Policy CS1: District Housing Provision
53 representations were made to this policy of which 8 were broadly in support of the housing provision and 15 considered the scale of housing provision as being too high. The reasons for latter included:
- Amount of development is in excess of local needs;
- insufficient jobs to meet housing growth;
- Increased commuting, traffic and pollution/CO2 emissions;
- Loss of greenfield land and biodiversity;
- Loss of quality of life;
- Largest house growth option has been chosen;
- Housing provision should be reviewed annually.

There were 26 representations which considered that the scale of housing provision was too low because:
- The housing provision does not accord with the East Midlands Regional Plan which makes provision for 510dw per annum and so is not in general conformity with the Regional Plan;
- More recent data suggests a higher housing provision;
- The provision is at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) objective of boosting housing supply;
- There is inconsistency between the level of housing and employment provision;
- There is no up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA);
- The plan does not meet the market and affordable housing needs of the district;
- Past completion rates are not a sound method of projecting housing needs;
- There is no agreed housing provision or distribution across the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA);
- Provision will not meet the full needs of the HMA. If the housing needs of the HMA are to be met this may result in other authorities making up the shortfall;
- Scale of development needs to increase to respond to delivery issues and social and economic problems;
- The GL Hearne Study was based on a limited range of options;
- Working Draft Sustainability Appraisal identified negative sustainability issues associated with this level of growth;
- Concerns about the need to make-up any past shortfall in housing provision.

There were 3 objections to the use of the term 'at least'.

Policy CS2: District Employment Provision
22 representations were received, with the majority supportive of the principle of the policy, although some queries were raised as to the amount of employment land proposed (there was a mathematical error in the Policy wording that has been corrected). Suggestions were made that a buffer should be applied to the amount of employment land required. Some queries raised by the development industry and residents about the relationship between level of employment land provision / distribution and existing and proposed level of housing land provision / distribution.

Policy CS3: East Midlands Airport
There were 15 representations to this policy. Of these 7 supported the overall approach made. The remaining 10 representations identified a number of concerns including the definition of airport related [or operational] development; a need to address odours from kerosene; failure to address the issue of general noise and its impact upon nearby areas; no clarification provided as to the limit to the amount of residential development in the vicinity of the airport and does not offer any mitigation for existing residents; policy too restrictive and fails to comply with the NPPF intentions to promote growth ; Part A too restricted and needs

more flexibility regarding the type of uses that will be allowed and concerns about the impact upon the local area, including the road network, and the loss of Greenfield land.

Policy CS4: Strategic Highway Network
6 representations were made to this Policy. Some support for the Policy and the reduction of traffic congestion generally but also concern that the cumulative impacts of developments have not been modelled; that cross-boundary issues have not been addressed; the Policy is not underpinned by an objective assessment of the Strategic Highway Network; lack of clarity on how improvements will be procured and completed or how they will impact on the determination of planning applications.

Policy CS5: Rail Infrastructure
6representations were made with general support for the policy and the reinstatement of a passenger rail line. 2 responses detailed that land should be protected for the railway line and for railway stations.

Policy CS6: Strategic Rail Freight Interchange
Some 377 representations were made to this policy of which 4 .were broadly in support of the SRFI policy including support from Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Council.
The remaining comments were objections, most of which were from residents in the Castle Donington, Hemington and Lockington area. The reasons for resident's objections included:
- Loss of greenfield land;
- Loss of high quality agricultural land;
- Other suitable sites are available, many of which are brownfield;
- Traffic impact;
- Air, noise and light pollution;
- Landscape impact;
- Lack of demand;
- Drainage and flood risk;
- Area already has to cope with East Midlands Airport, Donington Racetrack, East Midlands Distribution Centre and motorways;
- Development would be out of proportion to local communities;
- Impact on character of area principally through urbanisation;
- Impact on conservation areas and listed buildings;
- Impact on nature conservation;
- Loss of strategic green infrastructure;
- Loss of recreation land;
- Lack of job opportunities or unemployment is not a big problem in the area.

Policy CS7: Location of Development
There were almost 45 representations relating to this policy. The strategy of concentrating development on Coalville received broad support though there were some objections from local residents seeking a more equitable distribution of development. Otherwise, the broad development strategy received relatively few objections.

Policy CS8: Countryside
17 representations were made. Some word changes and additions to types of acceptable development in the Countryside were suggested by several respondents.

Policy CS9: Development Adjoining Swadlincote
There were 8 representations to this policy of which 3 provided some support and 1 more supported but suggested some changes to the policy. The remaining representations considered that more explanation was required; no evidence to support development in NWL to meet the needs of South Derbyshire ; that part A required clarification as to how decisions will be made whilst Part D does not define an area of separation; policy should

positively allow for a mixed use development comprising employment, housing and community facilities and the regeneration and growth of Swadlincote is a strategic matter that has not been addressed as a cross-boundary matter.

Policy CS10: Meeting the Development Needs of Business
11 representations were received. Some respondents questioned the amount of employment land proposed and the fact that no distribution is proposed. Some minor clarifications were also requested.

Policy CS11: Education and Training in Connection with New Developments
4 representations were made which generally supported the policy.

Policy CS12: Town and Local Centres
9 representations were made to this policy. Changes were requested to the policy wording seeking reference be made to the historic environment and for consistently with the NPPF and the sequential test. Support was stated for the overall policy, the role of Ashby and the rural centres. Others expressed concern that Ashby should be afforded equal status as Coalville, a new approach is needed to regenerate Coalville and the policy is restrictive in that it only deals with retail uses.

Policy CS13: Rural Economy
3 representations were made to this Policy and which were generally supportive although some concerns that it may be more restrictive than the NPPF.

Policy CS14: Donington Park
3 representations were made and the continued use of the race circuit is supported as is the commitment to public consultation of any future masterplan. Concern raised regarding intensification at the race circuit and the potential noise and traffic congestion that it may produce.

Policy CS15: Distribution of Housing
1,767 representations were made of which 1,606 were in the form of a standard letter and were concerned that this policy allowed too much housing in Ashby to the detriment of the River Mease SAC. There was some support for the overall distribution and specifically for the amount proposed in Ashby. The remaining representations raised a number of concerns including too much housing which will result in more commuting; too much development in Ashby; not enough development in Ashby; not considered all options in Ashby; the amount of development in Ashby based on ease of delivery rather than on the principles of the RSS; too much development in Coalville; not enough development in Coalville; too much development in Castle Donington; more development needed in Ibstock; not enough development in the sustainable villages; distribution not based on an objective assessment of needs of individual settlements; inconsistent with NPPF and not enough development; use of the words 'at least'; impact upon the historical environments of Ashby and Castle Donington; distribution needs to be amended in the event of higher figures, with more development going to the sustainable villages and issues around S106 and transparency.

Policy CS16: Housing Density
8 representations were made to this Policy which supported the objectives of the policy. There were objections to the specification of a minimum density as the policy should be flexible, and concerns that it may conflict with the NPPF; the policy is not based on an assessment of local circumstances (e.g. character of the settlement, marketing issues and infrastructure requirements) that justify the proposed density.

Policy CS17: Housing Mix
6 representations were made with no objection in principle; one respondent noted that there was a logical approach to the types of housing required in the District. However, housebuilders in particular identified the need for a commitment to regularly update the

information upon which decisions regarding mix are made. One representation suggested that housing mix should be determined on a site by site basis. Whilst another welcomed the recognition that future development needs to make provision for the elderly population. A further representation detailed that priority should be given to family homes and single story homes for the elderly and disabled.

Policy CS18: Affordable Housing
23 representations were made. There was general support for the provision of affordable housing. However, several representations considered the wording of the policy to be over-restrictive as it sets a minimum requirement and therefore the Policy lacks flexibility.
A number of representations considered the viability evidence to be out of date and that there is a failure to recognise the cost implication of other policy and infrastructure requirements.

Policy CS19: Rural 'Exception' Sites for Affordable Housing
1 representation was received which welcomed the recognition that market housing may be needed in order to make affordable provision viable.

Policy CS20: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
7 representations were made to this policy. There was some general support for the policy. Clarification was sought as to how provision would be made after 2016 and it was stated that more background information would be useful. Amendments sought to policy wording as it was considered too restrictive and not in accordance with national policy.

Policy CS21: Well-Designed Buildings and Places
8 representations were made, with the primary concern being that of the impact on the financial viability of housebuilding and that this had not been tested. Statutory consultees and amenity groups were supportive of the principle and content.

Policy CS22: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

There were 50 representations on this policy. Many of the representations from local people were concerned that there was not sufficient capacity in the existing infrastructure- especially roads, drainage, education and health- to cope with additional growth. Other representations wanted the Infrastructure Plan to contain more detail. Developers tended to highlight the need for developments to be viable and were concerned that there was no assessment of the likely costs and viability impacts of all the proposed requirements placed on development.

Policy CS23: Transport
This Policy attracted 5 responses. Some concern was raised about the following elements; residual cumulative impact of new development on the road network, that new housing should be linked to new employment areas and that the Policy should refer to connectivity between tourist centres. Another representation highlighted concern in relation to the first part of the policy which does not allow for development on farms which would prevent diversification projects and conflict with the NPPF.

Policy CS24: Climate Change and New Development
17 representations were made. Some concern was raised by the development industry over the use of the terms "low and zero carbon" and the impact of the policy on the financial viability of housebuilding had not been tested. Some support for the principle of the of the policy.

Policy CS25: Sustainability and New Development
12 representations were made, following similar lines to the comments made to CS24 although there was minimal support for CS25 either in principle or its specifics. There was some concern over duplication in respect of both CS24 and Building Regulations.

Policy CS26: Flood Risk
Some 38 representations were made, of which 22 were in the form of a standard objection letter in respect of pre-existing flooding issues. The primary issue raised was concern over the impact that new housing development would have in exacerbating existing or causing new, flooding problems.

Policy CS27: Groundwater Protection and Land Instability
2 representations were made to this policy. There was support for the principle of the policy but amendments were sought to policy wording in order to provide clarification and to be in line with Environment Agency Model Procedures.

Policy CS28: Strategic Green Infrastructure
6 representations were made to this policy, 4 of which stated support for the policy. Amendments were sought to policy wording to include clarification of role of new development and Green Infrastructure. Comments were also received with respect to Areas of Separation and that these should be agreed with community groups and parish councils.

Policy CS29: open Space, Sport and Recreation
15 representations were made. There was support for the protection or replacement of facilities and the requirement for new housing to make provision for appropriate sport, open space and recreation facilities based on an up to date assessment of need. There was some concern that the open space requirements do not reflect district variations and that the Policy should provide for more recreation not less whilst there were also concerns regarding the potential loss of open spaces in urban areas as this is where it is most needed for health and well-being reasons. A number of responses from developers suggested that the 2008 study needs updating as it cannot be considered up to date and robust evidence.

Policy CS30: The National Forest
10 representations were received, with both support (particularly for the principle) and objections. There were some requests for revisions and also objections related to clarity and scope of the policy.

Policy CS31 Charnwood Forest Regional Park
4 representations were made of which two supported the overall approach whilst one considered that part a) should be amended to include agricultural development as a means to maintaining the traditional working landscape of the area and one that policy should include reference to the ecological significance of the Charnwood Forest.

Policy CS32 Natural Environment
9 representations were received, with the principle of CS32 being considered appropriate. A number of key additions and alterations to both the supporting text and policy itself were requested from statutory consultees for purposes of clarity and NPPF-compliance.

Policy CS33: River Mease Special Area of Conservation
1,696 representations were made of which 1,604 were in the form of a standard letter which considered that the amount of new housing development proposed in Ashby is too high as it will impact upon the River Mease SAC and that the Habitats Regulations Assessment and Strategic Environmental are based on flawed information. Other concerns raised included that the policy should be reworded so as to support development proposals which could improve water quality; land south of Ashby (Packington Nook) has the potential to improve water quality; the Water Cycle Study did not consider all options for resolving issues in River Mease; improvements should be funded by OFWAT and not through the Developer Contributions Scheme; package treatment plants and cesspits should not be allowed; the Saltersford Brook which is a tributary of the River Mease is being contaminated by minewater and that some reference should be made to this and the current joint work with Severn Trent and the Coal Authority, There were 2 representations which supported the overall approach but which suggested some amended wording whilst there was 1 representation in support.

CS34: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment
2 representations were made to this policy. One supported whilst one representation considered that some changes would be required to make it sound in relation to the NPPF.

Policy CS35: Coalville Urban Area
There were around 500 individual objections (excluding petition signatories) to the exclusion of the Bardon Relief Road from the Plan's proposals (these were registered as objections to Chapter 8). These objections focussed on the environmental consequences of additional traffic using Bardon Road. Otherwise, Policy CS35 itself attracted 45 representations- mainly from local residents. These included objections to the scale of development proposed at Coalville, loss of community identity and issues relating to the Green Wedge/Area of Separation. There were several developer representations seeking more development in Coalville and raising more detailed, site-specific issues. Concern about the lack of reference to local heritage assets was also raised.

Policy CS36: Coalville Urban Area Broad Growth Locations
Policy CS36 attracted 160 representations. Local people raised concerns about the Bardon Relief Road, the scale of development being proposed for Coalville and the ability of infrastructure to cope with new development. Some developers questioned the deliverability of the SE Coalville Growth option. There were particular comments about the need to improve the Hugglescote Crossroads and concerns about the impact upon the existing rail crossing at Grange Road as well as heritage assets.

Policy CS37: Ashby de la Zouch
There were 35 representations on Policy CS37 with many residents raising objections to the scale of development proposed for Ashby and the capacity of infrastructure to cope with more housing growth. In addition to developer support for the proposed direction of growth, other housing options were put forward. Some concerns relating to the impact of development on heritage assets.

Policy CS38: Castle Donington
There were 13 representations relating to a variety of matters. Some concerns raised regarding heritage issues.

Policy CS39: Ibstock
There were 434 representations concerning this policy- most were objecting to the review of the Area of Separation between Ibstock and Heather and the broad location of housing growth to the west of the village. A number of developers/landowners put forward alternative development options.

Policy CS40: Kegworth
There were 9 representations concerning policy CS40, some of these concerned similar matters raised elsewhere e.g. heritage.

Policy CS41: Measham
12 representations were made. Most of the comments concerned the infrastructure requirements associated with the proposed housing growth location.

Policy CS42: Rural Area
8 representations were made and largely concerned level of housing development in the Sustainable Villages, with a number of developers seeking a higher level of provision.