised and where is the support from the District council?

**Response:**

Broughton Astley has a made Neighbourhood Plan which forms part of the Development Plan and allocates/supports the delivery of a new leisure centre. It is unnecessary for the Local Plan to repeat the aims and policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5341 The Theatres Trust (Mr Ross Anthony) [3907]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Despite culture being included in Objective 13 of the draft Local Plan, the promotion of culture is not clearly reflected in any of the relevant draft policies.

In the NPPF, Paragraph 70 states that in 'promoting healthy communities', planning decisions should 'plan positively for cultural buildings' and 'guard against the loss of cultural facilities and services.' In addition, Paragraph 156 directs local planning authorities to ensure their local plan includes cultural policies that reflect the NPPF.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

1. The Trust recommends amending Policy HC2 Community facilities and the supporting text to include cultural facilities.

We recommend this succinct all inclusive description for 'community facilities' is used in para. 8.3.2 which would obviate the need to provide examples: community facilities provide for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community.

The Policy would then reflect the full intention of para 70 of the NPPF.

2. Alternatively, Policy RT4 - Tourism and Leisure could be amended to also include cultural facilities.

**Response:**

The absence of reference to cultural facilities is noted. Suggested wording amendment in relation to 'community facilities' at paragraph 8.3.2 proposed as modification.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6820 Leicestershire & Rutland Sport (Mr Harry Venning) [4380]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Given the rural nature and scale of Harborough District, Leicesters-Shire & Rutland Sport would support the importance placed on community facilities, specifically as places for Harborough residents to be physically active. Longer drive times to larger leisure facilities in Harborough places even more significance on provision of high quality, accessible local facilities.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7077 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound. However, the Parish Council is concerned at the pressure on existing community facilities (schools, GP surgeries etc) during the construction of new developments, before trigger points are reached.

**Response:**

Noted. The trigger points balance developer cash flow with the requirement to provide community facilities. The Council is unable to require provision of services and facilities prior to development taking place.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6242 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Please add - information on Community rights to bid and assets of community value.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

include - where the community have been unable to exercise a right to bid for an asset of community Value.

**Response:**

The right to bid for an Asset of Community Value is a separate process to the determination of planning applications. No change to policy is proposed.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6567 EAST LANGTON and CHURCH LANGTON Parish Council (Alison Gibson) [2624]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Allows for the loss of pubs where alternatives are within safe walking distance. We believe this needs to be reworded to apply to not losing the last pub in a village

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We believe this needs to be reworded to apply to not losing the last pub in a village

**Response:**

Incorrect interpretation of the policy. There is no reference to loss of pubs where alternatives are within safe walking distance. Not losing the last pub in a village would not be a justifiable restriction.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5649 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6840 Campaign for Real Ale, Leicester Branch (Mr Philip Tiplady) [4289]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Pubs are vital centres of community, particularly in rural areas and we support the strategy for retaining pubs. We recognise that there are circumstances in which pubs will close, but we want fair and open tests to establish that a pub is not viable and there is no operator or community group that wishes to take it on. We see this policy meets these requirements.

**Response:**

Noted



**RepID** **Representation**

7078 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

6842 Campaign for Real Ale, Leicester Branch (Mr Philip Tiplady) [4289]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Communities change and community facilities may change to meet new needs. Pubs may need to pursue new business areas to survive. Community facilities can find a home in pubs. We support a policy that permits these changes.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

6243 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

These facilities are vital to sustainable village life

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

6126 Mr Peter Jones [6225]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Here in North Kilworth we have had several "near misses" with our pub and relaxation of approaches promoting any form of income supplementation are to be welcomed.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7116 **Bloor Home Ltd [4935]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Soundness:

Bloor Homes object to Policy G11, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:

- is not effective as a means of ensuring green infrastructure is fully integrated with other GI networks across the District.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proposed Changes:

To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan:

- Include cross-reference to meeting the requirements of Policy G12 as part of the GI network.

**Response:**

The plan should be read as a whole. There is no need to cross-reference to other policies and in any event G11 is about more than the open space, sport and recreation sites covered by G12. Effectiveness of G11 is to be monitored through Policy IMR1 (1).

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7079 **THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council support as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5739 **Mrs Claire Sixt [6092]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This development will severely damage an important wildlife corridor for deer, foxes, hedgehogs, fieldmice, voles, owls and raptors moving between Harborough and Bowden. It should not be located here. If it must be located here, then the small forest must be retained or reinstated nearby, access must be via the current farm access road, widened up to the reservoir (there is space), with passing spaces and pavements, but with the hedgerows and trees reinstated nearby to preserve the wildlife corridor.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It would be better for the development to proceed on a less environmentally sensitive site. If the proposed development is to be built here at all, access should be through a road built over the current Burnmill farm access road linking directly with the Burnmill Road, widened up to the reservoir (there is plenty of space for this) and with hedgerows and trees reinstated elsewhere to preserve the very important wildlife corridor.

**Response:**

Comment relates to Policy MH3 and is covered by criteria d. and e. of that policy. Consideration of any planning application to be informed by ecology survey. Highway authority recommends access from Kingston Way

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6234 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

If sensitively designed - the River Welland could become an attractive feature throughout the town not just in the Commons Car Park

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6248 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Railway lines and river corridors are often important natural spaces and provide local footpaths for leisure activity, they do not always need to be 'developed' in order to maximise their potential value to the community.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Development or protection which supports the potential of the following strategic green infrastructure assets to contribute to the aims of the wider green infrastructure network will be permitted:

**Response:**

Policy G11 clause 2 covers the safeguarding of green infrastructure assets.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6127 Mr Peter Jones [6225]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

It would be great to see CPOs or an ability to develop permissive rights of way over all the closed railway routes in the District for cycling and walking - particularly Harborough to Rugby as far as the A14 to the west.

**Response:**

Noted. The suggested action would require resources currently not available, but the policy would support this.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6480 **Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Not enough is being done to comply with NPPF - mapping of corridors along with habitat permeability mapping should inform this. There should be a commitment to establish the current position and improve it - e.g. connect fragmented habitats, a net gain of biodiversity / good quality habitat area etc). The management of existing and future habitats should also be written into the plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We would like to see an up-to-date habitat network map produced along with habitat permeability modelling to identify areas of strategic GI importance for their biological value as well as areas of opportunity to enhance and join up existing habitats. We would expect to see surveys undertaken to establish the baseline biodiversity and monitoring where opportunities are taken to protect, enhance green infrastructure - in particular that affecting wildlife (in line with paragraphs 114 and 117 of the NPPF). We would also like to see a commitment to a net gain of green infrastructure, especially habitat corridors and networks which benefit wildlife. The management of existing and future habitats should also be written into the plan.

**Response:**

Noted. The Open Spaces Strategy supports these aspirations.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7229 **Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Section is generally accepted and some of the previous comments have been addressed which is welcomed and adds to the clarity. A definition of Green Infrastructure would be useful at the beginning of the section and also to briefly refer to other benefits associated with Green Infrastructure to link it to relevant policy areas within the Plan e.g. Biodiversity, flooding, Air Quality/Climate Change, Sports/Recreation.

**Response:**

Green Infrastructure definition is provided in 9.1.1 as part of the NPPF definition.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6024 **Market Harborough & the Bowdens Charity [6192]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

My clients object to the entirety of their lands off Northampton Road being identified in the Local Plan as "open space, sport and recreational facilities";

The land as shown on the attached plan extends to 1.8ha however only approximately 1ha has been cultivated and used as allotments in the recent past. For the last 30+ years the vast majority of the area to the north of the access track has remained uncultivated whilst my clients pursued alternative use planning designations.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The area of land to the north of the access track extending to approximately 0.8ha should be removed from the Open Space designation and identified as land within the town boundary therefore suitable for a range of alternative uses including residential.

**Response:**

The site is an important allotment site within the town and linked to other open spaces. Alternative uses not considered appropriate.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6250 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Local village Greens and open spaces are not shown on the proposals map and presumably are not covered by this protection - we believe it is important that these are included here, or clarification made of how local village greens and volunteer run play areas are supported and protected.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Local village Greens and open spaces should be shown on the proposals map or clarification made of how local village greens and volunteer run play areas are supported and protected.

**Response:**

Open Space Sport and Recreation Sites and Local Green Space (where designated) are included on the Policies Map. Village Greens are not included unless within these categories.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7123 Bloor Home Ltd [4935]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Soundness:

Bloor Homes object to Policy GI2, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:

- is not justified in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not properly considered reasonable alternative strategies; and
- is inconsistent with national policy in that it does not fully reflect the Government's priorities and policies in terms of the provision of public open space and facilitating the delivery of sustainable development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proposed Changes:

To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan the policy should be reworded to provide additional flexibility in the provision of public open spaces on development sites that reflect the required standards taking account of the existing (or proposed) provision in the area and the specific characteristics of the development site and encourage the delivery of multi-functional public open space in the context of the aspirations of Policy GI1 in relation to Green Infrastructure.

**Response:**

The objection does not demonstrate how the policy is inconsistent with national policy nor what alternatives should have been addressed. It is not considered that there are any other reasonable alternatives. Criterion 2 provides flexibility in relation to loss or reduction of open space.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7372 Farmcare Trading Ltd [6512]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Go-Kart Track should not be identified as an open space, sport and recreation site. It does not fit with the typologies set out at table B.30 and therefore it is unclear why it has been protected.

There is currently conflict with retaining this use and the overall economic growth of the site, which is compatible with the established airfield and aviation uses. Furthermore the site is subject to local objection. It is therefore recommended that it is allocated for alternative employment uses as part of the 'complex north of Gartree Road'.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove go-kart track from open space, sport and recreation sites as shown on Policies Map and include area within 'complex to the north of Gartree Road'.

**Response:**

It is considered that the facility falls within the 'Outdoor Sports Facilities' typology.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6455 Mrs Kathleen Rowell [4871]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

This an opportunity to improve sports and recreation facilities in the broader HDC District, at the moment there is a great inequity, Lutterworth Broughton Astley are very poorly served..... TIME FOR A CHANGE IN HDC ATTITUDE TO TAX PAYERS ON THE FRINGES OF THE DISTRICT.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7273 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound. The Parish Council responded to the Green Spaces Review in 2016, recommending a number of sites be designated as OSSRs. Four of these have been omitted from the Inset Map 63 (Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby) and need to be included - the areas are the greens on Telford Way; between Forest and Anthony Drive; Bradgate Close; and, Hollies Way.

**Response:**

The sites included in the representation will be added to the Policies Map.

**RepID** **Representation**

7575 Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Agree with Thurnby & Bushby OSSRs as specified on the map.

They are in line with our response to HDC's Green Spaces Consultation 3 June - 15 July 2016 (which also included a list of proposed OSSRs).

Support as plan meets the soundness requirements.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6748 Leicestershire & Rutland Sport (Mr Harry Venning) [4380]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Leicester-Shire & Rutland Sport would support the this policy. Harborough District Council is currently undertaking a Playing Pitch Strategy (9.3.8) and we would expect this evidence base to be consulted within the first instance to help inform the decision making process

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6030 Market Harborough & the Bowdens Charity [6192]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of allotment lands there is a clear distinction between the gross area of land which may contain allotments and the actual net area used for allotments and their immediate ancillary and supporting uses. My clients land at Northampton Road extends to 1.8ha but only about 0.75ha has been used as allotments over the last thirty years or so. Consequently emerging planning policies should, in the event that the land may be developed at some time in the future, only provide for an equivalent replacement of the net allotment area lost to development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The policy should be amended so as to provide that if any such land is developed in the future, then the obligation to provide replacement allotments shall only extend to providing a facility with an area equivalent to the average area of those allotments previously under cultivation on the developed site over the course of the preceding five years.

I attach plans of the two allotment fields run by my client charity where the issue of gross/net equivalent replacement areas would be relevant.

**Response:**

The entire allotment site as defined on the Policies Map should be retained for increased use in the future as the town grows.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6252 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

all developments of over 10 dwellings (ideally over 5) should support local facilities e.g .play areas, open spaces, regardless of if they result in deficiencies etc

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Developments of more than 10 dwellings will contribute towards local play and sports facilities

**Response:**

It is not clear why the objector considers that Policy G12 does not meet the requirement described.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5921 Dr I.D. v.d. Ploeg [4817]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I have noticed green space is craftily being recycled for the next project such as the disused railway line which was used as green space for the first development and then reused for the next development by using the railway embankment which was part of the green space anyway. This should be stopped. More trees are needed.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No recycling of green space that was already there. More trees to be planted and more bicycle paths that are separate from the road so people can get to parks on their bikes instead of by car.

I don't know whether the plan is legally compliant as I am not a lawyer but I can only submit if I say it is so I have ticked yes.

**Response:**

All existing and proposed open space and all existing and committed development is taken into account in assessing the requirement for a particular development proposal.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6454 Mrs Kathleen Rowell [4871]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Developers should be required to include all neighbourhood facilities at an earlier stage of a large development and should not be allowed to opt out as is common practice.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Insert wording requiring developers to include all neighbourhood facilities at an earlier stage of a large development.

**Response:**

The phasing of infrastructure delivery in SDAs is included in Policies SC1 and L1 and would be covered in more detail in the Masterplans. On other large allocated sites, this will be a matter for Section 106 agreements as set out in Policy IN1 (2). No evidence is submitted to support the contention that developers have been allowed to opt out of provision. Policy IN1 (1) requires infrastructure to be either already provided or provided 'when needed'.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6751 **Leicestershire & Rutland Sport (Mr Harry Venning) [4380]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Leicester-Shire & Rutland Sport would support this policy in line with our own Physical Activity & Sport Strategy 2017-2021.

<https://www.lrsport.org/uploads/lrs-physical-activity-sport-strategy-2017-2021.pdf>

We would promote the use of National Governing Body design guidance where appropriate also to ensure high quality and good design is achieved that encourages Harborough residents to be physically active.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7392 **Sport England (Steven Beard) [4436]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

G12 this policy is supported in principle particularly around the use of the emerging Playing Pitch Strategy 2017 which details not only the provision requirements but also quality improvements which could meet the demands generated by development. We are concerned with regard to the reference to and accessibility standard 4km or 10mins drive/bus this is not appropriate in all circumstances and not for all sports. The emerging playing pitch strategy will provide more information on this aspect.

It is not clear if the plan fully details with the needs for new or replacement built sports facilities particularly sports halls and swimming pools (leisure centres) having regard to Para 70 of NPPF and the requirement to plan positively.

**Response:**

IN1 deals with indoor sports provision and is an enabling policy.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7233 **Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The Council notes that a Playing Pitch Strategy has not been produced to evidence sports provision.

**Response:**

The Playing Pitch Strategy was delayed due to various factors but is available now to support the Local Plan at examination.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6103 william davis (mr james chatterton) [5796]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We consider, therefore that Policy G13c should be amended to provide a non-site specific enabling policy for a cemetery to serve Market Harborough and surrounding villages pending further review of alternative options.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We consider, therefore that Policy G13c should be amended to provide a non-site specific enabling policy for a cemetery to serve Market Harborough and surrounding villages pending further review of alternative options.

**Response:**

There is an identified need for cemetery spaces in and around Market Harborough. The site has been allocated after site appraisals.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6158 John Martin & Associates (Mr Martin Bagshaw) [6235]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Without the agreement of the landowners the proposed allocation is not deliverable.

No evidence has been provided to confirm which other sites have been assessed or how consideration as to the future uses for the balance of the site area or proximity to the gas governor station have been taken into account in determining the proposed allocation

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reassessment of proposed allocation G13(c)

**Response:**

There is an identified need for cemetery space in and around MH. The site has been allocated after site appraisals.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7082 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6129 **MR Michael Wilcox [5164]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

There is no green space areas identified within Ullesthorpe

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The previous local plan identified some green spaces particularly near the conservation area and these should be retained

**Response:**

OSSR sites are shown (Fairway Meadows site needs to be added to Policies Map - considered to be a minor modification). No Local Green Space sites were submitted in Ullesthorpe. The Ullesthorpe NDP can designate Local Green Space.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7399 **Wells McFarlane (Trevor Wells) [3916]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

We object to the designation of a parcel of land to the west of Rugby Road, Lutterworth as a 'Local Green Space' (as shown on Inset Map: 64 (Lutterworth, Bitteswell and Magna Park)). The designation is not justified and, as such, Policy GI4 is unsound.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposed designation of 'Land to the west of Rugby Road, Lutterworth' should not be taken forward in the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The site has been assessed as being suitable to designate. The site has not been previously promoted as one suitable for development.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5650 **Ms Caroline Pick [4194]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6302 **HUNGARTON Parish Council (Mr Andrew May) [2640]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

The policy map for Hungarton does not show the 4 local green spaces identified and validated through our Neighbourhood Development Plan process. As the plan has now been made these should now be included in the policy map.

**Response:**

Neighbourhood Plan designated LGS does not appear in the Policies Map, since these will change as NPs are prepared. It will be included on the online mapping.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6549 Mrs Linda Bryan [6238]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Under the new proposal several areas previously designated as "important open space" have had that designation quite rightly removed. They do not serve either the 'public' or any other 'important' function. Planners have recognised inappropriate land designations.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7084 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7524 Dr Andrew Moltu [6001]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Arnesby is not the chocolate box village the Parish Council like to imply.

There are many areas that could support infill building that have been left unused offering nothing to the outlook or service of the village.

The district plan should facilitate reasonable development and not be used as a blunt tool for those who will object to all development.

I believe trained planners are better skilled to make these decisions than residents with Nimby agenda.

**Response:**

The issue of need for development in a settlement is not relevant to Local Green Space considerations. Concerns about lack of development in Arnesby are addressed under Policies SS1/ H1.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7576 Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Agree with Thurnby & Bushby LGSs as specified in Table 30 and on the map.

They are in line with our response to HDC's Green Spaces Consultation 3 June - 15 July 2016.

Support as plan meets the soundness requirements.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5922 Dr I.D. v.d. Ploeg [4817]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Green space should not be lost.

I don't know whether the plan is legally compliant as I am not a lawyer but I can only submit if I say it is so I have ticked yes.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Green space should not be lost.

**Response:**

The wording is in line with paragraphs 76 and 78 of the NPPF.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6697 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The Local Green Space Designation is restrictive in that it significantly limits development which can come forward within the designated land.

There are existing sewers in Anglian Water's ownership within the designated local green space for Medbourne as identified on the Policies Map. Our concern is that the policy as drafted does not allow for development to enable continuing operation of existing water recycling infrastructure to serve our customers.

It is therefore proposed that the wording of the second paragraph of the policy be amended as follows:

'The construction of new buildings....Local Green Space. Utility infrastructure where the benefits override the potential impact on the designation'

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is proposed that the wording of the second paragraph of the policy be amended as follows:

'The construction of new buildings....Local Green Space. Utility infrastructure where the benefits override the potential impact on the designation'

**Response:**

The policy relates only to new buildings and so would not restrict the maintenance of utilities infrastructure, or indeed other forms of development not involving new buildings.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7283 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The Local Green Space Designation is restrictive in that it significantly limits development which can come forward within the designated land.

There are existing sewers in Anglian Water's ownership within the designated local green space for Medbourne as identified on the Policies Map. Our concern is that the policy as drafted does not allow for development to enable continuing operation of existing water recycling infrastructure to serve our customers.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The wording of the second paragraph of the policy be amended as follows:

'The construction of new buildings....Local Green Space. Utility infrastructure where the benefits override the potential impact on the designation'

**Response:**

The policy relates only to new buildings and so would not restrict the maintenance of utilities infrastructure, or indeed other forms of development not involving new buildings.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5651 Ms Caroline Pick [4194]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

CPRE Leicestershire supports this policy

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6128 Mr Peter Jones [6225]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I support on the caveat that "open green spaces" are solely as defined in the Neighbourhood Plan and is not wrongly applied to private gardens as has been the case in the past in North Kilworth.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6815 Mr Carl Hunt [861]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Green spaces must be protected from infill and small pockets of development specifically when the development does not qualify as meeting community needs (e.g. sale of land for personal profit)

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7086 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7230 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The SSSI sites and areas of Local Green Space are included in the Appendix I and J but there is no reference to Local Wildlife Sites which although non-statutory are still a material consideration in planning.

The following needs to be addressed:

- There is no reference to how net loss/gain will be measured/monitored
- Will there be a map/plan to show the designated areas ?- the location of sites needs to be shown .

**Response:**

Local wildlife sites are included in the Policies Map, but would be too numerous to list in Appendix J. Monitoring of Policy G15 is included in the Monitoring Framework (Appendix K).

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6773 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the Environment Agency is in support of Policy G15, we would question whether bullet-points 3 - 6 in the Policy are correctly labelled or whether they are in fact sub-points of bullet-point 2 (and therefore should be roman numerals). This may have a knock-on effect of subsequent bullet-point labelling in the Policy.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5740 Mrs Claire Sixt [6092]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed housing development on part of Burnmill Farm will severely damage an important wildlife corridor for deer, foxes, hedgehogs, fieldmice, voles, owls (at least two species) and raptors moving between Harborough and Bowden.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The development should not be located here. If it must be located here, then the small forest must be retained or reinstated nearby, access must be via the current farm access road, widened up to the reservoir (there is plenty of space for this), with passing spaces and pavements, but with the current hedgerows and trees reinstated nearby to preserve the wildlife corridor.

**Response:**

Comment relates to Policy MH3 and is covered by criteria d. and e. of that policy. Further details can be negotiated through a planning application. Highway authority recommends access from Kingston Way.

---



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6481 **Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Should include sites that meet LWS criteria but have not been notified - a lack of a notification does not mean that the site does not contain locally valuable habitats.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Should include sites that meet LWS criteria but have not been notified - a lack of a notification does not mean that the site does not contain locally valuable habitats.

**Response:**

This would not be a practical policy since its application would be unclear. If a site meets the criteria then it should be designated.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6777 **Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the Environment Agency is in support of Policy G15, we would question whether bullet-points 3 - 6 in the Policy are correctly labelled or whether they are in fact sub-points of bullet-point 2 (and therefore should be roman numerals). This may have a knock-on effect of subsequent bullet-point labelling in the Policy.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6781 **Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the Environment Agency is in support of Policy G15, we would question whether bullet-points 3 - 6 in the Policy are correctly labelled or whether they are in fact sub-points of bullet-point 2 (and therefore should be roman numerals). This may have a knock-on effect of subsequent bullet-point labelling in the Policy.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6782 **Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the Environment Agency is in support of Policy G15, we would question whether bullet-points 3 - 6 in the Policy are correctly labelled or whether they are in fact sub-points of bullet-point 2 (and therefore should be roman numerals). This may have a knock-on effect of subsequent bullet-point labelling in the Policy.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6456 Mrs Kathleen Rowell [4871]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I support this statement but question commitment by HDC if they allow the devastation of biodiversity that would result if the massive Magna Park expansion is allowed.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6784 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the Environment Agency is in support of Policy G15, we would question whether bullet-point 3 - 6 in the Policy are correctly labelled or whether they are in fact sub-points of bullet-point 2 (and therefore should be roman numerals). This may have a knock-on effect of subsequent bullet-point labelling in the Policy.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6838 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Environment Agency is particularly supportive of points 'a' through to 'g' of clause 7.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6482 Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This should be modified. To be able to do this, a mapping exercise should identify 'strategic biodiversity networks and corridors'. This would be compliant with the NPPF, paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that 'To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, planning policies should: ● identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation'.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Produce an up-to-date habitat network map produced along with habitat permeability modelling to identify areas of strategic GI importance for their biological value as well as areas of opportunity to enhance and join up existing habitats.

**Response:**

Noted. Wildlife corridors are mapped but will not be included on the Policies Map. An online mapping facility will be available for these sites.

**RepID** **Representation**

7055 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We particularly welcome paragraph 9.9.2 as this will support a proposed Water Framework Directive and biodiversity improvement at Market Harborough Water Recycling Centre land which we are in discussion with Anglian Water about under PR19 draft submissions.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6483 Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not strong enough commitment NPPF states 'planning policies should: promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations'

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Change wording to 'Developments will result in a net gain of biodiversity. The LPA will actively promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations. Developments should aim not to harm geological conservation interests'.

**Response:**

Noted. The Open Spaces Strategy seeks to address these issues.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6484 Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

THIS COMMENT IS FOR 9.9.5

As stated before mapping of existing corridors should be done and this would help to inform the provision of / enhancement of blue or green corridors. See paragraph 117 of the NPPF regarding mapping.

**Response:**

The mapping of Green Infrastructure is complete. This will be shown on the online version of the district mapping.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6485 **Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We would welcome this but wish to point out the Harborough District Council have not contacted LRWT personally. We may be included on email circulations but have not received any personal day-to-day contact from officers or elected officials. The use of 'partners' or 'partnership' with relation to the current situation should be taken as the broadest use of these terms, although we would welcome more interest / partnership work to benefit biodiversity and habitats. As mentioned before, mapping of habitats and habitat permeability would be a good place to start as per paragraph 117 of the NPPF.

**Response:**

Noted. Further partnership working to be pursued subject to resources.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6797 **Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

The Environment Agency look forward to continuing to work with the Local Planning Authority and other professional partners in identifying key opportunity areas for the improvement of biodiversity value.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6486 **Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

We would like to see more here to comply with NPPF paragraph 117 - identify and map components of the local ecological networks... At present the wording of the Harborough Local Plan does not appear to be committed to addressing the biodiversity deficit in the District.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The LPA should be more committed to addressing the biodiversity deficit in Harborough, the current wording does not appear to give any commitment to delivering, as per the NPPF, for biodiversity.

**Response:**

Noted. The Open Spaces Strategy seeks to address these issues

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7046 **Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst we support the evidence base included here, we suggest consideration is given to also including the River Basin Management Plans listed in Table B42 in order to emphasis the evidence sources.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

6102 **william davis (mr james chatterton) [5796]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Despite the proposed Policy being in line with the central Government's overall objectives for mitigating against climate change, there has been no evidence to show the Policy has been subject to the required viability tests, in accordance with paragraph 173 of the NPPF. Therefore, these can be considered unsound.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This Policy should be altered to allow for site by site discussion with developers

**Response:**

Policy is robust. Carbon reduction measures included would be subject to viability considerations see 10.1.3. The Harborough Viability Assessment Report considered the viability implications of each policy within the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

7124 **Bloor Home Ltd [4935]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Soundness:

Bloor Homes object to Policy CC1, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:

- is not effective as a means of ensuring development mitigates climate change without unduly restricting the viability and/or delivery of development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proposed Changes:

To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan the policy should be reworded include reference to "alternative measures, such as a fabric first approach, as appropriate to the site and demonstrated by the developer to meet overarching climate targets".

**Response:**

Policy is robust. Carbon reduction measures included would be subject to viability considerations see 10.1.3. The Harborough Viability Assessment Report considered the viability implications of each policy within the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

7442 **Harborough Green Party (Mr Darren Woodiwiss) [6374]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

A robust model is needed to appraise developer viability assessments to ensure that they meet their moral responsibilities in terms of carbon emissions / energy efficiency.

There should be provision to ensure;

- Council building and commissioning is at the highest thermal standards.

- all new builds produce at least 15% of their energy requirements on site and commercial developments require a 40% BER improvement

**Response:**

Noted. Provisions relating to Council building and commissioning are considered to lie beyond the remit of the Local Plan. The suggested amendment is considered to make a specific requirement that could have viability implications which have not been assessed.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7315 Mr and Mrs Welton [6497]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the objectives of Policy CC1: Mitigating Climate Change in line with Paragraphs 93 and 94 of the Framework. The proposed development at Land off Harborough Road will serve to demonstrate how residential developments can be delivered in a low energy manner.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7331 IDI Gazeley [168]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Supported because of the obligations it places on major developments to minimise resource use and reduce carbon emissions.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7445 Harborough Green Party (Mr Darren Woodiwiss) [6374]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Suggest requirements for new build / refurbishment standards be implemented through a Sustainability Checklist, with applicants required to submit a completed checklist when a planning application is made. Checklist to include; Considerate Constructors Scheme registration, cycle storage standards, minimum daylighting standards, ecological mitigation and enhancement, environmental impact of materials, external lighting (low energy), flood risk assessments (FRA) and site waste management plans (SWMP).

Suggest Local Plan or associated guidance includes a requirement for;

- housing undergoing refurbishment to achieve minimum BREEAM 'Very Good' rating
- commercial refurbishments meet minimum BREEAM 'Very Good' (Refurbishment & Fit-out Standards) rating

**Response:**

Noted. The policy is considered NPPF compliant. The suggested amendment would have viability implications that have not been assessed.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5898 LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The aims and objectives of policy CC1 are supported; however it is considered that it goes beyond national planning policy and the requirements of the national housing standards. The policy as written could be open to wide interpretation which could hamper growth. It is also suggested that a clause that gives specific consideration to viability is inserted.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend policy to be in accordance with national policy and housing standards.

Insert a clause that gives specific consideration to viability.

**Response:**

Policy is robust. Carbon reduction measures included should include cost effective measures - see 10.1.3. The Harborough Viability Assessment Report considered the viability implications of each policy within the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The construction costs used within the assessment are based on BCIS costs from the last five years which therefore include any costs associated with the current building regulations. The assessment also includes a sensitivity test for increased construction costs. However, the policy requires the applicant to demonstrate how each element is addressed, rather than requiring a specific standard to be met.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6122 Mr Peter Jones [6225]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

As a personal house holder involved in the conversion of my own 2 barns to a very high standard of appearance and carbon efficiency it is galling to see commercial development permitted on a cheapskate basis without compulsory requirements for renewable energy or CHP.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7396 Historic England (Mrs Emilie Carr) [5702]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Historic England object to the wording of section one, criteria c in relation to 'harm', being unclear and over-simplistic in relation to 'substantial' and 'less than substantial harm', and to the approach taken within section two, it's supporting text and figure A.4 identifying potential areas for medium scale wind development and large wind farms, contrary to the NPPF.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Section one, criteria c should be reworded for clarity to:-  
"it avoids harm to any heritage asset, designated or not and its setting"

**Response:**

Policy is robust, it conforms with NPPF para 97, 132 and 134 in relation to the need to weigh any less than substantial harm against the benefits of the proposal.

**RepID Representation**

5514 LUTTERWORTH TOWN COUNCIL Parish Council (Andrew Ellis) [2656]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

It is sound because the cumulative visual impact is taken into consideration because there is significant developments bordering our area. specifically in Northamptonshire and Warwickshire.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

7402 Historic England (Mrs Emilie Carr) [5702]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Historic England object to the wording of section one, criteria c in relation to 'harm', being unclear and over-simplistic in relation to 'substantial' and 'less than substantial harm', and to the approach taken within section two, it's supporting text and figure A.4 identifying potential areas for medium scale wind development and large wind farms, contrary to the NPPF.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Section two of policy CC2 should be deleted. Figure A.4 cannot support a sound Local Plan policy in relation to wind energy, as it is not based on a robust evidence base or methodology nor does it adequately address the historic environment as set out above.

Before identifying specific areas as being potentially suitable or unsuitable for wind energy developments, there needs to be a more robust evaluation of the likely impact upon the heritage assets of the borough, reflected within policy CC2 and its supporting text. Since this would require a detailed site by site assessment considering multiple effects upon the significance of multiple assets, it would be problematic to produce a map based document that is fit for purpose, given that it would require a similar level of resource investment as the creation of a housing allocation plan with extensive site by site, option by option assessment.

**Response:**

Policy is robust (see section 10.3.2 and 10.3.4). Any development in one of the broad areas identified in clause 2 would be subject to full assessment against the criteria in clause 1. House of Commons Written Statement HCWS42 does not require the level of assessment suggested.

**RepID Representation**

6038 Mr David Jones [4742]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Wind turbines should not be permitted where they would visually affect the views of Lutterworth & particularly St Mary's Parish Church. from the south and east of the town.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No wind turbines will be permitted where they would visually affect the views of Lutterworth, & St Mary's Parish Church particularly from the East and South .

**Response:**

Noted. This is covered in criteria 1c and 1d.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5516 LUTTERWORTH TOWN COUNCIL Parish Council (Andrew Ellis) [2656]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is inappropriate and contradicts policy CC2 1g

**Change To Plan Sought:**

large wind farms (4 or more turbines up to 125 metres):Upper Soar landscape areas.

**Response:**

Policy is robust (see section 10.3.2 and 10.3.4). Any development in one of the broad areas identified in clause 2 would be subject to full assessment against the criteria in clause 1.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5822 Mr Paul Longhorn [6098]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

A reasonable number of wind turbines have been installed in the Upper Soar and Lutterworth Lowlands Landscape. The prospect of large scale wind farms in this area would have a permanently disastrous impact on the character of the area and the lives of the inhabitants.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Provide greater clarity on the safeguards to be included in the plan to ensure that the character of villages and the surrounding area is preserved.

**Response:**

Policy is robust. Cumulative impact is addressed in criterion 1g.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6040 Mr David Jones [4742]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No wind turbines will be permitted where they would visually affect the views of Lutterworth & St Mary's Parish Church particularly from the south and east.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No wind turbines will be permitted where they would visually affect the views of Lutterworth & St Mary's Parish Church particularly from the south and east.

**Response:**

Noted. This is covered in criteria 1c and 1d.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7447 **Harborough Green Party (Mr Darren Woodiwiss) [6374]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Definition (para. 10.3.3) should exclude incineration and Energy from waste solutions. These are not only detrimental to the health of the local population through the emissions of dioxins they also have the legacy of toxic fly ash that needs to be land filled as well as creating a need for large volumes of rubbish which diverts potential waste streams from the local recycling industry.

**Response:**

Policy is robust (see criterion 1f).

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7449 **Harborough Green Party (Mr Darren Woodiwiss) [6374]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Sustainable Harborough Challenge (referred to in para 10.3.6) was called simply 'Sustainable Harborough'

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5966 **Mr John Martin [5974]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Development in an area of any grade of flooding should not be allowed without the impact of such development on upstream dwellings is fully considered. The withdrawal of the Government backed insurance scheme is likely leaving houses built on areas with a risk of flooding un insurable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Rewrite this paragraph to take of comments above

**Response:**

Policy is robust. Sequential test required para 10.5.7

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6898 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The massive plans to significantly expand Magna Park would probably only add to the risk of flooding in the Swift Valley.

Lutterworth already is prone to flooding as the river swells on and over the A426.

Building warehouses equivalent to building 7 O2 or Millennium Domes on rural farmland will make flooding even more likely in the future.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not materially expand Magna Park.

**Response:**

Noted. Development will be considered against the requirements of Policy CC3. Development at Magna Park is covered by Policy BE2.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7013 Mr Simon Smith [4996]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Magna park and proposed developments causing downstream flooding.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Consult With LLFA on evidence they have in relation to flooding downstream of distribution centre. as it enlarges over recent years,

**Response:**

Noted. Development will be considered against the requirements of Policy CC3. Policy BE2 covers development at Magna Park.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6693 Mr and Mrs Gowling [6400]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy CC3: Managing Flood Risk, we fully support the objectives of this Policy in line with Paragraphs 14 and 100 of the NPPF. It is logical that this translates into development being located in areas that are not at high risk of flooding, and that developments do not increase flood risk elsewhere. With reference to the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning, MH2 & MH6 are in Flood Zone apart from a small tributary to the River Jordan. Any development at the site would be underpinned by a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy MH2 criterion 1h and Policy MH6 criterion 1j deal specifically with those sites.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6720 Mr and Mrs Sellers [6412]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Policy CC3: Managing Flood Risk, we fully support the objectives of this policy in line with Paragraphs 14 and 100 of the NPPF. Given that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is the golden thread running through the national and local planning policy, it is logical that this translates into development being located in areas that are not at high risk of flooding, and that schemes do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. With reference to the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning, the proposed development site not located in an area at risk of flooding.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6812 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Environment Agency supports the content of CC3, clause 1 in the respect that it emphasises the need for the Sequential Test to steer new development to the areas at least flood risk, and also for the effects of climate change to be taken into account during the decision making process.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6992 Family Carr [6455]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

With regards to Policy CC3: Managing Flood Risk, we fully support the objectives of the policy in line with Paragraphs 14 and 100 of the NPPF. Given that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is the golden thread running through the national and local planning policy, it is logical that this translates into development being located in areas that are not at high risk of flooding, and that schemes do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. With reference to the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning, the proposed development site is located within Flood Zone 1.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7317 Mr and Mrs Welton [6497]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy CC3: Managing Flood Risk, we fully support the objectives of this Policy in line with Paragraphs 14 and 100 of the NPPF. Given that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is the golden thread running through national and local planning policy, it is logical that this translates into development being located in areas that are not at high risk of flooding, and that schemes do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. With reference to the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning, the proposed development site is predominately located within Flood Zone 1.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7523 Westleigh Developments Ltd [423]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We fully support the objectives of this policy in line with Paragraphs 14 and 100 of the NPPF. Given the presumption in favour of sustainable development is the golden thread running through national and local planning policy, it is logical that this translates into development being located in areas that are not at high risk of flooding, and that schemes do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. With reference to the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning, the proposed development site is not located in an area at risk of flooding.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7541 Mr & Mrs Sandercock [6522]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

we fully support the objectives of the policy in line with Paragraphs 14 and 100 of the NPPF. Given that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is the golden thread running through the national and local planning policy, it is logical that this translates into development being located in areas that are not at high risk of flooding, and that schemes do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. With reference to the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning, the proposed development site is located within Flood Zone 1.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6816 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst noting that clause 2 'b' includes the need for flood resilience measures to allow for increased risk due to climate change, we suggest that the wording of clause 'a' be extended to also include the need for resilience measures. This would reinforce an important issue which a Flood Risk Assessment should address.

**Response:**

Noted. Modification proposed.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6818 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst we support Clause 3 'b', we suggest that the wording...' , where appropriate' is inserted after the words 'water compatible development'

**Response:**

Noted. Covered by proposed modification.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6825 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst we support CC3 Explanation we would like to point out that (10.5.4) "LLFAs are statutory consultees to any schemes that may impact on flood risk," will not necessarily be true in every case since the LLFA may not be consulted on Minor developments in Flood Zones 3 and 2.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7577 Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Design and location for flood prevention is essential. Support as plan meets the soundness requirements.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6821 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support 10.5.7, but suggest after the wording, "...The FRA should also consider the future risk by including the climate change projections" the following wording is added "...as detailed in 'Flood Risk Assessments: Climate Change Allowances (Environment Agency, 19th Feb, 2017)". An alternative would be to add this publication as a piece of evidence under Table B.37 Supporting Information: Policy CC3.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6906 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The massive Magna Park plans do pose a greater risk to flooding and sustainable drainage in the rural area in and around the Swift Valley between Cotesbach, Magna Park & Lutterworth.

Lutterworth already is prone to flooding.

As a resident of Cotesbach, I am gravely concerned about the many risks associated with a substantial expansion of Magna Park and further buildings erected between my village and Lutterworth.

These include:-

- Flooding
- Unsustainable drainage on very heavy clay soil
- Increased traffic & noise
- Increased air pollution especially from greater traffic volumes
- More light pollution at night from the 'spaceships' at Magna Park.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not materially expand Magna Park or build in the Swift Valley.

**Response:**

Noted. Development will be considered against the requirements of Policy CC3. Policy BE2 deals with development at Magna Park.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6698 Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Anglian Water is supportive of the requirement for major developments to provide Sustainable Drainage Systems which will help to address sewer flooding and surface water flooding.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7284 Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Anglian Water is supportive of the requirement for major developments to provide Sustainable Drainage Systems which will help to address sewer flooding and surface water flooding.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6258 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Concern is expressed about properties that suffer flooding because the flow of water is restricted by development further down the river system and rivers back up as flood plains are built on e.g. Farndon Fields estate.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

add - does not increase the flood risk or frequency of flooding events posed to adjacent properties or those further back up the river system.

**Response:**

Policy is robust. Policy CC3 covers the assessment of flood risk on a development site.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6822 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Environment Agency would recommend adding the wording,..."and reduced wherever possible" after the wording "was for the undeveloped site..."

**Response:**

This is considered to be an appropriate addition to CC4 3g, given the potential benefits it provides. Modification proposed to include 'and reduced wherever possible'.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5800 Mr John Whitehead [5943]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

My observation is a general one, although I give a specific example. The observation is that building on flood plains is NOT being avoided. The latest example is the warehousing nearing completion on the field at the north-east of the J20 roundabout on M1. In the 31 years that I have lived in Lutterworth I have seen this field, hitherto farmland, flooded by the River Swift on a number of occasions.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Pay attention to it in detail rather than, apparently, paying lip-service

Answering the questions below is difficult.

To the first one, probably.

To the second, No, for the reasons above

To the third one, probably to the letter rather than the spirit of the wording

**Response:**

Noted. Policy CC3 covers location of development and flood risk.

---



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7011 Mr Simon Smith [4996]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Flooding at Ullesthorpe Leicestershire has not been outlined in the Local Plan. The watercourse, a tributary of the Soar, drains the majority of the current Magna Park and, from my experience, floods more often onto surrounding property. Any further development of the distribution centre must address these issues.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

include the water course at Bittesby / Ullesthorpe in flood documentation due to new evidence at LLFA

**Response:**

Noted. Development will be considered against the requirements of Policy CC3. Policy BE2 covers development at Magna Park. The Strategic Growth Plan Strategic Flood Risk Assessment - Harborough District Update (2017) provides analysis of flood risk from rivers, surface water and groundwater.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5856 Mrs Gillian Groom [6152]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The A426 South of Lutterworth, the main route from M1 south to M6 north, and route used by commuters from Lutterworth, to Coventry, Rugby (inc London via train) and Birmingham. It is currently congested and when incidents occur south of junction 20 of the M1 the A426 and the A5 south become completely grid-locked. These incidents occur on a weekly basis. Any further development commercial or housing will make this situation worse.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This links southbound out of Lutterworth, (A426 and A5) used by commuters and the goods vehicles that service Magna Park, drift etc must be surveyed and a highways plan created to handle the current situation and all the traffic volumes after all the proposed building development in this plan have been completed.

**Response:**

This representation relates to Policy L1. Junction improvements will be delivered in advance of commencement. Subject to these, traffic modelling predicts that the road network can accommodate the additional traffic, although there will be some problems in Gilmorton village. Traffic modelling also indicates that the spine road will result in reductions in traffic through the town centre in the long term.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5968 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Infrastructure should be provided ahead of when it is required and not at some date afterwards

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Insert "only" after the words will be permitted and the timing for the provision of any infrastructure should be included within any major developments

**Response:**

The policy refers to the infrastructure being available when needed, which means it would have had to be provided in advance. The NPPF requires that policies should be positively worded.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7451 Harborough Green Party (Mr Darren Woodiwiss) [6374]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Is there a mechanism included to gather contributions from developers who phase their developments in such a way as to avoid developer contributions but cumulatively place a great burden on the local facilities.

**Response:**

IN1 requires that infrastructure provision be made when needed. Phasing of development does not avoid developer contributions. A single outline (or hybrid) planning application would be subject to a single S 106 agreement covering all of a major site.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5674 Mr Anthony Brookes [5991]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Infrastruction is currently inadequate for Magna Park and Lutterworth East. A426 needs to be dual carriageway from M6 to A5 and from A5 to Lutterworth

A426 needs a bypass around Lutterworth centre. A "spine Road" for Lutterworth East is totally inadequate and needs to be a bypass parallel to the M1 from the Jct 20 raoudabout to the proposed new bridge north of Lutterworth.

lutterworth centre needs a weight limit, as 3000 lorries a day currently use it, which will grow.

**Response:**

This representation relates to Policy L1. Traffic modelling shows that in the long term there would be a reduction in traffic and air pollution in Lutterworth town centre. The exact design of the spine road is yet to be determined but will be a compromise between what is required to encourage diversion of traffic and a design that will not adversely impact on the amenity of residents and workers in the SDA.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5923 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support in principle. However, a developers view of "sufficient " may be rather different to that of residents struggling to get a Drs appointment or to get their child into a local school .Sufficient is also an issue for the Local Transport Authority regarding access to and from developments and the impact of through traffic upon communities. This is especially true where through routes such as Grange Lane ,Main St and Station Lane etc are already under immense pressure and in reality have seen no mitigating measures. Public transport provision is poor.

Air quality is a major consequential concern .

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6831 Homes and Communities Agency [5784]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The HCA welcomes and supports the position that major development can be permitted where there is, or will be when needed, sufficient infrastructure capacity to support and meet all the requirements arising from it. Future development on land Stretton Hall Farm benefits from the presence of existing infrastructure, including direct access to the Strategic Highway Network.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7088 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7391 Sport England (Steven Beard) [4436]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We are unsure what evidence is available to understand the demand, supply and needs for built sports facilities.

**Response:**

IN1 allows for built sports facilities. SDAs will be required to provide facilities if a need is identified. Community Facilities study supports this part of the Local Plan.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7466 National Grid [5734]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We have reviewed the above Consultation document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

5763 James Baker [6106]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

IN1 omits details about how a prospective developer would be required to provide, or contribute to the provision of, the non-physical elements of social assets such as the teachers in schools, or the GPs and nurses at health centres and doctors' surgeries. (For example, where a housing development would overload an existing doctors' surgery it should not be sufficient for the developer to only provide a new health centre building; what would they do to enable the health authority to give a firm commitment to provide adequate staffing to meet the extra demand?)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Cover the provision of non-physical elements of the required social assets.

**Response:**

Staffing is not included in the definition of infrastructure and would be contrary to the CIL Regulations. Other sources of funding, based on population growth, are available for revenue costs.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6632 Mr Mark Graves [933]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The policy should be changed to be more inclusive, more sustainable, and with due regard taken to vulnerable residents or those without adequate personal transport. The policy currently excludes residents who live too far from the only 2 HDC leisure centres. A third leisure centre being built in the District has not received any practical support from HDC who ought to be taking responsibility in their statutory duty to provide enough leisure facilities for residents, in accessible locations.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Add clauses to ensure HDC complies with statutory duties in providing accessible, adequate leisure facilities for ALL of the District residents, instead of just residents in the two major towns.

**Response:**

There is no statutory duty to provide leisure centres.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6767 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no consideration given to the funding of a new bus service, or extension of an existing route, to new developments where no service exists. For example, Section 106 contributions from the Hamilton Trustees in Leicester were used over a number of years to fund the establishment of the bus service from Leicester to Hamilton which is now a successful commercial route. Therefore there is opportunity to explore this as part of the infrastructure required for any new developments.

**Response:**

This representation relates to Policy SC1. Policy SC1 (3) (l) requires the developer to provide a 20 minute bus service.

---

**RepID Representation**

6260 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Please add - consideration of local needs ( identified in consultation with Parish Councils) will be included in provision for section 106 contributions

**Response:**

Noted. The policy refers to 'all eligible costs'. There is therefore no need for the suggested amendment.

**RepID Representation**

6694 Mr and Mrs Gowling [6400]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the requirement for development proposals to make appropriate contributions to local infrastructure where necessary to support the proposal, in line with Paragraph 204 of the NPPF. As previously outlined, the clients are willing to enter into discussions with Harborough District Council in respect of planning obligations to be secured within a Section 106 Agreement.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

6994 Family Carr [6455]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision, we support the requirement for development proposals to make appropriate contributions to local infrastructure where necessary to support the proposal, in line with Paragraph 204 in the NPPF. The clients are willing to enter into discussions with Harborough District Council in respect of planning obligations to be secured within a Section 106 Agreement.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

7130 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Environment Agency would suggest adding ". flood defence infrastructure" as additional bullet point.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Add "flood defence infrastructure" as additional bullet point.

**Response:**

Noted. The list is not an exhaustive and gives examples only.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5764 James Baker [6106]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

IN1 omits details about how a prospective developer would be required to provide, or contribute to the provision of, the non-physical elements of social assets such as the teachers in schools, or the GPs and nurses at health centres and doctors' surgeries. (For example, where a housing development would overload an existing doctors' surgery it should not be sufficient for the developer to only provide a new health centre building; what would they do to enable the health authority to give a firm commitment to provide adequate staffing to meet the extra demand?)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Add an explanation of how a developer would be required to contribute to the non-physical elements of all additional infrastructure needed to provide extra capacity to support a development.

**Response:**

Staffing is not included in the definition of infrastructure and would be contrary to the CIL Regulations. Other sources of funding, based on population growth, are available for revenue costs.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6760 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Para. 11.1.10 noted that the City is acknowledged where highway mitigation measures are required as a result of growth in Harborough District. We will continue to work positively with Harborough District Council and Leicestershire County Council in delivering Harborough's Local Plan.

South East Leicester Transport Study (draft, phase 2, version 6, 16-9-17) looks at the cumulative effects on travel of a number of potential housing locations in the South East sector of the Leicester PUA. Whilst the report has not been finalised, where it is demonstrated that there is an adverse impact to the city's highway and transport network from new developments, for example from the proposed Scraftoft development, we will be looking for a range of measures to enhance and improve the efficiency and operation of the highway network that will address the problems of congestion, the public transport service and current journey times, particularly along the constrained A47 corridor.

A list of possible transport infrastructure that may be required for Leicester city, in the context of the Scraftoft North SDA was sent Peter Brett Associates (8th May, 2017) as part of their work in developing Harborough District Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6669 Mr Clive Grafton-Reed [4669]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The IDP makes no reference to planned developments of leisure facilities in Broughton Astley or the proposed massive investments in Market Harborough. It fails to acknowledge the deficit in provision in Broughton Astley or the actions required to reduce this deficit in provision.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There should be a positive statement that leisure provision in Broughton Astley will be supported so as to reduce the deficit in provision suffered by the residents.

That HDC will provide funding to support this provision at a level of funding no less than any other centre e.g. Market Harborough or Lutterworth  
The provision of facility funding will be met by a consistent and fair distribution of District Council funds with local residents contributing where necessary through local taxation so as to avoid double taxation being applied on residents not local to the two favoured centres.

**Response:**

Funding of leisure provision in Broughton Astley is outside the scope of this Local Plan given that it does not contain proposals for development there, all of it being covered by the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the provisions of IN1 and GI2 would apply to planning applications in Broughton Astley and would be a matter for inclusion in planning conditions and S 106 agreements as part of the DM process.

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

7248 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy IN1 - Infrastructure Provision, Explanation para. 11.1.11 refers to the Leicestershire Planning Obligations Policy (LPOP), only in terms of waste, it does not refer to education.

The Local Plan needs to recognise that Waste Management considers proposed developments on a case-by-case basis and, when it is identified that a proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the local civic amenity infrastructure, appropriate projects to increase the capacity to offset the impact have to be initiated. Contributions to fund these projects are requested in accordance with Leicestershire's Planning Obligations Policy and the Community Infrastructure Legislation Regulations.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID Representation**

5924 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support in principle but feel that this policy may not be sound.

There is insufficient emphasis on the effects of development and transport upon existing communities eg pollution, poor air quality, increased traffic flows through inadequate roads leading to dangerous conditions especially for pedestrians. The policy does not adequately address the impact of increased traffic levels arising from developments which will add to already heavily congested village roads and junctions and also affect Community cohesion.

**Response:**

Noted. The Edwards and Edwards South East Leicester Transport Study is location specific and relates to developments on the A6 and A47 corridors. The document seeks to influence site allocations in conjunction with Oadby and Wigston Borough Council, and does not mitigate existing permissions. The Scraftoft North SDA will be required to undertake a transport assessment, including suitable transport modelling, prior to submission of a planning application.

**RepID Representation**

5927 Mrs Pamela Parker OBE [6167]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support in principle but have some concerns. There is insufficient emphasis on the effects of development and transport upon existing communities such as Thurnby and Bushby e.g. pollution, poor air quality, increased traffic flows through inadequate roads leading to dangerous conditions especially for pedestrians. The policy does not adequately address the impact of increased traffic levels arising from developments which will add to already heavily congested village roads and impact upon community cohesion. When residents, both young and old, are afraid to cross the road due to both speeding and large volumes of traffic, we have a problem.

**Response:**

Noted. The Edwards and Edwards South East Leicester Transport Study is location specific and relates to developments on the A6 and A47 corridors. The document seeks to influence site allocations in conjunction with Oadby and Wigston Borough Council, and does not mitigate existing permissions. The Scraftoft North SDA will be required to undertake a transport assessment, including suitable transport modelling, prior to submission of a planning application.

**RepID Representation**

7090 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby supports in principle. However, the Parish Council is concerned that the policy does not make adequate reference to the evidence base provided by the Edwards and Edwards report (Appendix B: Stresses on the Highways Network, Section 4.3). The Policy does not adequately address the impact of increased traffic levels arising from new developments which will add to already heavily congested junctions, in particular that at Station Road/A47 Thurnby.

**Response:**

Noted. The Edwards and Edwards South East Leicester Transport Study is location specific and relates to developments on the A6 and A47 corridors. The document seeks to influence site allocations in conjunction with Oadby and Wigston Borough Council, and does not mitigate existing permissions. The Scraftoft North SDA will be required to undertake a transport assessment, including suitable transport modelling, prior to submission of a planning application.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5570 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Recent planning applications that have been allowed in Market Harborough have included statements to the effect that the new residents will be encouraged to use foot travel, bicycle, public transport etc but there are no obvious improvements proposed to make these suggestions effective. In fact the number of buses on each route have often been reduced and the service has deteriorated.

Harborough District Council has recently consulted on the future transport requirements and after several months the results are still being "assessed" If this consulataion and the recent one show different requirements what would be the outcome?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Future statements that encourage the use of transport other than private cars should be concluded with details of how the encouragement will be made.

It should also be made possible for actual use on non private car transport to be compared with the target.

**Response:**

The Market Harborough Transport Study will be adopted by both Leicestershire County Council and Harborough District Council in early 2018. The Study assesses both a baseline and future position based on planning consents known at the time, and creates a list of costed mitigation measures to improve the highway network in the town. All allocated Market Harborough sites will be required to provide a financial contribution towards wider mitigation measures in the town in addition to providing suitable transport mitigation to meet their own needs.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6769 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no consideration given to the funding of a new bus service, or extension of an existing route, to new developments where no service exists. For example, Section 106 contributions from the Hamilton Trustees in Leicester were used over a number of years to fund the establishment of the bus service from Leicester to Hamilton which is now a successful commercial route. Therefore there is opportunity to explore this as part of the infrastructure required for any new developments.

**Response:**

This is relevant to the policies for each residential allocation (MH1-3, SC1, L1 and F1) on a site specific basis, whilst criteria 2d allows for public transport enhancement where justified.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5758 Dr Stuart Rimmington [5143]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The air quality in and around Lutterworth is already shockingly bad. This development will only add to this.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Smaller developments around the county to minimise the impact to one area.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy L1 proposes a spine road between the A4304 and the A426 to remove traffic through Lutterworth town centre. The option of smaller developments around the District was considered and rejected as unsustainable and not meeting the housing requirement.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7453 **Harborough Green Party (Mr Darren Woodiwiss) [6374]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This clause can only be met if monitoring of the local area has been undertaken for 1 year to establish a baseline. For instance, HDC only has a single monitoring point in the settlement of Harborough. Who knows what affects development will have around the town without a baseline. Developers should be made to provide the council with the funding to gather this information and the viability assessments should include a worst case provision for mitigation should it be needed.

**Response:**

No existing AQMA identified in Market Harborough. AQMAs declared in Lutterworth town centre and at the A6 through the Kibworths.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5500 **Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Support .However,here is very little in the Local Plan about Improving Air quality for existing residents of the District not just when a new scheme is proposed. The policy does not adequately address the impact of increased traffic levels arising from developments which add to already congested roads.Many villages already have major problems with air quality due to very significant amounts of traffic.

**Response:**

Noted. No identified air quality issues outside of AQMAs in Lutterworth town centre and at the A6 through the Kibworths.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6403 **mrs lynn morris [6298]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

there is already overload of traffic in the area

**Change To Plan Sought:**

take another look at the transport plan

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7093 **THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports in principle. However, the Parish Council is concerned that there is insufficient reference to improving air quality for existing communities.

**Response:**

Noted. Impact on air quality is set out in para 11.3.5. This is not a policy because it relates only to process.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

5451 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

In this para refers to Market Harborough Transport Strategy 2017-2013. All M.Harborough allocations require to contribute. STRATEGY NOT APPROVED AND JUST A WISH LIST.

We responded to consultation in January 2017. Objected to some of the proposals- suggested other projects be included. Still waiting for a decision. Hope we will not be ignored.

Not clear which projects are relevant to which developments. Projects require Finance, Design and Land acquisition. so not Sustainable in the life of the Plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Consider another Option. Allocations in Market Harborough should not go ahead until relevant part of the Highway Strategy has been completed. Developers would have option to contribute to costs.

This comment applies to allocations in RT1, and Chapter 14 Market Harborough

**Response:**

Market Harborough Transport Strategy approved by LCC Cabinet and to be presented to HDC Executive in February 2018.

The Strategy outlines a number of highway improvements across the town.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6770 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Para. 11.3.7. This should refer to the Scraftoft SDA.

**Response:**

Noted. Paragraph refers specifically to developer contributions to highways strategies of the Market Harborough Transport Strategy and A5 Strategy.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

5899 LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Development should ensure that modern, electronic communications are provided or able to be provided on site, where it is viable to do so. This should be explicit within the policy. In addition, it may not be appropriate or necessary to implement all 3 types of infrastructure specified in criteria 1 - 3 (broadband, duct network or mobile solutions). Furthermore, new technologies may come on stream over those specified in the policy. Additional flexibility should be added to the policy to reflect this.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend policy to make reference to viability.

**Response:**

IN3 (1) is a reasonable general requirement that does not specify the exact methodology. IN3 (2) requires a duct network which is likely to be suitable for use by a variety of technologies and which could be designed differently as new technology emerges. In the event that it is redundant after 5 years, the policy can be changed when the plan is next reviewed. Reference to FTTP is already qualified as 'where viable'. IN3 (3) refers only to 'other forms of infrastructure', with mobile and wi-fi only as examples.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7094 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council supports as sound. The Parish Council is concerned that Broadband provision for new developments is future proof for the number of dwellings and is consistent with national policies on homeworking.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6263 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This should not be restricted to one network provider - there should be a choice for subsequent users.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Major development should incorporate a bespoke duct network, designed and implemented and where viable, a fibre to the premises (FTTP) solution

**Response:**

It is not reasonable to insist that more than one network provider be used in every major development. The policy does not prevent more than one provider being involved if desirable.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7405 Historic England (Mrs Emilie Carr) [5702]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Criteria b of section 4 is welcomed.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6699 Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Policy IN4 refers to development being permitted where it has access to an adequate water supply to the support the development and is supported. Similarly Anglian Water is supportive of the requirement that planning permission will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that adequate foul water treatment and disposal already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7146 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Environment Agency particularly supports IN4 since it addresses the important issues of both water resource and water quality.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7285 Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Policy IN4 refers to development being permitted where it has access to an adequate water supply to the support the development and is supported. Similarly Anglian Water is supportive of the requirement that planning permission will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that adequate foul water treatment and disposal already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6265 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

agree but add as below

**Change To Plan Sought:**

have access to an adequate water supply to support the development proposed and not jeopardise supply to others.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy is considered sound.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5900 LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

With respect to criterion 2, whilst both considerations of feasibility and practicality are important (albeit broadly having the same meaning) neither address the potential effect grey water and rainwater harvesting systems may have on viability of a development proposal. It is also unclear whether overall viability of this policy has been tested. In addition, consideration should be given to the environmental impact of any proposal on the water cycle, and ecology of an area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

With respect to criterion 2, whilst both considerations of feasibility and practicality are important (albeit broadly having the same meaning) neither address the potential effect grey water and rainwater harvesting systems may have on viability of a development proposal. It is also unclear whether overall viability of this policy has been tested. In addition, consideration should be given to the environmental impact of any proposal on the water cycle, and ecology of an area.

**Response:**

The term feasibility is intended to also cover viability. The impact of this policy on viability of the proposed SDAs was taken into account in the Local Plan Viability Assessment 2017. The environmental impact is covered by IN4 (1) but could also be covered by the word feasible in IN4 (2).

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5972 Mr John Martin [5974]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The review should include measures to show how the plan is lacking or not being adhered to and how such failings will be rectified

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The above should contain a paragraph as detailed above.

**Response:**

This will be monitored under Policy IMR (1) and in the Authority Monitoring Report and will form part of the evidence base for a future review.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7427 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Gladman object to Policy IMR1 as the review policy as written contains no firm commitments on the timing and completion of the Local Plan review. The Policy refers to commencing a review within 12 months of the need for a review being established but there is no specific timeframe for completion of the review. This means that the Council has no specific imperative to do anything but start the review process which may, under the current policy, never be completed. It is therefore suggested that the review mechanism contained in Policy IMR1 is far more robust and set within a definitive timescale.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Harborough District Council are committed to working with all Leicester and Leicestershire Local Planning Authorities on the preparation of the Strategic Growth Plan which is anticipated will be adopted in January 2018. Once adopted, Harborough District Council will commit to the delivery of the Strategic Growth Plan through the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding with all the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities. The Strategic Growth Plan will then provide the fundamental basis for the review of the Harborough District Local Plan and the preparation of the subsequent Local Plans for all other Leicester and Leicestershire authorities.

The District Council will commence a review of this Local Plan (defined as being publication of an invitation to make representations in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations (2012)) by the end of January 2018 or within 3 months of the adoption of this Local Plan (whichever is the later). The Plan Review will be submitted for Examination within two years from the commencement of the review. In the event that the reviewed plan is not submitted within two years then this plan will be deemed out of date.

**Response:**

The MOU setting out the scale of unmet needs (both total and for HDC) is not yet in place. A substantial contingency provision has been made. It is not possible to commit to a completion timing for any future review at this stage due to the need for this to be project managed and included in the LDS in due course. The appropriate timescale could be different depending on the issues and scale of development requirements. In any event it is likely that the timing of a review will be set by Government following review of the NPPF. The Strategic Growth Plan relates to the post-2031 period and so is not relevant to this Local Plan. It will not be in place by January 2018.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7437 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Concerned that IMR1 contains no firm commitment to a review or a timescale for review. Suggested modifications will ensure consistency with the North West Leicestershire Local Plan which also dealt with the same issue of unmet needs in the Leicester & Leicestershire HMA and was modified accordingly in its recently concluded Examination.

The final version of the MoU to be signed in January 2018 before the submission of the Harborough Local Plan for examination should set out unmet housing needs from Leicester/Oadby & Wigston together with the proposed re-distribution of these unmet needs across the remainder of the HMA.

Early review is not the optimum policy mechanism by which to resolve unmet housing need. A greater contingency is needed along with release of reserve sites.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is suggested that the wording is changed so that under Bullet Point (2) the Council commit to "complete" rather than "commence" and under Bullet Point (3) the review will be "commenced within 3 months and submitted for Examination within 2 years".

Policy IMR1 should set out scale of unmet housing needs and proposed re-distribution.

**Response:**

The MOU setting out the scale of unmet needs (both total and for HDC) will not be in place by January 2018 as claimed. A substantial contingency provision has been made. It is not possible to commit to a completion timing for a future review at this stage due to the need for this to be project managed and included in the LDS in due course. The appropriate timescale could be different depending on the issues and scale of development requirements. In any event it is likely that the timing of a review will be set by Government following review of the NPPF.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7651 Bloor Home Ltd [4935]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

A review mechanism is an inappropriate and ineffective response to the fundamental matters of soundness that need to be directly addressed now before the Local Plan can be found sound. Moreover, such a "commitment" to a Review cannot be enforced if the Council decide, for whatever reason, not to honour the commitment in the policy (e.g. a failure to agree a new MOU that addresses unmet need arising elsewhere).

A short delay in the submission of the Local Plan will allow the distribution of the development needs to be understood and then agreed ensuring that the unmet needs that are already arising in Leicester are appropriately provided for within the HMA.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

That requirement should reflect the up to date, full and objectively assessed needs for housing and economic development within the District and wider HMA, based on the findings of the HEDNA and the Final MOU between the HMA Authorities that addresses the likely unmet need arising in Leicester City and Oadby & Wigston.

**Response:**

There is no guarantee that awaiting a MoU would result in only a short delay; the City's needs are unlikely to be known until summer 2018 at the earliest. Even a short delay would result in triggering the national methodology for OAN calculation to replace the HEDNA, resulting in a much more significant delay due to the need to undertake another consultation and potentially extend the plan period. Not only would this be contrary to Government requirements to get up to date Local Plans in place as soon as possible, but it would also mean more years of unplanned development and planning by appeal. In any event the plan's flexibility is likely to be more than required to meet the unmet needs of Leicester (Oadby and Wigston have now declared that they have no unmet need to 2031).



**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

7365 **Davidsons Developments Limited [4740]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

An early review of the Local Plan is welcomed given the uncertainty of housing numbers within the HMA and pending changes to Government guidance on calculating housing requirements and changes to the NPPF.

It is necessary to provide greater clarity and certainty on the timing for a review of the Local Plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Suggest clarity and certainty on the timing for a review of the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The MOU setting out the scale of unmet needs (both total and for HDC) is not yet in place. A substantial contingency provision has been made. It is not possible to greater clarity and certainty on any future review at this stage. It is also important for the public that they have certainty that the provisions of this Local Plan will prevail for as long as possible, while the Council has a duty to minimise the costs involved in such a review. The appropriate timescale could be different depending on the issues and scale of development requirements. In any event it is likely that the timing of a review will be set by Government following review of the NPPF.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

7610 **Bidwells (Mr Robert Love) [4663]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

An early review of the Local Plan is welcomed given the uncertainty of housing numbers within the HMA and pending changes to Government guidance on calculating housing requirements and changes to the NPPF.

It is necessary to provide greater clarity and certainty on the timing for a review of the Local Plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Suggest clarity and certainty on the timing for a review of the Local Plan.

**Response:**

This is the current position and no further clarification is possible pending the Memorandum of Understanding on the distribution of unmet housing need. This wording has been agreed with the HMA authorities.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7510 Mr Steve Louth [5609]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The strategy for meeting the priorities takes full account of the most recent evidence of housing need for the HMA, and the fact that both Leicester City and Oadby and Wigston District Councils have confirmed that they will not be able to meet their full needs within their own administrative areas. If the Plan is to be adopted in advance of the extent of unmet need being confirmed, or its distribution between the remaining authorities in the HMA being agreed, a firm policy commitment must be made to undertake a prompt review of the plan at the earliest possible opportunity.

**Response:**

There will be no need for a review of the plan if sufficient flexibility is included in this Local Plan, which already contains a substantial contingency allowance to cover unmet need. Oadby and Wigston Council no longer have an unmet need in the period to 2031 covered by this Local Plan. It is important for the public that they have certainty that the provisions of this Local Plan will prevail for as long as possible, while the Council has a duty to minimise the costs involved in such a review.

---

**RepID** **Representation**5458 **Dr Matthew Clarke [5227]****Nature****Object****Representation Summary:**

We fundamentally object to this development. Based on the 2011 census, Scraftoft has a population of 1804, although this will have increased due to the significant housing developments that have subsequently taken place within the village. However, the development proposed here of 1200 dwellings would approximately double the population of the village, which would irrevocably destroy its character and create an unbearable burden on local infrastructure, education, health and recreation facilities. The relative size of the Scraftoft development is some 17 times that of the development proposed for Market Harborough, a town which is much better equipped to cope.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We appreciate that development within the Harborough area needs to take place, but this plan does not equitably share the burden across local sites. Scraftoft has borne an already heavy development burden without the requisite upgrading of local services and infrastructure taking place. Therefore, the burden for meeting the required development should fall on localities better placed to accommodate such significant growth, such as Market Harborough or Lutterworth.

**Response:**

Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft as village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery. The comparison with Market Harborough is misleading, since it was allocated a 1,500 dwelling SDA in the 2011 Core Strategy and has at least a further 1,140 dwellings proposed on the Local plan. Lutterworth will also receive 1,500 in the plan period with a further 1,250 thereafter. The 1,200 dwellings at Scraftoft should also be seen in the context of its location on the edge of Leicester City.

**RepID** **Representation**7578 **Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]****Nature****Object****Representation Summary:**

Thurnby, Bushby and Scraftoft are next to Leicester but have a poor transport links by bus, so a car is essential. This means development is not sustainable. Object as unsound in relation to transport links.

**Response:**

The proposed SDA is subject to the provision of a 20 minute bus service and other sustainable transport requirements as set out in SC1 3 k, l, m and n.

**RepID** **Representation**7580 **Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]****Nature****Object****Representation Summary:**

Thurnby & Bushby and Scraftoft are next to Leicester but have a poor transport links by bus. They are not within 'easy reach of Leicester services' unless you have a car. Object as unsound in relation to transport links.

**Response:**

The proposed SDA is subject to the provision of a 20 minute bus service and other sustainable transport requirements as set out in SC1 3 k, l, m and n.

**ReplD** **Representation**5465 **Dr Matthew Clarke [5227]****Nature****Object****Representation Summary:**

Beeby Road is entirely unsuitable to service the increased traffic volume that this development would generate. It is a rural road, narrow and winding, and would require substantial upgrading to make it a safe transport route for all users. The increased flow of traffic through Scraptoft village, already under severe pressure from the Strawberry Fields and Goodridge developments, would have a detrimental impact on road safety, as well as a negative noise and environmental impact on residents. The increased traffic flow along Station Lane would have a similar detrimental impact on residents along that route.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build the development in a more suitable and sustainable location.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.

**ReplD** **Representation**5571 **Mr Brett Bibby [5933]****Nature****Object****Representation Summary:**

721 new homes in 7 years and 7 solid years of disruption to all villagers in Scraptoft and surrounding areas. No infrastructure has been considered for this, the traffic gets heavier, the queues get longer, rural issues are not met, small village needs are NOT considered. Scraptoft has history, I have history in artifacts from the proposed area of build from people involved in wars, We have a stake in decision making?, Leicester council have forced a well established and popular golf course with closure to satisfy Thier own greed by refusing to re lease land owned by themselves.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

New homes are not being built in sustainable locations, they are being built here to satisfy a shortage of land within the city and building in this way is not the way forward

**Response:**

This is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City Boundaries.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5848 Mrs margaret Garven [6146]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft has Conservation Area status and the impact of another 1200 houses (in addition to the 900 already built or designated to be) will have a detrimental impact upon the unique nature of the village. There are several listed buildings within the central area each with different characteristics. The outer boundaries of area are of a semi - rural nature which help to maintain its unique ambiance. Scraptoft has already borne the brunt of several housing developments encroaching upon it, along with the extra traffic, and cannot absorb anymore.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Other areas for possible housing should be sought.

**Response:**

Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as village. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The extent of completions and commitments is recognised, but this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those from Leicester City which cannot be met there. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5859 Mrs margaret Garven [6146]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The strategic Development Area as identified on the map covers a very large area and will cause the unique nature of the village of Scraptoft and the open semi-rural aspect of the surrounding area to be changed dramatically. Scraptoft has already borne the brunt of several housing developments and another such large area of housing ( including other buildings) as per the proposal is likely to cause further damage to a village infrastructure which is already under considerable strain.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Give more consideration to the future ramifications, upon Scraptoft, of these proposals.

**Response:**

The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as village. A lower number of dwellings may not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5904 **Mr Stephen Clifton [6170]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The land is a designated green wedge. One of the main reasons green wedges are designated is to stop conurbations merging. Yet here you are trying to remove green wedge status for the purpose of a housing development which will cause conurbations to merge. Ludicrous.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Keep green wedge as is.

**Response:**

The Green Wedge is to be replaced to a more publically accessible location.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5934 **Scraptoft Parish Council (Ms Sally Skyrme) [6009]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft Parish Council has serious concerns about Traffic, Nature Reserve and Green Wedge.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A green wedge needs to be retained by creating a buffer all along Hamilton Lane - including the field between Hall Road and Hamilton Lane. The majority of the nature reserve needs to be retained as stated in the report by Leicestershire County Council's ecologists Sue Timms and Karen Headley.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. The most important parts of the LNR will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site with the agreement of the County Ecologist. All these matters will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5976 **mr stephen pratt [5056]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

building on all of the marked land will result in the loss of Scraptofts clear boundaries and thus becoming indistinguishable as a village.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Land to the west of the village and a belt of land to the north including the horse paddocks and nature reserve should be excluded from building.

**Response:**

These matters will be addressed through the masterplan. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5981 Mr Barry Barker [4955]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Objection

Summary

1. Plan ignores needs and wishes of Scraptoft community.
2. Significant impact on wildlife and environment, what provision is going to be made for the bat population?
3. Dangers of prison of war camp residue.
4. Scraptoft brook over flow.
5. Increased traffic flow through the village.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reconsider the area for development outside of the Scraptoft area where the impact can be managed to suit all effected.

**Response:**

These matters will be addressed through the masterplan to be developed with the engagement of the local community.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5984 Mr Barry Barker [4955]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Objection

Summary

1. Plan ignores needs and wishes of Scraptoft community.
2. Significant impact on wildlife and environment, what provision is going to be made for the bat population?
3. Dangers of prison of war camp residue.
4. Scraptoft brook over flow.
5. Increased traffic flow through the village.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Needs to be reconsidered so as not to impact a small community that has already had over 700 extra house built over the last 7 years along with all the noise, dust and heavy vehicle traffic. Needs to be proposed in an area that can handle the volume of traffic without disturbance the balance of life in the existing community.

**Response:**

All these matters will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. The important parts of the LNR will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site with the agreement of the County Ecologist. The important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The issue of bats will be addressed as part of a planning application.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6004 Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst accepting that areas need to be found for new housing Scraptoft has already had over 700 houses built in the last 5 years without any improvement to the infrastructure or facilities. To build another 1200 houses even though promises are made regarding facilities and infrastructure will lead to horrendous problems with traffic , insufficient education and health care provisions and turn Scraptoft into a high density area of population with all the associated problems that brings. Scraptoft has always been known as a village but will now only be an extension of Netherhall, Thurnby Lodge and Hamilton.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Maintain much larger areas of green wedge and especially the nature reserve. Find alternative areas to build the number of houses proposed thus spreading out the building of 1200 houses over a larger area

**Response:**

The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as a village. A lower number of dwellings would not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6049 Miss Susan Elgar [5936]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I object to SDA.

As previously mentioned, my concerns for 1200 houses and how this will affect the village of SCRAPTOFT.

I am aware that we have already had over 700 houses built in the last 5 years, this has had an increased negative effect on the traffic around Main Street which at present is one way and Station Lane, especially on school runs, rush hours morning and evenings.

In addition to that there has been no additions to the infrastructure of SCRAPTOFT village.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Develop elsewhere. I would have thought The land to Covert Lane would have been more appropriate especially considering the amount of new houses already built there, constructing a main road through that land that would feed onto A47 further away from the already busy junction at the top of Station Lane.

**Response:**

The land referred to was part of the original Scraptoft SDA proposal which was rejected at Options consultation stage. Its infrastructure costs would be higher, giving viability problems, and it would impinge on the valley between Thurnby/ Bushby and Scraptoft village.



**RepID Representation**

6150 Mr Colin Derrick [6149]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I am very concerned at the inadequate coverage of infrastructure matters ie traffic, roads,public transport and the provision of Community facilities such as schools, Drs surgeries etc which are already at capacity.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

More recognition of the needs of surrounding settlements who will be adversely affected by this proposal.

**Response:**

The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

**RepID Representation**

6349 Miss Nituben Patel [6280]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I moved to scraptoft for the village living, with that comes a quiet neighbourhood and pleasant surroundings. Fewer people, less populated areas and vast amounts of greenery and wildlife.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I understand that there is a shortage of housing. Perhaps build on a much rather smaller scale. This is still maintain the area, protect the space for wildlife and also provide housing for more people. Maybe only build luxury properties with traditional larger garden than the typical new build with smaller square footage space.

**Response:**

A lower number of dwellings may not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school and would not make the required contribution to housing needs. Larger properties are not what is required to meet needs for affordable housing, first-time buyers and down-sizing.

**RepID Representation**

6408 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy is not suitable and I Object. This will cause issues with increased traffic, noise, pollution, wildlife and the loss of a very popular Scraptoft golf club which is enjoyed by its members. The local residents and community do not want the village to lose its small community. There has been already a large number of poor quality homes built within Srraptoft and along Keyham lane west which has impacted Scraptoft village leading to traffic and noise. Furthermore and there are no community services to facilitate these residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

i oppose the land to the north of scraptoft as a sda. and does not meet any of the test of soundness as below..

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. The important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

**RepID Representation****Nature**

6414 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy is not suitable and I object. This will cause issues with increased traffic, noise, pollution, wildlife and the loss of a very popular Scraptoft golf club which is enjoyed by its members. The local residents and community do not want the village to lose its small community. There has been already a large number of poor quality homes built within Scraptoft and along Keyham Lane West which has impacted Scraptoft village leading to traffic and noise. Furthermore and there are no community services to facilitate these residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

to maintain and improve scraptoft golf club, consider humberstone golf club instead

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

**RepID Representation****Nature**

6450 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

131.1 - Scraptoft, is NOT a suburb of Leicester - we are a village in Harborough. We DO NOT have access to nearby schools/healthcare in Leicester - the majority of pupils/patients need to travel to the other side of the A47.

131.2 - over 750 houses have ALREADY been built and the land designated in our Village Local Plan for future planning was given permission immediately for another 170 + houses which are currently being built now. Our allocation has been the most of any village in Harborough already without ANY infrastructure benefits at all.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Having born the brunt of planning and houses for Harborough in recent years other Harborough areas that were put forward in the 2015 submission should be looked at again. This plan for Scraptoft North was NOT part of the original proposal - the Scraptoft option at the time was opposed by more Harborough residents than any other and subsequently dropped by Harborough Council.

**Response:**

The extent of housing completions and commitments is recognised, but this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6535 Miss Louise Bailey [6184]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This area has previously been stated to be an "ideal" green wedge. And now this status is to be removed.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The designated area should remain as a green wedge and not be built on.

**Response:**

An alternative and more accessible Green Wedge is proposed instead.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6368 Mr Brett Taylor [6284]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I feel that removing the green wedge on fields at the back of hall road that are currently being used as grazing fields for horses will bring Scraptoft in to the city and surrounding areas. I feel Scraptoft will lose its heritage as a village.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I feel that the fields at the back of hall road no 9 through to 35 should be protected ie a new area of nature reserve and the proposed 100m to the nature reserve that already exist is kept.

**Response:**

Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as a village.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6538 Miss Chloe Bibby [6241]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft doesn't have the infrastructure to support this scale of development. Village, junctions and one-way system will become congested. Land should be found beyond the boundaries of the LNR and Golf Course for housing or lower the target for Scraptoft.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Find land beyond the boundaries of the LNR and Golf Course or lower the target for Scraptoft.

**Response:**

Policy SC1 requires the provision of infrastructure. A lower number of dwellings may not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school and would not make the required contribution to housing needs. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Extending the development further east would have a greater landscape impact.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6565 **Mr Niles Holroyde [6378]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Scale and nature of development.  
Loss of Nature Reserve  
Loss of trees on Golf Course.  
Traffic disruption  
Impact on social infrastructure

**Change To Plan Sought:**

At the very least there needs to be a policy link between the provision of the new Leicester Eastern By Pass and the release of any development land at Scraftoft golf course.

**Response:**

A lower number of dwellings may not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school and would not make the required contribution to housing needs. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. Visually important hedgerows and trees will be retained and enhanced; they form ready-made effective landscaping for the new houses. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Social infrastructure requirements are set out in the policy. Provision of an eastern bypass for Leicester set out in the Strategic Growth Plan would be post 2031.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6597 **Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This development WILL have a significant adverse effect on our living conditions due to its overbearing impact of building 1200 houses in a conservation village which has already been expanded by over 700

**Response:**

Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6613 Mr David Campbell [6269]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Access from the site onto primary roads needs to be improved to cope with existing development and SDA houses. To make this plan sound you would have to improve Keyham Lane West so there is a minimum of a single lane in each direction without interruption giving current residents adequate parking to the properties and proper traffic light control for school pupils. Improvement to all junctions that enter Keyham Lane is needed. Station Road junction must operate more efficiently. Number of houses should be restricted to 200 onto Beeby Road and 400 houses with access from Hamilton Lane.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The number of dwellings needs to be reduced at least by 50%.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. A lower number of dwellings would not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6661 Mrs A J Crossland [6175]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The village has been developed enough.

The impact of the development is reduced wildlife, less trees, more traffic.

The wildlife needs a chance to recover and resettle. After the Scraftoft Hall development many species have made their home on the Nature Reserve. We need trees and wildlife to support our ecological systems, for future generations.

Increased traffic will add to already congested roads and increase pollution.

The developers are not taking into consideration the wishes of the residents.

There is also a pond in the nature reserve, which supports more wildlife.

Please reconsider these plans and keep Scraftoft a village.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Make the proposed housing site much smaller to enable Scraftoft to keep the Green Wedge, the Nature Reserve and the Golf Club.

The Harborough Local Plan is not officially in place which has enabled the developers to use this failing by HDC to their own financial gain at the expense of the local residents' wishes and without any consideration for wildlife.

**Response:**

The extent of completions and commitments is recognised, but this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries. The most important parts of the LNR will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site with the agreement of the County Ecologist. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. All these matters will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community. A lower number of dwellings may not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school and would not make the required contribution to housing needs.

---

**RepID Representation****Nature**

6662 Mrs Gill Dean [6044]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft has been overly developed over the past 7 years. Reconsider your building plans.

- The status of the Nature Reserve needs to be kept.
- A sound Plan needs to take into account the measured traffic.
- Trees should be protected.
- Wildlife should be protected and encouraged.
- Pollution should be kept to a minimum.
- The countryside should be kept for future generations.
- increased traffic is already a problem and will only get worse.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If the Plan is reconsidered, it should take into consideration ALL the views and wishes of the neighbourhood

- The status of the Nature Reserve needs to be kept.
- A sound Plan needs to take into account the measured traffic.
- Trees should be protected.
- Wildlife should be protected and encouraged.
- Pollution should be kept to a minimum.
- The countryside should be kept for future generations.

**Response:**

The extent of completions and commitments is recognised, but this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries. The important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.

**RepID Representation****Nature**

6664 Mr &amp; Mrs Roy Dean [6177]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Village facilities will not cater for the amount of houses this "Strategic Plan" is proposing.

The road will not be able to cope with the increased volume of traffic.

Nature Reserve should be kept.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Please consider the views and wishes of the residents. Reconsider the plans - make the housing development much smaller.

Get Harborough Local Plan agreed so developers cannot just buy land for their own profit.

**Response:**

The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. All these matters will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6733 Ms Shaveen Akhtar [4979]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The area is saturated with houses and cars already. Further development will completely overpower the local community and identity.

The congestion on Station Lane in peak hours is evidence that the nature of the area has been transformed and will be further with this development proposal. Also, the infrastructure is not present to support the population growth intended.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Please build elsewhere.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as village.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6943 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not go ahead

**Response:**

Scraptoft is identified within the Settlement Hierarchy as part of the Leicester Principal Urban Area since it forms part of the built up area of Leicester. As such it is considered capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment. Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. SCI requires provision of a two-form entry primary school and a neighbourhood centre.

**RepID Representation**

6971 kevin dias [6452]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not proceed

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery. Hospitals are available in Leicester City.

**RepID Representation**

7126 Bloor Home Ltd [4935]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Soundness

Policy SC1 is considered unsound on the basis that it:

- is not justified in that it has not fully acknowledged the practical constraints to development within the SDA;
- is not effective in that the SDA will not deliver the scale of development the Submission Plan currently assumes, and the identified needs will not therefore, be met; and
- is inconsistent with national policy in that it does not fully reflect the Government's priorities and policies in terms of enabling sustainable development and boosting the supply of housing to meet identified needs.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proposed Change

To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan:

- The housing trajectory should reflect a realistic timescale for the delivery of the Scraptoft SDA;
- The Local Plan should then identify sufficient deliverable and developable supply of housing land to meet the identified housing need in sustainable locations in the District, notably at the PUA; and
- That should include the allocation of the land off Uppingham Road, Bushby.

**Response:**

The housing trajectory takes account of the delivery timescale for this site including the need to relocate the golf course. The Council and the promoters are confident that 1200 dwellings can be completed in the plan period. No site plan of land off Uppingham Road submitted.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7133 Mrs Patrica Green [6072]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I am absolutely amazed that an 18 hole golf course is considered as a prime building site for 1200 houses in exchange for a 9 hole golf course just because LCC own 4 holes what lunacy when there are derelict factories and brown sites within the city boundary the properties lying empty for years on end for goodness sake stop covering the countryside with concrete LCC and allow nature to keep our environment stable our nature reserve and large number of trees on the golf course help our fight against greenhouse gasses and flooding no more felling or concrete

**Change To Plan Sought:**

don't build any houses on or near the nature reserve

**Response:**

Noted. These issues are mostly for the landowners and promoter to address. Within Harborough there are insufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs. Within Leicester City, the Council has been unable to identify sufficient developable land to meet their needs in full.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7150 Mrs Jennifer Smith [6432]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

If this goes ahead, Scraftoft will lose its village identity. Roads will be busier, wildlife will be pushed out from the fields the development is built on. Yes we want a Doctors surgery, but shops, pub and supermarket, I don't think so. Scraftoft is a village not a town. We have the Co op and Tesco for provisions. Most people like traditional older pubs for food and drink, not a modern development without character

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not build the 1200 houses

**Response:**

Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft as a village. The issue of what community facilities are required can be addressed through the masterplan, in consultation with the existing residents.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7175 Mr Nelson Renner [6137]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The SDA at Scraftoft North is not suitable due to adverse impacts on the existing Green Wedge designation, the Scraftoft Local Nature Reserve and unsuitable roads to accommodate the level of additional traffic. The proposed allocation conflicts with the recently adopted Neighbourhood Plan, which expressed the views and wishes of the local community and sought to protect this area from development.

Land to the north of Thurnby Brook is available to accommodate additional housing, either through a redistribution of the SDA Allocation and / or meeting unmet housing needs arising from Leicester City.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A new allocation should be made on land to the north of Thurnby Brook, reducing the size of the Scraftoft SDA and thereby reducing the adverse impacts on the local community.

**Response:**

The Green Wedge is to be replaced to a more publically accessible location. The most important part of the LNR will be replaced by a Local Wildlife Site. Transport assessments show no concerns. The Neighbourhood Plan was prepared in the context of the Core Strategy which had a much lower level of housing need.

Splitting the SDA between 2 sites will create problems for infrastructure provision and will not produce sufficient return to make development on the golf course viable, given the need to relocate it. Moreover the site suggested would represent an extension to existing commitments, encroaching into the proposed new Green Wedge (and current Area of Separation) and creating a total site on the same scale as Scraftoft North but without the ability to master-planned in a coordinated way.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7293 Mr Roy Draycott [6479]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Object to Scraftoft SDA for following reasons:

- destruction of the countryside
- Barkby village being overrun & destroyed with increasing traffic
- facilities (schools, clinics, police etc.) can't cope with development
- roads cannot manage extra traffic and pollution

**Response:**

The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

---

**RepID Representation****Nature**

7294 Ms J Deacon-Brown [6370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I feel that there has been no thought about the amount of new traffic new housing would bring to Scraptoft. Beeby Road is already a race track with cars & lorries. This road will not take more traffic. The one way system has already come to a stand still at times near the local shops. Children need to cross this road when going to school. We have wildlife, newts, kites, birds, hedgehogs, fox, badgers, to name a few which would be affected... more open space less petrol & Diesel fumes please.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

**RepID Representation****Nature**

7304 Mr Thomas Frisby [6047]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The traffic impact on Scraptoft will be huge. Many wanting to travel South will use Scraptoft as a rat run, which it already is. Station Lane is already blocked between 7.45am and 9.00am. The proposed principle access would be via Keyham Lane West which just been upgraded with traffic calming plus 20MPH speed limit. Certain parts can't be widened and Tesco roundabout is already nose to tail virtually all day. It would be impossible to upgrade Scraptoft/Station Lane without knocking houses down! The Green Wedge from Hall Road to Hamilton Lane needs to be protected to keep our village status.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If the new build does go ahead it should be made small, also the golf course has a large number of trees, many of them mature and healthy as we have lost a large amount of trees in this area so far, I think its imperative that as many of these as possible should be saved. Trees are natures natural barrier against flood. We are a low lying village, we have already felt the impact from new builds over the past 10 years. It is obvious that man made drainage isn't working, we need the green sites to keep things stable.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. A lower number of dwellings would not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school and would not make the required contribution to housing needs.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7305 Mrs Betty Geeson [6058]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Reasons for objection:

- impact of increased traffic on village, roads cannot cope
- residents do not want further development
- the Green Wedge needs to be protected

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Take into consideration the residents view, wants and needs for the village to remain as a village and not be further developed into a town. Harborough Local Plan should be "in place" properly to prevent the developers gain by using the loophole the lack of Plan has provided.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. The Green Wedge is to be replaced to a more publically accessible location. In order to get the Local Plan adopted enough housing development must be allocated to meet needs.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7316 Miss Claire Orton [6451]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraftoft has had many new houses built in recent years already which has had a negative impact in terms of increased traffic noise/pollution on the narrow road junction directly outside my house. The proposed new development in terms of number of houses far exceeds this. Any major road widening here would have a massive impact on the rural character of the conservation area. I value this greatly and do not want the historic village of Scraftoft swallowed up by the City/new housing estate.

As well as the traffic noise/pollution I believe this will also decrease the value of my house.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce number of houses

Create access roads that don't lead to or from Hamilton Lane

Create public open space (with outdoor gym, safe play space) for walking as part of the plan, protect current green wedges and increase amount of green space easily accessible for residents to access/walk-even if this borders housing development.

Provide very clear, pictorial representations of the proposed developments in hard copy to each of the addresses in the relevant area by post. Provide very clear and easy to respond to (i.e in hard copy/FREEPOST) documentation to enable all residents to have their say in an easily accessible way.

**Response:**

The extent of completions and commitments is recognised, this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft as village. House value is not a planning consideration.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7363 Mrs Gladys Middleton [6060]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Recently over the past 7 years - over 700 houses have been built on what was green land. I feel this proposal is too much. The village will lose it's identity, it will become too big and busy. The roads will be unable to cope with the increase in traffic. The roads that are proposed to be "upgraded" are unsuitable to carry the volume of traffic.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Make the proposed site much smaller or work with Leicester City Council to increase the lease on the four "golf holes" to enable Scraftoft to keep its wonderful golf course with all the wildlife and very established trees.

Put Harborough Local Plan in place to prevent developers taking advantage of the lack of the Plan!

**Response:**

The extent of completions and commitments is recognised, but this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft as village. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. A lower number of dwellings may not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school and would not make the required contribution to housing needs.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7378 Mrs Lisa Jones [6310]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Trying to make comments on the proposed building plot in Scraftoft I think it's disgusting, It's called a nature reserve for a reason.

**Response:**

The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7484 Mr Richard Procter [5854]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I disapprove of the proposed SDA for the Scraftoft area. The Nature reserve should be kept in its entirety and developed for use by the general public. The golf club should remain as a green area. The Scraftoft area including Bushby and Thurnby has seen its fair share of recent housing development. The new housing being built on Beeby Road will create hundreds of more cars and how will they get to the A47 other than by Church Lane and the mini roundabout at the the tip of Scraftoft Lane which is already inadequate?

**Response:**

The extent of completions and commitments is recognised, but this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City Boundaries. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.

**RepID Representation**

7533 Mrs Rita Ralhan [6270]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The number of houses should be restricted to a maximum of 600 split into 2 sites, one approximately 200 onto Beeby Road and second approximately 400 houses access from Hamilton Lane. Improve Keyham Lane West so there was a minimum of a single lane in each direction giving current residents adequate parking and proper traffic light control for school pupils. Improve all junctions that enter Keyham Lane with traffic light control onto the Thurmaston Lane/ Hungerton Boulevard roundabout. Station Road junction will need widening so there is a minimum of two lanes in all directions approximately 50 meters.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

To make this plan sound you would have to improve Keyham Lane West so there was a minimum of a single lane in each direction without interruption giving current residents adequate parking to the properties and proper traffic light control for school pupils. Also improvement to all junctions that enter Keyham Lane with proper sight easements traffic light control onto the Thurmaston Lane/ Hungerton Boulevard roundabout. Station Road junction must operate more efficiently; with existing traffic and proposed traffic this junction will need widening so there is a minimum of two lanes in all directions approximately 50meters. The number of houses should be restricted to a maximum of 600 split into 2 sites, one site approximately 200 onto Beeby Road and second site approximately 400 houses access from Hamilton Lane.

**Response:**

SC1 o) requires a package of mitigation measures on the existing highway and transport network, both within and outside the District, where adverse impacts are identified. The reduced capacity would be insufficient to support facilities, including the primary school.

**RepID Representation**

7551 Jelson Ltd [221]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We do not consider the Local Plan Proposed Submission to be sound due the increase in housing needs identified in the Housing and Economic Development Assessment (HEDNA) (January 2017) for the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA).

To help address the identified housing needs, the Local Plan should allocate the Scraptoft East SDA for an additional 2,700 homes over the Plan period (3,900 homes total including the Scraptoft North site).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Policy SC1 - should be amended to refer to the Scraptoft East SDA for 3,900 dwellings over the Plan period.

**Response:**

The Local Plan meets the needs identified by the HEDNA, plus 20% flexibility to meet unforeseen circumstances, the impact of growth at Magna Park and other unmet needs from Leicester City. Most of the additional land proposed was considered and rejected in the analysis of the potential Scraptoft SDA included in the Options Consultation (Sept- Oct 2015). This amount of additional development would be on top of commitments of 950 dwellings as well as 1200 in the proposed SDA at Scraptoft North. An additional 2,700 dwellings is unlikely to be deliverable within the plan period. Building on the land indicated would threaten the identity of the communities of Scraptoft and Thurnby / Bushby by building on land between them, identified as Green Wedge, by extending development into countryside to the east and by introducing housing at a rate which would be too fast to enable new residents to be integrated into the communities. To introduce this site at this stage would involve revisiting earlier assessments (on the Options and Selected Options) and could delay the Local Plan, and therefore the delivery of much needed housing and employment growth, contrary to the NPPF and Government policy more generally.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7618 **Armstrong Rigg Planning (Mr Geoff Armstrong) [4700]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Policy SC121 relating to Scraftoft North Strategic Development Area is unsound so far as it will fail to deliver the predicted number of homes during the plan period, which is likely to result in a shortfall against the plan requirement of circa 450 homes (Enclosure 3);

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to respond to the fundamental concerns raised above and to enable the preparation of a sound Plan, the following change is required:

\* Reduce the level of predicted delivery on this site to a more realistic level of circa 750 new homes and identify additional housing allocations elsewhere.

**Response:**

The Council and the promoters are confident that 1200 dwellings can be completed in the plan period. They are working collaboratively to achieve this through a Development Team approach and a Planning Performance Agreement.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7042 **mr Colin Griffiths [5118]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Scraftoft Golf Club, background and general position of the Golf club in support of the plan, in particular Scraftoft North development and New Golf Course. see the enclosed attachment.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**7343 **Davidsons Developments Ltd, Jelson Ltd & Parker Strategic Land Ltd [6507]****Support****Representation Summary:**

We support the proposed allocation at Scraptoft North for 1,200 new homes over the Plan period (Policy SC1). However, we do not consider the Local Plan Proposed Submission to be sound due the increase in housing needs identified in the Housing and Economic Development Assessment (HEDNA) for the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA).

To help address the identified housing needs, the Local Plan should allocate the Scraptoft East SDA for an additional 2,700 homes over the Plan period (3,900 homes total including the Scraptoft North site).

Further detail is provided in the Covering Letter (attached)and Masterplanning document.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Policy SC1 - should be amended to refer to the Scraptoft East SDA for 3,900 dwellings over the Plan period.

**Response:**

The Local Plan meets the needs identified by the HEDNA, plus 20% flexibility to meet unforeseen circumstances, the impact of growth at Magna Park and other unmet needs from Leicester City. Most of the additional land proposed was considered and rejected in the analysis of the potential Scraptoft SDA included in the Options Consultation (Sept- Oct 2015). This amount of additional development would be in on top of commitments of 950 dwellings as well as 1200 in the proposed SDA at Scraptoft North. An additional 2,700 dwellings is unlikely to be deliverable within the plan period. Building on the land indicated would threaten the identity of the communities of Scraptoft andThurnby / Busby by building on land between them, identified as Green Wedge, by extending development into countryside to the east and by introducing housing at a rate which would be too fast to enable new residents to be integrated into the communities. To introduce this site at this stage would involve revisiting earlier assessments (on the Options and Selected Options) and could delay the Local Plan, and therefore the delivery of much needed housing and employment growth, contrary to the NPPF and Government policy more generally.

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**7542 **Parker Strategic Land Limited [6459]****Support****Representation Summary:**

The representation is made by Parker Strategic Land Limited who are the promoters of the Scraptoft North SDA, provided for by Policy SC1 of the Local Plan.

PSL are supportive of the Policy SC1 although wish to make representations on the specific requirements of the Policy and make recommendations for proposed modifications. Our representations relate to paragraphs 3.e, 3.g, 3.h, 3.i, and 3.r, We also make representations on Inset Plan 55 (Houghton on the Hill) as the area shown for the proposed golf club is incorrect and should be amended.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proposed modifications are dealt with under relevant criteria representations.

**Response:**

Noted



**RepID** **Representation**

7546 Jelson Ltd [221]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We support the allocation of the Scraptoft North site in the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

5654 mrs Sarah Salisbury [6090]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I OBJECT

Traffic on Beeby road which leads to station lane/road already has heavy traffic at peak times the traffic lights on the A47 cannot not cope, the same can be said for the Hamilton area.

The amount of houses recently built and this new proposal will put a GREAT strain on our drainage system which will not be able to cope.

Where would the children go for secondary education the local secondary schools are struggling with allocations already for this area.

Concern for the local wildlife which will be risk once the local Nature reserve is taken away.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scaling down the amount of houses proposed to keep within the boundaries of the golf course only.

The amount of houses would be reduced significantly so this would mean less strain on the roads and local amenities and the local wildlife reserves,

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Drainage improvements will be put in place to serve the development, as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Secondary education is dealt with in Policy SC3 f. A lower number of dwellings would not support the new infrastructure and would not make the required contribution to housing needs.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6160 Mrs Helen Taylor [6109]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Despite our property being the one that is most likely to be affected by this development we only found out about this consultation and its deadline a week before it closed and that was via a flyer through our door from our local councillors about a meeting and I am sure that there are a large number of local residents who are not aware of this consultation despite the fact this development will have a major impact on their lives, especially the elderly.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Better publicity.

**Response:**

The proposal emerged after the previous consultation stage on the Local Plan (in Sept/ Oct 2015). This is the first formal consultation stage thereafter. The Council and the promoters are committed to engaging the local community in the masterplan once that stage is reached.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6186 Mr Grahame Taylor [6231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I do not believe that enough community consultation has been made in relation to such a large new development. Despite living within the green wedge proposed for development and being the property that is most likely to be significantly negatively affected, the only reason we knew about this present consultation was because of a flyer about a meeting being organised to discuss it, a week before the closing date. i am sure that there are plenty of other residents that are likely to be negatively effected that are unaware of this consultation.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Better publicity. Plus writing to households that are most likely to be affected. If my neighbour were to put in for planing permission for an extension we would be informed in writing and asked for comments but it seems that it is acceptable to build 1200 houses next door without informing me in writing about a consultation.

**Response:**

The proposal emerged after the previous consultation stage on the Local Plan (in Sept/ Oct 2015). This is the first formal consultation stage thereafter. The Council and the promoters are committed to engaging the local community in the masterplan once that stage is reached.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6410 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy is not suitable and I Object. This will cause issues with increased traffic, noise, pollution, wildlife and the loss of a very popular Scraptoft golf club which is enjoyed by its members. The local residents and community do not want the village to lose its small community. There has been already a large number of poor quality homes built within Scraptoft and along Keyham lane west which has impacted Scraptoft village leading to traffic and noise. Furthermore and there are no community services to facilitate these residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

i oppose the plan, build houses elsewhere in the country leicester has too many houses

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6530 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I feel I need to object to the statement as Harborough in the past appear to have allowed developers to get away with changing things in their favour rather than residents' wishes or not ensuring they comply with the work they were supposed to do - e.g. church storehouse getting relocated inside the churchyard, the state our sports pitch was left in, unfinished works to footpaths, fencing etc. Community consultation has been very poor - e.g. nature reserve - this plan for Scraptoft North which was NOT part of the original two years ago when we did make representations.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Developers MUST be held to account - no further permission granted anywhere inside Harborough for building UNTIL they make good on what they are supposed to have finished. Harborough need to be seen to have "teethe" rather than being a pushover!

**Response:**

Noted. The proposal emerged after the previous consultation stage on the Local Plan (in Sept/ Oct 2015). This is the first formal consultation stage thereafter. The Council and the promoters are committed to engaging the local community in the masterplan once that stage is reached.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6536 Miss Louise Bailey [6184]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The word should be maybe not will.  
Will makes it sound like a done deal.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Change will to maybe.

**Response:**

The Local Plan is written on the basis that it is sound and therefore that the development will proceed as proposed.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6937 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it should not go ahead at all. Not even in in a smaller proposal.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6938 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not go ahead

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6940 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not go ahead

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7219 Mrs Julie Freeston [6486]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The area cannot sustain an enormous increase in housing and the traffic etc this development will lead to. Scraftoft has already had over 700 houses built in the last seven years apart from other developments in Thurnby of around 500 houses during a similar period. This has already led to serious traffic congestion all around the area but particularly on Station Road at the A47 junction.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If further housing has to be in this area, the development should be much smaller with further consultation as to how increased traffic is to be managed.

**Response:**

The extent of completions and commitments is recognised, but this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those from Leicester City which cannot be met there. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7561 Parker Strategic Land Limited [6459]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

An additional clause should be added to the policy entitled 'Delivery and Phasing Programme'. This would require a Delivery and Phasing Programme to be prepared and for the programme to determine and specify the timing (dates) and thresholds (housing completions) for the provision of key facilities and pieces of infrastructure, as well as setting out the proposed housing trajectory and phasing arrangements.

This would provide the assessment to justify the timings and thresholds and obviate the need to set these out in the Policy at this stage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Suggested new sub-paragraph:

Delivery and Phasing Programme

A delivery and phasing programme will be provided to accompany the master plan and shall specify:

- i. An overall phasing and sequencing plan for development of the site;
- ii. The housing trajectory showing the programmed delivery of new homes by year for the whole development period;
- iii. The anticipated timing and threshold in dwelling numbers for provision of the following:
  - a. Local Centre, including provision of each proposed element of the centre;
  - b. Primary School;
  - c. Other community facilities;
  - d. Major areas of new parkland and recreational facilities; and
  - e. Key highways infrastructure and public transport services.

**Response:**

The suggested addition is a statement of process rather than policy. Inserting the thresholds in the policy gives the public assurance that these will be delivered, in the light of the numerous objections that there will be insufficient infrastructure provision to serve the SDA. Preparation of a Delivery and Phasing Programme is to be welcomed, but not as replacement for the thresholds. It could form an appendix to the masterplan.

---

**RepID Representation****Nature**

6082 Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Supported in principle provided the necessary infrastructure / services are provided at the time of construction and are fit for purpose. Existing local services e.g. roads, schools, Drs surgeries etc are at capacity and therefore would be unable to support the initial proposed number of dwellings/residents .

A planned community is not just another housing estate.

A major concern is that the consequential , increased traffic flow through Thurnby, Bushby and Scraftoft will make what are already congested roads even more dangerous and create more pollution.. These settlements have very poor transport links by bus, so a car is vital.

**Response:**

Noted. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery. Policy SC2 states that the masterplan will be 'informed by key design principles, an independent design review and community consultation'. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Policy SC1 3 l, m and n require a 20 minute bus service and other sustainable transport measures.

**RepID Representation****Nature**

5786 Mrs. m weller [6121]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is not sound:

Currently poor water management with the brook regularly flooding as can't cope with the increases from new and existing developments.

Scraftoft has grown exponentially in recent years and real risk of loss of identify/separation from Leicerster city.

Already insufficient roads. Proposed exit routes aren't viable leading to rat-running through Scraftoft/country lanes as not all traffic will head to Leicester e.g. A47/Station Rd junction, Hard to see how Keyham Lane with 3 schools could be upgraded

Other sites such as Brockshill in Oadby might be better as these already have infrastructure

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Need to maintain whole of local nature reserve as need separation and green wedge/space

Development is too big, roads can't really cope as present. and Scraftoft will lose it's identy as a village

**Response:**

Policy SC3 t and w require an integrated approach to surface water management and measures to naturalise the Scraftoft Brook. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft as village. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6402 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

this Policy not suitable and I Object. This will cause issues with increased traffic along Hamilton Lane, New Romney crescent, Scraftoft Lane, Station Lane, Beeby Rd and Covert Lane, which is already very busy during peak commute time and congested with speeding cars and motorbikes and other vehicles. The village will see a rise in pollution, noise, and furthermore, there will be an impact to the current residents, local community doctors, and schools. The area will lose its identity of being a village and local wildlife including owls, foxes and birds will be destroyed. along with the green wedge.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The plan should NOT go ahead, Having looked at local builds in the area, they are not high quality and infrastructure is not considered by developers. Keyham Lane iWest and Hamilton lane and Scraftoft village are not suitable for the volume of traffic the masterplan will bring.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6462 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Residents of Scraptoft will see their living environment deteriorate due to:

Increased cars travelling through our village due to the road/travel plan NOT being fit for purpose - increased noise, air pollution, accidents

Overload on all services - health and education - MUST come first BEFORE housing

Loss of green wedge and the wildlife it provides a home for - essential part of VILLAGE life

Rural aspect decreased which is important for mental health/well-being

Building work continues as it has over the past seven years with ALL of the disruption, noise, anti-social behaviour/loss of amenities it brings

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build nearer to existing road infrastructure in Harborough district.

Build closer to existing Harborough G.P. surgeries/secondary schools

Smaller developments located across Harborough NOT pushed on to ONE village.

IF building in Scraptoft - services i.e. roads/G.P.surgery/primary school built FIRST before any more houses.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery. The Green Wedge is to be replaced to a more publically accessible location. A more widespread pattern of development towards rural parts of the District was considered at options stage but was dismissed as unsustainable and not delivering the required housing numbers.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6942 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

it will not provide enough

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not go ahead

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7190 nicholas fielden [5185]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The masterplan is NOT VIABLE please see attached sheet for further details.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Harborough should be looking to liaise with Leicester to build homes where they CAN widen or build new roads to accommodate the amount of traffic travelling into Leicester and transport secondary school children to their schools in Oadby - therefore more likely nearer to the A6.

OR

Harborough concentrate on providing housing within Harborough for the benefit of their citizens who do NOT work in Leicester and want to live in the countryside and have a rural rather than city life.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. The Local Plan Viability Assessment specifically considered the viability of the scheme and concluded that it was economically viable.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7217 nicholas fielden [5185]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This masterplan will not create a high quality living environment and is NOT viable - the number of houses and facilities, infrastructure being proposed CANNOT actually fit on the area in question - please see attached sheet for reasons

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The amount of housing needs to be reconsidered and reduced CONSIDERABLY and the infrastructure built first - the primary school and doctor's surgery BEFORE any housing on this site.

**Response:**

A lower number of dwellings may not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school and would not make the required contribution to housing needs. Policy SC2 states that the masterplan will be 'informed by key design principles, an independent design review and community consultation'. The Local Plan Viability Assessment specifically considered the viability of the scheme and concluded that it was economically viable.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5463 **Dr Matthew Clarke [5227]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Based on the 2011 census, Scraftoft has a population of 1,804, Market Harborough has a population of 22,911 and Lutterworth some 9,353. Assuming that each dwelling contains one individual, the relative size of the development proposed for Scraftoft represents a 17 fold greater increase in population than proposed for Market Harborough and 4 times that proposed for Lutterworth. Both Market Harborough and Lutterworth, as towns, have the requisite infrastructure to meet much greater increases in population than does Scraftoft, and yet it is proposed that the village of Scraftoft takes a much heavier developmental burden and to double in size.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Locations within Harborough which have greater capacity to achieve sustainable development should take more of the developmental burden within this proposed plan. The plan offers no evidence that the proposed devastating impact on Scraftoft has been considered, nor why those urban centres better able to absorb high levels of development, Market Harborough in particular, are not identified for a greater share of the development burden.

**Response:**

This is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries. Market Harborough has already had a 1,500 dwelling SDA in the Core Strategy and is allocated at least 1,140 dwellings in the Local Plan, with limited capacity to expand further. Lutterworth will receive 1,500 dwellings in the plan period and 1,250 thereafter.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5956 **Mr. Martin Forbes [6182]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This is very near to a development that already has put pressure on the local infrastructure

**Change To Plan Sought:**

build less homes to give more greener spaces

**Response:**

SC1 requires a package of infrastructure and facilities to support the development.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5967 **Marie Forbes [6046]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This will make the area over populated and pressure put on the local infrastructure

**Change To Plan Sought:**

build half the number of homes and create more green space keeping in place some resemblance of the previous space

**Response:**

A lower number of dwellings may not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school, and would not make the required contribution to housing needs.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6001 **Miss Susan Elgar [5936]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

I object to the amount of houses to be built in SCRAPTOFT. This village will lose its identity. It will become a rat-run for traffic who need to travel to south of county. The noise, pollution and volume of construction traffic will be intolerable. There is not the infrastructure to support such a huge development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I accept there is a need to build houses for the future, but 1200 houses in this area is too many, so build less. Take into consideration the people of SCRAPTOFT.

**Response:**

Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as village. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Planning conditions will address the short/ medium term issue of construction traffic. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery. A lower number of dwellings would not support the new infrastructure and would not make the required contribution to housing needs.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6006 **Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft has already had over 700 houses built in the last 5 years and to build another 1200 is far too many within such a small area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build less houses or find alternative areas to spread the load

**Response:**

A lower number of dwellings may not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school, and would not make the required contribution to housing needs.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6045 **Scraptoft Parish Council (Ms Sally Skyrme) [6009]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

We consider 1200 houses to be excessive for a village such as Scraptoft that has minimum facilities and no car park outside the shops. We have already had over 700 houses built in the village.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Keep the nature reserve as it is and have less houses.

**Response:**

The extent of completions and commitments is recognised, but this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries. A lower number of dwellings would not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school, and would not make the required contribution to housing needs.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6048 Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft has already had over 700 houses built in the last 5 years and cannot sustain further building on this scale. Scraptoft will lose its identity and the infrastructure cannot support this further expansion

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Find alternative areas to build

**Response:**

The extent of completions and commitments is recognised, but this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6131 Mrs margaret Garven [6146]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The plan to create a large housing development of 1200 houses plus the proposed accompanying structures, namely, supermarket, pub, community centre, school, cemetery and recreational areas is tantamount to developing a self sufficient satellite settlement which will encroach upon the tranquility and rural nature of the old part of Scraptoft. Traffic flow, already a problem in the village centre, will become worse as will light and noise pollution from the new development. There are limited employment opportunities in Scraptoft for people living within the proposed development thus forcing most people to commute .

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Totally unsuitable area for development.

**Response:**

Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as village. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Bus services to employment and Leicester City Centre will be improved under Policy SC1 3 l, m and n.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6133 Catherine Allison [6102]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I feel this development will change the face of the village of Scraptoft which will resemble a town when completed. In recent years there have been large developments around the village, spoiling the look of the church and changing the look and feel of the surrounding area. This further development would cause countless other problems such as, traffic, congestion and pollution. If each household has more than one car this creates lots of problems.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Not a suitable area for development.

**Response:**

Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as village and the impact on the Conservation Area including the church. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6137 Mr Brian Quinn [6227]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

1200 new houses is a large number in a village that has already had 700+ houses. I feel that this scale of development will drastically alter the nature of the village. Traffic generally is an issue already and trying to leave and enter Scaptoft is already difficult at certain times. The other main issue is the reduction of the nature reserve.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

- 1 reduce the size of the development.
- 2 improve traffic flows in Station Lane particularly at the junction with the A47.
- 3 retain the nature reserve and possibly enlarge it

**Response:**

The extent of completions and commitments is recognised, but this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. The important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6187 Mr Grahame Taylor [6231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is too many houses for this area, we have already had significant expansion in this area of Scraftoft and had been told that with the Goodridge Development we would have met our housing quota. A firm maximum should be set so developers do not squeeze more housing in for greater profit.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A firm maximum number of properties should be set.

**Response:**

The extent of completions and commitments is recognised, but this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries. The allocation sets the limit for development during the current plan period.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6306 HUNGARTON Parish Council (Mr Andrew May) [2640]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

HPC is concerned that this development will cause congestion in this in relation to routes into the city and contribute to new "rat runs" in this very rural part of the district.

We are concerned to see 1,200 dwellings at Scraftoft North "many of which may be needed to help deal with meeting unmet needs arising from another local authority." There should be defined figures.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Define the need which is being met.

**Response:**

It is not possible to exactly define the need arising from Leicester City until they have progressed their Local Plan further and a Memorandum of Understanding is in place with the HMA authorities.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6352 Miss Nituben Patel [6280]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Please have consideration of my thoughts and feelings and protect my human rights of my chosen location. Listen to the local people.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build on much smaller scale eg 200 luxury spaced out housing.  
This is not the place for a crowded area. Please maintain my area.

**Response:**

This is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries. A lower number of dwellings would not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school, and would not make the required contribution to housing needs.

---



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6370 Mr Brett Taylor [6284]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I object to the amount of housing being proposed as I feel that the village of Scraptoft and its roads will not be able to cope with the added traffic that will be brought to the area.

I feel that this will increase pollution in the area that will affect local wild life within the area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

as no actual drawings have been put forward for the proposed dwellings it is hard to say what would be a better modification to facilitate the new dwellings .

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6412 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy is not suitable and I Object. This will cause issues with increased traffic, noise, pollution, wildlife and the loss of a very popular Scraptoft golf club which is enjoyed by its members. The local residents and community do not want the village to lose its small community. There has been already a large number of poor quality homes built within Scraptoft and along Keyham lane west which has impacted Scraptoft village leading to traffic and noise. Furthermore and there are no community services to facilitate these residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

1200 dwellings in a small village is not required, there is no infrastructure to support it. build houses in Derby

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6432 Mr Peter Freeston [6315]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposal is not sound because we have already had over 700 houses built in Scraptoft over the last 7 years, and the existing village facilities cannot sustain further growth. There would be absolute chaos for the village inhabitants whilst a site of this size was being constructed.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Brown field sites within the area should be used as a priority, and NOT already over crowded villages, or green wedge sites.

**Response:**

The extent of completions and commitments is recognised, but this is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries. Planning conditions will address the short/ medium term issue of construction traffic. There are insufficient brownfield sites in Harborough to meet its housing requirement.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6537 Miss Louise Bailey [6184]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The area is a green wedge and should not be built on.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove all paragraphs

**Response:**

The Green Wedge is to be replaced to a more publically accessible location.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6941 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not proceed to development

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7589 Mr Grahame Taylor [6231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I live in the centre of your proposed development site at Oak Lodge, Beeby Road, Scraftoft. I am going to suffer noise, dust, dirt and daily inconvenience during any building. I am likely to have my visual and living amenity seriously curtailed at the end of your project. You have now put me in a position where I am unlikely to be able to sell my house without huge financial loss in the near future in view of your proposed plans.

**Response:**

The masterplan will seek to limit long term impacts on the amenity of Oak Lodge. Planning conditions should minimise impact of construction traffic. House values are not a planning consideration.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6052 Miss Susan Elgar [5936]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I would question affordable housing, and be concerned that there would be insufficient for those wanting to get onto the property ladder. I would also be concerned that far too many houses are purchased and then sub - let to housing associations etc or larger more expensive houses rented out and not lived in.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build less houses, make sure those that are comply with affordable homes too.

**Response:**

The requirement is for 40% affordable housing which meets the requirement as evidenced by the HEDNA. It is not possible to control sub-letting or occupation through planning powers. A lower number of dwellings may not support the new infrastructure, especially the primary school, and would not make the required contribution to housing needs.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6415 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy is not suitable and I Object. This will cause issues with increased traffic, noise, pollution, wildlife and the loss of a very popular Scraptoft golf club which is enjoyed by its members. The local residents and community do not want the village to lose its small community. There has been already a large number of poor quality homes built within Scraptoft and along Keyham lane west which has impacted Scraptoft village leading to traffic and noise. Furthermore and there are no community services to facilitate these residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

do not build these houses in scraptoft look for alternatives in the country

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to provision of a mix of house types. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6416 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy is not suitable and I Object. This will cause issues with increased traffic, noise, pollution, wildlife and the loss of a very popular Scraptoft golf club which is enjoyed by its members. The local residents and community do not want the village to lose its small community. There has been already a large number of poor quality homes built within Scraptoft and along Keyham lane west which has impacted Scraptoft village leading to traffic and noise. Furthermore and there are no community services to facilitate these residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

don't build these houses, keep our countryside as it is

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6961 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

it's not fair to the residents that currently live in the area.

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors' surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which is currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not proceed

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to the provision of a range of housing densities. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6054 Miss Susan Elgar [5936]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is indeed a demand for schools in the area already.  
So many children already travel much further than is desirable and add to the volume of traffic.  
We shouldn't have to wait until 300 houses are built when we have already had 700 houses built in the last 5 years.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We should not have to wait until 300 houses are built when we have already had 700 houses built in the last 5 years.  
A school should already have been built.

**Response:**

The requirement is what is required by County Education in developments of this scale on the basis of their experience of the number of pupils likely to be generated. It would be unrealistic to expect provision earlier.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6417 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy is not suitable and I Object. This will cause issues with increased traffic, noise, pollution, wildlife and the loss of a very popular Scraptoft golf club which is enjoyed by its members. The local residents and community do not want the village to lose its small community. There has been already a large number of poor quality homes built within Scraptoft and along Keyham lane west which has impacted Scraptoft village leading to traffic and noise. Furthermore and there are no community services to facilitate these residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

review current schools and you will see they are not doing well. Leave the area alone.

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to provision of a primary school. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. The most important parts of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6437 Mr Peter Freeston [6315]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I object to this whole huge development, as primary school places are already over-subscribed within the area. The additional 300 houses before a new school is built will add to the already overcrowded classes and traffic problems.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Any new developments should consider more carefully primary school provision, and traffic issues.

**Response:**

The requirement is what is required by County Education in developments of this scale on the basis of their experience of the number of pupils likely to be generated. It would be unrealistic to expect provision earlier.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6736 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Due to the amount of housing already being built in Thurnby and Scraftoft at the moment, the primary school would need to be built IMMEDIATELY not after ANOTHER 300 houses. and as it would take years before it could operate as a full primary school NO further housing should be allowed until it was actually operational.

Building this school would NOT alleviate problems of senior school children and where they could go without extra travelling involved.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Harborough should be investing in the infrastructure FIRST that has been lacking throughout the development of Scraftoft over these past few years before we can have any more houses built here. Harborough needs to ensure that developers make good on their promises by getting them to do the infrastructure first before they can start building houses.

**Response:**

It is unrealistic to expect the school to be built before there are sufficient children to occupy it. Policy SC3 f addresses secondary school provision.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6862 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraftoft should remain a small village and therefore a school will bring a heavy traffic load, noise, pollution and litter, congestion.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

look to schools in Bushby or market habrough

**Response:**

It would be unsustainable and undesirable to require primary school pupils to travel elsewhere.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7544 Parker Strategic Land Limited [6459]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Provision trigger point for primary school is not supported by evidence and not justified. The requirement to deliver the school to this programme may limit the location within the site.

The timing of delivery should be tested through the proposed ' Delivery and Phasing Programme'. This may also consider the potential phasing of the school (e.g. phased opening).

**Response:**

The requirement is what is required by County Education in developments of this scale on the basis of their experience of the number of pupils likely to be generated. We will continue to work with and take advice from the County Education Authority.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5459 **Dr Matthew Clarke [5227]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Recent developments within Scraftoft have merely put aside 106 monies, now being used to enlarge Fernvale Primary School to cater for the current additional influx of children. St Luke's School is already at full capacity. However the additional demand on school places this development would create cannot be met by Fernvale without compromising its structures and culture. Furthermore, children would live 2 miles away from Fernvale, a considerable journey without bus service. It is therefore essential that Harborough District develops a legally binding requirement for the creation of a new primary school within the development and ensures it is enforced!

**Response:**

Noted. See Policy SC1 3 e.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6008 **Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

I have already commented on the number of houses that have already been built and are proposed. With an existing additional 700 houses that have already been built i would ask why a primary school has not already been built. Surely the area has needed a school for sometime and should not be built only when an additional 300 houses have been completed.

**Response:**

Previous developments were served by extensions to existing primary schools. The requirement is what is required by County Education in developments of this scale on the basis of their experience of the number of pupils likely to be generated. It would be unrealistic to expect provision earlier.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6786 **Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Inclusion of criteria welcomed. As the master-planning of the SDA progresses, it is important that there is effective dialogue between the City Council, Harborough District Council and the County Council in achieving effective outcomes.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7120 **THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

The Parish Council is concerned at the trigger point for schools and what will happen in the interim until trigger points are reached. What provision is there within the current primary school provision at Fernvale and St Luke's primary schools to meet the interim needs of families moving into the SDA?

**Response:**

This short term issue will need to be addressed as part of the delivery and phasing programme in the master-plan and/ or through the planning application.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6009 Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Currently secondary education is provided by schools in Oadby. The building of another 1200 houses in addition to the recent 700 will mean a large number of children having to travel to Oadby. This will mean traffic chaos in the Scraptoft area and an enormous influx of children into the existing schools in Oadby which do not have the capability for such an influx. What is proposed to remedy this problem?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Less houses. Build a school now thus easing traffic congestion in the area

**Response:**

Pupils could go to Oadby or Hamilton College which is accessible on foot. A new secondary school could not be justified. A lower number of dwellings may not support the new infrastructure and would not make the required contribution to housing needs.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6161 Mrs Helen Taylor [6109]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Where would the secondary education provision be. It is my understanding that it would be Beauchamp and Gartree is Oadby, despite Hamilton Community College being in effect over the road, but this is classed as Leicester City. Transport to the Oadby would involve passing through the Scraptoft one way system and the already congested Station Road. Have these schools been consulted about an increased intake.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Where secondary education will take place should be clarified.

**Response:**

Pupils could go to either school. Discussions are needed between the education authorities. Both agree they could accommodate additional numbers subject to receipt of contributions for extensions.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6188 Mr Grahame Taylor [6231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Where would these schools be and have they been consulted.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

clear plans for where secondary education would take place.

**Response:**

Pupils could go to schools in Oadby or Hamilton College. Discussions are needed between the education authorities. Both agree they could accommodate additional numbers subject to receipt of contributions for extensions.

---



**ReplID Representation**

6866 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy not suitable and I Object. due to the following:

Increased Traffic

increased pollution

Loss of peaceful village life

Loss of local wildlife

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build in a different area such as market arborough

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to contributions to secondary school provision, which will be off-site in any event.

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire

Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j,

o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft as village. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a

Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

**ReplID Representation**

6969 kevin dias [6452]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

it will not be enough and will add to the traffic issues of the area.

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not proceed

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to contributions towards secondary schools, which will be off-site in any event.

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire

Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge,

while the most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The

policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6789 **Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Inclusion of criteria welcomed. As the master-planning of the SDA progresses, it is important that there is effective dialogue between the City Council, Harborough District Council and the County Council in achieving effective outcomes.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6163 **Mrs Helen Taylor [6109]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

It is hard not to feel sceptical about this, it has taken many years, despite promises from developers for the new community hub in Scraftoft to become a reality. Developers seem to be full of promises until they get planning permission but slow when it comes to fulfilling said promises, if at all.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Maybe these facilities should be built first. What would happen if the developer responsible went bust before they were built.

**Response:**

It is not realistic to expect services to be provided by developers in advance of users being there. The correct approach is to phase in provision in parallel.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6741 **Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Scraftoft residents have just had a new community hall built using our own funds so we would not benefit from another one and this shows how Harborough does not seem to know what Scraftoft is like at all and what is actually going on here!

All of the other retail units and other things mentioned in the list would need parking facilities and the amount of what buildings and infrastructure suggested there is just not adding up on the size of space available!

I do not have faith that these plans are viable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scraftoft residents need to be able to see drawn up plans to scale of how all of this is going to be fitted onto the size of land initially proposed Golf Course and Nature Reserve (our Green Wedge!!) as it looks like a land grab for more fields will take place to allow this amount of housing to be built.

**Response:**

HDC was fully aware of the recent new provision, part funded through developer contributions. Additional provision will be required for the new housing. This will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community. All these matters will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6867 **Ms Bindu Modi [6276]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy not suitable and I Object. due to the following:

Increased Traffic

increased pollution

Loss of peaceful village life

Loss of local wildlife

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build in a different district such as Market Harborough

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to the neighbourhood centre. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as village. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7297 **Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Residents of Scraptoft will see their living environment deteriorate due to overload on all services - health and education - MUST come first BEFORE housing.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build closer to existing Harborough G.P. surgeries/secondary schools.

IF building in Scraptoft - services i.e. roads/G.P. surgery/primary school built FIRST before any more houses.

**Response:**

There are insufficient sites in Market Harborough and Scraptoft is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs. It is not realistic to expect services to be provided by developers in advance of users being there. The correct approach is to phase in provision in parallel.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7547 **Parker Strategic Land Limited [6459]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Provision is required before the completion of 500 dwellings, but this figure is not supported by evidence and therefore not justified. The figure is specific and would mean delivery of the entire local centre before half(that is 42%) of the proposed development is completed. Timing could affect the quality of operator, the need to subsidise (affecting overall viability), or not be supported by third parties. Better to identify the need for and composition of the local centre, as the policy does, but that its timing be determined through the master plan process (proposed Delivery and Phasing Programme).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Suggest revising criteria to read:

3.g. a neighbourhood centre as a social and retail hub for the new community to be provided as soon as can be achieved, to be determined by the master plan delivery and phasing programme to include some or all of the following: (etc.)

**Response:**

It is important to maintain a threshold figure to ensure necessary infrastructure and facilities are provided in a timely manner in order to provide sustainable development.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5460 **Dr Matthew Clarke [5227]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

This is an essential aspect of the plan if the development is to be successful and sustainable. The pressure particularly on local health facilities is considerable and there is no capacity to meet further demand. However, we do not have confidence that the development will meet its commitment to this provision and it will be essential to the sustainability of the development and existing Scraftoft residents to ensure that a neighbourhood centre is provided. The provision of a separate centre is also essential to reduce the impact of traffic coming into the village centre.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6010 **Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

This is long overdue. The building of over 700 houses during the last 5 years has not been matched by the provision of additional social and retail outlets for the community. Having lived in the area for 20 years i have seen no improvement to either despite the enormous increase in population. Unless this is done now Scraftoft will become another area where in the absence of social outlets,we will be subjected to an increase in anti social behaviour and crime which is becoming increasingly prevalent elsewhere.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6868 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy not suitable and I Object. due to the following:

Increased Traffic

increased pollution

Loss of peaceful village life

Loss of local wildlife

**Change To Plan Sought:**

NA

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to the provision of a supermarket or shops to meet local needs. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as village. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6050 Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The one shop we currently have in the village is insufficient for its purpose. Increases in population will mean greater traffic and therefore additional shops and supermarkets are required now to cater for what has already been done. The current roads cannot meet the requirements of traffic using existing facilities and if the plan is adopted it will be impossible without significant additional retail outlets. The roads are currently insufficient and increased use by people travelling to out of town shopping parks will make it worse. Do something now

**Response:**

SC1 3 g i requires a supermarket or shops to meet local need. It is not realistic to expect a retailer to provide this before customers are available. The scale of development would not be sufficient to justify larger scale retail, even if land were available and there is already provision at Tesco. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6869 **Ms Bindu Modi [6276]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy not suitable and I Object. due to the following:

Increased Traffic

increased pollution

Loss of peaceful village life

Loss of local wildlife

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There is a local Public house in Scraftoft - namely the White House and this is sufficient.

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to the provision of a public house. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft as village. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6011 **Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst Scraftoft currently has a public house, The White House, which is a Wetherspoons pub it would nice to have a more upmarket establishment elsewhere in the area serving good food in keeping with a number of other country pubs and restaurants in nearby villages. Also there currently isn't a good coffee shop in the area and it is necessary to travel some way to find somewhere serving good quality coffee, cakes and snacks

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6165 **Mrs Helen Taylor [6109]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Would this be a new GP practice. At present there is a real shortage of GPs with many practices closing. If it were to be a branch surgery from one of the existing practices, have they been consulted. At present there is not a GP practice within the Scraftoft area that is within walking distance or on a bus route.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Clarification of who would be responsible for the running of this practice.

**Response:**

All these matters will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community. The correct approach is to phase in provision in parallel.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6189 Mr Grahame Taylor [6231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Would this be a new practice or would nearby GP practices be expected to staff it, if so have they been consulted. There is a significant shortage of GPs with many existing practices closing. with 1200 houses you could be looking at up to 5000 new residents needing to register. At present there is no GP in Scraftoft that is within walking distance or on a bus route.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It should be clear who will be responsible for running this doctors surgery.

**Response:**

All these matters will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community. The correct approach is to phase in provision in parallel.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6738 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Due to the amount of housing already being built in Thurnby and Scraftoft at the moment, the doctor's surgery would need to be built IMMEDIATELY not after ANOTHER 500 houses. and in this climate of underfunding even if it was built this would not guarantee it could become operational Therefore NO further housing should be allowed until it actually began functioning as a G.P. surgery..

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Harborough needs to plan for the building of the infrastructure first before any more houses at all in Scraftoft and Thurnby..

**Response:**

It is unrealistic to expect a doctors' surgery to begin to function before it has patients. The correct approach is to phase in provision in parallel.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6855 Mr Richard Wayman [5147]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Insufficient information regarding how surgeries will be expanded to meet additional influx of population.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Provide documentation and explanation of how surgeries will handle influx of population.

**Response:**

This matter will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6871 **Ms Bindu Modi [6276]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy not suitable and I Object. due to the following:

Increased Traffic

increased pollution

Loss of peaceful village life

Loss of local wildlife

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Dont build !

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to a doctors' surgery. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft as village. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5407 **Mr Ian Ball [5065]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

No such facility in area near to Scraftoft.

**Response:**

Noted

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5461 **Dr Matthew Clarke [5227]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Pressure on existing local primary health services is considerable, and there is no capacity to meet further demand. If the development is to go ahead, a doctors' surgery will be essential to ensure the wellbeing of existing and new residents in the area. However, we do not have confidence that this element of the plan will be achieved and so a robust administrative structure will be required to ensure that these commitments are actually met. Therefore, this should be a priority within the development timetable, and further construction prohibited after 500 dwellings until this facility is provided.

**Response:**

All these matters will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community.



<u>RepID</u>	<u>Representation</u>	<u>Nature</u>
6013	<b>Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> Good idea in principle but may prove difficult to find the medical practitioners required <b>Response:</b> Noted	Support
6055	<b>Miss Susan Elgar [5936]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> A Doctors surgery/nurse led practise is very much required but should be in situ now. <b>Response:</b> Noted	Support
6406	<b>mrs lynn morris [6298]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> due to the increase in the population of the area it will need a doctors surgery as there is already overload at current surgeries <b>Response:</b> Noted	Support
7125	<b>THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]</b> <b>Representation Summary:</b> The Parish Council is concerned at the trigger point for a doctor's surgery and what will happen in the interim until trigger points are reached. GP provision needs to be the full range of primary care and not simply a GP surgery. It should be noted that the Bushby surgery is a satellite to Billesdon surgery and does not have the capacity to expand. What provision is there within current provision to meet the interim needs of families moving into the SDA? <b>Response:</b> Noted. These matters will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community.	Support

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6872 **Ms Bindu Modi [6276]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy not suitable and I Object. due to the following:

Increased Traffic

increased pollution

Loss of peaceful village life

Loss of local wildlife

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This will ruin the Scraptoft village - Don't build!

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to a community hall. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraptoft as village. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5462 **Dr Matthew Clarke [5227]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

The village needs a more suitable village hall and commitments by previous developments to provide this have not been met. Therefore, this should be a priority within the development timetable, and further construction prohibited after 500 dwellings until this facility is provided.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5959 **Mr. Martin Forbes [6182]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

This should look to be larger than the current scraptoft parish hall

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6014 Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

A community hall has just been built in the area but has not opened yet so the local residents do not know what this will provide. If the proposed development goes through there is no doubt that a community hall will be required for use by the whole community and not just youngsters although it is vital that they are catered for and the community hall is managed properly so as to minimise anti social behaviour and criminal activity

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6057 Miss Susan Elgar [5936]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We do have a community hub which is near completion, although I am as yet unclear as to what its purpose will be. We will need somewhere for young members of our community to have somewhere to go and encourage them off the streets where unsocial activities and vandalism is already an issue.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6191 Mr Grahame Taylor [6231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

What other community facilities are there to upgrade?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

One possibility would be to extend the existing village hall. This can be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6873 **Ms Bindu Modi [6276]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy not suitable and I Object. due to the following:

Increased Traffic

increased pollution

Loss of peaceful village life

Loss of local wildlife

**Change To Plan Sought:**

NA

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to the provision of community facilities. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft as village. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5406 **Mr Ian Ball [5065]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Area needs a coordinated approach, lots of recent housing give a small field here a couple of trees there is no field the size of a football pitch available for people to play for example.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6016 **Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

As there are no plans or details available as to what this means it is impossible to comment. As far as improving existing facilities is concerned the only existing facility is the village hall and it is difficult to see what could be done to improve or expand upon this.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7122 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Parish Council is concerned at the trigger point for community facilities and what will happen in the interim until trigger points are reached.

It is important that any community facilities are located centrally so that they are easily accessible. Facilities should also complement existing provision within Scraftoft and the neighbouring parish of Thurnby and Bushby.

**Response:**

All these matters will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community. The correct approach is to phase in provision in parallel.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6874 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy not suitable and I Object. due to the following:

- Increased Traffic
- increased pollution
- Loss of peaceful village life
- Loss of local wildlife

**Change To Plan Sought:**

NA  
Leicester city counsellors are not aware of the plan

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to the multifunctional green infrastructure network. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft as village. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5725 Ms Fiona Ashberry [5935]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Scraftoft Nature Reserve should be left as a nature reserve not made a green corridor. it is vital to protect the many species of plants and animals on this site and any disturbance to the nature reserve would result in a loss of these species. The plan is supposed to protect Local Green Spaces.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Nature reserve should not be de-declared.

**Response:**

The most important parts of the LNR will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site with the agreement of the County Ecologist.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5905 Mr Stephen Clifton [6170]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft nature resrvev is fine as it is. The proposed wildlife corridors will not support the variety of wildlife that the resrve does.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Keep the nature resrve as is. And don't build within s certain distance of it.

**Response:**

The most important parts of the LNR will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site with the agreement of the County Ecologist.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6021 Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The nature reserve should be retained as it is to retain the wildlife presently in situ.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The nature reserve needs to be retained as it is and not lose its status. Work needs to be considered to ensure that the brook is maintained properly and houses will not be at risk of flooding. This means identifying additional areas to provide housing

**Response:**

The most important parts of the LNR will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site with the agreement of the County Ecologist.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6138 Catherine Allison [6102]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

A great number of trees and shrubs will be lost due to recent building developments. The green corridor is not enough to sustain a variety of wildlife, trees have already been lost due to building in the area and reducing this further will be very detrimental to song birds, birds of prey and other creatures . The green corridor will in no way make up for the loss of a large natural area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Not viable or sustainable for wildlife

**Response:**

The most important parts of the LNR will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site with the agreement of the County Ecologist. This matter will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community.

---

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6166 Mrs Helen Taylor [6109]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The nature reserve becoming a "wildlife corridor" would result in a significant loss of wildlife. Building work close by with all its noise and disturbance would also have a severe negative impact on wildlife within the corridor.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

keep the nature reserve as it is

**Response:**

The most important parts of the LNR will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site with the agreement of the County Ecologist.

---

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

6185 Cllr Simon Galton [4845]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It has not been justified why the development of the site would require the de-declaration of the Local Nature Reserve. The explanation at 13.2.12 is not based on the most up to date surveys and evidence. The proposal is contrary to paragraphs 9 & 109 of the NPPF which states that sustainable development should seek positive improvements in the quality of the natural environment, minimise the impact on biodiversity and provide net gains where possible. The proposed SDA also conflicts with the Scraftoft Neighbourhood Plan Policy S11 on Biodiversity.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not de-declare Scraftoft Local Nature Reserve. Retain the land currently designated as an LNR based on the area identified in the plan shown at Appendix 5 of the report by Sue Timms and Karen Headley (May 17).

**Response:**

The most valuable parts of the LNR for nature conservation should be preserved and enhanced in order to meet the NPPF's requirement that sustainable development achieves net gains for nature. The details of how this will be achieved are still to be worked up through the ongoing master planning process that accompanies the proposed SDA. However, the Scraftoft North SDA provides opportunities to enhance and protect the most valuable parts of the LNR, whilst providing opportunities to enhance public access to the site and to actively manage the site for nature. The key principles of the proposed mitigation strategy involves the retention and enhancement of the most valuable parts of the existing LNR, as set out at Appendix 5 of the Scraftoft Local Nature Reserve Consultation document. This involves managing area A for its biodiversity value, retaining and managing for wildlife value higher quality existing grasslands shown as area B and restoring existing poorer quality areas as replacement habitat shown as areas C1, C2, C3, C4 and C5. The mitigation and enhancement strategy will ensure impacts on biodiversity are minimised and net gains are achieved, where possible.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6539 Miss Louise Bailey [6184]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

These proposed corridors will not replace the nature reserve

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not build on the nature reserve

**Response:**

The evidence does not justify retention of the whole nature reserve. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6542 Miss Chloe Bibby [6241]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Local Nature Reserve should be retained.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Land beyond the boundaries of the LNR should be found for housing.

**Response:**

The evidence does not justify this. The most important parts of the LNR will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site with the agreement of the County Ecologist.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6564 Mrs Patrica Green [6072]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is NOT a corridor but a thriving Nature Reserve and should be kept as such and the brook maintained in a proper manner. Large numbers of wildlife have migrated to the nature reserve due to being squeezed out of their previous habitat, due to the excessive felling of trees and the 720 houses built in their place. The green wedge between Hamilton Lane and Hall Road is also an important part of our village identity and should be kept as such.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Any buildings should not go beyond the golf course. No land should be taken from the nature reserve and no trees should be felled. The nature reserve and brook should be managed properly by the city council, which they have failed to do over the last 10 years. The land between Hall Road and Hamilton Lane should be left as a green wedge.

**Response:**

The evidence does not justify retention of the nature reserve. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. It is unlikely that the field between Hamilton Lane and Hall Road can be kept free of development. These matters will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community.

---



**RepID Representation**

6877 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy not suitable and I Object. due to the following:

Increased Traffic

increased pollution

Loss of peaceful village life

Loss of local wildlife

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scraptoft already has a natural wildlife site and therefore the proposal should be to increase the site and ensure it is litter free, and attractive

**Response:**

Green corridors are not likely to have the impacts listed. The evidence does not justify retention of the whole nature reserve, let alone an extension to it. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

**RepID Representation**

6950 kevin dias [6452]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

its not enough to accommodate the current wildlife in the area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not go ahead

**Response:**

The most important parts of the LNR will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site with the agreement of the County Ecologist. This matter will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community.

**RepID Representation**

6962 kevin dias [6452]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

the area proposed is not enough.

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not proceed

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to green corridors. Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7053 Mrs margaret Garven [6146]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

How can the 'creation' of a wildlife corridor along Scraftoft Brook compensate for the loss of the existing habitat and the displacement of wildlife elsewhere by the building of 1200 houses ? Also. there seems to be no mention of the history of the proposed building area having been the site of a Second World War prisoner camp and a muster area for the preparation of D Day Normandy Landings. The resulting archaeological earthworks of this area have created an uneven ground surface of hollows and small mounds which provides habitat for a variety of existing flora and fauna..

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reconsider

**Response:**

The most important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. An archaeological survey could be a requirement of a planning condition.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5408 Mr Ian Ball [5065]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Local nature reserve must be left as not yet established and area of golf course suffice to provide all requirements.

**Response:**

The important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5466 Dr Matthew Clarke [5227]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

If a more suitable site for the proposed development is not achieved, then a green separation between existing properties and the proposed new development would be essential to support local wildlife and retain something of the rural location of the village to the east and north.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5662 Mr Morris Naylor [6093]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Wildlife presently seen in the area surrounding Hall Road. Pheasants, greater spotted woodpecker, green woodpecker, bull finch, ducks, sparrow hawk, mink Jack deer, bats, owls an abundance of insects, butterflies, dragonfly, these and many more all thrive on an undeveloped area of land that limits access to the public. Residents enjoy relative security at the rear of their property because public access is limited. It would best left as a wildlife corridor only.

**Response:**

The important parts of the LNR will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site with the agreement of the County Ecologist. It is important to enable public access to most of the green corridor for reasons of pedestrian circulation, enjoyment and community integration.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6029 Scraptoft Parish Council (Ms Sally Skyrme) [6009]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The nature reserve is in good condition and should be retained as a priority. As per report by Sue Timms and Karen Headley.

**Response:**

The most important parts of the LNR will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site with the agreement of the County Ecologist.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6060 Miss Susan Elgar [5936]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I support this as it is vital to maintain the wildlife in this area, but I am concerned that the area designated in the plan is far too small.

The brook has never been maintained to my knowledge, I have never seen any work here even though in years past there were supposed to be monies allocated.

The " corridor " should go back as far as the Golf Club Practise field.

Many of the mature trees should be kept.

To lose Green Wedge in the Hamilton Lane area means the identity of SCRAPTOFT will become an extension of Netherhall.

**Response:**

The evidence does not justify this larger area. The most important parts of the LNR will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site with the agreement of the County Ecologist. This matter will be addressed through the development of a master plan in consultation with the local community.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6407 mrs lynn morris [6298]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

this needs to stay

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7188 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support the policy in general. However, The current Scraftoft nature reserve is too important to the local community to be de-designated and the land built on. This part of the proposal is in conflict with the made Scraftoft Neighbourhood Plan, Policy S11, which highlights the nature reserve as an important element of the Green Wedge between Scraftoft and Leicester City.

**Response:**

Noted. The most valuable parts of the LNR for nature conservation should be preserved and enhanced in order to meet the NPPF's requirement that sustainable development achieves net gains for nature. The details of how this will be achieved are still to be worked up through the ongoing master planning process that accompanies the proposed SDA. However, the existing proposed Scraftoft North SDA provides opportunities to enhance and protect the most valuable parts of the LNR, whilst providing opportunities to enhance public access to the site and to actively manage the site for nature.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7232 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The ecological value of areas of the site should be recognised which may include designation as a Local Wildlife Site where criteria for designation are met. If the de-declaration is submitted to Natural England, alternative areas for designation as a LNR and/or further enhancements to an existing LNR nearby would be required. Taking a strategic approach to Green Infrastructure/Biodiversity and the establishment of the green networks would be beneficial in trying to avoid this situation of designation/de-declaration in the future, but in any case it is recommended that potential mitigation areas are identified within the Local Plan.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7249 Lecestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

It is acknowledged that the de-declaration of the Scraftoft Local Nature Reserve is also currently being consulted on, and that its de-declaration would enable land to come forward for development as part of the Scraftoft North Strategic Development Area (SDA). The County ecologist has and continues to be actively involved, working through an approach which ensures the retention and management of areas of ecological value whilst enabling the release of some land for future development. This may involve the designation of a Local Wildlife Site.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7197 Mrs margaret Garven [6146]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not only is Scraftoft expected to absorb another 1200 houses and a range of other buildings (in addition to a large no of houses already built) but will, also, be expected to find space for sports pitches and open space for recreation facilities. This will mean the destruction of the majority of the land surrounding Scraftoft including the natural habitat and wildlife. Not only do some of the surrounding fields have evidence of ridge and furrow from Medieval times but, also, retain much of the historical, rural and pastoral nature of the village..

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Not a suitable area for building.

**Response:**

Most of the land lost comprises the golf course, the degraded nature reserve site/ former PoW camp and horse paddocks. Surrounding fields to the north and east are not affected.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5409 Mr Ian Ball [5065]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Must be more coordinated not a tree here or small area of green there.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5464 Dr Matthew Clarke [5227]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Scraftoft golf course represents one of the very few existing sports and recreational facilities within the village. Ironically, by building on this facility, Scraftoft will be further depleted in terms of recreational opportunities! Therefore, the provision and prioritisation of substantial new sports and recreation facilities based on the projected population demographics is essential to the proposed plan, if no alternative site is achieved for the development. A clear plan for the financing and maintaining the new facilities for the long term by the responsible local authority will also be required in order to avoid them falling into disrepair.

**Response:**

Noted. Provision and maintenance of recreational facilities provided through the development of the Scraftoft North SDA will be covered by a Section 106 agreement.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6025 Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

In the event of the plan being successful there has to be provision for significant play space and sports facilities to ensure the needs of the population as a whole are met. This means the provision of both indoor and outdoor facilities and sports pitches catering for all ages. There are currently no sports facilities in the village at all and we need to make sure that we try to attract youngsters especially into sport to give them things to do and work towards and take a pride in.

**Response:**

This will be addressed in detail in the masterplanning and planning application process. G12 requires open space, sports pitches and outdoor facilities. A primary school and other indoor facilities are required by SC1.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6878 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy not suitable and I Object. due to the following:

- Increased Traffic
- increased pollution
- Loss of peaceful village life
- Loss of local wildlife

**Change To Plan Sought:**

na

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to provision of a cemetery, which is not likely to have serious impacts on traffic and pollution and will not detract from village life or lead to a significant, if any, loss of wildlife.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7552 **Parker Strategic Land Limited [6459]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Cemetery could be located within the retained Green Wedge area within the SDA, subject to specific assessments of the site suitability. However, the Policy isn't evidenced or justified, for the following reasons:

- no comparative assessment of the suitability of specific alternative locations or sites.
- evidence identifies a surplus of capacity within Scraftoft
- provision is proposed to meet wider needs
- options closer to larger population centres would be better able to meet the requirements than this more peripheral location.

Policy is not justified and should be supported by a comprehensive consideration of the specific alternative options first.

**Response:**

A shortfall of burial provision in the Principal Urban Area has been demonstrated as part of the Cemetery and Burial Strategy 2017. Provision of burial facilities is therefore required for any new development in the vicinity of Scraftoft, Thurnby , Bushby and Houghton on the Hill. A Strategic Development Area is of sufficient size to provide an on site burial facility, rather than provision through an off site contribution. The provision of on site burial provision is to cater for the burial requirements of the north of Scraftoft SDA for those deaths that are projected to be generated by the new development over the lifetime of the cemetery.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6027 **Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

The increase in population over the last 20 years has not been met by improvement in many areas. There is not currently a cemetery in the area and one will be needed

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5729 **Ms Fiona Ashberry [5935]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

A47 junction at full capacity already.  
One way system in Scraptoft village unsuitable for more traffic.  
Keyham Lane West unsuitable as main thoroughfare - has traffic calming.  
School students would be put at risk.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

New ring road would need to be built to cope with traffic.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted as part of any planning application for the site. This is expected to be informed by further transport modelling and will identify suitable mitigation measures to mitigate for the development traffic. The details of the mitigation measures are not yet known, however, they could include changes to roads and junctions in the immediate vicinity of the site, together with those within the administrative area of Leicester City, as required.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5906 **Mr Stephen Clifton [6170]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed access via keyham lane is unsafe and unsound.  
That road already has traffic calming measures, 15 speed bumps in all  
The road passes 3 schools.  
Increased traffic volumes will bring increased risk.  
Barkby road will become more of a rat run and there is no scope for widening or improving this road at certain points.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Don't build any houses. Look elsewhere.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5951 Mrs margaret Garven [6146]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is proposed that the Scraptoft North development requires an east west access road between Beeby Road and Hamilton Lane. Both these roads onto which the access road would emerge are narrow, have blind bends and are not suited to an increase in the amount of extra traffic which an extra 1200 houses would bring.. The village has already suffered in recent years because of ongoing house building and large construction vehicles. Current access to most of the major radial roads involves driving through the narrow one-way system in the centre of scraptoft.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Shelve.

**Response:**

Noted - see 3i).

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5958 Mr. Martin Forbes [6182]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This will cause major disruption to a road that is heavily used in peak traffic times

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The second access point should not at the junction of Keyham Lane and there should a widening of the road outside of city boundary

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted as part of any planning application for the site. This is expected to be informed by further transport modelling and will identify suitable mitigation measures to mitigate for the development traffic. The details of the mitigation measures are not yet known, however, they could include changes to roads and junctions in the immediate vicinity of the site, together with those within the administrative area of Leicester City, as required.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5987 mr stephen pratt [5056]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I cannot see how any extra traffic can be accommodated in a satisfactory manor with the exit roads we have at present without causing considerable congestion, delays and ultimately danger to the residents of Scraptoft.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

these houses should not be built.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6032 Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The current system of roads we currently have are totally unsuitable for such a development and there is little or no way these can be improved

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build houses along Covert Lane and provide road access to Uppingham Road therefore avoiding the undoubtedly increase in traffic to areas that cannot cope with it

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6064 Miss Susan Elgar [5936]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Where exactly will this road start and finish?

What impact will it have on the already congested roads in the areas surrounding SCRAPTOFT?

The condition of the roads / wear and tear are already suffering with HGV and construction site vehicles constantly coming through the village.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Alternative routes/roads.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted as part of any planning application for the site. This is expected to be informed by further transport modelling and will identify suitable mitigation measures to mitigate for the development traffic. The details of the mitigation measures are not yet known, however, they could include changes to roads and junctions in the immediate vicinity of the site, together with those within the administrative area of Leicester City, as required.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6142 Catherine Allison [6102]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The roads in Scraftoft are not suitable. Hamilton Lane leads off from the proposed new road leading onto a heavily traffic calmed narrow road past a large secondary school which is already a parking issue with narrow pavements. The high number of cars and commuters leaving for work and school will have a negative impact for lots of residents. Scraftoft is a one-way system and would not cope with such large amounts of traffic which will be heading towards the A47 down Station Lane. There is already congestion here during peak times without another 2,000 plus cars on top.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

No

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6371 Mr Brett Taylor [6284]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I feel that the local infrastructure around scraftoft i.e. station lane that leads to the a47 would not be able to cope with the increased traffic I feel will be brought to the area

**Change To Plan Sought:**

an upgrade in the local highways around the area would need massive improvement first to take the added increase in transport.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6436 **Mr Peter Freeston [6315]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The proposal is not sound because Keyham Lane West would need to be upgraded, and it already contains two large schools and a bus route and has recently received traffic calming measures. Any upgrading to Keyham Lane West is not mentioned in the plan. A similar problem will relate to New Romney Crescent, and the additional traffic leaving the village will contribute to the existing traffic congestion on Station Road every week day. This is a road that cannot be widened and additional traffic will add to the traffic problems already experienced on a daily basis at the A47 junction.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We have traffic congestion issues all around the area already, and so I strongly object, as additional traffic will only add to the problem. I propose that brown field sites within the area with far better transport links should be considered rather than this HUGE development.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted as part of any planning application for the site. This is expected to be informed by further transport modelling and will identify suitable mitigation measures to mitigate for the development traffic. The details of the mitigation measures are not yet known, however, they could include changes to roads and junctions in the immediate vicinity of the site, together with those within the administrative area of Leicester City, as required.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6541 **Miss Louise Bailey [6184]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The surround road infrastructure will not support the increased volume of traffic.  
Access via keyham Lane will be problematic as that road already has traffic calming measures and passes three schools.  
The access via new Romney crescent is too close to the brook.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Review access provisions to the site.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6550 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The main highway proposed through the development would NOT be fit for purpose and therefore brings into doubt the suitability of Scraptoft North for such a development.

Please see attached sheet for further details.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet for details

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6629 Mrs Patrica Green [6072]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Keyham Lane West having just been upgraded with 20 speed bumps a 20 mph limit 3 major schools add to this Tesco roundabout completely blocked along Troon Way and Hungarton Boulevard morning and evening. Not a sound proposal. The alternative is along Beeby Road and Station Lane to the A47. This is already blocked morning and afternoon with people unable to get out of the side roads along Station Lane. children living in the old part of Scraptoft have to cross Beeby Road to get the school bus at the busiest time of the day. Definitely not well assessed.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

an outer ring road would be far more appropriate missing the village completely and skirting around keyham lane west the schools and the new housing estate just built along keyham lane IF land was available definitely needs to be properly assessed

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6880 **Ms Bindu Modi [6276]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy not suitable and I Object. due to the following:

Increased Traffic

increased pollution

Loss of peaceful village life

Loss of local wildlife

Furthermore, please can you ensure the traffic does not come through on Hamilton lane or New Romney crescent as how will the residents gain access to property and the noise levels will be so high as well as pollution

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Dont build the houses!!!!

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than specifically to the two access points and east-west connection. Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6926 **Mrs Julie Pemberton [6446]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This is unsound due to the inadequate infrastructure which is already in place. Traffic already queues on three quarter of the length Station Lane in the mornings. Keyham Lane West has been widened recently and traffic calming put in place due to two schools along it', cars are parked everywhere, the roads in this area are county LANES and not suitable for the volume of traffic being proposed. Access should be taken away from the village as the one way system cannot cope.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The infrastructure should be put in place before any building commences.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

---

**RepID Representation**

6945 kevin dias [6452]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

far more than two points required which is why this must not go ahead

**Change To Plan Sought:**

must not proceed

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID Representation**

7127 Mrs Jennifer Smith [6432]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Beeby Road and Hamilton Lane will be access points for the development, I strongly disagree with this, as both roads are very narrow, with blind bends, making them not suited to the increased traffic flow. Beeby Road is already a cut through in the morning and evening for commuters to and from work, adding another 1200 houses with potentially 2 cars per household, will make these roads so busy

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not build 1200 Houses.  
Or cut the amount down to half this

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID Representation**

7223 Mrs Julie Freeston [6486]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This proposal is not sound as Keyham Lane West would need to be substantially upgraded to take all the new traffic created by such a large development. How feasible is this? The road would be used as a distributor road but already has two schools and a bus route and has recently had speed humps installed. The current traffic congestion would be increased massively.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A much smaller development with more consultation re traffic would be more sensible in this area.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID** **Representation**

5946 Scraptoft Parish Council (Ms Sally Skyrme) [6009]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

East west connection across the site is essential to stop traffic entering the village

**Response:**

Support for 3i) noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

7115 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Councils has major concerns that the impact on existing residential and rural roads in and around Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby has been underestimated. See full text for details.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID** **Representation**

6551 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

If you can't adequately widen the roads or control the speed of cars along them how can you make it safe for pedestrians or cyclists? Where are our existing safe cycle routes located? You can't propose to connect to them if we haven't got any. Existing bus services are constantly under threat. Please see attached sheet for details

**Change To Plan Sought:**

see attached sheet

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6856 Mr Richard Wayman [5147]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The increased traffic controls and safety at the round-about at Covert Lane and Station Lane and the zebra crossing need to be addressed. There have been a number of "near misses" at this intersection due to the increased traffic from the new developments such as Strawberry Fields.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Please discuss and document how these traffic concerns will be mitigated.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6881 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Policy not suitable and I Object. due to the following:

- Increased Traffic
- increased pollution
- Loss of peaceful village life
- Loss of local wildlife

**Change To Plan Sought:**

na

**Response:**

The issues raised appear to relate to the development as a whole rather than to the the issue of well related street patterns. Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7139 Mrs Jennifer Smith [6432]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Usually with new housing developments, cyclists are last on the list to be thought of. For example, most households have more than one car, the houses built do not have sufficient parking facilities for 2 cars, so the owners tend to park on the road, blocking cycle paths, or making cycling difficult around developments

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6168 Mrs Helen Taylor [6109]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

What existing cycle routes? My husband is a keen cyclist and is not aware of any in the vicinity. The nearest designated cycle routes are on Hamilton Boulevard towards Troon Way and after the Trocodero petrol station. Improvement on routes into the city would be dependent on Leicester City not Harborough.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

better specification of how routes would connect and who would be responsible for building them and maintaining them

**Response:**

The details of improved connections to existing cycle routes have not yet been determined and are likely to be considered during the planning application process. However, this could involve connections to the existing National Cycle Network route 6 & 48, the Watermead Corridor, and recommended leisure routes as identified on the Leicestershire County Council Market Harborough Rural Cycle Map and any proposed routes to be provided by the North East of Leicester Sustainable Urban Extension.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6192 Mr Grahame Taylor [6231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I am a keen cyclist and do not know of any existing designated cycle routes in this immediate area. Any new cycle routes into the city would be reliant of the cooperation of Leicester city.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Be clear about how cycle routes would be connected and who would be responsible for the building and maintenance of them.

**Response:**

The details of improved connections to existing cycle routes have not yet been determined and are likely to be considered during the planning application process. However, this could involve connections to the existing National Cycle Network route 6 & 48, the Watermead Corridor, and recommended leisure routes as identified on the Leicestershire County Council Market Harborough Rural Cycle Map and any proposed routes to be provided by the North East of Leicester Sustainable Urban Extension.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6552 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Where are these local safe cycle routes the proposed plan would be connecting too? You can't propose to connect to them if we haven't got any. See attached sheet for details of objection.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet

**Response:**

The details of improved connections to existing cycle routes have not yet been determined and are likely to be considered during the planning application process. However, this could involve connections to the existing National Cycle Network route 6 & 48, the Watermead Corridor, and recommended leisure routes as identified on the Leicestershire County Council Market Harborough Rural Cycle Map and any proposed routes to be provided by the North East of Leicester Sustainable Urban Extension.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7227 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Opportunities for;  
links towards the development and the existing cycle network at Hamilton which would connect to the proposed North East of Leicester sustainable urban extension. Mitigation at junctions should include facilities for cycling and walking.  
Walking and cycling links from the development to local / district key centre(s) and services (including leisure, retail, education and health care) to Hamilton, Netherhall Road and Uppingham Road.

**Response:**

The details of improved connections to existing cycle routes have not yet been determined and are likely to be considered during the planning application process. However, this could involve connections to the existing National Cycle Network route 6 & 48, the Watermead Corridor, and recommended leisure routes as identified on the Leicestershire County Council Market Harborough Rural Cycle Map and any proposed routes to be provided by the North East of Leicester Sustainable Urban Extension.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7131 Mrs Jennifer Smith [6432]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I am confused with this statement, because I cycle to work and back and there are no cycle routes in Scraftoft to do the improving too. Which cycle routes are you talking about I wonder.  
I welcome cycle routes, I do not welcome the housing development

**Response:**

The details of improved connections to existing cycle routes have not yet been determined and are likely to be considered during the planning application process. However, this could involve connections to the existing National Cycle Network route 6 & 48, the Watermead Corridor, and recommended leisure routes as identified on the Leicestershire County Council Market Harborough Rural Cycle Map and any proposed routes to be provided by the North East of Leicester Sustainable Urban Extension.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6171 Mrs Helen Taylor [6109]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I am not sure how this can be guaranteed. This is solely at the whim of bus companies and Scraftoft has already seen the loss of a bus service on Station Road despite a new housing development. There is also no evening or Sunday bus service. Have bus companies been consulted, has there been a show of interest. Will the developer have to subsidise a service if no bus company is interested.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

make sure there is a bus company willing to provide a service before promising a 20 minute frequency bus service into the city.

**Response:**

SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6194 Mr Grahame Taylor [6231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is a promise dependant on the whims of bus companies as we have seen with the withdrawal of a bus service on Station Lane Scraftoft, despite new housing development. Have bus companies been consulted as to whether they would be willing to provide this service. Would the developer need to subsidise this. At present there is no evening or Sunday bus service in Scraftoft.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I feel that there should be some proof that this service will be provided before stating that it will happen.

**Response:**

SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6553 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As bus services have already or are in the process of being cut or further restricted serving our village and along the A47 how can we have confidence in these proposals? How can we have faith that Harborough can provide this 20 min frequency bus service when it is allowing important bus services to constantly be under threat? E.g. the 747 bus along the A47. See attached sheet for further details of why not fit for purpose.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet for changes.

**Response:**

SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6882 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraftoft should remain a village, this frequency is only appropriate of areas that in city boundary

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Buses should run every 45 mins

**Response:**

Scraftoft is identified within the Settlement Hierarchy as part of the Leicester Principal Urban Area since it forms part of the built up area of Leicester. As such it is considered capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment. Provision of a frequent bus service will aid sustainable access to higher levels of employment, services and facilities within Leicester.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7226 **Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Contributions towards public transport infrastructure improvements are likely to be expected to support existing services and any new/extended services. Targeted bus services may be required to run to / from the city centre or serve any other relevant destinations e.g. Hamilton, Thurmaston etc. Strategy for removing 'bus pinch points' on key bus routes in the city, 5 relevant ones for further assessment are identified (see full representation). Other infrastructure required along the preferred route are expected to include, where appropriate:

- \* bus priority measures,
- \* bus gates,
- \* bus links,
- \* real time information
- \* bus shelters for bus stops serving the city.

**Response:**

SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7553 **Parker Strategic Land Limited [6459]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The location is already well-served by public transport and extending the current services into the site can be achieved relatively easily and discussions are already underway with operators.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We consider this requirement is too onerous and should refer to 'peak hours' only.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6033 **Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We should have a much better bus service now but unfortunately this has greatly been reduced recently and stops at 6pm and does not run at all on Sundays. The current service is woefully insufficient and there are no guarantees it will improve in the event of the development

**Response:**

SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7117 THURNBY AND BUSHBY Parish Council (Mrs S Bloy) [2685]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

This is essential. Recent cuts in the already poor bus services into the City of Leicester and within the PUA have greatly reduced provision for the local community.

**Response:**

SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6884 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is not necessary, Scraptoft should remain a Village and thus the community understand buses are infrequent

**Change To Plan Sought:**

NA

**Response:**

Scraptoft is identified within the Settlement Hierarchy as part of the Leicester Principal Urban Area since it forms part of the built up area of Leicester. As such it is considered capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment. Provision of a frequent bus service will aid sustainable access to higher levels of employment, services and facilities within Leicester.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5989 mr stephen pratt [5056]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

these alternatives are rarely used by commuters

**Change To Plan Sought:**

waste of time and money even attempting this

**Response:**

SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6173 Mrs Helen Taylor [6109]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is a very unspecific statement. I haven't seen anything that has made any difference with any of the new housing developments around , despite having a similar clause. Most houses still seem to have on average 2 cars. this sounds like jargon.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Be specific what this package is and how it will be implemented.

**Response:**

SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6196 Mr Grahame Taylor [6231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

What is this. I believe this was included in the granting of planning permission for the new developments around us, most households still seem to have 2 cars and not make use of any green travel package.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Specify more clearly what this is.

**Response:**

SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6554 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Another example of an idea rather than an actual plan on how you are to do this and no previous attempts during all the previous construction and building in Scraftoft so how can this be trusted? See attached sheet for objections and comments on this.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet

**Response:**

SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7228 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Leicester has a declared an Air Quality Management Area which includes parts of the A47 (E) corridor. Road traffic is the main source of pollution. Our adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2015-26) supports measures that reduce emissions and congestion that will ensure we will meet the EU targets for nitrogen dioxide by 2020. This would need to include:

- \* Provision of monitoring equipment or enhancements to urban traffic control measures to mitigate development impacts.
- \* Opportunities to encourage the use of low emission vehicles (including public transport).

**Response:**

SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5457 Dr Matthew Clarke [5227]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

13.2.9: Beeby Road is entirely unsuitable to service the increased traffic volume that this development would generate. It is a rural road, narrow and winding, and would require substantial upgrading to make it a safe transport route for all users. The increased flow of traffic through Scraptoft village, already under severe pressure from the Strawberry Fields and Goodridge developments, would have a detrimental impact on road safety, as well as a negative noise and environmental impact on residents. The increased traffic flow along Station Lane would have a similar detrimental impact on residents along that route.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If it is not possible to build the development in a more suitable and sustainable location, a substantial upgrade of the road system will be required to ensure the safety of road users and pedestrians alike, including appropriate traffic-calming measures and speed enforcement cameras.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5659 Mr Morris Naylor [6093]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft will not be able to accommodate the influx of traffic that would be made by a development of this size, on top of previous new builds in the surrounding area and traffic that uses it as a rat run to the A47.

No provision is being made for the north to south commute apart from the A563 already in place. Journeys on this road, at peak times can take twice as long.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There needs to be a decent road network in place like the other large developments that are being proposed.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5730 Ms Fiona Ashberry [5935]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

One way system in Scraptoft unsuitable for more traffic.

Traffic already queuing up Church Hill.

A47 junction with Station Lane at capacity.

Station Lane can't be widened.

Keyham Lane West unsuitable as main thoroughfare.

School students would be put at risk.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

New bypass or ring road would be needed.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5907 Mr Stephen Clifton [6170]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed changes to the onrstructure are unsound and unworkable.  
There is traffic congestion on certain rods at peak times now.  
The increase volume of traffic to and from 1200 houses will make things worse.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Abandon the plan

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5974 Mrs Margaret Garven [6146]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

A package of measures on existing highway and transport networks will not solve the problem of a large increase in the number of people driving through the center of the narrow one-way system in Scraptoft. At peak times the village center has become increasingly congested and there is little scope to widen any of the central roads. Access to the major roads from Scraptoft, such as the A47 involves driving along Church Hill. Also, the village is already used as a through route to Barkby, Syston and the A46.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Scraptoft's road network cannot sustain more vehicles.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6044 **Scraptoft Parish Council (Ms Sally Skyrme) [6009]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

We do not consider the package of mitigation to be well thought out or adequate for the additional traffic which would be generated by 1200 new homes on top of the 700 that have already been built in Scraptoft. We believe that the A6 to the south of the city has more potential for development and movement into the city than Scraptoft and the A47.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The traffic lights at A47 Thurnby would need to be completely re-organised. The use of Keyham Lane West needs to be re - thought.

**Response:**

Scraptoft is identified within the Settlement Hierarchy as part of the Leicester Principal Urban Area since it forms part of the built up area of Leicester. As such it is considered capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment. No other sites for potential Strategic Development Areas within or adjacent to the Leicester Principal Urban Area were put forward for consideration during the preparation of the Proposed Submission Local Plan. Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6108 **Mrs Elaine Derrick [4213]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

A major concern is that the consequential , increased traffic flow through Thurnby, Bushby and Scraptoft will make what are already congested roads even more dangerous and create more pollution.. These settlements have very poor transport links by bus, so a car is vital.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6176 **Mrs Helen Taylor [6109]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

There will definitely be a significant increase in traffic and it is hard to see how the Scraptoft one way system can be improved or Keyham Lane, also this would be dependant on Leicester City.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Improvements to roads should be made before any building work is permitted.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6193 Cllr Simon Galton [4845]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It has not been demonstrated that the traffic impacts of the SDA can be satisfactorily mitigated. New development and changes to the road layout raise doubt whether Keyham Lane West can be upgraded to act as the principle route serving a development of 1,200 houses. If it can't function as the principle access traffic will find unsuitable alternative routes through residential areas in particular, the one way system through Scraptoft village. A number of junctions in Scraptoft and Thurnby are already at or are predicted to exceed their capacity by the time existing commitments are built.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The SDA should not go-ahead unless the traffic impacts can be satisfactorily addressed and mitigated.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6199 Mr Grahame Taylor [6231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is difficult to see how existing roads can be improved to cope with the likely increase in traffic, especially through Scraptoft village with its narrow one way system and nowhere to widen. Other road improvements would be dependent on Leicester City. The traffic through Scraptoft at peak times heading down Station Lane regularly backs well past Pulford Drive, and this is without residents at the Goodridge development.. The mini roundabout by the church would definitely need upgrading.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I am not sure how the road system could be improved, but there any road improvements should be in place before development is permitted.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6373 **Ms Sally Skyrme [6288]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Not fair on residents along Keyham Lane or Scraptoft and Netherhall.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Instead of moving a golf course and building on it - keep the golf course and build somewhere else - such as where the golf course is being moved to.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6543 **Miss Louise Bailey [6184]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The existing infrastructure is already heavily congested at certain parts of the day. I do not see any way that improvements will alleviate this, only make it worse.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The development should not go ahead for the reasons stated above.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6555 **Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Mitigation measures in this area would not be possible due to the recent building Leicester has carried out along the proposed route - therefore this part of the plan is NOT fit for purpose. Current building work along Keyham Lane West along with the two Leicester secondary schools located there would make it impossible to widen the road and ensure good traffic flow to and from Scraptoft North to Leicester along this route. See attached sheet for additional comments.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

see attached sheet for comments

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6651 **SCRAPTOFT Parish Council (Mr P Elliot) [4520]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

I am concerned that this policy does not adequately take into account the study by Edwards and Edwards on options for the location of housing on travel and transport in the east and south East of the principal urban Area.

Those traveling South and East from the proposed development would have very little option but to travel via Scraptoft Lane or through Scraptoft Village onto Station Lane and down to the A47 which will involve negotiating a small island at the Scraptoft end of Station Lane and traffic lights at the A47, nether of which can cope with present traffic.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Traffic traveling from the development and further afield traveling south along Hamilton Lane would need to be diverted from traveling up into the village, also traffic traveling along Beeby Road from the North and East, would need to be diverted away from the village across any new development to Hamilton Lane, as no more traffic can be taken through the village.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6724 **Mr & Mrs J Trafford [844]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Lack of specific detail.

Traffic flow on Station Lane /Rd

Covert Lane roundabout safety issues.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Yes.

Larger roundabout. Zebra crossing moved up Covert Lane with new footpath on the south side.

New measures at A47 junction to aid traffic flow at peak time.

N.B I have no idea how to answer the following 3 questions? There needs to be a don't know.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7119 Mrs Jennifer Smith [6432]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I object to 1200 houses being built, because the one way system in Scraptoft has no scope to widen the roads to allow the increased flow of traffic through the village. The village roads are busy all day now, especially during peak times, with all the extra cars, the roads won't be able to cope with the extra traffic.. Increased Traffic coming through the village will mean a queue forming and hold ups at he top of Church Hill and also at station Road junction onto the A47

**Change To Plan Sought:**

ideally, do not build 1200 houses, half this number and build 600 houses

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7225 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Highway links and junctions that are currently of concern and may need further assessment are:

- \* A47 Uppingham Road corridor;
- \* A563 Outer Ring Road ;
- \* Spencefield Lane junctions with the A47 Uppingham Road, Goodwood Road and Evington Lane (routes towards the north and south of the city); and
- \* Ambassdor Road / Wicklow Road / Green Lane Road.

The following would also need to be considered:

- \* Traffic calming measures to deter rat running if appropriate.
- \* Road safety measures to alleviate any accident 'hotspot' areas.
- \* Contributions towards improvements of urban traffic control systems and equipment, and the implementation of new technology to enable more efficient and responsive movement of traffic around the city.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7296

**Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Residents of Scraptoft will see their living environment deteriorate due to increased cars travelling through our village due to the road/travel plan NOT being fit for purpose - increased noise, air pollution, accidents

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build nearer to existing road infrastructure in Harborough district.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7374

**Mr Anthony Ingall [6176]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

I am very concerned of the traffic impact on the additional 1200 houses in Scraptoft village centre and Station Lane, as there has already been in the last seven years over 700 houses already been built. If this proposal is granted, a total of 1294 new houses being built will remove our village status into a town. This is not what the residents of Scraptoft want.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I don't believe Scraptoft can sustain any more houses and I am concerned regarding the drainage.

The Harborough Local Plan needs to be agreed and approved before this development can go ahead. Parkers have seen a loophole and are financially gaining at the expense of our local history and ecological sites.

**Response:**

Scraptoft is identified within the Settlement Hierarchy as part of the Leicester Principal Urban Area since it forms part of the built up area of Leicester. As such it is considered capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment. Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7375 Mrs Barbara Ireland [6062]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft village and Station Lane will not be able to cope with extra traffic, lorries etc that 1200 houses would create as its already used as a "rat run" from Hamilton to reach A47 and Scraptoft lane, resulting in long delays at peak time.

Proposed new route via Keyham Lane West already has schools and college on route so would not be safe for children and parents. The Tesco roundabout and Troon Way is already very congested.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7380 Mrs Irene Trewin [6068]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We have a dangerous amount of traffic going through Scraptoft now, the village one way system cannot take any more, it is dangerous for all ages to cross the road on Main Street and Church Hill. At peak times the queuing of cars is unbearable, it takes so much longer for children to get to school and adults to get to their places of work.

Station Lane cannot take any more traffic. It is going to get worse with the Pulford Drive development & Beeby Road - Are you waiting for a major accident to happen!?

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7436 Mr Lewis Johnson [5631]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Regarding the Local Plan and the proposal to build 1200 houses at Scraftoft North. Traffic congestion in the narrow roads of Scraftoft village, will result from the traffic that wishes to go south or east.

Whilst I understand that Keyham Lane will be widened, enabling the traffic to join the Leicester ring road. This ends at Evington. Therefore the majority of such traffic will cut through Scraftoft, Thurnby, Stoughton and Oadby.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7508 Mr Michael Newell [6316]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I have concerns re the current and further development at Scraftoft. There is inadequate infrastructure to support the current development let alone further development.

Church Hill is the only road that provides access to Scraftoft and the A47 from the new development. It is an accident waiting to happen, especially when there is a service or other function at the Church.

I think the exit off the new development at Beeby Road is in the wrong place and should be approximately 100 yards further up the road away from Scraftoft.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7543 Mr Roger Trewin [6067]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I consider the Local Plan to be unsound because it does not take into account the lack of road infrastructure in the area to account of the extra traffic.

The roads are already saturated at peak times. This will get worse as 300 house developments take place on Pulford Drive and at Bushy Woods . Also the 4,500 houses at Thurmaston and Barkby Thorpe, some of which will use Hamilton Lane to get to the A47.

The village streets are narrow and there are often hold ups.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5467 Dr Matthew Clarke [5227]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Traffic-calming measures and speed enforcement cameras around the village are required under the present volume of traffic and so a thorough-going assessment and provision of the requisite mitigation measures would be essential to promote a safe environment throughout the village, especially along Beeby Rd, Main Street, Church Hill, Station Lane, and Pulford Drive, which are all routes used substantially by pedestrians and cyclists, including primary and secondary school children commuting to and from school or bus stops.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5929 Mrs Pamela Parker OBE [6167]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support. I am very concerned at the impact of an additional 1200 houses (over and above those dwellings for which Planning consent has already been granted in recent years) on the local road network.

Existing local road networks are up to capacity with major queues at junctions and heavy vehicle flows through our village centres and to date, no satisfactory mitigation measures have put in place. Air Quality and Pollution are another worry.

This aspect will need serious consideration and Highway measures/improvements to surrounding settlements must be insisted upon as part of any Planning permission granted.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6556 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Parking is already a problem in areas of Scraftoft and has been reported as such to no avail. This needs to be sorted first before additional building and cars are added to the area. Construction traffic too has caused problems with parking on verges etc over the past few years so although The Plan is to make this better it does not inspire confidence. See attached sheet for further details.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See attached sheet.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6774 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Suggest the inclusion that SMART improvements - the application of modern technologies and management strategies to improve the performance of the highway and transport system.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Suggest the inclusion that SMART improvements - the application of modern technologies and management strategies to improve the performance of the highway and transport system.

**Response:**

SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling. The specific details of the measures, including the bus service(s) to be subsidised and associated public transport infrastructure, together with details of the travel plan and green travel package will be submitted and considered during the assessment of any future planning application for the site.

**RepID** **Representation**

5970 **Marie Forbes [6046]**

**Representation Summary:**

The measure will only be seen as token

**Change To Plan Sought:**

To keep the status quo

**Response:**

Noted

**Nature**

Object

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5986 **Mr Barry Barker [4955]**

**Representation Summary:**

The reserve, it is proposed, should have its Local Nature Reserve status removed; this is not tenable as the status was pleased upon that area for a purpose and cannot be removed at will otherwise what was the pint of giving the area such a prestigious status in the first place? It is an ecological area of importance for wild life and environment. The area provides a corridor of safety and feeding areas for a wide range of wildlife and is part of the process of cleaning the air through the green leaf trees.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Needs to be reconsidered so as not to impact a small community that has already had over 700 extra house built over the last 7 years along with all the noise, dust and heavy vehicle traffic. Needs to be proposed in an area that can handle the volume of traffic without disturbance the balance of life in the existing community.

**Response:**

The most valuable parts of the LNR for nature conservation will be preserved and enhanced in order to meet the NPPF's requirement that sustainable development achieves net gains for nature. Scraftoft North SDA provides opportunities to enhance and protect the most valuable parts of the LNR, whilst providing opportunities to enhance public access to the site and to actively manage the site for nature.

**Nature**

Object

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6136 **Mrs margaret Garven [6146]**

**Representation Summary:**

Plan unsuitable for Scraftoft.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposed site is unsuitable.

**Response:**

Scraftoft is identified within the Settlement Hierarchy as part of the Leicester Principal Urban Area since it forms part of the built up area of Leicester. As such it is considered capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment.

**Nature**

Object

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7158 Mrs Jennifer Smith [6432]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

How can you minimize potential impact on the Scraftoft conservation area. How can you hide 1200 houses. It is impossible. No amount of trees will hide the houses from anyone's view

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Don't build the 1200 houses

**Response:**

Noted. Criteria SC1 3q) seeks to ensure that new development reflects and respects the special characteristics of the Conservation Area, including local design and materials.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5468 Dr Matthew Clarke [5227]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

This would be essential if the conservation area is to continue to provide a significant contribution to local wildlife.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6201 Mr Grahame Taylor [6231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

as recently as 2015 the HDC Green Wedge review considered the entire present green wedge extent and scale appropriate and that it should be protected in the consideration of scale of development to be directed towards Scraftoft. ie not built on. Certainly our property will not be protected from merging with the new development and so essentially merging with Hamilton and Netherhall.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Take the advice from HDC own Green Wedge Review and protect the whole of the green wedge.

**Response:**

The 2015 Green Wedge Review - Draft Technical Update recognised that the boundaries of Green Wedges would need to take into account the strategy to meet development needs across the District to 2031. In order to meet housing requirements, including unmet need from Leicester City, there is a need to amend Green Wedge boundaries. When taken as a whole, the redefined Green Wedge meets the 4 functions of a Green Wedge, benefitting local residents and protecting the character of Scraftoft village.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6600 Mrs Patrica Green [6072]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The green wedge between Hamilton Lane and Hall Road is also an important part of our village identity and should be kept as such.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The land between Hall Road and Hamilton Lane should be left as a green wedge.

**Response:**

There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA and meet housing requirements. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge fulfils the 4 functions of a Green Wedge as set out in GD7, benefitting local residents and protecting the character of Scraptoft village. The most valuable part of the LNR in biodiversity terms will be replaced by a Local Wildlife Site. The Golf course is to be relocated in conjunction with the SDA.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6615 Mr David Campbell [6269]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is very important to keep the Green Wedge between Scraptoft and Leicester to maintain our village status identity and not to be swallowed up as suburb of Leicester.

**Response:**

There is a need to amend the boundaries of the Leicester/Scraptoft Green Wedge to accommodate the SDA and meet housing requirements. Taken as a whole, the proposed Green Wedge fulfils the 4 functions of a Green Wedge as set out in GD7, benefitting local residents and protecting the character of Scraptoft village. The most valuable part of the LNR in biodiversity terms will be replaced by a Local Wildlife Site. The Golf course is to be relocated in conjunction with the SDA.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6947 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

must not go ahead

**Response:**

Scraptoft is identified within the Settlement Hierarchy as part of the Leicester Principal Urban Area since it forms part of the built up area of Leicester. As such it is considered capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment. SCI requires provision of a two-form entry primary school and a neighbourhood centre.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6964 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not go ahead

**Response:**

Scraptoft is identified within the Settlement Hierarchy as part of the Leicester Principal Urban Area since it forms part of the built up area of Leicester. As such it is considered capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment. SC1 requires provision of a two-form entry primary school and a neighbourhood centre. Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7557 Parker Strategic Land Limited [6459]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy would restrict its potential use which may not lead to the best master planned proposals for the whole SDA.

Policy should not rule out the potential to locate the built element of the school within the (existing/retained)Green Wedge area at this stage. The proposed master plan should be able to assess and evaluate options,which can include for issues such as the availability of alternative sites, timings, scale and nature of the school (including community uses) and such like.

Area defined as Green Wedge should be considered as a potential location for the new primary school because it:

- is unconstrained,
- is well-located to serve the proposed and existing population / village
- offers an opportunity to provide a larger community facility for use by the wider community.
- currently has buildings of a similar scale within it
- would occupy less than 6% of proposed retained Green Wedge, and pitches / outdoor space would be compatible with policy GD7
- would not compromise the objective of maintaining separation
- offers associated public benefits of; additional access and new facilities

The current golf course area would not be available for development for around 3 years. Delivery would therefore start elsewhere, to the south of the SDA area. The trigger point (SC1.3 criteria e)for the school and our trajectory for housing delivery would require school construction to start before 3 years meaning it must be on land in the South of the SDA.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If the primary school is considered incompatible with the Green Wedge policy as it stands, we recommend the area east of New Romney Crescent within the SDA is omitted from the Green Wedge. Alternatively, that criteria r. is revised to read as follows:

r. retention of the area bounded by New Romney Crescent, Hamilton Lane and Scraftoft Lane as predominantly open space uses to prevent the merging of Leicester and Scraftoft, and to provide recreational and other community facilities (including the primary school), for new and existing residents of the locality.

**Response:**

The proposed extent of the Leicester/Scraftoft/Bushby Green Wedge is justified in light of the housing requirement set out in the Local Plan and the recognition that has an important role to play in protecting Scraftoft village from merging with other built up areas to the south and west, guiding future growth at the PUA settlements, allowing for recreational opportunities and providing improvements to recreational opportunities.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5988 mr stephen pratt [5056]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

this area should be preserved

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6151 Mrs margaret Garven [6146]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Green Wedge bordered by New Romney Crescent, Hamilton Lane and Scraptoft Lane is an open grazing area for horses. It is of an uncultivated, quaint and almost unkempt nature but provides a complete contrast to the manicured and artificial nature of other nearby green areas and parks at Scraptoft, Netherhall Road and Thurncourt. The area has a variety of flora and fauna. Although not open to the public local people, especially children, do enjoy seeing the horses and observing a traditional rural outlook. This area should be left untouched and remain as it is.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6640 Mrs margaret Garven [6146]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Building 1200 houses will cause irreparable damage to the landscape and natural vegetation of Scraptoft. Although (quote) ".....retention and enhancement of visually important hedgerows and boundary trees....." has been included in the plan this does not justify the destruction of a very large area of natural habitat. Also, no provision has been made for the preservation of the tree-lined BRIDLEWAY which runs from Hamilton Lane, through the golf course and out to Beeby Road near Keyham Lane Junction, This is used regularly by horse-riders..

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reconsider

**Response:**

The most valuable parts of the LNR for nature conservation should be preserved and enhanced in order to meet the NPPF's requirement that sustainable development achieves net gains for nature. The details of how this will be achieved are still to be worked up through the ongoing master planning process that accompanies the proposed SDA. However, the existing proposed Scraptoft North SDA provides opportunities to enhance and protect the most valuable parts of the LNR, whilst providing opportunities to enhance public access to the site and to actively manage the site for nature. The statutory status of the informal route between Hamilton Lane and Beeby Road is not clear.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6965 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

its not enough to what is currently there

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not proceed

**Response:**

Scraptoft is identified within the Settlement Hierarchy as part of the Leicester Principal Urban Area since it forms part of the built up area of Leicester. As such it is considered capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment. SC1 requires provision of a two-form entry primary school and a neighbourhood centre. Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6197 Mr Grahame Taylor [6231]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Having lived next to the golf course for 20 years we know it is prone to flooding in heavy rain, as is the lower part of our garden. I would be worried that any drainage measures on the new development would have a negative effect on our property.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

Policy CC4 requires that greenfield development should discharge water from the site no more quickly than the original green field site.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6956 Mrs margaret Garven [6146]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The village of scraptoft is situated in a valley and forms part of a flood plain. The building of 1200 houses on the surrounding higher ground will increase the amount of surface water. The Scraptoft brook has limited capacity and often floods where it passes under Hamilton Lane. After a heavy rain storm water often runs down Church Hill into Main Street. This has increased since the building of houses around the Hall. The geographical location of Scraptoft and an increasing amount of rainfall, due to climate change, will create real problems in the future.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reconsider suitability of this site.

**Response:**

Policy CC4 requires that greenfield development should discharge water from the site no more quickly than the original green field site.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7106 Mrs Patrica Green [6072]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

as the golf course sits on high ground above low lying scraftoft which already has seen flooding over the last few years due to other housing developments on high ground without vast changes to the drainage system no way could I think of supporting this huge development which is completely unwarranted .this 18 hole golf course should stay as the huge amount of trees act as a natural drainage system and is a natural extension to our much loved nature reserve the huge quantity of concrete required for this development would be devastating for the environment

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I am not a drainage expert but a vast drainage system would need to be provided. nature is the best protector against surface water low lying houses along hall road have wet gardens all year round since the previous developments were built even the experts cant get it right

**Response:**

Policy CC4 requires that greenfield development should discharge water from the site no more quickly than the original green field site. Policy SC1 criteria 3 s) requires the retention and enhancement of visually important hedgerows and boundary trees, whilst criteria 3x) requires the retention of habitat connectivity by enhancing or sensitively replacing the habitat value of existing herb-rich grassland, scrub, hedgerows and ponds.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7322 Severn Trent Water (Rebecca McLean) [6157]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Foul flows from the development will join a 225 mm dia foul pipe on Hamilton Lane. Surface Water flows will join local network or drain directly to Scraftcroft Brook. There are no reported floodings nearby. However further D/S there is a large flooding cluster on Uppingham Rd and The Portney Road. Flows from the development may exacerbate flooding in these locations. Topography of the site means that pumps won't be required on site. Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: Low

**Response:**

Noted

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6035 Mr Gary Shepherd [6055]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

What does this mean and what plans are in place to do so. The brook has not been maintained in the 20 years i have lived here and is needed to prevent the risk of flooding in the event of the development plan being adopted. There are already issues with the brook relating to flooding as a result of the recent development off Beeby Road. This needs to be addressed

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I am asking you a question

**Response:**

Noted. Naturalising the Scraftoft Brook, as required by policy SC1 criteria 3w) would involve removing some of the man-made features, the details of which have not yet been identified and are likely to be agreed as part of any future planning application for the site.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6963 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

it is fine as it is and shouldnt be changed

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not proceed

**Response:**

Noted. Leicester Principal Urban Area since it forms part of the built up area of Leicester. As such it is considered capable of sustaining expansion, infill and redevelopment. SCI requires provision of a two-form entry primary school and a neighbourhood centre.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7087 Mrs margaret Garven [6146]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

How can the Scraftoft Brook be "naturalised"? Surely its present state is the natural one created by the habitat through which it flows. Any measures to "naturalise" it will, therefore, be ARTIFICIALLY created and .as usual, would end up with an "idealised" cosmetic appearance of what the developers think "natural" should look like. Also, there is no mention of how this will affect the residents of Keays Way and Hall Road whose gardens border the Scraftoft Brook..

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The brook should be left in its natural state as should the surrounding area with NO building taking place.

**Response:**

Noted. Naturalising the Scraftoft Brook, as required by policy SC1 criteria 3w) would involve removing some of the man-made features, the details of which have not yet been identified and are likely to be agreed as part of any future planning application for the site.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6066 Miss Susan Elgar [5936]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Not sure what this entails.

The brook clearly needs to be maintained and the water that is currently entering from Beeby Road area has already had an impact on the amount of silting, clearly looks like builders sand, which has had an adverse effect on wildlife that is supported by the Brook. Also adding to the fact that it now floods with heavy rainfall.

**Response:**

Noted. Naturalising the Scraftoft Brook, as required by policy SC1 criteria 3w) would involve removing some of the man-made features, the details of which have not yet been identified and are likely to be agreed as part of any future planning application for the site.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7118 Mrs margaret Garven [6146]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The so called (quote) ..... "retention of habitat connectivity".... is not possible if 1200 houses and other buildings are to be built. The huge land area required will destroy the existing habitat. It is not possible to replace the value of the existing herb rich grassland without making changes to the flora which already grows there or adding others which do not grow there naturally (and, maybe, destroying others which do). The proposed plan will cause the destruction of the majority of the natural habitat surrounding Scruptoft and change its semi-rural nature.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not destroy this habitat with building developments.

**Response:**

The most valuable parts of the LNR for nature conservation should be preserved and enhanced in order to meet the NPPF's requirement that sustainable development achieves net gains for nature. The details of how this will be achieved are still to be worked up through the ongoing master planning process that accompanies the proposed SDA. However, the existing proposed Scruptoft North SDA provides opportunities to enhance and protect the most valuable parts of the LNR, whilst providing opportunities to enhance public access to the site and to actively manage the site for nature.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6068 Miss Susan Elgar [5936]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Enhancement and retention are key.  
Mature shrubs and trees need to be preserved in order to encourage the wildlife.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5726 Ms Fiona Ashberry [5935]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I do not understand how it makes environmental sense to build on an existing golf course and create a replacement golf course elsewhere at huge expense and damage to the environment.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Leave the existing golf course.

**Response:**

This is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6544 Miss Chloe Bibby [6241]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Golf course should stay in Scraptoft.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Find land elsewhere beyond the boundaries of the Golf Course for housing, or reduce housing target for Scraptoft.

**Response:**

This is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6671 Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

SGC has an illustrious history on its present site and is well known and liked. It provides great recreational facility with added bonus of being part of our Green Wedge.

Leicester City Council has held it hostage over not allowing the lease on 4 holes to be renewed. Golf Club doesn't want to move and we don't want it to!

Proposing to build replacement course other side of Houghton seems mad - Harborough need to preserve what we already have and not give in to pressure from Leicester.

Too many provisos listed below to allow for not building replacement anyway!

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Request that Leicester renew the lease on the 4 holes and allow the golf course at Scraptoft to continue as is.

It is part of our Scraptoft Neighbourhood Plan 2016 Green Wedge and provides a very important function n that respect.

Preserve this recreational facility as it is also an important wildlife habitat that would be decimated by the proposed plan to build 1200 houses on it plus roads and doctor's surgery, primary school and retail units.

**Response:**

The willingness of the current landowners and occupiers of the site to the proposals contained within SC1 has been confirmed to the satisfaction of the Council

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6886 Ms Bindu Modi [6276]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft Golf club is a very popular course to local golf enthusiasts many of whom dont want to move. The owners at the Scraptoft golf club are greedy and dont really need to move

**Change To Plan Sought:**

NA

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7154 Mrs Jennifer Smith [6432]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Why close a perfectly good golf course in Scraptoft, to then rebuild one 5 miles up the road. It doesn't make sense

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Don't close the golf course in Scraptoft

**Response:**

This is one of the most sustainable locations within the District to meet housing needs, including those arising from Leicester City which Leicester City Council has indicated cannot all be met within the City boundaries.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7558 Parker Strategic Land Limited [6459]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The boundary shown for the proposed golf course (shaded green with a red boundary) is incorrect and not the area now being promoted for the golf course.

**Response:**

Noted. Modification proposed to Policies Map to show correct golf course boundary at Houghton on the Hill.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7272 mr Colin Griffiths [5118]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Scraptoft Golf Club, background and general position of the Golf club in support of the plan, in particular Scraptoft North development and New Golf Course. see the enclosed attachment.

**Response:**

Noted

---



**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6954 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

it will cause major disruption and traffic to an already busy road.

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not go ahead

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5909 Mr Stephen Clifton [6170]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is no capacity in the current road network to accomodate this development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Don't build any houses

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5990 mr stephen pratt [5056]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

there is no feasible way of distributing any extra traffic along Keyham lane, Beeby road, Hamilton lane, Scraftoft lane and Station Lane via the centre of Scraftoft as these roads are already congested at peak times.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

do not build these houses

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6955 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

it will destroy the natural look and appeal of the area.

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not go ahead

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6967 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

it is not enough.

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not go ahead

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been assessed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraptoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraptoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. SC1 requires a package of transport measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the highway network together with a package of 'green travel' measures to encourage use of public transport and walking and cycling.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6958 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not proceed

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6959 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

it wont be enough to support the additional houses proposed.

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not proceed

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6139 Mr Brian Quinn [6227]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

There is already a traffic problem in and around Scraftoft, particularly on Station Lane. Keyham Lane West is a very narrow road and already very busy. The recent development along its north side limits scope for widening.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the size of the development to match the local road capacity.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6779 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Para 13.2.7 - suggest the inclusion of walking, cycling and bus service routes to Leicester city centre. It is noted in the Jacobs report produced for Harborough District Council's Local Plan, 'Preliminary Traffic Impact Assessment' (version 1, November, 2016) that much of the traffic generated by the Scraftoft North SDA distributes to the road network in Leicester. A Transport Assessment produced as part of the planning process will need to be based on strategic modelling as well as local modelling scenarios.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Para 13.2.7 - suggest the inclusion of walking, cycling and bus service routes to Leicester city centre.

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6949 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

must not proceed

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6141 Mr Brian Quinn [6227]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The nature reserve is a unique asset. There is abundant wildlife in it, deer, foxes, owls, grouse, woodpeckers etc. and to destroy an area that has already been left undisturbed for so long would be foolish. Who needs a park when the nature reserve was already there. Previous mismanagement of the area, grazing, is not a justification for abandoning it. Rather it is a case for sorting out the matter

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The nature reserve should be retained and possibly increased. Improving access from the east would be good and benefit those that live on that.

**Response:**

The important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6560 Mrs Margaret Garven [6146]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This proposal will destroy and not enhance the village of Scraftoft and its outlying areas. The location of the building development is not sensitive to the existing landscape nor will it enhance the local environment. Instead it will destroy the village distinctiveness, cause substantial harm to the landscape, heritage and historic environment. It will not safeguard surrounding views nor will it provide mitigation for damaged rural features. Scraftoft lies in a valley and any houses built on the valley slopes to the north will be visible from afar (as are those recently built on Beeby Road)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reconsider.

**Response:**

The landscape evidence (Leicester PUA Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study: Scraftoft Addendum 2016) shows that the site has medium/ high capacity for development from a landscape perspective. Green Wedge (Policy GD7), together with Policy SC1 (especially 3 h, l, j, o, q, r, and s) and the masterplan will seek to maintain the identity of Scraftoft as village.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6598 Mr Niles Holroyde [6378]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Loss of Nature Reserve and loss of trees on Golf Course. The Nature Reserve must be protected as much for its historic importance as its wildlife value and the landscape value of the existing Golf Course must be protected.

**Response:**

The important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. Retention of trees will be addressed in detail in the masterplanning and planning application process.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6614 **Mr David Campbell [6269]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Local Nature reserve designation was sound in 1999 and remains more so in light of recent development. It appears to have become a major feeding ground to a number of birds. Species seen deer, rabbits, foxes, kites, bats, owls, green woodpeckers, kingfisher, hedge sparrows, thrushes, yellow wag tails, robins, wrens, great-tits, chiff-chaffs, starlings, song thrushes, numerous butterflies. It would be beneficial to wildlife if the nature reserve was extended with a corridor through the existing golf course of around 100 metres wide to the open land north of the developments.

**Response:**

Noted. The important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6461 **Mrs Penelope Fielden [5046]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

I fully support that IF development was allowed it is imperative to preserve as many trees as possible. However, from personal experience developers" say trees are diseased and cut them down anyway.

Harborough has done little in the way of tree protection, enforcement and prosecution in Scraftoft when people move into the new houses and chop down the trees in their gardens! The number of houses and roads as well as proposed doctor's surgery, primary school, retail development for the site seems incredibly high and I feel Harborough will NOT preserve enough of the wonderful trees and vegetation here..

**Response:**

Noted. This will be addressed in detail in the masterplanning and planning application process.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5843 **Mrs margaret Garven [6146]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

To destroy a well established golf course in Scraftoft in order to accommodate a large housing development and then re-create another golf course elsewhere seems to be somewhat illogical and unnecessary, The scale of such an undertaking will cause immense disruption to the Scraftoft area and to the neighbouring Leicester City residents. The Leicester City Council itself, who own the land on which part of the Golf course is situated, also, needs to consider the feasibility of this proposal and the impact it will have on the local community and the loss of a recreational facility.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The golf course should not be considered as a suitable site for a housing development.

**Response:**

The golf club have approved the relocation which will provide a better course and security of tenure over the whole course. The City council consider the scheme to be viable.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6957 kevin dias [6452]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

it should remain where it is as it is adequate

I totally object to the development of the 1200 new homes as it will cause major disruption to the area. I have concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, and the major disruption to the natural wildlife and greenery of the area. It will also have a massive impact to the schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, and nurseries in the area which area currently struggling without the added pressure. The roads cannot handle the traffic now and I fail to see how an additional 1200 homes will manage.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

it must not go ahead

**Response:**

Transport impacts have been addressed in the Land East of Hamilton Lane Scraftoft Initial Transport Feasibility 2016 and the Scraftoft, Leicestershire Transport Scoping Report 2017. A full Transport Assessment will also be submitted. Land to the west of Hamilton Lane will be retained as Green Wedge, while the important part of the Nature Reserve will be retained as a Local Wildlife Site, together with open space to the north of the current village. The policy requires infrastructure to be delivered, including transport improvements, a primary school, and doctors' surgery.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6019 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

In Para 14.1.3 there is a reference to public transport improvements in Market Harborough. We have referred elsewhere to our concerns about the status and contents of the Transport Strategy. However we are not aware that there are any proposals in the strategy for improving public transport. in the Town.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Before any more development is allowed in the Town a strategy for improving public Transport CIRCULATING IN THE TOWN IS NEEDED. A TWENTY MINUTE BUS SERVICE IS SUGGESTED WHICH CONNECTS WITH ALL THE MAIN FACILITIES AND GIVES ACCESS TO ALL NEIGHBOURHOODS..

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7480 Mr Robert Mason [836]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We have suffered complete and utter traffic chaos in Market Harborough for many. Pollution, congestion, and a lack of suitable parking all pose a risk to our health and wellbeing.

All major junctions are congested particularly in the morning and afternoon with ever increasing amounts of traffic, the Town must have a further bypass and the one way system around Fairfield Road and Abbey Street sending forty ton articulated lorries into the centre of the Town is total madness.

The bridges on Rockingham Road and Kettering Road are a cause of major congestion.

**Response:**

The Market Harborough Transport Strategy, together with the Local Plan Preliminary Traffic Impact Assessment (Jacobs), identifies junctions under stress and proposed mitigation measures in the town, including provision of a south east bypass. Already permitted Airfield Farm development to the west of town will relieve congestion in the town centre.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5378 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Following our comments relating to H1.

This development will aggravate the traffic problems in the Town and cause danger and disturbance to other road users(as identified by the County Council).

Main access to Town is Kettering Road.The problems at the Kettering Road bridge will be aggravated-priority given to traffic heading out of Town.. MHTS

2016 contains no viable proposals to solve problem

Problems will also be aggravated in Scotland Road and Gores Lane as motorists try to avoid problems.

Even if motorists can get on to A6, access to town restricted in Rockingham Rd.

Local Centre not proved viable.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete allocation

**Response:**

Noted. Criteria MH1 1e requires necessary highway works and sustainable transport measures to ensure safe access into the town centre and onto the A6, whilst MH1 1f requires a financial contribution towards highway mitigation measures. Final MH Transport Study has since been approved by LCC (12th December).

Provision of a southern relief road in the MH Transport Study however as an aspiration only, with no contribution sought for the southern relief road from this development.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5389 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

SEE OUR RESPONSE TO H1

ID 5373

**Change To Plan Sought:**

DELETE ALLOCATION

**Response:**

Noted



**RepID** **Representation****Nature**7238 **Kettering Borough Council (Ms Julia Baish) [6480]****Object****Representation Summary:**

KBC doesn't consider that the site is a suitable location for residential development of the scale proposed for following reasons:

- adverse wider landscape impacts associated with the scheme which could not be effectively mitigated against.
- doesn't constitute sustainable development, due to open countryside location and remoteness from Market Harborough town centre
- significant negative impact on the landscape.

Sustainability Appraisal noted. For this site 'Landscape capacity to change' identified as high and scored as 'promotes sustainable growth'. KBC disagrees with this assessment. Site is in a highly visible location which would have adverse impacts on the wider landscape.

**Response:**

Noted. A planning application has been submitted for the site, and includes extensive landscape assessment, including a landscape assessment to inform the layout of the site commissioned by HDC. Criteria MH1 1k requires that the layout and design is shaped by a suitable LVIA, whilst criteria MH1 1e requires necessary highway works and sustainable transport measures.

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**7246 **Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]****Object****Representation Summary:**

Policy MH2 includes no reference to securing suitable contributions for educational facilities. It may be that the intention is that this is covered by Policy IN1 - Infrastructure Provision, however whilst this policy refers to the Leicestershire Planning Obligations Policy (LPOP), it only does so in terms of waste, it does not refer to education.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**7490 **Jelson Homes Limited [3965]****Object****Representation Summary:**

Our only concern relates to the number of homes that the site could accommodate. According to the SHLAA 2016, the site could deliver 64 dwellings less than its allocation (600dw).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If this is the case, then further land will need to be allocated for residential development in the town to make up the shortfall.

**Response:**

Noted. The SHLAA is policy off and based on a standardised density ration that covers the whole County. Each site is assessed on its own merits.

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**

5806 The Owners of Market Harborough Land [6134]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The owner of Overstone Park supports the principle of the allocation in Policy MH1. We have detailed comments to make on certain aspects of the policy (see separate representations) but we support the principle of the allocation.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**

5816 The Owners of Market Harborough Land [6134]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The masterplan for Overstone Park was subject to public consultation by way of a public exhibition held in June 2016. This preceded the planning application. Since this consultation has already taken place and the planning application has already been made, this element of policy MH1 would seem to be unnecessary.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete criterion a from Policy MH1

**Response:**

Noted. Whilst the planning application has been submitted, this remains pending consideration. Should the application be permitted prior to the Examination no masterplan will be required.

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**

5813 The Owners of Market Harborough Land [6134]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The required pedestrian and cycle link through development to the west is not deliverable by the Overstone Park development outside of the site boundary. It should be described as a "potential" link.

Two points of access from Kettering Road can be achieved through providing one access through the Overstone House development. This should be clarified in the policy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The required pedestrian and cycle link through development to the west should be described as a "potential" link since it involves land outside of the allocated site.

Two points of access from Kettering Road can be achieved through providing one access through the Overstone House development, as has been agreed by Leicestershire County Council and the developer of Little Bowden Rise. This should be clarified in the policy as follows: "...from Kettering Road, one of which includes access via the Overstone House development."

**Response:**

Noted. Only relevant should the application not be permitted prior to Local Plan Examination.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5547 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

If this development goes ahead a reliable and frequent bus service must be provided to the other facilities in the Town. An hourly service ,which does not run in the evening or Sundays, is not good enough.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete allocation and research viability of bus services.

**Response:**

Noted. Criteria 1e requires necessary sustainable transport measures whilst criteria f also includes a financial contribution towards highway mitigation measures within the town.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6042 Great Oxendon PC (Mr Peter Rowbotham) [6212]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Required works to the A6 to handle increased capacity - and the A508 should be in place as early as possible and be subject to the appropriate legal agreements.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5548 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As we have pointed out elsewhere the Transport Strategy has not yet been approved. In the draft Strategy, there is a proposal for a southern By Pass to the Town. This will no doubt affect this site. What has happened to this proposal.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete allocation and research need for a By Pass among other infrastructure.

**Response:**

Final MH Transport Study has since been approved by LCC (12th December), and will be considered by HDC in February 2018. Provision of a southern relief road remains in the MH Transport Study however as an aspiration only due to a current poor cost-benefit ratio, with no contribution sought for the southern relief road from this development.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6270 **LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

As far as we are aware the MH Transport Strategy has not yet been published since the consultation phase and therefore how can residents comment on policies relating to a document that we have yet to see. While the prospect of a financial contribution is supported - we would like to know what measures it may provide.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Please publish the MH transport study before the end of this consultation so that we can comment with an informed opinion

**Response:**

Final MH Transport Study has since been approved by LCC (12th December), and will be considered by HDC in February 2018.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5879 **The Owners of Market Harborough Land [6134]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

A Contamination Desk Based Assessment was carried out for the site in December 2015, which showed the site had a low to medium environmental risk. Any risk was associated with particular parts of the site, mainly the area to the west of the site. However, land adjacent to this part of the site has already been developed for housing purposes and there would appear no reason why this part of the site cannot also be developed. Additional survey work was recommended to be carried out after the outline planning permission stage.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6700 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Initial assessment of the implications of this site for our existing infrastructure undertaken and indicates a need for foul sewerage network improvements to enable development of this site.

No objection to the principle of development of site. Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services), requiring applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

As the policies are intended to be read as a whole, not considered necessary to duplicate these requirements in site specific policy.

Support reference to an integrated approach to surface water drainage and multi functional greenspace.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7286 Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Anglian Water has made an initial assessment of the implications of this site for our existing infrastructure and considers that there is a need for foul sewerage network improvements to enable the development of this site.

We have no objection to the principle of development of this site for mixed uses.

This policy refers to the an integrated approach to surface water drainage and multi functional greenspace which is supported.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

None. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5390 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

SEE OUR RESPONSE TO H1

ID5376

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Road improvements must be carried out before development allowed to proceed.

**Response:**

Noted. Final MH Transport Study has since been approved by LCC (12th December), and will be considered by HDC in February 2018.

Provision of a southern relief road remains in the MH Transport Study however as an aspiration only due to a current poor cost-benefit ratio, with no contribution sought for the southern relief road from this development.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7492 Jelson Homes Limited [3965]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

According to the SHLAA 2016 the site could accommodate 136dw less than its allocation (350dw).

The proximity of the part of the MH2 site, located to the west of SHLAA site ref. A/MH/HSG/34, adjacent to future Class B1 employment development, is likely to bring with it further issues with regards to residential amenity.

**Response:**

Noted. The SHLAA is policy off and based on a standardised density ration that covers the whole County. Each site is assessed on its own merits.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6680 Mr and Mrs Gowling [6400]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

This submission supports the proposed allocations of Land at Northampton Road, Market Harborough for employment and residential uses as identified on the Proposals Plan.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6271 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As far as we are aware the MH Transport Strategy has not yet been published since the consultation phase and therefore how can residents comment on policies relating to a document that we have yet to see. While the prospect of a financial contribution is supported we would like to know what measures it may provide.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Please publish the MH Transport Strategy before the end of this consultation period so that we can comment with an informed opinion.

**Response:**

Noted. Final MH Transport Study has since been approved by LCC (12th December), and will be considered by HDC in February 2018.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6041 Great Oxendon PC (Mr Peter Rowbotham) [6212]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Leicestershire and Northants must work together to minimise the impact on villages along the A508.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6704 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Initial assessment of the implications of site for our existing infrastructure undertaken and indicates a need for foul sewerage network improvements to enable the development of this site.

No objection to the principle of development of site. Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) requiring applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development. Local plan policies intended to be read as a whole therefore not necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

Reference to an integrated approach to surface water drainage and multi functional greenspace supported.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7287 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Anglian Water has made an initial assessment of the implications of this site for our existing infrastructure and considers that there is a need for foul sewerage network improvements to enable the development of this site.

We have no objection to the principle of development of this site for mixed uses.

This policy refers to the an integrated approach to surface water drainage and multi functional greenspace which is supported.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

None. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID Representation****Nature**

5377 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The site adjoins a 400 housing development served by Alvington Way. The boundaries were carefully considered when the estate was approved. Development of the Farm will represent an intrusion in to the countryside setting of the estate, be detrimental to amenities of residents and views from the north, and detract from gap with Gt Bowden.

The estate and its roads were not designed to take extra traffic. There are no local facilities so the development will create extra traffic moving to and from those facilities. Walking, cycling and public transport not an alternative. Detrimental to residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Look to allocate more land at Airfield Farm.

**Response:**

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be submitted with, and inform the layout and design of, any proposed planning application.

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced.

Impact on residential amenity is safeguarded by Policy GD8 1e and Supplementary Planning Documents.

**RepID Representation****Nature**

5391 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

SEE OUR RESPONSE TO H1

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete allocation. Consider more land adjoining Airfield Farm

**Response:**

Noted. Policy H1 sets out the proposed level of development required in Market Harborough to meet district housing needs. Three sites are proposed as housing allocations, together with an additional 100 dwellings to Market Harborough.

Insufficient capacity to expand permitted Airfield Farm development to accommodate housing needs.



**ReplID Representation**

5543 MRS JANET HOLLINGSWORTH [6042]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As a resident of 18 years and after purchasing a house that overlooked green belt when it was bought, and at the time when greenbelt was protected; I am somewhat dumbfounded to have this now being taken away for housing. The impact the increased traffic will have on a quiet back road will be considerable. I have major concerns about flooding on this site. We have all had historic problems with flooding since living here and the removal of these fields can only make drainage issues even more relevant.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The developers need to choose sites with better access options than Burnmill farm and also negotiations with the farm owner who is selling the land about coming up with better access options if it does go ahead.

**Response:**

The site is not protected through a greenbelt or other designation, including area of separation.

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

**ReplID Representation**

5749 Mr David Moore [6110]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I live on Bates Close that is immediately next to the proposed development and I am very concerned about;

- a) the scale of development in an area of natural beauty
- b) increased vehicular use of Bates Close/Kingston way resulting in noise, danger to children and diesel exhaust pollution, now known to be a significant risk to human health,
- c) the visual impact of the new housing on what is presently farmland,
- d) damage to the natural habitat of rare species

I have lived here for nearly 20 years and specifically bought in this location to be next to the countryside

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Significant reduction in the proposed size of the new development, making it more proportionate to the existing (award winning) estate

Construction of a separate access road directly off Burnmill Road; reducing vehicle movements through what is a narrow residential "close", hence reducing air pollution and increasing child safety

Creation of an "environmental separation zone" between the proposed new and existing housing including newly planted trees to minimise visual intrusion and protect existing very low ambient noise levels of below 35Db (a)

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology consultation and planning application process as appropriate.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5883 Mr Paul Henry [6165]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This development will limit opportunities for the residents of the existing dwellings to gain reasonable access to their own properties. As the increased traffic will have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of residents, by reason of (among other factors) significantly increased traffic associated noise\*, disturbance\* as well as overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, etc of properties along the border between the existing and new development at MH3

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove development MH3 from the plan.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

Impact on residential amenity is safeguarded by Policy GD8 1e and Supplementary Planning Documents.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5886 Mr Paul Henry [6165]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Layout and Site at MH3, both in itself and relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views, is inappropriate and unsympathetic to the appearance and character of the local environment. The site is located in a predominantly residential area where residents could reasonably expect a level of amenity concurrent with their property. The new development at MH3 is likely to result in noise, disturbance and nuisance to the detriment of neighbour's residential amenity due to the fact that the only entrance and egress is via Kingston way..

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove development MH3 from the plan and or require access to the site from the Leicester Road.

**Response:**

Impact on residential amenity is safeguarded by Policy GD8 1e and Supplementary Planning Documents.

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6145 Mr Jeff Forrest [6228]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We consider that 90 dwellings is too many due to the significant impact of the new local traffic using the only access point off Kingston way. This is a winding multi junction road already needing vicious traffic calming measures.

Whatever the final agreed number of dwellings is this needs to be adhered to by the developers unlike the figure of over 100 dwellings in the current proposals by David Wilson Homes.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A reduction in the number of dwellings reducing the new local traffic or an alternative more direct site access. Provision of infrastructure to enable lower environmental impact such as electric vehicles and cycles.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5732 Mrs Claire Sixt [6092]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed housing development on part of the Burnmill Farm will damage a very important green space combined mixed agriculture and some forestry which is an important corridor for wildlife including deer, foxes, voles, fieldmix, hedgehogs, owls and raptors moving around Harborough and Great Bowden and needing the resource afforded by the high ground on which the development is proposed: the remaining lower fields are not a substitute. It will therefore damage a vital green space and compromise national policy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposed housing development on the Burnmill Farm land should not be given permission to proceed.

**Response:**

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology consultation and planning application process as appropriate.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6208 Mr Steve Orr [6246]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed development on this land is crazy due to:

> The access in to the development being from Bates Close, how can access to a development be permitted from a close. The increase in traffic in to a Close for 90 dwellings is not fit for purpose.

> The planned development is not in keeping with Burnmill Grange (Alvington Way) area.

> There are also environmental and ecological aspects that will be affected by this proposed development due to the diverse wildlife that have habitats on this land.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Moved to the open land off Airfield park.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology consultation and planning application process as appropriate.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6216 Mr Steve Orr [6246]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The planned dwellings are not in keeping with this area and will significantly impact the visual landscape of this area.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It should reflect the local area and not squeeze dwellings of this nature that are not in keeping with Burnmill Grange. I would expect dwellings of this nature to be positioned in a new development area away from a nice development. A precedent for suitable positioning is similar to the development opposite the Harborough Leisure Centre, where a mix of properties were built in an area that did not adversely affect the local area. This mix of housing should go on the proposed Airfield site.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy H1 sets out the proposed level of development required in Market Harborough to meet district housing needs. Three sites are proposed as housing allocations, together with an additional 100 dwellings to Market Harborough.

Insufficient capacity to expand permitted Airfield Farm development to accommodate housing needs.

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be submitted with, and inform the layout and design of, any proposed planning application.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6312 Mr Richard Beer [6263]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The location of the development means the objective of reducing car use will not be achieved. Amenities are not close with schools in particular not in practical walking distance. Car use will therefore be above average compared to other areas in the town closer to shops, schools etc.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

To lessen the impact reduce the development area and number of houses to the original area proposed 20 years ago and omit the area nearest the water reservoir end.

**Response:**

Noted. The site is considered to be a sustainable location on the edge of a sub regional centre. Both primary and secondary school provision considered to be within suitable distance from the proposed site.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6146 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed new road linking the north of the town to the west should be considered when approving any new development off any Alvington Way. It will increase traffic along Alvington Way making it a through road to the East of Market Harborough to avoid the town centre

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Burnmill Farm development site should only be considered if it can be shown that the potential increase in traffic from the new road will not impact on overall traffic using Alvington Way.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

Criteria 1b requires a financial contribution from the development to the mitigation measures outlined in the Market Harborough Transport Strategy.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6527 Mrs Sarah Verbruggen [6357]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Having seen the David Wilson plans it is clear that 90 houses being built on site would

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the number of houses being built .

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6563 Mr David Goddard [6344]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Wildlife records have not been considered when putting these proposals forward

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Respect our protected species

Change the local plan where necessary

**Response:**

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology consultation and planning application process as appropriate.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6602 Mr David Goddard [6344]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Proposed development of 90 houses is the wrong development in the wrong place as it will;

- adversely affect the population and breeding grounds of Great Crested Newts on site
- make roads busy and dangerous
- cause noise pollution

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology consultation and planning application process as appropriate.

**ReplD Representation**6895 **Mr David Hart [6181]****Nature****Object****Representation Summary:**

The Burnmill Farm development will have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of existing residents of Kingston Way, Bates Close and Alvington Way. The large size of the proposed development will mean that traffic and pedestrian volumes will be significantly greater. This will introduce levels of noise, pollution, danger to children playing in these areas far in excess of those currently. It will also significantly reduce the amount of privacy enjoyed by residents in this quiet residential area. These factors, in turn, lead to potentially significant negative impact on the mental and physical health of these residents

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Local Plan and National Planning regulations clearly state the importance of new developments not having a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of existing and new residents. This is clearly not the case here with almost unanimous lack of support for this development among local residents

**Response:**

Impact on residential amenity is safeguarded by Policy GD8 1e and Supplementary Planning Documents.

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

**ReplD Representation**6903 **Mr David Hart [6181]****Nature****Object****Representation Summary:**

The Burnmill Farm development must be subject to full, and critically independent, transport, environmental, ecological, archaeological and flood risk assessments. There is evidence for example of protected species such as greater crested newts in this area. There is also recent archaeological survey activity. Failure to undertake these independent assessments would mean the approval of a development without thought for material considerations

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Independent transport, ecological, environmental, archaeological and flood risk assessments are required before this development should be considered

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology consultation and planning application process as appropriate.

**ReplD Representation**6912 **Mr David Hart [6181]****Nature****Object****Representation Summary:**

Burnmill Farm has appeared on the Local Plan as a proposed development of up to 90 dwellings. However, it is not clear how and when Burnmill Farm was actually added to the Local Plan, Documents seen from Oct 2015 consultation identify 3 sites for development with reference that no other additional development in MH was planned. Burnmill Farm was not among these sites. Clarity is required here. A development being added to the Local Plan is a significant step for a developer and it would be helpful to see what level of consultation with residents was undertaken

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is not apparent how or when Burnmill Farm was added to the Local Plan and what level of consultation there was with residents and affected parties beforehand. It is important to understand this before this development is taken any further. It is also interesting to note that the developer has proposed a site of more than 100 dwellings as opposed to "up to 90"

**Response:**

Noted. Policy H1 sets out the proposed level of development required in Market Harborough to meet district housing needs. Three sites are proposed as housing allocations, together with an additional 100 dwellings to Market Harborough.

**ReplD Representation**6923 **Mrs Susan Goddard [6388]****Nature****Object****Representation Summary:**

Accessing the development from Alvington Way and in particular Bates Close and Kingston Way will be inadequate for the new development of 90 homes, this together with the 70 existing homes what will total 160. The Kingston Way/Bates Close junction will not be adequate for potentially 2 cars for most households.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The development should be reviewed and the number of homes built should be decreased to ensure the road is adequate for the amount of traffic.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6985 Mr Jamie Buckby [6335]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

90 dwellings does not fit in with the existing housing development. The existing houses are not in a dense development and therefore the proposed 90 dwellings does not fit with the existing development as it is dense development. The existing development has bungalows towards the highest point of the development. There are no existing 2.5 storey houses.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I do not consider the site suitable for development. There are too many houses. The site is not suitable for 2.5 storey houses. There aren't enough open spaces. The site would impact on the privacy, light and views of existing owners.

**Response:**

Site does not border to the existing bungalows at the top of Kingston Way.  
Impact on residential amenity is safeguarded by Policy GD8 1e and Supplementary Planning Documents.  
Criteria 1f requires provision of open space and recreational facilities across the site, including to the southern boundary to protect residential amenity.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7017 Mr Jamie Buckby [6335]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I object to this site being developed. There are many other sites, in Market Harborough, that have been given permission. The town centre and supermarket roads already get congested. This site has no additional facilities so development, of this site, will place further burden on the existing infrastructure and facilities.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There should be no further development in addition to that already planned.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy H1 sets out the proposed level of development required in Market Harborough to meet district housing needs. Three sites are proposed as housing allocations, together with an additional 100 dwellings to Market Harborough.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7198 Mr Peter Taylor [6461]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed development of Burnmill farm will impact on the living conditions of existing residents through loss of privacy; overshadowing, since the new site is higher than existing houses on Kingston Way; and overbearing impact from additional traffic both on Kingston Way and Alvington Way which will have significantly more traffic movements from the Airfield development as people use Alvington Way to avoid the town centre.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Lower, less condensed housing, access via the A6 rather than Kingston Way and Burnmill Road.

**Response:**

Noted. Impact on residential amenity is safeguarded by Policy GD8 1e and Supplementary Planning Documents.

**RepID Representation**

7247 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy MH3 includes no reference to securing suitable contributions for educational facilities. It may be that the intention is that this is covered by Policy IN1 - Infrastructure Provision, however whilst this policy refers to the Leicestershire Planning Obligations Policy (LPOP), it only does so in terms of waste, it does not refer to education.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID Representation**

7302 Christine Forde [6158]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Site Access not big enough  
Drainage is of concern  
Too many houses planned for road infrastructure  
Mix of housing types.  
Ecological impact. Insufficient evidence for comprehensive survey  
Road Infrastructure Impact.  
Area Impact.  
Drainage capacity planning.  
Sustainable drainage plugs into Victorian drainage system on Burnmill Road.  
Archaeological Impact.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Different access road  
Fewer houses in keeping with the area  
Not building on this site

**Response:**

The site is not protected through a greenbelt or other designation, including area of separation.  
Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.  
The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7397 Mr & Mrs John Gilding [6518]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Object to site as proposed due to:

- unsafe and impracticable access with no consideration of impacts on existing residents
- ecological implications
- insufficient separation
- distance from local facilities and lack of capacity in school/medical facilities

We hope our comments will help balance your proposal aimed at policies to protect and improve a quality of people's lives and approve your objectives for the environment.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology consultation and planning application process as appropriate.

Impact on residential amenity is safeguarded by Policy GD8 1e and Supplementary Planning Documents.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5738 Mrs Claire Sixt [6092]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposal to use Kingston Way and Bates Close as the access route for the proposed new Burnmill Farm development is unsuitable and unsafe for pedestrians and especially for children walking to school. The proposed 5ft wide extension with no pavements at the end of Kingston Way will leave children walking on the highway at risk from traffic. Those from houses nearer the Burnmill Road would have to walk a long west and then all the way back east along Kingston Way to get to Robert Smyth or Ridgeway Schools, which most will use: this is entirely unsuitable and unsafe.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If the proposed development is to be built at all, access should be through a road built over the current Burnmill farm access road linking directly with the Burnmill Road, widened up to the reservoir (there is plenty of space for this) and with hedgerows and trees reinstated elsewhere to preserve the very important wildlife corridor.

**Response:**

The wording of this objection does not relate to the Policy H5. Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**7341 **David Wilson Homes East Midlands [6254]****Support****Representation Summary:**

The proposed allocation is supported, as are requirements a to h iii) of the Policy. David Wilson Homes agree that the land at Burnmill Farm is a suitable/sustainable site for residential development. However, for the reasons detailed in respect of Policy H1 (refer to attached document), David Wilson Homes object to a maximum number of 90 dwellings.

It is understood that the site capacity for the proposed allocation was reduced as a result of advice received from the Highways Authority. There is however no evidence to support this position. It is therefore considered that Policy H1 and MH3 should be amended to reflect a site capacity of up to 144 dwellings.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is therefore considered that Policy H1 and MH3 should be amended to reflect a site capacity of up to 144 dwellings.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**5542 **MRS JANET HOLLINGSWORTH [6042]****Object****Representation Summary:**

Access to Burnmill Farm via Kingston Way will cause traffic chaos along a quiet housing estate road. The mess and noise and excess traffic caused by heavy building equipment and transport will cause massive problems for existing residents. The proposed entrance to the development is planned to run into a short gap between two existing houses which would be very oppressive for the current occupants of those homes.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There is a track that runs behind the estate which access the Burnmill reservoir and then the farm. This would provide less intrusive access for heavy goods vehicles during construction phase.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**5660 **Mrs N Stanley [1279]****Object****Representation Summary:**

Kingston Way is limited due to width of proposed access into development between 42 and 44. The drive to 42 Kingston way is for 2 vehicles following the addition of a double garage to the property, additional Cars could park on road.. There will also be a steep gradient between the two sites. Vehicular access is difficult in winter weather as they are unable to drive up resulting in cars being left lower down the road and on Alvington way. LCC 6c's state max 150 houses for single access road, already 60 dwellings in place.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Find alternative access

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5677 Mr Michael Major [4083]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Kingston Way is not suitable for the additional traffic that would be generated by this proposed development. Being so far from shops, schools, health care facilities and other amenities including a bus route would mean occupants would need to use their own motorised transport. The nearest bus route has one bus in each direction each hour and non on Sundays and Bank Holidays. From the site to the bus is about half kilometre. From the furthest extreme of the development this means a kilometre walk. The developer plans mixed dwellings so the old and infirm will be disadvantaged.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It should be abandoned as it is inappropriate.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5741 Mrs Claire Sixt [6092]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Kingston Way access is utterly unsuitable. The road is very narrow at two points, is close to garages, has to be used for onstreet parking by current residents, and has five speed humps which will make lorry use during construction hazardous and cause gridlock and congestion. The proposed 5 ft wide extension with no pavements to the development will be a bottleneck causing major delays at school and work travel times and dangerous for children. New residents need direct access to Burnmill Road for schools, not a circuitous route west and then back east again, causing gridlock and congestion.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If the proposed development is to be built at all, access should be through a road built over the current Burnmill farm access road linking directly with the Burnmill Road, widened up to the reservoir (there is plenty of space for this) and with hedgerows and trees reinstated elsewhere to preserve the very important wildlife corridor.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

Construction traffic and access to be considered through appropriate planning condition.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

5762 Mrs Sarah Tandy [6115]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Road width  
Gradient of road and the effect of that in icy conditions  
Traffic calming  
Car usage  
Access to and from current driveway of number 42 Kingston Way

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I do not consider Kingston Way to be a suitable or safe access road and other considerations should be made including the existing track from the top of Burnmill Road

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

5881 Mr Paul Henry [6165]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The development would adversely affect highway safety or the convenience of road users particularly at the junction between Alvington Way and Bates Close which is already an area of congestion at busy times of the day. Further Kingston Way is inaccessible in times of inclement weather when there is more than 1" inch of snowfall that accumulates on the road surface, given the increase in traffic hesitated by have this as the only access and egress can only exacerbate this situation.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove development MH3 from the Plan and require access to the Site from Leicester Road.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5950 Mr Steven West [6147]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Kingston Way is not suitable for big vehicles or large volumes of traffic due to the amount of cars that park on the street, the speed bumps and the fact that the area is highly populated with children who play on the large grass area. My wife and I also work long hours and the noise pollution will not be ideal when we are relaxing at home.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The access to the site for the builders needs to be off a main road, such as Burnmill Road, not a small street which is populated with local residents where there is already not much space for the flow of traffic.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6149 Mr Jeff Forrest [6228]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The increased volume of traffic with the new development will cause detrimental effect on the whole community. During the construction phase the heavy vehicles will cause significant disruption on the multi junction, winding road with parked vehicles and pedestrians. This already has vicious traffic calming measures. Farm traffic will try to use the new access point and add to the disruption of the whole community. The new 5.5m access road with two 2m footpaths needs to be positioned to minimise the direct impact on the 3 adjoining dwellings as they are in very close proximity.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Alternative more direct access road to the site.  
Alternative access road used for the construction phase of the development.  
Measures to ensure farm traffic uses existing farm track and not Kingston Way.  
Construction of shielding boundary walls where existing dwellings are adjacent to the new access road.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.  
Construction access to be agreed through a planning condition

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6210 **Mr Steve Orr [6246]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The impact of all this additional traffic coming through a Close is not practicable. I can not see how the Close can safely manage the volume of traffic of 90 additional dwellings.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Access via Great Bowden

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

**RepID** **Representation**

6284 **Mrs Janet Willis [6118]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

I feel the access from Kingston Way into the new development is very restrictive for the number of houses proposed for this site. There is a potential for an extra 150 cars to be using Kingston Way if this development goes ahead. This will also have an impact on the T junction where Kingston Way joins Bates Close and then onto Alvington Way, I think this will have a very negative impact from pollution and noise on the properties on these roads were traffic at the moment is very light.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The changes I would suggest would be to make the access road onto Burnmill Road, a road which is designed to take a greater volume of traffic or alternatively two access roads for different parts of the development. Which would make access traffic flow onto Kingston Way lighter.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

**RepID** **Representation**

6311 **Mr Richard Beer [6263]**

**Nature**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The access at the top of Kingston Way is inappropriate. The required width cannot be attained without severe impact to the houses already in situ near the proposed entrance, with the proposed number of houses to be built.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the width of the entrance to 4.5m under the 1992 guidelines and rescue the number of houses to be built within that guideline. This will achieve the objectives more easily to protect the ridgeline existing residents and impact on the houses by the entrance

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6422 Mrs Anna Burbidge [6306]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Kingston Way is a small cul-de-sac and I feel concerned about the large increase in traffic this will produce. The road is not easy to negotiate, particularly in bad weather. I feel Kingston Way is not able to cope with large increases in traffic.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Main alternative access should be considered.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6528 Mrs Sarah Verbruggen [6357]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As there are currently 60 houses off Kingston Way there would be an increase in traffic and pollution in a residential area .

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Is there another more effective access road which would prevent unnecessary traffic travelling through residential areas.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6570 Mr Christopher Sellwood [6379]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Currently traffic exiting Kingston Way causes a real danger to cars exiting Bates Close. This is because drivers seem to only look right as they exit Kingston Way so that traffic from Bates Close is overlooked. This currently has been the cause of several near misses for Bates Close residents and an increase of circa 100% in traffic volume will cause unacceptably high risk of traffic accidents and so personal injury.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A stop sign and white lines across the junction from Kingston Way and Bates Close to manage traffic flow.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6848 Mr David Hart [6181]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This proposal is a high density development in a peripheral location with access from Kingston Way, a narrow, winding, cambered, undulating cul-de-sac unsuitable for high volumes of traffic. Traffic from the development will create a bottleneck traffic situation in Kingston Way with a much heightened risk of traffic accidents. The junctions of Alvington Way and Bates Close and Bates Close and Kingston Way are of particular concern and this will be exacerbated by the proposed new road linking the north of the town to the west increasing use of Alvington Way as a route to the east

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Alternative access routes must be found which reduce the impact of road traffic on local communities and which do not have significant adverse impact on the health and welfare of local residents.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6851 Mr David Hart [6181]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Too high a density for the peripheral location and limited access route proposal. Traffic increment in Alvington Way/Bates Close/Kingston Way will be significant in any event, but this will exacerbated when the new road from the Airfield Farm is complete. The latter will inevitably drive huge volumes of traffic from west to east across town via Alvington Way

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A detailed transport assessment needs to take place based on the impact of the Burnmill Farm development on traffic in Kingston Way, Bates Close and Alvington Way, and a further transport assessment is needed to review the impact of traffic following the completion of the Airfield Farm development. Both these assessments should be undertaken ahead of any development in this area.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**ReplID** **Representation****Nature**7001 **Mr Jamie Buckby [6335]****Object****Representation Summary:**

Kingston Way is unsuitable for the site access. It is a narrow road with limited parking. The road freezes in winter and cars get stranded due to the incline. The additional traffic would cause a risk to safety as children play on the two greens, Safety is also a major concern as traffic cuts the corner when turning into Bates Close leading to Kingston Way, Bushes on the perimeter of the green obscure the view of the turning. The increase in traffic would impact the privacy of the houses and increase traffic noise in the existing quite neighbourhood.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

An alternative entrance should be found.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

**ReplID** **Representation****Nature**7111 **Mrs N Stanley [1279]****Object****Representation Summary:**

According to the site assessment companion guide, P24 the Highway authority has indicated that a maximum of 90 dwellings could be delivered due to capacity limitations. It states that that access needs to meet Highways Authority standards which may present a viability issue. David Wilson Homes have already produced a outlined exhibition stating that the wish to build more than 100 Dwellings. Access point into the site from Kingston Way is narrow and possible issues with site lines from existing farm access track crossing the access point.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Access into the site isn't clear with the existing farm track crossing at the site of entry. Given limited capacity, number of dwellings on this site should be considered.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

**ReplID** **Representation****Nature**7176 **Mr Peter Taylor [6461]****Object****Representation Summary:**

Access via Kingston Way will further increase traffic onto Alvington Way, which will become even more congested with traffic from the Airfield farm development as traffic tries to avoid the town centre.

The number of houses proposed by the developer is too many for the size of the access road.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Access to any development on Burnmill Farm should be from the A6 Leicester Road, which would also give access to further development land between Burnmill Farm and the A6 in the future.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

**RepID** **Representation**

7184 Mr Peter Taylor [6461]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

In respect of the Burnmill farm site, full consideration must be taken of ecological, archeological, and flood risk prior to planning applications being approved. The proposed access point is flawed due to positioning, continued use of farm vehicles and gradient of road in the winter preventing access/exit.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Access should be via the A6 rather than Kingston Way.

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5661 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Financial contribution will not mitigate effects of this development. It is stated in the proposed strategy that traffic will increase by 24% which is not sustainable as roads are already near gridlock. The new road on the Airfield Farm development will become 'an outer ring road' linking with Alvington Way and The Ridgeway to avoid the town centre increasing traffic in this area. The car is the most used mode of transport from this area due to the distance from amenities. Bus route is underused and proposed formal bus stops will not encourage use of public transport.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Review the level of development and justify if this site is necessary given its location to amenities, given that residents are likely to make multiple car journeys each day.

**Response:**

Financial contribution is towards the mitigation measures as outlined in the Market Harborough Transport Strategy and spread across the town and taking into account the level of development proposed.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5663 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Leicestershire County Council ecological dept have recently confirmed that they have evidence of ponds on or near this site to have had Great Crested Newts. A residential pond 10m from the site boundary also has evidence that it is a breeding site for Great Crested Newts. Other protected species mainly bats and badgers have been seen on the proposed site. The Tree belt screening has enhanced the area and has inadvertently become a corridor for wildlife - owls, muncjack deer, foxes, snakes, birds of prey. The proximity to the Grand Union Canal is also a factor

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Consider if there alternative sites that would be more suitable if it is found the Great Crested Newts an other protected species are present.

**Response:**

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology and planning application process as appropriate.

**ReplD** **Representation**

5742 Mrs Claire Sixt [6092]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This development will severely damage an important wildlife corridor for deer, foxes, hedgehogs, fieldmice, voles, owls and raptors moving between Harborough and Bowden. It should not be located here.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It should not be located here. If it must be located here, then the small forest must be retained or reinstated nearby, access must be via the current farm access road, widened up to the reservoir (there is space), with passing spaces and pavements, but with the hedgerows and trees reinstated nearby to preserve the wildlife corridor.

**Response:**

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology consultation and planning application process as appropriate.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

6908 Mr David Hart [6181]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

LCC has confirmed recent evidence of Greater Crested Newts in this area. Other protected species such as bats, birds of prey and badgers are also present. The independent ecological and archaeological surveys must be carried out and the findings reviewed as a priority

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Simply, the independent ecological and archaeological surveys must be undertaken and understood before any planning decisions should be made

**Response:**

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology and planning application process as appropriate.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

6924 Mrs Susan Goddard [6388]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We have a colony of Great Crested Newts in our garden pond, the new development would have a great impact on this endangered species, indeed it may even destroy the colony.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Ensure that there is sufficient areas of separation and green wedges.

**Response:**

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology consultation and planning application process as appropriate.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7012 Mr Jamie Buckby [6335]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The site is unsuitable for development due to the impact on the ecology. The land is home to Great Crested Newts and bats.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The site is unsuitable due to the ecological effects.

**Response:**

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology consultation and planning application process as appropriate.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7212 Mr Peter Taylor [6461]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Retention of existing hedgerows between the existing development and the farm track should also remain as they form a wildlife corridor.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

maintain existing hedgerows.

**Response:**

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology and planning application process as appropriate.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5664 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The trees and hedgerow in and around the site should be retained to protect the wildlife in around the area. With the planting of the tree line, this has made this a additional wildlife corridor. The tree line has a small area of scrub around the edge and this should also be retained. A full ecological survey should be carried out as many species use this area especially in relation to its location to the Grand Union Canal which itself is a conservation area. Protected species have been seen on this site.

**Response:**

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology and planning application process as appropriate.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

6308 Mr Richard Beer [6263]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The existing tree screen is coniferous planted by the farmer trying to take the easiest route to get the site developed. They are incompatible with local species and should be replaced as such. To ensure protection of the Ridgeline to the North, the woodland boundary should be widened from its current footprint to ensure any development does not intrude. To assist in this and meet other objectives reduce the number of houses proposed by one third.

**Response:**

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology and planning application process as appropriate.

**RepID** **Representation**

5665 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Sheet Water run off is a problem in the area causing flooding to,property and across Kingston Way. An Environment Agency diagram shows the watercourse off this development is at 'High Risk'? The Proposed SUDS shows discharge water is to be made through watercourse over third party land which is inaccessible in areas. Will it be adopted by water authority and will it be maintained ? It was recommended that ditches should be considered in the planning consent in 1994, this didn't happen. There is no gravity powered connection to mains sewer or for surface water run off

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The site isn't suitable due to the constraints of SUDS outflow and lack of gravity powered sewer mains connection. An alternative site should be considered.

**Response:**

Noted. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

**RepID** **Representation**

5679 Mr Michael Major [4083]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Properties near to us already flood because of a failure to carry out promised mitigation by the previous developer which happens to be the same developer as wishes to develop the new site i.e. David Wilson. We are concerned that our property will be adversely affected by rain water run off from the developed site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is inappropriate to develop the site.

**Response:**

Noted. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5885 **Mr Paul Henry [6165]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

During periods on intense rainfall Kingston Way and Burnmill Road often suffer from flooding which will be exacerbated by the new development on Burnmill Farm. The proposed flooding measures are not sufficient in our view to prevent this from occurring. In such cases the increased run off from the new development is likely to cause damage and reduce the social amenity of the existing development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove development MH3 from the plan.

**Response:**

Noted. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6423 **Mrs Anna Burbidge [6306]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

I am extremely concerned about the risk of flooding which may be caused by this development. When we moved to the area our garden was flooded by water running down from the area where this development will be and needed extra drainage. The lower part of Kingston Way still floods when there is excessive rain. I feel that there is a great danger of flooding to existing gardens and houses from this new development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The development as a whole poses a risk to existing properties.

**Response:**

Noted. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6571 **Mr Christopher Sellwood [6379]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Some houses in Bates Close have already experienced flooding due to excessive rain water run off and lack of drainage. This is in spite of previous assurances that adequate drainage would be put in place. Further development will only makes this current problem worse.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Don't build on land currently used to soak away rain.

**Response:**

Noted. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6917 Mr David Hart [6181]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Surface water run off and risk of flooding to property in Kingston Way is a big concern . There is mention of surface water being "retained on site in a landscaped balancing pond before being discharged into local watercourse" but this is of little comfort without full assessment and the pond itself brings issues re safety of children and who will be responsible for maintaining it. Foul drainage will apparently be pumped into the existing sewerage system on Kingston Way - there is no evidence that the existing infrastructure can handle this

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Flood risk management and drainage proposals are significant concerns and require full assessment before this development should be considered. As does assessment of safety in relation to the pond

**Response:**

Noted. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7003 Mr Jamie Buckby [6335]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The site is unsuitable as it floods. Surface water collects in the field and pours onto the road at Bates Close and Kingston Way.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

An alternative site should be found. Any changes made to the site would impact existing houses in the near and neighbouring streets.

**Response:**

Noted. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7091 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Exacerbation of surface water run off through hard surfaces causing flooding to property and quality of water through watercourse, contamination of water from general household chemicals entering drainage system and from vehicles using roads. Will riparian owners be consulted and consents obtained as they have the right to receive water in its natural quantity and quality.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If development is to take place then the density of houses on the site should be kept at a minimum to reduce areas of hard surfaces to ensure surface water run off is not increased.

**Response:**

Noted. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6529 Mrs Sarah Verbruggen [6357]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Surface water resulting from heavy rainfall is a concern for local residents. As we are an area of high risk from flooding additional housing will increase this risk .

**Response:**

Noted. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6708 Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Initial assessment of the implications of site for our existing infrastructure undertaken and indicates a need for foul sewerage network improvements to enable the development of this site.

No objection to the principle of development of site. Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) requiring applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

Local plan policies intended to be read as a whole therefore not necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

Reference to an integrated approach to surface water drainage and multi functional greenspace supported.

**Response:**

Noted. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7288 Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Anglian Water has made an initial assessment of the implications of this site for our existing infrastructure and considers that there is a need for foul sewerage network improvements to enable the development of this site.

We have no objection to the principle of development of this site for mixed uses.

This policy refers to the an integrated approach to surface water drainage and multi functional greenspace which is supported.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

None. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

**Response:**

Noted. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and water supplies will all be consulted as part of a planning application and submission of a suitable flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is required.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5666 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Following exhibition by David Wilson Homes, there is little provision of open space, mainly covered by a balancing lagoon and little space for recreation. Open space along the southern boarder should be adequate all along it to protect privacy of existing residents as this site sits higher than the existing one. There will be an adverse effect and loss of residents amenity - loss of privacy and existing view, visual impact, effect on character of neighbourhood and additional noise. The site is on the periphery, density of housing should be low to reflect the landscape.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Density of the proposed development should be taken into account given that the tree belt takes up part of the site. There should be more space between dwellings to be in keeping with existing development and reduce the loss of amenity.

**Response:**

Criteria 1f proposes open space and recreational facilities across the site, including to the southern boundary. Impact on residential amenity is safeguarded by Policy GD8 1e and Supplementary Planning Documents.

---

**RepID Representation**

6309 Mr Richard Beer [6263]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

sufficient space should be allowed to mitigate the impacts to existing residents

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Green space etc proposed by David Wilson is insufficient to mitigate the impact both on the Ridgeline and to the existing residents on Kingston Way and Bates Close

**Response:**

Criteria 1f proposes open space and recreational facilities across the site, including to the southern boundary. Impact on residential amenity is safeguarded by Policy GD8 1e and Supplementary Planning Documents.

**RepID Representation**

7008 Mr Jamie Buckby [6335]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The southern boundary of the site is unsuitable for development. The existing houses have been built at a much lower level to that of the field. Any houses built on the south boundary, next to the farm track, would be built at an elevated level and would have a serious impact on the privacy, light and view of the existing houses.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Any structures should be a significant distance from the southern boundary so that the privacy, light and outlook are protected for the existing home owners.

**Response:**

Criteria 1f proposes open space and recreational facilities across the site, including to the southern boundary. Impact on residential amenity is safeguarded by Policy GD8 1e and Supplementary Planning Documents.

**RepID Representation**

6922 Mr David Hart [6181]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

With multiple cars typical in most households these days, on street parking will be prevalent and with the proposed density of housing this could lead to access issues and a generally untidy look and feel. Another issue of great concern is that in the event of wintry conditions, Kingston Way is a steep and difficult road to pass and cars will often be parked on-street and parked lower down the road due to being unable to drive further up the road. This is manageable now, however, the new development would introduce many more cars to this scenario

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proposed development will create parking issues on site and on the access route. There will be a high risk of traffic accident and significant parking issues on the access route in wintry conditions as outlined above, This highlights two issues - an inadequate access route and too high a density in the proposed development

**Response:**

Proposed allocation MH3 will be subject to appropriate LCC Highways consultation including impact on the highway network and use of Kingston Way for access. LCC Highways have proposed restriction to 90 dwellings.

Parking provision for off street parking relates to the number of bedrooms per dwelling.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5405 **Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The Council has not fully researched the possible impact of the new development on the views from the north and from Gt Bowden. It is essential for this appraisal to be done before any land is allocated.

See our Response to H1 ID5377

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Delete allocation

**Response:**

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be submitted with, and inform the layout and design of, any proposed planning application.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5686 **Mr Michael Major [4083]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Your documents expresses concern about the visual impact on the northern edge but is not at all concerned about the visual and other adverse impacts on the houses on the southern edge

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposed use of this land for housing development is inappropriate and should be rejected.

**Response:**

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be submitted with, and inform the layout and design of, any proposed planning application. Impact on residential amenity is safeguarded by Policy GD8 1e and Supplementary Planning Documents.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5846 **Mrs N Stanley [1279]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Having viewed the potential development proposed by David Wilson Homes at a recent exhibition, the design of the development was compact and dense. It appeared not to be open and didn't fit in with its surrounding area. Existing development is wide and open. Ridge height to the farm end should be low as farm buildings are already visible from Leicester Road. It doesn't meet your Objective number 9 - Design, as it doesn't reflect the local area or respect residents amenity.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Design should be sympathetic to existing residential development with low density and much more open space between dwellings. Given that the site is on the edge of unique area of countryside, this should be reflected in its design.

**Response:**

Noted. Due weight will be applied to the policy MH3 as part of any planning application prior to the adoption of the Local Plan. A landscape assessment and the policy should influence the proposed layout and design of any scheme.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6424 Mrs Anna Burbidge [6306]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed site is higher than existing properties and it appears from the plans that the new houses will be built very close to existing properties. It is impossible to see what sort of housing will definitely be built and I feel there is cause for concern that existing properties will find themselves overlooked, which was something David Wilson assured would not happen originally.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If this development goes ahead much more consideration needs to be given to existing houses and the impact of being overlooked and crowded.

**Response:**

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be submitted with, and inform the layout and design of, any proposed planning application. Impact on residential amenity is safeguarded by Policy GD8 1e and Supplementary Planning Documents.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7010 Mr Jamie Buckby [6335]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The site is unsuitable for development as the ridge height of the houses would affect the views of the houses in Great Bowden. Trees have been planted but they would not obscure the ridge height. In winter, the trees wouldn't have foliage and wouldn't offer a screen to the house, or the ridge view.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I don't consider the site suitable.

**Response:**

Impact on residential amenity is safeguarded by Policy GD8 1e and Supplementary Planning Documents.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7203 Mr Peter Taylor [6461]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed number of house and the height of their ridge tiles impacts on the view from Kingston Way, Great Bowden and the grand Union Canal.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the number of houses, introduce more bungalow and do have have higher than 2 storey houses which are shielded from view.

**Response:**

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be submitted with, and inform the layout and design of, any proposed planning application.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5844 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is close to a canal, mature trees, tall hedgerows, and Wooded areas. The area is rich in wildlife including protected species. In the Market Harborough habitat survey 2008 2.4.5 it states that 'Narrow strips of habitat may be vulnerable to edge effects, and consequently the wider the corridor can be, better for many species.' And 'Such networks should be protected from development'. The Landscape Character assessment 2009 states area is 'highly sensitive'should be 'safeguarded and managed'. it also states that the tree belt appears to be coming to the end of its life.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Given the unique aspects of this site in relation to the area around it, consideration should be given as to whether it is suitable for development and whether an alternative site would be better sort.

**Response:**

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be submitted with, and inform the layout and design of, any proposed planning application. Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be maintained and enhanced.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7121 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Having recently discovered that the adjacent land to Burnmill Farm is already owned by developers, it is concerning that the corridor between the Grand Union Canal and the Burnmill Farm site could be developed. It is stated in one document that this site should be safeguarded and managed but I fear the development of Burnmill Farm may encourage developers to seek permission to develop this area. David Wilson Homes at their recent consultation of the Burnmill Farm site show they are retaining an unnecessary farm access point which could be used as access to the scarp slopes.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Ensure covenants are put in place so that there is no development on the Burnmill Farm Scarp slopes to protect wildlife and the aspect of the entry point into Market Harborough.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy refers only to proposed development at Burnmill Farm as shown on the Policies maps.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7208 Mr Peter Taylor [6461]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed development encroaches on the openness of the landscape and area of separation from Great Bowden and the Grand Union Canal.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Lower height houses, reduced number of houses and improved shielding at the northern boundary

**Response:**

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be submitted with, and inform the layout and design of, any proposed planning application.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5850 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Grand Union Canal which is a conservation area is located within a very short distance of this site. This sizeable corridor is considered to be extremely valuable, and any potential impacts due to lighting or disturbance should be minimised. Objective 6 Natural Environment states: creating links between wildlife sites ensuring that open countryside is protected against insensitive and sporadic development, the characteristics of the local landscape are respected and the unnecessary loss or sterilisation of natural resources is prevented. This proposed development is outside the existing building line and is unnecessary.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The developemnt of this site should be reconsidered due to its proximity of the Grand Union Canal to 'Protect, maintain, restore and enhance the quality, diversity, character, local distinctiveness, biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment' as per your Objective 6 in the Local Plan.

**Response:**

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be submitted with, and inform the layout and design of, any proposed planning application.

Impact on the existing grand union canal conservation area is noted.

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced. Further ecological mitigation to be informed through appropriate ecology surveys, LCC Ecology and planning application process as appropriate.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6310 Mr Richard Beer [6263]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Scale of the development will be detrimental to the views. The density means the screening to the North will be insufficient screening. The trees currently there are also incompatible with local species.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reduce the scale of the development by one third

**Response:**

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be submitted with, and inform the layout and design of, any proposed planning application.

Criteria 1d states that existing hedgerows and trees, particularly to the northern boundary of the site, should be retained and enhanced.

---



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5658 Mrs N Stanley [1279]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The site is Not in reasonable range of services. Most properties will use a private car to commute to work, take children to school, shop for groceries, visit community facilities. There are no amenities pub/shops/park including children's play area in the existing estate around this site. Car journeys per household will be multiple per day. Local. Issues such as surface water run off causing flooding and inability to access the higher end of Kingston Way in winter weather has not been taken into account when assessing suitability. Doesn't meet Objective 10 Transport

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Find alternative development site that isn't so reliant on vehicles and has amenities closer (more environmentally friendly). The developer is looking to make a contribution towards formal bus stops along Alvington Way however I have hardly ever seen a bus flagged by a resident on this part of the route.

**Response:**

Noted. Site is located on the edge of a sub regional centre and considered a sustainable location for development.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5692 Mr Michael Major [4083]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Local facilities and amenities are already inadequate and overloaded. By way of example it is proposed that residents of the development should use health care at Kibworth some 7.5 Km's distant.

The plan refers to 90 dwellings but David Wilson in its written consultation documents at Robert Smythe School on 24th October stated "over 100 houses" will be built.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The use of this land for housing is inappropriate and should be rejected.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5487 Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Civic Society feels from experience that the GallowField Road/Leicester Road/Bowden Road crossroads is dangerous. The junction needs to be improved before any development is commenced.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The policy needs to be strengthened to ensure the junction is improved before development commences.

**Response:**

Policy MH1 a. covers this issue. The timing of the delivery of any necessary road improvements would be negotiated and agreed as part of the planning application, but are likely to be in advance of development.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6184 ECL (Mr Dean Harrison) [4646]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As promoter of the site, the access specification from Gallow Field Road is too specific. Following feedback from County Council Highways Department, it may be more feasible to seek access from Leicester Road.

Therefore in order to maintain some flexibility regarding access provisions. it should read: access to the site to be from Gallow Field Road and /or Leicester Road, and subject to a transport assessment taking into account neighbouring permissions and any improvements required to the Gallow Field Road/Leicester Road/Bowden Road crossroads

**Change To Plan Sought:**

"access to the site to be from Gallow Field Road and /or Leicester Road, and subject to a transport assessment taking into account neighbouring permissions and any improvements required to the Gallow Field Road/Leicester Road/Bowden Road crossroads"

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6273 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We do not yet know what the MH transport strategy includes

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Publish the transport strategy

**Response:**

The draft strategy has been consulted on and the final strategy will be published in advance of the Examination into the Local Plan.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6275 LUBENHAM Parish Council (Kal Budwell) [2655]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This area is in Lubenham Parish and traffic will be likely to use the new link road through the SDA and /or the Foxton Road

Add financial contribution to mitigate any likely impacts of increased traffic on the Road system in Lubenham Parish including A4304 and Foxton Road (weight restricted)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Add financial contribution to mitigate any likely impacts of increased traffic on the Road system in Lubenham Parish including A4304 and Foxton Road (weight restricted)

**Response:**

There is insufficient evidence to support a specific financial contribution at this stage, but it could be considered as part of a planning application if mitigation is shown to be required by the transport assessment (criterion a.) and it is not included in the Market Harborough Transport Strategy (criterion d.)

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6710 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We have no objection to the principle of development of this site for employment uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

This policy refers to an integrated approach to provision of SuDs and flood mitigation which is supported.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7289 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We have no objection to the principle of development of this site for employment uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

This policy refers to an integrated approach to provision of SuDs and flood mitigation which is supported.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

None. As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6713 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We have no objection to the principle of development of this site for employment uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

This policy refers to an integrated approach to provision of SuDs and flood mitigation which is supported.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7290 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We have no objection to the principle of development of this site for employment uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

This policy refers to an integrated approach to provision of SuDs and flood mitigation which is supported.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

None. As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5392 **Market Harborough Civic Society (Bernard Bowen) [3938]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

More parking needs to be provided. On all business estates in Market Harborough cars are parked on the access roads. Now that housing is proposed next door this will be dangerous to other road users and detrimental to the amenity of residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Standards for car parking need to be increased.

**Response:**

The Local Plan is intended to be read as whole. Policy IN2 (Sustainable Transport) sets out requirements for residential and commercial development proposals in terms of safe access, servicing and parking arrangements, while Policy MH6 (1 e) establishes consistent parking standards across the county. MH6 also requires sustainable transport measures to encourage the use of modes other than the private car (MH6 (1 c, d, f, and g)).

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6679 **Mr and Mrs Gowling [6400]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

This submission supports the proposed allocations of Land at Northampton Road, Market Harborough for employment and residential uses as identified on the Proposals Plan.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7291 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We have no objection to the principle of development of this site for employment uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

This policy refers to an integrated approach to provision of SuDs and flood mitigation which is supported.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

None. As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6714 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We have no objection to the principle of development of this site for employment uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

This policy refers to an integrated approach to provision of SuDs and flood mitigation which is supported.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5752 Mr Kevin Meanwell [6108]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This approach to be able to respond is very complex for individuals and should be changed to allow those affected to put views as paragraphs in a straight forward manner. You are penalising the people who are going to be affected.

This could result in us not being heard or our comments ignored because they don't fit your prescriptive approach.

I feel this is discourteous towards Lutterworth and district people whose lives will be impacted by these proposals.

The comments below cover all section 15 and it's subsections.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Lutterworth is bursting at the seams in terms of warehousing, road traffic congestion, poor air quality, dangerous traffic levels to Leicester, M1 and M6 which your proposal will exacerbate immensely.

We have only 1 % unemployment, a destroyed shopping centre, no police station, closing banks and a proposed closure of the hospital. So how can 700,000sq metres of warehousing and 2500 new houses help us. Move all this to where the unemployment problem is - maybe Market Harborough itself to achieve your objectives. We have no rail service and a weak bus service so you add 2.500 cars minimum and thousands more lorries thundering through and polluting our children's air!!! Unacceptable surely in law against pollution targets..

It doesn't support your stated objectives and would be detrimental to the town of Lutterworth and it's occupants. So if no benefit and not achieving objectives and destroying what is left of our historic town then how can it be legally or morally compliant?

**Response:**

The East of Lutterworth SDA will help reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality in the centre of Lutterworth in the long term. It will also offer the opportunity to help reduce commuting to Magna Park from outside the District. Housing and employment growth will support the shopping centre.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5357 Mr Gerard Growney [5881]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Lutterworth is already meeting its social obligations with 4 (or more) new housing developments in the year 2016 - 2017 alone. The idea to build a 1500+ dwelling development to the East of the M1 will destroy the local existing Lutterworth community and identity. It will saturate the existing local resources and compromise the ability of the local schools to deliver their mandate of high quality education. It will turn a Market Town with some identity into an urban sprawl, diluted from any persona and will reduce the quality of living of the existing residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Instead of Lutterworth East, an adjunct to Lutterworth, why not look to build a whole new town with its own identity. There is plenty of Green space in the district. Or even change the plans for the extension of Manga Park (which is absolutely not required at all) and look to build on that targeted land.

**Response:**

The intention is that the east of Lutterworth SDA will be developed as a 'sustainable, high quality and largely self-sufficient settlement' as set out in the Policy. It is separated from Lutterworth by the M1 and so would not therefore be urban sprawl.

**RepID Representation**

5503 Mrs Jaqueline Strong [4069]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Housing development not currently required, would only be required if further development of Magna Park were to go ahead (policy BE2) and even then no evidence to support need.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Relocate development to where it is needed e.g. nearer Leicester City

**Response:**

Evidence is provided by the HEDNA and the Magna Park Sensitivity Study.

**RepID Representation**

5521 Mr Dennis O'Neill [6025]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This plan is completely disproportionate to the area's needs and ability to cope with the increased demand on its infrastructure, amenities, services and air quality, all of which are considerably overstretched. This consultation is also clearly designed to minimise criticism and objections by being as difficult to respond to as possible, and specifically to put off anyone who would like to complain by overwhelming them with options and requests for further information at every one of the literally hundreds of possible touchpoints.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It should be binned entirely and the council should start again, this time coming up with something more reasonable and achievable.

**Response:**

The development meets the demonstrable needs of Harborough District in a strategic location near to employment growth and local facilities.

**RepID Representation**

5801 Mr A Adcock [3747]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This random development is prime agricultural land to the East of the M1. There is a distinct lack of commitment to the infrastructure needs of the locality to support such an expansion. Amongst a long list such items as schools, medical centre, recreational facilities, pollution in the town centre, a North/South Bypass and the retention of the hugely respected cottage hospital should ALL be conditions of the planning approval. Therefore planners should consider the housing proposal as a whole, not in piecemeal lots of say 40 to 70 houses with little or no commitment to individual infrastructure improvement.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The only way infrastructure improvements to roads, junctions and environmental issues to be satisfied is to make them conditions of the planning approval or the developers will "pick them off" with series of smaller applications as in the past.

**Response:**

The policy requires a comprehensive development in accordance with a master-plan and expects a SPD or a single outline planning application. The infrastructure provision is required by the policy and will be delivered through a Section 106 agreement, with the exception of retention of the hospital which is outside the control of the developers or, indeed, the planning system.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5829 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst Misterton with Walcote Parish Council appreciates the advantages of allocating substantial parcels of land for housing allowing the economic provision of infrastructure, it wishes to raise concerns about certain aspects of the allocation of land to the east of Lutterworth.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

No response possible to this generic comment- concerns listed separately will be responded to elsewhere.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5889 LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the Consortium considers that the triggers for delivery of infrastructure as specified in the policy should be capable of being met, it is felt that they are not necessary in the policy itself.

National policy states that in bringing forward land, Local Plans should provide detail on form, scale access and quantum (bp 5, paragraph 157 of NPPF), but it does not require infrastructure trigger points to be specified. Furthermore, national policy states that the Local Plan should only include policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react (paragraph 154).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove triggers for delivery of infrastructure from criteria in policy.

**Response:**

Given the concerns raised by the public about provision of infrastructure, it is important to ensure that this is provided at the appropriate time without adding an undue burden on viability. Evidence demonstrates that the policy is viable. Bullet point 1 of paragraph 157 states that Local Plans should plan positively for the infrastructure required. Paragraph 177 states that it is important to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion. Paragraph 70 states that planning policies should plan positively for provision and use of community facilities and other local services and paragraph 72 states that LPAs should take a proactive approach to ensuring that a sufficient choice of schools is available to meet the needs of new communities.



**RepID** **Representation**5920 **Ms Josephine Muldowney [6178]****Nature****Object****Representation Summary:**

Lutterworth already has high levels of pollution and resultant health problems as identified in your own assessment. Traffic congestion and shortage of parking is already a problem in Lutterworth. Building right next to a major motoway will not only affect the health and air quality for the new residents, but also, with the huge increase in car usage and traffic from this development cause further deterioration in air quality and traffic congestion. The siting of this development also involves the extra cost and upheaval of building another bridge over a major motorway.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Don't build a vast housing estate next to a motorway and a town with existing air quality and traffic congestion issues.

**Response:**

In the long term the provision of the spine road will result in a reduction in traffic congestion and pollution in Lutterworth town centre. Evidence shows that the motorway bridge is deliverable by the scale of development proposed.

**RepID** **Representation**6610 **Mr Brian Burgoine [6036]****Nature****Object****Representation Summary:**

To the best of my knowledge there has been no representation or opinions asked of any of the local residents in Lutterworth town, so cannot have been positively prepared, justified or effective. , Lutterworth town centre is in desperate need of a North-South Bypass with noise traffic, HGV's and pollution currently running at a national record high. Developer funded bypass must be done first. Can't allow small developers to come in and pick off sites without having to put any infrastructure in place. They must contribute proportionately to bypass as well as improved shopping, schooling and medical services.

**Response:**

The policy requires a comprehensive development in accordance with a master-plan and expects a SPD or a single outline planning application. The infrastructure provision is required by the policy and will be delivered through a Section 106 agreement.

**RepID** **Representation**6611 **Mrs Joy Burgoine [4726]****Nature****Object****Representation Summary:**

Local Plan has no consideration for Lutterworth residents and how it is going to impact on them now and in the future. The roads and by-pass should be put in place BEFORE building commences. To say the road network is ADEQUATE is absolutely rubbish. The town gets congested, noisy and polluted. The proposals for Magna Park area will lead to more traffic and our town will become gridlocked on a regular basis.

**Response:**

Junction improvements will be delivered in advance of commencement. It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development. Traffic modelling indicates that the spine road will result in reductions in traffic through the town centre in the long term.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7128 **Bloor Home Ltd [4935]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Policy L1 is considered unsound on the basis that it:

- is not justified in that it has not fully acknowledged the practical constraints to development within the SDA;
- is not effective in that the SDA will not deliver the scale of development the Submission Plan currently assumes, and the identified needs will not therefore, be met; and
- is inconsistent with national policy in that it does not fully reflect the Government's priorities and policies in terms of enabling sustainable development and boosting the supply of housing to meet identified needs.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proposed Change

To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan:

- The housing trajectory should reflect a realistic timescale for the delivery of the Lutterworth SDA.
- The Local Plan should then identify sufficient deliverable and developable supply of housing land to meet the identified housing need in sustainable locations in the District, notably at the PUA.
- That should include the allocation of the land off Uppingham Road, Bushby.

**Response:**

The trajectory for delivery of the East of Lutterworth SDA is considered to be realistic and will be updated before submission, taking into account further commitments and commitments up to 31st March 2018. Measures are being put in place to ensure timely consideration of a planning application and that all other approvals and preparatory works are delivered in accordance with the timetable agreed with the SDA promoters.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7277 **Miss A Tiktin [6043]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

This Plan is neither legally compliant nor sound, claims being made about what the current situation is to claim this is sustainable are fundamentally untrue. The Plan as is, will endanger the lives of local residents.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I do not believe there is any willingness to make such modifications, based on past experience of ignoring existing issues/incompetency/disregard for public safety.

**Response:**

No evidence is submitted to support the contentions.

---

**RepID Representation****Nature**

7393 Historic England (Mrs Emilie Carr) [5702]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The allocation would have a negative impact on the setting and be harmful to the overall significance the grade II\* Church of St Leonard at Misterton and the Grade 1 Listed Church of St. Mary, Lutterworth and that which non-designated heritage assets derive from their setting. As such, Historic England object to this allocation on the grounds of soundness.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There may be some potential for development but not on the scale shown, if the southern boundary of the site could be moved north to a sufficient level to overcome the objections set out above.

**Response:**

A Heritage Impact Assessment demonstrates that no overriding heritage constraints to the proposals have been identified, although sensitive design is recommended to minimise the degree of harm to the Church of St Leonard. There is no need to adjust the southern boundary as the extent of development can be controlled through the masterplan and detailed design. Retention of the land within the boundary enables the LPA to ensure that the setting of the II\* Listed church can be protected by allocating open space in the area concerned.

**RepID Representation****Nature**

7475 Mr Peter Bailey [6019]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The A4303, A426, and the A5 are already very congested as they connect with main routes from and to the M6 (especially to and from the North). The development of Magna Park and DIRFT (together with the latter's new town development) will further increase the strain on these routes. In my opinion, the developments planned should not go-ahead without the infrastructural problems of the A426, A4303 and A5 being solved.

**Response:**

Junction improvements, including on the A426 and A4303, will be delivered in advance of commencement. Improvements to the A5 are not required to serve the SDA. Traffic modelling indicates that the spine road will result in reductions in traffic through the town centre in the long term.

**RepID Representation****Nature**

7619 Armstrong Rigg Planning (Mr Geoff Armstrong) [4700]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy L1 relating to East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area is unsound so far as it will fail to deliver the predicted number of homes during the plan period, which is likely to result in a shortfall against the plan requirement of circa 600 homes (Enclosure 4);

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to respond to the fundamental concerns raised above and to enable the preparation of a sound Plan, the following change is required:  
\* Reduce the level of predicted delivery on this site to a more realistic level of circa 900 new homes and identify additional housing allocations

**Response:**

The trajectory for delivery of the East of Lutterworth SDA is considered to be realistic and will be updated before submission, taking into account further commitments and commitments up to 31st March 2018. Measures are being put in place to ensure timely consideration of a planning application and that all other approvals and preparatory works are delivered in accordance with the timetable agreed with the SDA promoters.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5884 LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

East of Lutterworth fits with the Local Plan's overall strategy, and is the most appropriate location for large scale growth to meet development needs in the town and the District. Lutterworth benefits from range of services and facilities, which make it suitable for significant development as a Key Centre. It is also located close to significant employment opportunities.

The Consortium has produced a Vision Statement, submitted with these representations which sets out in detail the site characteristics, context, the alignment of the East of Lutterworth SDA with the Local Plan, the benefits of the scheme and a concept masterplan.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6078 Mr Brian Poulter [4826]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

This acceptable in line with government regulations

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7263 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

East of Lutterworth SDA is strongly supported for the following reasons:

- situated in the M1 corridor within one of the priority areas for economic growth in the Strategic Economic Plan
- it is seen to meet best the criteria set out in Key Issues section of the plan and compliments the further development of Magna Park.
- it is confirmed that the site, is available (being owned by a consortium of willing landowners) deliverable and capable of supporting a viable development.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**7318 **Highways England (Scarlett Griffiths) [6496]****Support****Representation Summary:**

Due to its proximity to M1 J20, we consider that there would be significant impacts upon the operation of the junction. Initial traffic model sensitivity tests indicate that M1 J20 would reach capacity before the site (to the scale up to the end of the plan period) is built out.

HE is aware of a scheme which includes signalisation at M1 J20, A4303/A426 Frank Whittle signalised cross-roads and proposed signalised site accesses on the A4304. We consider that these improvements are likely to be suitable, but the interaction of M1 J20 with the adjacent junctions will need to be closely monitored and carefully designed. A risk that if not suitably coordinated then potential blocking issues at the exit arms could impact the operation of M1 J20. HE keen to maintain close engagement with LCC and HDC in the development of this scheme.

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**6359 **Cotesbach Parish Council (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6283]****Object****Representation Summary:**

Not positively prepared as this policy has not considered how the potential benefits of the SDA could be used to enhance Lutterworth Town, for example specific allocations or Retail land.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Allocate retail and amenity land in Lutterworth Town more specifically exactly as has been done in Market Harborough. Local Government has a role to invest and commit to beneficial changes.

**Response:**

The level of need demonstrated by the retail study is lower in Lutterworth than in Market Harborough and much of this is accounted for by the SDA so much of the local provision should be there in order to make the settlement sustainable. The Council is not aware of land available for retail in Lutterworth town centre so anticipates that this will come forward on windfall sites.

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**5505 **Mrs Carol Wasik [6011]****Object****Representation Summary:**

I object to the plan as it stands as there is no appropriate road, or entries to these new sites. They should be installed before any major development occurs.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

See above.

**Response:**

The policy ensures that access and roads will be provided

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6350 Cotesbach Parish Council (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6283]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Low carbon design techniques and technologies are not sufficiently being committed to in Policy L1

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Benchmarks for low carbon energy systems, from consultation with developers, LLEP and Central Government should be identified now and included in the plan.

**Response:**

The Local Plan should be read as a whole - see Policy CC1, CC2 and L1 3x.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5830 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the size of the allocation to 2031 is now reduced to 1500 dwellings, the ultimate size of the development to 2036 remains 2750, 750 more than was in the original consultation document.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

The level of housing development has been reconsidered since the original submission. This scale ensures adequate infrastructure can be provided for the benefit of the future residents and those of Lutterworth.

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5847 Alison Anderton [6006]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This planned development is way too big, far too many houses bringing cars which will greatly impact on all surrounding roads and connecting villages / towns. Our roads are already becoming grid locked at certain times of the day, noise pollution, air pollution will greatly increase. This will cause more health problems as a result.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not build as many houses spread them out around the county Lutterworth does not need another town sitting next door. Our roads were not built to take the inpacked of so many more cars.

**Response:**

This scale of development ensures adequate infrastructure can be provided for the benefit of the future residents and those of Lutterworth. Traffic modelling demonstrates that, given the junction improvements to be made, increases in traffic can be accommodated and indeed that there will be reductions in traffic and pollution in Lutterworth town centre in the long term.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6517 **MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Parish Council appreciates the advantages of allocating substantial parcels of land for housing, but has concerns about certain aspects of the allocation; \*Whilst the size of the allocation to 2031 is now reduced to 1500 dwellings, the ultimate size of the development to 2036 remains 2750, 750 more than was in the original consultation document.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

None stated.

**Response:**

The level of housing development has been reconsidered since the original submission. This scale ensures adequate infrastructure can be provided for the benefit of the future residents and those of Lutterworth.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7031 **Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the size of the allocation to 2031 is now reduced to 1,500 dwellings, the ultimate size of the development to 2036 remains 2,750. This is 750 more dwellings than was proposed in the original consultation documents. This is a massive development, much bigger than any other housing proposal in the plan, the impact on surrounding areas will be significant.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Spread housing requirement throughout the district rather than burdening one small area.

**Response:**

The spreading of housing throughout the District was considered as Option 1 at the Options consultation stage but was rejected as being unsustainable and unable to deliver the scale of housing development required. The east of Lutterworth SDA only comprises about 1/3rd of the residual requirement and 12% of total housing provision over the plan period.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7043 **SWINFORD Parish Council (Katherine Clarke) [2678]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the size of the allocation to 2031 is now reduced to 1,500 dwellings, the ultimate size of the development to 2036 remains 2,750. This is 750 more dwellings than was proposed in the original consultation documents. This is a massive development, much bigger than any other housing proposal in the plan, the impact on surrounding areas will be significant.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Spread of the housing burden throughout the district rather than one massive housing development.

**Response:**

The spreading of housing throughout the District was considered as Option 1 at the Options consultation stage but was rejected as being unsustainable and unable to deliver the scale of housing development required. The east of Lutterworth SDA only comprises about 1/3rd of the residual requirement and 12% of total housing provision over the plan period.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7137 North Kilworth Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [6469]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the size of the allocation to 2031 is now reduced to 1,500 dwellings, the ultimate size of the development to 2036 remains 2,750. This is 750 more dwellings than was proposed in the original consultation documents. This is a massive development, much bigger than any other housing proposal in the plan, the impact on surrounding areas will be significant.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Spread of the housing burden throughout the district rather than one massive housing development.

**Response:**

The spreading of housing throughout the District was considered as Option 1 at the Options consultation stage but was rejected as being unsustainable and unable to deliver the scale of housing development required. The East of Lutterworth SDA only comprises about 1/3rd of the residual requirement and 12% of total housing provision over the plan period.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7141 North Kilworth Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [6469]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Affordable Housing: Is 40% affordable housing viable or deliverable? This amounts to 1,100 affordable housing units for the proposed Lutterworth East development.

Specialist Housing: Lutterworth is surrounded by a great number of villages who are all facing the same problem, there are not enough properties for elderly people wishing to downsize. There is a definite need for extra care provision. On the proposed Lutterworth East development implementation of this policy would allow for 275 properties of this nature, is this sufficient, particularly when considered against the 40% affordable housing requirement.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reassess the percentage of affordable housing required on new developments.

**Response:**

The level of affordable housing to be delivered is shown by the evidence to be viable and deliverable. A much larger proportion of specialised housing would have had an unacceptable impact on the design of the settlement and on its social and demographic mix. However it should be noted that the 10% requirement is a minimum figure.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7142 SWINFORD Parish Council (Katherine Clarke) [2678]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Affordable Housing: Is 40% affordable housing viable or deliverable? This amounts to 1,100 affordable housing units for the proposed Lutterworth East development.

Specialist Housing: Lutterworth is surrounded by a great number of villages who are all facing the same problem, there are not enough properties for elderly people wishing to downsize. There is a definite need for extra care provision. On the proposed Lutterworth East development implementation of this policy would allow for 275 properties of this nature, is this sufficient, particularly when considered against the 40% affordable housing requirement.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reassess the percentage requirements of affordable and specialist housing.

**Response:**

The level of affordable housing to be delivered is shown by the evidence to be viable and deliverable. A much larger proportion of specialised housing would have had an unacceptable impact on the design of the settlement and on its social and demographic mix. However it should be noted that the 10% requirement is a minimum figure.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7143 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Affordable Housing: Is 40% affordable housing viable or deliverable? This amounts to 1,100 affordable housing units for the proposed Lutterworth East development.

Specialist Housing: Lutterworth is surrounded by a great number of villages who are all facing the same problem, there are not enough properties for elderly people wishing to downsize. There is a definite need for extra care provision. On the proposed Lutterworth East development implementation of this policy would allow for 275 properties of this nature, is this sufficient, particularly when considered against the 40% affordable housing requirement.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Reassess the percentage requirements of affordable and specialist housing.

**Response:**

The level of affordable housing to be delivered is shown by the evidence to be viable and deliverable. A much larger proportion of specialised housing would have had an unacceptable impact on the design of the settlement and on its social and demographic mix. However it should be noted that the 10% requirement is a minimum figure.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5522 Mr Dennis O'Neill [6025]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This development is completely out of proportion to the area's needs - it is claimed this will bring in much needed employment, yet Lutterworth and the surrounding areas is one of the most highly-employed areas in the county. All it can bring in is extra traffic as the public transport doesn't exist, thus increasing congestion, air pollution and difficulty in travelling. It will also be in competition with considerably sized similar developments in and around Rugby, Corby and other surrounding areas.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It should be scrapped as it is unnecessary, disproportionate and there is little or no business case to support it.

**Response:**

The scale of development is required to meet housing needs and to ensure the deliverability of necessary infrastructure. While employment development on the site is important in meeting needs and ensuring sustainable development, the SDA is housing, not employment, driven. Traffic modelling shows it can be accommodated with junction improvements and congestion and air pollution will be reduced in the long term. A bus service to the SDA will be required.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5887 LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

An objection is raised at the imposition of a maximum floor space area of 9,000sq.m. It is suggested a more flexible approach should be taken that responds positively to economic demand and opportunities in accordance with national policy (see bullet point 3 of paragraph 21 of the Framework).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

It is suggested a more flexible approach should be taken that responds positively to economic demand and opportunities in accordance with national policy (see bullet point 3 of paragraph 21 of the Framework).

**Response:**

To allow development greater than 9000 sq m would be incompatible with Policy BE2 and the strategy of locating strategic distribution uses as extensions to existing sites as recommended by the MDS Transmodal studies. In discussions with the developers, assurances were given that there was a buoyant market for units of this size.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5908 Mr Wesley Thomas [5617]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Our property, Park Lodge, Misterton, is situated directly adjacent to the East of Lutterworth proposed development and overlooks the land to the south of the A4304.

Section 15.2.11 of Harborough District Council's Local Plan Proposed Submission 2011- 2031 states that 'The site to the south of the A4304 is for business uses within Use Class Order B8'

Section 15.2.12 states that 'B8 uses [are] incompatible with residential amenity.'

As such if the plan is to be implemented it will be incompatible with us continuing to reside at Park Lodge, Misterton.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to make the plans sound Harborough District Council need to purchase Park Lodge, Misterton

**Response:**

Noted. Consideration to be given to this request as part of implementation of the scheme by the promoters.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6503 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Object to allocation because;

- plan has not demonstrated a need for this development (ref. Para 15.2.11)
- it opens up further land to the south of A4303 to development pressure, as no natural or landscape barrier with surrounding countryside
- it's not been tested through consultation, differs from Options stage proposal
- includes grade 2 agricultural land, so contrary to selection criteria and policy GI5.3
- access likely to cause excess traffic congestion (4 traffic light controlled junctions within 0.73miles between site and A426) in combination with extra traffic generated by policies L1, BE2, BE4 and displaced from Lutterworth town centre.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

None stated.

**Response:**

The promoters state that this development is necessary to fund the up-front infrastructure costs of delivering the SDA and have submitted cashflow evidence to support this.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5348 Mr Roger Arnold [5849]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Why is there no allowance for a senior school? The schools in town are already over capacity. There could potentially be an additional 300 primary school children needing a school place before the builder has to build one. How do you propose fitting those children into already overcrowded schools?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

build the schools as soon as the houses start getting built.

**Response:**

It is not reasonable to require a school to be provided in advance of the need for it. It would be nearly empty for 2-3 years. There is no evidence that secondary schools are full. However, this situation may change and so the policy includes a requirement for 'appropriate contributions towards secondary education provision if necessary'. This matter can be addressed as part of discussions on the Section 106 agreement in consultation with the Education Authority in due course.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6079 Mr Brian Poulter [4826]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Why wait for 300 houses to be built before the Primary School starts. Current Lutterworth Primary Schools are already full.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

So either build the new school immediately the house build begins or expand the existing schools,

**Response:**

The SDA should not be used to deal with any primary school problems in the existing community since this would encourage unsustainable transport patterns. Expansion of existing schools is a separate issue.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6844 Ms Nina Woodcock [6440]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Although I agree with the proposal for two primary schools I am concerned that there appears to be no additional provision for secondary schools. As a director of the Lutterworth Academies Trust I believe that funding should be made available (e.g. from S106 monies) for improvements to Lutterworth College to ensure that the facilities are available for the expected increase in pupil numbers.

**Response:**

Currently there is sufficient capacity in Lutterworth secondary schools. However, this situation may change and so the policy includes a requirement for 'appropriate contributions towards secondary education provision if necessary'. This matter can be addressed as part of discussions on the Section 106 agreement in consultation with the Education Authority in due course.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6107 John Miller [6218]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No specific examples of "appropriate contributions" or what the "necessary provisions" might be.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Make clear and definite what the contributions and provisions will be

**Response:**

This cannot be determined at present . Currently there is sufficient secondary school provision but this situation may change. This matter can be addressed as part of discussions on the Section 106 agreement in consultation with the Education Authority in due course.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6731 Mrs Helen Christie [6423]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This is not clear & is too vague.What are the appropriate contributions going to cover as they will be necessary, & planning in advance would be needed. New infrastructure would be needed to accommodate extra students in current secondary schools.Buildings & upgrading would be necessary.Accommodation for dining/cooking would need expanding.Dedicated bus services,cycle routes & walking routes etc.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Be more specific about what will be provided by liaising with local secondary schools so plans can be put into place & stakeholders can work together.

**Response:**

This cannot be determined at present . Currently there is sufficient secondary school provision but this situation may change. This matter can be addressed as part of discussions on the Section 106 agreement in consultation with the Education Authority in due course.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6865 Friends of Lutterworth College (Mrs Patricia Barnett) [6408]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

I am responding as a member of the Friends of Lutterworth College where my son attends. Lutterworth's two exciting schools are already oversubscribed. Lutterworth College is already experiencing pressures on its infrastructure i.e. catering and dining facilities which would be significantly exacerbated if expected to absorb over Pupil Admission numbers.

I feel the proposal for East of Lutterworth has not adequately considered the impact of secondary school infrastructure, and this should be factored into the strategic planning as well as the more detailed master planning stage, so that any developer is aware.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

I would like to see fuller assessment of the impact on local secondary school provision, including what capital investment may be required across the existing schools to accommodate the expected increase in young people age 11-18 years. This should be done in consultation with Lutterworth College and Lutterworth High School. I would like to see at what stage (i.e. after how many dwellings) this needs to be enacted upon.

**Response:**

Currently there is sufficient secondary school provision but this situation may change. This matter can be addressed as part of discussions on the Section 106 agreement in consultation with the Education Authority in due course.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6952 Lutterworth College (Mr Nicholas Summers) [6405]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As Headteacher of Lutterworth College I am objecting to this proposal on the basis that it does not take into the account the impact on secondary school places at Lutterworth College. Lutterworth High School is already oversubscribed and has a restricted site so Lutterworth College would take any additional secondary school pupils. Lutterworth College is reaching its PAN of 240 in Year 7; hence significant infrastructure investment would be required to absorb any additional students as a result of this development. Lutterworth Collge's site is not restricted. A change in PAN would be required following investment.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The development would require a more detailed assessment of the significant infrastructure investment at local schools thatwould have to be made i.e. additional classrooms, additional dining facilities & spaces, in order that secondary school provision was adequate.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy L1 requires a financial contribution through a S106 agreement to secondary school provision.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6730 Mr Chris Skelton [6424]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I am very much in favour of the expansion of Lutterworth. however I believe that proper provision should be included for the secondary schools - in particular Lutterworth College (which includes A levels). The College is in need of improved facilities currently and additional students would place further demand on this even if only for things like catering. I believe some classrooms have been mothballed and provision would be needed to bring these back into use so that the school is appropriate and safe for all students.

**Response:**

Currently there is sufficient secondary school provision but this situation may change. This matter can be addressed as part of discussions on the Section 106 agreement in consultation with the Education Authority in due course.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6487 Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We welcome this but feel that this does not do enough to be in line with paragraph 114 of the NPPF.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Change the wording from:

'greenways for walking, cycling and horse riding, as part of a central green spine distributor route through and beyond the site, to provide structure to the distribution of development and incorporate most existing hedgerows, trees, field ponds, and footpaths'

To:

'greenways for walking, cycling and horse riding, as part of a central green spine distributor route through and beyond the site, to provide structure to the distribution of development and incorporate most existing footpaths. In addition existing hedgerows, trees and field ponds will be protected, enhanced and managed, where this is not possible, mitigation will be provided to give a net gain in biodiversity overall.'

**Response:**

The suggested amendment to the policy would make it too long and duplicates Policy G15.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5506 LUTTERWORTH TOWN COUNCIL Parish Council (Andrew Ellis) [2656]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The policy is open ended and unsound

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A community park containing outdoor sports facilities to be provided before completion of 300 dwellings;

**Response:**

It is important to ensure flexibility in delivery to enable the Council to take account of unforeseen circumstances. The promoters are asking for the removal of such triggers. The submitted policy is considered to be an appropriate compromise.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5351 Mr Roger Arnold [5849]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

every estate should have open space for people to use otherwise this causes social tension

**Response:**

This is provided for under Policy L1 3 j vi and Policy G12.

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6488 **Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The local authority does not appear to be giving the natural environment the priority or protection that the NPPF identifies it should, especially as there are alternative less damaging locations. The sensitive hydrology of Misterton Marshes needs to be protected or a study should be undertaken to prove that there will not be a negative effect on the hydrology of the SSSI.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Carry out a full and detailed hydrological model and risk assessment to check for any potential negative impacts on Misterton Marshes SSSI and its sensitive hydrology.

**Response:**

This has been undertaken as part of the Feasibility Study referred to in the Supporting Information. It will also be a matter for consideration as part of the Master Plan and/ or planning application.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6520 **MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We consider that it is imperative that the detailed ecological assessment of the Misterton Marshes site is completed before any development is begun on the site.

**Response:**

This is covered by Policy L 3 u I and by Policy GI5 and will be a matter for consideration as part of the planning application.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

5507 **LUTTERWORTH TOWN COUNCIL Parish Council (Andrew Ellis) [2656]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Land or financial contributions should be sought for an additional Leisure Centre to serve both Lutterworth and the Development East of Lutterworth

**Change To Plan Sought:**

land for an additional leisure centre to serve Lutterworth, towards the end of the plan period;

**Response:**

Land is being sought under Policy L1 3 k, but it is not possible to put the whole cost of a replacement leisure centre down to the SDA since it would serve the whole of the town.

---



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5845 Alison Anderton [6006]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Our swimming pool / leisure centre has been available to the immediate town for over 50 years, I totally disagree to the Leisure centre being Re built out of the immediate town, many of our older residents using the facilities would be unable to get to the new centre if relocated, the same would be for mums that don't drive taking their children for swimming lessons.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build a new centre in East Lutterworth and update and keep the Leisure centre in Lutterworth.

**Response:**

Although land would be reserved for a new leisure centre within the SDA, no final decision has yet been made as to whether this is the preferred option for Lutterworth Leisure Centre. This would be done by the Council as part of a separate process and would take into account the availability of public transport to the potential sites as well as such matters as the cost and disruption of on-site replacement, land requirements and availability, and the need for the existing site for other purposes such as education.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5508 LUTTERWORTH TOWN COUNCIL Parish Council (Andrew Ellis) [2656]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The policy does not specify where construction traffic will be prohibited from the Lutterworth Town Centre

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Specify roads

**Response:**

Site traffic would be required to use the southern access from the A4304 initially and subsequently also the northern access across the M1. Once the latter has been completed the part of Gilmorton Road crossing the M1 will be closed to all but public transport, cycling, pedestrians and emergency vehicles. Routing of site traffic would be a matter for the planning application.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5552 Mr Philip Ashton [6052]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Fully interconnected North East bypass is required to meet needs of the people and business if all the current plans in and around Lutterworth are to be granted.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Fully interconnected North East bypass for Lutterworth & Lutt East

**Response:**

The proposed spine road in L1 3 m will provide such a by-pass. The master plan will address the issue of the scale, design and exact route of this road.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6080 Mr Brian Poulter [4826]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Gilmorton Road is not substantial enough for the addition of site traffic.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Make separate junctions on the A4304 to serve both as the site entrance & work force entrance.  
Or as well as make a site entrance on the A426 north of Lutterworth town

**Response:**

Site traffic may be required to use the southern access from the A4304 initially and subsequently also the northern access across the M1. Once the latter has been completed the part of Gilmorton Road crossing the M1 will be closed to all but public transport, cycling, pedestrians and emergency vehicles. Routing of site traffic would be a matter for the planning application.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6879 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

If the massive plans to expand Magna Park were to be approved by HDC, the increased volume of traffic in and around the Lutterworth area would change beyond recognition.

Building a large number of houses in East Lutterworth can only add to the traffic congestion, increase road traffic accidents and produce even more contaminated air for us (and any new residents in East Lutterworth) to breathe.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The local road network would need radical and substantial improvement if we are to avoid gridlock in and around the Lutterworth area.

Local roads already struggle very badly to cope with existing traffic volumes.

Expansion of Magna Park (already Europe's largest distribution centre) would lead to thousands of more HGVs and commuter cars flooding onto our already congested roads.

As well as increasing congestion, all this extra traffic will generate unacceptable levels of poor air quality threatening the health of those who live and work in the Lutterworth area.

This should be considered as a serious public health issue.

**Response:**

Junction improvements will be delivered in advance of commencement. Subject to these, traffic modelling predicts that the road network can accommodate the additional traffic, although there may be a need for some mitigation in Gilmorton village. Traffic modelling also indicates that the spine road will result in reductions in traffic through the town centre in the long term.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7151 **Gilmorton Parish Council (Mr Julian Kent) [6472]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed Lutterworth East development includes provision of a spine road and closure of the current Gilmorton Road in Lutterworth to general traffic. We note the mention of Traffic Calming measures being required in Gilmorton and we would like to understand a.) what is behind this comment / proposed measure and b.) whether we will be consulted on the type and location of such measures. Our concern is that Gilmorton will increasingly become a 'rat run' for traffic heading for the southern outskirts of Leicester.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

A motorway junction linking the A426 north of Lutterworth would avoid some of the potential issues with through traffic in Gilmorton.

**Response:**

The traffic modelling does indicate potential traffic problems in Gilmorton village which would need to be addressed through traffic calming. These will be discussed with the residents and Parish Council as part of the Master Plan. An additional motorway junction north of Lutterworth is unlikely to be acceptable to Highways England and would adversely affect viability of the SDA. Its impact would need to be modelled but it is unlikely to be a cost-effective solution to the problems in Gilmorton.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5350 **Mr Roger Arnold [5849]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

There is no mention of how you are going to get people to use this bypass and stop traffic traveling through town once it's built. There is potentially going to be thousands of extra vehicle journeys through the town centre before the road is finished.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

the road needs building before the houses get built. there needs to be a HGV restriction through town now let alone when the roads built, Asda trucks use it as a short cut instead of driving on the M1.

**Response:**

Policy L1 5 refers to the introduction of traffic management measures.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

5556 **Mr Philip Ashton [6052]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

New Mway bridge is in the wrong place. Dumping traffic on the A426 Leicester road at this point in the middle of new housing development. The opportunity for this was lost when housing development was permitted right up to the road side verges on Bill Crane Way thus preventing the completion of a proper Bypass.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Move the Bridge further North make it fully interconnected with the M1 and continue the bypass to the A5.

**Response:**

A fully interconnected junction in the location described is unlikely to be acceptable to Highways England. Its impacts cannot be predicted without further modelling and it is likely to create viability problems. It is too late to provide an alternative by-pass route along Bill Crane Way.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5558 Mr Philip Ashton [6052]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Required at the Start of the development

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Required at the start of the development

**Response:**

It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. It may also not be physically possible because of the need for a CPO. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5759 Dr Stuart Rimmington [5143]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The traffic around Lutterworth is already bad. The proposal not to increase the road network until after a very high occupancy rate is absurd.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Improve the road network at a much lower occupancy rate. Smaller developments around the county to minimise the impact to one area.

**Response:**

Junction improvements on existing roads would be done in advance of the development's commencement. It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this. Traffic modelling indicates that the spine road will result in reductions in traffic through the town centre in the long term. Smaller developments around the county were rejected as an unsustainable option that would not deliver the quantity of dwellings required.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5831 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Parish Council is concerned that delaying the completion of the spine road until 1250 house have been constructed (2029 approximately) will be contrary to policy IN1.1 as the infrastructure provision will not be in place until a substantial proportion of the site has already been developed.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

Evidence submitted by the promoter demonstrates that up to 1290 dwellings could be delivered off the southern access road and Gilmorton Road, so the policy does not contradict Policy IN1 1. It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. It may also not be physically possible because of the need for a CPO. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5832 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposal will be contrary to Key Issue 8 and policy IN2.g as delayed provision of the spine road will have an adverse impact on the Air Quality Management area in Lutterworth town centre.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

Traffic modelling shows that in the long term there would be a reduction in traffic and air pollution in Lutterworth town centre. It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. It may also not be physically possible because of the need for a CPO. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this. Evidence submitted by the promoter demonstrates that up to 1290 dwellings could be delivered off the southern access road and Gilmorton Road.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5833 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Parish Council notes that the main road through the development site between the A426 north of Lutterworth and the A4304 to the east of Lutterworth is described as a spine road (policyL1.3.m) rather than the Lutterworth Eastern by-pass, the provision of which was the prime factor on which previous support for the development was based. The access via a traffic light controlled junction is likely to discourage drivers from using the spine road, the design standard of which is lower than previously detailed.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

There was no previous proposal for a dual carriageway by-pass and so no down-grading to a spine road. No decisions have yet been made on the design of the junction with the A426 which is a matter for the masterplan and / or planning application. The junction design and signage should be such as to encourage through traffic along the new spine road rather than through the town centre.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6026 **Mr David Jones [4742]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

Early completion of the relief road utilising Cauldwell Lane and the existing bridge over the M1 motorway to reduce traffic and air pollution in Lutterworth town centre.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The relief road to be constructed before completion of any dwellings on the East of Lutterworth. The northern section relief road to utilize an upgraded Cauldwell Lane from its junction with the A426 and use the existing bridge over the M1 motorway.

**Response:**

Traffic modelling shows that in the long term there would be a reduction in traffic and air pollution in Lutterworth town centre. It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. It may also not be physically possible because of the need for a CPO. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this. Evidence submitted by the promoter demonstrates that up to 1290 dwellings could be delivered off the southern access road and Gilmorton Road. Use of Cauldwell Lane would involve more land not in the control of the developers, increase the length and therefore the cost of the relief road and make the alternative route less attractive to HGVs diverting from the town centre because of its length.

---

**ReplD** **Representation**

**Nature**

6081 **Mr Brian Poulter [4826]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

With the increase of traffic at the site the town centre will be 10 grid-locked & 20 suffer from poor air quality much higher than the current unacceptable level.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The spine road to be established before the housing build begins. This road therefore takes the traffic load away from Lutterworth town centre. Also close off the far end of Gilmorton Road again to remove the additional traffic from the town centre.

**Response:**

Traffic modelling shows that in the long term there would be a reduction in traffic and air pollution in Lutterworth town centre. It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. It may also not be physically possible because of the need for a CPO. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this. Evidence submitted by the promoter demonstrates that up to 1290 dwellings could be delivered off the southern access road and Gilmorton Road. Gilmorton Road will be closed to general traffic across the motorway once the spine road is complete.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6360 Cotesbach Parish Council (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6283]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The 'spine road' needs to be fit for purpose, i.e enable Town Centre traffic reduction, and be committed to earlier than 1,250 dwellings - this will be almost when the development is complete and traffic levels are too high.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

reduce the new road threshold to 300 as per other thresholds.

**Response:**

It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. It may also not be physically possible because of the need for a CPO. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this. Evidence submitted by the promoter demonstrates that up to 1290 dwellings could be delivered off the southern access road and Gilmorton Road. The design of the spine road should be such as to enable it to perform as a relief road while not creating an impassable barrier to pedestrian and cycle movement within the SDA. This is a matter for the master plan and / or a planning application. The trigger of 1250 dwellings is 45% of the full scheme, which is not 'almost complete'.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6447 Mrs Deborah Martin [5112]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Would just like to comment that this solution would be short sighted and short lived. Surely there is case to construct an additional junction for the M1 to the south of Leicester thus alleviating traffic through Lutterworth accessing Junction 20 and decreasing capacity to the already congested Junction 21. This would be more efficient in terms of financial cost and loss of land.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Examine alternative options

**Response:**

The suggestion for an additional junction further north as described is being considered as part of the post 2031 Strategic Growth Plan. However, this could not be delivered as part of the East of Lutterworth SDA for viability and land ownership reasons. This is not ruled out by the SDA proposed and a future review of the Local Plan could consider the implications of such a junction for possible further development and highway provision at East of Lutterworth.

---

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6518 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* spine road not in place until site substantially developed, contrary to policy IN1.1
- \* delayed provision of the spine road will have an adverse impact on Lutterworth AQMA (contrary to Key Issue 8, policy IN2.g)
- \*main road described as a spine road not Lutterworth Eastern by-pass, the provision of which was the basis of previous support for the development.
- \*design standard of spine road likely to discourage use and is lower than previously detailed.
- \*only 'some relief to through traffic within Lutterworth town centre'
- \*concern Para 15.2.16 might further delay or down grade quality of the spine road.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

None stated

**Response:**

Evidence submitted by the promoter demonstrates that up to 1290 dwellings could be delivered off the southern access road and Gilmorton Road, so the policy does not contradict Policy IN1 1. It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this. A high speed by-pass on the route currently shown would have an adverse impact on the proposed SDA and its links with Lutterworth town centre, although detailed work on the scale, design and exact alignment of the spine road would be done as part of the master plan. Traffic modelling indicates that the spine road will result in reductions in traffic through the town centre in the long term.

---



**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

6628 Cllr Geraldine Robinson [2493]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Importance of providing a by-pass around Lutterworth or at least a dual carriageway.

Lutterworth Town Council supported the SDA in principle, based on a dual carriageway (now down-graded to a spine road) being constructed in the early stages of development to alleviate air pollution and traffic congestion.

Consideration should be given to imminent future housing development on the A426 in Blaby District and the emerging growth plan. This housing intensification will add to the problems of an already congested A426 especially at times of Magna Park shift changes. Traffic congestion is having an effect as far away as Rugby.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

L1 East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area - Re-evaluate the decision to down grade the by-pass to a spine road in view of the future housing development in Blaby District in the emerging growth plan.

THIS PLAN SEEM TO FOCUS ON ADDING TO THE ALREADY EXISTING NEGATIVE EFFECT OF GYPSY, TRAVELLER AND SHOWMAN'S PROVISION, MAGNA PARK AND WIND TURBINES BY INCREASING THIS PROVISION RATHER THAN EXERCISING A FAIR GEORGRAPHICAL SPREAD.

**Response:**

There was no previous proposal for a dual carriageway by-pass and so no down grading to a spine road. It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. It may also not be physically possible because of the need for a CPO. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this. The emerging Strategic Growth Plan covers the period from 2031 and any proposals in it are still at an early stage. They are certainly not 'imminent'. Any need for an upgrading of the by-pass cannot be taken into account in the Local Plan, but would need to be considered by traffic modelling at such time as this Local Plan is reviewed. The issues of Gypsy and Traveller sites, Magna Park and wind turbines are not relevant to this Policy.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7033 Ullesthorpe Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [5370]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* spine road is not due to be constructed early enough in the development
- \* infrastructure not in place until 45% of the development is complete
- \* contradicts Policy 11
- \* previous support of the development was based on the implementation of a by-pass which has now been down-graded to a spine road
- \* delaying implementation will impact the Air Quaility Management Area in Lutterworth Town Centre

**Change To Plan Sought:**

If development must take place implementation of the originally proposed by-pass or at the least earlier implementation of the spine road.

**Response:**

It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. It may also not be physically possible because of the need for a CPO. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this. Evidence submitted by the promoter demonstrates that up to 1290 dwellings could be delivered off the southern access road and Gilmorton Road, so the policy does not contradict Policy IN1 1. There was no previous proposal for a dual carriageway by-pass and so no down grading to a spine road.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7041 SWINFORD Parish Council (Katherine Clarke) [2678]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* spine road is not going to be implemented until 45% of the proposed development is in place
- \* traffic issues already exist, the spine road is required much earlier
- \* previous support for the development was based upon the implementation of a by-pass which has now been down-graded to a spine road
- \* delaying implementation will adversely affect the Air Quality Management Area in Lutterworth town centre

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Upgrade proposed spine road to the by-pass originally consulted on. If the spine road goes ahead implement it at an earlier stage of the development.

**Response:**

It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. It may also not be physically possible because of the need for a CPO. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this. A high speed by-pass on the route currently shown would have an adverse impact on the proposed SDA and its links with Lutterworth town centre, although detailed work on the scale, design and exact alignment of the spine road would be done as part of the master plan. Traffic modelling indicates that the spine road will result in reductions in traffic through the town centre in the long term.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7136 North Kilworth Parish Council (Mrs Katherine Clarke) [6469]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

- \* spine road is not going to be implemented until 45% of the proposed development is in place
- \* traffic issues already exist, the spine road is required much earlier
- \* previous support for the development was based upon the implementation of a by-pass which has now been down-graded to a spine road
- \* delaying implementation will adversely affect the Air Quality Management Area in Lutterworth town centre

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Upgrade proposed spine road to the by-pass originally consulted on. If the spine road goes ahead implement it at an earlier stage of the development.

**Response:**

It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this. A high speed by-pass on the route currently shown would have an adverse impact on the proposed SDA and its links with Lutterworth town centre, although detailed work on the scale, design and exact alignment of the spine road would be done as part of the master plan. Traffic modelling indicates that the spine road will result in reductions in traffic through the town centre in the long term.

**RepID Representation**

7298 Mrs Jaqueline Strong [4069]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

A426 at capacity and roads inadequate to support increased traffic, bottlenecks likely at Gibbett and Whittle roundabouts. Proposed bypass for SDA comes too late in the process.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Build bypass road (if development approved) earlier in project.

**Response:**

Junction improvements are proposed in advance of development. It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. It may also not be physically possible because of the need for a CPO. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this.

---

**RepID Representation**

7631 Mr Michael Bates [6242]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed "spine road" bypass, north of Lutterworth, shown on the plans is to serve the new Lutterworth East development and is not proposed until a threshold number of houses are constructed. It is my understanding that there is no budget in the national roads plan to support the road outside the confines of the Lutterworth East development. The new road will not therefore reduce the through traffic in Lutterworth and in fact during construction of Lutterworth East the volume of heavy traffic will increase to serve the needs of the site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The addition of a major A road by-pass for Lutterworth with restrictions on heavy goods through traffic will vastly improve the centre of Lutterworth. This in turn will enable the town character to be maintained as a social, professional services (Banks, solicitors, social services etc) and amenity retail hub for the area. This would complement Market Harborough in the east and Rugby in the west. Its adjacency to the M1 could then be exploited in a more sustainable manner.

**Response:**

Traffic modelling shows that in the long term there would be a reduction in traffic and air pollution in Lutterworth town centre as a result of the spine road, the exact design of which is yet to be determined. It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this. This is from a different source than the national roads plan. The policy includes the provision of traffic management measures in Lutterworth town centre .

---

**RepID** **Representation**

5796 Mr. Peter Ernest Kay Fuchs [6124]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I support the development of East Lutterworth on the basic premise that it is the means to provide bypass possibilities for HGVs, removing them from passing through central Lutterworth, where there is a serious problem with pollution. So it is important that the spine road is provided at the earliest opportunity, certainly within the first 3-5 years of the housing development despite the reluctance of developers to do this at the early stage. The provision of the spine road as a bypass will also help access for housing development without causing even more disruption where Gilmorton Road meets Leicester Road.

**Response:**

It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. It may also not be physically possible because of the need for a CPO. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this.

**RepID** **Representation**

6836 Mrs Jacqueline Smethurst-Todd [4096]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This should not be done as it will increase traffic through Gilmorton village. My reasoning behind this is that closing the Gilmorton road will cause people to cut through and head to Lutterworth through Gilmorton and up the Ullesthorpe road. Gilmorton cannot take anymore traffic. The roads are stuggling already and the Ullesthorpe road is dangerous already.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This road needs to be kept open It is the centre of Lutterworth is the place that needs sorting!

**Response:**

Gilmorton Road across the M1 will only close to general traffic once the new spine road is in place. The diversion described is not likely to be as attractive as the new road. While the traffic modelling does show impacts on Gilmorton village, this is not as a direct result of the Gilmorton Road closure.

**RepID** **Representation**

6361 Cotesbach Parish Council (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6283]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This needs to include a regular bus service to local train stations as currently Lutterworth is highly dependent on the road network. The 2015 Sustainability Assessment recognised a risk with the Lutterworth SDA being so far from a train station, but this has not been addressed within the Local Plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not only consider a bus service within Lutterworth but also the rural communities surrounding it,

**Response:**

Establishment of bus services, other than through a Section 106 directly related to the development, is outside the scope of the Local Plan.

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

7300 Mrs Jaqueline Strong [4069]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Town centre is not appropriate for increased traffic use, extra affordable car parking needed and associated public transport needs addressing. No plans for reducing air pollution. Plan unsustainable due to non-consideration of traffic movement and public transport arrangements.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Introduce weight limit (no HGVs) and speed limit (40 mph) on A426 between Whittle roundabout and Gibbet roundabout to protect the rural, historic settlement of Cotesbach.

**Response:**

Policy L1 5 allows for the introduction of traffic management measures following completion of the spine road, in order to reduce traffic, especially HGVs, and air pollution in Lutterworth town centre. However the proposed weight and speed limits would probably be outside the scope of this. Cotesbach is already by-passed by the Rugby Road. Other than this, traffic management is outside the scope of the Local Plan.

---

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

5554 Mr Philip Ashton [6052]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

This Traffic island is not fit for purpose already and traffic lights will not fix the issue.. Made worse by the permitted change in use from Office to Distribution Warehouse. The effects of which we are yet to experience..

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Proper North East bypass required

**Response:**

A major redevelopment of the Frank Whittle roundabout will create a new traffic light controlled junction. Traffic modelling demonstrates that the additional traffic can be accommodated by this new junction. It is not clear what is meant by a 'proper North East bypass' but this appears to be a matter for national strategic highway planning and so outside the scope of this Local Plan.

---

**ReplID Representation**

**Nature**

5555 Mr Philip Ashton [6052]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Frank Whittle traffic island is not fit for purpose now, let alone with all the planned developments in and around Lutterworth. A recent minor traffic hiccup on this island closed the M1 in both directions within an hour. The effect of a recent change of use from Offices to Warehousing granted to a new development between this island and M1 J19 island are yet to be felt. Traffic lights will not fix it.

Fully interconnected North East by pass required

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Fully interconnected Lutterworth North East bypass from M1 J19 to the A5 is required

**Response:**

A major redevelopment of the Frank Whittle roundabout will create a new traffic light controlled junction. Traffic modelling demonstrates that the additional traffic can be accommodated by this new junction. It is not clear what is meant by a 'fully interconnected Lutterworth North east bypass' but this appears to be a matter for national strategic highway planning and so outside the scope of this Local Plan.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5557 Mr Philip Ashton [6052]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Fully interconnected Lutterworth North East bypass from M1 J19 to the A5 is required and will mean no changes at Bill Crane way are required

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Fully interconnected Lutterworth North East bypass from M1 J19 to the A5 is required

**Response:**

It is not clear what is meant by a 'fully interconnected Lutterworth North east bypass' but this appears to be a matter for national strategic highway planning and so outside the scope of this Local Plan.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5347 Mr Roger Arnold [5849]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

why wasn't this carried out when the new housing estate was being built, the existing junction is already a safety issue. this should be carried out before any new houses get built.

**Response:**

The proposed junction improvement at Bill Crane Way would be carried out when required by the SDA proposal and not to serve other unconnected development. It is proposed at the same time as the first phase of residential development.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6521 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We consider that it is imperative that the detailed ecological assessment of the Misterton marshes site is completed before any development is begun on the site.

**Response:**

This is covered by Policy L 3 u l and by Policy G15 and will be a matter for consideration as part of the planning application.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7528 Natural England (Mr Sean Mahoney) [4428]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We have already provided comments on previous iterations of the Local Plan and have nothing further to add here except to welcome the commitment to continue to liaise with Natural England, the Environment Agency, the Lead Local Flood Authority and other stakeholders over the mitigation measures to protect the integrity of Misterton Marshes SSSI from any impacts arising from the proposed East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area. As a statutory consultee, we would also expect to be consulted on the associated planning applications.

**Response:**

Noted

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6489 **Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The local authority does not appear to be giving the natural environment the priority or protection that the NPPF identifies it should, especially as there are alternative less damaging locations.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Carry out a full and detailed hydrological model and risk assessment to check for any potential negative impacts on Misterton Marshes SSSI and its sensitive hydrology. The local authority would also need to be entirely confident that measures can be implemented and maintained (in perpetuity) to protect the highly delicate hydrology that is integral to Misterton Marshes SSSI.

**Response:**

This has been undertaken as part of the Feasibility Study referred to in the Supporting Information. It will also be a matter for consideration as part of the Master Plan and/ or planning application/ S106 agreement. A minor change could be considered to the Explanation in paragraph 15.2.5 to refer to the Feasibility Study.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5836 **MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

Misterton with Walcote Parish Council SUPPORTS the policies L1.3.jiii and L1.3.u which aims to protect greenspaces, woodland and the Misterton Marshes SSSI within the site. Although paragraph 15.2.25 promises that Harborough District Council will consider a detailed ecological assessment of the site, Misterton with Walcote Parish Council considers it imperative such survey be completed before any development is begun on the site.

**Response:**

Noted. This will be a matter for the master plan and/ or planning application.

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5838 **MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

In addition, we urge careful consideration be given to the siting of development in relation to St Leonard's Church Misterton, a grade 2\* building.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

A Heritage Impact Assessment demonstrates that no overriding heritage constraints to the proposals have been identified, although sensitive design is recommended to minimise the degree of harm to the Church of St Leonard.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6523 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

We urge careful consideration be given to the siting of development in relation to St Leonard's Church Misterton, a grade 2\* building.

**Response:**

A Heritage Impact Assessment demonstrates that no overriding heritage constraints to the proposals have been identified, although sensitive design is recommended to minimise the degree of harm to the Church of St Leonard.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5837 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Parish Council is concerned that land proposed for development lies within the floodplain of the River Swift, an area frequently subject to flooding. Consequently, poorly designed development may impede the flow of the stream, causing problems within our parish.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

The area concerned is proposed for a Community Park and will include flood storage measures as discussed with the Environment Agency. This is matter for consideration as part of the master plan and planning application.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6522 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Parish Council is concerned that land proposed for development lies within the floodplain of the River Swift, an area frequently subject to flooding. Consequently, poorly designed development may impede the flow of the stream, causing problems within our parish.

**Response:**

The area concerned is proposed for a Community Park and will include flood storage measures as discussed with the Environment Agency. This is matter for consideration as part of the master plan and planning application.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7098 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

The Environment Agency specifically supports the incorporation of flood storage to reduce flood risk downstream and is willing to work with our professional partners and other stakeholders in respect of the aims stated in (v).

**Response:**

Noted. This will be done as part of the work on the master plan.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7323 Severn Trent Water (Rebecca McLean) [6157]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

It is likely that a new pumped rising main will be required to take flows from the development under the M1 to Lutterworth. There are a number of flooding and pollution incidents related to the Fox Inn CSO which flows from the development will flow through. The size of the development means that issues in this location will be worsened and alterations to the network are likely to be required.

Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: HIGH

**Response:**

Noted. This is a matter for the masteplan and the IDP, as well as any planning application. Allowance has been made for the costs in the IDP and the viability study.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5888 LANDOWNWER CONSORTIUM FOR EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA [6054]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Air Quality (y)

The delivery of the spine road for East of Lutterworth SDA will facilitate a reduction in traffic passing through Lutterworth town centre and consequent concentrations of air pollution. However, the Consortium has concerns as to the specific wording 'no moderate or worse adverse impact' in respect of impacts of the Lutterworth AQMA. This phraseology is not consistent with national policy which is concerned with preventing 'unacceptable levels' of air pollution (see bullet point 5 of paragraph 109 of the Framework).

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Revise in accordance with para. 109 of the Framework.

**Response:**

The NPPF wording is not measurable, since the term 'unacceptable' is not defined. The wording in the policy gives such definition, and so is consistent with the NPPF. This is explained in paragraph 15.2.22.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5509 LUTTERWORTH TOWN COUNCIL Parish Council (Andrew Ellis) [2656]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The policies would not need to be safeguarded if the spine road is completed before the housing development using the Cauldwell Lane Bridge proposal

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove Policy

**Response:**

Use of Cauldwell Lane would involve more land not in the control of the developers, increase the length and therefore the cost of the relief road and make the alternative route less attractive to HGVs diverting from the town centre because of its length.

<u>RepID</u>	<u>Representation</u>	<u>Nature</u>
5510	<p><b>LUTTERWORTH TOWN COUNCIL Parish Council (Andrew Ellis) [2656]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> no scope for emergency vehicles - air quality standards within the Town Centre have been significantly exceeded for over a decade by existing traffic levels.</p> <p><b>Change To Plan Sought:</b> Following completion of the spine road, in partnership with County Highway Authority and the SDA promoters, the Council will develop traffic management measures that remove or minimise the passage of heavy goods vehicles through the centre of Lutterworth without impeding emergency vehicles, as part of the implementation of an effective air quality mitigation strategy for the Air Quality Management Area in Lutterworth town centre.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Reference to emergency vehicles is unnecessary since this is a detailed matter, alongside others, which will be considered as part of the traffic management proposals .</p>	Object
5839	<p><b>MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> Misterton with Walcote Council is concerned that the Plan has no overall strategic view of transport issues throughout the District, including the intergration of traffic generated by different policies. We are concerned that the cumulative effect of these allocations may have unforeseen consequences for the road network which have not been addressed.</p> <p><b>Change To Plan Sought:</b> ?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The Local Plan's proposals have had regard to transport modelling by consultants for the promoters at Lutterworth (AECOM), HDC's consultants (Jacobs) and consultants working jointly with HDC and Oadby and Wigston BC (Edwards and Edwards), all in consultation with LCC's transport planners and using LCC's transport model (LLITM). Cumulative effects have been taken into account.</p>	Object
5835	<p><b>MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]</b></p> <p><b>Representation Summary:</b> Misterton with Walcote Parish Council SUPPORTS the policy L1.5 to minimise the number of heavy vehicles passing through Lutterworth town centre.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Noted</p>	Support

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6362 Cotesbach Parish Council (Dr Edmund Hunt) [6283]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Lowering the threshold of completed houses before the spine road is built will support this policy to ensure that Lutterworth has an opportunity to be enhanced more quickly.

**Response:**

It would not be viable to deliver the whole spine road in advance of the development or at an earlier stage. It may also not be physically possible because of the need for a CPO. Public sector funding is being sought to enable earlier provision of the M1 crossing and spine road completion but the plan cannot rely on this. Evidence submitted by the promoter demonstrates that up to 1290 dwellings could be delivered off the southern access road and Gilmorton Road.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6519 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Support minimising the number of HGV's passing through Lutterworth Town centre.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5419 Mr Neil Gladstone [5962]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

I welcome this development 100% if commercial gain is secondary to getting it right for this part of south west Leicestershire. Lutterworth would benefit from the removal of "bulky" traffic from it's thoroughfare as long as "free parking" is provided to ensure the towns high streets are diverted past. I moved to Lutterworth (but now live in Ullesthorpe) because of its appeal as a small market town and that should be its identity, even as it grows to become a large market town. Additional thought should be given to the provision of central sports facilities.

**Response:**

Noted. Diversion of traffic via East of Lutterworth SDA will provide the opportunity to improve the town centre in the long term.

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**

6183 Mr Michael Bates [6242]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The local plan does not address the problem of heavy goods traffic passing through Lutterworth. The increase in construction traffic resulting from the plan and the omission of a major A road by-pass will condemn the existing area of Lutterworth to a run down polluted dormitory of the proposed Lutterworth East development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The addition of a major A road by-pass for Lutterworth with restrictions on heavy goods through traffic will vastly improve the centre of Lutterworth. This in turn will enable the town character to be maintained as a social, professional services (Banks, solicitors, social services etc) and amenity retail hub for the area. This would complement Market Harborough in the east and Rugby in the west. Its adjacency to the M1 could then be exploited in a more sustainable manner.

**Response:**

Development of the East of Lutterworth SDA will provide a new spine road linking the A426 to the A4304. This road is predicted to remove some of the through traffic currently travelling through the centre of Lutterworth in the long term.

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**

6490 Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

COMMENTING ON SECTION 15.2.7 HERE AS THE FORM DOES NOT ALLOW COMMENTS ON THAT SECTION

We agree with this, and would like to see evidence that the development would not pose an unacceptable risk to the natural environment, in particular Misterton Marshes SSSI. To be confident of that, a full and detailed hydrological model and risk assessment would need to be undertaken before the site is allocated.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Would like to see evidence that the development would not pose an unacceptable risk to the natural environment, in particular Misterton Marshes SSSI. To be confident of that, a full and detailed hydrological model and risk assessment would need to be undertaken before the site is allocated.

**Response:**

The Feasibility Study for Misterton Marshes SSSI has been accepted by Natural England as demonstrating that any impacts on the SSSI can be satisfactorily managed. Further information would be required as part of the masterplanning/ planning application process.

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**

6492 Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust (Claire Install) [6217]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

COMMENTING ON SECTION 15.2.14

Please note that amenity grassland should not be included as wildlife habitat or linking habitats. It is part of Green Infrastructure but will not suffice for habitat in habitat connections or habitat connectivity mapping - an exercise that paragraph 117 of the NPPF recommends planning policies should do.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Separate amenity grassland (sports pitches) from habitats of value for wildlife to avoid confusion.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5834 MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE Parish Council (Cathy Walsh) [2659]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Paragraph 15.2.16 suggests the road will facilitate only 'some relief to through traffic within Lutterworth town centre' and is concerned that 'currently unforeseen circumstances' might further delay or down grade the quality of the spine road.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

?

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7224 Leicester City Council (Mr Jeevan Dhesi) [6399]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Page 195 / 201 (para 15.2.21) - the Transport Assessment produced for Lutterworth SDA will need to consider if there are any strategic impacts, particularly to Leicester.

**Response:**

The transport study undertaken by Edwards and Edwards for SE Leicester City showed very little interaction between Lutterworth and roads in this part of Leicester.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7113 Environment Agency (Mr Nick Wakefield) [5127]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Whilst the Environment Agency supports paragraphs 15.2.23 to 15.2.26 we note that there is no mention of the need to protect the quality of groundwater in the area during the development of and for the lifetime of the development. We would welcome inclusion of this requirement within the explanatory text.

**Response:**

Noted. The issue is covered by Policy IN4.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5559 Mr Philip Ashton [6052]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

No evidence of requirement

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Not required

**Response:**

HEDNA states the minimum future requirement for employment land to 2031.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6901 Mr Graham Logan [4816]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Not only are we threatened with the immense Magna Park plans but also the intention to build other developments, which will irretrievably erode the rural segregation between Cotesbach and Magna Park and Lutterworth.

HDC's Local Plan seems intent on destroying the pleasant Swift Valley rurality between our village and the massive Magna Park "spaceships" to the north west, which light up the night sky in our village.

All of this makes a mockery of Leicestershire's claim to be the Heart of Rural England!

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Do not develop in or around the Swift Valley between Cotesbach and Magna Park & Lutterworth.

PLEASE.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7221 Mrs Elaine Chapman [6416]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The map doesn't seem to show the correct location for this site?

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Show the correct map on the consultation

**Response:**

Policy L2 in the online PS LP document published for consultation is incorrectly linked to the site for L1 on policies map. The error will be corrected.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7264 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Outline planning consent has been granted and accordingly it should be regarded as an existing commitment for the purposes of the Local Plan.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Outline planning consent has been granted and accordingly it should be regarded as an existing commitment for the purposes of the Local Plan.

**Response:**

The site is identified as an allocation on the Policies Map in preference to a commitment as its delivery is relied upon to meet land requirements to 2031. Para 6.1.13 acknowledges that several allocated sites, including this site, have the benefit of outline planning consent.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7324 **Severn Trent Water (Rebecca McLean) [6157]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

It is likely that a new pumped rising main will be required to take flows from the development under the M1 to Lutterworth. There are a number of flooding and pollution incidents related to the Fox Inn CSO which flows from the development will flow through. The size of the development means that issues in this location will be worsened and alterations to the network are likely to be required.

Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: LOW

**Response:**

Noted

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6074 **Shire Homes [6203]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

As indicated in my clients representations on policy H1 (4) (reference 6070), there is a concern that the allocation of land at Arnesby Road, Fleckney for 130 dwellings without reference to the work being undertaken on the Neighbourhood Plan risks a lack of co-ordination between this document and the emerging Local Plan. Furthermore, it is evident from the proposed Housing Trajectory that the Council do not envisage commencement of development on the Arnesby Road site until 2023-4. This indicates that there may be issues with the delivery of this site which would delay or prevent its development.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

As indicated in rep 6070, modify the Plan to allow the choice of allocated site in Fleckney to be made by the Parish Council as part of the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan or alternatively, allocate both sites at Arnesby Road and High Street

**Response:**

Policy F1 allocates a proposal for up to 130 dwellings, of a total allocation for Fleckney of 295 dwellings (Policy H1). This allows for additional development of sites for a further 165 dwellings in Fleckney outside of the single allocated site. The additional dwellings are able to be put forward through a Neighbourhood Plan. The Housing Trajectory demonstrates expected commencement dates for each site, based on an assessment of likely issues affecting delivery.

---

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**

6399 Catesby Property Group (Mr Edward Barrett) [5772]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy F1 is unsound. The proposed allocation is not deliverable. Land south of Kilby Road as promoted by Catesby Estates is deliverable and should be allocated.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

In order to make the Plan sound, Policy F1 should be amended to allocate land south of Kilby Road, Fleckney for 150 homes. The site is situated to the west of Fleckney, accessed from Priest Meadow. It has capacity for 150 dwellings. The site is well located for local services and facilities in Fleckney village centre and was judged to be deliverable over 0 to 5 years in the SHLAA. The SHLAA identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Fleckney.

Accompanying these representations is a Vision Framework for the proposed residential allocation on land south of Kilby Road, Fleckney. A separate Location Plan for the site is also enclosed. The enclosed Vision Framework demonstrates that the 7 hectare site is deliverable and capable of appropriately accommodating up to 150 dwellings.

**Response:**

Noted. No additional information provided over deliverability of site F1.

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**

7245 Leicestershire County Council (Mrs Sharon Wiggins) [5137]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy F1 includes no reference to securing suitable contributions for educational facilities. It may be that the intention is that this is covered by Policy IN1 - Infrastructure Provision, however whilst this policy refers to the Leicestershire Planning Obligations Policy (LPOP), it only does so in terms of waste, it does not refer to education.

**Response:**

Covered by Policy IN1.

**RepID** **Representation****Nature**

5370 Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd [5909]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed allocation at Fleckney results in a significant development on high quality best and most versatile agricultural land, which other sustainable alternative sites do not. National policy requires that the significant release of high quality agricultural land can only be justified where there are no such alternatives.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The proposed allocation at Land off Arnesby Road should be deleted and replaced with the Land at Fleckney Road. However, if there is a need for additional development to that at Land at Fleckney Road, there may be a case for maintaining the proposed allocation as well.

**Response:**

Natural England Agricultural Land Classification map shows all land surrounding Fleckney identified as Grade 3 agricultural land (good to moderate). Grade 3 is not shown as subdivided between grade 3a and 3b.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7430 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Gladman support the allocation of Land off Arnesby Road, Fleckney for residential development and can confirm that the site is available, achievable and deliverable. adoption. However, both of the fields that directly adjoin Arnesby Road are unavailable for development because of ownership issues and a restrictive covenant which precludes built development. It is therefore considered that the allocation as shown on the Policies Map should be amended to reflect the above (see Appendix 1 of attached document). Gladman consider that 160 units can be accommodated on the site.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend allocations as shown on Policies Map and increase capacity of site to 160 units.

**Response:**

Noted. Change to allocation boundary. No change to capacity of site as expressed in the policy.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6448 Mrs Deborah Martin [5112]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Arnesby Road is already too narrow to accommodate larger vehicles and potential increase in traffic from the village center and from the west would increase an existing problem.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Access via Manor Road and Elisabeth Road.

**Response:**

Noted. Policy F1 b states that necessary highways works and sustainable transport measures in accordance with an approved transport assessment and travel plan, including integrating public footpaths crossing the site into the design and layout of the site for the development to be permitted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7431 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Gladman object to Criterion (f) of Policy F1 as it precludes the provision of large retention ponds on site to deal with surface water drainage. There is no definition in the Policy as to what the Council would consider to be 'large' and therefore the clause is ambiguous and difficult to implement. In addition, as the drainage strategy for the site is still being worked up, there is no indication as yet as to what the most appropriate drainage strategy is. There is no reasoning included within the supporting text to Policy F1 as to why a large retention pond would not be appropriate.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

this requirement should either be removed from Policy F1 or flexibility should be added to state that large retention ponds should be avoided if possible.

**Response:**

Noted.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7325 Severn Trent Water (Rebecca McLean) [6157]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Foul flows from the development will join a 225 mm dia pipe at the back of properties on Main St. Surface water from the development will drain to the local watercourse. There is one pollution recorded at the watercourse D/S from the development. There is one flooding incident further D/S. Potential impact on the sewerage infrastructure: LOW

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7326 Severn Trent Water (Rebecca McLean) [6157]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Flows from the site are likely to drain to Cobwells Cl. There are no flooding or pollution incidents recorded. Potential impact on the sewerage infrastructure: LOW

**Response:**

Noted

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5396 KIBWORTH HARCOURT Parish Council (Dr Kevin Feltham) [3789]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Incorrect description of the settlement - it consists of two parishes/villages not one.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Kibworths straddle the A6 lying some 7 miles north west of Market Harborough and 9 miles south east of Leicester city centre. The settlement comprises 2 parishes, Kibworth Beauchamp and Kibworth Harcourt. The cores of both parishes have Conservation Area status. Kibworth Beauchamp has a good range of shops, services and facilities, including a secondary school, along with some employment opportunities in both villages. There are bus services to Leicester and Market Harborough, but the settlement's railway station closed in 1968.

**Response:**

Noted but the 2 separate parishes comprise one village entity in the settlement hierarchy. No change proposed.

**RepID Representation**

5397 KIBWORTH HARCOURT Parish Council (Dr Kevin Feltham) [3789]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Alter number of houses completed in 17.1.2 from over 400 to over 600  
Replace almost 450 with more than 450 further homes (actually 464 as this is written)

**Change To Plan Sought:**

There have been over 600 dwellings completed since 2011 and there are planning commitments for more than 450 further homes.

**Response:**

As of 31st March 2017, total completions for the Kibworth were 421, with commitments at 241 plus an additional 195 for Fleckney Road, Kibworth site. No need for wording change.

---

**RepID Representation**

7620 Armstrong Rigg Planning (Mr Geoff Armstrong) [4700]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed allocation of land to the South and West of Priory Business Park is supported but amendments are required to the policy and supporting text to ensure that it accurately reflects the provisions of the permitted scheme and would result in a viable development that meets the needs of the market. In its current form, the policy is considered ineffective and inconsistent with national policy as it places policy burdens on the site that threaten its ability to be viably developed (Enclosure 5);

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend Policy K1, point 1. to read:  
"1. The area of land south and west of Priory Business Park, Kibworth Harcourt, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for a mix of business, and light industrial and retail development (Use Classes A1, B1a, B1b, B1c, B2).

**Response:**

The inclusion of A1 is noted from the outline consent, however the proposed retail element is not required as part of the site allocation.

---

**RepID Representation**

6719 Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]

**Nature**

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We have no objection to the principle of development of this site for employment uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

This policy refers to an integrated approach to provision of SuDs and flood mitigation which is supported.

**Response:**

Noted

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7292 **Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mr Stewart Patience) [4571]**

**Support**

**Representation Summary:**

We have no objection to the principle of development of this site for employment uses. The Submission Local Plan includes Policy IN4 (Water resources and services) which requires applicants to demonstrate that foulwater treatment and disposal exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.

This policy refers to an integrated approach to provision of SuDs and flood mitigation which is supported.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

None. As the Local plan policies are intended to be read as a whole we do not consider that it is necessary to duplicate these requirements in this site specific policy.

**Response:**

Noted

---

**ReplID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7621 **Armstrong Rigg Planning (Mr Geoff Armstrong) [4700]**

**Object**

**Representation Summary:**

The proposed allocation of land to the South and West of Priory Business Park is supported but amendments are required to the policy and supporting text to ensure that it accurately reflects the provisions of the permitted scheme and would result in a viable development that meets the needs of the market. In its current form, the policy is considered ineffective and inconsistent with national policy as it places policy burdens on the site that threaten its ability to be viably developed (Enclosure 5);

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Amend the supporting text at paragraph 17.2.5 to read:

"17.2.5 The site is allocated for a mix of A1, B1a, B1b, B1c /B2 uses totalling approximately 12,500sq.m, with B1c/B2 uses expected to predominate.

Commercial units will range from approximately 100-1,000m<sup>2</sup> in size.

Ideally units will be flexible in size with the potential for neighbouring units to be joined together to cater for the needs of starter and expanding businesses"

Delete existing wording: "Provision of approximately 12,500sq.m of business floorspace in units ranging from 48sq.m to 140sq.m within a developable area of approximately 5.7hectares is envisaged to meet market demand"

**Response:**

Wording refers to the outline planning consent, but does not form part of the policy. The submitted Planning Statement states:

'The proposals have been designed to provide the specific type of employment space needed in Kibworth and the wider District, as identified through the Council's evidence base and through pre-application discussions with Officers. Whilst the layout is still indicative at this stage, it is proposed the commercial / industrial units will range in size from approximately 46m<sup>2</sup> (495ft<sup>2</sup>) to 140m<sup>2</sup> (1,500ft<sup>2</sup>) so as to respond to the demand for smaller units of between 500-1,500ft<sup>2</sup>.'

The inclusion of A1 is noted from the outline consent, however the proposed retail element is not required as part of the site allocation.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5442 Mrs Jan Butcher [4328]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

As set out in earlier comments, the Claybrookes does not meet the criteria for SRV status - Majority of households are not within an acceptable and safe walking distance of the school in Parva so unjustifiable designation

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Remove SRV status from the Claybrookes

**Response:**

The co-joining of the Claybrookes for this purpose recognises the importance of locating new housing development within acceptable and safe walking distance to a primary school. This serves to reduce potential car borne trips to primary school, thus reducing congestion, improving the health and wellbeing of young children and helping to sustain existing rural schools.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5811 Mr Paul Johnson [953]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The size of a settlement in terms of the number of households has no bearing whatsoever on its sustainability if the level of services within or nearby it (as per the Framework) to indicate the development is otherwise sustainable. In the absence of any specific justification or evidence to say that the number of households has any practical bearing or other constraint to housing delivery, it is unclear why this is being heralded as an additional barrier to housing delivery - so not being positively prepared as a result.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

This element should be omitted - household number has no bearing on sustainability of the levels and nature of services within and nearby to a village otherwise indicate the development is sustainable (as per the definition within the Framework).

**Response:**

The number of households is taken into account as a secondary consideration in a settlement's position in the hierarchy. The number of households in a settlement has a bearing on the potential support for local key services and community facilities and its overall sustainability.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6728 TILTON ON THE HILL Parish Council (Jenny Saville) [2686]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Tilton on the Hill and Halstead Parish Council seeks Tilton's re-classification as "Other Villages and Rural Settlements". Tilton does not have a GP surgery or primary school within acceptable walking distance. The library van calls monthly, 4 residents access this service, thus a threat of withdrawal. The post office is an outreach service in the foyer of our village hall two afternoons a week, the post office employee will be leaving with the possible closure of this facility. The public house closed on 20th July and will remain so for the foreseeable future. Tilton has a shop.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

We would with the re-classification of Tilton from Selected Rural Village to Other Villages and Rural Settlements

**Response:**

Closure of the public house is noted. However, the community has access to 2 key services within the village.

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7581 Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Thurnby & Bushby and Scraftoft are next to Leicester but have a poor transport links by bus. So access to 'a wide range of services, facilities and employment opportunities' requires a car. Object as unsound in relation to transport links.

**Response:**

Relative to other parts of the District Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby residents have access to reasonable bus services. Being close to Leicester urban areas means that distances travelled to access services, facilities and employment opportunities are less than from other parts of the District.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5609 STOUGHTON Parish Council (Coco Connor) [2677]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Stoughton Parish Council strongly support our inclusion under 'Other Villages and Rural Settlements' in Appendix F/

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6608 Mrs Linda Bryan [6238]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Planners have recognised inappropriate land designations; I hope the District Plan will allow for reasonable development within the village of Arnesby to ensure its future as a community rather than an exclusive private estate for the few.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

7514 Mr Steve Louth [5609]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

6. We support the identification of Gilmorton as a SRV which reflects the range of services and facilities available in the village and confirms its sustainability and suitability as a location for growth.

**Response:**

Noted.

---

**RepID Representation**

5371 Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd [5909]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

The Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year land supply and will need to identify additional deliverable sites within the Local Plan to stand any prospect of restoring and maintaining a five-year land supply in accordance with national policy.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

The Local Plan will need to allocate additional sites.

**Response:**

Appendix G sets out the expected annual housing delivery throughout the plan period. From 2018/9 and every year throughout the plan period, the housing trajectory demonstrates at least a five year supply of deliverable housing land.

**RepID Representation**

7243 Alpha Investments [6478]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Policy H1 identifies minimum housing requirements for the Selected Rural Villages, including Bitteswell (a minimum of 30). The fact that these are expressed as minimum requirements is supported as it incorporates a degree of flexibility into the policy. Marrons Planning does have concerns that the housing trajectory at Appendix G would not ensure a 5 year housing land supply on adoption and thinks this should be addressed by the Local Plan prior to submission to the Secretary of State.

**Response:**

Appendix G sets out the expected annual housing delivery throughout the plan period. From 2018/9 and every year throughout the plan period, the housing trajectory demonstrates at least a five year supply of deliverable housing land.

**RepID Representation**

7429 Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Agnew) [6504]

**Nature**

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Gladman consider that the large-scale sites allocated in the HLP have significant requirements for infrastructure and will take a considerable amount of time to deliver. It is considered that the Council's view on the number of units which will be delivered on each of the Strategic Development Areas (SDAs) by the end of the Plan period (2031) is ambitious especially in terms of the delivery rates in the latter part of the Plan period. It is considered that additional, small scale allocations should be made in the HLP to deliver housing in the short term, contributing to the Council's 5-year housing land supply and allowing small and medium sized housebuilders the opportunity to deliver sites in Harborough.

**Response:**

Appendix G sets out the expected annual housing delivery throughout the plan period. From 2018/9 and every year throughout the plan period, the housing trajectory demonstrates at least a five year supply of deliverable housing land. Assumptions concerning lead-in times, lapse rates and delivery rates are considered realistic and have taken account of timescales required to deliver necessary infrastructure.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7446 Home Builders Federation (Susan Green) [6519]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

It is also essential that the Council's assumptions on lead-in times, lapse rates and delivery rates for sites are realistic. These assumptions should be supported by parties responsible for delivery of housing and sense checked by the Council using historical empirical data and local knowledge. The Council should also consider the allocation of developable reserve sites together with an appropriate release mechanism as recommended by the LPEG Report.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Ensure trajectory is realistic and consider reserve site identification.

**Response:**

Appendix G sets out the expected annual housing delivery throughout the plan period. From 2018/9 and every year throughout the plan period, the housing trajectory demonstrates at least a five year supply of deliverable housing land. Assumptions concerning lead-in times, lapse rates and delivery rates are considered realistic.

**RepID Representation**

**Nature**

7582 Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We are pleased that the Thurnby and Bushby Conservation Area is reconfirmed (CA56). Support as plan meets the soundness requirements.

5614 STOUGHTON Parish Council (Coco Connor) [2677]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Stoughton Parish Council strongly support our inclusion within Table D25.

5615 STOUGHTON Parish Council (Coco Connor) [2677]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Stoughton Parish Council strongly support our continued inclusion under Appendix H Section 4 - Scheduled Monuments.

**Response:**

Noted.



**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

6109 HUSBANDS BOSWORTH Parish Council (Mrs J Fletcher) [2641]

Object

**Representation Summary:**

Appendix I does not mention Husbands Bosworth as having any Local Green Space designations.

**Change To Plan Sought:**

Please add Husbands Bosworth to the list. HDC sent us plans of our Local Green Space some time ago and it has not changed since then.

**Response:**

Husbands Bosworth did not provide any Local Green Space for designation. The HB NDP can designate Local Green Space.

---

**RepID** **Representation**

**Nature**

5612 STOUGHTON Parish Council (Coco Connor) [2677]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

Stoughton Parish Council strongly supports the inclusion of the two Local Green Spaces G14hh and G14ii as per Appendix I.

7583 Thurnby And Bushby Society (Mr Jeffrey Rosenthal) [2441]

Support

**Representation Summary:**

We agree with Local Green Spaces G14k, G14ll, G14mm. Support as plan meets the soundness requirements.

**Response:**

Noted.

---